CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONTAINING

THE PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES

OF THE

SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION,

ALSO

SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SENATE.

VOLUME L.

WASHINGTON
1913



VOLUME L, PART I.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,

SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SENATE,

AND

SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SENATE.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *March 4, 1913.*

THOMAS R. MARSHALL, Vice President of the United States, to whom the oath was administered at the close of the last regular session of the Sixty-second Congress, called the Senate to order and said:

Let us reverently attend while the Chaplain invokes the blessing of the God of our fathers and our God upon us.

Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., the Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, at the opening of this Congress we stand before Thee to acknowledge Thy Providence and to implore the continuance of Thy favor toward this Thy people. Bend over us, we humbly beseech Thee, and hearken unto our prayer.

We ask Thy blessing, our Father, upon him who this day surrenders the high office to which he was called by the suffrages of this people. We pray Thee to watch over him, to direct his feet into the paths of peace, and to keep him in the memory and esteem of this people.

We pray Thee, most merciful God, to bless Thy servants, the President and Vice President of the United States. Anoint them with Thy Spirit and plenteously endue them with Thy grace. Protect them by Thy heavenly power and direct them by Thy counsel, that they may serve Thee with reverence and godly fear.

For all who, by the suffrages of this people, are called to exercise authority, we pray that as they rule by Thy favor, so they may serve in Thy fear and with an eye single to Thy glory.

We pray Thee, O God, to bless our country. Deliver us from violence without and from discord within. Defend our liberties and uphold our free institutions. Extend unto us the peace that floweth as a river, enriching our borders with peaceable industries and with honorable toil. Upon the altar of the hearts of this people kindle into flame the fire of patriotic devotion, that, by Thy grace, this may be that happy Nation whose God is the Lord.

We invoke Thy blessing upon this Congress, begun in Thy name. So direct their deliberations and order their counsels that the time may be hastened when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our God and of His Christ.

And unto Thee, O God, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom and whose dominion endureth throughout all generations be glory and praise now and forevermore. Amen.

ADDRESS OF VICE PRESIDENT MARSHALL.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators, the proprieties of this occasion probably require a few words from one who is grateful to the American people for the honor heretofore done him and this day consummated.

No Senator has, I trust, a keener appreciation of the necessities in the way of tact and courtesy now devolving upon me than I myself. I offer no surety as to my discharge of duties other than a personal pledge that I will seek to familiarize myself with them and will endeavor always to exercise that complaisance and forbearance which are essential to him who ably presides over great debates upon great public questions by great men.

Divergent views relative to this body would be less divergent if the American people would come to realize that on all sides of real questions much may truthfully be said. Such an attitude of the public mind would eliminate the view that this body is distinctively deliberative and not thoroughly patriotic.

Charges of bad faith based upon an attitude of mind or upon conduct should never be made until it is clearly established that the resultant action is the outcome of personal interest or improper and dishonorable business or social relations.

Your action has not always met with universal approval, but up to this good hour no workable substitute for the exercise of the functions of this body has been proposed. It is not needful for me here and now to accept a brief in your defense. This body will continue to stand, not because of its Presiding Officer, but because of the patriotism and intelligence of its constituent Members and their devotion to our system of government.

To my mind, government is the harness with which a people draws its load of civilization. If the harness be properly adjusted the load, though heavy, will be drawn with ease and no part of the people will be galled. The Senate is the blinders, intended to keep the people from shying at imaginary dangers and toppling into the ditch our system of government. So long as the blinders serve this purpose they are a most valuable part of the harness, but if they be drawn so closely to the eyes as to prevent the seeing of real dangers, then they should either be spread or done away with entirely. I am one of those who think that we can so adjust our blinders as to meet new conditions and render us sanely responsive to every reasonable demand of the people without disturbing any of the checks and balances of our system of government and preserving with loyalty and fidelity the ancient ideals of the Republic.

With neither right nor desire to infringe upon the prerogatives of the President so soon to be, I beg the expression of the opinion that whatever diverse views may be held relative to the work of this body all persons are agreed that under the Constitution the Senate of the United States is singularly the guardian of the people's honor; that more and more as righteousness is exalted among this people the idea is becoming more firmly fixed that it is not vast territory, great wealth, nor large learning which mark the real status of America; that America is to be measured by the golden metewand of honor; and as the idea in her formation was the inherent right of men to rule themselves, that now she can ill afford to announce this doctrine in her own land and renounce it for an instrument of oppression in other lands.

Unfortunately there is no fixed standard of honor outside the dictionary. The gambler may hold it to consist in paying his gambling debts, the member of the smart set in divorcing his neighbor's wife before taking her unto himself, the Senator in eliminating personalities. But when we enter the chancelleries of the world and submit to their judgments not only our right to be but our right to be respected, we can hope to be measured in but one way, and we must be able to show that the solemn treaty obligations of this Republic will be kept with the same scrupulous honesty, both of spirit and letter, whether made with the humblest people of this continent struggling for self-government or with the mightiest monarch of the Old World. This high sense of honor constitutes the panoply of the American people. Armies and battleships furnish no substitute for it. These are valuable, but the people never intended that authority should use them as accessories to a burglar's kit.

If anyone, in the name of the American people, either in violation of treaty obligations or the manifest purpose of the Monroe doctrine, has taken aught while this body was deliberating, it is your duty to ascertain all facts thereto. And if wrong or injustice has been done, even to the humblest republic, let this people be brave enough and sufficiently honest to make reparation. The real greatness of this Republic rests upon its unsullied honor, and it is the duty of this body to search down rumors of bad faith and dishonesty and to rectify wrong wherever wrong is discovered.

Here in this most sacred spot where war has been made and peace declared; here in the presence of the distinguished representatives of the Governments of the civilized world; here

265942

within the hearing of the beauty, culture, and ripened statecraft of his own land may one humble American express the hope before he enters upon a four years' silence that all our diplomacy may spell peace with all peoples, justice for all Governments, and righteousness the world around.

PROCLAMATION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the proclamation of the President convening the Senate in extraordinary session.

The Secretary (Charles G. Bennett) read the proclamation, as follows:

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Whereas public interests require that the Senate of the United States be convened at 12 o'clock on the 4th day of March next to receive such communications as may be made by the Executive;

Now, therefore, I, William Howard Taft, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim and declare that an extraordinary occasion requires the Senate of the United States to convene at the Capitol, in the city of Washington, on the 4th day of March next, at 12 o'clock noon, of which all persons who shall at that time be entitled to act as Members of that body are hereby required to take notice.

Given under my hand and the seal of the United States at Washington the 13th day of February in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and thirteen, and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and thirty-seventh.

[SEAL.] WM. H. TAFT.

By the President:

P. C. KNOX,

Secretary of State.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The names of the newly elected Senators will be called, four at a time, Mr. Secretary, and as their names are called they will present themselves at the Vice President's desk for the purpose of taking the oath of office.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. BACON, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. BORAH, and Mr. BURLEIGH.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama, Mr. BRADY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Maine, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. COLT, Mr. FALL, Mr. GOFF, and Mr. HUGHES.

These Senators (with the exception of Mr. GOFF), escorted by Mr. LIPPITT, Mr. CATRON, and Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk and the oath was administered to them.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. JAMES, Mr. KENYON, Mr. LANE, and Mr. MARTIN of Virginia.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, and Mr. SWANSON, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk and the oath was administered to them.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. NELSON, Mr. NORRIS, Mr. OWEN, and Mr. RANSDELL.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. CLAPP, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. GORE, and Mr. THORNTON, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk and the oath was administered to them.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. SAULSBURY, Mr. SHAFROTH, and Mr. SHEPPARD.

These Senators (with the exception of Mr. ROBINSON), escorted by Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. CULBERSON, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk and the oath was administered to them.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. SHIELDS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, and Mr. STERLING.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. LEA, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. TOWNSEND, and Mr. CRAWFORD, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk and the oath was administered to them.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. TILLMAN, Mr. VARDAMAN, and Mr. WALSH.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. BRISTOW, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. MYERS, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk and the oath was administered to them.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. WARREN and Mr. WEEKS.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. CLARK of Wyoming and Mr. LODGE, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk and the oath was administered to them.

LIST OF SENATORS.

The list of Senators, by States, is as follows:

Alabama—John H. Bankhead and Joseph F. Johnston.
Arizona—Henry F. Ashurst and Marcus A. Smith.
Arkansas—James P. Clarke.
California—George C. Perkins and John D. Works.
Colorado—John F. Shafroth and Charles S. Thomas.
Connecticut—Frank B. Brandegee and George P. McLean.
Delaware—Henry A. du Pont and Willard Saulsbury.
Florida—Nathan P. Bryan and Duncan U. Fletcher.
Georgia—Augustus O. Bacon and Hoke Smith.
Idaho—William E. Borah and James H. Brady.
Illinois—
Indiana—John W. Kern and Benjamin F. Shively.
Iowa—Albert B. Cummins and William S. Kenyon.
Kansas—Joseph L. Bristow and William H. Thompson.
Kentucky—William O. Bradley and Ollie M. James.
Louisiana—Joseph E. Ransdell and John R. Thornton.
Maine—Edwin C. Burleigh and Charles F. Johnson.
Maryland—William P. Jackson and John Walter Smith.
Massachusetts—Henry Cabot Lodge and John W. Weeks.
Michigan—William Alden Smith and Charles E. Townsend.
Minnesota—Moses E. Clapp and Knute Nelson.
Mississippi—John Sharp Williams and James K. Vardaman.
Missouri—William J. Stone.
Montana—Henry L. Myers and Thomas J. Walsh.
Nebraska—Gilbert M. Hitchcock and George W. Norris.
Nevada—Francis G. Newlands and Key Pittman.
New Hampshire—Jacob H. Gallinger.
New Jersey—William Hughes and James E. Martine.
New Mexico—Thomas B. Catron and Albert B. Fall.
New York—James A. O'Gorman and Elihu Root.
North Carolina—Lee S. Overman and F. M. Simmons.
North Dakota—Asle J. Gronna and Porter J. McCumber.
Ohio—Theodore E. Burton and Atlee Pomerene.
Oklahoma—Thomas P. Gore and Robert L. Owen.
Oregon—George E. Chamberlain and Harry Lane.
Pennsylvania—George T. Oliver and Boies Penrose.
Rhode Island—LeBaron B. Colt and Henry F. Lippitt.
South Carolina—Ellison D. Smith and Benjamin R. Tillman.
South Dakota—Coe I. Crawford and Thomas Sterling.
Tennessee—Luke Lea and John K. Shields.
Texas—Charles A. Culberson and Morris Sheppard.
Utah—Reed Smoot and George Sutherland.
Vermont—William P. Dillingham and Carroll S. Page.
Virginia—Thomas S. Martin and Claude A. Swanson.
Washington—Wesley L. Jones and Miles Poindexter.
West Virginia—William E. Chilton.
Wisconsin—Robert M. La Follette and Isaac Stephenson.
Wyoming—Clarence D. Clark and Francis E. Warren.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the order of the Senate for the inauguration of the President of the United States upon the east front of the Capitol.

The President elect, Woodrow Wilson, accompanied by the Chief Justice of the United States, the joint committee on arrangements of the two Houses, the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, and followed by the ambassadors of and ministers plenipotentiary from foreign countries, the Members of the Senate, preceded by the Vice President and Secretary of the Senate, the Members of the House of Representatives, preceded by the Speaker and Clerk, and the other guests of the Senate proceeded to the inaugural platform at the east front of the Capitol.

The oath of office having been administered to the President elect by the Chief Justice of the United States, he delivered the following

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

There has been a change of government. It began two years ago, when the House of Representatives became Democratic by a decisive majority. It has now been completed. The Senate about to assemble will also be Democratic. The offices of President and Vice President have been put into the hands of Democrats. What does the change mean? That is the question that is uppermost in our minds to-day. That is the question I am going to try to answer, in order, if I may, to interpret the occasion.

It means much more than the mere success of a party. The success of a party means little except when the Nation is using that party for a large and definite purpose. No one can mistake the purpose for which the Nation now seeks to use the Democratic Party. It seeks to use it to interpret a change in its own plans and point of view. Some old things with which we had grown familiar, and which had begun to creep into the very habit of our thought and of our lives, have altered their aspect as we have latterly looked critically upon them with fresh,

awakened eyes; have dropped their disguises and shown themselves alien and sinister. Some new things, as we look frankly upon them, willing to comprehend their real character, have come to assume the aspect of things long believed in and familiar, stuff of our own convictions. We have been refreshed by a new insight into our own life.

We see that in many things that life is very great. It is incomparably great in its material aspects, in its body of wealth, in the diversity and sweep of its energy, in the industries which have been conceived and built up by the genius of individual men and the limitless enterprise of groups of men. It is great, also, very great, in its moral force. Nowhere else in the world have noble men and women exhibited in more striking forms the beauty and the energy of sympathy and helpfulness and counsel in their efforts to rectify wrong, alleviate suffering, and set the weak in the way of strength and hope. We have built up, moreover, a great system of government, which has stood through a long age as in many respects a model for those who seek to set liberty upon foundations that will endure against fortuitous change, against storm and accident. Our life contains every great thing, and contains it in rich abundance.

But the evil has come with the good, and much fine gold has been corroded. With riches has come inexcusable waste. We have squandered a great part of what we might have used, and have not stopped to conserve the exceeding bounty of nature, without which our genius for enterprise would have been worthless and impotent, scorning to be careful, shamefully prodigal as well as admirably efficient. We have been proud of our industrial achievements, but we have not hitherto stopped thoughtfully enough to count the human cost, the cost of lives snuffed out, of energies overtaxed and broken, the fearful physical and spiritual cost to the men and women and children upon whom the dead weight and burden of it all has fallen pitilessly the years through. The groans and agony of it all had not yet reached our ears, the solemn, moving undertone of our life, coming up out of the mines and factories and out of every home where the struggle had its intimate and familiar seat. With the great Government went many deep secret things which we too long delayed to look into and scrutinize with candid, fearless eyes. The great Government we loved has too often been made use of for private and selfish purposes, and those who used it had forgotten the people.

At last a vision has been vouchsafed us of our life as a whole. We see the bad with the good, the debased and decadent with the sound and vital. With this vision we approach new affairs. Our duty is to cleanse, to reconsider, to restore, to correct the evil without impairing the good, to purify and humanize every process of our common life without weakening or sentimentalizing it. There has been something crude and heartless and unfeeling in our haste to succeed and be great. Our thought has been "Let every man look out for himself, let every generation look out for itself," while we reared giant machinery which made it impossible that any but those who stood at the levers of control should have a chance to look out for themselves. We had not forgotten our morals. We remembered well enough that we had set up a policy which was meant to serve the humblest as well as the most powerful, with an eye single to the standards of justice and fair play, and remembered it with pride. But we were very heedless and in a hurry to be great.

We have come now to the sober second thought. The scales of heedlessness have fallen from our eyes. We have made up our minds to square every process of our national life again with the standards we so proudly set up at the beginning and have always carried at our hearts. Our work is a work of restoration.

We have itemized with some degree of particularity the things that ought to be altered, and here are some of the chief items: A tariff which cuts us off from our proper part in the commerce of the world, violates the just principles of taxation, and makes the Government a facile instrument in the hands of private interests; a banking and currency system based upon the necessity of the Government to sell its bonds 50 years ago and perfectly adapted to concentrating cash and restricting credits; an industrial system which, take it on all its sides, financial as well as administrative, holds capital in leading strings, restricts the liberties and limits the opportunities of labor, and exploits without renewing or conserving the natural resources of the country; a body of agricultural activities never yet given the efficiency of great business undertakings or served as it should be through the instrumentality of science taken directly to the farm, or afforded the facilities of credit best suited to its practical needs; watercourses undeveloped, waste places unreclaimed, forests untended, fast disappearing without plan or prospect of renewal, unregarded waste heaps at every mine. We have studied as perhaps no other nation has the most effective means of production, but we have not studied cost or economy as we should either as organizers of industry, as statesmen, or as individuals.

Nor have we studied and perfected the means by which government may be put at the service of humanity, in safeguarding the health of the Nation, the health of its men and its women and its children, as well as their rights in the struggle for existence. This is no sentimental duty. The firm basis of government is justice, not pity. These are matters of justice. There can be no equality or opportunity, the first essential of justice in the body politic, if men and women and children be not shielded in their lives, their very vitality, from the consequences of great industrial and social processes which they can not alter, control, or singly cope with. Society must see to it that it does not itself crush or weaken or damage its own constituent parts. The first duty of law is to keep sound the society it serves. Sanitary laws, pure-food laws, and laws determining conditions of labor which individuals are powerless to determine for themselves are intimate parts of the very business of justice and legal efficiency.

These are some of the things we ought to do, and not leave the others undone, the old-fashioned, never-to-be-neglected, fundamental safeguarding of property and of individual right. This is the high enterprise of the new day: To lift everything that concerns our life as a Nation to the light that shines from the hearthfire of every man's conscience and vision of the right. It is inconceivable that we should do this as partisans; it is inconceivable we should do it in ignorance of the facts as they are or in blind haste. We shall restore, not destroy. We shall deal with our economic system as it is and as it may be modified, not as it might be if we had a clean sheet of paper to write upon; and step by step we shall make it what it should be, in the spirit of those who question their own wisdom and seek counsel and knowledge, not shallow self-satisfaction or the excitement of excursions whither they can not tell. Justice, and only justice, shall always be our motto.

And yet it will be no cool process of mere science. The Nation has been deeply stirred, stirred by a solemn passion, stirred by the knowledge of wrong, of ideals lost, of government too often debauched and made an instrument of evil. The feelings with which we face this new age of right and opportunity sweep across our heartstrings like some air out of God's own presence, where justice and mercy are reconciled and the judge and the brother are one. We know our task to be no mere task of politics, but a task which shall search us through and through, whether we be able to understand our time and the need of our people, whether we be indeed their spokesmen and interpreters, whether we have the pure heart to comprehend and the rectified will to choose our high course of action.

This is not a day of triumph; it is a day of dedication. Here muster, not the forces of party, but the forces of humanity. Men's hearts wait upon us; men's lives hang in the balance; men's hopes call upon us to say what we will do. Who shall live up to the great trust? Who dares fail to try? I summon all honest men, all patriotic, all forward-looking men, to my side. God helping me, I will not fail them, if they will but counsel and sustain me!

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m., and the Vice President took the chair.

HOUR OF MEETING.

On motion of Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, it was:

Ordered, That the hour of the daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian until otherwise ordered.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 5, 1913, at 12 o'clock m.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *March 5, 1913.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, to the end that the presence of a quorum may be ascertained I suggest the lack of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Brady	Catron	Clarke, Ark.
Bacon	Brandegee	Chamberlain	Colt
Bankhead	Bristow	Chilton	Culberson
Borah	Bryan	Clapp	Cummins
Bradley	Burton	Clark, Wyo.	Dillingham

du Pont	Lippitt	Pittman	Sterling
Fall	Lodge	Pomerene	Stone
Fletcher	McCumber	Ransdell	Sutherland
Gallinger	McLean	Root	Swanson
Gore	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Thomas
Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Shafroth	Thompson
Hughes	Myers	Sheppard	Thornton
Jackson	Nelson	Shields	Tillman
James	Newlands	Shively	Townsend
Johnson, Me.	Norris	Simmons	Vardaman
Johnston, Ala.	O'Gorman	Smith, Ariz.	Warren
Jones	Oliver	Smith, Ga.	Walsh
Kenyon	Overman	Smith, Md.	Weeks
Kern	Owen	Smith, Mich.	Williams
La Follette	Page	Smith, S. C.	Works
Lane	Penrose	Smoot	
Lea	Perkins	Stephenson	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to offer the resolution I send to the desk. I offer the resolution at the suggestion of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], and I therefore take the liberty to suggest that he be made chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 2) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of five Senators be appointed to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed as the committee under the resolution Mr. KERN, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. ROOT.

WOMAN-SUFFRAGE PROCESSION.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if it is in order I should like to submit a resolution. I have prepared it very hastily, the handwriting is not very clear, and I will therefore read it before sending it to the Secretary's desk:

Whereas the superintendent of police of the District of Columbia was, by a joint resolution of the Congress, directed to stop all ordinary traffic along Pennsylvania Avenue between the hours of 3 p. m. and 5 p. m. on Monday, the 3d day of March, 1913, and prevent any interference with the suffrage procession on that day; and

Whereas it is charged by the press and by many of those participating therein that the said resolution was not adequately or properly regarded or enforced upon the occasion mentioned, and that the said procession was seriously interfered with: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, directed to make a full, immediate, and rigid inquiry and investigation into the truth or falsity of said charge, and report their conclusions to the Senate at the next session thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Colorado that the substance of the resolution was adopted by the Senate on yesterday in a resolution offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], and another resolution was offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. THOMAS. If such a resolution has been offered and adopted, this resolution is unnecessary, and, of course, I shall withdraw it; but it is a subject——

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator from Colorado will allow me——

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. BRISTOW. I will state that yesterday morning the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] introduced a resolution almost identical in language, I think, and it was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and reported back to the Senate and adopted yesterday.

Mr. THOMAS. That being the case, I withdraw this resolution.

Mr. JONES. If the Senator will allow me, I will state that the resolution I introduced directed the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate to make the investigation.

Mr. THOMAS. I was not aware of the fact that such a resolution had been introduced and adopted. I am very glad to know that it has been done, because I consider that this matter——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Chair understand that the Senator from Colorado wishes to withdraw the resolution?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have withdrawn the resolution, but I consider the matter of such great importance that it should not be allowed to slumber. It ought to be investigated and reported upon as soon as possible to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, before the matter passes from consideration I wish to say that as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia for the time being I have taken notice of the resolution adopted yesterday and I have appointed a subcommittee for the purpose of making this very investigaton.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution is withdrawn.

RECESS.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire, if any Senator can inform me, about what time the committee appointed to wait on the President will make its report?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks there is no information on the subject.

Mr. BACON. I will state that in the nature of things it must necessarily be 20 or 30 minutes; possibly more than that.

Mr. GORE. I move that the Senate take a recess until 1 o'clock.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Say 1.30.

Mr. GORE. Very well; I will make it 1.30.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma moves that the Senate take a recess until 1.30 o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma that there is no use to take such a long recess. One o'clock will give plenty of time for the committee to go to the White House and come back.

Mr. GORE. I will make it 1 o'clock, and ask that the question be put on my motion as originally offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma modifies his motion and moves that the Senate take a recess until 1 o'clock.

Mr. BACON. I suggest to Senators that we all wish, of course, to be present at the expiration of the recess, and it is known to everyone that between 1 and 2 o'clock it is extremely difficult for Senators to be here. It would be better for us to have the hour of reassembling after the recess fixed for such time as may be convenient for all Senators to be present. We have no other work to do but this, and it will be very much better to have it so rather than to have a partial attendance of the Senate at that time. If we meet at 1 o'clock, before the work can be done the Senate will become thin within a very few moments. I will not offer it in the form of an amendment or endeavor to effect any change unless it is agreeable to the maker of the motion; but it seems to me it would be very much better to have the hour for reassembling fixed a little later.

Mr. GORE. I will, of course, defer my judgment to that of the Senator from Georgia, though other Senators had suggested to me to move a recess to 1 o'clock. I therefore modify my motion by making the hour for reassembling 2 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma moves that the Senate take a recess until the hour of 2 o'clock p. m. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senate stands in recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock p. m., when it reassembled.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Bacon	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Hughes	Norris	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Jackson	O'Gorman	Smith, S. C.
Brady	James	Oliver	Smoot
Brandegee	Johnson, Me.	Overman	Stephenson
Bryan	Johnston, Ala.	Owen	Sterling
Burton	Jones	Page	Stone
Catron	Kenyon	Penrose	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Kern	Perkins	Thomas
Chilton	La Follette	Pittman	Thompson
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Pomerene	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Lea	Ransdell	Townsend
Colt	Lippitt	Root	Warren
Culberson	Lodge	Shafroth	Walsh
du Pont	McCumber	Sheppard	Weeks
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Shields	Williams
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	Works

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names, and there is a quorum of the Senate present.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. KERN, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. ROOT appeared, and

Mr. KERN said: Mr. President, the committee appointed to wait on the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and ready to receive any communications he may have to make, beg leave to report that

they have performed that duty, and the President replied that he would immediately communicate to the Senate a message in writing.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by M. P. Latta, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BACON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 25 minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

THE CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 3), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That an edition of the Congressional Directory for the first session of the Sixty-third Congress be prepared and published as provided for in section 73 of an act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents, approved January 12, 1895, and that the Secretary of the Senate is directed to pay from the contingent fund for compiling, preparing, and indexing the said edition the sum of $800.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate adjourn to meet on Friday next at 2 o'clock p. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, March 7, 1913, at 2 o'clock p. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 5, 1913.

SECRETARY OF STATE.

William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska, to be Secretary of State.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

William Gibbs McAdoo, of New York, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

SECRETARY OF WAR.

Lindley M. Garrison, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of War.

ATTORNEY GENERAL.

James Clark McReynolds, of Tennessee, to be Attorney General.

POSTMASTER GENERAL.

Albert Sidney Burleson, of Texas, to be Postmaster General.

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

Josephus Daniels, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of the Navy.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Franklin Knight Lane, of California, to be Secretary of the Interior.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

David Franklin Houston, of Missouri, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

William C. Redfield, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce.

SECRETARY OF LABOR.

William Bauchop Wilson, of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of Labor.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONERS.

Edgar E. Clark, of Iowa, to be an interstate commerce commissioner for a term of seven years from January 1, 1913. (Reappointment.)

John H. Marble, of California, to be an interstate commerce commissioner, to fill the unexpired term of Franklin Knight Lane, nominated to be Secretary of the Interior.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 5, 1913.

SECRETARY OF STATE.

William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

William Gibbs McAdoo, of New York.

SECRETARY OF WAR.

Lindley M. Garrison, of New Jersey.

ATTORNEY GENERAL.

James Clark McReynolds, of Tennessee.

POSTMASTER GENERAL.

Albert Sidney Burleson, of Texas.

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

Josephus Daniels, of North Carolina.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Franklin Knight Lane, of California.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

David Franklin Houston, of Missouri.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

William C. Redfield, of New York.

SECRETARY OF LABOR.

William Bauchop Wilson, of Pennsylvania.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER.

Edgar E. Clark, of Iowa.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *March 7, 1913.*

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday last was read and approved.

WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE PROCESSION (S. DOC. NO. 1).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, in response to Senate joint resolution No. 164, copies of official orders pertaining to the woman's suffrage procession on March 3, 1913, issued by the major and superintendent of police on the 1st and 2d days of March, and also a copy of a detailed statement made to the Board of Commissioners by the major and superintendent of police on March 4, 1913, relating to and covering the manner in which the various orders of the major and superintendent of police to his subordinate officers were carried out, etc., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Just Government League of Maryland, relative to the conduct of the police force of the District of Columbia during the woman's suffrage parade on Monday, March 3, 1913, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS ON LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators, I am traveling here more with your hearts than with my head. There are certain communications which, in my judgment, require the action of both Houses of Congress. I deem it unadvisable to hand them down to be referred at this extraordinary session, but I desire to challenge the judgment of the Senate as to my duty to hand them down. I am ruling that I should hand down nothing except matters which can be taken up and disposed of by the Senate at the present extraordinary session.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I would say that the judgment of the Chair, in my opinion, is correct—that nothing shall be submitted to the Senate in its executive session except such communications as relate to matters that the Senate at this extraordinary session by itself can dispose of. I would suggest that the proper course would be to retain them, and when the Senate is in session at the extra session of Congress, then to lay them before the Senate.

I should suppose, if the Chair were in doubt as to any particular communications, that that matter might be laid before the Senate for its disposition.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I can not at this minute readily recall any sort of communication that could find its way to the desk at this time which would require the joint action of the two Houses. I think the statement of the situation by the Chair is a complete indication of the proper course. These documents will have to remain on the desk of the Vice President until there is another House in session to take cognizance of that particular part of the responsibility involved in its required cooperation.

This extraordinary session was called for the purpose of considering executive business, but it is a matter we can not overlook that the dominant political branch of the Senate shall avail itself of the fact that the Senate is now in session to organize along the line of the recent change in political senti-

ment in the country, and the Presiding Officer will find himself almost completely out of a job until that service has been completed. It is now in progress, and no greater length of time will be consumed in disposing of it than the necessities of the case require. We hope when it is done it may be well done, at least to the satisfaction of our complacent brethren on the other side of the Chamber.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After four minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.), on motion of Mr. KERN, the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 10, 1913, at 2 o'clock p. m.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *March 10, 1913.*

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

SENATOR FROM ARKANSAS.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I rise to a question of privilege.

The credentials of Mr. JOSEPH T. ROBINSON, Senator elect from the State of Arkansas, have heretofore been presented to the Senate and are now on file. That gentleman is present, and I ask that the oath of office be administered to him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator elect will present himself at the desk for that purpose.

Mr. ROBINSON was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In pursuance of the terms of section 5581 of the Revised Statutes the Vice President appoints the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] as senatorial Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate adjourn until to-morrow at 2 o'clock p. m.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 11, 1913, at 2 o'clock p. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 10, 1913.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Peter J. Hamilton, of Alabama, to be United States district judge of the district of Porto Rico, vice Paul Charlton, resigned.

FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

Daniel C. Roper, of South Carolina, to be First Assistant Postmaster General, vice Charles P. Grandfield, resigned.

THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

Alexander M. Dockery, of Missouri, to be Third Assistant Postmaster General, vice James J. Britt, resigned.

FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

James I. Blakslee, of Pennsylvania, to be Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, vice Peter V. De Graw, resigned.

COMMISSIONER OF LABOR STATISTICS.

Charles P. Neill, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Jacob G. Galbraith, Fourth Cavalry, to be colonel from March 4, 1913.

Maj. William S. Scott, Cavalry, unassigned, to be lieutenant colonel from March 4, 1913.

Lieut. Col. Joseph A. Gaston, Tenth Cavalry, to be colonel from March 4, 1913, vice Col. James Parker, Eleventh Cavalry, who accepted an appointment as brigadier general on that date.

Maj. Daniel L. Tate, Third Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 4, 1913, vice Lieut. Col. Joseph A. Gaston, Tenth Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Samuel G. Jones, Cavalry, unassigned, to be major from March 4, 1913, vice Maj. Daniel L. Tate, Third Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Melvin W. Rowell, Eleventh Cavalry, to be major from March 6, 1913, vice Maj. Francis J. Koester, Twelfth Cavalry, detailed as adjutant general on that date.

First Lieut. Thomas M. Knox, First Cavalry, to be captain from March 4, 1913, vice Capt. Samuel G. Jones, Cavalry, unassigned, promoted.

First Lieut. Basil N. Rittenhouse, Cavalry, unassigned, to be captain from March 6, 1913, vice Capt. Melvin W. Rowell, Eleventh Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. William R. Taylor, Third Cavalry, to be captain from March 7, 1913, vice Capt. Herbert A. White, Eleventh Cavalry, who resigned his line commission March 6, 1913.

Second Lieut. Donald A. Robinson, Eleventh Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 4, 1913, vice First Lieut. Thomas M. Knox, First Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Bruce L. Burch, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 5, 1913, vice First Lieut. Allen C. Keyes, Fourteenth Cavalry, who died March 4, 1913.

Second Lieut. Edgar M. Whiting, Tenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 7, 1913, vice First Lieut. William R. Taylor, Third Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edward G. Elliott, Ninth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 7, 1913, vice First Lieut. Leon R. Partridge, Third Cavalry, detached from his proper command.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

Lieut. Col. Daniel E. McCarthy, Quartermaster Corps, to be colonel from March 5, 1913, vice Col. Carroll A. Devol, who accepted an appointment as brigadier general in the Quartermaster Corps on that date.

Lieut. Col. George B. Davis, Quartermaster Corps, to be colonel from March 6, 1913, vice Col. Edward E. Dravo, retired from active service March 5, 1913.

Maj. Amos W. Kimball, Quartermaster Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from March 5, 1913, vice Lieut. Col. Daniel E. McCarthy, promoted.

Maj. William H. Hart, Quartermaster Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from March 6, 1913, vice Lieut. Col. George B. Davis, promoted.

SIGNAL CORPS.

Lieut. Col. William A. Glassford, Signal Corps, to be colonel from March 5, 1913, vice Col. George P. Scriven, who accepted an appointment as Chief Signal Officer, with the rank of brigadier general, on that date.

Maj. Samuel Reber, Signal Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from March 5, 1913, vice Lieut. Col. William A. Glassford, promoted.

Capt. Leonard D. Wildman, Signal Corps, to be major from March 5, 1913, vice Maj. Samuel Reber, promoted.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Maj. Wilmot E. Ellis, Coast Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from March 2, 1913, vice Lieut. Col. Gustave W. S. Stevens, retired from active service March 1, 1913.

Capt. Albert G. Jenkins, Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from March 2, 1913, vice Maj. Wilmot E. Ellis, promoted.

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Charles M. Truitt, Twenty-ninth Infantry, to be colonel from March 5, 1913, vice Col. Hunter Liggett, Infantry, unassigned, who accepted an appointment as brigadier general on that date.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

Charles Dudley Daly, late second lieutenant in the Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant of Field Artillery, with rank from March 5, 1913.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Ensign Ralph D. Spalding to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy from the 3d day of March, 1912, to fill a vacancy.

Nathaniel M. Terry, a citizen of Maryland, to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 4th day of March, 1913, in accordance with a provision contained in an act of Congress approved on that date.

William W. Johnson, a citizen of Maryland, to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 4th day of March, 1913, in accordance with a provision contained in an act of Congress approved on that date.

Antoine J. Corbesier, a citizen of Maryland, to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of March, 1913, in accordance with a provision contained in an act of Congress approved on that date.

Henry P. Torrey, a citizen of the District of Columbia, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 16th day of February, 1913, to fill a vacancy.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 10, 1913.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER.

John H. Marble, to be an interstate commerce commissioner.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *March 11, 1913.*

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by Rev. John Van Schaick, jr., of the city of Washington

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	James	Page	Smoot
Bacon	Johnson, Me.	Penrose	Sterling
Bankhead	Johnston, Ala.	Perkins	Stone
Bradley	Jones	Ransdell	Sutherland
Brandegee	Kern	Robinson	Swanson
Bristow	La Follette	Root	Thomas
Catron	Lane	Saulsbury	Thompson
Chamberlain	Lea	Shafroth	Thornton
Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Sheppard	Tillman
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Shields	Townsend
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Vardaman
Fall	Myers	Simmons	Walsh
Fletcher	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	Warren
Gallinger	Newlands	Smith, Ga.	Weeks
Gore	O'Gorman	Smith, Md.	Williams
Hitchcock	Overman	Smith, Mich.	Works
Hughes	Owen	Smith, S. C.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 17 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next at 2 o'clock p. m.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, March 13, 1913, at 2 o'clock p. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 11, 1913.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Thomas Corbally, of Montana, to be receiver of public moneys at Great Falls, Mont., vice James W. Roberts, recess appointee, failed of confirmation.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Robert N. Sutherlin, of Montana, to be register of the land office at Great Falls, Mont., vice Julius C. Peters, recess appointee, failed of confirmation.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *March 13, 1913.*

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday last was read and approved.

SERVICE OF PROCESS ON SENATE COMMITTEE.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

I desire to say that in the performance of my duty as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations directed to inquire into certain phases of the Mexican and Cuban rebellion I came into the possession of many facts and papers bearing upon that question, and at New Orleans certain papers came into the possession of the Senate subcommittee, of which I am chairman, which are now demanded by the courts.

This morning I was served with a subpœna duces tecum to produce certain of those papers to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana in the New Orleans division. As I am acting in the purely representative capacity I do not desire to assume the responsibility of passing upon the question of jurisdiction, neither do I desire to turn over any papers to that court or any other tribunal without the consent and authority of the Senate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I desire to send to the Secretary's desk the subpœna with which I was served, and before finally disposing of the matter by reference or otherwise I ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I trust the Senator will reconsider that request to have the paper read and go into the RECORD. I think it is very proper that he should present the paper and have it referred. I do not believe it has enough importance to be put into the RECORD. I think it is an absolute and unwarranted assumption of authority on the part of the court. I do not think it ought to be tolerated by the Senate or recognized in the slightest degree. Official papers in the possession of the Senate can not be taken from the Senate by any court process.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, it is the possibility of such a view prevailing as has been expressed by the Senator from Georgia which, it seems to me, should lead to the presentation of the paper to the Senate.

Mr. BACON. I think that is proper.

Mr. ROOT. Upon the request of the Senator from Michigan I examined the paper a short time ago with some care. It appears to me to be a proceeding to take papers out of the hands of the Senate under the process of the court, threatening a penalty in case the person who holds them as the custodian for the Senate does not comply. I think the proper course to follow in the case of a proceeding of that kind by a coordinate branch of the Government is that the paper should be brought to the attention of the Senate, and that the Committee on the Judiciary should be directed to report to the Senate what course should be followed.

Mr. BACON. I quite agree with the Senator from New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being objection to the reading of the paper——

Mr. BACON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary without reading.

Mr. BACON. I have the floor, if the Chair will pardon me.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

Mr. BACON. I beg the Senator's pardon. I understood that the Senator from Michigan yielded the floor with the presentation of the paper and the request that it be read.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I will yield gladly to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. Before the Senator resumes, as I had not entirely completed when the Senator from New York made his suggestion, I wish to say that I think the Senator from Michigan pursued a course exactly correct in presenting the paper and asking that it should be referred, as has been suggested by the Senator from New York, to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

Mr. BACON. Let me just complete my proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. I think the paper should be referred without reading. I do not think that the reading of it or not reading it is a matter of very grave importance, but I do think the proper direction is a reference to the committee. I, myself, utterly repudiate and deny the right of any court to attempt to take papers of the Senate out of the possession of the Senate by any process it may see fit to issue.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the subpœna had been directed solely to me personally I would not have made the request that it be read for the information of the Senate. My request, however, was made because it is directed to me officially as a member of the committee. That fact I desire Senators to know. Beyond that I have no question at all as to the wisdom of the immediate reference.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. In glancing over the report of the subcommittee which the chairman has filed, I find that quite a number of witnesses testified with the assurance evidently that the evidence given by them would not be used in any court or in any subsequent proceeding. How far that would be binding I do not know; but it seems to me it ought to have some weight with the Senate in its final action with reference to the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, the committee endeavored not to exceed its powers by promising that testimony shall not be used. I do not think in a single instance that has been done without the reservation that such evidence would be used as the Senate might determine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Michigan suspend for a moment, that the Senate may receive a message from the President of the United States?

[A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan will proceed.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If there is no objection upon the part of the Senator from Georgia, I think the orderly way to dispose of the matter is to have the subpœna read. I ask that it be read and that it be then referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. STONE. Will the Senator from Michigan yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. What possible objection would there be to having the subpœna read for the information of the Senate?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think it ought to be read.

Mr. STONE. It is a document about which it seems to me the Senate should be informed. Then let it be referred to the Judiciary Committee for its examination, and that committee can report to the Senate its judgment as to the proceeding that should be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I might say in reply to the Senator from Missouri that the subpœna is returnable on the 27th of March, possibly during the vacation of the Senate, and this disposition of the matter has been deemed wise by members of the Committee on Foreign Relations with whom I have been able to confer in the few moments that have elapsed since I was served with the writ.

Mr. BACON. When the Senator from Michigan yields the floor I desire to say a word.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield now to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. The question of reading the paper is, of course, a matter I do not regard as of sufficient importance to interpose an objection to. It was a mere suggestion on my part that the paper was of a character which might properly be referred without reading; that was all. I think it is giving it a little too much dignity and importance to have it read into the RECORD. That was the only reason why I made the suggestion to the Senator. I did not intend to interpose any objection to such a course as he might suggest would be proper to have it take. If the Senator wants it read, of course I make no objection.

I wish to say that this is not the first time the Senate has had brought to its attention the assumption on the part of another branch of the Government to exercise judicial authority over the acts and proceedings of the Senate, and it was for that reason, remembering the former occasion, that I was probably a little too prompt to interpose my suggestion in regard to the matter.

There was a time within the recent past when a court in this District saw fit to issue a subpœna, a subpœna coupled with a penalty as in this case, calling upon the members of a committee of the Senate to appear before that court and answer to that court for their official acts as a committee of the Senate. The Senate, after a very thorough discussion, refused to recognize such authority in any court, and refused to respond to that summons in any manner, shape, or form. It not only failed to appear but to make any official response except to direct the Secretary of the Senate to inform the court that the Senate did not recognize its authority and would not receive its command in any way.

Of course I have not given this present matter the same consideration and examination which I had the opportunity then to give to the other case. It may be that there are particular circumstances which may justify some other direction being given in this case, but unless something is brought to my attention which will differentiate it in nature and kind from the other proceeding, I shall be very emphatically of the opinion that similar action should be taken in this instance on the part of the Senate.

I hope the subpœna will be read and then referred to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I ask to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

United States of America, District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

The President of the United States to Senator WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH, personally and as the representative and agent of a committee of the United States Senate, Washington, D. C., or wherever found:

You are hereby commanded to be and appear and to bring with you the following papers, to wit:

1. Written order, or orders, directed to A. Baldwin & Co. (Ltd.), of New Orleans, or their manager or representative, and signed by one Vincent or Vincente Segura, in his own name or that of some alias, directing the delivery by A. Baldwin & Co. (Ltd.), of certain arms and ammunition and other articles, the date or dates of said order or orders being unknown, but believed to be either in August or September or December, 1912.

And all other papers and documents or evidence of every character obtained from the said A. Baldwin & Co. (Ltd.). or any representative of said company, during a stay in New Orleans, by Senator WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH and John W. Barbrick, during January, 1913, all pertaining to a certain sale, or sales, of arms and munitions of war by A. Baldwin & Co. (Ltd.), and pertaining to the delivery of such arms and munitions of war.

2. All shipping orders given to or by the agents of the railroad company, believed to be the Illinois Central Railroad Co., for the movement of certain cars containing arms and munitions of war from the warehouse of A. Baldwin & Co. in New Orleans to another place in the city of New Orleans, believed to be a place called Terrys Switch, and from Terrys Switch back to the public warehouse.

3. Bank statement of the New Orleans National Bank, in account with A. Baldwin & Co. (Ltd.).

4. Letter written by New Orleans National Bank to John W. Barbrick, or some one else, in regard to the manner of transferring certain funds from Mexico for A. Baldwin & Co. (Ltd.) or for Vincent Segura.

5. Copy or original of letter received by Stauffer, Eshleman & Co. (Ltd.), of New Orleans, from the Schuster Commission Co., of El Paso, Tex., said to be dated about January 8, 1913.

6. Any and all other papers pertaining to the sale and delivery of arms and munitions of war by A. Baldwin & Co. (Ltd.) before the district court of the United States in and for the said district, to be holden at the city of New Orleans on Thursday, the 27th day of March, 1913, then and there to be used in evidence in a certain cause now pending therein, and to be tried between the United States, plaintiff, *v.* Vincent Segura et al., defendants, and No. 2832 of the criminal docket of this court, at 11 o'clock a. m., and herein fail not under penalty of $250.

Witness the Hon. Rufus E. Foster, judge of said court, at New Orleans, this 7th day of March, A. D. 1913, and the one hundred and thirty-seventh year of American independence.

(Signed) H. J. CARTER, *Clerk.*

CLERK'S OFFICE.

A true copy.
[SEAL.] H. J. CARTER, *Clerk.*

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *March 7, 1913.*

(Indorsement: Return. No. 2832. United States District Court, Eastern District of Louisiana, New Orleans division. United States *v.* Vincent Segura et al. Subpœna duces tecum. Marshal's return.)

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, before the reference is made I wish to say that, if it were not for the fact that I believe under the Federal practice some authority from the judge is required before a subpœna duces tecum of that kind can be issued, I would suppose that its issuance in this case was the act of some irresponsible clerk. I may be mistaken, however, in my recollection of the Federal practice in this regard, and I do not wish to do the judge any injustice.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I ask that the subpœna be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so referred.

PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE AND OFFICERS OF THE SENATE.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the election of President pro tempore of this body.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KERN. I offer the resolution I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 5), as follows:

Resolved, That the Hon. JAMES P. CLARKE, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, be, and he is hereby, elected President of the Senate pro tempore, to hold and exercise the office in the absence of the Vice President from time to time during the pleasure of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I move as an amendment to the resolution to substitute for the name of Hon. JAMES P. CLARKE, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, the name of Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, why should not the vote be taken by ballot, so that Senators may vote for whomsoever they please for President pro tempore instead of voting on just the two names?

Mr. STONE. We can do that on a roll call.

Mr. BRISTOW. I move a roll call on the election of President pro tempore.

Mr. LODGE. I think the resolution must be disposed of first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts moves to substitute the name he has indicated for the name that was incorporated in the resolution offered by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRISTOW. I move, as a substitute, that the roll be called for the purpose of electing a President pro tempore of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair can scarcely entertain that as a substitute for the motion to amend made by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BRISTOW. I offer it as a substitute for the resolution as amended.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think that can be moved as an amendment. That is an attempt to interpose another motion.

Mr. BRISTOW. It is a substitute for the pending motion.

Mr. LODGE. I think it is another method of determining the same question. It is not a substitute or in the nature of an amendment.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senate can determine whether or not it desires to proceed by resolution or roll call, can it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair can not entertain the motion of the Senator from Kansas as a substitute for the motion that has been made to elect, and will put the question on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BRISTOW. Can not the Senate by a vote choose to elect its President pro tempore by ballot, or upon a roll call, instead of by a resolution? Is there anything in the rules that precludes the Senate from determining how the President pro tempore shall be elected?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] has made a motion to proceed to the election of a President pro tempore of the Senate. He has made that motion in the way in which it has usually been done; and until that motion is disposed of, it clearly seems to me no other motion is in order. That motion has been adopted, as I recall it.

Mr. BRISTOW. It has not.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Indiana moved to proceed to the election of a President pro tempore. That motion was adopted. He then offered a resolution. The Senator shakes his head. I ask the Secretary to read the record. I repeat, the Senator from Indiana moved to proceed to the election of a President pro tempore. I think I am correct. That motion was agreed to. Acting under that resolution, the Senator then moved that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] be declared President pro tempore of the Senate.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. And he offered a resolution.

Mr. LODGE. And he offered a resolution to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that, as the Chair recalls it—and he will refresh his memory by looking at the resolution—the Senator from Indiana coupled the request for the election of the Senator from Arkansas as President pro tempore with a motion to proceed to the election.

Mr. LODGE. I ask for the reading of the stenographer's notes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Secretary that the minutes show that the motion to proceed to the election of a President pro tempore was put and carried, and that now the motion of the Senator from Indiana is before the Senate with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BRISTOW. My contention is that a Senator has the right and that it is in order to move that, instead of proceeding by resolution in this way, the roll be called and that we proceed to elect a President pro tempore by a call of the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suggest to the Senator from Kansas that the Chair is of opinion that if the Senator would make a motion that the vote be taken by a call of the roll it would be in order, if the Senate chooses to so decide.

Mr. BRISTOW. Well, I move that the vote for President pro tempore be taken by a call of the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW]. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the roll will be called.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. JACKSON], and therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote for Senator CLARKE of Arkansas.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry. Are pairs to be observed on a vote of this kind?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRANDEGEE in the chair). That is something that the Chair has no authority to decide.

Mr. STONE. Of course the Chair has not, but I express the opinion that pairs should not obtain.

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], who is absent. I therefore withhold my vote. If the junior Senator from Massachusetts were present, I should vote for Senator CLARKE.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote for Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] and shall vote. I vote for Mr. GALLINGER.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and vote. I vote for Mr. GALLINGER.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I am reliably informed that, if he were present, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote for the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. If I were at liberty to vote I would vote for the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. In view of all the facts I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CULBERSON (after having voted for Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas). As I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT], who has not voted, I withdraw my vote.

The result of the vote for President pro tempore was as follows:

FOR MR. CLARKE OF ARKANSAS—41.

Ashurst	Lane	Robinson	Stone
Bacon	Lea	Saulsbury	Swanson
Bankhead	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Thomas
Chamberlain	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Thompson
Fletcher	Newlands	Shields	Thornton
Gore	O'Gorman	Shively	Tillman
Hitchcock	Overman	Simmons	Vardaman
Hughes	Owen	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh
Johnson, Me.	Pittman	Smith, Ga.	
Johnston, Ala.	Pomerene	Smith, Md.	
Kern	Ransdell	Smith, S. C.	

FOR MR. GALLINGER—18.

Bradley	Fall	Page	Sutherland
Brandegee	Jones	Perkins	Townsend
Catron	Lodge	Root	Warren.
Clark, Wyo.	Nelson	Smith, Mich.	
Dillingham	Oliver	Smoot	

FOR MR. CLAPP—1.

Mr. Bristow.

FOR MR. BRISTOW—1.

Mr. Clapp.

FOR MR. BORAH—1.

Mr. La Follette.

NOT VOTING—30.

Borah	Crawford	Kenyon	Reed
Brady	Culberson	Lippitt	Stephenson
Bryan	Cummins	McCumber	Sterling
Burleigh	du Pont	McLean	Weeks
Burton	Gallinger	Myers	Williams
Chilton	Gronna	Norris	Works.
Clarke, Ark.	Jackson	Penrose	
Colt	James	Poindexter	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] has received 1 vote; the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] 1 vote; the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] 1 vote; the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] 18 votes; and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] 41 votes. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] having received a majority of all the votes cast is duly elected President pro tempore of the Senate. The Senator will appear at the desk and take the oath of office.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas advanced to the desk, and the oath of office was administered to him by the Presiding Officer.

Mr. KERN. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana offers a resolution, and asks unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 6), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate do now proceed to the election of the following officers in the order named: Secretary of the Senate, Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, Chaplain of the Senate, Assistant Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. KERN. I desire to add to that resolution the words "and Acting Assistant Doorkeeper of the Senate."

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, those words will be added.

Mr. GORE. I object to the addition of the last clause, for reasons which I will state later if it becomes necessary. I hope the Senator will not make that request.

Mr. OLIVER. I object to the consideration of the original resolution, if that is the case.

Mr. KERN. We can not hear the Senator on this side.

Mr. OLIVER. I say, inasmuch as the addition of the words "Acting Assistant Doorkeeper" is objected to, I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. KERN. Notwithstanding the objection, I move that the Senate proceed to the election of officers in the order named.

Mr. OLIVER. Do I understand the Senator from Indiana to include the Acting Assistant Doorkeeper?

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator will speak louder. It is important we should hear him.

Mr. OLIVER. I asked for information, if the Senator from Indiana included in his resolution the election of Acting Assistant Doorkeeper as well as the other officers?

Mr. KERN. My resolution is there. It speaks for itself. I am sorry I can not acquiesce for the moment in the request of my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the reason why I made the suggestion was because of the fact that I have been informed that Mr. Loeffler has been agreed upon by the caucus on the other side of the Chamber. I appreciate the courtesy which has always been extended by the one side to the other, by the majority to the minority, to allow them to select this particular officer. I am disposed to acquiesce in this precedent and to extend this courtesy, and I regret to have been obliged to raise this particular objection, but I would say, Mr. President, that a matter has come to my attention, a charge going to the official conduct of Mr. Loeffler, which I desire to call to the attention of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. If the charge be true, no Senator in this Chamber, on either side, would consent for him to serve this body in this capacity. If the charge is not founded in fact, then the suspicion ought to be cleared away. In view of the particular matter out of which the charge arose, I think the Committee on Privileges and Elections ought to look into it, and I intend to ask that it be referred to that committee. I will bring the charge to the attention of the committee, together with the witness sustaining the charge. That is the reason why I was obliged, against my will, to interpose this objection. I trust that the election of this officer at this time will not be insisted upon.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a certain party came to me making a charge against another gentleman whose name is incorporated in this resolution, but I have not felt it incumbent upon me to raise the question. There is no proof of the charge. It is a very easy matter to make accusations against anybody. I think the Senate ought not, simply because somebody has said something against Mr. Loeffler, unproven, unsubstantiated, to discriminate against him in the procedure that we are about to take.

I trust no change will be made so far as the phraseology of the resolution is concerned.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I agree generally with what the Senator has suggested. This charge is of such a serious character, however, that I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire would not desire the services of this man if it be true; and if it be not true, the suspicion ought to be removed from the minds of Senators who entertain it. I do not care to state the charge here unless this matter be pressed further.

I therefore move to strike from the pending resolution the clause providing for the election of the Acting Assistant Doorkeeper.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I move that the recommendation embraced in the resolution offered by the Senator from Indiana, so far as it affects the selection of an Acting Assistant Doorkeeper, lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it has always been the custom in the Senate, as it has been in the House, to permit the minority to choose an Assistant Doorkeeper who should be at their service. The service is largely a confidential one. I have seen it done repeatedly when the party now in the majority has been in the minority; and the nominee of the majority for Doorkeeper was chosen to his present position on motion of the then Senator from Maine, Mr. Hale.

There never has been any question raised before on either side as to the right of the minority to have this one officer. It is as unreasonable, it seems to me, to have him selected in any other way than by the minority as to expect to have our private and confidential clerks elected by the conference of the other party.

The conference of the minority thought they knew what they were doing when they selected Mr. Loeffler, who has been long in the service of the Senate. If he is guilty of any offense such as suggested by the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senate may rest assured that the minority will not wish him retained in his place. But I think to turn him down and reject him and lay him aside in this way, on an unnamed charge, from an unnamed accuser, in the presence of the action of the conference of the minority, is an injustice to which no man should be subjected. I sincerely trust we shall be allowed at least to vote upon the matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the universal custom of leaving to the minority the privilege of filling this place carries with it a responsibility resting upon them and not upon the majority at all. They have a right to select anybody whom they please. If they select the wrong sort of man, they have hurt themselves and not the majority. It is not to be assumed that they purposely would have selected a man unfit for the position. The fact that the choice is left to them involves the idea that we shall not question their choice. If, later on, it shall appear from evidence of any description that this officer is guilty of anything which would be unbecoming an officer of the Senate, he can be removed by a vote of the Senate; and in the meanwhile the matter can be first brought by gentlemen upon that side to the attention of the minority caucus, and they can act upon it.

I decline to have ourselves put in a position where we are to be taken by the country as responsible for a selection made by a minority conference. We are responsible only for the selections made by our conference. In according them this place we are doing a courtesy which has grown reverent with age.

I hope the form of the resolution will not be altered, and that we will carry it through as it is, unless Senators upon the other side, with whom the choice is left, choose to withdraw their man. It is their affair and not ours.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I desire to add simply one thought, and that is this: It has been already correctly stated that the responsibility is with the minority. It must be apparent to everyone that when we seek to pass upon the question whether they have selected a fit man, we assume that which we ought not to assume, and that if we should determine that they had presented a man who was not a fit man it would be a reflection upon the minority. Further, Mr. President, if it so happens that they have selected an officer to represent them, as is their recognized right, against whom there is a valid charge which would unfit him for the discharge of his duty, it is certainly due to the minority that the majority should show confidence in them and to feel assured that when that matter is brought to their attention, if it is found by them to be sufficient to justify his discharge, they themselves will be the parties to move it.

I think it would be not only an injustice but an impropriety on the part of the majority to undertake to assume to supervise the action of the minority in the selection of the official accorded to them, and to further assume if there be unfitness on the part of the officers that when that is called to their attention they will not themselves undertake to rectify it.

I hope we may proceed in the orderly and regular manner. I have no idea what this charge is, or as to its justice; but I do have the fullest confidence that if there be a charge of unfitness on the part of this proposed officer, when it is brought to the attention of the minority, who are fully competent to deal with the matter, they will certainly apply the proper remedy.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I certainly have no disposition to inflict any injustice upon the other side of this Chamber, and I had hoped to escape any suggestion of being guilty of any impropriety. I realize the responsibility which devolves upon the other side in connection with this particular selection. I realize that they are amply able to meet and to bear their own responsibility. I had felt, however, that I was under some responsibility myself in connection with this particular matter. I felt under some responsibility to make the suggestion here and now that this man was under a charge of official misconduct which would disqualify him from holding this place.

I have performed that duty, and I have met my responsibility. I do not know whether Senators on the other side desire to have the charge suggested now or not; but I do want the matter looked into, because, in the judgment of every man, it would disqualify this man from serving the Senate if the charge be true. I shall state it now, or I shall defer it——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, as a member of the minority, before this resolution is acted upon, in view of the record that has already been made, I call upon the Senator from Oklahoma to state the charge against Mr. Loeffler.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I was stating that I would either make the statement now, or I would defer it, as leaders on the other side might desire. I have no disposition to precipitate this matter here and now in this way, and I sought to avoid it. But, Mr. President, Senators here who served during the Sixty-first Congress remember an incident which occurred upon this floor in which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]; the Senator from Texas, Mr. Bailey; and I think the Senator from Indiana, Mr. Beveridge, figured. It related to a certificate of deposit on the part of one Holstlaw, which was a part of the evidence in the Lorimer trial. That certificate mysteriously disappeared from the Senate. It placed Senators in a most embarrassing situation. I can furnish a witness who will make the statement that Mr. Loeffler is and was responsible for the disappearance of that certificate of deposit.

That is the statement which I desire the Committee on Privileges and Elections to investigate and report upon. I have discharged my duty and have met my responsibility. I remit all further responsibility to Senators on the other side.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator object to giving the Senate the name of his informant?

Mr. GORE. If the matter is going to be investigated, I would rather bring the witness before the committee. If it is insisted upon, I will name the witness now.

Mr. SMOOT. I think before we decide this question we ought to be informed as to the name.

Mr. GORE. I have no objection to stating it.

Mr. SMOOT. I should be obliged if the Senator would do so.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it was the page who took this certificate from the hand of the Senator and started with it to the desk. Mr. Loeffler called the page to him, and said: "Let me see that." The page handed it to him. Mr. Loeffler retired out yonder door, and the page has never seen the certificate from that time to this. He told me of the matter in confidence, and I have no reason to doubt the truth of the allegation. His name is Harrison. He is the young man who is now at the telephone.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I have no disposition, of course, to interfere with the proper investigation of this matter. I think it is a matter which rests with the minority. It is their responsibility. I would suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma to pursue the line indicated by himself—that it be left to them as to whether we shall now proceed, or whether it shall be postponed. The Senator suggested that course, and I think it is the proper one.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion. I omitted to do that. I have washed my hands entirely of this affair.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, in view of the withdrawal of the motion made by the Senator from Oklahoma, I do not press my motion to let the matter lie on the table.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I renew the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon the motion to lay upon the table.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, just a word.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable, but it has been debated.

Mr. GALLINGER. A portion of a proposition can not be laid on the table. If it is anything it is an amendment which is debatable.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. The original resolution called for a schedule of officers, including the Acting Assistant Doorkeeper. The amendment was proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] to omit the Acting Assistant Doorkeeper from that schedule. That amendment has been withdrawn. Subsequently to that, the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] offered another amendment, and that has been withdrawn. So the question now before the Senate is on the original resolution, without any motion or amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is in error. The motion of the Senator from New York was to lay upon the table that part of the resolution which had to do with the election of the Acting Assistant Doorkeeper.

Mr. GALLINGER. I repeat the point I made a moment ago, which was that we can not lay upon the table a part of a resolution. It is in the nature of an amendment; and I desire to speak to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from New York withdrew his motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; but the Senator from Wisconsin renewed it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I renewed the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. I so understood; and I rose to make that suggestion.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that this matter has come up in the form that it has. The minority, recognizing the fact that the Democrats have a majority of the Senate, are ready to recognize their right to elect to office in the Senate such men as they see fit, and upon them will rest the responsibility. If they elect an unworthy man, I know they will hasten to undo the mistake they made as soon as it is called to their attention. Taking the same view, the minority will take whatever responsibility attaches to the election of this one official. I submit to the Senate that the minority ought to be given that responsibility, with the assurance—speaking as one member of the minority—that after Mr. Loeffler shall be elected, if any charge properly substantiated is made against him, the Republican minority will hasten to make an investigation of the matter.

I do not think so important a matter ought to be determined by snap judgment. It certainly ought not to be determined upon the statement of a boy, very likely irresponsible, who happened to say to a Senator that a paper was taken from his hand which perhaps never was taken from his hand. If we are going to proceed upon assumptions of that kind, Mr. President, much more serious charges than that have been made to me concerning another gentleman whose name is included in that list, but I do not believe a word of them. They have not been substantiated. They were very likely made by a personal enemy, and I have cast them aside as being unworthy of serious consideration.

Mr. President, let us proceed in the usual way. We ought not to be diverted from the usual, and, as I look at it, the proper course, because of the situation that has arisen. If the Senator from Oklahoma can produce any proof of the accusation he has made, he will have an opportunity to do so before a committee of the minority a little later on. But I am quite unwilling that this young man's name, which stands high in the estimation of some of us—a young man who comes from a family distinguished in both civil and military life—should be smirched simply upon a statement made by a boy acting as page in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President——

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Oklahoma when this boy told him this.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, let me say, first, that I entirely concur in the spirit of the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. ASHURST. I should like to have an answer to my question.

Mr. GORE. I hope the Senator will let me make that statement first. I think the minority ought to be extended this courtesy; and only upon a ground going to the official conduct of this person should I have raised this question, or even suggested it. I did not intend and did not desire to make this suggestion here and now; in fact, I desired not to do so. For that reason I had suggested the propriety of referring the matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

I will say that the page advised me of this about three weeks prior to the last vote in the Lorimer case. He told me that he had cherished this secret, and he desired to confide it to some one. I immediately advised the then Senator from Texas, Mr. Bailey, and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], who had figured in the incident resulting in the loss of this paper. I thought I was under obligation to communicate to them this fact. I made no public statement in regard to it because I did not wish to interject any extraneous matter in the Lorimer trial.

Mr. GALLINGER. It seems to me that that was the proper time to present to the Senate what the Senator from Oklahoma has on his mind to-day, and that it ought not to have been withheld until this young man is nominated for an office, which, if refused him upon the statement of a mere boy, will be in the nature of a disgrace, a taint on his name. Mr. President, without detaining the Senate a moment longer——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, just one other word. I wish to say that I have told several other Senators of this matter. I had intended to tell the Senator from New Hampshire, but during the rush of the closing days it escaped my attention.

I merely wish, however, to resent the intimation that this story came from a mere boy. That is no impeachment of this lad's character. If it were taken at all, it probably would not have been taken from the hands of a grown man; it would have been transmitted to the desk by a page. It is natural that it should happen in that way.

I have no further word to say on this subject, and I regret that it should have taken this turn. I think another course would have been better.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I do not think this matter ought to be referred to a committee. It seems to me that it should not be acted upon on the flimsy evidence that is before the Senate.

I repeat what I said a moment ago: If the minority makes a mistake, it will be quick to remedy that mistake as soon as it is brought to its attention. Let us be just, and not by hasty action bring reproach upon a young man who has heretofore had the affectionate regard of those of us who know him best.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I agree very fully with the position which has been taken upon both sides of the aisle regarding the responsibility of the minority in the election of the Acting Assistant Doorkeeper, whose services are to be peculiarly confidential in respect to the service to the minority.

I should not detain the Senate by a single word on the subject, except that I do not wish this occasion to pass without saying that I was watching the proceedings in the Lorimer case with great intentness. I had just made an extended argument in the case against Mr. Lorimer. There was no Senator who was more alert and more keenly interested in the production and treatment of the certificate which has been referred to, and the statement that has been made regarding the taking of the paper by Mr. Loeffler from the page, assuming the statement to be absolutely correct, carries to my mind no conclusion, suggestion, or suspicion of wrongdoing on Mr. Loeffler's part. I think that is entirely consistent with absolute right conduct. I am not at liberty to draw any unfavorable inferences regarding him from the statement that has been made so far.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma has known for some time that there was a committee on committees of the minority which had under consideration the selection of the Acting Assistant Doorkeeper. He also knew that Mr. Loeffler's name was under consideration as well as that of another party. To-day is the first time that I ever heard any intimation made against the character of Mr. Loeffler. I have never heard a word against him as a man.

If the Senator from Oklahoma had mentioned this to any member of the committee or brought his charge to the attention of the committee, there is no doubt that it would have been investigated. He failed in this and now brings it to the attention of the Senate. It has not been considered by the committee.

Mr. JONES. If the Senator from Utah will allow me, I desire to suggest to him that it was not the minority committee on committees that selected Mr. Loeffler; it was the caucus.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true; I should have said the caucus. The Republican caucus, of course, selected him, and his selection was discussed by the caucus and voted upon, and I never heard a member of the committee even suggest that there was a charge of wrongdoing against Mr. Loeffler.

If there is a formal charge against him and he is found guilty of any wrongdoing, there is no member of the minority party who would not vote to remove him from office just as quickly as any member of the majority.

I do not feel justified in voting against Mr. Loeffler on the charge made here to-day, and particularly in the way made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, in this particular matter I shall be guided by the expressed wish of the minority. These matters of understanding are obligatory according to their just application. We understand that the minority are responsible for the selection of their representative on this floor to perform certain important duties that are especially applicable to service on the other side of the Chamber.

Custom has evolved a system by which it is thought best to allow each side to select that particular officer at its discretion. If the Republican minority are satisfied, in the first instance, with this particular nominee of theirs, I am going to accept their judgment about it.

In his official character he is an officer of the Senate and the same vote that will accept him now will turn him out then if a charge is made that would go to his official integrity. If he should prove to be a person unfit for the service to which he has been assigned by the minority, that becomes a question that goes to the integrity of the Senate's organization, and it will involve a fair trial, when the accused will be confronted by those who testify against him, but he will not be condemned in the outset in the face of a practically unanimous indorsement of those in whose service he is to enlist.

So, unless there is something like a general dissatisfaction on the other side of the Chamber manifested, I shall vote in accordance with their desire in this matter.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I simply desire to say that I shall vote to elect Mr. Loeffler because of my knowledge of the man. For 24 years he has been a faithful official of the Senate. He has received six promotions here—from a page to his present position, and there has never been a dishonorable act connected with his name. I do not believe he has done anything for which he should be criticized, and upon such testimony as has been cited I would hesitate long before I would blast a reputation honestly earned and dearly prized by one who has been honored on both sides of this Chamber from his early boyhood.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] has properly stated the attitude which is to be occupied by Senators on this side of the Chamber. I only rose in view of the fact that I am on this side of the Chamber to bear testimony to the correctness of what has been so well stated by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] as to the character of this young man. I do not know anything about the correctness or truth of the particular charge made against him. I do not intend in anything I may say to make any issue upon that one way or the other, but I do wish to say as this young man's character has been brought in question that for 18 years at least he has been under my observation and I have regarded him as a most upright and efficient official of this body, first as a page and later one who has had charge of the training and the direction of the pages. While he has not been in such close association or under such close observation, perhaps, by the Senators on this side of the Chamber as on the other, I have known the fact of the estimate in which he has been held by Senators. I have heard, for instance, when the question of an increase of compensation came up, the fact of his efficiency and his integrity and his capacity commented upon in the open Senate as that of a man entitled to recognition, promotion, and reward.

I am sure the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] will recall the fact that more than once the question of this young man's ability, efficiency, and character has come before the Senate, and in that connection everyone has borne testimony in his favor to that extent. I think this statement is due to him.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I merely wish to add this word: That I had no intention to introduce this matter in the Senate at this time and in this way. My idea was that it should be referred to a standing committee of the Senate, where it could be given judicial investigation and fair investigation and a deliberate report made, based upon the evidence, either favorable or unfavorable, to Mr. Loeffler. As far as that is concerned I am, of course, entirely indifferent. I had not anticipated that the matter would take this course or that such a charge would be necessary. Indeed, I did not apprehend that there would be any objection to a reference of the matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. This is, of course, unanticipated on my part.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the discussion has proceeded upon the motion which I submitted entirely upon the assumption that this is a trial. It is not. The motion simply provides that the position of Acting Assistant Doorkeeper be omitted from the resolution which is presented for consideration at this time.

A charge has been made in the Senate which, if true, should disqualify the candidate named for the position of Assistant Doorkeeper or for any other position in the service of the Senate. The charge is a part of the record of this day's proceedings. It is proposed now, with that charge on the record, to proceed with the election of the man accused. Senators upon the other side assume that they can participate in that election and divest themselves of all responsibility regarding it, upon the ground that it would be a discourtesy for the majority to refuse to accept the candidate presented by the minority for a position conceded to the minority, even in the face of the gravest accusation made at the same time against that candidate. The accused can not be elected by the votes of this side alone, if they were all cast for him.

This candidate is charged with having surreptitiously removed an important piece of record evidence in a case involving the highest possible privilege, a case involving the title of a Senator to a seat on this floor. With that charge on the record it is proposed that he shall, notwithstanding, be elected to a position of responsibility and confidence in this body. This matter, in my opinion, should be investigated, and the time to investigate it is before the election, not after.

On the motion which I have submitted I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, inasmuch as I propose to vote for Mr. Loeffler, if I am given an opportunity to do it, I desire to state my reasons for doing so.

I realize that the Senator from Oklahoma has made a rather serious charge; but I am convinced of the fact, with all due deference to him, that that charge has not been fairly made. He has stated on the floor of the Senate that this knowledge was in his possession at the time the Lorimer case was being tried. During all the time from then until now this man has been serving as an officer of the Senate. At that time the information was fresh; the facts were clearly before the gentleman who possessed them, if they were facts; and they should have been presented to the Senate at that time.

Now, inasmuch as we have gone this far, I propose, so far as my vote will influence it, to elect Mr. Loeffler to this place. Then I shall be as active as any other Senator in trying to find out what the facts are, and if those charges are sustained I will readily vote that he shall be turned out from this office and another placed in his stead.

But I repeat that the Senate has not been fairly treated to wait until this moment and then make public charges against the man who, so far as every other Member of the Senate is concerned, has a good, clean record and a reputation untarnished. This is unfair to him, it is unfair to the Senate, and I will not be a party to making that stain any more indelible.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I agree with what has been said, but I want to say in addition to what Senators on the other side have stated, who have spoken on this subject as I should have expected them to speak, I happen to be chairman of our committee on committees, and can assure Senators on the other side that that committee will look into this matter thoroughly. The minority has no more desire to place unfit men in office in the Senate than the majority; we are all equally interested in having honorable and proper service; but I do think that it would be the grossest injustice, with what has been said here to-day, to strike down, as it would strike down, a man of unblemished character hitherto, so far as we have all known—and he has been among us for 15 or 18 years—simply on what has been alleged on the floor to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to amend made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I hardly think it is fair for the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] to suggest that I have been unfair in this regard. The matter has taken a course entirely unexpected to me, and I am not responsible for having precipitated this specific charge. In fact, I did not make the charge. I suggested to the Senate that the charge had come to my attention.

It is true, sir, I was advised of this prior to the last vote in the Lorimer case. I immediately advised Senator Bailey and Senator CUMMINS. I felt I could not honorably withhold the information from those two Senators, whatever it might be worth. I have since told several other Senators of the statement made to me.

I did not make it at that time because I was unwilling to introduce this incident into the Lorimer trial, and I did not make it sooner with a view to removing this officer because I did not believe that it would be possible at that time to undertake his removal. I thought the wiser course was to defer until this occasion, when I supposed the charge could be investigated and he would either be vindicated or convicted of the charge and suitable action could be based upon a responsible report.

I have pursued the course which I think the wise one.

Mr. LODGE. I only desire to say, in view of what the Senator from Oklahoma has said, that the certificate of deposit was lost when the first trial of the Lorimer case came on three years ago.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Four years ago.

Mr. LODGE. I should have said four years ago. The Lorimer case was tried a second time, and even then this matter was never brought out.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Massachusetts has entirely misconceived what I said. I remember the incident; I know that it occurred on the first trial; I know that it was not material evidence on the last trial, owing to a fuller investigation by the committee; but the matter did not come to my attention until about three weeks before the last vote, and I did not think it was necessary to introduce it at that time. I could not foretell that Mr. Loeffler would be nominated for this place, and if he had not been so nominated, I should not have felt under any obligation to mention the matter now or hereafter. There would have been no occasion to make the matter public.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, inasmuch as I am paired and shall not have the privilege of casting a vote on this roll call, I desire, in a very few words, to explain my vote. I am not one of those on the majority side, referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], if there be any, who believe that we can proceed with this election now and divest ourselves of all responsibility. I believe that the majority side in a matter of this kind, and in this particular action, has responsibility as well as has the minority. I will suggest that this is not a question of electing or defeating this gentleman at this time; it is merely a question of postponing the matter temporarily until it can be looked into, investigated, and reported upon; that is all. Then, if he is found innocent, the election can be proceeded with at once and made unanimous. If he is found guilty, he will simply not be elected, instead of being turned out. I concur in the views of the Senator from Wisconsin, that this is a matter which needs investigation before being acted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the question.

Mr. BACON. I understand the question to be upon the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to strike out so much of the resolution as relates to this particular official.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the question.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike from the end of the resolution the words—

And Acting Assistant Doorkeeper of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. JACKSON]. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. OLIVER (when the name of Mr. PENROSE was called). I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. PENROSE] is necessarily absent from the city to-day. If he were present, he would vote "nay" on this proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], who is necessarily absent from the Senate. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], but in view of the statement made on the floor a moment ago by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER], I desire to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 18, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—18.

Bristow	Kern	Newlands	Thompson
Clapp	La Follette	O'Gorman	Vardaman
Gore	Lane	Owen	Walsh
James	Lea	Shafroth	
Jones	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	

NAYS—45.

Ashurst	Hughes	Ransdell	Smoot
Bacon	Johnson, Me.	Robinson	Stone
Bankhead	Johnston, Ala.	Root	Sutherland
Bradley	Lodge	Saulsbury	Swanson
Brandegee	Martin, Va.	Shields	Thornton
Catron	Nelson	Shively	Tillman
Chamberlain	Oliver	Simmons	Townsend
Clarke, Ark.	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	Warren
Dillingham	Page	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Fall	Perkins	Smith, Md.	
Fletcher	Pittman	Smith, Mich.	
Gallinger	Pomerene	Smith, S. C.	

NOT VOTING—29.

Borah	Crawford	Lippitt	Stephenson
Brady	Culberson	McCumber	Sterling
Bryan	Cummins	McLean	Thomas
Burleigh	du Pont	Myers	Weeks
Burton	Gronna	Norris	Works
Chilton	Hitchcock	Penrose	
Clark, Wyo.	Jackson	Poindexter	
Colt	Kenyon	Reed	

So Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the original resolution.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask for a division of the question on so much of the resolution as relates to the election of an Acting Assistant Doorkeeper at this time.

Mr. LODGE. The officers are all elected separately.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am informed that all these officials are elected separately. That being true, I withdraw my request. This I understand to be a motion to proceed to the election.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KERN. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana submits a resolution and asks unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The resolution will be read. (S. Res. 7.)

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That James M. Baker, of South Carolina, be, and he is hereby, elected Secretary of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none. The question is upon agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I move to amend the resolution by striking out the name of "James M. Baker, of South Carolina," and inserting the name of "Charles Goodwin Bennett, of New York," as Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. BRISTOW. I move that we proceed to elect a Secretary of the Senate by ballot, and that the roll be called, or by a viva voce vote, if it is not desired to have the roll called.

Mr. LODGE. There is no intention to call the roll.

Mr. BRISTOW. Very well; I withdraw the motion which I just made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] to the resolution.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs upon the adoption of the original resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KERN. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana submits a resolution and asks unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 11), as follows:

Resolved, That Charles P. Higgins, of Missouri, be, and he is hereby, elected Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I move to amend the resolution by striking out the name of "Charles P. Higgins, of Missouri," and substituting the name of "E. Livingstone Cornelius, of Maryland."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon the amendment to the resolution proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the adoption of the original resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KERN. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana submits a resolution and asks unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 8), as follows:

Resolved, That Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, of the District of Columbia, be, and he is hereby, elected Chaplain of the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I move to amend the resolution by striking out the name of "Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman" and inserting that of "Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D." for Chaplain.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment to the resolution, proposed by the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the adoption of the original resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KERN. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana submits a resolution and asks unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That Thomas W. Keller, of West Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected Assistant Doorkeeper of the Senate; and that Carl A. Loeffler, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Acting Assistant Doorkeeper of the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Now, Mr. President, I ask for a separate vote on those two proposed names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin asks for a separate vote on the two names contained in the resolution. The votes will be taken separately in the absence of objection.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not ask for a roll call upon the first name, that of Mr. Keller; but I propose to ask for a roll call upon the election of the Acting Assistant Doorkeeper for this side of the Chamber; and I propose to offer another name for the consideration of the Senate for that position.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question will first be taken upon the election of the Assistant Doorkeeper. The first clause of the resolution will be read. (S. Res. 9.)

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That Thomas W. Keller, of West Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected Assistant Doorkeeper of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to so much of the resolution as has just been read.

The first clause of the resolution was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the second division of the resolution, which will be read. (S. Res. 10.)

The Secretary read as follows:

And that Carl A. Loeffler, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Acting Assistant Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. For that position, Mr. President, I place in nomination the name of "A. D. Sumner," who has served in the capacity, I think, of Acting Assistant Doorkeeper upon the other side of the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the name of "Carl A. Loeffler, of Pennsylvania," and insert "A. D. Sumner, of Iowa."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I simply nominate Mr. Sumner, and ask for a roll call on the election.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin asks for a roll call upon the question.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think we might proceed as we did in the case of the election of the President pro tempore of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Substituting the name of Mr. Sumner.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let each Senator as his name is called announce his preference.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I desire to say that I had intended to vote for Mr. Loeffler, but I do not believe that the election of any candidate should be proceeded with while charges are pending against him. I think that an investigation should first have been made; and if he is not guilty, which, from my knowledge of him, I do not believe he is, then he could have been elected with the unanimous vote of the Senate, but I can not vote for Mr. Loeffler or anybody else under the circumstances that present themselves to us at this time. I wanted to make that statement before the roll was called

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have not taken any part in this matter, and the fact is this is the first I have heard of it; but I will ask the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] if he will not withdraw the motion to substitute another name for the simple reason that these charges have just been made, and under the law as it has obtained all the while a man is considered innocent until he is proven guilty. In view of the fact that these charges are now made and that the minority have declared their intention to sift them, and if the person be found guilty then judgment will be pronounced upon him, I think, in justice to the man charged, that we should allow him to be elected and then allow the investigation to be afterwards made.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to say that I voted for the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] a few moments ago simply because I thought that this matter ought to be investigated before the election was had. I can not vote for Mr. Sumner under the circumstances, however, although I supported him in the Republican conference. Mr. Loeffler was the choice of that conference, and I am perfectly willing to accept their verdict in that matter so far as this election of

the man is concerned. I am very much in the position of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW]; I do not like to vote for anybody under these circumstances, because I think this matter ought to have been investigated before the election was had; but, as I have said, I can not vote for Mr. Sumner under the circumstances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the question and call the roll.

The SECRETARY. The second clause of the resolution is as follows:

And that Carl A. Loeffler, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Acting Assistant Doorkeeper of the Senate.

To this Mr. LA FOLLETTE offers an amendment to substitute for the name of "Carl A. Loeffler" the name of "A. D. Sumner."

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, there seems to be some confusion upon this side as to just what is the question before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the name of "Mr. Sumner" be substituted in the resolution for the name of "Mr. Loeffler"? The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I again announce my pair, as on the previous vote, with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. JACKSON]. If I were permitted to vote under what I understand to be the agreement and arrangement, I should vote "nay."

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN], and on account of his absence withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. OWEN. (when his name was called). I do not feel willing to vote against this young man without a hearing, and I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMPSON. I feel regarding this matter much the same as does the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. I would prefer to have the matter referred to the proper committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. Debate is not in order, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Debate is not in order.

Mr. THOMPSON. Under the circumstances of the case I do not feel like voting against this young man. The presumption of law is that he is innocent, and I vote "nay."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). As I have already stated, I am paired with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GALLINGER (after having voted in the negative). I inquire if the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that that Senator has not voted.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 5, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—5.

Bristow	James	La Follette	Sheppard
Clapp			

NAYS—47.

Bacon	Johnson, Me.	Perkins	Smoot
Bankhead	Johnston, Ala.	Pittman	Stone
Bradley	Jones	Pomerene	Sutherland
Brandegee	Kern	Ransdell	Swanson
Catron	Lodge	Robinson	Thompson
Chamberlain	Martin, Va.	Root	Thornton
Clarke, Ark.	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Tillman
Dillingham	Nelson	Simmons	Townsend
Fall	Oliver	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh
Fletcher	Overman	Smith, Md.	Warren
Hitchcock	Owen	Smith, Mich.	Williams
Hughes	Page	Smith, S. C.	

NOT VOTING—40.

Ashurst	Culberson	Lippitt	Saulsbury
Borah	Cummins	McCumber	Shafroth
Brady	du Pont	McLean	Shields
Bryan	Gallinger	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Burleigh	Gore	Newlands	Stephenson
Burton	Gronna	Norris	Sterling
Chilton	Jackson	O'Gorman	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Penrose	Vardaman
Colt	Lane	Poindexter	Weeks
Crawford	Lea	Reed	Works

So the amendment of Mr. LA FOLLETTE was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the adoption of the original resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I have no interest in this controversy, and have had none, other than that the truth should be known. I thought it ought to have been ascertained in advance. The Senate has ordered otherwise. It is to me a matter of indifference as to how it shall be done, so that it carries a guaranty of having been done deliberately.

Mr. Loeffler is now an officer of the Senate, and not a candidate of the minority side. A vindication at the hands of the Committee on Privileges and Elections would, of course, set him entirely square before the Senate and before the country. I am sure that he would court such an investigation and desire such a vindication. I therefore move that the Committee on Privileges and Elections be instructed to look into this matter.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that assurances have been given on the minority side that this matter will be properly attended to, I move to lay the motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire moves to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I should like to say just a word.

It seems to me that the proper way to dispose of this matter is to withdraw this motion, if the Senator from Oklahoma will do so, which of course will result in withdrawing the motion to lay on the table, and leave this matter with the minority membership.

These Senators are just as much concerned in the integrity of the Senate administration as any other Senators. I am sure they will look into it and make a satisfactory report to Senators. It may be in executive session; it may be to Senators individually. If that is not done, this is something that can be taken up at any moment. But I submit that it is not quite the right thing to do to take this matter away from the minority by one sweep and refer it to a standing committee of the Senate, for the reason that, as I view it, this is a matter which especially appeals to a proper consideration and a proper disposition by the minority themselves. I think we ought to leave it there for the time being.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon laying upon the table——

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to say a word. I know this motion is not debatable.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I think I can——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Were the yeas and nays ordered?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GORE. I think I can relieve the situation——

Mr. OLIVER. Have I the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I appeal to the Senator from New Hampshire to withdraw his motion to lay on the table. This matter having come up, if it is simply investigated by the conference of the minority, it may not be looked upon as a sufficient vindication of this young man, whom I believe to be thoroughly innocent of any wrong. I think it is due to him that an investigation be made by a body whose verdict will be accepted by everybody as final. I appeal to the Senator from New Hampshire to allow the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma to go through, and to allow the Committee on Privileges and Elections to take up the matter and decide it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will not withdraw my motion, and I trust no further debate will be permitted by the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon laying on the table the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma that the matter be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRISTOW (when his name was called). Upon this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If he were here, he would vote "yea," and if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I again announce my pair. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). I transfer the general pair I had with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] to the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN], and

on account of his absence withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I again announce my general pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

I desire to have this announcement stand for the day on all future votes.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. Not knowing how he would vote upon this particular question I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote upon this question, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHILTON. I made an announcement understanding that there was an agreement and an arrangement, but seeing that it is not so regarded I should like the RECORD to show that if I were at liberty to vote now I should vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER. I am paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BACON (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, I desire to say that I voted "yea" because I thought that was the desire of the minority, and I thought the matter ought to be left exclusively to them. But as they are divided on the subject I will, with the permission of the Senate, change my vote from "yea" to "nay." I should be willing to leave it to them if they were unanimously of that desire.

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—10.

Catron	Nelson	Root	Warren
Dillingham	Page	Smith, Mich.	
Gallinger	Perkins	Sutherland	

NAYS—38.

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.
Bacon	Hughes	Oliver	Smoot
Bankhead	James	Overman	Stone
Bradley	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Swanson
Brandegee	Johnston, Ala.	Pomerene	Thompson
Chamberlain	Jones	Ransdell	Thornton
Clapp	Kern	Robinson	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Saulsbury	Walsh
Fall	Lea	Shafroth	
Gore	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	

NOT VOTING—44.

Borah	Cummins	Myers	Smith, Ariz.
Brady	du Pont	Newlands	Smith, Ga.
Bristow	Fletcher	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Gronna	O'Gorman	Stephenson
Burleigh	Jackson	Penrose	Sterling
Burton	Kenyon	Pittman	Thomas
Chilton	Lane	Poindexter	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Lippitt	Reed	Vardaman
Colt	Lodge	Shields	Weeks
Crawford	McCumber	Shively	Williams
Culberson	McLean	Simmons	Works

So Mr. GALLINGER's motion to lay upon the table the motion made by Mr. GORE was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] to refer the charges to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KERN. I ask that the oath of office be administered to the Secretary elect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary elect will present himself at the desk for that purpose.

Mr. Baker was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Henry M. Rose, Assistant Secretary, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat at the Secretary's desk.

Mr. KERN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 12), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. JAMES P. CLARKE of Arkansas as President pro tempore of the Senate, James M. Baker as Secretary of the Senate, and Charles P. Higgins as Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR EXTRA SESSION.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to offer a resolution. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD and that it may lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada does not ask to have it read?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not ask to have it read, but printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to know the nature of it before consenting.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is a resolution for a legislative program. I will address the Senate on it at the next session.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 4) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution for a legislative program during the extra session.

1. *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that during the approaching extra session for the immediate revision of the tariff Congress should not only consider and pass comprehensive legislation regarding all the schedules of the tariff but should also, through the appropriate committees, consider other subjects of needed legislation, to be taken up for final action at the next regular session of Congress.

TARIFF AND TAXATION.

2. *Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Finance report at as early a date as possible during the extra session upon the following questions:

(a) Whether the prices of any farm products in the United States are raised above the international level of prices by the duties now imposed on such products; and if so, what products, and whether such duties on such products can be abolished or materially reduced without injury to American industry, and to what extent. In such inquiry shall be included meats, cheese, wool, sugar, tobacco, wines, citrus fruits, and dried and preserved fruits.

(b) What products now on the dutiable list should be put on the free list.

(c) Whether it is practicable and advisable to change all duties from specific to ad valorem duties.

(d) The average percentage of the duties imposed by the existing tariff, and the average percentage to which it is desirable to reduce the duties imposed under the proposed revision of the tariff, and the maximum and the minimum duties which it is desirable to impose.

(e) Whether it is practicable and desirable to distribute the proposed reduction over a period of four years.

(f) Whether it is practicable and advisable after making the contemplated reduction in the tariff to organize an administrative tariff board, which, acting under rules fixed by Congress, shall have the power, either upon its own initiative, or upon the initiative of any importer, producer, or consumer, to further inquire into complaints of excessive duties prohibiting or unduly restricting importations, or of diminished duties permitting excessive importations, to the prejudice of existing domestic industries, and to the injury of the capital or labor employed therein, or of excessive duties prejudicial to domestic consumers, such board to present to the President and to Congress such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

(g) Whether it is practicable and advisable to give such tariff board, after full investigation and hearing, the power, with the approval of the President, to make reductions or increases in duties, within certain limitations and under rules prescribed by Congress; and if so, what limitations and rules should be prescribed.

(h) Whether it is practicable and advisable to make such rules and regulations for the action of such a tariff board as will enable the Government to feel its way gradually from a higher protective to a revenue basis without readjustments prejudicial both to domestic labor and capital, and without denying to the consumers needed relief from the imposition of excessive taxes upon foreign imports and excessive prices for domestic products.

(i) Whether it is advisable to provide a graduated income tax and a graduated inheritance tax with a view to making up any deficit in revenue caused by a reduction in customs duties, and also with a view to extending the operations of the National Government in cooperation with the States in the improvement of post roads, the regulation of rivers in aid of navigation, irrigation, water-power development, and swamp-land reclamation, and also in cooperation with the States in the advancement of vocational education.

(k) Whether it is practicable and advisable to appoint a budget committee, of which the chairman of the Appropriation Committee and the chairmen of the other supply committees shall be members.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

3. *Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce report at as early a date as possible during the extra session upon the following questions:

(a) Whether it is advisable to supplement the existing Sherman Antitrust Act by legislation which will more specifically define restraints of trade, including therein the prevention of unfair competition, stock watering, overcapitalization, excessive size, interlocking directors, and the holding by one corporation of the stock of another.

(b) Whether it is advisable to substitute for the present system of holding companies, by which a corporation organized under the laws of a single State is made the means of federating corporations organized under the laws of other States for the purpose of interstate transportation, a national act for the incorporation of holding companies, under which railway companies organized under the laws of different States may be federated for interstate transportation, such holding companies to be subject in their general conduct to the regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

(c) Whether it is advisable to organize an interstate-trade commission, in which shall be merged the officials, powers, and functions of the Bureau of Corporations, with powers of publicity, investigation, correction, and recommendation regarding corporations engaged in interstate trade similar to those conferred upon the Interstate Commerce Commission regarding corporations engaged in interstate transportation, but without the power to fix prices, such interstate-trade commission to have the power to aid the courts in the administration of the Sherman Act and other legislation supplementary thereto.

(d) Whether it is advisable to provide for the creation of a board of river regulation which shall bring into cooperation the departments and services of the National Government whose duties in any way relate to waterways in devising and carrying out comprehensive plans for the promotion of interstate commerce by the regulation of river flow, the mitigation of destructive floods, by the promotion of storage above and of bank and levee protection below, the establishment of terminal and transfer facilities, the coordination of rail and water carriers, and the cooperation of the Nation with the States, each within its jurisdiction, in plans and works for the full and, so far as practicable, compensatory development of the rivers for every useful purpose, and the establishment of an ample fund for continuous work during a period of 10 years.

(e) Whether it is practicable and advisable to bring into coordination under the Interstate Commerce Commission the related subjects

of interstate transportation, interstate trade, and interstate exchange, by the creation of three boards in such commission, one relating to interstate transportation, one relating to interstate trade, and one relating to interstate exchange, the present Interstate Commerce Commission to constitute the board of interstate transportation, the proposed interstate-trade commission to constitute the board of interstate trade, and the proposed banking commission to constitute the board of interstate exchange, merging into the board of interstate trade the present Bureau of Corporations and merging into the board of interstate exchange the Comptroller's office.

INTERSTATE EXCHANGE.

4. *Resolved*, That the proper Senate committee report as soon as possible during the extra session upon the following question:

(a) Whether it is practicable and advisable to organize under national law in each State a national reserve association, in which the State banks engaged in interstate exchange and complying with the national legislation as to capital and reserves shall be united with the national banks as members, such associations to have the powers of issue relating to emergency currency now enjoyed by the constituent national banks; such associations to have such of the powers proposed by the National Monetary Commission to be conferred upon a central national reserve association as are necessary and advisable; such State associations to have the powers of investigation and correction regarding the affairs of the constituent banks; such State associations to be brought into federation for the protection of interstate exchange and the prevention of bank panics through a national banking commission fairly representative of the different sections of the country, part of which shall be selected by such associations and part by the President of the United States; such national banking commission to have powers of investigation and correction over the State associations, and to report to the President and Congress annually such recommendations as it deems advisable regarding legislation and administration concerning monetary affairs.

PUBLIC LANDS AND NATURAL RESOURCES.

5. *Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Public Lands report at as early a date as possible during the extra session upon the following questions:

(a) Whether it would be advisable for the National Government to promote the development of Alaska by the construction of a railroad or railroads; and, if so, the probable cost and plans for construction and operation.

(b) Recommendations regarding the protection of our natural resources in timber, coal, iron, and oil against monopolistic control.

(c) The applicability of the land laws of Canada to the conditions of our public domain, and particularly those provisions regarding the grant of the surface to settlers, excluding from the operation of the grant—timber, coal, iron, oil, and water-power sites.

MILITARY EXPENSES AND AUXILIARY NAVY.

6. *Resolved*, That the Committees on Military and Naval Affairs report at as early a date as possible during the extra session upon the following questions:

(a) The preparation of a plan for the more efficient administration and cooperation of the Army and Navy and the reduction of the total Army and Navy expense for the next four years to not exceeding $225,000,000 annually, with the aid of a board of Army and Navy officers to be selected by the President.

(b) A plan for the construction of auxiliary ships for the Navy, to be used in time of war in aid of the fighting ships and in time of peace in establishing necessary service through the Panama Canal and new routes of commerce to foreign countries through lease to shipping companies; such legislation involving the temporary diminution of the construction of fighting ships and the substitution of auxiliary ships with a view to the organization of a well-proportioned and efficient Navy.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, my purpose in offering these resolutions is to secure the consideration during the extra session by the appropriate committees of the various subjects which are likely to come up for legislative action during the next regular session in December.

Our experience in these extra sessions teaches us that whilst the tariff bill is in committee or pending in the House, the Senate has nothing to do, and whilst the bill is pending in the Senate the House has nothing to do, and that while the committees in the Senate and the House having jurisdiction of the tariff are busy the remaining committees are without occupation.

The Democratic platform presents so many matters requiring legislative action that it is important that the committees should clear the way as soon as practicable, and the extra session offers this opportunity. It is not my purpose to embarrass the extra session by any legislation relating to subjects other than the tariff, but simply to keep the committees of the Senate during the extra session employed in work which will be productive of results at the next regular session commencing in December.

The subjects which I have incorporated in this legislative program are subjects which are referred to in the Democratic platform and require early solution.

The membership of Congress is highly efficient. The methods of Congress are not highly efficient. Experience has shown that owing to these methods the sessions of Congress are constantly increasing in length, so that they threaten to become continuous. The resolutions do not commit the Senate in any way to specific legislation, but simply call upon the appropriate committees for reports upon the different subjects of legislation which will be of great advantage in the ultimate solution of legislative problems.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table and be printed.

THE PANAMA CANAL (S. DOC. NO. 2).

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I present and ask to have printed as a public document an article appearing in The Outlook on the Panama Canal, by Samuel Seabury, justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York. It is a very illuminating article, and I feel that it is exceedingly appropriate at this particular time.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not hear the request of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It is an article appearing in The Outlook on the Panama Canal, by Samuel Seabury, justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York. As I stated, it is a most illuminating article and an intelligent one, and I feel that it is infinitely appropriate to the conditions that today confront us regarding the canal. I ask that it may be printed as a public document. It is a short article.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course I am not going to object, but it is becoming the practice of the Senate to have every article published in any of the magazines made a public document.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have no desire to incumber the RECORD with every magazine article, and I see many of them.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not going to object to the Senator's request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate adjourn until Saturday next at 2 o'clock p. m.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Saturday, March 15, 1913, at 2 o'clock p. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 13, 1913.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

Beverly T. Galloway, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, vice Willet M. Hays, resigned.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

Edwin F. Sweet, of Michigan, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

John Skelton Williams, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy, vice Beekman Winthrop, resigned.

PURCHASING AGENT FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

James A. Edgerton, of New Jersey, to be purchasing agent for the Post Office Department for a period of four years, vice John A. Holmes, resigned.

PROMOTION IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Passed Asst. Surg. Carroll Fox to be surgeon in the Public Health Service, to rank as such from December 1, 1912. This officer has served the required time in his present grade and has passed the necessary examination for promotion.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Charles R. Noyes, Infantry, unassigned, to be colonel from March 8, 1913.

Lieut. Col. George Bell, jr., detailed inspector general (Infantry), to be colonel from March 9, 1913, vice Col. Samuel W. Miller, Infantry, unassigned, detached from his proper command.

Maj. Benjamin C. Morse, Infantry, unassigned, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1913, vice Lieut. Col. David C. Shanks, Ninth Infantry, detailed as inspector general on that date.

Capt. Hanson E. Ely, Infantry, unassigned, to be major from March 2, 1913, vice Maj. James Baylies, Ninth Infantry, retired from active service March 1, 1913.

CAVALRY ARM.

First Lieut. John P. Hasson, Sixth Cavalry, to be captain from March 10, 1913, vice Capt. Thomas G. Carson, Tenth Cavalry, who died March 9, 1913.

Second Lieut. Guy H. Wyman, Eleventh Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 10, 1913, vice First Lieut. John P. Hasson, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Capt. Michael J. McDonough, Corps of Engineers, to be major from February 27, 1913, vice Maj. Chester Harding, promoted.

First Lieut. Harold S. Hetrick, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from February 27, 1913, vice Capt. Michael J. McDonough, promoted.

First Lieut. William A. Johnson, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from February 28, 1913, vice Capt. Edward M. Adams, retired from active service February 27, 1913.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants with rank from March 12, 1913.

Harry Loren Arnold, of Michigan.
Guy Cluxton Boughton, of Pennsylvania.
Athel Campbell Burnham, of New York.
Charles Horace Francis, of Illinois.
Beverley Drake Harison, of Michigan.
John Barnes Jack, of Illinois.
Thomas Martin Joyce, of Minnesota.
Joseph Victor Klauder, of Pennsylvania.
George Alexander Knowles, of Pennsylvania.
Walter Estell Lee, of Pennsylvania.
James Acker Mattison, of South Dakota.
Wilhelm Weinberger, of New York.
Luther Halsey Reichelderfer, of the District of Columbia.
William Toy Shoemaker, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph Marius Shramek, of Nebraska.
Otto Augustus Wall, jr., of Missouri.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 13, 1913.

FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

Daniel C. Roper to be First Assistant Postmaster General.

THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

Alexander M. Dockery to be Third Assistant Postmaster General.

FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

James I. Blakslee to be Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Ensign Ralph D. Spalding to be an assistant civil engineer.

Nathaniel M. Terry, a citizen of Maryland, to be a professor of mathematics.

William W. Johnson, a citizen of Maryland, to be a professor of mathematics.

Antoine J. Corbesier, a citizen of Maryland, to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

Henry P. Torrey to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *March 15, 1913.*

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., of the city of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

SENATOR FROM NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I rise to a question of privilege. I present the credentials of Mr. HENRY F. HOLLIS, elected a Senator from the State of New Hampshire. I ask that the credentials may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The credentials of HENRY F. HOLLIS, chosen by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1913, were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator elect is present and prepared to take the oath.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The newly elected Senator will present himself at the desk for that purpose.

Mr. HOLLIS was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. GALLINGER, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise to ask unanimous consent to print certain matter in the RECORD. I may say in explanation that it is usual for the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate to submit on the last day of the session a statement giving a history of the appropriation bills and the sum total of the appropriations, also the estimates from the departments and the amounts at the various stages of progress of the bills—amounts of the bills as brought into the House and voted upon there, and as they came to the Senate, and so forth.

The stress of business near the close of the last session of the Sixty-second Congress was such that the clerks of the committees of the House and Senate were unable to complete the statement. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House received permission to extend his remarks and print tables in the RECORD, I think, within 15 days after final adjournment—that is, as the RECORD is being printed from day to day containing speeches which were withheld. The appropriation matter was released yesterday.

So, on the part of the Senate, I now wish to submit this table, which has been agreed upon by the accountants of both committees. In fact, there are two tables—one which shows the totals and another which shows a comparison between the appropriation bills for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914.

It is usual for the chairmen of such committees to make somewhat extended remarks when they present the matter. I shall not do that now. I observe from the printed proofs, which I have here before me, that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House and the former ranking member of the minority of the House have submitted or will submit extended remarks, and while they differ, as party statements always do, they unite upon one recommendation—that all appropriation bills should be handled by one committee. I shall offer no remarks upon that statement, but shall ask those who are interested in the subject to turn to the record that will be made on the House side by the two Members chosen to represent their parties in connection with this table.

I merely ask now that the table may be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I was taken very much by surprise, I confess, yesterday when I was notified by the Senator from Wyoming, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that he intended to make a financial statement. I was not first upon the list of the minority of the Committee on Appropriations, and, as is well known by Senators, I have been sick. If I had known that the Senator from Wyoming was going to make this statement, I should have taken it upon myself, as an individual member of that committee, to prepare a counter statement, because the statements of the views of the minority and majority do not agree in many respects. I do not know that I shall now have time to make out a statement.

I wish to say, however, Mr. President, that many, many millions of dollars were added to the appropriation bills by the Senate, and many great items in the legislative appropriation bill and other bills that came from the House of Representatives were increased against my protest.

If I had time I should like to make a statement. It is impossible to make a statement without having the figures at hand ready to read. I have not, of course, examined the statement submitted by the Senator from Wyoming. It may be correct. I do not say it is not correct, but I expect on many items we will have some differences. I merely thought, as a member of the minority of the committee and not a leading member, but as an individual member——

Mr. BACON. I should like to make a suggestion to the Senator, which I presume would be entirely acceptable to the Senator from Wyoming.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield.

Mr. BACON. It is that in view of the statement made by the Senator from North Carolina that he would desire to make such a statement and has not now time to do it, that the Senator from Wyoming will withhold his statement until the extra session, in order that the two statements may go into the RECORD at the same time.

Mr. WARREN. My idea in offering it now is this: The country is always anxious to know what the expenses of a session are when it is over, and it is usual to have the statement prepared and submitted on the last day of the session.

It was not the fault of the Senate any more than it was of the House that we were unable to make it prior to March 4.

The statement itself does not make charges against any party nor does it affirm for any party any approbation. It simply gives the figures, and I may say to my friend from North Carolina that it gives in detail the additions made by the Senate, which is exactly what the Senator will want to know. It gives every detail of addition and subtraction by the Senate and is to be printed in that manner, furnishing that information. If the Senator should wish to have something printed later, I certainly would have no objection.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I will say in answer to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] what I was about to state, that I shall not be precluded from making a statement later. I wanted the statement that I make now to go in the RECORD with the statement made by the chairman of the committee. Not having been able to examine his figures, I felt called upon at this time to make this statement, and later I will submit a statement in detail.

Mr. WARREN. I think I ought to correct the Senator in one respect. They are not my figures at all. They are the figures of the two accountants or head clerks of the two Committees on Appropriations—on the House side and the Senate side—and they are identical.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? There being no objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to follows.

History of appropriation bills, third session of the Sixty-second Congress; estimates and appropriations for the fiscal year 1913-14; and appropriations for the fiscal year 1912-13.

[Prepared by the clerks to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.]

Title.	Estimates, 1914.	Reported to the House.	Passed the House.	Reported to the Senate.	Passed the Senate.	Law, 1913-14.	Law, 1912-13.
Agriculture	$18,287,230.00	$17,593,275.00	$17,593,325.00	$18,566,580.00	$18,553,202.00	$17,986,945.00	$16,651,490.00
Army	95,397,631.13	93,990,177.56	93,905,177.56	94,585,728.51	94,585,728.51	94,266,145.51	[1] 90,953,712.98
Diplomatic and Consular	3,965,392.61	3,764,642.66	3,707,642.66	3,745,642.66	3,743,642.66	3,730,642.66	3,638,047.41
District of Columbia [2]	12,874,297.60	11,221,964.00	10,720,534.00	11,702,893.00	11,751,999.00	11,375,639.00	10,670,733.00
Fortification	7,009,834.00	5,218,250.00	5,218,250.00	5,218,250.00	5,218,250.00	5,218,250.00	4,036,235.00
Indian	11,303,316.53	7,674,653.28	13,127,747.23	13,127,747.23	13,229,447.23	9,411,129.98	8,920,970.66
Legislative, etc	36,514,955.50	34,897,505.50	34,899,583.50	35,385,714.62	35,403,040.62	[3] 35,183,864.50	34,216,463.38
Military Academy	1,666,735.69	1,069,870.87	1,099,570.87	1,124,590.87	1,133,590.87	1,099,734.87	1,064,668.26
Navy	151,463,758.53	146,617,824.53	138,079,460.53	138,824,016.02	146,794,120.02	140,800,643.53	123,225,007.76
Pension	185,220,000.00	180,300,000.00	180,300,000.00	180,300,000.00	180,300,000.00	180,300,000.00	165,146,145.84
Post Office [4]	281,791,508.00	283,721,481.00	284,164,181.00	285,589,542.00	285,809,542.00	285,376,271.00	271,429,599.00
Rivers and harbors	[5] 43,829,010.00	37,112,958.00	37,112,958.00	41,195,945.00	42,034,945.00	[6] 41,073,094.00	[7] 31,059,370.50
Sundry civil	[8] 128,357,629.43	113,271,614.66	113,163,620.66	118,525,726.91	119,523,000.91	[9] 116,718,386.91	[10] 112,039,184.40
Total	977,681,299.02	936,454,217.06	927,711,457.06	947,892,382.82	958,121,508.82	942,540,746.96	873,056,634.19
Deficiency, 1913, and prior years	[11] 31,500,000.00	24,235,740.17	24,224,110.17	28,048,624.33	28,604,672.38	28,081,549.13	9,700,939.67
Total	1,009,181,299.02	960,689,957.23	951,935,567.23	975,941,007.15	986,726,181.20	970,622,296.09	882,757,573.86
Miscellaneous	[11] 13,500,000.00					500,000.00	3,448,712.93
Total regular annual appropriations	1,022,681,299.02					971,122,296.09	886,206,286.79
Permanent annual appropriations	[12] 127,525,664.12					[12] 127,525,664.12	133,206,424.12
Grand total, regular and permanent annual appropriations	1,150,206,963.14					[13] 1,098,647,960.21	[14] 1,019,412,710.91

Amount of estimated revenues for fiscal year 1914	$710,000,000.00
Amount of estimated postal revenues for fiscal year 1914	281,791,508.00
Total of estimated revenues for fiscal year 1914	991,791,508.00

[1] This amount includes $1,350,000 appropriated in a joint resolution, approved July 8, 1912, for the Organized Militia, a like sum having been carried by the Army act which was vetoed, and omitted from the Army act finally approved.

[2] One-half of the amounts for the District of Columbia payable by the United States, except amounts for the water department, which are payable from the revenues of the water department.

[3] This amount includes appropriations for objects for which there was appropriated for similar purposes $999,670 in other than the legislative act for 1913.

[4] Includes all expenses of the postal service payable from postal revenues and out of the Treasury.

[5] In addition to this amount the sum of $12,937,982 to meet contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements is included in the sundry civil estimates for 1914.

[6] In addition to this amount the sum of $10,045,795 is appropriated in the sundry civil act to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements for 1914.

[7] In addition to this amount the sum of $9,500,250 was appropriated in the sundry civil act to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements for 1913.

[8] This amount includes $12,937,982 to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements, and $30,174,432.11 for construction and fortification of the Panama Canal for 1914.

[9] This amount includes $10,045,795 to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements, and $21,135,393 for construction and fortification of the Panama Canal for 1914, and appropriations for objects for which there was appropriated for similar purposes $6,152,798.56 in other than the sundry civil act for 1913.

[10] This amount includes $9,500,250 to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements, and $31,786,950 for the construction and fortification of the Panama Canal for 1913.

[11] This amount is approximated.

[12] This is the amount submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury in the annual estimates for the fiscal year 1914, the exact amount appropriated not being ascertainable until two years after the close of the fiscal year. This amount includes estimated amount of $60,685,000 to meet sinking-fund obligations for 1914.

[13] In addition to this amount contracts are authorized to be entered into, subject to future appropriations by Congress, as follows: By the Army act, $150,000; by the District of Columbia act, $2,185,000; by the fortification act, $300,000; by the naval act, $21,296,524; by the rivers and harbors act, $5,795,800; by the public buildings act, $39,892,850 (exclusive of $5,116,000 for authorizations without contracts); in all, $70,620,174.

[14] In addition to this amount contracts are authorized to be entered into, subject to future appropriations by Congress, as follows: By the fortification act, $371,400; by the naval act, $23,852,500; by the rivers and harbors act, $2,200,000; in all, $26,423,900.

Comparison of appropriations, fiscal years 1913 and 1914.

Title of bill.	Fiscal year 1913.	Fiscal year 1914.	Increase 1914 over 1913.	Decrease 1914 under 1913.
Agriculture	$16,651,490.00	$17,986,945.00	$1,335,449.00	
Army	90,958,712.98	94,266,145.51	3,307,432.53	
Diplomatic and Consular	3,638,047.41	3,730,642.66	92,595.25	
District of Columbia	10,670,733.00	11,375,639.00	704,906.00	
Fortification	4,036,235.00	5,218,250.00	1,182,015.00	
Indian	8,920,970.66	9,411,129.98	490,159.32	
Legislative, etc	34,216,463.38	35,183,864.50	967,401.12	
Military Academy	1,064,668.26	1,099,734.87	35,066.61	
Navy	123,225,007.76	140,800,643.53	17,575,635.77	
Pension	165,146,145.84	180,300,000.00	15,153,854.16	
Post Office	271,429,599.00	285,376,271.00	13,946,672.00	
River and harbor	31,059,370.50	41,073,094.00	10,013,723.50	
Sundry civil	112,039,184.40	116,718,386.91	4,679,202.51	
Deficiencies	9,700,939.67	28,081,549.13	18,380,609.46	
Miscellaneous	3,448,712.93	500,000.00		$2,948,712.93
Permanent annual appropriations	133,206,424.12	127,525,664.12		5,680,760.00
Total	1,019,412,710.91	1,098,647,960.21	87,864,722.23	8,629,472.93

Net increase, 1914 over 1913, $79,235,249.30.

COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I propose the order I send to the desk, and ask for its adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana asks for the adoption of an order, which will be read.

The Secretary read the order, as follows:

Ordered, That so much of Rule XXIV of the Senate as provides for appointment of the standing and other committees of the Senate by ballot be suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the order just read? The Chair hears none, and the order is adopted.

Mr. KERN. I offer the resolution I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution, and the Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the standing committees of the Senate of the Sixty-third Congress:

On Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress: Mr. Penrose (chairman), Mr. Poindexter, Mr. Stone, Mr. Hughes, and Mr. Vardaman.

On Agriculture and Forestry: Mr. Gore (chairman), Mr. Smith of South Carolina, Mr. Smith of Georgia, Mr. Sheppard, Mr. Shafroth, Mr. Ransdell, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Warren, Mr. Page, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Gronna, Mr. Brady, and Mr. Norris.

On Appropriations: Mr. Martin of Virginia (chairman), Mr. Overman, Mr. Owen, Mr. Smith of Maryland, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Lea, Mr. Bryan, Mr. Shafroth, Mr. Tillman, Mr. Culberson, Mr. Warren, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Gallinger, Mr. Smoot, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Dillingham, and Mr. Jones.

To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate: Mr. Williams (chairman), Mr. Shafroth, Mr. Reed, Mr. Dillingham, and Mr. Bristow.

On Banking and Currency: Mr. Owen (chairman), Mr. Hitchcock, Mr. O'Gorman, Mr. Reed, Mr. Pomerene, Mr. Shafroth, Mr. Hollis, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Bristow, Mr. Burton, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Weeks.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, it is a little unexpected that the Senator from Indiana should offer as complete the Senate committees, inasmuch as we were only informed late yesterday that the majority desired some changes, and I thought I was understood in suggesting that we should have time for a meeting this morning of the committee on committees to rearrange the committees as proposed as nearly as we could.

However, I do not wish to delay action on the resolution of the Senator from Indiana, and if I may correct the minority list as each committee is reached I shall then offer no objection, of course, to the further consideration of the resolution.

Mr. KERN. Very well.

Mr. WARREN. On Banking and Currency, commencing with the minority members, the list should read Mr. Nelson, Mr. Bristow, Mr. Crawford, Mr. McLean, and Mr. Weeks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the list of the committee as amended.

The SECRETARY. The Committee on Banking and Currency would then read:

Mr. Owen (chairman), Mr. Hitchcock, Mr. O'Gorman, Mr. Reed, Mr. Pomerene, Mr. Shafroth, Mr. Hollis, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Bristow, Mr. Crawford, Mr. McLean, and Mr. Weeks.

The reading was continued, as follows:

On Canadian Relations: Mr. Shields (chairman), Mr. Ransdell, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Gore, Mr. Smith of Maryland, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Cummins, Mr. Burton, and Mr. Root.

On the Census: Mr. Chilton (chairman), Mr. Pomerene, Mr. Sheppard, Mr. Shively, Mr. Thornton, Mr. Martine of New Jersey, Mr. Thompson, Mr. La Follette, Mr. Cummins, Mr. du Pont, Mr. McLean, and Mr. Townsend.

On Civil Service and Retrenchment: Mr. Pomerene (chairman), Mr. Johnston of Alabama, Mr. Myers, Mr. James, Mr. Hollis, Mr. Shields, Mr. Ransdell, Mr. Cummins, Mr. La Follette, Mr. Smoot, Mr. Colt, and Mr. Sterling.

On Claims: Mr. Bryan (chairman), Mr. Overman, Mr. Pittman, Mr. Robinson, Mr. James, Mr. Johnson of Maine, Mr. Martin of Virginia, Mr. Lane, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Bristow, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Burleigh, Mr. ———, and Mr. Norris.

On Coast and Insular Survey: Mr. Saulsbury (chairman), Mr. Bryan, Mr. Culberson, Mr. Bankhead, Mr. Pittman, Mr. Townsend, Mr. Works, Mr. Brady, and Mr. Sterling.

On Coast Defenses: Mr. Martine of New Jersey (chairman), Mr. Johnson of Maine, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Smith of Maryland, Mr. Sheppard, Mr. Lane, Mr. du Pont, Mr. Root, Mr. Catron, Mr. Weeks, and Mr. Burleigh.

On Commerce: Mr. Clarke of Arkansas (chairman), Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Ransdell, Mr. Sheppard, Mr. Vardaman, Mr. Shields, Mr. Martin of Virginia, Mr. Bankhead, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Smith of Michigan, Mr. Stephenson, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Oliver, and Mr. McLean.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, after the name of "Mr. SMITH of Michigan," I move to insert the name of "Mr. BURTON" and to strike off the name of "Mr. MCLEAN."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the list as proposed to be amended by the Senator from Wyoming.

The SECRETARY. The names of the minority side of the committee will then read:

Mr. Nelson, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Smith of Michigan, Mr. Burton, Mr. Stephenson, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Oliver.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, at that point there should be inserted, so that it may be printed in the usual way:

The conference of the minority: Mr. Gallinger, chairman.

Mr. KERN. There is no objection to that, but the list as presented is exactly the way it was presented from the other side two years ago.

Mr. BACON. That has never heretofore appeared in the list of committees.

Mr. WARREN. It so appears in the list of committees in the office of the financial clerk and in other lists.

Mr. BACON. In what list?

Mr. WARREN. In all the lists, I think.

Mr. BACON. As adopted by the Senate?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. Does the Senator mean to say that the Senate has heretofore adopted in the list of committees the name of a party official?

Mr. WARREN. Is the Senate not adopting the entire party nominees for committees?

Mr. BACON. Undoubtedly; but that is a different matter. I do not think I can be mistaken in the fact, as the Senator will find.

Mr. WARREN. I understand I am right. Perhaps the Senator will look at the paper I have here.

Mr. BACON. I may be in error, but I am speaking about the action of the Senate. Of course we know who such officials are, and all that, but the Senate does not.

Mr. WARREN. Here it is in the committee list, which gives the name of Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. BACON. From what paper does the Senator read?

Mr. WARREN. From the list of committees that was prepared officially; but, Mr. President, I do not wish to have any misunderstanding about this matter. I withdraw the suggestion.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I beg pardon of the Senator, but it is not the manner in which it has always been done, for I have before me the action of the Senate organizing the committees at the last Congress, where a list is given of committees named in the resolution offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], and that particular committee is not included in the list.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I rise simply to say that, as objection has been made, I trust that it will be dropped from the list. I have no desire——

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. There is no objection to its being done in a proper way.

Mr. WARREN. Well, would the Senator suggest in what way it should be done to get it into print?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. It does not seem to have any place in the official list of committees, at least it has not heretofore had a place. I have no objection to the minority putting it in as a separate resolution, and I do not believe I have any objection to their putting it in now, if they want to do so; it will take less time to do it than to talk about it. If they have any preference about it, I am satisfied that nobody over here will object to it.

Mr. BRISTOW. In the list of committees that is printed in the Directory the name of such a committee does not appear.

Mr. WARREN. It appears in the official list for the use of the Senate. However, I withdraw the suggestion, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will proceed with the reading.

The Secretary read as follows:

On Conservation of National Resources: Mr. Smith of Arizona (chairman), Mr. Smith of South Carolina, Mr. Vardaman, Mr. Saulsbury, Mr. James, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Newlands, Mr. Bankhead, Mr. Clark of Wyoming, Mr. Jones, Mr. Gronna, Mr. Brady, Mr. ———, Mr. Sterling, and Mr. Weeks.

On Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia: Mr. La Follette (chairman), Mr. Lippitt, Mr. Stone, Mr. Shively, and Mr. Bacon.

On Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments: Mr. Page (chairman), Mr. Smoot, and Mr. Lane.

On the District of Columbia: Mr. Smith of Maryland (chairman), Mr. Pomerene, Mr. Smith of Arizona, Mr. Kern, Mr. Hollis, Mr. James, Mr. Saulsbury, Mr. Martin of Virginia, Mr. Dillingham, Mr. Jones, Mr. Works, Mr. Kenyon, Mr. Fall, and Mr. Lippitt.

On Education and Labor: Mr. Smith of Georgia (chairman), Mr. Shively, Mr. Swanson, Mr. Martine of New Jersey, Mr. Johnson of Maine, Mr. Shields, Mr. Borah, Mr. Penrose, Mr. Page, Mr. McLean, and Mr. Kenyon.

On Engrossed Bills: Mr. Warren (chairman), Mr. Simmons, and Mr. Saulsbury.

On Enrolled Bills: Mr. Hollis (chairman), Mr. James, and Mr. Stephenson.

To Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service: Mr. Smith of Michigan (chairman), Mr. Crawford, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Lea, Mr. Culberson, Mr. Simmons, and Mr. Smith of Maryland.

On Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture: Mr. Sheppard (chairman), Mr. Simmons, Mr. Gore, Mr. Lippitt, and Mr. Stephenson.

On Expenditures in the Departments of Commerce and Labor: Mr. Thompson (chairman), Mr. Chilton, Mr. Martin of Virginia, Mr. Fall, and Mr. Brady.

On Expenditures in the Interior Department: Mr. Catron (chairman), Mr. Poindexter, Mr. Swanson, and Mr. Hollis.

Mr. WARREN. We have now reached the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, and the chairman selected by the minority for that committee is Mr. SMOOT. The list should be changed accordingly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The change will be made in the absence of objection. The Secretary will read the committee as it now appears.

The Secretary read as follows:

On Expenditures in the Interior Department: Mr. Smoot (chairman), Mr. Swanson, Mr. Hollis, and Mr. Poindexter.

Mr. WARREN. The name of Mr. CATRON should appear. The Senator from Indiana will remember that we were to add a member there, so that there would be a majority of the minority party.

Mr. KERN. Yes; it was so read a moment ago.

Mr. WARREN. Perhaps I did not catch it. Will the Secretary please read it again?

Mr. KERN. The name of the chairman was left blank.

Mr. WARREN. I will ask the Secretary to read the names of the entire committee.

The SECRETARY. As written it reads:

Mr. Catron (chairman), Mr. Swanson, Mr. Hollis, and Mr. Poindexter.

Mr. WARREN. It should read "Mr. SMOOT, chairman," and Mr. CATRON's name should remain.

Mr. KERN. That is right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That change will be made in the absence of objection.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of Senators who have had experience in such matters what the practice has been with reference to minority committees as to the majority of the committee? I can well conceive that something might arise with reference to the expenditures of a department like that of the Interior, where the majority of the committee ought to be on the majority side; but, as suggested by my friend from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], the majority of this committee would be on the minority side. What the Senator from Wyoming said was that the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] was to be substituted as chairman, and that the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] was to remain. That would make it 3 to 2, as I heard the list read by the Secretary, and I am not quite satisfied with that.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I might explain to the Senator from Missouri that this constitutes an exchange. The Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department was exchanged so as to make the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine a majority committee, and that is the arrangement now. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] being chairman, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] being on the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department gives a majority of the membership to the minority in the Chamber, in accordance with the previous practice of the Senate in permitting certain minority committees to have a majority of the membership of those committees.

Mr. STONE. Do I understand my friend to say that that has been the previous practice? If it has been, I have nothing to say.

Mr. OWEN. It has been.

Mr. STONE. For the minority to have control of a committee?

Mr. OWEN. In this case the minority have control.

Mr. STONE. What was the rule in the last Congress, and what was the committee in the last Congress?

Mr. OWEN. The rule in the last Congress with regard to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine was——

Mr. STONE. I am not speaking of the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine. I am speaking of the committee now under discussion.

Mr. OWEN. I am explaining to the Senator that the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine was exchanged and this committee was given in lieu of it to the minority. It was, as I have said, an exchange.

Mr. GALLINGER. In the last Congress, if the Senator will permit me, it was a majority committee and has now been made a minority committee.

Mr. STONE. The Senator means the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department?

Mr. GALLINGER. That was a majority committee in the last Congress.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

Mr. STONE. Well, let me ask, if my friend will pardon me, was the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine a minority committee?

Mr. WARREN. It was.

Mr. STONE. And was the minority in a majority on that committee?

Mr. WARREN. It was. This simply leaves it exactly as it was before the exchange.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, if I may say this in the Senate, in the House of Representatives a number of investigations have been made into expenditures and into the administration of affairs in the different departments. It may be that that is at an end; possibly it is; but if a question should arise during this Congress affecting the expenditures in that department, or the correct administration of the affairs of that department, and the House should take cognizance of it and proceed, as it has in the case of other departments and possibly of this—I have not kept track of it, and so I am not sure—I submit to my friends on the other side whether a contingency might not arise where the majority of that committee ought to be with the majority side of the Senate. However, I am not very particular about it.

Mr. OWEN. If it should become of any importance, the majority can ask that that be done, and it would be done as a matter of course. The committee only represents the Senate at last, and there is no need for any controversy about it.

Mr. STONE. I will make none.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, the committee which prepared the list of committees thought that the committee substituted for the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine should have the same status with reference to the preponderance of party membership that that committee had, so that when the Democrats took over the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine and substituted the other committee as a minority committee they intended that the minority should have a majority of that committee.

Mr. WARREN. I understand now that the name of Mr. CATRON is on the list, and that it appears with Mr. SMOOT as chairman, and Mr. CATRON and Mr. POINDEXTER as the other members from this side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is so informed.

The Secretary read as follows:

On Expenditures in the Department of Justice: Mr. ——— (chairman), Mr. Pittman, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Bradley, and Mr. Borah.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask to have the blank filled by inserting the name of Mr. SUTHERLAND as chairman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the name of Mr. SUTHERLAND will be inserted; and the Secretary will read the list of names of the committee as now made up.

The Secretary read as follows:

On Expenditures in the Department of Justice: Mr. Sutherland (chairman), Mr. Pittman, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Bradley, and Mr. Borah.

On Expenditures in the Navy Department: Mr. Hughes (chairman), Mr. Martin of Virginia, Mr. Tillman, Mr. Gronna, and Mr. Dillingham.

On Expenditures in the Post Office Department: Mr. Vardaman (chairman), Mr. Bacon, Mr. Chilton, Mr. Bristow, and Mr. Smith of Michigan.

On Expenditures in the Department of State: Mr. ——— (chairman), Mr. Stone, Mr. Ransdell, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Penrose.

Mr. OWEN. The vacancy in the chairmanship of that committee is an intentional one.

The Secretary read as follows:

On Expenditures in the Treasury Department: Mr. Robinson (chairman), Mr. Smith of Maryland, Mr. Lea, Mr. Burton, and Mr. Works.

On Expenditures in the War Department: Mr. Poindexter (chairman), Mr. Kenyon, Mr. Lane, Mr. Johnston of Alabama, and Mr. Shields.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, we also have on our list of that committee the name of Mr. NORRIS. I think that is the proper number for us to have. Do I understand that the name of Mr. NORRIS has been inserted?

Mr. KERN. I move to strike out the name of "Mr. SHIELDS" as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and to substitute the name of "Mr. NORRIS."

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the committee as now proposed.

The Secretary read as follows:

On Expenditures in the War Department: Mr. Poindexter (chairman), Mr. Lane, Mr. Johnston of Alabama, Mr. Norris, and Mr. Kenyon.

Mr. WARREN. As a matter of seniority, the names of Mr. KENYON and Mr. NORRIS should be transposed, so that Mr. KENYON will be first and Mr. NORRIS second. I think the Senator from Indiana will agree to that.

Mr. KERN. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, that change will be made.

The Secretary read as follows:

On Finance: Mr. Simmons (chairman), Mr. Stone, Mr. Williams, Mr. Johnson of Maine, Mr. Shively, Mr. Smith of Georgia, Mr. Thomas, Mr. James, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Gore, Mr. Penrose, Mr. Lodge, Mr. McCumber, Mr. Smoot, Mr. Gallinger, Mr. Clark of Wyoming, and Mr. La Follette.

On Fisheries: Mr. Thornton (chairman), Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Johnson of Maine, Mr. Martin of Virginia, Mr. Lane, Mr. Works, Mr. Jones, Mr. Perkins, and Mr. Burleigh.

On the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians: Mr. Nelson (chairman), Mr. Colt, Mr. Tillman, and Mr. Newlands.

On Foreign Relations: Mr. Bacon (chairman), Mr. Stone, Mr. Shively, Mr. Clarke of Arkansas, Mr. Hitchcock, Mr. O'Gorman, Mr. Williams, Mr. Swanson, Mr. Pomerene, Mr. Smith of Arizona, Mr. Lodge, Mr. Smith of Michigan, Mr. Root, Mr. McCumber, Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Borah, and Mr. Burton.

On Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game: Mr. Lane (chairman), Mr. Ashurst, Mr. Tillman, Mr. Overman, Mr. Hitchcock, Mr. McLean, Mr. Poindexter, Mr. Norris, and Mr. Weeks.

On the Geological Survey: Mr. Clark of Wyoming (chairman), Mr. Fall, Mr. Norris, Mr. Kern, Mr. Smith of South Carolina, Mr. James, and Mr. Smith of Arizona.

On Immigration: Mr. Smith of South Carolina (chairman), Mr. Kern, Mr. O'Gorman, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sheppard, Mr. Gore, Mr. Hollis, Mr. Lodge, Mr. Dillingham, Mr. Penrose, Mr. Burton, Mr. Gronna, and Mr. Colt.

On Indian Affairs: Mr. Stone (chairman), Mr. Myers, Mr. Ashurst, Mr. Thornton, Mr. Pittman, Mr. Lane, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Owen, Mr. Clapp, Mr. La Follette, Mr. Page, Mr. Gronna, Mr. Townsend, and Mr. Fall.

On Indian Depredations: Mr. Borah (chairman), Mr. Perkins, Mr. McCumber, Mr. Burleigh, Mr. Weeks, Mr. Swanson, Mr. Myers, Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Pomerene, Mr. Newlands, and Mr. Johnson of Maine.

On Industrial Expositions: Mr. Ashurst (chairman), Mr. Overman, Mr. Pittman, Mr. Martine of New Jersey, Mr. Bryan, Mr. Shields, Mr. Myers, Mr. Root, Mr. Stephenson, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Gronna, Mr. Works, and Mr. Catron.

On Interoceanic Canals: Mr. O'Gorman (chairman), Mr. Thornton, Mr. Chilton, Mr. Shields, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Owen, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Brandegee, Mr. Borah, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Bristow, Mr. Perkins, and Mr. Page.

On Interstate Commerce: Mr. Newlands (chairman), Mr. Smith of South Carolina, Mr. Pomerene, Mr. Kern, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Myers, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Saulsbury, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Clapp, Mr. Cummins, Mr. Brandegee, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Lippitt, Mr. Townsend, and Mr. La Follette.

To Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands: Mr. Stephenson (chairman), Mr. Poindexter, Mr. Smith of Maryland, Mr. Bryan, and Mr. James.

On Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands: Mr. Myers (chairman), Mr. Smith of Arizona, Mr. Lane, Mr. Pittman, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Sheppard, Mr. Gore, Mr. Jones, Mr. Warren, Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Borah, Mr. Works, and Mr. Catron.

On Revision of the Laws of the United States (Joint): Mr. ——— (chairman), Mr. Johnston of Alabama, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sutherland, and Mr. Colt.

On the Judiciary: Mr. Culberson (chairman), Mr. Overman, Mr. Chilton, Mr. O'Gorman, Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Reed, Mr. Ashurst, Mr. Shields, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Clark of Wyoming, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Dillingham, Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Brandegee, Mr. Borah, Mr. Cummins, and Mr. Root.

On the Library: Mr. Lea (chairman), Mr. Shively, Mr. Smith of Georgia, Mr. Owen, Mr. Newlands, Mr. Cummins, Mr. Root, and Mr. Burton.

On Manufactures: Mr. Reed (chairman), Mr. Smith of South Carolina, Mr. Pomerene, Mr. O'Gorman, Mr. Thornton, Mr. Saulsbury, Mr. Oliver, Mr. La Follette, Mr. Cummins, Mr. McLean, and Mr. Jackson.

On Military Affairs: Mr. Johnston of Alabama (chairman), Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Hitchcock, Mr. Lea, Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Myers, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Vardaman, Mr. Clarke of Arkansas, Mr. du Pont, Mr. Warren, Mr. Bristow, Mr. Catron, Mr. Brady, Mr. Kenyon, and Mr. ———.

On Mines and Mining: Mr. Walsh (chairman), Mr. Ashurst, Mr. Tillman, Mr. Johnston of Alabama, Mr. Pittman, Mr. Shafroth, Mr. Poindexter, Mr. Fall, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Sterling.

On the Mississippi River and its Tributaries: Mr. Cummins (chairman), Mr. Burton, Mr. Sterling, Mr. Williams, Mr. Shields, Mr. Thornton, and Mr. Stone.

On National Banks: Mr. Johnson of Maine (chairman), Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Martine of New Jersey, Mr. Brady, and Mr. Burton.

On Naval Affairs: Mr. Tillman (chairman), Mr. Thornton, Mr. Swanson, Mr. Bryan, Mr. Johnson of Maine, Mr. Chilton, Mr. O'Gorman, Mr. Smith of Maryland, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Penrose, Mr. Clapp, Mr. Lodge, Mr. Smith of Michigan, Mr. Page, and Mr. Poindexter.

On Pacific Islands and Porto Rico: Mr. Shafroth (chairman), Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Kern, Mr. Thornton, Mr. Saulsbury, Mr. Vardaman, Mr. James, Mr. Poindexter, Mr. Clapp, Mr. Fall, Mr. Burleigh, and Mr. ———.

On Pacific Railroads: Mr. Brandegee (chairman), Mr. Gallinger, Mr. McCumber, Mr. Jones, Mr. Townsend, Mr. Shively, Mr. Reed, Mr. Pittman, Mr. Saulsbury, and Mr. Stone.

On Patents: Mr. James (chairman), Mr. Shively, Mr. Smith of South Carolina, Mr. Gore, Mr. Brandegee, Mr. Kenyon, and Mr. Colt.

On Pensions: Mr. Shively (chairman), Mr. Bryan, Mr. Johnson of Maine, Mr. Ashurst, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Gore, Mr. McCumber, Mr. Smoot, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Poindexter, Mr. Sterling, and Mr. ———.

On the Philippines: Mr. Hitchcock (chairman), Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Reed, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Lane, Mr. Saulsbury, Mr. Ransdell, Mr. Martine of New Jersey, Mr. Bristow, Mr. Crawford, Mr. McLean, Mr. Lippitt, Mr. Kenyon, and Mr. Weeks.

On Post Offices and Post Roads: Mr. Bankhead (chairman), Mr. Smith of South Carolina, Mr. Swanson, Mr. Bryan, Mr. Martine of New Jersey, Mr. Smith of Georgia, Mr. Lea, Mr. Chilton, Mr. Vardaman, Mr. Penrose, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Bristow, Mr. Townsend, Mr. Catron, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Colt.

On Printing: Mr. Fletcher (chairman), Mr. Chilton, Mr. Kern, Mr. Hitchcock, Mr. Smith of Arizona, Mr. Smoot, Mr. Gallinger, and Mr. Page.

On Private Land Claims: Mr. Lodge (chairman), Mr. Smith of Michigan, Mr. Gronna, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Tillman, Mr. Thomas, and Mr. Hitchcock.

On Privileges and Elections: Mr. Kern (chairman), Mr. Lea, Mr. Pomerene, Mr. Reed, Mr. Johnson of Maine, Mr. Vardaman, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Dillingham, Mr. Clapp, Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Oliver, and Mr. Kenyon.

On Public Buildings and Grounds: Mr. Swanson (chairman), Mr. Martine of New Jersey, Mr. Reed, Mr. Ashurst, Mr. Kern, Mr. Lane, Mr. Johnston of Alabama, Mr. Saulsbury, Mr. Culberson, Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Warren, Mr. du Pont, Mr. Stephenson, Mr. Poindexter, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Burleigh.

On Public Health and National Quarantine: Mr. Ransdell (chairman), Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Owen, Mr. Williams, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Culberson, Mr. Smoot, Mr. Root, Mr. Works, Mr. Brady, and Mr. Weeks.

On Public Lands: Mr. Chamberlain (chairman), Mr. Myers, Mr. Smith of Arizona, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Pittman, Mr. Ransdell, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Smoot, Mr. Clark of Wyoming, Mr. Works, Mr. Fall, Mr. Norris, and Mr. Sterling.

On Railroads: Mr. Perkins (chairman), Mr. Oliver, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Norris, Mr. ———, Mr. Clarke of Arkansas, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Reed, Mr. Smith of Arizona, Mr. Williams, and Mr. Smith of South Carolina.

On Revolutionary Claims: Mr. Bradley (chairman), Mr. Burleigh, Mr. Newlands, Mr. Chilton, and Mr. Myers.

On Rules: Mr. Overman (chairman), Mr. Kern, Mr. O'Gorman, Mr. Williams, Mr. Lea, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Warren, Mr. Gallinger, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Cummins.

On Standards, Weights, and Measures: Mr. Bankhead, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Clapp, and Mr. du Pont.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, Mr. CLAPP should be chairman of that committee, I think.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, at the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia, I move that Mr. BACON's name be struck off and Mr. SHIELDS's name inserted.

Mr. WARREN. That is a minority committee, with Mr. CLAPP as chairman. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Indiana to that fact. We have chosen Mr. CLAPP as chairman of the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures.

Mr. KERN. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. I think it should be so inserted.

Mr. OWEN. Yes.

The reading was resumed, as follows:

On Standards, Weights, and Measures: Mr. Clapp (chairman), Mr. du Pont, Mr. Bankhead, Mr. Shields, and Mr. Hughes.

On Territories: Mr. Pittman (chairman), Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Shively, Mr. Johnson of Maine, Mr. Hitchcock, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Owen, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Bristow, Mr. McLean, Mr. Lippitt, and Mr. Jones.

On Transportation Routes to the Seaboard: Mr. McCumber (chairman), Mr. Lodge, Mr. Burton, Mr. Burleigh, Mr. Sheppard, Mr. Bankhead, Mr. Vardaman, and Mr. Hughes.

On Transportation and Sale of Meat Products: Mr. du Pont (chairman), Mr. Stephenson, Mr. Hollis, Mr. Simmons, and Mr. Shafroth.

On the University of the United States: Mr. Dillingham (chairman), Mr. Brandegee, Mr. Clark of Wyoming, Mr. McCumber, Mr. ———, Mr. Colt, Mr. Johnston of Alabama, Mr. Overman, Mr. Williams, Mr. Hollis, and Mr. Saulsbury.

On Woman Suffrage: Mr. Thomas (chairman), Mr. Owen, Mr. Ashurst, Mr. Ransdell, Mr. Hollis, Mr. Sutherland, and Mr. Jones.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, as to the Committee on Woman Suffrage, let me ask the Senator from Indiana how many places he has accorded the minority there? I understand that there should be four.

Mr. OWEN. There were two members allowed to the minority that were not named, and were to be named in a subsequent resolution.

Mr. WARREN. I understand that; but I was about to name them now. The members of the minority should be Mr. CLAPP, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. JONES, and Mr. CATRON.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, the question is on agreeing to the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. TILLMAN. I move that it be agreed to, and I want to say a word.

Under the rules of seniority which have always obtained here I was entitled to the chairmanship of the Committee on Appropriations. I asked for that committee; but my colleagues, in their wisdom—and I recognize that every man on the steering committee that selected the membership of this committee is my friend—thought that I had better retire into the still water for a while and leave the battleships to go out in the open. I bow, and cheerfully submit to that decision.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in the case of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce, I wish to inquire whether the words "and Labor" were omitted. I did not understand as to that when the resolution was read.

Mr. KERN. It was intended to read "Departments." The word should be pluralized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Senators, on agreeing to the constitution of the standing committees as proposed by the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The list of committees as constituted is as follows:

STANDING COMMITTEES.

On Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress: Boies Penrose, of Pennsylvania (chairman); Miles Poindexter, of Washington; William J. Stone, of Missouri; William Hughes, of New Jersey; James K. Vardaman, of Mississippi.

On Agriculture and Forestry: Thomas P. Gore, of Oklahoma (chairman); George E. Chamberlain, of Oregon; Ellison D. Smith, of South Carolina; Hoke Smith, of Georgia; Morris Sheppard, of Texas; John F. Shafroth, of Colorado; Joseph E. Ransdell, of Louisiana; William H. Thompson, of Kansas; Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas; Francis E. Warren, of Wyoming; Carroll S. Page, of Vermont; Coe I. Crawford, of South Dakota; William O. Bradley, of Kentucky; Asle J. Gronna, of North Dakota; James H. Brady, of Idaho; George W. Norris, of Nebraska.

On Appropriations: Thomas S. Martin, of Virginia (chairman); Lee S. Overman, of North Carolina; Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma; John Walter Smith, of Maryland; George E. Chamberlain, of Oregon; Luke Lea, of Tennessee; Nathan P. Bryan, of Florida; John F. Shafroth, of Colorado; Benjamin R. Tillman, of South Carolina; Charles A. Culberson, of Texas; Francis E. Warren, of Wyoming; George C. Perkins, of California; Jacob H. Gallinger, of New Hampshire; Reed Smoot, of Utah; George T. Oliver, of Pennsylvania; William P. Dillingham, of Vermont; Wesley L. Jones, of Washington.

To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate: John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi (chairman); John F. Shafroth, of Colorado; James A. Reed, of Missouri; William P. Dillingham, of Vermont; Joseph L. Bristow, of Kansas.

On Banking and Currency: Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma (chairman); Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Nebraska; James A. O'Gorman, of New York; James A. Reed, of Missouri; Atlee Pomerene, of Ohio; John F. Shafroth, of Colorado; Henry F. Hollis, of New Hampshire; Knute Nelson, of Minnesota; Joseph L. Bristow, of Kansas; Coe I. Crawford, of South Dakota; George P. McLean, of Connecticut; John W. Weeks, of Massachusetts.

On Canadian Relations: John K. Shields, of Tennessee (chairman); Joseph E. Ransdell, of Louisiana; Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana; Thomas P. Gore, of Oklahoma; John Walter Smith, of Maryland; George T. Oliver, of Pennsylvania; Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa; Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio; Elihu Root, of New York.

On the Census: William E. Chilton, of West Virginia (chairman); Atlee Pomerene, of Ohio; Morris Sheppard, of Texas; Benjamin F. Shively, of Indiana; John R. Thornton, of Louisiana; James E. Martine, of New Jersey; William H. Thompson, of Kansas; Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin; Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa; Henry A. du Pont, of Delaware; George P. McLean, of Connecticut; Charles E. Townsend, of Michigan.

On Civil Service and Retrenchment: Atlee Pomerene, of Ohio (chairman); Joseph F. Johnston, of Alabama; Henry L. Myers, of Montana; Ollie M. James, of Kentucky; Henry F. Hollis, of New Hampshire; John K. Shields, of Tennessee; Joseph E. Ransdell, of Louisiana; Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa; Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin; Reed Smoot, of Utah; LeBaron B. Colt, of Rhode Island; Thomas Sterling, of South Dakota.

On Claims: Nathan P. Bryan, of Florida (chairman); Lee S. Overman, of North Carolina; Key Pittman, of Nevada; Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas; Ollie M. James, of Kentucky; Charles F. Johnson, of Maine; Thomas S. Martin, of Virginia; Harry Lane, of Oregon; Coe I. Crawford, of South Dakota; Joseph L. Bristow, of Kansas; William O. Bradley, of Kentucky; Edwin C. Burleigh, of Maine; ———, ———; George W. Norris, of Nebraska.

On Coast and Insular Survey: Willard Saulsbury, of Delaware (chairman); Nathan P. Bryan, of Florida; Charles A. Culberson, of Texas; John H. Bankhead, of Alabama; Key Pittman, of Nevada; Charles E. Townsend, of Michigan; John D. Works, of California; James H. Brady, of Idaho; Thomas Sterling, of South Dakota.

On Coast Defenses: James E. Martine, of New Jersey (chairman); Charles F. Johnson, of Maine; Furnifold McL. Simmons, of North Carolina; John Walter Smith, of Maryland; Morris Sheppard, of Texas; Harry Lane, of Oregon; Henry A. du Pont, of Delaware; Elihu Root, of New York; Thomas B. Catron, of New Mexico; John W. Weeks, of Massachusetts; Edwin C. Burleigh, of Maine.

On Commerce: James P. Clarke, of Arkansas (chairman); Duncan U. Fletcher, of Florida; George E. Chamberlain, of Oregon; Joseph E. Ransdell, of Louisiana; Morris Sheppard, of Texas; James K. Vardaman, of Mississippi; John K. Shields, of Tennessee; Thomas S. Martin, of Virginia; John H. Bankhead, of Alabama; Furnifold McL. Simmons, of North Carolina; Knute Nelson, of Minnesota; George C. Perkins, of California; William Alden Smith, of Michigan; Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio; Isaac Stephenson, of Wisconsin; Coe I. Crawford, of South Dakota; George T. Oliver, of Pennsylvania.

On Conservation of National Resources: Marcus A. Smith, of Arizona (chairman); Ellison D. Smith, of South Carolina; James K. Vardaman, of Mississippi; Willard Saulsbury, of Delaware; Ollie M. James, of Kentucky; William H. Thompson, of Kansas; Francis G. Newlands, of Nevada; John H. Bankhead, of Alabama; Clarence D. Clark, of Wyoming; Wesley L. Jones, of Washington; Asle J. Gronna, of North Dakota; James H. Brady, of Idaho; ———, ———; Thomas Sterling, of South Dakota; John W. Weeks, of Massachusetts.

On Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia: Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin (chairman); Henry F. Lippitt, of Rhode Island; William J. Stone, of Missouri; Benjamin F. Shively, of Indiana; Augustus O. Bacon, of Georgia.

On Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments: Carroll S. Page, of Vermont (chairman); Reed Smoot, of Utah; Harry Lane, of Oregon.

On the District of Columbia: John Walter Smith, of Maryland (chairman); Atlee Pomerene, of Ohio; Marcus A. Smith, of Arizona; John W. Kern, of Indiana; Henry F. Hollis, of New Hampshire; Ollie M. James, of Kentucky; Willard Saulsbury, of Delaware; Thomas S. Martin, of Virginia; William P. Dillingham, of Vermont; Wesley L. Jones, of Washington; John D. Works, of California; William S. Kenyon, of Iowa; Albert B. Fall, of New Mexico; Henry F. Lippitt, of Rhode Island.

On Education and Labor: Hoke Smith, of Georgia (chairman); Benjamin F. Shively, of Indiana; Claude A. Swanson, of Virginia; James E. Martine, of New Jersey; Charles F. Johnson, of Maine; John K. Shields, of Tennessee; William E. Borah, of Idaho; Boies Penrose, of Pennsylvania; Carroll S. Page, of Vermont; George P. McLean, of Connecticut; William S. Kenyon, of Iowa.

On Engrossed Bills: Francis E. Warren, of Wyoming (chairman); Furnifold McL. Simmons, of North Carolina; Willard Saulsbury, of Delaware.

On Enrolled Bills: Henry F. Hollis, of New Hampshire (chairman); Ollie M. James, of Kentucky; Isaac Stephenson, of Wisconsin.

To Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service: William Alden Smith, of Michigan (chairman); Coe I. Crawford, of South Dakota; William Purnell Jackson, of Maryland; Luke Lea, of Tennessee; Charles A. Culberson, of Texas; Furnifold McL. Simmons, of North Carolina; John Walter Smith, of Maryland.

On Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture: Morris Sheppard, of Texas (chairman); Furnifold McL. Simmons, of North Carolina; Thomas P. Gore, of Oklahoma; Henry F. Lippitt, of Rhode Island; Isaac Stephenson, of Wisconsin.

On Expenditures in the Departments of Commerce and Labor: William H. Thompson, of Kansas (chairman); William E. Chilton, of West Virginia; Thomas S. Martin, of Virginia; Albert B. Fall, of New Mexico; James H. Brady, of Idaho.

On Expenditures in the Interior Department: Reed Smoot, of Utah (chairman); Thomas B. Catron, of New Mexico; Miles Poindexter, of Washington; Claude A. Swanson, of Virginia; Henry F. Hollis, of New Hampshire.

On Expenditures in the Department of Justice: George Sutherland, of Utah (chairman); William O. Bradley, of Kentucky; William E. Borah, of Idaho; Key Pittman, of Nevada; Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas.

On Expenditures in the Navy Department: William Hughes, of New Jersey (chairman); Thomas S. Martin, of Virginia; Benjamin R. Tillman, of South Carolina; Asle J. Gronna, of North Dakota; William P. Dillingham, of Vermont.

On Expenditures in the Post Office Department: James K. Vardaman, of Mississippi (chairman); Augustus O. Bacon, of Georgia; William E. Chilton, of West Virginia; Joseph L. Bristow, of Kansas; William Alden Smith, of Michigan.

On Expenditures in the Department of State: ———, ——— (chairman); William J. Stone, of Missouri; Joseph E. Ransdell, of Louisiana; William Purnell Jackson, of Maryland; Boies Penrose, of Pennsylvania.

On Expenditures in the Treasury Department: Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas (chairman); John Walter Smith, of Maryland; Luke Lea, of Tennessee; Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio; John D. Works, of California.

On Expenditures in the War Department: Miles Poindexter, of Washington (chairman); William S. Kenyon, of Iowa; George W. Norris, of Nebraska; Harry Lane, of Oregon; Joseph F. Johnston, of Alabama.

On Finance: Furnifold McL. Simmons, of North Carolina (chairman); William J. Stone, of Missouri; John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi; Charles F. Johnson, of Maine; Benjamin F. Shively, of Indiana; Hoke Smith, of Georgia; Charles S. Thomas, of Colorado; Ollie M. James, of Kentucky; William Hughes, of New Jersey; Thomas P. Gore, of Oklahoma; Boies Penrose, of Pennsylvania; Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts; Porter J. McCumber, of North Dakota; Reed Smoot, of Utah; Jacob H. Gallinger, of New Hampshire; Clarence D. Clark, of Wyoming; Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin.

On Fisheries: John R. Thornton, of Louisiana (chairman); Duncan U. Fletcher, of Florida; Charles F. Johnson, of Maine; Thomas S. Martin, of Virginia; Harry Lane, of Oregon; John D. Works, of California; Wesley L. Jones, of Washington; George C. Perkins, of California; Edwin C. Burleigh, of Maine.

On the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians: Knute Nelson, of Minnesota (chairman); LeBaron B. Colt, of Rhode Island; Benjamin R. Tillman, of South Carolina; James P. Clarke, of Arkansas; Francis G. Newlands, of Nevada.

On Foreign Relations: Augustus O. Bacon, of Georgia (chairman); William J. Stone, of Missouri; Benjamin F. Shively, of Indiana; James P. Clarke, of Arkansas; Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Nebraska; James A. O'Gorman, of New York; John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi; Claude A. Swanson, of Virginia; Atlee Pomerene, of Ohio; Marcus A. Smith, of Arizona; Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts; William Alden Smith, of Michigan; Elihu Root, of New York; Porter J. McCumber, of North Dakota; George Sutherland, of Utah; William E. Borah, of Idaho; Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio.

On Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game: Harry Lane, of Oregon (chairman); Henry F. Ashurst, of Arizona; Benjamin R. Tillman, of South Carolina; Lee S. Overman, of North Carolina; Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Nebraska; George P. McLean, of Connecticut; Miles Poindexter, of Washington; George W. Norris, of Nebraska; John W. Weeks, of Massachusetts.

On the Geological Survey: Clarence D. Clark, of Wyoming (chairman); Albert B. Fall, of New Mexico; George W. Norris, of Nebraska; John W. Kern, of Indiana; Ellison D. Smith, of South Carolina; Ollie M. James, of Kentucky; Marcus A. Smith, of Arizona.

On Immigration: Ellison D. Smith, of South Carolina (chairman); John W. Kern, of Indiana; James A. O'Gorman, of New York; Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas; Morris Sheppard, of Texas; Thomas P. Gore, of Oklahoma; Henry F. Hollis, of New Hampshire; Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts; William P. Dillingham, of Vermont; Boies Penrose, of Pennsylvania; Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio; Asle J. Gronna, of North Dakota; LeBaron B. Colt, of Rhode Island.

On Indian Affairs: William J. Stone, of Missouri (chairman); Henry L. Myers, of Montana; Henry F. Ashurst, of Arizona; John R. Thornton, of Louisiana; Key Pittman, of Nevada; Harry Lane, of Oregon; Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas; William H. Thompson, of Kansas; Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma; Moses E. Clapp, of Minnesota; Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin; Carroll S. Page, of Vermont; Asle J. Gronna, of North Dakota; Charles E. Townsend, of Michigan; Albert B. Fall, of New Mexico.

On Indian Depredations: William E. Borah, of Idaho (chairman); George C. Perkins, of California; Porter J. McCumber, of North Dakota; Edwin C. Burleigh, of Maine; John W. Weeks, of Massachusetts; Claude A. Swanson, of Virginia; Henry L. Myers, of Montana; Duncan U. Fletcher, of Florida; Atlee Pomerene, of Ohio; Francis G. Newlands, of Nevada; Charles F. Johnson, of Maine.

On Industrial Expositions: Henry F. Ashurst, of Arizona (chairman); Lee S. Overman, of North Carolina; Key Pittman, of Nevada; James E. Martine, of New Jersey; Nathan P. Bryan, of Florida; John K. Shields, of Tennessee; Henry L. Myers, of Montana; Elihu Root, of New York; Isaac Stephenson, of Wisconsin; George T. Oliver, of Pennsylvania; Asle J. Gronna, of North Dakota; John D. Works, of California; Thomas B. Catron, of New Mexico.

On Interoceanic Canals: James A. O'Gorman, of New York (chairman); John R. Thornton, of Louisiana; William E. Chilton, of West Virginia; John K. Shields, of Tennessee; Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana; Charles S. Thomas, of Colorado; Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma; F. M. Simmons, of North Carolina; Frank B. Brandegee, of Connecticut; William E. Borah, of Idaho; Coe I. Crawford, of South Dakota; Joseph L. Bristow, of Kansas; George C. Perkins, of California; Carroll S. Page, of Vermont.

On Interstate Commerce: Francis G. Newlands, of Nevada (chairman); Ellison D. Smith, of South Carolina; Atlee Pomerene, of Ohio; John W. Kern, of Indiana; Charles S. Thomas, of Colorado; Henry L. Myers, of Montana; Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas; Willard Saulsbury, of Delaware; William H. Thompson, of Kansas; Moses E. Clapp, of Minnesota; Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa; Frank B. Brandegee, of Connecticut; George T. Oliver, of Pennsylvania; Henry F. Lippitt, of Rhode Island; Charles E. Townsend, of Michigan; Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin.

To Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands: Isaac Stephenson, of Wisconsin (chairman); Miles Poindexter, of Washington; John Walter Smith, of Maryland; Nathan P. Bryan, of Florida; Ollie M. James, of Kentucky.

On Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands: Henry L. Myers, of Montana (chairman); Marcus A. Smith, of Arizona; Harry Lane, of Oregon; Key Pittman, of Nevada; William H. Thompson, of Kansas; Morris Sheppard, of Texas; Thomas P.

Gore, of Oklahoma; Wesley L. Jones, of Washington; Francis E. Warren, of Wyoming; George Sutherland, of Utah; William E. Borah, of Idaho; John D. Works, of California; Thomas B. Catron, of New Mexico.

On Revision of the Laws of the United States (Joint): Joseph F. Johnston, of Alabama; Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas; George Sutherland, of Utah; LeBaron B. Colt, of Rhode Island.

On the Judiciary: Charles A. Culberson, of Texas (chairman); Lee S. Overman, of North Carolina; William E. Chilton, of West Virginia; James A. O'Gorman, of New York; Duncan U. Fletcher, of Florida; James A. Reed, of Missouri; Henry F. Ashurst, of Arizona; John K. Shields, of Tennessee; Thomas A. Walsh, of Montana; Augustus O. Bacon, of Georgia; Clarence D. Clark, of Wyoming; Knute Nelson, of Minnesota; William P. Dillingham, of Vermont; George Sutherland, of Utah; Frank B. Brandegee, of Connecticut; William E. Borah, of Idaho; Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa; Elihu Root, of New York.

On the Library: Luke Lea, of Tennessee (chairman); Benjamin F. Shively, of Indiana; Hoke Smith, of Georgia; Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma; Francis G. Newlands, of Nevada; Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa; Elihu Root, of New York; Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio.

On Manufactures: James A. Reed, of Missouri (chairman); Ellison D. Smith, of South Carolina; Atlee Pomerene, of Ohio; James A. O'Gorman, of New York; John R. Thornton, of Louisiana; Willard A. Saulsbury, of Delaware; George T. Oliver, of Pennsylvania; Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin; Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa; George P. McLean, of Connecticut; William Purnell Jackson, of Maryland.

On Military Affairs: Joseph F. Johnston, of Alabama (chairman); George E. Chamberlain, of Oregon; Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Nebraska; Luke Lea, of Tennessee; Duncan U. Fletcher, of Florida; Henry L. Myers, of Montana; Charles S. Thomas, of Colorado; James K. Vardaman, of Mississippi; James P. Clarke, of Arkansas; Henry A. du Pont, of Delaware; Francis E. Warren, of Wyoming; Joseph L. Bristow, of Kansas; Thomas B. Catron, of New Mexico; James H. Brady, of Idaho; William S. Kenyon, of Iowa; ———, ———.

On Mines and Mining: Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana (chairman); Henry F. Ashurst, of Arizona; Benjamin R. Tillman, of South Carolina; Joseph F. Johnston, of Alabama; Key Pittman, of Nevada; John F. Shafroth, of Colorado; Miles Poindexter, of Washington; Albert B. Fall, of New Mexico; William Purnell Jackson, of Maryland; Thomas Sterling, of South Dakota.

On the Mississippi River and its Tributaries: Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa (chairman); Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio; Thomas Sterling, of South Dakota; John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi; John K. Shields, of Tennessee; John R. Thornton, of Louisiana; William J. Stone, of Missouri.

On National Banks: Charles F. Johnson, of Maine (chairman); George E. Chamberlain, of Oregon; James E. Martine, of New Jersey; James H. Brady, of Idaho; Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio.

On Naval Affairs: Benjamin R. Tillman, of South Carolina (chairman); John R. Thornton, of Louisiana; Claude A. Swanson, of Virginia; Nathan P. Bryan, of Florida; Charles F. Johnson, of Maine; William E. Chilton, of West Virginia; James A. O'Gorman, of New York; John Walter Smith, of Maryland; George C. Perkins, of California; Boies Penrose, of Pennsylvania; Moses E. Clapp, of Minnesota; Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts; William Alden Smith, of Michigan; Carroll S. Page, of Vermont; Miles Poindexter, of Washington.

On Pacific Islands and Porto Rico: John F. Shafroth, of Colorado (chairman); Duncan U. Fletcher, of Florida; John W. Kern, of Indiana; John R. Thornton, of Louisiana; Willard Saulsbury, of Delaware; James K. Vardaman, of Mississippi; Ollie M. James, of Kentucky; Miles Poindexter, of Washington; Moses E. Clapp, of Minnesota; Albert B. Fall, of New Mexico; Edwin C. Burleigh, of Maine; ———, ———.

On Pacific Railroads: Frank B. Brandegee, of Connecticut (chairman); Jacob H. Gallinger, of New Hampshire; Porter J. McCumber, of North Dakota; Wesley L. Jones, of Washington; Charles E. Townsend, of Michigan; Benjamin F. Shively, of Indiana; James A. Reed, of Missouri; Key Pittman, of Nevada; Willard Saulsbury, of Delaware; William J. Stone, of Missouri.

On Patents: Ollie M. James, of Kentucky (chairman); Benjamin F. Shively, of Indiana; Ellison D. Smith, of South Carolina; Thomas P. Gore, of Oklahoma; Frank B. Brandegee, of Connecticut; William S. Kenyon, of Iowa; LeBaron B. Colt, of Rhode Island.

On Pensions: Benjamin F. Shively, of Indiana (chairman); Nathan P. Bryan, of Florida; Charles F. Johnson, of Maine; Henry F. Ashurst, of Arizona; William Hughes, of New Jersey; Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana; Thomas P. Gore, of Oklahoma; Porter J. McCumber, of North Dakota; Reed Smoot, of Utah; William O. Bradley, of Kentucky; Miles Poindexter, of Washington; ———, ———; Thomas Sterling, of South Dakota.

On the Philippines: Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Nebraska (chairman); Duncan U. Fletcher, of Florida; James A. Reed, of Missouri; Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana; Harry Lane, of Oregon; Willard Saulsbury, of Delaware; Joseph E. Ransdell, of Louisiana; James E. Martine, of New Jersey; Joseph L. Bristow, of Kansas; Coe I. Crawford, of South Dakota; George P. McLean, of Connecticut; Henry F. Lippitt, of Rhode Island; William S. Kenyon, of Iowa; John W. Weeks, of Massachusetts.

On Post Offices and Post Roads: John H. Bankhead, of Alabama (chairman); Ellison D. Smith, of South Carolina; Claude A. Swanson, of Virginia; Nathan P. Bryan, of Florida; James E. Martine, of New Jersey; Hoke Smith, of Georgia; Luke Lea, of Tennessee; William E. Chilton, of West Virginia; James K. Vardaman, of Mississippi; Boies Penrose, of Pennsylvania; William O. Bradley, of Kentucky; Joseph L. Bristow, of Kansas; Charles E. Townsend, of Michigan; Thomas B. Catron, of New Mexico; William Purnell Jackson, of Maryland; LeBaron B. Colt, of Rhode Island.

On Printing: Duncan U. Fletcher, of Florida (chairman); William E. Chilton, of West Virginia; John W. Kern, of Indiana; Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Nebraska; Marcus A. Smith, of Arizona; Reed Smoot, of Utah; Jacob H. Gallinger, of New Hampshire; Carroll S. Page, of Vermont.

On Private Land Claims: Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts (chairman); William Alden Smith, of Michigan; Asle J. Gronna, of North Dakota; Augustus O. Bacon, of Georgia; Benjamin R. Tillman, of South Carolina; Charles S. Thomas, of Colorado; Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Nebraska.

On Privileges and Elections: John W. Kern, of Indiana (chairman); Luke Lea, of Tennessee; Atlee Pomerene, of Ohio; James A. Reed, of Missouri; Charles F. Johnson, of Maine; James K. Vardaman, of Mississippi; William Hughes, of New Jersey; Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana; William H. Thompson, of Kansas; William P. Dillingham, of Vermont; Moses E. Clapp, of Minnesota; George Sutherland, of Utah; William O. Bradley, of Kentucky; George T. Oliver, of Pennsylvania; William S. Kenyon, of Iowa.

On Public Buildings and Grounds: Claude A. Swanson, of Virginia (chairman); James E. Martine, of New Jersey; James A. Reed, of Missouri; Henry F. Ashurst, of Arizona; John W. Kern, of Indiana; Harry Lane, of Oregon; Joseph F. Johnston, of Alabama; Willard Saulsbury, of Delaware; Charles A. Culberson, of Texas; George Sutherland, of Utah; Francis E. Warren, of Wyoming; Henry A. du Pont, of Delaware; Isaac Stephenson, of Wisconsin; Miles Poindexter, of Washington; William Purnell Jackson, of Maryland; Edwin C. Burleigh, of Maine.

On Public Health and National Quarantine: Joseph E. Ransdell, of Louisiana (chairman); Duncan U. Fletcher, of Florida; Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma; John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi; William Hughes, of New Jersey; Charles A. Culberson, of Texas; Reed Smoot, of Utah; Elihu Root, of New York; John D. Works, of California; James H. Brady, of Idaho; John W. Weeks, of Massachusetts.

On Public Lands: George E. Chamberlain, of Oregon (chairman); Henry L. Myers, of Montana; Marcus A. Smith, of Arizona; Charles S. Thomas, of Colorado; Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas; William H. Thompson, of Kansas; Key Pittman, of Nevada; Joseph E. Ransdell, of Louisiana; William Hughes, of New Jersey; Reed Smoot, of Utah; Clarence D. Clark, of Wyoming; John D. Works, of California; Albert B. Fall, of New Mexico; George W. Norris, of Nebraska; Thomas Sterling, of South Dakota.

On Railroads: George C. Perkins, of California (chairman); George T. Oliver, of Pennsylvania; William Purnell Jackson, of Maryland; George W. Norris, of Nebraska; ———, ———; James P. Clarke, of Arkansas; Augustus O. Bacon, of Georgia; James A. Reed, of Missouri; Marcus A. Smith, of Arizona; John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi; Ellison D. Smith, of South Carolina.

On Revolutionary Claims: William O. Bradley, of Kentucky (chairman); Edwin C. Burleigh, of Maine; Francis G. Newlands, of Nevada; William E. Chilton, of West Virginia; Henry L. Myers, of Montana.

On Rules: Lee S. Overman, of North Carolina (chairman); John W. Kern, of Indiana; James A. O'Gorman, of New York; John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi; Luke Lea, of Tennessee; Augustus O. Bacon, of Georgia; Francis E. Warren, of Wyoming; Jacob H. Gallinger, of New Hampshire; Knute Nelson, of Minnesota; Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa.

On Standards, Weights, and Measures: Moses E. Clapp, of Minnesota (chairman); Henry A. du Pont, of Delaware; John

H. Bankhead, of Alabama; John K. Shields, of Tennessee; William Hughes, of New Jersey.

On Territories: Key Pittman, of Nevada (chairman); George E. Chamberlain, of Oregon; Benjamin F. Shively, of Indiana; Charles F. Johnson, of Maine; Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Nebraska; Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana; Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma; Knute Nelson, of Minnesota; Joseph L. Bristow, of Kansas; George P. McLean, of Connecticut; Henry F. Lippitt, of Rhode Island; Wesley L. Jones, of Washington.

On Transportation Routes to the Seaboard: Porter J. McCumber, of North Dakota (chairman); Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts; Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio; Edwin C. Burleigh, of Maine; Morris Sheppard, of Texas; John H. Bankhead, of Alabama; James K. Vardaman, of Mississippi; William Hughes, of New Jersey.

On Transportation and Sale of Meat Products: Henry A. du Pont, of Delaware (chairman); Isaac Stephenson, of Wisconsin; Henry F. Hollis, of New Hampshire; Furnifold McL. Simmons, of North Carolina; John F. Shafroth, of Colorado.

On the University of the United States: William P. Dillingham, of Vermont (chairman); Frank B. Brandegee, of Connecticut; Clarence D. Clark, of Wyoming; Porter J. McCumber, of North Dakota; ———, ———; LeBaron B. Colt, of Rhode Island; Joseph F. Johnston, of Alabama; Lee S. Overman, of North Carolina; John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi; Henry F. Hollis, of New Hampshire; Willard Saulsbury, of Delaware.

On Woman Suffrage: Charles S. Thomas, of Colorado (chairman); Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma; Henry F. Ashurst, of Arizona; Joseph E. Ransdell, of Louisiana; Henry F. Hollis, of New Hampshire; George Sutherland, of Utah; Wesley L. Jones, of Washington; Moses E. Clapp, of Minnesota; ———, ———; Thomas B. Catron, of New Mexico; ———, ———.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I offer a resolution that I ask to have referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina offers a resolution, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 13) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ a clerk at $3,000 per annum, an assistant clerk at $1,440 per annum, and a messenger at $1,200 per annum, to be paid from "miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Under the law it must be referred to that committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That reference has been made.

INAUGURAL ADDRESSES OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 3).

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, occasionally we have use for a pamphlet copy of the President's inaugural address. I ask to have printed as a public document the inaugural address of President Woodrow Wilson. I also ask that 1,000 extra copies be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I ask that the address of Vice President MARSHALL be printed in connection with the inaugural address of the President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Mississippi will be granted.

PRINTING OF PRAYERS OF CHAPLAIN AND MEMORIAL ADDRESSES.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I submit the resolution which I send to the desk. I ask that it be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 14), as follows:

Resolved, That the prayers as delivered before the United States Senate by the Chaplain, Ulysses G. B. Pierce, during the Sixty-second Congress be, and they are hereby, ordered printed as a public document.

Resolved further, That the eulogies delivered in the Senate over the death of deceased Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives in the Sixty-second Congress be also published in the same document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over and be printed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 20 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 17, 1913, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 15, 1913.

TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES.

John Burke, of North Dakota, to be Treasurer of the United States in place of Carmi A. Thompson, resigned.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

William Wellington Prude, jr., of Alabama, a cadet at the United States Military Academy, for appointment as second lieutenant of Infantry, with rank from March 10, 1913, with the view of placing him on the retired list of the Army.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Robert N. Campbell, late first lieutenant in the Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant in the Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 4, 1909, to take rank in said corps next after First Lieut. Robert O. Edwards.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 15, 1913.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Jacob G. Galbraith to be colonel.
Lieut. Col. Joseph A. Gaston to be colonel.
Maj. William S. Scott to be lieutenant colonel.
Maj. Daniel L. Tate to be lieutenant colonel.
Capt. Samuel G. Jones to be major.
Capt. Melvin W. Rowell to be major.
First Lieut. Thomas M. Knox to be captain.
First Lieut. Basil N. Rittenhouse to be captain.
First Lieut. William R. Taylor to be captain.
Second Lieut. Donald A. Robinson to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Bruce L. Burch to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Edgar M. Whiting to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Edward G. Elliott to be first lieutenant.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

Lieut. Col. Daniel E. McCarthy to be colonel.
Lieut. Col. George B. Davis to be colonel.
Maj. Amos W. Kimball to be lieutenant colonel.
Maj. William H. Hart to be lieutenant colonel.

SIGNAL CORPS.

Lieut. Col. William A. Glassford to be colonel.
Maj. Samuel Reber to be lieutenant colonel.
Capt. Leonard D. Wildman to be major.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Maj. Wilmot E. Ellis to be lieutenant colonel.
Capt. Albert G. Jenkins to be major.

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Charles M. Truitt to be colonel.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *March 17, 1913.*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., of the city of Washington.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I present a communication, in the nature of a petition, signed by the president of the Connecticut Peace Society, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARTFORD, CONN., *March 15, 1913.*

Senator FRANK B. BRANDEGEE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In view of the fact that by the terms of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty the United States agreed to grant all nations observing the rules of neutrality the use of the Panama Canal on terms of entire equality and without discrimination, and in view of the further fact that by the Panama Canal act the Congress of the United States has made a discrimination against the shipping of Great Britain and other nations, contrary to the terms of this treaty, by exempting American coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls, the board of directors of the Connecticut Peace Society feels that a breach of national honor has been committed, and hopes that the Congress of the United States will repeal the exemption clause in the Panama Canal act, or, upon application of Great Britain, will agree to submit to arbitration the question at issue with the British Government.

Personally I feel strongly that the repeal of the clause would be better. I am very proud of the record that our country has made for its honorable methods of diplomacy, and I should deplore any backward step in our dealings with sister nations.

Very truly, yours,

WILBUR F. GORDY,
President Connecticut Peace Society.

HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS ON FLOOR OF SENATE AND HOUSE (S. DOC. NO. 4).

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for a reprint as a document of House Report No. 43, Thirty-eighth Congress, first session, being the report of a select committee of seven Members, of which Mr. Pendleton was chairman, and Senate Report No. 837, Forty-sixth Congress, third session, being the report by Mr. Pendleton from a select committee of eight Senators. Both reports relate to a proposal that the heads of the executive departments should occupy seats on the floor of the two Houses. The reports are not very long, and they are very instructive. I should like to have them reprinted, so that they will be available, together with the appendices which form a part of the reports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

Mr. BACON. I understand the Senator from New York desires to have the matter printed as a document.

Mr. ROOT. Yes. I desire a reprint of a report presented by Mr. Pendleton in the Thirty-eighth Congress and a report presented by him in the Forty-third Congress.

Mr. BACON. It is a reprint?

Mr. ROOT. A reprint.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF PRAYERS OF CHAPLAIN AND MEMORIAL ADDRESSES.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to call up for consideration Senate resolution No. 14, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 14) submitted by Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey on the 15th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the prayers as delivered before the United States Senate by the Chaplain, Ulysses G. B. Pierce, during the Sixty-second Congress, be, and they are hereby, ordered printed as a public document.

Resolved further, That the eulogies delivered in the Senate over the death of deceased Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives in the Sixty-second Congress be also published in the same document.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I desire to amend the resolution by striking out all after line 5, the part pertaining to eulogies on deceased Members of the Senate and House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection——

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Then I move you, sir, that the resolution as read be adopted as the sense of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand that all the prayers on particular occasions have been printed in the RECORD, and I can see no necessity for going to the expense of printing them again in separate form. I certainly hope the Senate will not order the prayers printed.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I stated on Saturday when I offered the resolution——

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina will state his point of order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Objection has been made, and therefore the resolution goes over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is not well taken. The resolution is before the Senate.

Mr. HUGHES. The senior Senator from New Jersey has moved that the resolution be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution is before the Senate. The point of order is not well taken.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to another point of order. If the printing will cost more than $500, the rule requires that it shall go to the Committee on Printing. I do not know what it is going to cost; I have no idea what the cost will be, but that is the rule of the Senate; and whenever a resolution is introduced for printing it goes to the Committee on Printing if the printing is to cost over $500.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Of course, I can not tell what it may cost, but my impression is that the cost will come far short of $500 to print simply the prayers. As I originally offered the resolution it provided for the printing as well of the eulogies that have been delivered on deceased Members of the Senate and the House; but I am quite willing that that part shall be stricken out.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from New Jersey has withdrawn that part of the resolution?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have withdrawn that part of it. The printing of the prayers will require a very small outlay. I feel that the Senate would be richly justified in incurring the small expenditure necessary. The prayers were in infinite good taste and were models in their way. When I think of the resolutions for printing papers on alcohol and the documents on thousands of other subjects that have been published, I can see no justifiable reason for opposing this proposition.

Mr. JAMES. I understand that the resolution has been amended by unanimous consent. I ask that the resolution as amended be read, so that we may see what is to be voted upon.

Mr. HUGHES. The resolution was not amended by unanimous consent. Unanimous consent was refused.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution as it stands.

Mr. JAMES. I understand that unanimous consent was granted.

Mr. HUGHES. Objection was made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read as modified.

The Secretary read the resolution as modified, as follows:

Resolved, That the prayers as delivered before the United States Senate by the Chaplain, Ulysses G. B. Pierce, during the Sixty-second Congress, be, and they are hereby, ordered printed as a public document.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, under the rule the resolution must go over for a day.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is unanimous consent necessary for the consideration of the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution came over from Saturday last.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand it goes over and can not be considered now.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let it go to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If this matter is out of the way——

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not out of the way. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask whether my point of order has been ruled upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order made by the Senator from North Carolina has been ruled upon by the Chair. The point of order is not well taken.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the printing costs over $500, the resolution must be referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That applies only to additional copies, according to the rule of the Senate. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. The resolution was offered this morning?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it was offered on Saturday.

Mr. THOMAS. It was offered on Saturday, but no action was taken on it, and it was reoffered this morning.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It was offered and ordered to be printed and to lie on the table, to be called up subsequently for consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, before the resolution is voted on I wish to make an inquiry. I understood that it would require the unanimous consent of the Senate to consider it this morning. Has the Chair ruled upon that question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has ruled upon it. The resolution is before the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well. Then, if it does not require unanimous consent, unless there are precedents for this action, and a good many of them, I think it is a bad precedent to make. It is very doubtful as to whether connection between church and state is not carried far enough, and if we are going to begin to publish the prayers of one Chaplain, I do not see how we are ever going to decline to publish as public documents the prayers of all the Chaplains.

No human being can sit as a critic upon the quality of a prayer. A prayer is a request sent to the throne of God. It may be an able request or it may be a crude request, and some of the best prayers have perhaps been the crudest prayers. The prayer of the publican who merely bowed his head and confessed his sins has been generally considered as one of the greatest prayers ever offered in the history of the world.

I do not see how we are going to escape making all Chaplains' prayers in both Houses public documents if we once start the precedent. No man can criticize a prayer; no man can praise a prayer. A prayer's value depends upon its sincerity, not its verbiage. It seems to me we are establishing a pretty bad precedent out of mere good humor.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, if I could be assured that the Members of this body would read the prayers after they had

been published as a document, I would be glad to have them published in that way. But I am morally certain that very few heard them when they were delivered, and I fear they would not be read.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. My understanding of the resolution as called up by the senior Senator from New Jersey was that it carried with it the printing of memorial addresses. The senior Senator then asked unanimous consent that that part of the resolution be stricken out. Objection was made, and then it was requested that the resolution be read, and when reported at the desk it was read with that language stricken out. My understanding of the pending proposition is that the resolution as it stands before the Senate calls for the printing of the prayers of the Chaplain and the memorial addresses on the deceased Members of the House and the Senate. Am I correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. For the information of the junior Senator from New Jersey the Chair will state that the senior Senator from New Jersey had a right to modify his resolution, and he did so.

Mr. HUGHES. I did not hear him make that modification.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I made that modification.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I call for the reading of the resolution as it is now presented to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will again read the resolution as modified.

The Secretary read the resolution as modified, as follows:

Resolved, That the prayers as delivered before the United States Senate by the Chaplain, Ulysses G. B. Pierce, during the Sixty-second Congress be, and they are hereby, ordered printed as a public document.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is what I thought it was. What I said applies to the resolution as it stands.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I trust the Senator from Mississippi will not object to the resolution. The Senator declares that prayers depend upon their sincerity. Heaven knows nobody would question the sincerity of Dr. Pierce's prayers. Inasmuch as in ninety instances out of one hundred the seats here are not as well filled during the prayer as they are now, if the prayers were valuable and potent and beautiful, as I think the prayers were, many Senators having had no opportunity to hear them, my proposition is that they may be printed in the form of a public document, so that those who care to do so may have the opportunity to read them in their own chamber. I hope that the resolution will be passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I expressed myself with peculiar awkwardness if from what I said anyone could understand that I was questioning the sincerity of the Chaplain's prayers. I know him well and honor him very much, and I appreciate his piety and his sincerity very much. In what I had to say about prayers and the quality of prayers I was merely trying to reenforce the point that the Senate could never make any distinction, because the Senate never could question or criticize a prayer; and therefore if we print as a public document one Chaplain's prayers there will never remain any valid reason for objecting to the printing of another Chaplain's prayers.

A great many churches do not believe in prayer books, but if the Senate every time it changes parties or every time a new Congress comes in publishes a new prayer book under the authorization of the United States Government, and with the indorsement of the United States Government, it seems to me we are going pretty far in the direction not of the establishment of a religion, but of moral suasion in favor of five or six or ten or twelve conflicting religions, succeeding one another rather rapidly on the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House. When we adopt the policy doubtless the House will adopt it, too, so that every two years there, and certainly every six years here, the United States Government will publish a new prayer book. I think that is going a little too far.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I rise to a parlimentary inquiry.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, my principal objection to the resolution lies in the fact that it is an expense that is to my mind unnecessary; I was about to say useless. Economy consists largely of saving in small things. Economies should have a beginning in small things that they may end in larger ones.

This is a precedent that, of course, would be acted upon in the future. Let us begin this new Senate by a system of practical and sensible economy. It may be that this is a trivial expenditure; I concede it; but the mass of expenses, and useless expenses, consist in an aggregate of small items that in themselves amount to little.

It is true, as was stated by the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS], that many of us have not heard all these prayers. It will be equally true probably that a great many of us will not read them because we have not time, and probably for other reasons. But this is the beginning of another item of publication which we should not set a precedent for, especially at a special session of the Senate.

I therefore move that the resolution lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before that motion is put——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand the resolution has never been to a committee, and that no committee has ever been polled even in connection with it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I was going to make that point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I make the point of order that the resolution has never been referred to a committee.

Mr. HUGHES. I submit that the point of order comes too late. Certain action was taken on the resolution last Saturday, and it went over and came up this morning in regular order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

Mr. HUGHES. In the absence of an opposing motion the senior Senator from New Jersey called up the resolution this morning.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. HUGHES. I am speaking to the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. A motion to lay on the table is not debatable. That motion is before the Senate.

Mr. HUGHES. I am not debating the Senator's motion.

Mr. THOMAS. That may be, but it is not subject to discussion.

Mr. HUGHES. I am discussing the point of order raised by another Senator, and I make the point that the point of order comes too late, because debate has proceeded upon the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Colorado is in order. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado to lay the resolution on the table.

The question being put, there were, on a division—ayes 25, noes 16, no quorum voting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the motion to lay on the table no quorum has voted. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	Newlands	Smith, Ga.
Bacon	Hitchcock	Page	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Hollis	Penrose	Stone
Bradley	Hughes	Perkins	Sutherland
Brandegee	James	Pittman	Thomas
Bristow	Johnson, Me.	Pomerene	Thompson
Catron	Johnston, Ala.	Ransdell	Thornton
Clapp	Jones	Robinson	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Kern	Root	Townsend
Clarke, Ark.	La Follette	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Culberson	Lane	Shafroth	Walsh
Cummins	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Warren
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Williams
Fletcher	Myers	Simmons	Works
Gallinger	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. TOWNSEND. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is unavoidably absent from the city on important business. I desire this statement to stand for the day. He is paired on all votes requiring a pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. For that reason I shall not vote.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CULBERSON (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT], who has not voted. I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania

[Mr. OLIVER]. As that Senator has not voted, I desire to withdraw my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—29.

Bankhead	Kern	Shafroth	Thompson
Brandegee	Lane	Shively	Thornton
Clarke, Ark.	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Tillman
Hitchcock	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh
Hollis	Pomerene	Smith, Md.	Williams
Johnson, Me.	Ransdell	Smith, S. C.	
Johnston, Ala.	Robinson	Swanson	
Jones	Saulsbury	Thomas	

NAYS—27.

Dillingham	Bacon	Myers	Stone
Fletcher	Bradley	Nelson	Sutherland
Gore	Bristow	Page	Townsend
Hughes	Catron	Penrose	Vardaman
James	Clapp	Perkins	Warren
La Follette	Clark, Wyo.	Root	Works
Martine, N. J.	Cummins	Sheppard	

NOT VOTING—37.

Ashurst	Culberson	McCumber	Shields
Borah	du Pont	McLean	Smith, Ga.
Brady	Fall	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Bryan	Gallinger	Norris	Smoot
Burleigh	Gronna	O'Gorman	Stephenson
Burton	Jackson	Oliver	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Owen	Weeks
Chilton	Lea	Pittman	
Colt	Lippitt	Poindexter	
Crawford	Lodge	Reed	

So the motion of Mr. THOMAS to lay the resolution on the table was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, by instruction of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report the resolution which I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I will state that there has not been a regular committee meeting in the committee room, but a vote of the committee has been taken by polling.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi reports from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate a resolution for which he asks immediate consideration. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 13), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ a clerk at $3,000 per annum, an assistant clerk at $1,440 per annum, and a messenger at $1,200 per annum, to be paid from "miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I will say, in explanation of the resolution, that it merely proposes to organize the new Committee on Banking and Currency in the manner in which committees of its order of importance are already organized.

Mr. WARREN. I assume that the Senator from Mississippi expects when the next legislative appropriation bill is passed to include the employees of that committee in that bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution. The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Mississippi why the salary of the clerk of this committee is fixed at $3,000?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Because that is the salary of clerks of committees of like standing in the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand the salary of other committee clerks is $2,500.

Mr. BACON. It is $2,500.

Mr. THOMAS. I am informed that such salaries are $2,500, and I move to strike out "$3,000" and to insert "$2,500."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought the salary of the clerk of the Committee on Finance was $3,000.

Mr. BACON. That may be true, Mr. President, but I think that the compensation of the clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations is $2,500, and that of the clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary is $2,500.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I will say, in that connection, that this is a committee organized for the purpose of dividing the work which has hitherto been done by the Finance Committee, and I suppose the idea was that it should have the same force that the Finance Committee has. However, I do not care. I am perfectly willing to reduce the salary of the clerk to $2,500.

Mr. THOMAS. If that is done, then I shall not object to the resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, by the way, as I am just informed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], gets $4,000. The Committee on Banking and Currency is about to take its place as one of the three great committees of the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, that is true. The clerk of the Committee on Appropriations gets $4,000, and up to two years ago he got $5,000. The clerk of the Committee on Appropriations in the other House now gets $5,000. It is also true that the clerk of the Committee on Finance has for six or seven years received a salary of $3,000. Only those two receive above $2,500. Then come the committees next in importance, whose clerks have a salary of $2,500, and the clerks of the committees next in importance have a salary of $2,220.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This committee is expected to class with the two most important committees, and is expected to have very important work to do as soon as we begin to consider banking and currency legislation.

Mr. SWANSON. It seems to me that as soon as currency legislation is disposed of this committee will not have very much to do, while the other committees are working committees all the time. If we are going to fix this salary——

Mr. WILLIAMS. If any Senator will make a motion to reduce the salary of the clerk of this committee to $2,500, I shall not resist the motion.

Mr. SWANSON. I make the motion.

Mr. THOMAS. I have already made it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 3, before the words "per annum," it is moved to strike out "$3,000" and to insert "$2,500."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon the amendment. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I should like to have the resolution again read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will again read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERKS TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, pursuant to the instructions of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of another resolution, which I send to the desk; and I call the attention of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] to the reading of the resolution. I will state that the report of the committee in this case, as in the other, was arrived at by polling the committee and getting the signatures of the members, and not by a regular meeting. Therefore I ask unanimous consent instead of making the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 15), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committees on Coast and Insular Survey, on Enrolled Bills, on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department, on Expenditures in the Departments of Commerce and Labor, on Standards, Weights, and Measures, on Expenditures in the Department of State, on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game, on National Banks, and on Public Health and National Quarantine be, and they are hereby, authorized to employ one assistant clerk each, at $1,440 per annum, to be paid from "miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I think under the law that resolution ought to go to the committee. It has not yet been printed. I will ask that it be printed and referred to the committee for its consideration at the committee meeting.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Kansas has a right to make that point; and if he makes the request that the resolution take that course, I see no way of resisting it. I ask, therefore, that the resolution be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will inquire of the Senator from Mississippi, for the purpose of ruling, as to whether this is not a report from the committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is a report from the committee, but the report was obtained by polling the committee instead of by a

regular meeting of the committee in the committee room. A majority of the committee have signed an indorsement of it upon the back of the resolution.

Mr. BRISTOW. Of course the Senator from Mississippi will understand that I declined to indorse it myself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. BRISTOW. And I said I should insist that it go before the committee in the regular way, as required by statute.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say, Mr. President, that this indorsement was signed by all the members of the committee who were present in the city at the time, except the Senator from Kansas; and it was for that reason that I called his attention to the matter when I called it up.

Mr. BRISTOW. I insist that it shall go to the committee in the regular way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be so referred.

MONEY TRUST INVESTIGATION.

Mr. KERN (for Mr. POINDEXTER) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 16), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That there be printed 10,000 copies of the report of the Money Trust investigation for the use of the Senate and House document rooms.

RURAL CREDIT OR FARM FINANCE (S. DOC. NO. 5).

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address by J. L. Coulter relating to farm credit associations be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF SPEECH OF SENATOR TILLMAN (S. DOC. NO. 6).

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech made by Senator TILLMAN in the Democratic caucus on Saturday be printed in the RECORD, and also as a public document.

Mr. ASHURST. I did not hear the request of the Senator from South Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request of the Senator from South Carolina is that the speech delivered by him at the Democratic caucus on Saturday last be printed in the RECORD and also as a public document.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina if the request includes the letters read?

Mr. TILLMAN. I have submitted that matter to the gentleman who wrote the letters; and if he objects, I will not include them.

Mr. JAMES. Very well; I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The speech delivered by Mr. TILLMAN before the Democratic caucus on Saturday, March 15, 1913, is as follows:

CHAIRMANSHIP OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Chairman, speaking to the resolution I have just offered, I want to say this: Nothing that this caucus can do will affect my personal or political status, except that it may affect my health. A Chinese philosopher once said, "A duck's legs are short; a stork's legs are long; you can not make a duck's legs long or a stork's legs short. Why worry?" It is an easy thing to ask a man this question, but we all know that men can not control their brains, and they will worry in spite of themselves.

The reasons assigned for the action of the steering committee that it is solely because they are solicitous of my health and do not believe I am physically able to perform the arduous labors of the Committee on Appropriations are sincere, I hope, and rest on that motive alone. If I did not believe that this motive governed them, I would have to believe that ambition and not the best interests of the Democratic Party caused their verdict.

Tillman, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, was the keystone of an arch, and it was necessary to remove this keystone and get Tillman out of the way in order to let some chairmanships very much desired by some men fall where the steering committee wanted them. This is the natural human view to take of it, and I prefer to believe their own version of the affair. I recognize that they are all honorable gentlemen, and I believe not one of them has any reason other than his own judgment as to what is right and proper to actuate him in this matter. I know all human beings are naturally selfish and inevitably so, and when spurred by ambition they sometimes become unscrupulous and cruel. Dealing with motives is very dangerous anyway, and I will not pursue that train of thought further.

I am not contending here so much for myself as for my State and the principle of seniority. By all of the rules that have obtained heretofore in the Senate since the foundation of the Government appointment on committees has been governed by the rule of seniority. It is an unwritten law, almost a constitutional provision, that should not be lightly brushed aside. It has been observed by the steering committee in making up its assignments in the case of every man, except myself. Why this discrimination? South Carolina has seen fit to send me here for 18 years, and I have just entered on my fourth term and have six more years yet to serve. Last August I was reelected against two strong men by a large majority without spending a dollar and without making a speech. The people have thus shown their continued love for and trust in me. My long service and, if I may be permitted to say, my more or less distinguished service, entitles me to this chairmanship. Four years longer than Jacob served for his two wives I have striven here in the interest of true democracy. When the Senate had dwindled to 30 Democrats I was still valiantly battling at the front for the principles and policies outlined in the Chicago platform of 1896. I was on the committee which drafted that platform. Bryan was not a member of it because he was a contesting delegate and only came into the convention with a right to speak after the committee on credentials had declared his delegation the lawful one. It was late in the proceedings when the delegation was seated, and his speech, as well as one I made at the same time, was in defense of the platform. The goldbugs in that convention had packed the galleries on purpose to howl me down, and they did it until I told them with all the emphasis which I was capable of that there were only three things which could hiss—a goose, a snake, and a man. That seemed to quiet them and they allowed me to go on without interruption afterwards. I had predated Bryan in advocacy of those principles, for I made my first speech in the Senate, which has been designated the "Pitchfork speech," in January of that year, while Bryan's "Cross of Gold" speech was not delivered until in July.

I was a member of the committee on resolutions at the Kansas City convention four years later and read the platform, as some of you may remember, for no one who heard it can ever forget the demonstration which followed my declamation of that platform.

Four years later at St. Louis, when Parker's gold telegram threw the Democratic cohorts into confusion, and it seemed that the party was about to disband in disorder and become a mob, I again stepped into the breach and made the speech which pacified the delegates. In 1896, 1900, and 1904 I campaigned for the presidential nominees, although I had no faith whatever in Parker's election and knew he would be defeated, as he ought to have been.

I was not at the Denver convention because my health had begun to give way and I was in Europe. But in my lectures, which carried me all over the country and into every State, I preached the true gospel and had as much to do with the success of what is now called "progressiveness," I believe, as Bryan himself. That term properly interpreted in its essence is the Chicago platform and nothing else.

I do not mention this for the purpose of influencing your action, but like an old soldier, I point to my work and the wounds I received in battle and ask simply for justice. I do not ask pity or sympathy. I will not have them. Give me what I am entitled to and nothing more. Had I not believed that President Wilson wanted me to accept the chairmanship of the Committee on Appropriations I would not have asked for it, but having received his letter in answer to mine I felt it my duty to ask for the place in order that I might help him, as he seemed to think I could.

In order that you may fully understand everything connected with it I will read the letter I wrote him, and then will read his reply:

JANUARY 21, 1913.

Hon. WOODROW WILSON,
Trenton, N. J.

MY DEAR MR. WILSON: I despise the words "President elect" and yet I think of you so much as President to be that I can not bring myself to call you "Dear Governor." I have been thinking about writing you for some time. You were kind enough last summer to thank me for the letter I wrote giving you some pointers about the personnel of the National Democratic Committee.

This emboldens me to give you some inside information I have gained in my 18 years in the Senate, and incidentally to make some suggestions or comments on the future policy of the Democratic Party.

I am proud of the speech you made at Chicago. It rings true, every word of it, and some of the expressions are very felicitous. In fact, my dear sir, without wishing to make you vain I want to say in all seriousness that you have the happy knack or gift of never opening your mouth in public without saying something worth while. You differ from Charles II, as photographed by the Earl of Rochester, in

doing wise things as well as saying them. Of course, you recall the famous mot written on the door of Charles' bedchamber:

"Here lies our sovereign lord the king,
"Whose word no man relies on;
"He never says a foolish thing,
"Nor ever does a wise one."

President Taft has taken Charles's place.

Since I have been in Washington I have seen the appropriation bills grow from a little over four hundred millions of dollars annually to over a thousand millions. You will recall the howl about the "billion-dollar Congress." We have witnessed the change to a two-billion-dollar Congress without much comment. The newspapers seem to take it as a matter of course and are always harping on the growth of the country as a justification. This growth has been marvelous, but the expansion in population and wealth has not kept pace with the growth of the taxes or expenditures. I have heard Senator Aldrich, who surely was an expert on levying taxes for the purposes of protection, proclaim on the floor of the Senate his belief that the Government could be run for $200,000,000 less than is now being appropriated.

Being on the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate, I know just how the appropriation bills have grown so rapidly. It is largely due to personal influence and importunity. Some clerk or officer under the Government wants an increase in his salary, and his Senator or Congressman goes to some one on the Committee on Appropriations, very often to the chairman, and asks for the item to go in. I have often done it myself to oblige a friend. An increase in the salary of one man produces a desire or demand to increase others, and the result is that the figures are moved up all along the line. This happens in one bureau and immediately other bureaus begin to clamor for increases, and so it goes.

Then men have haunted the Congress, since I have been here, with schemes for new bureaus. I have seen these created, many of them necessary and useful, but some of them worthless and mere vehicles to spend money and create places for friends.

Then commission after commission has been appointed for any and every conceivable purpose to make fat places for friends, very often "lame ducks" who have been repudiated by their constituents. I have seen Republican Presidents who have been glad to take care of Democratic "lame ducks." In Cleveland's time I saw Democrats who had been repudiated by their home people on account of free silver rewarded with judgeships and appointments on commissions.

I do not want to tire you, so I will stop this enumeration until I can have the pleasure of talking with you in person. This I do know, Mr. President, that if the Democrats are in earnest about reducing expenditures, it is an easy matter to do it, and that, too, without crippling the Government. It will mean the selection of Cabinet officers who will not be at all complaisant, but intent only on having the Government machine work smoothly, accurately, and effectively for the people's benefit and not for the benefit of the officeholders. The estimates are all made up by the Cabinet officers, and appropriations are always based on estimates, or supposed to be, unless they come as independent propositions from the floor of the Senate Chamber itself. I know you understand the importance of a loyal Cabinet in sympathy with this idea of economy. What we need in the United States is more attention to the needs and protection of the taxpayers than to the wishes and desires of the tax eaters.

There are any number of buildings in Washington rented at high prices from local real estate agents for Government use. Some of these are necessary, no doubt; but many of them are not necessary at all. This city is a veritable Augean stable and the "daughters of the horseleech" are abroad and always crying, "give, give."

Some of the departments are very much cramped for lack of room. These are clamorous for new buildings. Government buildings have been erected for one purpose, and almost before they were completed the demand grew up for that use to be discontinued and the buildings appropriated for some other use, or rather new one.

When I first came here the Members of the House had no place to receive their visitors or constituents, while the Senators had the "marble room" and overflow Senators who had no committee rooms were quartered in the Maltby. The House conceived the idea of building a palace for the use of its Members; the Senate immediately demanded and enforced that demand to build one for their own use. The two marble palaces we now have are the result. Undoubtedly they supply a want, but not a necessity, except on the part of the House. Recently the House has demanded that the Senate turn the Maltby Building over to it, and I understand this will be done when the new Congress meets in March. There is much lost space in the Senate Office Building which could well be utilized to good advantage for other purposes if the Senate would agree.

But why go into all of these details? You will find it all out when you come to Washington. Speaking with a very intelligent clerk not long ago he made this significant statement: "Senator, the only way to reduce expenses is to have Senators and Congressmen who will rise in their places and inquire to know why certain items are in the appropriation bills when they are not needed, and say so, and thus call the attention of the country to them." I know this to be true. But the rule is rather to increase than to reduce.

My long service here and the custom which has obtained almost from the beginning of the Government entitles me to select from among the committees of which I am a member a chairmanship. I am senior Democrat on three important committees and can select the chairmanship of either one of them: Appropriations, Interstate Commerce, and Naval Affairs.

I want you to tell me frankly on which one of these committees you think I can best serve your administration and the country, for I will serve the country best by serving Wilson's administration best.

The Committee on Appropriations, as you know, applies the money, or designates how it shall be spent on many appropriation bills. The Committee on Indian Affairs, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and the Committee on Pensions make up their own appropriation bills. Thus there is no coordination and general understanding by one committee and its head as to the scope and amount of all the appropriations. This was the way it was done when I first came to Congress. I remember what a bitter fight the change from this system to the general distribution of the appropriation bills brought about. There was too much work for any one committee to do, and it gave one man too much power. The change was salutary in that respect, but it has largely been responsible for the increased expenses, taken as a whole.

The Committee on Finance in the Senate ought to be divided as it is in the House, one part of it to deal with the tariff and the taxes to raise money, while the other deals with banking and currency and the money problem.

The Committee on Interstate Commerce, while of minor importance at first, has come to be one of the most important in Congress. It deals with the problem of transportation in all of its ramifications. This problem has come to be one of the greatest of the age. The gamblers in New York, Boston, and Chicago who manipulate the stocks and bonds of the banks and railroad securities, have amassed great fortunes based on water alone. Multimillionaires have multiplied with great rapidity, and the masses of the people are expected to sustain these fortunes by paying dividends on stocks and bonds which never had any honest or real foundation. Pierpont Morgan and men of that type have been the prime movers and leaders in amassing wealth of this kind. Having "scrambled the eggs" they boldly stand and ask the committees of Congress what they are going to do about it. Rockefeller, who has amassed millions by monopolies which could have been prevented by an honest enforcement of the Sherman law, rolls in wealth and snaps his fingers at the House Committee. Carnegie, whose hundreds of millions have been stolen from the people through Roosevelt's connivance at his organization of the Steel Trust and the absorption of the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co., tries to buy immortality by giving back to the people a modicum of money in the shape of libraries, etc.

If you and I were to go into a restaurant and there see the cook mixing rotten eggs to scramble for us, would we eat the dish when the waiter brought it to us or would we throw it out of the window? The temper of mind of the American people is to throw the eggs out of the window. Your greatest problem will be how to "unscramble eggs" and bring back the railroads of the country to an honest basis. This will involve a valuation of the railroad properties to find out their actual value, not cost, of the railroads. The Committee on Interstate Commerce will have to do this work, if it be done, and I am therefore inclined to take that burden upon my shoulders, if you so advise, and select that chairmanship.

The Committee on Naval Affairs has to deal with the question of an "adequate Navy." This is the happy phrase of the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore. Just what is an "adequate and well-proportioned" Navy must be determined. Whether it shall be Hobsonized to make a market for structural steel and armor plate manufacturers, or give us such a fleet as will be sufficient for the needs of the country, is a question to be settled.

My health has been too poor for me to keep abreast of things as I used to do. But I have tried to keep in touch enough and have kept in touch enough to believe that we have a good enough Navy now, and only need to maintain it at its present degree of efficiency. The fifteen or twenty millions of dollars required to build a first-class battleship of the best type can do so many more things for the people, and better things, that I do not feel willing to see the money sunk that way, especially when the life of such a vessel is only about 20 years. Already the *Oregon*, made famous in the Spanish-American War, is obsolete and ready for the junk pile.

If I take the Committee on Appropriations, I can help reduce expenses; if I take the Committee on Interstate Commerce, I can assist in "unscrambling the eggs;" if I take the Committee on Naval Affairs, I can resist as best I may the clamor which has been nursed by the money of the steel manufacturers and armor-plate people for an ever-increasing Navy. My strength is limited as you know; my will is equal to any task. I realize every day more and more that for the purposes of this world a live jackass is better than a dead Senator.

Please think this over and give me your advice in the same spirit I have written you.

Very sincerely, yours.

—

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
January 30, 1913.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Brief absence from my office and constant absorption with the business connected with the opening of our legislative session here have prevented my replying sooner to your most interesting and important letter of the 21st. I want you to know with what deep and genuine appreciation I have read it. I thank you for it very warmly, indeed.

Confidentially, the Appropriations Committee is the committee on which you would have the hardest work, but your letter convinced me that it is also the committee in which your interest chiefly lies and where you can certainly be of the greatest and most constant service.

Ever since I was a youngster I have been deeply interested in our methods of financial legislation. Ever since then I have insisted upon the absolute necessity of a carefully considered and wisely planned budget, and one of the objects I shall have most in mind when I get to Washington will be conferences with my legislative colleagues there with a view to bringing some budget system into existence. This business of building up the expenses of the Nation, piece by piece, will certainly lead us to error and perhaps embarrassment.

I was very much pleased by your reelection and shall look forward to the greatest interest to being associated with you in counsel.

Again thanking you for your splendid letter,

Cordially yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Hon. BENJAMIN R. TILLMAN,
Washington, D. C.

Contrast my services and work for the party with Senator MARTIN'S. Last summer at Baltimore I led the South Carolina delegation. South Carolina's 18 votes were cast first, last, and all the time for Woodrow Wilson, while Virginia, led by MARTIN, never did give Wilson any votes until he no longer needed them.

In June, while the convention was still balloting and the question as to who would receive the nomination hung in the balance, Mr. MARTIN gave out an interview, and here is what he had to say about the political situation, and his feelings and his advice to the Virginians as to what candidate they ought to support. It speaks for itself, too, and I have no comments to make:

VIRGINIANS SUPPORT OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD—THEY WILL VOTE FOR HIM AS LONG AS HE HAS CHANCE OF NOMINATION—MARTIN IS STRONG FOR HIM—MEN FROM OLD DOMINION WILL BE CLASSED AMONG THE CONSERVATIVES.

"The great majority of the Virginia delegation," said Senator THOMAS S. MARTIN this afternoon, "will, I am sure, vote for UNDERWOOD. I believe that after the first ballot the unit rule will be voted by the necessary two-thirds majority. It ought to be. There is

every reason why UNDERWOOD should be the nominee; none why he should not be. He is a man of pronounced ability, of clean life, of unblemished record. He has been highly successful as the party leader in the House. Doubt as to his availability because he is a southern man is heard only from our own people. I have yet to hear of such objection from the North.

"I hope all the Virginia delegates will vote for Judge Parker for temporary chairman. He has been always a loyal party worker, and it would be an outrage to defeat him merely on the ipse dixit of Mr. Bryan, who chooses to call him a reactionary.

"Of course, I do not mean that Virginia should keep on voting for UNDERWOOD if it turns out there is no chance for him. She would then go to some one else, perhaps CLARK, perhaps Harmon—to any one rather than to Woodrow Wilson, who has done nothing to deserve party honors unless to help wreck it in his own State."

Is there any progressiveness about this?

It must have been Senator MARTIN'S attitude at Baltimore, and his known opinion on Democratic policies in general, that caused the so-called progressives in the Senate to determine that he should not have the chairmanship of the caucus and the floor leadership. It is a mystery to me now, and will always be, whenever I think of it, how the steering committee could have changed front so soon and jumped him over my head and into my place as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Another phase of this subject and I am through. I have been on the rack, as it were, ever since the caucus met on Monday last, and have persistently refused to consider getting off the Committee on Appropriations or of giving up its chairmanship. It seemed that this demand was so insistent and so persistent that suspicions came into my mind, and in analyzing the situation I grew very angry. I declared to the gentlemen of the committee who came to see me about it that if I were turned down in caucus I would carry the fight into the Senate itself. Yesterday morning, when there had been no conclusion of the case, I went to the Capitol and began writing a speech to be delivered in caucus, and was engaged on it nearly all day. It was hot enough, I assure you, so hot that it almost burned the paper it was written on, for I was angry from the ground up, and my indignation was such that I pulled the bridle off and gave free rein to my vitriolic tongue. Some of you who have heard me in days past know that there are few men who can surpass me in saying biting and vindictive things.

I was in this frame of mind last night, but as is often the case with men of my temperament, I slept only two or three hours and then waked up and began to think. All public men know that some of their best thoughts and speeches have come to them in this way. I myself know that if I could have recollected them next day I have made better speeches in bed than I have ever made on the platform or rostrum. When I analyzed the situation and the conditions here my anger vanished. I thought how pitiful and contemptible in comparison was my fight for my rights and the rights of my State as compared with the great battle to be fought and now being fought by Democracy for the rights of the people. I had thought and written bitter things; but my passion was stilled and entirely disappeared when I remembered President Wilson's clarion call in the last paragraph of his inaugural address: "I summon all honest men, all patriotic, all forward-looking men to my side. God helping me, I will not fail them, if they will but counsel and sustain me."

I decided to write another speech this morning and tell my brother Democrats just how I feel, and then leave it all to them. I still feel a great injustice has been done me in this report. I also feel that Senator MARTIN has not acted the noble part I expected of him as a Virginian, for not once but twice and even three times since I came to Washington in January he has told me he wanted me to have on the committees whatever place I was entitled to and desired; and he has never notified me that he had changed his feelings or purpose. Senator MARTIN, after making these voluntary statements and pledges to me, became a member of the steering committee which has given him my chairmanship. Fairness and decency, it seems to me, required him to notify me of his change of mind and attitude toward me. He never at any time expressed any uneasiness about my health to me. Had he done so his conduct would not seem so despicable. When I talked with him about his own race for the chairmanship of the caucus and mentioned to him that I wanted the Committee on Appropriations he advised me to say nothing about it and keep others guessing, which I did. It is this phase of the subject which I do not understand. I would hate to believe there has been any understanding or any promises or pledges made. As I have no proof I must perforce leave any accusations unsaid. But I can not help the suspicion that there must have been a deal of some kind or Senator MARTIN would not have retired without a show-down.

While I am no longer able to battle on the floor of the Senate and deliver philippics as I once did I am still able to give counsel and advice. I am still able to say "NO," and spell it with capitals, too, and that is what is needed on the Committee on Appropriations. I outlined in my letter to President Wilson my ideas as to why the appropriations have grown so rapidly and why so much money is being squandered needlessly. My ambition is as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to bring into the Senate bills which have passed the House without increasing the amounts at all, and, if possible, to bring in the bills reducing them as they passed the House. I believe it is possible to do this. In fact, I know it, and if I am given help on the committee of young and willing men, earnestly striving for the same object, I will do it.

Then, Senators, contrast the way the Republicans treat their old men and the way ours are being treated. Senator Allison was kept chairman of the Committee on Appropriations as long as he was in the Senate, although in his last years he was very feeble. Senator PERKINS, although far more feeble than I am, is still chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. Senator Cullom, when he retired from the Senate on the 4th of March, was still chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. They do not demote and discredit their old leaders because of age.

I have said more than once, and to more people than one, that if the wrong was not righted in the caucus I would carry it to the Senate itself, which, under Rule XXIV, must elect its committees. My idea in going to the Senate was to get into the RECORD, for preservation for the future historian, my vindication and defense, as it were. But when I considered the spectacle which I would present to the country by allowing my grievances against the party, however justifiable, to militate against that unity and harmony which ought to prevail among us, I decided that it was a selfish motive and I bade the devil get behind me.

Democratic harmony and concert of action are more necessary at this time than anything I know of. Democratic discipline is also needed very, very much, for as compared with the Republicans we are an untrained mob with little knowledge of parliamentary law and very little effective knowledge of the rules of the Senate.

Yesterday one of the newspaper boys told me he had seen the two Georgia Senators in amicable conference in the restaurant. Immediately the thought flashed on my mind, if Mr. BACON and Mr. HOKE SMITH are friendly after what has happened why should Mr. HOKE SMITH and Mr. TILLMAN fall out about it. I have already, in the caucus, told Mr. HOKE SMITH how I felt about Mr. BACON'S not getting the place of President pro tempore, and it was that indignation which prompted the interview with the correspondent of the Atlanta Constitution.

I used the word "progressives" in that interview. The reporter changed it to "conspirators," and when I hastily revised the interview, I did not note the change in the language. I do not feel that those Senators who brought about Mr. BACON'S defeat were conspirators at all. They merely expressed their preference as between the two men as they had a right to do. I know if they saw this interview they must have become angry, because it was unjust. I recognize that now, and desire to apologize to them for using the word in the interview. I also desire to apologize to Senator HOKE SMITH for the way I have treated him.

My regret is more keen because I have since learned—only last night—that he was my friend on the steering committee and battled manfully to keep the rest from demoting me or giving Mr. MARTIN the chairmanship of appropriations.

Yesterday, when I was so hot, a reporter for a Georgia paper came into my room and said something about Mr. BACON and Mr. HOKE SMITH talking about Georgia patronage and expressed surprise that they should be speaking to each other. I told him I hoped Mr. HOKE SMITH would never speak to me again; but I do not feel that way now. I am always ready and willing—nay, anxious—to make the amende honorable when I am in error, and that is my reason for speaking as I do.

The other day I said I loved the two Georgia Senators. I did not tell the exact truth. I do love Senator BACON, and was beginning to like Senator HOKE SMITH very much. I hope I shall continue to like him, and will unless he gives me just reason not to. We have need in the Senate of his brains, for we presented a sorry spectacle yesterday for lack of consultation among the leaders and concert of action. The party is so new in its rôle of conducting affairs that the people must make allowances. The new men are nearly all awkward and green, and unless they acquaint themselves thoroughly with the rules and precedents, they will be subjected to very many mortifications, and the party itself will become a laughing stock.

The Biblical quotation I used a few days ago will become historical. The "wild asses of the desert, athirst and hungry, have broken into the green corn." That applies all along the line from the top to the bottom. The Senators themselves are

green and the Democrats of the country have been "out in the cold" so long and have had so little hope or opportunity to get patronage or any of the offices that they are simply wild. President Wilson will, I hope and believe, as soon as he becomes familiar with the usages and customs of the other Presidents in dealing with Congress, become a good herdsman. He is going slow, I am glad to say, about making appointments; has adopted David Crockett's motto: "Be sure you are right and then go ahead." Indeed, I have no reason to believe otherwise than that the militant Democracy, after its long exile, will assist and aid the President to carry out his program and make his glorious vision as portrayed in his inaugural address a reality.

I shall, what little time I have left in this world, watch with deep interest and concern his success or failure. I am sure, if he does fail, it will be due to the Congress and not to him. I appeal to all Democrats to throw aside selfish ambitions and impulses, and let us all unite and work for the good of this great Republic.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I offer a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 17), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate; and that the expenses thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution must be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. KERN. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the statute provides that if it takes money from the contingent fund of the Senate, it must be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. KERN. I wish to say that this resolution was prepared by my predecessor as chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and was intended to be presented by him to the Senate. The Senate has ordered an investigation into the conduct of one of the employees of the Senate, which investigation is in progress. If that investigation is to be proceeded with, the resolution must be reported and acted on before the Senate adjourns. Let it go to the committee, however, and we will try to get a report on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

ARMOR PLATE FOR VESSELS OF THE NAVY.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I offer a resolution, which I ask to have read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 18), as follows:

Whereas bids were opened by the Secretary of the Navy in February, 1913, for furnishing armor plate for the dreadnought Pennsylvania; and

Whereas the representatives of three firms manufacturing armor plate in the State of Pennsylvania, while pretending to bid as competitors, after a conference, submitted bids which did not vary more than $1 per ton; and

Whereas the then Secretary of the Navy, notwithstanding an intimation made on the floor of the Senate of the United States that it was alleged there existed collusion among different manufacturers to advance the price of armor plate and divide the profits of the contract, awarded the contract on March 3, 1913, by dividing for all practical purposes the award of 8,000 tons of armor plate among the three companies; and

Whereas it is alleged that this action of the said firms reveals that they comprise an armor-plate trust and that the price named in the contract awarded by the Secretary of the Navy is in the neighborhood of about $25 per ton higher than the previous awards by the Department of the Navy for armor plate: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to forward to the Senate, at as early a date as practicable, a report on the amount of armor plate ordered by the Department of the Navy during the past 25 years, the prices paid in each award, and the names of the firms or corporations to whom the contracts were awarded.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, of course I do not ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution, but presume it should go to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department. I have no particular request as to the committee to which it should go.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to that committee, in the absence of objection.

Mr. ASHURST subsequently said: Mr. President, my attention has been called by one of the learned Senators on the floor to the fact that there is an error in the phraseology of the resolution which I introduced a moment ago, and which was referred to the appropriate committee. The resolution as prepared by me requests the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain information. I am advised that the proper form is that the Secretary of the Navy be directed to furnish the information. Hence, I ask unanimous consent that the word "requested" be stricken out and that the word "directed" be inserted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the resolution will be amended as requested, and it will be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department and printed.

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 19), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That all Senators now having less than three employees be allowed an additional employee, to be paid at the rate of $1,200 per annum from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

COMMITTEE ON THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. HITCHCOCK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 20), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the salary of the clerk of the Committee on the Philippines be increased from $2,200 per year to $2,500 per year, and the pay of messenger to said committee be reduced from $1,440 per year to $1,200 per year.

THE CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I report back favorably, with an amendment, a resolution from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I make the report by direction of that committee, arrived at by a poll vote, signed on the back of the resolution. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. (S. Res. 3.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution reported by him from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The amendment of the committee was, in line 9, after "$800," to insert ": *Provided*, That the House of Representatives shall pay one-half of the said sum."

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, may I inquire of the honorable Senator from Mississippi if that ought not to be a concurrent resolution, inasmuch as the House is called upon to contribute one-half of the expense?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is impossible at this time, of course, to have a concurrent resolution, because the other House is not in session. The matter, therefore, was reported in this shape by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] with the idea that it could not take effect until the House had appropriated its part, so we might appropriate our part from the contingent fund.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very well. I think it is very desirable that the resolution should be passed in some form, and I certainly shall not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment to the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That an edition of the Congressional Directory for the first session of the Sixty-third Congress be prepared and published, as provided for in section 73 of an act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents, approved January 12, 1895, and that the Secretary of the Senate is directed to pay from the contingent fund, for compiling, preparing, and indexing the said edition, the sum of $800: *Provided*, That the House of Representatives shall pay one-half of the said sum.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR EXTRA SESSION.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I gave notice the other day that I would address the Senate on a resolution for a legislative program during the extra session. I now call up the resolution from the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada calls up from the table Senate resolution No. 4, submitted by Mr. NEWLANDS on the 13th instant.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will say that I do not think the Senate is disposed to listen to speeches just now, and that all I shall ask will be the reference of this resolution to the Committee on Rules, in the hope that that committee will report upon it early in the next session. The resolution relates to the legislative problems that are before us regarding the tariff and taxation of incomes and inheritances; regarding interstate trade, legislation supplementary to the Sherman Act, and the organization of an interstate-trade commission; regarding interstate banking exchange; regarding public lands and natural resources; regarding economy in military expenses; and regarding enlargement of constructive works in improving waterways and roads.

I believe that if we can outline beforehand in the Senate the leading subjects upon which we desire reports and upon which

we desire to take action we shall very much expedite the labors of the extra session, and that if we can pursue this course in the future we shall very much diminish the length of our sessions. As I stated before, we have been gradually expanding the sessions of Congress until now they threaten to take up the entire year. This resolution is in the line of efficiency, and particularly of economy of time.

Mr. GALLINGER. I should like to ask the Senator if he expects the Senate at the coming special session to take up all the subjects he has enumerated?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state that the object of this resolution is not to take up for legislation all these subjects, but simply to take up the question of the tariff so far as legislation is concerned, and at the same time to engage the various committees of the Senate having jurisdiction of these subjects in investigations, so that they can report to the Senate in the first days of the regular session in December next.

Mr. GALLINGER. I caught from the Senator the suggestion that the purpose was to expedite the business of Congress, and, I suppose, abbreviate our sessions. I was afraid that if the Senator had this program in view for the special session, we might as well send for our summer clothing.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to say, in that regard—and I think it is a matter of very proper solicitude—that I do not think the extra session will be lengthened at all by the consideration of these subjects by the appropriate committees. We all know that in these extra sessions that are devoted to a specific subject of legislation, when the House is busy the Senate is idle, and when the Senate is occupied the House is idle, and when the Ways and Means Committee of the House on the one side or the Finance Committee of the Senate on the other is engaged in framing legislation all the other committees of the Senate and the House are idle. The result is that none of the Members of the Senate or of the House, outside of the members of the committees having jurisdiction of the tariff, will have anything to do, and yet they will be detained in Washington. The purpose of this resolution is to occupy those committees in investigations with reference to reports which will expedite legislation during the regular session.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator's purpose, then, is to give the committees something to do?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Something to do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think that is a laudable undertaking, and I trust the Senator's resolution will be considered. The Senator will not object to the Committee on Rules amending it to some extent, and enlarging it if necessary?

Mr. NEWLANDS. No; not at all.

I will simply add that this resolution is, in my judgment, in the interest of economy of time; that it will not extend in any degree the extra session, which I understand will be called for legislative action upon the subject of the tariff, and it will clear the way, in my belief, for quick and decisive action upon matters concerning which public opinion is practically made up during the regular session commencing in December. I believe if we can pursue this course we will diminish the entire length of the session of Congress for the next year a period of at least two or three months. My belief is that the sessions of Congress have been unnecessarily lengthened because of the imperfection of our legislative methods in Congress, and that we will thus clear the way for legislative action at the next regular session by the intermediate action of the committees, when compelled to be in session for a period of at least three months attending to the consideration of the tariff, and we will thus be able to diminish by that period the length of the next regular session.

Next year there will be a congressional election. If the Democratic Party carries that election, it will have the opportunity of continued usefulness in carrying out needed reforms. If it loses that election, it will lose the opportunity for crystallizing in legislation and administration such needed reforms, and there will be a renewal of the legislative deadlock from which we suffered so much during the last administration. Democratic success at the next congressional election will depend upon the state of mind of the American people. If there is a temporary diminution of work and business activity and a temporary depression as the result of it, we may lose the next election. We must therefore move along the lines of progressive legislation with firmness, precision, and caution, taking care neither to disappoint nor to alarm, and we must close this legislation at least six months before the next election. Both celerity and caution are required, and the earlier we adjust ourselves to the past the better our chance of continued public confidence and success.

I ask leave to insert the resolution in the RECORD in connection with these remarks.

There being no objection, Senate resolution 4, submitted by Mr. NEWLANDS March 13, 1913, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that during the approaching extra session for the immediate revision of the tariff Congress should not only consider and pass comprehensive legislation regarding all the schedules of the tariff but should also, through the appropriate committees, consider other subjects of needed legislation, to be taken up for final action at the next regular session of Congress.

TARIFF AND TAXATION.

2. *Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Finance report at as early a date as possible during the extra session upon the following questions:

(a) Whether the prices of any farm products in the United States are raised above the international level of prices by the duties now imposed on such products, and if so, what products, and whether such duties on such products can be abolished or materially reduced without injury to American industry, and to what extent. In such inquiry shall be included meats, cheese, wool, sugar, tobacco, wines, citrus fruits, and dried and preserved fruits.

(b) What products now on the dutiable list should be put on the free list.

(c) Whether it is practicable and advisable to change all duties from specific to ad valorem duties.

(d) The average percentage of the duties imposed by the existing tariff, and the average percentage to which it is desirable to reduce the duties imposed under the proposed revision of the tariff, and the maximum and the minimum duties which it is desirable to impose.

(e) Whether it is practicable and desirable to distribute the proposed reduction over a period of four years.

(f) Whether it is practicable and advisable after making the contemplated reduction in the tariff to organize an administrative tariff board, which, acting under rules fixed by Congress, shall have the power, either upon its own initiative or upon the initiative of any importer, producer, or consumer to further inquire into complaints of excessive duties prohibiting or unduly restricting importations, or of diminished duties permitting excessive importations, to the prejudice of existing domestic industries, and to the injury of the capital or labor employed therein, or of excessive duties prejudicial to domestic consumers; such board to present to the President and to Congress such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

(g) Whether it is practicable and advisable to give such tariff board, after full investigation and hearing, the power, with the approval of the President, to make reductions or increases in duties, within certain limitations and under rules prescribed by Congress; and if so, what limitations and rules should be prescribed.

(h) Whether it is practicable and advisable to make such rules and regulations for the action of such a tariff board as will enable the Government to feel its way gradually from a high protective to a revenue basis without readjustments prejudicial both to domestic labor and capital, and without denying to the consumers needed relief from the imposition of excessive taxes upon foreign imports and excessive prices for domestic products.

(i) Whether it is advisable to provide a graduated income tax and a graduated inheritance tax with a view to making up any deficit in revenue caused by a reduction in customs duties, and also with a view to extending the operations of the National Government in cooperation with the States in the improvement of post roads, the regulation of rivers in aid of navigation, irrigation, water-power development, and swamp-land reclamation, and also in cooperation with the States in the advancement of vocational education.

(k) Whether it is practicable and advisable to appoint a budget committee, of which the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the chairmen of the other supply committees shall be members.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

3. *Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce report at as early a date as possible during the extra session upon the following questions:

(a) Whether it is advisable to supplement the existing Sherman Antitrust Act by legislation which will more specifically define restraints of trade, including therein the prevention of unfair competition, stock watering, overcapitalization, excessive size, interlocking directors, and the holding by one corporation of the stock of another.

(b) Whether it is advisable to substitute for the present system of holding companies, by which a corporation organized under the laws of a single State is made the means of federating corporations organized under the laws of other States for the purpose of interstate transportation, a national act for the incorporation of holding companies, under which railway companies organized under the laws of different States may be federated for interstate transportation, such holding companies to be subject in their general conduct to the regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

(c) Whether it is advisable to organize an interstate trade commission, in which shall be merged the officials, powers, and functions of the Bureau of Corporations, with powers of publicity, investigation, correction, and recommendation regarding corporations engaged in interstate trade similar to those conferred upon the Interstate Commerce Commission regarding corporations engaged in interstate transportation, but without the power to fix prices; such interstate trade commission to have the power to aid the courts in the administration of the Sherman Act and other legislation supplementary thereto.

(d) Whether it is advisable to provide for the creation of a board of river regulation which shall bring into cooperation the departments and services of the National Government whose duties in any way relate to waterways in devising and carrying out comprehensive plans for the promotion of interstate commerce by the regulation of river flow, the mitigation of destructive floods, by the promotion of storage above and of bank and levee protection below, the establishment of terminal and transfer facilities, the coordination of rail and water carriers, and the cooperation of the Nation with the States, each within its jurisdiction, in plans and works for the full and, so far as practicable, compensatory development of the rivers for every useful purpose, and the establishment of an ample fund for continuous work during a period of 10 years.

(e) Whether it is practicable and advisable to bring into coordination under the Interstate Commerce Commission the related subjects of interstate transportation, interstate trade, and interstate exchange, by the creation of three boards in such commission, one relating to interstate transportation, one relating to interstate trade, and one relating to interstate exchange, the present Interstate Commerce Commission to constitute the board of interstate transportation, the proposed interstate-trade commission to constitute the board of interstate trade, and the

proposed banking commission to constitute the board of interstate exchange, merging into the board of interstate trade the present Bureau of Corporations and merging into the board of interstate exchange the comptroller's office.

INTERSTATE EXCHANGE.

4. *Resolved*, That the proper Senate committee report as soon as possible during the extra session upon the following question:

(a) Whether it is practicable and advisable to organize under national law in each State a national reserve association, in which the State banks engaged in interstate exchange and complying with the national legislation as to capital and reserves shall be united with the national banks as members, such associations to have the powers of issue relating to emergency currency now enjoyed by the constituent national banks; such associations to have such of the powers proposed by the National Monetary Commission to be conferred upon a central national reserve association as are necessary and advisable; such State associations to have the powers of investigation and correction regarding the affairs of the constituent banks; such State associations to be brought into federation for the protection of interstate exchange and the prevention of bank panics through a national banking commission fairly representative of the different sections of the country, part of which shall be selected by such associations and part by the President of the United States; such national banking commission to have powers of investigation and correction over the State associations, and to report to the President and Congress annually such recommendations as it deems advisable regarding legislation and administration concerning monetary affairs.

PUBLIC LANDS AND NATURAL RESOURCES.

5. *Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Public Lands report at as early a date as possible during the extra session upon the following questions:

(a) Whether it would be advisable for the National Government to promote the development of Alaska by the construction of a railroad or railroads; and if so, the probable cost and plans for construction and operation.

(b) Recommendations regarding the protection of our natural resources in timber, coal, iron, and oil against monopolistic control.

(c) The applicability of the land laws of Canada to the conditions of our public domain, and particularly those provisions regarding the grant of the surface to settlers, excluding from the operation of the grant timber, coal, iron, oil, and water-power sites.

MILITARY EXPENSES AND AUXILIARY NAVY.

6. *Resolved*, That the Committee on Military and Naval Affairs report at as early a date as possible during the extra session upon the following questions:

(a) The preparation of a plan for the more efficient administration and cooperation of the Army and Navy, and the reduction of the total Army and Navy expense for the next four years to not exceeding $225,000,000 annually, with the aid of a board of Army and Navy officers to be selected by the President.

(b) A plan for the construction of auxiliary ships for the Navy, to be used in time of war in aid of the fighting ships and in time of peace in establishing necessary service through the Panama Canal and new routes of commerce to foreign countries through lease to shipping companies; such legislation involving the temporary diminution of the construction of fighting ships and the substitution of auxiliary ships with a view to the organization of a well-proportioned and efficient Navy.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BACON. If there is no other legislative matter to be brought to the attention of the Senate, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 12 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably, without amendment, the resolution indorsed by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, submitted by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN]. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. (S. Res. 17.)

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution, which was read and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate; and that the expenses thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. KERN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 21), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the Senate, having completed the business of the present session, is ready to adjourn unless the President has some other communication to make to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. KERN and Mr. GALLINGER the committee under the resolution.

RECESS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate take a recess for 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia and others. Make it until 2 o'clock.

Mr. FLETCHER. Very well; I move that the Senate take a recess until 2 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock p. m., when it reassembled.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 5 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. KERN and Mr. GALLINGER appeared, and

Mr. KERN said: Mr. President, your committee appointed to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the Senate is ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make have performed that duty, and they were informed by the President of the United States that he has no further communication at present to make to this body.

PROHIBITION OF SMOKING IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a notice which I wish to give of an amendment to the rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina presents a notice, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from South Carolina gives notice that he will move the following amendment to the rules of the Senate (S. Res. 22):

Resolved, That Rule XXXIV be amended as follows:

"Strike out the period at the end of the first clause and insert a semicolon, and then add the following: 'no smoking shall be permitted at any time on the floor of the Senate, or lighted cigars be brought into the Chamber.'"

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate adjourn sine die.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned without day.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 17, 1913.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

W. F. Eatman, of Mountain Home, Ark., to be receiver of public moneys at Harrison, Ark., vice Jesse W. Freeman, term expired.

Edward J. McLean, of Montana, to be receiver of public moneys at Billings, Mont., vice Luther T. Hauberg, recess appointee failed of confirmation.

James T. Hamilton, of Montana, to be receiver of public moneys at Miles City, Mont., vice Joseph C. Auld, term expired.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Fred H. Foster, of Montana, to be register of the land office at Billings, Mont., vice Charles L. Harris, term expired.

Fletcher W. Appleton, of Montana, to be register of the land office at Bozeman, Mont., vice Matthew R. Wilson, term expired.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 17, 1913.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

Edwin F. Sweet, of Michigan, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

John Skelton Williams, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

Beverly T. Galloway, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES.

John Burke, of North Dakota, to be Treasurer of the United States.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Peter J. Hamilton, of Alabama, to be United States district judge, district of Porto Rico.

PURCHASING AGENT FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

James A. Edgerton, of New Jersey, to be purchasing agent for the Post Office Department.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

W. F. Eatman, at Harrison, Ark.
James T. Hamilton, at Miles City, Mont.
Edward J. McLean, at Billings, Mont.
Thomas Corbally, at Great Falls, Mont.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Fletcher W. Appleton, at Bozeman, Mont.
Fred H. Foster, at Billings, Mont.
Robert N. Sutherlin, at Great Falls, Mont.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Capt. Michael J. McDonough to be major.
First Lieut. Harold S. Hetrick to be captain.
First Lieut. William A. Johnson to be captain.

CAVALRY ARM.

First Lieut. John P. Hasson to be captain.
Second Lieut. Guy H. Wyman to be first lieutenant.

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. George Bell, jr., detailed inspector general (Infantry), to be colonel.
Lieut. Col. Charles R. Noyes to be colonel.
Maj. Benjamin C. Morse to be lieutenant colonel.
Capt. Hanson E. Ely to be major.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants.

Harry Loren Arnold.
Guy Cluxton Boughton.
Athel Campbell Burnham.
Charles Horace Francis.
Beverley Drake Harison.
John Barnes Jack.
Thomas Martin Joyce.
Joseph Victor Klauder.
George Alexander Knowles.
Walter Estell Lee.
James Acker Mattison.
Wilhelm Weinberger.
Luther Halsey Reichelderfer.
William Toy Shoemaker.
Joseph Marius Shramek.
Otto Augustus Wall, jr.

INFANTRY ARM.

William Wellington Prude, jr., to be second lieutenant.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Robert N. Campbell, to be first lieutenant.

SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

FIRST SESSION.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *April 7, 1913.*

The first session of the Sixty-third Congress commenced this day at the Capitol, in the city of Washington, in pursuance of the proclamation of the President of the United States of the 17th day of March, 1913.

The Vice President (THOMAS R. MARSHALL, of Indiana) took the chair and called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock noon.

PRAYER.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we worship Thee, Thou who dwellest in ineffable light, creator and judge of all men. Thou art worthy to receive our adoration and praise. Thy name is glorious in all the earth.

We come unto Thee to-day under a sense of a mighty responsibility and obligation. We look to Thee for Thy guidance and commit our ways unto Thee and pray that Thou wilt order our steps. If Thy presence go not with us, send us not up hence; but if Thou wilt guide Thy servants, we will find our place in the order of a divine government whose lord is God. To this end we submit ourselves to Thee in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE PROCLAMATION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the proclamation of the President of the United States convening Congress in extraordinary session.

The Secretary (James M. Baker) read the proclamation as follows:

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas public interests require that the Congress of the United States should be convened in extra session at 12 o'clock noon on the 7th day of April, 1913, to receive such communication as may be made by the Executive:

Now, therefore, I, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim and declare that an extraordinary occasion requires the Congress of the United States to convene in extra session at the Capitol in the city of Washington on the 7th day of April, 1913, at 12 o'clock noon, of which all persons who shall at that time be entitled to act as Members thereof are hereby required to take notice.

Given under my hand and the seal of the United States of America the 17th day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and thirteen, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and thirty-seventh.

[SEAL.] WOODROW WILSON.

By the President:

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN,
Secretary of State.

SENATORS FROM ILLINOIS AND WEST VIRGINIA.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I present the credentials of Hon. LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN, a Senator elect from Illinois, and ask that they may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read by the Secretary.

The credentials of LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN, chosen by the Legislature of the State of Illinois a Senator from that State for the unexpired portion of the term ending March 3, 1915, were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, the Senator elect from the State of West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], whose credentials have been presented and filed, is present and ready to take the oath of office as a Senator from that State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator elect from West Virginia will present himself at the desk for that purpose.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. SHERMAN is also present and ready to take the oath.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator elect from Illinois will also present himself at the desk.

Mr. GOFF and Mr. SHERMAN were escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. CHILTON and Mr. BURTON, respectively, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to them they took their seats in the Senate.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll of the Senate.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	Newlands	Smith, Ariz.
Bacon	Hitchcock	Norris	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Hollis	O'Gorman	Smith, Md.
Borah	Hughes	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Bradley	Jackson	Overman	Smoot
Brady	James	Owen	Sterling
Brandegee	Johnson, Me.	Page	Stone
Bristow	Johnston, Ala.	Perkins	Sutherland
Burton	Jones	Pittman	Swanson
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Poindexter	Thomas
Chilton	Kern	Ransdell	Thompson
Clapp	La Follette	Reed	Thornton
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Robinson	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Lippitt	Root	Townsend
Colt	Lodge	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Culberson	McCumber	Shafroth	Walsh
Cummins	McLean	Sheppard	Warren
Fall	Martin, Va.	Sherman	Williams
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Works
Gallinger	Myers	Shively	
Goff	Nelson	Simmons	

Mr. TOWNSEND. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily absent from the city. I desire this announcement to stand for all roll calls which may take place to-day.

Mr. STERLING. I was requested to announce that my colleague [Mr. CRAWFORD] is unavoidably detained to-day and will be present at the session to-morrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. BURLEIGH] is absent because of sickness. I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. BURTON. I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. POMERENE] is detained by a belated train, but that he will be here at a very early date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

LIST OF SENATORS.

The list of Senators by States is as follows:

Alabama—John H. Bankhead and Joseph F. Johnston.
Arizona—Henry F. Ashurst and Marcus A. Smith.
Arkansas—James P. Clarke and Joseph T. Robinson.
California—George C. Perkins and John D. Works.
Colorado—John F. Shafroth and Charles S. Thomas.
Connecticut—Frank B. Brandegee and George P. McLean.
Delaware—Henry A. du Pont and Willard Saulsbury.
Florida—Nathan P. Bryan and Duncan U. Fletcher.
Georgia—Augustus O. Bacon and Hoke Smith.
Idaho—William E. Borah and James H. Brady.
Illinois—Lawrence Y. Sherman.
Indiana—John W. Kern and Benjamin F. Shively.
Iowa—Albert B. Cummins and William S. Kenyon.
Kansas—Joseph L. Bristow and William H. Thompson.
Kentucky—William O. Bradley and Ollie M. James.
Louisiana—Joseph E. Ransdell and John R. Thornton.
Maine—Edwin C. Burleigh and Charles F. Johnson.
Maryland—William P. Jackson and John Walter Smith.
Massachusetts—Henry Cabot Lodge and John W. Weeks.
Michigan—William Alden Smith and Charles E. Townsend.

Minnesota—Moses E. Clapp and Knute Nelson.
Mississippi—John Sharp Williams and James K. Vardaman.
Missouri—James A. Reed and William J. Stone.
Montana—Henry L. Myers and Thomas J. Walsh.
Nebraska—Gilbert M. Hitchcock and George W. Norris.
Nevada—Francis G. Newlands and Key Pittman.
New Hampshire—Jacob H. Gallinger and Henry F. Hollis.
New Jersey—William Hughes and James E. Martine.
New Mexico—Thomas B. Catron and Albert B. Fall.
New York—James A. O'Gorman and Elihu Root.
North Carolina—Lee S. Overman and F. M. Simmons.
North Dakota—Asle J. Gronna and Porter J. McCumber.
Ohio—Theodore E. Burton and Atlee Pomerene.
Oklahoma—Thomas P. Gore and Robert L. Owen.
Oregon—George E. Chamberlain and Harry Lane.
Pennsylvania—George T. Oliver and Boies Penrose.
Rhode Island—Le Baron B. Colt and Henry F. Lippitt.
South Carolina—Ellison D. Smith and Benjamin R. Tillman.
South Dakota—Coe I. Crawford and Thomas Sterling.
Tennessee—Luke Lea and John K. Shields.
Texas—Charles A. Culberson and Morris Sheppard.
Utah—Reed Smoot and George Sutherland.
Vermont—William P. Dillingham and Carroll S. Page.
Virginia—Thomas S. Martin and Claude A. Swanson.
Washington—Wesley L. Jones and Miles Poindexter.
West Virginia—William E. Chilton and Nathan Goff.
Wisconsin—Robert M. La Follette and Isaac Stephenson.
Wyoming—Clarence D. Clark and Francis E. Warren.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE.

Mr. BACON. I present a resolution for which I ask present consideration and action by the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 24) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. KERN. I offer the following resolution and ask for its adoption.

The resolution (S. Res. 23) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. KERN and Mr. GALLINGER the committee on the part of the Senate.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING.

On motion of Mr. HITCHCOCK, it was

Ordered, That the hour of the daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian until otherwise ordered.

RECESS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What is the further pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask whether regular morning business would be now in order?

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 2 o'clock.

Mr. BRISTOW. Is it not in order to have regular morning business transacted?

Mr. OVERMAN. I think not until we hear from the committee appointed to wait on the President. That is the usual course, and I therefore move that the Senate take a recess until 2 o'clock.

Mr. KERN. I suggest that the House not yet having organized it may not have a committee appointed to wait on the President by that time.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think there will be appointed by that time a committee to act with the committee appointed here. I do not see what else we can now do but take a recess.

Mr. SMOOT. We could take another recess at 2 o'clock if it should be necessary.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the other House has not been organized by 2 o'clock another recess can be taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina, that the Senate take a recess until 2 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 12 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock p. m., when it reassembled.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Newlands	Smith, Ga.
Bacon	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Hollis	Oliver	Smoot
Bradley	Hughes	Overman	Sterling
Brady	James	Owen	Stone
Brandegee	Johnson, Me.	Page	Sutherland
Bristow	Johnston, Ala.	Perkins	Swanson
Burton	Jones	Pittman	Thomas
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Ransdell	Thompson
Chilton	Kern	Reed	Thornton
Clapp	La Follette	Robinson	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Root	Townsend
Colt	Lippitt	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Culberson	Lodge	Shafroth	Walsh
Cummins	McCumber	Sheppard	Warren
Fall	McLean	Sherman	Williams
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Shields	Works
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Shively	
Goff	Myers	Simmons	
Gore	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. BRYAN] is necessarily absent on account of some public matters. I wish to have this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum of the Senate present.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. OVERMAN. I moved that the Senate take a recess until 2 o'clock, taking the position that we ought not to do anything—as the President has called us in extraordinary session—until the President is communicated with and we shall have a communication from him. I thought at the time that I was following the usual custom, and I desire to read a short extract from the RECORD of the Fifty-seventh Congress, first session:

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MCLAURIN. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina asks that the resolution submitted by him shall be received at this time. If there is no objection, it will be received. He asks for the present consideration of the resolution. It will be read to the Senate for its information.

The Secretary proceeded to read the resolution, and read as follows:

"Joint resolution allowing the importation free of payment of duty, customs fees, or charges of articles from foreign countries, and the transfer of foreign exhibits from the Pan-American Exposition at Buffalo, for the purpose of exhibition at the South Carolina Interstate and West Indian Exposition at Charleston, S. C.

"*Resolved by the Senate, etc.*, That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries"——

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I think it is the *universal etiquette* not to enter upon any business until the President has been informed that the two Houses are in session and his communication has been received. I hope the Senator from South Carolina will, under the usual practice, allow the resolution to lie over. I shall object to any resolution of the kind being received.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina withdraw the resolution?

Mr. MCLAURIN. Yes, sir; for the present I will withdraw it.

Then the Senate took a recess, and after the recess the then Senator from Ohio, Mr. Foraker, said:

Mr. President, pending a report from the other House of the appointment of a committee to notify the President in conjunction with the committee of the Senate that Congress is in session and ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, I move that the Senate take a recess for 30 minutes.

The Senate took another recess, and no communication having been received on that day, the Senate adjourned.

At the special session of the Senate, Fifty-eighth Congress, March 5, 1903, I find from the RECORD that the following occurred:

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, pending the report of the committee which has just been appointed, I desire to rise to a question of privilege.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for that purpose.

Mr. TILLMAN. In the second or continued part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 3, which did not come from the Printer until late yesterday morning, I find a very remarkable speech, so remarkable——

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. PETTUS. It is the universal custom, Mr. President, to transact no business until the President has been informed that the Senate is in session.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Chair shall so rule, I will very quietly subside and wait until we get into working order. I simply wanted to save some time. It will take half an hour or more to go to the White House and return. I will await the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair knows of no parliamentary rule which prevents a Senator from addressing the Senate under such circumstances.

Mr. PETTUS. It is not a parliamentary rule, I admit; but it is a *custom of the Senate and a rule of courtesy*.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks it is the custom of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I hardly think the Senate could do any business before it received notice from the House that that body was in session and organized. I think perhaps if the House gave notice that it was in session and organized we could transact business without waiting for a message from the President of the United States. But as the matter now stands, officially the Senate has not been notified that the House is in session, and until that notification has been received I doubt very much whether it would be proper to go on with business.

Mr. STONE. I think we could proceed if we had been informed that the House was in session, organized, and ready for business. We have had no such communication. As a matter of courtesy at least I think it has been the rule that no business should be transacted until the President has likewise been informed that the two Houses were organized and ready to proceed with business. Without information as to when the House will be organized and ready to report to the Senate, I suggest to my friend the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] that it might be advisable now to move an adjournment until to-morrow. I submit the matter, however, to his discretion.

RECESS.

Mr. BACON. It is possible that there may be a communication from the other House after it shall have organized which will require some action on the part of the Senate this afternoon. In view of that fact, at the suggestion of Senators I move that the Senate take a further recess until 4 o'clock.

I will state, Mr. President, that the hour suggested by me is not one which has been originated by me, but I do so at the suggestion of Senators who have had the matter under consideration. I make the motion that the Senate take a further recess until 4 o'clock this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia, that the Senate take a further recess until 4 o'clock.

Mr. BACON. Some Senators around me suggest 3 o'clock, and possibly it may be better to make it 3. If in the meantime the House shall be organized we will have gained that much time. I will therefore, with the permission of the Senate, change the hour to 3 o'clock.

Mr. SMOOT. It is now 10 minutes past 2, and that would be a recess of only 50 minutes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That may be enough.

Mr. SMOOT. If it were a recess until 4 o'clock we could go to work during that time.

Mr. BACON. Very well; I will adhere to the original hour named in the motion made by me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia, that the Senate take a further recess until 4 o'clock.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rose to make an inquiry. The question is not debatable, I suppose, but I wish to ask the Senator from Georgia whether in view of the fact that we have a caucus called for this afternoon it would not be well to adjourn until to-morrow morning?

Mr. BACON. I moved a recess only in view of the suggestion which I made, that there will probably come from the House during the afternoon a resolution which will require that the Senate shall act upon it this afternoon, if it shall be practicable to do so. It is only upon that ground that the suggestion of a further recess is made. I presume there is no probability of any other business being transacted by the Senate to-day.

Mr. GALLINGER. Regular order, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia, that the Senate take a further recess until 4 o'clock p. m.

The motion was agreed to, there being, on a division, ayes 51, noes 15; and (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 4 o'clock p. m., when it reassembled.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah suggests the absence of a quorum, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Clapp	James	McLean
Bacon	Clark, Wyo.	Johnson, Me.	Nelson
Bankhead	Clarke, Ark.	Johnston, Ala.	Newlands
Borah	Colt	Jones	Norris
Bradley	Fall	Kenyon	O'Gorman
Brady	Fletcher	Kern	Overman
Brandegee	Gallinger	La Follette	Page
Bristow	Goff	Lane	Pittman
Burton	Gore	Lodge	Ransdell
Chamberlain	Hollis	Martine, N. J.	Reed
Chilton	Hughes	McCumber	Robinson
Saulsbury	Simmons	Sutherland	Walsh
Shafroth	Smith, Ariz.	Thomas	Warren
Sheppard	Smith, S. C.	Thompson	Williams
Sherman	Smoot	Thornton	Works
Shields	Sterling	Townsend	
Shively	Stone	Vardaman	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum of the Senate present. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

Mr. South, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, appeared and delivered the following message:

Mr. President, I am directed by the House of Representatives to inform the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that CHAMP CLARK, a Representative from the State of Missouri, has been elected Speaker; that South Trimble, a citizen of the State of Kentucky, has been elected Clerk; and that the House is ready for business.

Also, that a committee of three were appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join the committee appointed by the Senate to wait on the President of the United States and notify him that a quorum of the two Houses has assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make, and that Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Mr. MANN were appointed such committee on the part of the House.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. KERN and Mr. GALLINGER, the committee on the part of the Senate appointed to wait upon the President of the United States, appeared; and

Mr. KERN said: Mr. President, the committee appointed by the Senate and House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and to inform him that the two Houses of Congress have assembled and are ready to receive any communication he might be pleased to make have attended to their duty, and we, the Senate members of that committee, beg leave to report that the President will present in person a communication to Congress to-morrow at 1 o'clock in the afternoon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—THE TARIFF.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, if I am not violating a precedent or a rule, I desire to make a personal statement. I ask the Chair whether it is proper at this particular time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that it is proper.

Mr. ASHURST. I notice in a New York newspaper this morning, to wit, the Times, and I should observe that the paper to which I refer is usually correct in its news dispatches, therefore I assume it must be an error, unwittingly made, of course, this paper and some others state that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is one of five Senators who will be in opposition to the Democratic plan of reducing the tariff.

I feel, in justice to myself and the Democratic Party, of which I am a member, which is pledged to an immediate and a downward revision of the tariff, that I should at once and for all time make my position clear and thus correct the erroneous impression conveyed by these dispatches to the New York papers. I feel that I may do so more succinctly and at least more specifically by reading the following telegraphic dispatches. First, I read a telegraphic dispatch from the Flagstaff Board of Trade, of Flagstaff, Ariz., as follows:

FLAGSTAFF, ARIZ., *April 5, 1913.*

HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to stick for fair measure of protection on wool and meats. All business of State, especially central and northern Arizona, dependent on success of live-stock industry.

FLAGSTAFF BOARD OF TRADE.

My reply was as follows, which I transmitted by telegraph:

APRIL 6, 1913.

FLAGSTAFF BOARD OF TRADE,
Flagstaff, Ariz.:

Your telegram would indicate you think I am a standpat Republican instead of a Progressive Democrat. I believe you are intelligent, honest, and brave enough to get along very well without any bounty or gift from the Government, and you may be sure that the Democratic Party will keep its promises and that it will not destroy the cattle or sheep industry.

HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senator.

A gentleman in the State of Arizona transmitted a letter to me urging that I should vote against any bill which had for its purpose the reduction of the tariff on meats, cattle, sheep, or wool, and I transmitted to him the following letter, which I ask the Secretary to read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

MARCH 28, 1913.

MY DEAR FRIEND: This is reply to yours of the 10th instant.

In asking me to oppose any reduction in the tariff on beef, mutton, cattle, sheep, raw wool, woolen goods, and leather goods you surely must have been under the impression that I was a standpat Republican instead of a progressive Democrat. The Democratic Party is committed, so far as faith and honor can bind men, to reduce the tariff on the necessaries of life; and I could not take the action you request me to take unless I turned traitor to every principle I have been advocating since I reached majority. Every person in the world is a free trader after he gets his own interests protected. The cattlemen want cattle, meats, and hides protected, but want to buy everything else as cheaply as possible. The woolgrowers want wool protected, but naturally desire to purchase everything else as cheaply as they may. The pineapple growers want everything on the free list but pineapples; the sewing-machine manufacturer wants sewing machines protected and everything else on the free list, and so on down the line.

I am always glad to please my friends in Arizona, but I can not do what you ask. I shall not vote to permit one set of men to make money improperly at the expense of the whole public. No legitimate business should require a gift, bounty, or largess from the Government. If the Democratic Party, after the promises it has made to the people to reduce the tariff, should then begin to equivocate, it would be the end—and ought to be the end—of the Democratic Party.

With kindest personal regards,

Yours, cordially, HENRY F. ASHURST.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, many of the gentlemen asking me to vote against a reduction of the tariff on beef, cattle, meat, wool, and sheep are my close personal friends and have been for many years. Naturally it is not pleasant for me to cast a vote directly against what they believe to be their best interests, but the time has come when a public man must give up his personal interests and the interests of a few men of his own particular State for the larger good and general good of all the people.

The other day some gentlemen urged me to oppose a reduction of the tariff on sugar. My reply was that I am concerned with seeing to it that the 300,000 sugar consumers in the State of Arizona shall have consideration above the few men raising sugar beets in Arizona.

Mr. President, I make this statement and correction in no spirit of resentment against the newspapers that have so completely misstated my position. There is not a Senator here who owes the newspapers more than I do. As a distinguished Senator sitting before me once said, the only way the newspapers have ever abused me was to overpraise me and to say good things about me that I did not deserve.

I trust I have made my position clear, and thank the Senate for its attention.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I wish in a word to say that, in my opinion, the exploitation of individual views on the tariff question might well be delayed for a while. This is a great question we are confronting, and for the manner of dealing with it the Democratic Party is responsible. I think we could very well await with patience a time when this whole question is brought before the Senate in some form that will challenge our serious consideration.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I arose with much deliberation and asked if it was proper for me to make this statement. The distinguished Senator from Missouri seems to think that I should have waited for a more convenient season. I was very careful not to violate a precedent. I asked in advance if it would be a violation of precedent. Our distinguished and beloved Vice President ruled correctly, as I believe, and held it would not be a violation of the precedents and rules for me to make this personal statement, and in all kindness to the Senator from Missouri, I am bound to say that I am a very accurate umpire as to time, place, and manner in which I should exploit my individual views.

RELIEF OF FLOOD SUFFERERS IN OHIO.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. I desire to introduce a rather urgent resolution relating to the floods in Ohio. Is it in order to introduce the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that it is.

Mr. BURTON. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution in the name of my colleague [Mr. POMERENE], who is unavoidably absent to-day. We are, however, equally interested in it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Ohio, and the Chair understands that the Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. BURTON. I do not feel justified in asking for its immediate consideration. I desire to introduce it and have it referred to the appropriate committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to suggest that unless the Senate takes some other action the regular order is the transaction of morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts object to the introduction of the joint resolution?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; I do not object. I am very glad to have the joint resolution introduced; but all morning business is in order, I should think.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio introduces a joint resolution which will be read by title.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the joint resolution be read in full, if it is not too long, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) for the relief of destitute persons within the State of Ohio in the districts devastated by the recent floods was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the sum of $2,000,000 is hereby appropriated, to be immediately available, of which sum so much as is necessary shall be used to reimburse the War Department for such expenditures as have been made for the relief of flood sufferers within the State of Ohio, and the balance shall be placed in the hands of the American National Red Cross Society, to be expended in cooperation with the State and local authorities within the State of Ohio, for the further relief of people rendered destitute by the devastation of the floods in that State.

The officers of the American National Red Cross Society are hereby authorized to expend the amount available for the purpose of this resolution in their discretion and in cooperation with the State and local authorities; and an accounting of such funds shall be made to and audited by the Auditor for the War Department.

Mr. STONE. I am uncertain as to just what committee that joint resolution ought to go.

Mr. WARREN. I think it should go to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. STONE. I should think it should be referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Then I move, if it is necessary for me to do so, that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WARREN. I understood the Chair to direct that the joint resolution be referred to that committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will take that course, if there is no objection.

Mr. STONE. I rose under the impression that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] desired immediate consideration for the joint resolution.

Mr. BURTON. I have conferred with some of my fellow Senators to obtain their opinions in regard to it, and, in deference to them, I do not feel justified in asking for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution. I give notice, however, that I shall call it up at the earliest possible date. I trust it will receive very early consideration by the Committee on Appropriations, and that that committee will be called to meet not later than to-morrow morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask leave to introduce a bill for reference to the proper committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks he will be compelled to rule that petitions and memorials shall first be presented.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I present a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas it appears from investigation recently made by the Senate of the United States, and otherwise, that polygamy still exists in certain places in the United States, notwithstanding prohibitory statutes enacted by the several States thereof; and

Whereas the practice of polygamy is generally condemned by the people of the United States, and there is a demand for the more effectual prohibition thereof by placing the subject under Federal jurisdiction and control, at the same time reserving to each State the right to make and enforce its own laws relating to marriage and divorce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the application be made, and hereby is made, to Congress under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States whereby polygamy and polygamous cohabitation shall be prohibited, and Congress shall be given power to enforce such prohibition by appropriate legislation.

Resolved further, That the legislatures of all other States of the United States, now in session or when next convened, be, and they hereby are, respectfully requested to join in this application by the adoption of this or an equivalent resolution.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this application to the Senate and House

of Representatives of the United States and to the several Members of said bodies representing this State therein; also to transmit copies hereof to the legislatures of all other States of the United States.

THOMAS MORRIS,
President of the Senate.
MERLIN HULL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
A. C. TRETOW,
Acting Chief Clerk.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Received March 26, 1913, 9.10 a. m.

J. S. DONALD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Wisconsin Woman's Suffrage Association, which was referred to the Committee on Woman's Suffrage and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That this meeting of the Wisconsin Woman's Suffrage Association deplores the treatment accorded Wisconsin women during the procession March 3, as well as the treatment accorded the women of other States, and we believe that the proper person or persons should be held responsible.

Mrs. Henry M. Youmans, president, Waukesha, Wis.; Mrs. H. W. Chynoweth, president, Dane County, Madison, Wis.; Miss Harriett F. Bain, president, Kenosha, Kenosha, Wis.; Mrs. Rex McCreery, Brown County, Green Bay, Wis.; Mrs. Frank Eggers, president, Manitowoc County, Manitowoc, Wis.; Mrs. Mary D. Bradford, past president Wisconsin State Teachers' Association; Mrs. Gustav A. Hipke, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. C. W. Steele, president, Whitewater, Whitewater, Wis.; Mrs. W. M. Waters, Richland Center; Miss Ada L. James, ex-secretary Wisconsin Woman's Suffrage Association, Richland Center, Wis.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, do I understand now that we are proceeding in regular order under the head of morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. We are.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If so, at the proper time I shall present certain matters.

Mr. WORKS presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assembly joint resolution 2, relative to requesting the United States Congress to authorize and direct the postal savings system to loan its funds to school districts.

Whereas under the act of Congress now in force, which establishes a postal savings system throughout the United States, there is no authority by which the board of trustees of said postal savings system is permitted to loan the funds of said system to the various school districts throughout the Nation; and

Whereas it appears that, if such authority existed, the school districts of this State and every State would be able thereby to obtain money directly from the funds of said postal savings system with more facility and at lower rates of interest; and

Whereas it appears that, by their ability to borrow money more easily and under better conditions, the school districts of this State and of every State will receive great benefits of economy, saving, and financial prosperity, which will consequently afford the rising generation of our Nation better education and development: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Senate and Assembly of the State of California hereby join in requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the act establishing the postal savings system in such manner as will authorize and direct the board of trustees of said postal savings system to invest the funds of said system in school-district bonds of the various school districts of the several States, and that our representatives in the Senate and the House of Representatives of Congress do their utmost to further such legislation as will effect the above result; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the assembly to the President of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and a copy hereof to each Member of Congress and to each newly elected Member of Congress.

C. C. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
L. B. MALLORY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. WORKS presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assembly joint resolution 19, relative to establishing game refuges in the national forest reserve in the State of California.

Whereas there is in the State of California over 25,000,000 acres of national forest reserves, containing a large variety of wild game animals and birds; and

Whereas, because of the largely increasing population adjacent to such forest reserves, many species of wild animals and birds are facing extinction and there is a necessity for the protection and preservation of such game animals and birds, that they have places of refuge where they can propagate and increase unmolested:

Resolved, That the Senate and Assembly of the Legislature of the State of California in joint action, memorialize Congress to set aside all or part of each of the national forest reserves in California as game refuges in which the taking or hunting of game animals and birds shall be prohibited.

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to use all honorable means to secure the passage of a measure, or such other action as may be necessary, declaring said lands as game refuges for the protection and conservation of the game therein.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the respective Houses in Congress, and to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress now in office, and those who will assume office on March 4, 1913.

Mr. McCUMBER. I present a concurrent resolution passed by the Legislature of North Dakota which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Mr. Hoge introduced the following concurrent resolution urging Congress to enact a law prohibiting the use of the parcel post for the mailing of cigarettes, snuff, etc., within States prohibiting the sale thereof:

Whereas the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota has passed laws prohibiting the sale of cigarettes and snuff in this State; and

Whereas several other States have passed similar laws; and

Whereas the common violators of these and any other prohibition laws are now planning the importation of cigarettes and snuff by parcel post in defiance of the laws of this and other States; and

Whereas said laws have been enacted for the purpose of being enforced: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring), That we urge upon our Senators and Representatives in Congress of the United States to use their best efforts and influence toward securing the passage of an act of Congress prohibiting the use of the parcel post for the mailing of cigarettes or snuff or any substitute therefor addressed to any post office within the State of North Dakota or any other State having such anti-cigarette and antisnuff laws, and to prevail upon the Postmaster General to promulgate rules and regulations of the Post Office Department that will prevent the use of the parcel post to evade State laws: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be mailed by the secretary of state to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress of the United States.

This is to certify that the foregoing resolution originated in the house and was adopted on the 6th day of March and was concurred in by the senate on the 7th day of March, 1913.

J. H. FRAINE,
Speaker of the House.
M. J. GEORGE,
Chief Clerk of the House.
A. T. KRAABEL,
President of the Senate.
W. D. AUSTIN,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. WALSH presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 6.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialists, the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do hereby submit for your consideration the following memorial:

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill for an act providing, among other things, that if the State of Montana shall agree to establish and maintain an agricultural, manual training, or other educational or public institution upon a section of land upon which the buildings at Fort Assinniboine are located, the President is authorized to grant the lands and buildings to the State on payment of $2.50 per acre therefor; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana a bill for an act entitled "An act to establish and locate the Northern Montana Agricultural and Manual-Training School, and an agricultural experimental substation in connection therewith; appropriating money to pay the United States Government for the land upon which the same is to be situated, and to start and institute said institution," which is to be located at Fort Assinniboine aforesaid; and

Whereas in the judgment of your memorialists one section of arid land is not a sufficient area to be devoted to the purpose aforesaid, and with 2,000 acres the efficiency of said school would be greatly increased, and it would soon become almost, if not entirely, self-supporting:

Therefore, we respectfully request your honorable body to increase the area of land to be devoted to the purposes aforesaid from one section to 2,000 acres, to be granted to the State of Montana under the same conditions and for the same consideration per acre as in said bill already provided.

This memorial shall be in force from and after its adoption by both houses and approval by the governor.

W. W. McDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
A. D. MACDONALD,
Speaker of the House.

Filed March 14, 1913, at 11.40 o'clock a. m.

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.
By COPELAND C. BURG, *Deputy.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Montana, ss:*

I, A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate joint memorial 6, petitioning Congress to increase the area of land at Fort Assinniboine from one section to 2,000 acres, for the purpose of establishing and locating the Northern Montana Agricultural and Manual-Training School and an agricultural experiment substation in connection therewith, enacted by the thirteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 14th day of March, A. D. 1913.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 15th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. WALSH presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint resolution 5, relative to suspending entries on Flathead Reservation.

Whereas a large number of citizens on what was formerly the Flathead Reservation in Montana have presented filings on lands which are unoccupied and unallotted; and

Whereas said filings have been rejected and suspended by reason of the fact that the said land has not been classified or appraised; and

Whereas many of these settlers have made their applications several years ago and said applications have been rejected or suspended, awaiting the action of the department, which action has not yet been taken; be it therefore

Resolved, That the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana does hereby protest against the dilatory action of the Department of the Interior and does hereby demand that the said Department of the Interior take steps to immediately classify and appraise said lands to the end that settlers may have proper filings accepted and that the land in question may be cultivated and become homes for citizens of the United States who have applied for and desire the same; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be presented to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from Montana.

A. D. MACDONALD,
Speaker of the House.
W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.

Approved February 25, 1913.

S. V. STEWART, *Governor.*

Filed February 25, 1913, at 1.10 o'clock p. m.

A. M. ALDERSON, *Secretary of State.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Montana, ss:*

I, A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution 5, relative to suspending entries on Flathead Reservation, enacted by the thirteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 25th day of February, 1913.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 25th day of February, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. WALSH presented a joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 4.

Petition to Congress to enact such legislation as will be necessary for the establishment and the maintenance of an agricultural building for the display of agricultural products.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress of the United States assembled:

Whereas the State of Montana desires to stimulate interest in and direct attention to agricultural pursuits, and we believe that an attractive display of agricultural products will render good results in the matter of the settlement and cultivation of unoccupied lands in Montana and other States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the senate and house concurring, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States for the passage of legislation providing for the establishment and maintenance, under the supervision and regulation of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, of an agricultural building in the city of Washington, D. C., for the permanent and conspicuous display of agricultural products of every kind and description from every State and Territory of the United States. That said building be kept open during business hours of all legal days, and that an examination and inspection of said products be permitted by visitors from all parts of the world.

Resolved further, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state to the honorable Secretary of Agriculture of the United States and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, with the request that they use every effort within their power to secure the enactment of such legislation as is necessary to carry out the purposes herein expressed.

W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
A. D. MACDONALD,
Speaker of the House.

Approved, March 14, 1913.

S. V. STEWART,
Governor.

Filed March 14, 1913, at 4.15 o'clock p. m.

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.
By COPELAND C. BURG,
Deputy.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Montana, ss:*

I, A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 4, petitioning Congress to enact such legislation as will be necessary for the establishment and the maintenance of an agricultural building for the display of agricultural products, enacted by the thirteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 22d day of March, A. D. 1913.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 14th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. WALSH presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 3.

Petition to Congress to enact such legislation as will be necessary for the construction of a system of paved public highways connecting the capitol of the several States of the Union with the National Capitol and with each other, and also with the principal national parks.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States assembled:

Whereas a uniform system of national public highways or roads, connecting the capitols of the several States of the Union with the National Capitol at Washington and with each other and also with the principal national parks, will vastly promote commerce between the several States and reduce the cost of transportation thereof; facilitate and cheapen travel and social intercourse between the people; discourage sectionalism, and render the entire people more cosmopolitan intellectually, morally, and politically; aid the farmer in marketing his produce and make farm life more agreeable, attractive, and profitable; induce Americans to see and know America; beautify all parts of the Union; intensify industrial activities; encourage good road building throughout the continent; and bring the entire people countless blessings, conveniences, and joys known only to a highly developed country; and

Whereas to secure uniformity, thoroughness, and economy in construction, fitness, and adaptability of grades and avoidance of such local controversies in the selection of routes as would probably delay, if not defeat, the entire enterprise, and the cost of such a system of highways being beyond the probable financial resources of the several States, it would be necessary that it be constructed at the expense and under the supervision of the General Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (the house concurring), We, the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do hereby petition and earnestly pray the honorable Congress of the United States for the passage of legislation for the location and construction, under the supervision and by the General Government, of a system of national highways or roads which shall connect the capitols of the several States of the Union with the National Capitol at Washington and with each other, and also with the principal national parks; that such national highways be constructed on firm concrete bases with hard surfaces and as nearly dustless as possible; that they be located solely with regard to the greatest public good and feasibility of route and grades; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress provide in such legislation means of raising the necessary money for the location and construction of such national highway by the restoration of the internal-revenue tax of 1879 on tobacco, or in some other manner as to it shall seem meet and proper, and that the location and construction of such system of highways be commenced, as means can be provided, throughout the country generally without giving priority to any sections or locations; and it is further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senate of the United States, and that copies of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the House of Representatives of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies thereof be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the State of Montana, with the request that they use every effort within their power to bring about a speedy action for the accomplishment of the ends and purposes herein indicated.

W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
A. D. MACDONALD,
Speaker of the House.

Approved, February 25, 1913.

S. V. STEWART, *Governor.*

Filed February 25, 1913, at 3.30 o'clock p. m.

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Montana, ss:*

I, A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 3, petitioning Congress to enact such legislation as will be necessary for the construction of a system of paved public highways connecting the capitols of the several States of the Union with the National Capitol and with each other, and also with the principal national parks, enacted by the thirteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 25th day of February, 1913.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 26th day of February, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. WALSH presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 1.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas the settlers under the Lower Yellowstone project, Montana and North Dakota, organized under the supervision and direction of the Reclamation Service, the Lower Yellowstone Water Users' Association, a corporation, and executed and delivered a contract to said corporation subscribing for stock in said corporation, which empowered said corporation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to sell their homesteads and their lands unless the owners made application for water rights and complied with the provisions of the act of Congress of June 17, 1902; and

Whereas said contracts were entered into and executed with the understanding that the final estimated cost of the project was $30 per acre, and that the cost to them should not exceed that amount per acre on their holdings, and that the farm unit under said project was 160 acres; and

Whereas the provisions of the act of Congress of June 17, 1902, provided that the payments should be made with a view of returning to the reclamation fund the estimated cost of construction, and also that the farm unit should be fixed at the time the project is determined feasible by the Secretary of the Interior; and

Whereas the cost of construction of said project has exceeded the original estimated cost of $750,000, increasing the cost thereof to the settlers to $42.50 per acre; and

Whereas many settlers prior to the initiation of said project have secured from the Government tracts of land embracing more than 80 acres, and the Secretary of the Interior by his ruling has required that such settlers reduce their holdings to 80-acre tracts, the same being adopted as the farm unit under said project, which said ruling the said settlers denounce as contrary to the provisions of the reclamation act: Now therefore be it

Resolved (the senate concurring), That we, the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States for the passage of necessary legislation and the abrogation of unjust rulings, providing that the settlers under said Yellowstone project shall not be required to return to the reclamation fund an amount exceeding the original estimated cost of $30 per acre; and, further, that said settlers under said project who acquired from the Government prior to the initiation thereof tracts of land embracing more than 80 acres be permitted to hold the same under said project, not exceeding 160 acres each, and to acquire water rights thereunder for the whole of said holdings; further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of the Interior and our Senators and Representatives in Congress, with the request that they use their every effort to bring about speedy action for the accomplishment of the ends and purposes herein indicated.

A. D. MACDONALD,
Speaker of the House.
W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.

Approved February 25, 1913.

S. V. STEWART,
Governor.

Filed February 25, 1913, at 1.10 o'clock p. m.

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Montana, ss:*

I, A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of House joint memorial No. 1, petitioning Congress for the enactment of such legislation as will relieve the settlers under the lower Yellowstone project enacted by the thirteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 25th day of February, 1913.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 25th day of February, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. THOMAS presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, which was referred to the Committee on the Conservation of National Resources and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 5.

To Hon. Woodrow Wilson, President elect, and the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialist, the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, respectfully represents that under the present Federal policy of control of the public domain the following conditions obtain:

1. The people of Colorado are in favor of conservation in the meaning of prevention of waste and monopoly, but are unalterably opposed to it in the definition of preserving our lands and resources in their present state for future generations. We agree that these natural resources belong to all the people, but this ownership is not now different from what it always has been, namely, subject to the right of the citizen to acquire the same under liberal laws to the extent necessary to satisfactory settlement and the building of permanent homes.

2. It has been charged that the Western States have failed in the past to do their duty in the conservation of these resources, but those who make these charges utterly fail to consider that any unlawful acquisition or waste was committed under Federal laws and on public lands, and that the States, having no control, were powerless to prevent it. They also fail to recognize the fact that the amount of lands unlawfully acquired was a mere trifle compared with that lawfully acquired by bona fide settlers and others.

3. The older States have had, and still have, the benefits arising from private acquisitions of all the public lands within their boundaries, receiving revenue therefrom through taxation and otherwise, and it is therefore a great injustice that they should now seek to impose upon the Western States obstructions and burdens with which they themselves did not have to contend.

4. We deny that it is right or advisable for the Federal Government to retain the title to and lease the public lands for any purpose, as the history of the country shows that in 1807 Congress authorized the War Department to lease the lead mines in the territory afterwards embraced in the States of Missouri, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Iowa, reserving to the United States a royalty of one-sixth of the product.

5. This system was vigorously opposed by the residents of the region involved from the very beginning, and after a few years' trial the Missouri Legislature and the governor of Illinois protested against it. Presidents Polk and Fillmore urged its abandonment. The Secretary of War condemned it, saying that the benefit to the Government bore "no just proportion to the injury done to the country, first, by retarding the settlement of the country and, second, by the demoralizing influence of the system."

Year after year congressional Committees on Public Lands reported against it. One of these reports concludes as follows:

"When the United States accepted the cession of the northwestern territory the acceptance was on the express condition and under a pledge to form it into distinct republican States and to admit them as members of the Federal Union, having the same rights of freedom, sovereignty, and independence as the other States. This pledge your committee believes would not be redeemed by merely dividing the surface into States and giving them names, but it includes a pledge to sell the lands, so that they may be settled and thus form States. No other mode of disposing of them can be regarded as a compliance with that pledge."

For nearly 40 years this controversy was waged with increasing intensity, until 1846, when an act was passed directing the sale of these lands.

This condemned and discarded policy is now sought to be resurrected; and in pursuance thereof there have been withdrawn forest, coal, oil, phosphate, and power-site lands, aggregating in Colorado over 21,000,000 acres, equal to 33 per cent of the total area of the State, together with similar amounts in other Western States, so that in all the area thus withdrawn is greater than the combined area of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, both Virginias, Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois, and thus nearly 300,000,000 acres are now, and have been for several years, practically out of reach of individual enterprise or taxation for the support of the State government. This obstructive policy is a departure from the policy of the past 50 years and in violation of the rights of these States as provided in their enabling acts admitting them into the Union, their constitutions, and the fundamental principles on which the Union of the States is predicated.

The idea that the leasing of the forests and other public lands for grazing purposes to stockmen, reserving to the settler and miner a right to enter them, will give the latter adequate protection is a fallacy for the reason that it is obvious that such entries will necessarily interfere with the proper handling of stock. Where a stockman has 1,000 acres or more under such a lease, and a homesteader should undertake to enter 160 or 320 acres of the best of it, it is a certainty that the stockman would in every way not positively unlawful discourage the settler, unless we credit the stockman with less than ordinary sense of self-protection. And it is equally certain that he would succeed in preventing the entry, even if he had to buy the settler off.

The inevitable result of such leases will be to substantially end homesteading and mining on the public lands.

6. We assert that the States are vested with the right to control the waters within their respective borders (subject only to the right of the Federal Government to protect navigation on those streams that are navigable), to dispose of them to those who will use them for beneficial purposes, and that all returns therefrom, direct or indirect, justly belong to the States and not to the Federal Government.

7. Experience has shown that the methods of the Reclamation Service in the irrigation of arid lands have been less expeditious and more arbitrary and unjust in the disregard of the equitable rights of its own water users and other competitive projects than those of private enterprises. Not only so, but these projects have been made the excuse by officers of the departments concerned for refusal and interminable delays in approving the rights of way and occupancy of private irrigation projects, to which the latter are unquestionably entitled under the laws of the United States.

Reclamation of arid lands when undertaken by the United States Government should in all cases recognize the rights of the States to control the waters within their borders and should also recognize the equitable rights of its water users and other competitive projects and those of private enterprises.

These projects and enterprises should not be made by officers of the Reclamation Service an excuse for refusal to approve of rights of way and occupancy of lands under private irrigation projects; such delays seriously obstruct private enterprise and the development and improvement of lands belonging to the States, and we ask that any such refusals be revoked.

We further ask that the Reclamation Service take immediate steps looking toward the early completion of all projects now under way within this State, in order that early settlement under these projects may take place.

8. The great descent and general character of mountain streams gives such endless opportunities for water plants that any monopoly of the same is physically impossible. Indeed, the idea is growing rapidly that the small power plant is the coming one. When water has served its purpose for one power plant it continues its descent. It is not consumed nor does it vanish. Its volume is as great after as before, and therefore but a little lower down in the mountains another power plant may be constructed and so on while the stream shall last.

These delays have seriously obstructed not only these private projects but have also interfered with the irrigation and improvement of several hundred thousand acres of land belonging to the State of Colorado and granted under the laws of the United States for the purpose of improvement and sale by the State.

9. We recognize that some good has been accomplished by the Forest Service, yet at the same time its cost has been many times greater than its benefit; it has materially hindered the settlement and development of the country chiefly because of the hard and fast rules made at Washington by chiefs unfamiliar with actual conditions, and administered by subordinates, many of whom are equally unfamiliar with such conditions.

As to the scientific forestry promised, it is only necessary to refer to the reports of the forester to show that his management in many respects is most unscientific. His reports show that billions of feet of timber in the national forests are overripe, decaying and decayed, and are an actual fire menace to the remainder and ought to be cut. Yet the high prices he asks and the rules and regulations enforced are greatly restricting sales and cutting.

We urge that a committee, congressional or otherwise, be immediately appointed to visit Colorado and investigate the conditions referred to above and report on the same. It seems necessary to have the committee pursue its investigation on the ground, as few of those who suffer by the methods in force would be able to advance the expenses of a trip to Washington. Besides, an actual view of many of these things will disclose features which it would be difficult to make clear by testimony.

10. An unjust discrimination is made between grazing and other agricultural lands. The major portion of this State is composed of what is termed grazing lands, and grass is the greatest agricultural crop known and the most indispensable. All lands at present chiefly valuable for grazing should be as freely open to entry as are "farm" lands, but in sufficient quantities to support families. More than three-fourths of our present cultivated area was originally located as pasture.

and it was largely through this privilege that our present cultivated area was developed.

There is hardly an acre of grazing land on the plains that will not ultimately become agricultural lands with the development of storage of water and the economical use thereof.

11. Nearly all of our metalliferous lands have been included in forest reserves, since which time not a single important mining camp has been opened. The unwarranted interference by the Forest Service is largely responsible for the falling off of approximately $20,000,000 in the annual metal output. The man who is willing to put his labor and money into the development of a mining claim is the person best fitted to classify the land and should be permitted to acquire it.

We venture the assurance that if 40 years ago the forest reserves had been established neither Leadville nor Cripple Creek nor a score of other mining camps would have been discovered or developed.

Although our lands are of great variety they are open to entry for but few purposes and in unsuited quantities. For instance, a piece of land can not be taken merely for a home.

12. In territorial days Congress gave us the water of our natural streams and confirmed that right in the acceptance of our State constitution. Certain Federal bureaus are trying to take away that right by denying rights of way over the public domain. The contention of Federal authority, as in the case of the Eagle Dam, for the first storage of water at the lower end of the stream, instead of near the source of supply, would prevent the repeated use of water for power and irrigation upstream, would uselessly deprive large areas of development and would therefore be contrary to the principle of the "best use" as demonstrated by the experience of more than half a century.

The diversion and use of water when streams are high equalize the flow, furnish a better supply of water during the dry season, and by lessening floods save lives and property on the rivers below.

Special agents are permitted to protest against the validity of entries without any knowledge of facts relating thereto. They should be required to make their objections at the time of final proof, that the entryman may face his accusers.

13. The courts should be opened to land disputes, that citizens may be afforded an opportunity to enforce their rights, instead of the system now in vogue of determination through star-chamber proceedings by administrative officers.

14. Under the express terms of the enabling act, Colorado was admitted to the Union on an equal footing in all respects whatsoever with the original States. To be on an equal footing we must have the power to tax the land and other property within the State, for without that power we can not maintain State and local governments and institutions. The present policy of the Federal Government is to place our lands and resources on a revenue basis, paying taxes in the form of royalties into the Federal Treasury, thereby seriously interfering with the means of supporting our needy growing institutions. The effect of the present policy is to permit local taxation, only upon farm and city and town lands now privately owned. This might be less objectionable in Iowa and Illinois, where practically all of the land is tillable. More than half of the area of Colorado is not tillable under any known method, but is composed of mineral, grazing, and timbered areas which take the place of farm lands, and which are just as expensive to govern, if not more so, than are the farm lands. The policy, therefore, which withdraws these from taxation is a serious handicap to the State.

While our resources are of great variety they are not naturally ready for use. On the average there has been a dollar in expense for every dollar in precious metals taken from the mountains, and the value of our lands is measured by the labor required for their irrigation and development. Without the value the presence and industry our people have added to them, there is not a dollar's worth of value on any of our mineral resources. Every dollar, therefore, charged in the form of royalty on the products of these resources is a tax on human toil.

We can not hope to secure the best settlement of our lands nor development of our resources upon a tenantry basis. The man who is permitted to lease lands cheaply for grazing will try to keep them for pasture.

15. There is but one-third of our area on the tax rolls, with extraordinary educational requirements to equip our people to meet mining, industrial, irrigation, and other agricultural development. We must, therefore, increase the taxable area to include all the lands if every portion of the State shall bear its just share of this burden.

A large part of our territory is included in the Louisiana Purchase, in the treaty ratifying which it is decreed:

"The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States."

If this provision were complied with the present bureaucratic government over large areas of our State would be impossible. Is there any reason why people who must live in and do business with the said reservations should be deprived of the same rights and privileges enjoyed by the citizens of the older States, and what reason is there to suppose that forests can not be grown and protected or monopolies prevented under the republican form of government?

The incentive of ownership is necessary to secure the best development of our mineral territory, and we can not expect the best citizenship unless people are permitted to own their own homes, no matter in what business they engage.

The private-owned land in the State is scattered promiscuously amongst the Federal-owned land, and there can be no hope of harmonious action or good feeling through the intermingled double jurisdiction over our territory.

The Government proposes as a landlord to go into almost every kind of business within the State on untaxed property in competition with private owned and taxed property. The public business does not need to pay expenses, but the owner of the private property must pay taxes to make up the loss of his Federal competitor. The Federal Government engaging in business as a proprietor must necessarily occupy a contractual relation with the citizen under which the Government may enforce its contract against the citizen, whereas the citizen may not enforce his contract against the Government.

Under the present administration of the forest reserves the Government acknowledges the moral right of the State to tax the property by returning to the State 25 per cent of the proceeds from sales, rentals, and special privileges. It assumed the right, however, to dictate the disposition of this rebate by decreeing that it shall go to the support of roads and schools—two popular purposes—but ignoring the necessity of the State to protect in the courts the very lives of those living upon Federal-owned property and the necessity for the maintenance of educational, charitable, and penal institutions by the State.

16. The continued withdrawal of our lands and resources from entry and placing them upon a revenue basis to pay royalties into the Federal Treasury means their control by Congress, and that Texas, which never had any public lands, would in the House of Representatives have four times the legislative power over our territory that we ourselves could exert; and that New York, which has no public domain, would have ten times the legislative power over our territory that we ourselves possess, and that, too, without any adequate knowledge of local conditions and necessities.

The double jurisdiction over the territory of the State has led to strong opposition to Federal officials, against whose orders and rules there is no recourse in the courts, and employees of the Federal bureaus defending their position have been constantly doing missionary work in behalf of the general principle of Federal control of our lands and resources. The Forest Service, for instance, through its numerous employees, has been able to enlist the Eastern press in praise of its work and to create a sentiment against the West.

The Federal Constitution declares, "The United States shall guarantee to each State in the Union a republican form of government," not a republican form of government over part of the State but over it all. Certainly no man can contend that a republican form of government exists under the bureaucratic control already in force over a large part of our territory, and sought to be enforced over two-thirds of our area, with its arbitrary rules and regulations enforceable at the pleasure of the bureau with discretionary power, with its natural antagonism to State laws and State control, with a long list of special privileges to enlist support, and with all the evils therefore of a system of favoritism.

"Republicanism and bureaucracy are incompatible existences."—Century Encyclopedia.

Our laws and customs are built upon experience, and our people are better acquainted with local conditions and necessities and more interested in building the State aright than are the people of the East. If there is fear of monopolization, Congress in the act of cession could provide effective means for reversion of title to the State whenever monopoly is attempted. The administration of our public lands and resources should be under the jurisdiction of Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, familiar from experience with the local situation, in order that it may be for the settlement of our lands, the development of our institutions, and the betterment of social conditions.

17. We therefore earnestly request, under existing or more appropriate laws, such an administration as will secure the settlement of our public lands and the development of our resources, placing them upon the tax rolls with effective provisions against monopolization and waste. We ask for no advantage or privilege not enjoyed by the older States, but feel we have a right to insist that we be placed on an equal footing in all respects whatsoever with the original States to own and use our lands and resources to build our State and support its government and institutions.

Mr. BRADY presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Wilfred L. Gifford, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial No. 5, by Koelsch, passed the house March 4, 1913, passed the senate March 8, 1913, which was filed in this office on the 10th day of March, A. D. 1913, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 10th day of March, A. D. 1913, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and thirty-seventh.

[SEAL.] WILFRED L. GIFFORD,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 5.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows:

Whereas from the time of the organization of the Territory of Idaho until it became a State there were numerous Indian wars within its boundaries; and

Whereas a number of the citizens of the Territory of Idaho participated in such wars and have never been paid for their services: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to take measures by appropriate legislation to cause payment to be made to all those of our citizens who participated in the Indian wars within the boundaries of Idaho while it was a Territory and who have not been paid for such services.

This joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 4th day of March, 1913.

C. S. FRENCH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This joint memorial passed the senate on the 8th day of March, 1913.

HERMAN H. TAYLOR,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 5 originated in the house of representatives during the twelfth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

[SEAL.] DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BRADY presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Wilfred L. Gifford, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate joint memorial 9, by Fairchild. Passed the senate March 7, 1913. Passed the house March 8, 1913, which was filed in this office on the 10th day of March, A. D. 1913, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 10th day of March, A. D. 1913, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and thirty-seventh.

[SEAL.] WILFRED L. GIFFORD,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 9.

To the honorable, the Senators and Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent: That—

Whereas the United States military post located near the city of Boise, State of Idaho, known as Boise Barracks is about to be abandoned by the United States for military or Army purposes; and

Whereas the said Boise Barracks by such abandonment would soon assume a dilapidated appearance unless properly maintained at heavy expense to the Government; and

Whereas the State of Idaho is greatly in need of a site at or near its capitol for the establishment of experimental stations whereby the advancement and development of its resources may be aided through scientific research:

We therefore pray that said Boise Barracks be donated to the State of Idaho for such uses and purposes as the legislature of the State may deem proper. The secretary of state of the State of Idaho is instructed to forward copies of this memorial to the House of Representatives of the United States and copies of the same to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 7th day of March, 1913.

HERMAN H. TAYLOR,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 8th day of March, 1913.

C. S. FRENCH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within senate joint memorial 9 originated in the senate during the twelfth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

[SEAL.] SUMNER C. BROWN,
Secretary of State.

Mr. BRADY presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Wilfred L. Gifford, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial No. 8, by Oversmith, passed the house February 21, 1913, passed the senate March 3, 1913, which was filed in this office on the 5th day of March, A. D. 1913, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 6th day of March, A. D. 1913, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and thirty-seventh.

[SEAL.] WILFRED L. GIFFORD,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 8.

To the honorable the Senators and Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists the Legislature of the State of Idaho respectfully represent that—

Whereas a large portion of the State of Idaho has been set aside by the United States Government and placed in forest reserves; and

Whereas it is necessary on the part of several counties of the State of Idaho in which a part of the forest reserves are situated to maintain and construct roads and bridges in such forest reserves; and

Whereas the cost of the construction and maintenance of such roads and bridges is a grievous burden upon the taxpayers of said counties and there being no revenue derived by such counties from such forest reserves commensurate with such cost,

We therefore pray and earnestly urge that the Department of the Interior be required to make a thorough investigation of the roads and bridges which should be constructed and maintained in such forest reserves, and a sufficient appropriation be made by the United States for the purpose of building and maintaining all necessary roads and bridges in such forest reserves.

The secretary of state is hereby instructed to forward copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and copies of the same to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This memorial passed the house of representatives on the 21st day of February, 1913.

C. S. FRENCH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This memorial passed the senate on the 3d day of March, 1913.

HERMAN H. TAYLOR,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 8 originated in the house during the twelfth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

[SEAL.] DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BRADY presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on the Library and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Wilfred L. Gifford, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true and complete transcript of senate joint memorial No. 7, by Macbeth and Hart, relating to the restoration of Monticello, the home of Thomas Jefferson—passed the senate February 28, 1913; passed the house March 1, 1913—which was filed in this office on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1913, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 4th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1913, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and thirty-seventh.

[SEAL.] WILFRED L. GIFFORD,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 7.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent, that—

Whereas the members of the twelfth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, united by feelings of deepest affection and national bonds to Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of American Independence, heartily indorse the action of the Jefferson-Monticello Association in endeavoring to restore to a position of national dignity his home, Monticello, where he lived, died, and is buried.

The secretary of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and copies of the same to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This senate joint memorial No. 7 passed the senate on the 28th day of February, 1913.

HERMAN H. TAYLOR,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial No. 7 passed the house of representatives on the 1st day of March, 1913.

C. S. FRENCH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within senate joint memorial No. 7 originated in the senate during the twelfth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

[SEAL.] SUMNER C. BROWN,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. BRADY presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Wilfred L. Gifford, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate joint memorial No. 5, by Edgington; passed the senate February 26, 1913; passed the house February 26, 1913; which was filed in this office on the 28th day of February, A. D. 1913, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 28th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1912, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and thirty-seventh.

[SEAL.] WILFRED L. GIFFORD,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 5.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represents that—

Whereas agriculture in its various forms is the basis of our national prosperity; and

Whereas, as clearly shown by President Taft's letter of October 11, 1912, directed to the governors of the various States of the Union, there are over 12,000,000 farmers in the United States who raise crops each year of the aggregate value of $8,400,000,000 and are operating upon a borrowed capital of $6,040,000,000, on which yearly interest in the amount of $510,000,000 is paid, the average rate of interest, including commissions and renewal charges, being about 8½ per cent per annum as against 3½ or 4½ per cent paid upon loans of this character in Europe; and

Whereas this economic waste is due to the difficulties surrounding the farmer in borrowing money to pay part of the purchase price of his holdings or improve his land after its acquisition; and

Whereas in both Germany and France, as well as other countries of continental Europe, a system of rural banks has been organized whose object it is to grant loans in the interest of agriculture and that the experience of half a century of operation of this class of banks has demonstrated the benefits derived therefrom by persons engaged in agricultural pursuits, and the soundness of the underlying principles upon which such banks are founded; and

Whereas, in our judgment, this system of banking could be applied in the United States to the great advantage of our people engaged in agricultural pursuits by lessening the difficulties of borrowing money at a low rate of interest and would enable prices to be lowered to the consumer, and thus benefit all of our people; and

Whereas, in order to insure the economical and honest conduct of institutions of this kind, to give proper understanding of their methods and the proper standing to their debentures, National as well as State legislation is needed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be requested to enact such laws as will permit the organization of national land-mortgage banks, with such privileges only as will necessarily pertain to their effectiveness and the security of those dealing with them, and so guarded and strictly supervised as to protect alike the stockholders and the customers of such banks, with power to guarantee and market guaranteed debenture bonds of State mortgage banks or cooperative credit associations; with such limitations and restrictions as will insure practical uniformity in the laws of the several States in the matter of establishing and carrying on rural credit banks and similar associations.

This senate joint memorial No. 5 passed the senate on the 26th day of February, 1913.

HERMAN H. TAYLOR,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial No. 5 passed the house of representatives on the 26th day of February, 1913.

C. S. FRENCH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within senate joint memorial No. 5 originated in the senate during the twelfth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

[SEAL.] SUMNER C. BROWN,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. BRADY presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Wilfred L. Gifford, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate joint memorial No. 3, by Goodnight, memorializing Congress of the United States to make certain appropriation for completion of the Celilo Canal—passed the senate February 26, 1913; passed the house February 27, 1913—which was filed in this office on the 28th day of February, A. D. 1913, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 28th day of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and thirteen, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and thirty-seventh.

[SEAL.] WILFRED L. GIFFORD,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 3.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas the opening of the Panama Canal will bring to the Pacific seaboard a largely increased volume of waterway traffic, necessitating the thorough improvement of our waterways and the enlargement of our harbor and dockage facilities; and

Whereas the Columbia River and its tributaries constitute the greatest inland waterways system of the Pacific coast of America and the second greatest of the Nation; and

Whereas the preeminent importance of this waterway has been recognized by the National Government hitherto by large appropriations, covering its improvement from its mouth inland; and

Whereas one of the great steamship lines of the world, namely, the Hamburg-American Line, has selected the Columbia River as the Pacific coast terminal for its trans-Pacific-Oriental service; and

Whereas the volume of traffic tributary to the Columbia gateway virtually embraces in actual freight carried or directly affected by its water craft the entire coast business, inward and outward, of the Columbia and Snake River basins, a territory almost 250,000 square miles in extent; and

Whereas the full benefits to be obtained from the operation of this waterway can only be secured by its complete and adequate improvement: Therefore

Resolved, That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States, at its present session, to appropriate the sum of $1,400,000, to be immediately available, for the completion of the Celilo Canal and the opening of the Columbia and Snake Rivers to free navigation, this sum being, in reality, only an increase of $800,000 over the amount necessary to carry on this work on the continuous-contract basis already in operation.

Resolved, That we urge upon Congress the importance of this appropriation in order to save the net sum of $100,000, according to the estimate of the United States engineers in charge of this work.

Resolved, That the opening of the Celilo Canal and the Columbia and Snake Rivers to free navigation during the year 1915 will stimulate the building of municipal docks, the extension of feeder lines of railway, and the construction of steamboats, barges, etc., essential to the development of a vast traffic territory.

Resolved further, That the completion of these improvements at the time indicated will enable the people of the Pacific Northwest, both American and Canadian, to fittingly celebrate the opening of the Celilo Canal and the Columbia River in conjunction with the international ceremonies in honor of the Panama Canal in 1915, thus giving notice to the world of an all-water route from the ports of the world to the interior of western America and British Columbia.

This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 24th day of February, 1913.

HERMAN H. TAYLOR,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 25th day of February, 1913.

C. S. FRENCH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within senate joint memorial No. 3 originated in the senate during the twelfth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

[SEAL.] SUMNER C. BROWN,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. BRADY presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Wilfred L. Gifford, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of Senate joint memorial No. 1, by Haight. Passed the senate February 19, 1913; passed the house February 20, 1913; which was filed in this office on the 21st day of February, A. D. 1913, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 21st day of February, in the year of our Lord 1913, and of the independence of the United States of American the one hundred and thirty-seventh.

[SEAL.] WILFRED L. GIFFORD,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 1.

To the Congress of the United States:

We, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Idaho, respectfully submit the following memorial:

Whereas a bill is now pending before Congress which provides for the leasing of the remaining unappropriated public domain; and

Whereas we believe this bill to be inimical to the best interests of the State; and

Whereas it is necessary for the growth and advancement of this State that the public lands be settled by bona fide homesteaders, your memorialists believe that the leasing of the public domain will result in irreparable injury to the proper development of this State by reason of retarding the freedom of home builders, regardless of any theoretical rights they may be given in and to leased lands: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Idaho, impelled by our interest in the future welfare of our Commonwealth and in the equity and rights of our coming citizenship, do most respectfully urge and petition that the bill providing for the leasing of our public domain be not enacted into law.

This senate joint memorial passed the Senate on the 19th day of February, 1913.

HERMAN H. TAYLOR,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 20th day of February, 1913.

C. S. FRENCH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within senate joint memorial No. 1 originated in the senate during the twelfth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

[SEAL.] SUMNER C. BROWN,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. BRADY presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Wilfred L. Gifford, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial No. 7, by Mason, passed the house February 21, 1913, passed the Senate March 3, 1913, which was filed in this office on the 5th day of March, A. D. 1913, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 6th day of March, A. D. 1913, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and thirty-seventh.

[SEAL.] WILFRED L. GIFFORD,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 7.

To the honorable the Senators and Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent and petition as follows: That—

Whereas, on the 19th day of April, 1911, there was introduced in the National House of Representatives House bill No. 5966, providing for the permanent location of and for the marking and monumenting of the old Oregon Trail, from the Missouri River to the Puget Sound, as a memorial to the brave and hardy pioneers, whose hardships, suffering, and brilliant achievements saved the Oregon country, of which Idaho was a part, to the Union and opened the way for the further development of this vast territory: Now, therefore,

Your memorialists, in the name of and for the people of the State of Idaho and speaking in behalf of all of the people living in the territory traversed by the old Oregon Trail, earnestly and respectfully petition and urge that said House bill No. 5966 be passed by Congress.

The secretary of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and copies of the same to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This memorial passed the house of representatives on the 21st day of February, 1913.

C. S. FRENCH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This memorial passed the senate on the 3d day of March, 1913.

HERMAN H. TAYLOR,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 7 originated in the house during the twelfth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

[SEAL.] DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BRADY presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Wilfred L. Gifford, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate joint memorial No. 2, by Hart—passed the senate February 19, 1913; passed the house February 20, 1913—which was filed in this office on the 21st day of February, A. D. 1913, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State.

Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 25th day of February, A. D. 1913, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and thirty-seventh.

[SEAL.] WILFRED L. GIFFORD,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 2, memorializing Congress of the United States to transfer 50,000 acres of timbered land now held within the national forests by the United States within the boundaries of the State of Idaho to this State for the purpose of creating a fund for establishing and maintaining good roads in the said State of Idaho.

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows:

Whereas good roads are an important factor and one of the great first needs of every State, and also one of the surest means of aiding the material prosperity and advancing the settlement thereof, this being especially true in Idaho, where the country is not thickly populated and where the means of communication between the several parts of the State are not numerous: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to transfer 50,000 acres of timbered lands from within the national forests now existing and now held by the United States within the boundaries of the State of Idaho to this State for the purpose of creating a fund to be used by the State of Idaho solely for the establishment and maintenance in good repair of a system of public roads within its borders, said selection to be made jointly and agreed upon by the Department of Agriculture and the State land board: Be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial be sent to each of the members of the congressional delegation from this State in Congress, with a request that they employ their best efforts to secure action in the premises.

This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 19th day of February, 1913.

HERMAN H. TAYLOR,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 20th day of February, 1913.

C. S. FRENCH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within senate joint memorial No. 2 originated in the senate during the twelfth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

[SEAL.]

SUMNER C. BROWN,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate journal memorial No. 18, with the original thereof filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Oregon on the 27th day of February, 1913, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 27th day of February, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent that—

Whereas it appears from reliable information that the price of grain bags, wool bags, and jute cloth is excessive and unreasonably high; and

Whereas the jute crop for the year 1912 was as large as that of the year 1907 (the former high-water mark in the production of jute), and that there was carried over from last year several millions of grain bags, thus indicating that a shortage of raw material and reserved manufactured product can not be the cause of the recent high prices for bags; and

Whereas it is reported that the price of jute grain bags, wool bags, and cloth has been unreasonably advanced by a few large corporations and dealers of the Pacific coast brought about by cornering the market and so manipulating the sale thereof that they have been able to force all prices to almost double that paid by consumers in previous years; and

Whereas it is believed these high and exorbitant prices exist by reason of the large corporations on the Pacific coast entering into an illegal combination in restraint of trade and by uslug other artificial means which have enabled them to fix the price of jute grain bags, wool bags, and cloth at an exorbitant and unreasonable price and in violation of the laws of the United States, and thereby forcing the consumers to buy all jute products at a very high, exorbitant, and unreasonable price; and

Whereas it is estimated that the alleged jute bag and cloth trust has completely cornered and controlled the price of jute bags and cloth, enabling the trust to obtain enormous profits, amounting to at least 50 per cent: Be it

Resolved, That your memorialists respectfully and earnestly petition and request the Congress of the United States to thoroughly investigate and probe the grain-bag monopoly existing on the Pacific coast, and should this probe and investigation disclose violation of the Federal laws, the proper officials of the United States be instructed to use all just means to punish such individuals, firms, or corporations participating in any grain-bag monopoly or illegal acts in violation of the Federal laws.

Adopted by the house February 26, 1913.

C. N. MCARTHUR,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the Senate February 26, 1913.

DAN J. MALARKEY,
President of the Senate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Oregon, which was referred to the Committeee on Claims and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 14 with the original thereof filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Oregon on the 27th day of February, 1913, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 28th day of February, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 14.

Whereas Harry Hill and other settlers, known as the "Sherman County Settlers," have suffered great damages by reason of the erroneous restoration to homestead settlement of certain lands in the State of Oregon by the Secretary of the Interior, from which lands said settlers were afterwards ousted as a result of a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, as set forth in the report made by Special Agent Thomas B. Neuhausen, of the Department of the Interior; and

Whereas the honorable Senate of the United States on August 19, 1911, passed an act to adjust the claims of said settlers, and appropriating therefor the sum of $250,000; and

Whereas the Committee on Claims of the honorable House of Representatives of the United States has favorably reported a like bill for the settlement of the claims of said settlers, which is now pending on the Private Calendar of the House of Representatives as No. 123: Be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the honorable House of Representatives of the United States is hereby memorialized to pass the said bill for the relief of said settlers, and the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon are hereby urged to use their influence in behalf of the passage of the said bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon.

Adopted by the House February 26, 1913.

C. N. MCARTHUR,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the Senate February 14, 1913.

DAN J. MALARKEY,
President of the Senate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 13 with the original thereof filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Oregon on the 4th day of March, 1913, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 5th day of March, 1913.

[SEAL.]

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 13.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America:

Whereas the English walnut industry of the United States is of commercial importance inasmuch as the use of walnuts as a food is increasing among the civilized nations faster than that of any other product that the importation of walnuts into this country increased from 11,000,000 pounds in 1902 to 32,000,000 pounds in 1910; and

Whereas your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Oregon, have recognized the importance of the industry in this State by appropriating the sum of $2,000 for a walnut experimental station at McMinnville, Yamhill County, in this State, and the county court of Yamhill County has given 10 acres, or so much as may be needed, of good walnut land for such experimental purposes: Therefore,

We, your memorialists, favor an appropriation of such funds as may be necessary to facilitate this work.

Further, we recommend that the secretary of state be instructed to forward a copy of this memorial to each of our Members in Congress.

Adopted by the house March 4, 1913.

C. N. MCARTHUR,
Speaker of the House.

Concurred in by the senate March 4, 1913.

DAN J. MALARKEY,
President of the Senate.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of Kansas, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House concurrent resolution 27.

Whereas 12,000 citizens of Kansas served as militia-men during the War of the Rebellion in suppressing Price raid and other warlike invasions and border disturbances; and

Whereas the men so serving were ordered into active service by Gen. Curtis under martial law, and ordered into the State of Missouri in 1864 to repulse the invasion by Gen. Price's army, and they do not now have pensionable status under the United States pension laws, although they rendered valuable and valiant service in the preservation of the Republic: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring therein), That the Senators and Members of Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to propose and secure the passage of proper legislation by Congress fixing and establishing for such militia-men a pensionable status the same as though they had been regularly mustered into regular service, and allowing to such men suitable pensions; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Members of Congress from this State.

W. L. BROWN,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house and passed that body January 31, 1913.

GEO. E. ROGERS,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Passed the Senate February 5, 1913.

SHEFFIELD INGALLS,
President of the Senate.
BURT E. BROWN,
Secretary of the Senate.

STATE OF KANSAS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Chas. H. Sessions, secretary of state of the State of Kansas, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a correct copy of the original enrolled resolution now on file in my office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my official seal this 6th day of March, 1913.

[SEAL.] CHAS. H. SESSIONS,
Secretary of State.

By ———,
Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a petition of sundry citizens of Conway Springs, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of Spring Hill, Kans., praying that an investigation be made into the prosecution of the Appeal to Reason, a socialist newspaper published at Girard, Kans., which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Downs, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona presented a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint resolution 1.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress of the United States:

Whereas the statistics prepared by the registrar of vital statistics of the State of Arizona show a serious condition existing within our borders resulting from the immigration from other States to Arizona of people afflicted with tuberculosis, and further show that the number of deaths in Arizona of people afflicted with tuberculosis coming from other States is constantly on the increase, thereby endangering the lives of the people of Arizona; and

Whereas at the present time adequate care of these unfortunate people is impossible without great drain on the State's finances; and

Whereas a movement is now on foot among the executives of several Southwestern States having as its object the setting aside by Congress of certain abandoned military posts in the Western States to be used as sanatoria for the sufferers from tuberculosis: Therefore be it

Resolved by your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the First Legislature of the State of Arizona, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to appoint a committee to investigate conditions in the Southwestern States having in view the setting aside of certain abandoned military reservations to be used as the sites for proposed sanatoria to be established, at Government expense, for the care of tubercular patients, and the making of an adequate appropriation by the Congress of the United States to relieve the present deplorable conditions mentioned above: Be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives of the State legislature be instructed to send one copy of this resolution to Hon. MARCUS A. SMITH, Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST, and Hon. CARL HAYDEN; also one copy to the Senate and to the House of Representatives of Congress.

Mr. WARREN presented a memorial of the Legislature of Wyoming, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Wyoming, ss:*

I, Frank L. Houx, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached copy of enrolled joint resolution No. 3, House of Representatives, State of Wyoming, has been carefully compared with the original, filed in this office on the 28th day of February, A. D. 1913, and is a full, true, and correct copy of the same and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 1st day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] FRANK L. HOUX,
Secretary of State.
By F. H. WESCOTT,
Deputy.

Enrolled joint resolution 3.

A joint resolution relating to the refunding of certain moneys now lying in the Treasury of the United States, being paid therein by certain citizens of the United States in attempting to make final proofs on the public domain, and memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass such legislation as may be necessary for the refunding of these moneys to those who have so paid them into the Treasury of the United States, and thereby relieving the distress caused to certain citizens of the United by both denying patent on public lands for different causes and then retaining the money paid, as provided by law, preliminary to perfecting such proofs.

Whereas certain citizens of the United States have filed on portions of the public domain pursuant to the several acts of the Congress of the United States providing for the filing on and for the making of final proof and the securing of patent on the said public domain of the United States so set apart for such purposes; and

Whereas these citizens, in attempting to make final proof previous to perfecting patents on the public domain filed on under the several acts of Congress providing for the securing of patents on the public domain, to wit, under the homestead act, the stone-and-timber act, the desert-land act, and the coal-land act, have been unsuccessful, and for one cause or another have been denied patent; and

Whereas these citizens have paid different sums of money into the Treasury of the United States previous to their attempts to make final proofs, as provided by the acts of the Congress of the United States, and which proofs were unsuccessful and patents were denied; and

Whereas these moneys have never been refunded to the citizens who have so paid them into the Treasury of the United States previous to their unsuccessful attempts to make final proofs; and

Whereas both the failure to secure title to the lands on which these attempts to make final proofs were made and the loss of the moneys so paid into the Treasury of the United States have wrought untold hardship and loss to these citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, memorialized and requested to enact such legislation as may be necessary for the refunding of these moneys so paid into the Treasury of the United States to the citizens so paying them in, and thus relieve the hardship and loss which the withholding of these moneys is causing these citizens; be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies of this memorial and request be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Secretary of the Interior, asking their aid in bringing the object of this memorial and request before Congress and in securing from same adequate legislation for the purpose herein set forth; and be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies of this memorial and request be sent to the Senators from Wyoming in the Congress of the United States, viz, Hons. CLARENCE D. CLARK and FRANCIS E. WARREN, and our Representative in said Congress, Hon. FRANK W. MONDELL, asking them to use their best efforts to secure a favorable action upon the request embodied herein.

BIRNEY H. SAGE,
President of the Senate.
MARTIN L. PRATT,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 28, 1913, at 11 a. m.
JOSEPH M. CAREY, *Governor.*

Mr. WARREN presented resolutions adopted by Local Union 2312, United Mine Workers of America, of Dietz, Wyo., which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
DISTRICT NO. 22,
Dietz, Wyo., March 25, 1913.

To the Hon. Senator FRANCIS E. WARREN, greeting:

At a regular meeting of Dietz Local Union, No. 2312, United Mine Workers of America, at Dietz, Wyo., the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas there is a labor struggle in the State of West Virginia between the union miners and coal operators which has been in existence for the past 11 months; and

Whereas the miners are only demanding a living wage and the right to organize a labor union the same as miners in other States; and

Whereas the coal operators of West Virginia, with the aid of the governor and militia and Baldwin thugs, are doing all in their power to deprive these people of their rights by violation of the Constitution of the State of West Virginia and the United States; and

Whereas they have caused the arrest of Paul J. Paulsen, national board member of district No. 22, United Mine Workers of America, an honored and law abiding citizen of the State of Wyoming with other labor leaders, and placed them in a military bull pen and have denied them the right of being tried by a jury of their peers in the civil courts which are open and accessible: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we ask our Representatives in Congress to take immediate steps to prevent any further persecution of said labor leaders; and be it further

Resolved, That we demand of them to introduce a measure in Congress demanding a thorough investigation into the strike situation in West Virginia; and be it further

Resolved, That we condemn the governor and the judges of the Supreme Court of West Virginia for their actions and unconstitutional decisions rendered toward these men and women; and be it further

Resolved, That we send a copy of these resolutions to our Representatives in Congress, the Hon. Senators F. E. WARREN, C. D. CLARK, and F. W. MONDELL, also to the Wyoming Labor Journal and United Mine Workers Journal for publication.

JOHN MCMANUS,
President.
CHAS. WONTSKY,
Recording Secretary.
GEO. E. BATEMAN.
WM. EYNEN.

Mr. WARREN presented resolutions adopted by Local Union 2335, United Mine Workers of America, of Hanna, Wyo., which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL UNION NO. 2335,
Hanna, Wyo., March —, 1913.

To the Hon. F. E. WARREN,
United States Senator for Wyoming, Washington, D. C.:

At a regular meeting of Hanna Local Union 2335, United Mine Workers of America, Hanna, Wyo., the following resolutions were unanimously adopted, to wit:

Whereas the mine workers of West Virginia are fighting for their rights, which belong to every free American citizen, namely, the right of free speech, the right to belong to a labor union, and a living wage, whereby they can exist and live as free Americans and not as serfs; and

Whereas the coal barons of West Virginia, with the aid of the governor and militia, are doing all in their power to deprive these people of their rights by violations of the constitution of the State and the United States; and

Whereas they have caused to be arrested Mother Jones, Charles H. Boswell, Charles Battey, also Paul J. Paulson, national board member of our District 22, Wyoming, on some trumped-up charges on account of their activities in behalf of the striking miners of West Virginia, who are fighting to receive what rightfully belongs to them, namely, the right to organize for a living wage and the abolishment of the Siberian methods in that State, which is the guard system; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of West Virginia has refused the rights of these men and woman to a trial by jury, which is theirs by constitutional provisions of that State, and turned them over to the military authorities to have them say what shall be done with them, when they have already declared that they are guilty before they have had a hearing: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we ask the representatives in United States Congress to make a thorough investigation into the mining affairs of West Virginia, and demand for the miners of that State the rights which belong to them, namely, protection, equality, justice, and freedom, which belongs to any civilized people; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to our representatives in Congress, Senators F. E. WARREN, C. D. CLARK, and Congressman F. W. MONDELL, also to the Wyoming Labor Journal and United Mine Workers of America Journal.

GEO. A. BROWN,
JAS. W. CASE,
W. NEIVO,
W. BROWN,
Secretary, Box 342, Hanna, Committee on said Resolutions.

Mr. WARREN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Sheridan, Wyo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROOT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of New York, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN ASSEMBLY,
March 10, 1913.

Mr. Cuvillier offered for the consideration of the House a resolution in the words following:

Whereas the State of New York is the Empire State of the Union, the largest in population, and has more commercial business, both import and export, than half the States of the United States, and millions of dollars are paid into the United States Treasury through the customs ports of the State of New York.

Whereas by Executive order, issued by former President Taft, many customs ports of entry in various localities in the State of New York have been abolished, thereby causing the citizens, merchants, and manufacturers of the State of New York greater expense, inconvenience, and loss of time, which will tend to drive out of the State of New York capital for business enterprises into other States.

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That it is the sense of the legislature that the customs ports in the State of New York be reestablished as existing before the Executive order issued by former President Taft abolishing said customs ports of entry, and that the Representatives in Congress from the State of New York use their best offices in this direction, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and each Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Mr. Speaker put the question whether the house would agree to said motion and it was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the clerk deliver said resolution to the senate and request their concurrence therein.

MARCH 19, 1913.

The senate returned the concurrent resolution in relation to the Executive order in relation to the customs ports of entry with a message that they have concurred in the passage of the same without amendment.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of Albany, Office of the Clerk of the Assembly, ss:

I, George R. Van Namee, clerk of the assembly, do hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing record of proceedings of the assembly of March 10 and 19, 1913, relative to the resolution therein set forth with the original thereof, as contained in the original official copy of the journal of proceedings of the assembly of said dates, and that the same is a true and correct transcript of said journal of proceedings in so far as the same relates to said resolution and of the whole thereof.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand this 27th day of March, 1913.

[SEAL.] GEORGE R. VAN NAMEE,
Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. ROOT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of New York, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN ASSEMBLY,
February 10, 1913.

Mr. Cuvillier offered for the consideration of the house a resolution in the words following:

Whereas by reason of the establishment of the parcel post and the increase of the United States mail, the letter carriers are compelled to work longer, and their compensation is unequal in proportion to similar work of other public employees, and they are not subject to pensions after long and faithful service, though they are required to be men of the highest character, and they are exposed to the elements; and

Whereas it is the duty of the United States to protect these faithful employees, in better compensation and a future maintenance in the way of pensions after long service.

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That it is the sense of the legislature that the Congress should do all in its power to increase their compensation and provide a pension for the letter carriers, the same as provided for other faithful public servants in other departments of Government; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That our Representatives in Congress use their best endeavor in behalf of the betterment of letter carriers of the United States; and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Postmaster General and the Representatives in Congress from the State of New York.

Said resolution giving rise to debate, ordered that the same be laid upon the table.

FEBRUARY 17, 1913.

By unanimous consent Mr. Cuvillier called up his resolution in relation to the pay of letter carriers and the parcel post.

Debate was had thereon.

Mr. Speaker put the question whether the house would agree to said resolution, and it was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the clerk deliver said resolution to the senate and request their concurrence therein.

FEBRUARY 18, 1913.

The senate returned the concurrent resolution in relation to pay of letter carriers and the parcel post with a message that they have concurred in the passage of the same without amendment.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of Albany, Office of the Clerk of the Assembly, ss:

I, George R. Van Namee, clerk of the assembly, do hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing record of proceedings of the assembly of February 10, 17, and 18, 1913, relative to the resolution therein set forth with the original thereof, and that the same is a true transcript of said proceedings so far as the same relates to said resolution and of the whole thereof.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand this 24th day of February, 1913.

[SEAL.] GEORGE R. VAN NAMEE,
Clerk of the Assembly.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not wish to object, and I am not sure that I am correct, but I find upon page 11 of the Standing Rules of the Senate that on August 10, 1888, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That after to-day, unless otherwise ordered, the morning hour shall terminate at the expiration of two hours after the meeting of the Senate.

The Senate having met at 12 o'clock to-day, I desire to inquire whether morning business is now in order, not that I intend to object; but if it is not in order, I do not want this proceeding to pass as a precedent?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. We have been proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, unquestionably the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] is right, and so that we may now present morning business, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be now received.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 1) to establish a department of health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 2) appropriating funds to prevent floods on the Mississippi River and to improve navigation thereon; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PAGE:

A bill (S. 3) to provide for cooperation with the States in promoting instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics in secondary schools; in preparing teachers for these vocational subjects in State colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts, in State normal schools, and in other training schools for teachers supported and controlled by the public; in maintaining extension departments of State colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts; in maintaining branches of State experiment stations; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 4) to abolish the involuntary servitude imposed upon seamen in the merchant marine of the United States while in foreign ports and the involuntary servitude imposed upon the seamen of the merchant marine of foreign countries while in ports of the United States, to prevent unskilled manning of American vessels, to encourage the training of boys in the American merchant marine, for the further protection of life at sea, and to amend the laws relative to seamen; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 5) to correct the military record of Harry Sharff, alias Herman Shofrensky, alias Herman Schofrensky; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 6) granting an increase of pension to Elisha L. Ashley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE (for Mr. WEEKS):

A bill (S. 7) to incorporate the National Reserve Association of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 8) for the erection of a statue to the memory of Gen. James Miller at Peterboro, N. H., (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 9) to amend paragraph 43 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902 (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 10) to amend an act entitled "An act to require the erection of fire escapes in certain buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 19, 1906, as amended by the act approved March 2, 1907 (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 11) for the relief of Charlotte J. Pile, Eastmond P. Green, and Easie C. Gandell, owners of lots Nos. 53, 54, and 55, in square No. 753, Washington, D. C., with regard to assessment and payment of damages on account of change of grade due to construction of the Union Station in said District (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 12) to provide for annual assessments of real estate in the District of Columbia (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 13) to authorize the widening and opening of Rhode Island Avenue from Fourth Street east to the District line (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 14) to authorize the extension of Twenty-fifth Street SE. and of White Place (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 15) providing for the cancellation of certain overdue personal taxes in the District of Columbia (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 16) to amend section 558 of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia relating to notaries public (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 17) to amend subchapter 2, chapter 19, of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, by providing a penalty for omission to return library property in the District of Columbia (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 18) to establish a home for feeble-minded, imbecile, and idiotic children in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 19) to authorize the widening and extension of Spring Road NW., and for other purposes (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 20) to redeem a certain outstanding certificate of indebtedness issued by the late board of audit of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 21) to regulate the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 22) to authorize the opening, widening, and extension of highways within and adjacent to the subdivision of the Barry farm, and for other purposes (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 23) for the relief of Clara Dougherty, Ernest Kubel, and Josephine Taylor, owners of lot No. 13; of Ernest Kubel, owner of lot No. 41, and of Mary Meder, owner of the south 17.10 feet front by the full depth thereof of lot No. 14, all of said property in square No. 724, in Washington, D. C., with regard to assessment and payment for damages on account of change of grade due to the construction of Union Station, in said District (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 24) to authorize certain changes in the plan for the permanent system of highways for that portion of the District of Columbia lying west of Fourteenth Street, south of Taylor Street, east of Rock Creek Park, and north of Newton Street NW. (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 25) to authorize the surveyor of the District of Columbia to adopt the system of designating land in the District of Columbia in force in the office of the assessor of said District (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 26) to authorize the extension of Grant Street NE. and Deane Avenue NE., in the District of Columbia, from Minnesota Avenue to Fifty-eighth Street (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 27) to authorize a new highway plan for that portion of the District of Columbia lying between Van Buren Street on the north, Georgia Avenue on the east, Nicholson Street on the south, and Rock Creek Park on the west (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 28) to provide for the extension of Buchanan Street NW. between Piney Branch Road and Sixteenth Street, and the abandonment of Piney Branch Road between Allison Street and Buchanan Street NW., District of Columbia (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 29) directing the Secretary of War to convey the outstanding legal title of the United States to sublots Nos. 31, 32, and 33 of original lot No. 3, square No. 80, in the city of Washington, D. C. (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 30) authorizing the Secretary of War to convey the outstanding title of the United States to lots 3 and 4, square 103, in the city of Washington, D. C. (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 31) for the relief of Ida A. Chew, owner of lot 112, square 721, Washington, D. C., with regard to assessment and payment of damages on account of changes of grade due to construction of the Union Station, District of Columbia (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 32) providing for guides in the District of Columbia, and defining their duties (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 33) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the better registration of births in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1907 (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 34) to amend sections 680 and 686 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 35) to receive arrearages of taxes due to the District of Columbia to July 1, 1908, at 6 per cent interest per annum, in lieu of penalties, and costs (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 36) to amend "An act authorizing the widening and extension of Minnesota Avenue SE. from its present terminus near Pennsylvania Avenue SE. to the Sheriff Road," approved February 25, 1909 (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 37) authorizing the extension of First Street east, and for other purposes (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 38) to change the name of Fort Place, from Seventeenth to Eighteenth Streets NE., to Irving Street (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 39) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the extension of Newton Place NW. from New Hampshire Avenue to Georgia Avenue, and to connect Newton Place in Gass's subdivision with Newton Place in Whitney Close subdivision," approved February 21, 1910 (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 40) to provide for the extension of Kenyon Street from Seventeenth Street to Mount Pleasant Street and for the extension of Seventeenth Street from Kenyon Street to Irving Street, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 41) for the widening of Sixteenth Street NW. at Piney Branch, and for other purposes (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 42) granting an increase of pension to William Heywood (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 43) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Cook (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BACON. My colleague [Mr. SMITH of Georgia] is necessarily absent from the Chamber on account of illness in his family. At his request I introduce certain bills and a joint resolution, which I ask to have read twice and referred, as indicated.

By Mr. BACON (for Mr. SMITH of Georgia):

A bill (S. 44) to amend section 5137 of the Compiled Statutes of the United States, 1901, so as to authorize and empower national banks to take and hold mortgages, deeds of trust, and other conveyances of real estate as security for loans made by said banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 45) to create a teachers' training fund, to provide for its use by the States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 46) to establish agricultural extension departments in connection with agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto; and

A bill (S. 47) to establish in the Bureau of Statistics, in the Department of Agriculture, a division of markets; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 48) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories.

A bill (S. 49) to provide for the exchange with the State of Oregon of certain school lands and indemnity rights within the national forests of that State for an equal area of national forest land; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 50) to further restrict undesirable immigration, secure the better enforcement of the immigration law, improve conditions on immigrant-carrying vessels, and provide for the deportation of undesirable aliens; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 51) to amend section 715 of the Revised Statutes as amended by act of Congress of March 3, 1905; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 52) providing for the destruction of predatory wild animals upon the national forests and the lands adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 53) for the improvement of the roads on the Wind River Reservation, in Wyoming; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 54) for the relief of George W. Hoyt; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 55) for the relief of Daniel Hampton;

A bill (S. 56) for the relief of the relatives of John McCurry, deceased;

A bill (S. 57) fixing the rank of military attachés; and

A bill (S. 58) relative to the exchange of certain properties between the insular government of Porto Rico and the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 59) for the relief of Fred C. and C. Hellen Fisher;

A bill (S. 60) to provide for agricultural entry of oil lands;

A bill (S. 61) providing for patents to homesteads on the ceded portion of the Wind River Reservation, in Wyoming;

A bill (S. 62) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain lands to be used as a sanitarium by the Order of Owls;

A bill (S. 63) to amend the enlarged homestead act;

A bill (S. 64) giving a new right of homestead entry to former homesteaders;

A bill (S. 65) to amend an act entitled "An act providing that the State of Wyoming be permitted to relinquish to the United States certain lands heretofore selected and to select other lands from the public domain in lieu thereof," approved April 12, 1910; and

A bill (S. 66) granting to the State of Wyoming 2,000,000 acres of land to aid in the maintenance of a system of public roads in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 67) for the relief of Emory Scott Land;

A bill (S. 68) for the relief of Clarence D. Houck;

A bill (S. 69) for the relief of Allen Edward O'Toole and others, who sustained damage by reason of accident at Rock Island Arsenal;

A bill (S. 70) for the relief of John Schnoor;

A bill (S. 71) for the relief of William H. and C. G. Cazier;

A bill (S. 72) for the relief of John Shaw;

A bill (S. 73) for the relief of Henry Altman;

A bill (S. 74) for the relief of Henry Altman;

A bill (S. 75) for the relief of Theresa A. Murray;

A bill (S. 76) for the relief of Charles B. Boyce; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 77) granting an increase of pension to Annie Jane Saffell;

A bill (S. 78) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia M. Clagett;

A bill (S. 79) granting an increase of pension to Carrie H. Travis;

A bill (S. 80) granting an increase of pension to Isabella S. Snyder;

A bill (S. 81) granting a pension to Finley Lowry;

A bill (S. 82) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Hake;

A bill (S. 83) granting an increase of pension to Kate Dodge Augur;

A bill (S. 84) granting a pension to William McCabe;

A bill (S. 85) granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Smith;

A bill (S. 86) granting a pension to Francis M. Jones;

A bill (S. 87) granting a pension to Tillie Johnson;

A bill (S. 88) granting a pension to George L. Granbery;

A bill (S. 89) granting a pension to Annie Walker Burch;

A bill (S. 90) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Hubbell; and

A bill (S. 91) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Lafontaine; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROOT:

A bill (S. 92) to amend section 914 of the Revised Statutes;

A bill (S. 93) to regulate the judicial procedure of the courts of the United States;

A bill (S. 94) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; and

A bill (S. 95) to amend chapter 11 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 96) to prevent discrimination in Panama Canal tolls; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 97) to provide for the acquisition of a site for a Federal courthouse in the Borough of Manhattan, city of New York; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona:

A bill (S. 98) granting relief to certain American citizens in El Paso, Tex., and Douglas, Ariz.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 99) to fix the times and places of holding district court for the district of Arizona, and creating divisions thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 100) to provide for an extension of time within which the cost of the Salt River irrigation and reclamation project, in the State of Arizona, may be repaid by the landowners within the same, and granting the same privileges to the Yuma irrigation project and others similarly situated upon the same terms (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 101) authorizing homestead entrymen who are officers of water users' associations to reside off their entries during their terms as such officers (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 102) to grant an honorable discharge to Charles T. Nutter (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 103) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant permission for the erection of a hotel on the Fort Huachuca Military Reservation in Arizona (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 104) for the relief of G. O. Nolan; and

A bill (S. 105) for the relief of John T. Brickwood, Edward Gaynor, Theodore Gebler, Lee W. Mix, Arthur L. Peck, Thomas D. Casanega, Joseph de Lusignan, and Joseph H. Berger; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 106) granting a pension to Henry Lottner (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 107) granting a pension to Bert O. Brown (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 108) granting a pension to Mary Ann Golding; and

A bill (S. 109) granting an increase of pension to Grace M. Thomas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of South Carolina:

A bill (S. 110) to regulate trading in cotton futures and provide for the standardization of "upland" and "gulf" cottons separately; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 111) divesting goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured by convicts or by convict labor of their interstate character in certain cases; and

A bill (S. 112) to restore section 1 of the act of Congress of July 2, 1890, chapter 647, 26 Statutes at Large, to its original form as enacted by striking out the words "unreasonable or undue," inserted therein by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 113) providing for a commission to settle certain claims between the United States Government and the Sisseton and Wahpeton Indians and the Sioux of the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Bands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 114) for the relief of Ethel M. Young;

A bill (S. 115) defining procedure in case of protested or objected final proof on public lands; and

A bill (S. 116) granting to the State of North Dakota 50,000 acres of land to aid in the maintenance of a normal school at Minot, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 117) to provide for the incorporation, control, and government of associations organized to carry on business entering into or becoming a part of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 118) for payment to the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. the $4,583.67 improperly collected under the act of August 5, 1909; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 119) to authorize the sale of lands contained in the abandoned military reservation of Fort Hancock, near Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 120) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 121) to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine

Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 122) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 123) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States"; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 124) establishing rate of pay for rural free carriers; and

A bill (S. 125) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1912; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 126) to permit citizens of the United States to be admitted to Government tuberculosis hospitals; and

A bill (S. 127) for the protection of passengers on ocean vessels; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 128) to provide for the sanitary wrapping of bread in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 129) amending section 2 of an act entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War," approved April 19, 1908;

(By request.) A bill (S. 130) granting pension to volunteer Army nurses of the Civil War; and

A bill (S. 131) to provide for placing ex-Presidents of the United States on the retired list as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and to provide for an annuity for the widows of Presidents and ex-Presidents; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

(By request.) A bill (S. 132) to amend the national banking law; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 133) to provide for the construction of railroads in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 134) for the permanent improvement of the Consular and Diplomatic Services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 135) for the relief of Severin and Berthe L. Evensen, dependent parents of Sigurd Evensen; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 136) to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States, to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto, and to promote safety at sea; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. NELSON (by request):

A bill (S. 137) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 138) to amend the act approved May 9, 1888, as amended by the act of June 11, 1896; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 139) for the relief of Mariah V. Drum; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 140) for the relief of G. O. Nolan; and

A bill (S. 141) for the relief of Alfred Cluff, Orson Cluff, Henry E. Norton, William B. Ballard, Elijah Hancock, Susan R. Saline, Oscar Mann, Celia Thayne, William Cox, Theodore Farley, Adelaide Laxton, Clara L. Tenney, George M. Adams, Charlotte Jensen, and Sophia Huff; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 142) to fix the times and places of holding district court for the district of Arizona, and creating divisions thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 143) opening the surplus and unallotted lands in the Colorado River Indian Reservation to settlement under the provisions of the Carey Land Acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BRADY:

A bill (S. 144) for the relief of Charles Richter;

A bill (S. 145) for the relief of Charles Richter; and

A bill (S. 146) for the relief of Aaron Kibler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 147) granting an increase of pension to William Oliver;

A bill (S. 148) granting an increase of pension to William Oliver (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 149) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Wheeler;

A bill (S. 150) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Wheeler; and

A bill (S. 151) granting a pension to John Orr; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON:

A bill (S. 152) for reduction of postage rates on first-class mail matter; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 153) to create an Industrial Commission and defining its powers and duties; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 154) to provide for a primary nominating election in the District of Columbia, at which the qualified electors of the said District shall have the opportunity to vote for their first and second choice among those aspiring to be candidates of their respective political parties for President and Vice President of the United States, to elect their party delegates to their national conventions, and to elect their national committeemen; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 155) for the relief of Joseph B. Riley, alias Thomas B. Keesy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 156) for the relief of R. W. Branson; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 157) to place positions under the government of the District of Columbia within the classified service of the United States; to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

A bill (S. 158) granting an increase of pension to Anna Glendening;

A bill (S. 159) granting an increase of pension to Louis E. Brusher;

A bill (S. 160) granting an increase of pension to Martin Parker;

A bill (S. 161) granting a pension to Adam Ross;

A bill (S. 162) granting an increase of pension to John D. Kirkpatrick;

A bill (S. 163) granting an increase of pension to Minnie A. Piety;

A bill (S. 164) granting a pension to Martha Benner;

A bill (S. 165) granting a pension to Mary E. Bennett;

A bill (S. 166) granting an increase of pension to Otis Crawford;

A bill (S. 167) granting an increase of pension to Morton A. Pratt;

A bill (S. 168) granting an increase of pension to George W. Miller;

A bill (S. 169) granting an increase of pension to Thomas T. Keibler;

A bill (S. 170) granting a pension to Hiram Strayer;

A bill (S. 171) granting a pension to Sarah A. Walker (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 172) granting an increase of pension to J. M. Dickerson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 173) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Frye (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 174) to provide for the selection and purchase of a site for and erection of a monument or memorial to the memory of Gen. George Rogers Clark; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 175) for the relief of Lawson Reno, collector second district of Kentucky;

A bill (S. 176) for the relief of the county court of Allen County, Ky.;

A bill (S. 177) for the relief of Marion B. Patterson, widow of the late Gen. Robert F. Patterson; and

A bill (S. 178) for the relief of the estate of John Wesley Eubanks; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 179) granting an increase of pension to Levi Hoskins;

A bill (S. 180) granting an increase of pension to Elender B. Gabbard;

A bill (S. 181) granting an increase of pension to Sidney Payne Smith;

A bill (S. 182) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel White;

A bill (S. 183) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Adams;

A bill (S. 184) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hammack;

A bill (S. 185) granting an increase of pension to Katie Royston;

A bill (S. 186) granting an increase of pension to Adeline Stoker;
A bill (S. 187) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Lewis;
A bill (S. 188) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Hill (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 189) granting a pension to Juliet S. White; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAPP:
A bill (S. 190) to prevent undue delay in settlement of freight claims; and
A bill (S. 191) to prohibit unfair discrimination between different sections, communities, or localities; unfair competition; and providing penalties therefor; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.
A bill (S. 192) to limit the use of campaign funds in presidential and national elections; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.
A bill (S. 193) to amend the public-printing law; to the Committee on Printing.
A bill (S. 194) to amend section 235 of the Criminal Code, act of March 4, 1909; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
A bill (S. 195) to correct the record in the case of Passed Asst. Surg. William Niel McDonnell, United States Navy; and
A bill (S. 196) for the reinstatement of Lieut. Col. Constantine Marrast Perkins to the active list of the Marine Corps (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
(By request.) A bill (S. 197) for the relief of the estate of Israel Folsom;
A bill (S. 198) for the relief of Mary G. Brown and others; and
A bill (S. 199) for the relief of the Ottawa Indian Tribe of Blanchard Fork and Rouch de Boeuf; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.
A bill (S. 200) to remove the charge of desertion against Charlie Meyers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 201) for the relief of John W. Cupp;
A bill (S. 202) for the relief of the estate of John Frazer, deceased; and
A bill (S. 203) for the relief of the estate of Zephaniah Kingsley, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 204) granting an increase of pension to Zacheus Borager;
A bill (S. 205) granting a pension to Marilla Lee Stone;
A bill (S. 206) granting a pension to Mary E. Seeley;
A bill (S. 207) granting an increase of pension to Minnie Barnard;
A bill (S. 208) granting a pension to Minnie A. Thornhill;
A bill (S. 209) granting a pension to Charles Meyers;
A bill (S. 210) granting an increase of pension to Giles A. Woolsey;
A bill (S. 211) granting a pension to William A. Gray;
A bill (S. 212) to amend an act entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Marie J. Blaisdell," approved May 24, 1900;
A bill (S. 213) granting a pension to Anna L. Freeman;
A bill (S. 214) granting a pension to Melissa Gross;
A bill (S. 215) granting an increase of pension to Jeanette Dring;
A bill (S. 216) granting a pension to Caroline Fust;
A bill (S. 217) granting an increase of pension to Kathryn Riley;
A bill (S. 218) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Hallsworth;
A bill (S. 219) granting an increase of pension to Susan C. Brown (now Perrin); and
A bill (S. 220) granting a pension to Sarah A. Mitchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON:
A bill (S. 221) for the relief of the Garden City (Kans.) Water Users' Association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. KENYON:
A bill (S. 222) to prevent the employment of children in factories and mines; and
A bill (S. 223) to prevent the employment of females in mills, factories, or manufacturing establishments for a longer period than eight hours; to the Committee on Education and Labor.
A bill (S. 224) for the relief of John Dauberman;
A bill (S. 225) for the relief of James Boyle, alias James Black;
A bill (S. 226) for the relief of Rufus F. Hull;
A bill (S. 227) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William M. Carroll;
A bill (S. 228) for the relief of John W. Terry;
A bill (S. 229) for the relief of John P. Wagner;
A bill (S. 230) for the relief of Robert McFarland; and
A bill (S. 231) for the relief of John Doyle, alias John Geary; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 232) fixing the time for election of Representatives and Delegates in Congress and for the appointment of electors of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.
A bill (S. 233) to amend section 15 of the act to regulate commerce, as amended June 29, 1906, and June 18, 1910; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.
A bill (S. 234) to enjoin and abate houses of lewdness, assignation, and prostitution; to declare the same to be nuisances; to enjoin the person or persons who conduct or maintain the same, and the owner or agent of any building used for such purpose; and to assess a tax against the person maintaining said nuisance and against the building and owner thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.
A bill (S. 235) for the relief of the widow of Thomas R. Faherty; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.
A bill (S. 236) to pay Charles Max Wittig $500 back bounty; and
A bill (S. 237) for the relief of Harry Fosdick; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 238) granting an increase of pension to William Guhl;
A bill (S. 239) granting a pension to Saloma Bowman Ellsworth;
A bill (S. 240) granting a pension to Willis Hood;
A bill (S. 241) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Henderson;
A bill (S. 242) granting an increase of pension to George W. Crosley;
A bill (S. 243) granting an increase of pension to Isaac O. Foote;
A bill (S. 244) granting an increase of pension to John C. Steeves;
A bill (S. 245) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Tucker;
A bill (S. 246) granting an increase of pension to R. C. Jones;
A bill (S. 247) granting an increase of pension to Louisa J. Jackson;
A bill (S. 248) granting an increase of pension to George W. Stratton;
A bill (S. 249) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Maher;
A bill (S. 250) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia F. Lintleman;
A bill (S. 251) granting a pension to Neal McCoy;
A bill (S. 252) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Edwards;
A bill (S. 253) granting a pension to Kate Hauchett;
A bill (S. 254) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Summers;
A bill (S. 255) granting an increase of pension to Asa Wren;
A bill (S. 256) granting a pension to Mary Josephine Stotts;
A bill (S. 257) granting a pension to Rachel Tillotson;
A bill (S. 258) granting a pension to Mary U. Hull;
A bill (S. 259) granting an increase of pension to Thomas N. Primm;
A bill (S. 260) granting a pension to Ellen G. Robison;
A bill (S. 261) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. McKenry;
A bill (S. 262) granting a pension to Samuel H. Portz;
A bill (S. 263) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Bowles;
A bill (S. 264) granting a pension to Daniel P. Andrus;
A bill (S. 265) granting a pension to Mary E. Lock;
A bill (S. 266) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Kramer;
A bill (S. 267) granting a pension to Sarah C. Goodrich;
A bill (S. 268) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Edson;
A bill (S. 269) granting an increase of pension to John G. Powers;
A bill (S. 270) granting an increase of pension to Harold L. Clifton;
A bill (S. 271) granting a pension to Ezra Edwards;
A bill (S. 272) granting a pension to Edwin R. Gibson;
A bill (S. 273) granting an increase of pension to George F. Brechtel;
A bill (S. 274) granting a pension to Ada Byrd;
A bill (S. 275) granting an increase of pension to Gottlieb Ruge; and
A bill (S. 276) granting a pension to James Rogers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 277) providing for the establishment of a national institute of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 278) providing that the Secretary of the Interior make a per capita payment to the members of the Chickasaw and Choctaw and Cherokee Tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 279) to establish a public health service and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

A bill (S. 280) to provide for an increased annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations, to be used in researches in home economics, and regulating the expenditure thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 281) providing for an increase of salary of the United States attorney for the district of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 282) to grant medals to survivors and heirs of the volunteers of the Port Hudson forlorn-hope storming party; and

A bill (S. 283) for the relief of Lester A. Rockwell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 284) for the relief of Charles J. Fuller; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 285) granting a pension to Charles L. Stevens;

A bill (S. 286) granting an increase of pension to Jennie C. Marks;

A bill (S. 287) granting a pension to Mary L. Tucker Spittle;

A bill (S. 288) granting an increase of pension to Lyman H. Leach;

A bill (S. 289) granting an increase of pension to Henry Stowe;

A bill (S. 290) granting an increase of pension to Emma Sherwood;

A bill (S. 291) granting a pension to Conrad Hockenberger;

A bill (S. 292) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Northend;

A bill (S. 293) granting an increase of pension to Stephen T. Gray;

A bill (S. 294) granting a pension to Frances M. Swift;

A bill (S. 295) granting a pension to John B. Hines;

A bill (S. 296) granting an increase of pension to William Thomas;

A bill (S. 297) granting an increase of pension to Alice P. B. Kenyon;

A bill (S. 298) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Dunn;

A bill (S. 299) granting an increase of pension to Ruth A. Jackson;

A bill (S. 300) granting an increase of pension to Melly L. Smith Ford;

A bill (S. 301) granting an increase of pension to Carrie E. Hartwell;

A bill (S. 302) granting an increase of pension to Sophronia E. Sawyer;

A bill (S. 303) granting an increase of pension to William Morrison;

A bill (S. 304) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Bradley;

A bill (S. 305) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. P. Blodgett;

A bill (S. 306) granting a pension to Elizabeth Blake;

A bill (S. 307) granting an increase of pension to Ellen S. Pember;

A bill (S. 308) granting an increase of pension to Catherine A. Payne;

A bill (S. 309) granting an increase of pension to Helena S. Clark;

A bill (S. 310) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Goff;

A bill (S. 311) granting an increase of pension to Lillian A. Loomis;

A bill (S. 312) granting an increase of pension to Imogene Crissey;

A bill (S. 313) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Beach;

A bill (S. 314) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Vinton;

A bill (S. 315) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Wheatley;

A bill (S. 316) granting an increase of pension to Katharina Britsch;

A bill (S. 317) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Foulkes;

A bill (S. 318) granting an increase of pension to Abbie A. Upson;

A bill (S. 319) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Sparrow;

A bill (S. 320) granting an increase of pension to Ivory Phillips;

A bill (S. 321) granting an increase of pension to Ralph Kent, jr.;

A bill (S. 322) granting an increase of pension to Philander B. Sargent;

A bill (S. 323) granting an increase of pension to Edward P. Morgan;

A bill (S. 324) granting an increase of pension to Delia Wight;

A bill (S. 325) granting an increase of pension to Ruth A. Quien;

A bill (S. 326) granting an increase of pension to William L. McCormick;

A bill (S. 327) granting an increase of pension to John McCarthy;

A bill (S. 328) granting a pension to Margaret Brennan;

A bill (S. 329) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Bentley;

A bill (S. 330) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Braman;

A bill (S. 331) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Fogg;

A bill (S. 332) granting an increase of pension to Emily H. Bailey;

A bill (S. 333) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Stockbridge;

A bill (S. 334) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Banning;

A bill (S. 335) granting an increase of pension to Maria L. Bishop;

A bill (S. 336) granting an increase of pension to Sarah McMunigale;

A bill (S. 337) granting an increase of pension to James A. Fancher;

A bill (S. 338) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Newport;

A bill (S. 339) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Mackin;

A bill (S. 340) granting an increase of pension to James T. Mather;

A bill (S. 341) granting an increase of pension to Anna R. Atwood;

A bill (S. 342) granting an increase of pension to Don Pedro Griswold;

A bill (S. 343) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Thomas;

A bill (S. 344) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Bunnell;

A bill (S. 345) granting an increase of pension to Elmira H. Cowles;

A bill (S. 346) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Kelsey;

A bill (S. 347) granting a pension to Cora H. Griswold;

A bill (S. 348) granting an increase of pension to Albert L. Church;

A bill (S. 349) granting an increase of pensions to Catherine A. French;

A bill (S. 350) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Griswold;

A bill (S. 351) granting an increase of pension to John Robinson;

A bill (S. 352) granting an increase of pension to Harriet A. C. Griggs;

A bill (S. 353) granting an increase of pension to Emma F. Dimock;

A bill (S. 354) granting a pension to Edwin B. Wright;

A bill (S. 355) granting an increase of pension to David Burns;

A bill (S. 356) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Eddy;

A bill (S. 357) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Atwood;

A bill (S. 358) granting an increase of pension to Bridgett D. Farrell;

A bill (S. 359) granting an increase of pension to Ellen J. Raymond (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 360) granting an increase of pension to Jane E. Peck (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 361) granting an increase of pension to Mary G. Fox (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 362) granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Fuller (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 363) granting an increase of pension to Rosanna Miller (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 364) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Burke (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 365) granting an increase of pension to George W. Garthwaite (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 366) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson Conklin (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 367) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Ball (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 368) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia Bacon (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 369) granting an increase of pension to Katie A. Beardsley (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 370) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Attmore (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 371) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Pond (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 372) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Hughes (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 373) granting a pension to Alice G. Geer (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 374) granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Roselle (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 375) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Starr (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 376) granting an increase of pension to Ernestine Leist (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 377) granting an increase of pension to Carrie H. Cummings (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 378) granting an increase of pension to Amy M. Slocum (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 379) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Edgerton (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 380) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie B. Wellman (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 381) granting an increase of pension to Betsey E. Hannahs (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 382) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Fish (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 383) granting an increase of pension to George E. Smith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. BRADY:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) for the relief of Fred White; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of South Carolina:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4) proposing the repeal of Articles XIV and XV of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BACON (for Mr. SMITH of Georgia):

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 5) providing for the appointment of a commission to consider the need and report a plan for national aid to vocational education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REED:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 6) proposing an amendment to section 1 of Article III of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 7) amending, reenacting, and extending the operation of the act for the control and regulation of the waters of Niagara River, for the preservation of Niagara Falls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 8) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for submitting to the people of the United States acts of Congress for their approval; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 9) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that a majority of both Houses shall be necessary to propose amendments to the Constitution, which shall be valid when ratified by the legislatures of a majority of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF THE WATERS OF NIAGARA FALLS.

Mr. ROOT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 7) amending and extending the operation of the act for the control and regulation of the waters of Niagara River, for the preservation of Niagara Falls, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. SWANSON. On behalf of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], who is unavoidably detained from the Senate, I introduce three Senate resolutions, which I send to the desk.

Mr. SWANSON (for Mr. SMITH of Maryland) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 26), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate, and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. SWANSON (for Mr. SMITH of Maryland) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 28), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the authority heretofore vested in the Committee on the District of Columbia by Senate resolution of February 20, 1909, directing the said committee to examine into matters relating to the District of Columbia, is hereby continued, and the said committee is hereby directed to pursue its investigations during the Sixty-third Congress.

Mr. SWANSON (for Mr. SMITH of Maryland) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 27), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That authority is granted to print and bind, for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia, such papers and documents as may be deemed necessary in connection with subjects heretofore considered or to be considered by said committee during the Sixty-third Congress.

FRED N. WEBBER.

Mr. BRADLEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 29), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to Fred N. Webber, jr., son of Fred N. Webber, sr., deceased, late a Senate policeman, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PROTECTION AND PRESERVATION OF BIRDS.

Mr. McLEAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 25), which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolved, That the President be requested to propose to the Governments of other countries the negotiation of a convention for the mutual protection and preservation of birds.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—JOINT ASSEMBLY TO-MORROW.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing that the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, the 8th day of April, 1913, at 12.30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the resolution just received from the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
April 7, 1913.

House concurrent resolution 1.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, the 8th day of April, 1913, at 12.30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House resolution.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I take it the resolution is open to debate. I have no intention whatever of opposing the resolution, but it is such an interesting reversion to an earlier system

of transacting public business that I can not refrain from calling attention to it.

It is well known to everyone, of course, that under the administrations of Washington and Adams it was the practice for the President to come either to the Hall of the Senate or to the Hall of the House and deliver his annual message in person. It was then the practice for the Congress to adopt an address in reply to the message and carry that address themselves to the residence of the President and present it to him. The custom or form was borrowed from England, where, as a rule, the King or the Queen opens the Parliament in person, and an address is then adopted by the Houses in reply.

That went on during those 12 years and was the subject of much animadversion by the opposition of those days, who looked upon it as another attempt of the Federalists to introduce monarchical customs; and it was much assailed by the opposition, who were then called anti-Federalists, or Republicans. I do not think the danger of its producing a return to monarchical forms is perhaps as evident to-day as it was then, but there was a great deal made of it.

When Mr. Jefferson was elected he altered this custom once for all, and we have always adhered to the Jeffersonian change. I suppose Mr. Jefferson possibly had the feeling in regard to it that was expressed by his followers, and I think he was not, as a rule, much given to speech making. At all events, he addressed a letter to the President of the Senate on the 8th of December, 1801, in which he said:

SIR: The circumstances under which we find ourselves at this place, rendering inconvenient the mode heretofore practiced of making by personal address the first communications between the legislative and executive branches, I have adopted that by message, as used on all subsequent occasions through the session. In doing this I have had principal regard to the convenience of the legislature, to the economy of their time, to their relief from the embarrassment of immediate answers on subjects not yet fully before them, and to the benefits thence resulting to the public affairs. Trusting that a procedure founded in these motives will meet their approbation, I beg leave, through you, sir, to communicate the inclosed message, with the documents accompanying it, to the honorable the Senate, and pray you to accept for yourself and them the homage of my high respect and consideration.

A little later in the month, on the 20th of December, in writing to a friend in Philadelphia, Dr. Benjamin Rush, he said:

By sending a message instead of making a speech at the opening of the session I have prevented the bloody conflict to which the making an answer would have committed them. They consequently were able to set into real business at once, without losing 10 or 12 days in combating an answer.

I do not know, Mr. President, whether it is the plan of this reversion to the earlier and very dignified Federalist procedure to continue it and make an address in reply to the personally delivered message. It seems to me it would be very appropriate to do so. But Mr. Jefferson's change was accepted by the country, and has been followed from that day to this. I do not recall at this moment but one adverse comment after it had once gone into effect; and that, curiously enough, proceeded from John Randolph, who stated on one occasion—I do not remember the exact day, and I do not give his exact words, but the substance of them—that he thought it very unfortunate that the old plan of the President coming and delivering his message in person, and the Houses then adopting an address, had been abandoned, because, he said, the consideration of the message and the adoption of the address gave such an excellent opportunity to review what had been done and to comment and criticize the message; and it seemed to him that it was a great pity to have it given up.

I do not know, Mr. President, whether it is proposed to follow up the personal delivery of the message with an address or not. I wish to call attention to it, however, simply to point out that the President, in coming to Congress and personally delivering his address, is only half carrying out the old practice, in behalf of which, I think, much can be said. I have no objection whatever, of course, to the resolution, and I shall be very glad to have it adopted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I for one very much regret that the President has chosen to take this course. Of course, whether this course be pursued or not, it is not going materially to affect the legislative interests of the American people. But the old Federalist custom in imitation of the English custom of making "speeches from the throne," when it was once disused, fell by unanimous consent into subsequent constant disuse and ridicule; and it did it because the common sense underlying the method of sending a written communication to Congress was obvious and plain to everybody, and because of the fact that it was so much more in accord with American republican institutions than the old observance, with its pomposities and its cavalcadings, had been. It was not without reason, therefore, that Mr. Jefferson's example was subsequently imitated by every President, whether Democrat, Whig, Republican, or what not, I for one hope that this will be the only instance of the breach of the perfectly simple and perfectly republican method which he introduced.

Like the Senator from Massachusetts, I shall not oppose the resolution. The President is acting both within his right and within his power, and it would be discourteous to oppose it. He has a perfect right to "communicate with Congress" in either way—either by word of mouth or by written message.

But I do express my regret that the old Federalistic procedure should be revamped; and I rather envy the happiness with which the Senator from Massachusetts can recur to it as perhaps a long-deferred and unexpected Democratic approbation of a custom which originated upon the other side of this Chamber with the Federalist Party, of which the present-day "standpat" Republican Party is a lineal political descendant, and which received Democratic disapprobation and was covered with deserved ridicule by Democrats and Republicans to an extent much greater even than the Senator from Massachusetts has expressed to-day.

Even the change to Democratic-Republican legislation and measures perhaps did not do as much toward democratizing this Republic at that time as did doing away with the levees, the receptions by the Presidents standing on a raised dais, with cocked hat and sword and other frumperies, and "the speeches from the throne," and the cavalcadings of Congress down to the President's House, and all the balance of the little cheap and tawdry and tinsel imitations of British monarchical customs.

I had hoped, upon the contrary, that some President at some time would be bold enough and brave enough to do away with inaugural processions. They, too, are a cheap and tinsel imitation of British coronation procedure. They do nobody any good. Some few people catch pneumonia every year at it; a lot more are discommoded in every way. It may fill up the Washington boarding houses and hotels for a little while and lead to a little quickening of trade, especially in the barrooms. But it seems to me that instead of going back to the old thing we should have gone further in the new direction. The more we can simplify the machinery of this Government in every way the more, in my mind, at any rate, is it in keeping with the American spirit and American institutions.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, it affords me personally great delight to adjourn the Senate for a short while to go into the House of Representatives as a body to hear the President deliver his message to Congress. As the Senator from Mississippi says, it is an innovation on long-established customs; but that, perhaps, is not of much moment. I am ready to go to the House of Representatives and hear the President deliver his message in person, which I am sure will be far more impressive than if it should be read by one of the clerks at this desk, although the clerk who will read it has, we know, fine capacity as a reader. But I rise particularly to make a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STONE. I find in clause 5 of Rule XIV, what I read:

All resolutions shall lie over one day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

Now, Mr. President, desirous as I am and happy as I would be to vote for this resolution and take part in carrying it out, I submit to the Chair whether it can be considered at this time. As this is a body governed by rules long established, I am not sure, sir, that this rule governs in this particular instance, but being a body that is controlled by rules that govern it, I submit to the Chair the question whether we can now take up the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that it is a question of the highest privilege, involving the right of this body to attend a joint session of Congress in the Hall of the House of Representatives, and that the resolution is in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just to keep the RECORD straight, do I understand the Chair rules that if any Senator objected the resolution would not have to go over for the day?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so rules.

Mr. SMOOT. Just for the RECORD, because I want the resolution to pass and am ready to vote for it, I will say that in my judgment——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that this is a question of the highest privilege, to which the rule does not apply.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course I can not agree to that opinion, but that makes no difference whatever, because it is only for the RECORD that I refer to it.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, if the question were whether the President should come in person or whether he should send a message in writing of course there would be ample latitude for debate, and I am not sure but what I would agree with

what has been said by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], but it is the constitutional right of the President to communicate with Congress in such a way as he may himself elect, and it is not for us to determine in what manner he shall do so. Having communicated to us formally the fact that he proposes to deliver his communication in person, there is nothing left for us but to arrange to receive him and also to receive his message with due solemnity and formality.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I believe that an objection to the consideration of this resolution would, under the rule, send it over. No one has made that objection, and no one will probably make it. I agree with my friend, the Senator from Georgia, that since the President has indicated his wish to communicate to Congress in this way, we should conform to it. I am of the opinion that under the rules of the Senate the resolution should go over, except by unanimous consent. I rise to ask unanimous consent that the resolution be now considered.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, if the Chair will pardon me, I think the Chair is right in its ruling, and that therefore the request for unanimous consent should not be submitted to the Senate unless that ruling should be reversed.

I will frankly say to the Senator that the original information received, at least by some of us, was that there would be a resolution inviting the President to deliver his address in person. If that had been the resolution, it would not be a privileged resolution, but anything which relates to the action of the body itself as to what the body itself shall do—not what it shall prescribe for others, but what it shall itself do—is necessarily a matter of privilege. This is a question as to the voluntary action of the body. There is a wide distinction between that and other resolutions which seek to have the effect of law, either as a joint resolution or in the shape of a concurrent resolution, if it is for the purpose of having an effect upon some one else. Anything which relates to the action of the body itself must necessarily be a privileged resolution.

Mr. STONE. I ask the Senator from Georgia, if he will pardon me, if he is of the opinion that under the rule I read this resolution would, in the ordinary course of the business of the Senate, go over?

Mr. BACON. I think if it related to a matter which is not privileged it would certainly go over.

Mr. STONE. What is the privileged matter?

Mr. BACON. The privileged matter is the determination of the body as to its own act.

Mr. STONE. Everything the Senate does is its own act.

Mr. BACON. It is true that it is its own act, but this is a resolution as to what shall be its act.

Mr. STONE. But that is true in every case, I assume.

Mr. BACON. Oh, no; we pass resolutions continuously which prescribe what shall be the act of others. This is a prescription as to what we shall do ourselves.

Mr. STONE. But this is a rule that governs the action of the Senate itself.

Mr. BACON. And that, I think, makes it privileged.

Mr. STONE. And the rule determines what the action of the Senate shall be, unless the rule is set aside. We find a rule that certain things shall be done in a given case, and I insist that that rule controls the action of the Senate unless it is obviated by consent or in some other way.

Mr. BACON. Anything which is privileged is not involved in that rule. I think that is a plain proposition, as the Senator will see.

Mr. STONE. There is no objection to it; I see no privilege to it; and hence my request. I care nothing about the resolution, except to preserve the orderly procedure of this body. I shall vote for the resolution, but I do not care to have the rules of this body set aside arbitrarily to please even the President of the United States or the House of Representatives. Hence, I say it ought to be done by some action of this body in the form of unanimous consent, and there will be no objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has ruled upon this question. The Chair does not pretend now and will not pretend at any future time to be right, and there is always an appeal from the decision of the Chair to the Senate.

Mr. STONE. What is the ruling of the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The ruling is that the resolution is in order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the request for unanimous consent were put by the Chair, I certainly should not object. I most assuredly shall vote for the resolution. It lies wholly with the President to determine as to what method he prefers to communicate with the Houses. But I think I must enter a protest at least against the parliamentary question which has arisen. I confess I am astounded at the argument of my friend from Georgia [Mr. BACON]. The rule is that—

> All resolutions shall lie over one day for consideration unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

Mr. BACON. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. I will ask the Senator this question: Suppose there were a resolution, *Resolved*, That when the Senate adjourns to-day it shall adjourn to meet to-morrow at 10 o'clock. That would be a resolution of high privilege. It would be a resolution which related to the action of the body, and certainly it would not go over to another day.

Mr. SMOOT. On objection?

Mr. BACON. Never.

Mr. LODGE. If it were a resolution, it could be objected to, unless privileged. If put in the form of a motion, it is a privileged motion, and it is so defined by the rules. It is to adjourn to a day certain. The word "resolution" does not alter it; it is a motion.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. One moment, if I may be allowed to continue. There can be no possible privilege attached to a concurrent resolution sent here by the House. There is no higher duty performed by Congress than the counting and the declaration of the electoral votes. I have seen that resolution come here time after time and it always has gone over for consideration. Certainly nothing affecting Congress can be more important than a resolution to adjourn Congress without day. Such a resolution has come over here and it has been kept here day after day in order that the Senate might ascertain the state of public business and determine whether it could assent to the proposition of the House.

The fact that this is a concurrent resolution of the House gives it no privilege. The fact that it concerns the action of the Senate gives it no privilege unless that privilege is set forth in the rule. Everything we do here affects our own action. Everything we do by resolution or order or motion is certainly not privileged.

Mr. President, it seems to me perfectly clear that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] is absolutely and unquestionably right, and that we can not attach a privilege to this resolution without any word of definition in the rules or anything to indicate that it has the slightest character of privilege.

I have no desire to take an appeal from the ruling of the Chair, but I do desire at least to put myself on record, with a view to possible questions in the future, as saying that a resolution of this character does not have any privileged quality and that action on it can not be compelled unless it has gone over one day; I mean, of course, without unanimous consent.

Mr. BACON. I understand the proposition of the Senator to be that if this were a motion it would be privileged.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; I made no such statement. As the illustration of adjournment was used, I said that a resolution that when the Senate adjourns it shall adjourn to meet to-morrow at 10 o'clock is not privileged because it is a resolution; it is privileged because it is made privileged by the rule. It makes no difference whether you put it in the form of a resolution or a motion, the essence of it is a motion to adjourn to a day certain, and the motion to adjourn to a day and an hour certain is, of course, a privileged motion, as stated in the rule.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I think the ruling of the Chair is entirely proper and is sustained by the precedents of the Senate, but not particularly on the ground announced by the Chair that the resolution is privileged. There may be some room for rational dispute there. I hold to the view that it is not privileged, because I do not think the President of the United States can command the two Houses to meet together in joint assembly or to do anything except in the instances pointed out by the Constitution or agreed upon by a system of joint rules. I do not think anybody can control the deliberations of either House of Congress. It is a matter of high courtesy, and it almost partakes of the nature of a privilege, when the President of the United States makes a request to do a thing which necessarily involves a joint assembly.

But I think the ruling of the Chair is in accordance with the undisputed precedents of the Senate, because it has been held that our rule requiring that a resolution shall go over for a day upon objection applies only to Senate resolutions and not resolutions coming from the other House. I could give the precedents on this subject if I had time to look them up and if it was a material matter.

Mr. LODGE. I am open to conviction. If the Senator will point to those precedents, I am ready to be convinced.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I have not readily at hand a copy of the precedents as collected by Mr. Gilfry. I remember, however, that that is the case.

Mr. LODGE. I mean precedents showing that this is a privileged matter.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No; I do not insist upon that. I say that our rule requiring resolutions to go over for a day applies to resolutions that originate in the Senate and does not apply to resolutions coming from the other House. They are laid before the Senate by the Presiding Officer under another rule, and having been laid before the Senate, they are open to immediate consideration.

Mr. LODGE. Of course that can only be true in the case of a concurrent resolution. Joint resolutions are provided for by another rule, which requires them to take a first and a second reading, and one objection will carry them over two days.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I understand.

Mr. LODGE. Therefore it applies only to concurrent resolutions.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. This is a concurrent resolution. It is not a resolution which requires the approval of the President.

Mr. LODGE. And being one, does it make the resolution privileged?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I am having nothing to do with the particular feature of the discussion which deals with the question whether or not it is a privileged resolution. I simply say that it is a House resolution, and under the precedents here it is not vulnerable to the rule that has been invoked by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. I am not invoking the rule with the idea of preventing action. I am invoking the rule simply with a view to the orderly proceeding of the Senate, and hence it was that I asked unanimous consent to consider the resolution now, for which I will vote.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the rule the Senator from Arkansas referred to is Rule VII, paragraph 6, which reads as follows:

6. The Presiding Officer may at any time lay, and it shall be in order at any time for a Senator to move to lay, before the Senate, any bill or other matter sent to the Senate by the President or the House of Representatives, and any question pending at that time shall be suspended for this purpose. Any motion so made shall be determined without debate.

It is the practice of the Senate, I will say, that bills and resolutions coming from the House are presented oftentimes in the midst of the business of the Senate. The Presiding Officer will ask that the Senator speaking shall suspend that the Chair may lay before the Senate certain messages from the House of Representatives. But that does not give the right of immediate action upon those bills or resolutions. They go to the committee to which they should be referred, and are reported back from the committee to the Senate in due course of time. If when a resolution which came from the House was handed down to the Senate there was an objection to its consideration, I have never known an instance where it did not go to the committee or go over for one day. I can not see but that the Senator from Missouri is absolutely right, as I said in the beginning, in this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah will permit the Chair to read what took place in the Senate:

The Vice President—

Mr. Hobart—

laid before the Senate for its consideration the resolution of the House of Representatives providing for the final adjournment of the two Houses of Congress at 9 o'clock p. m. this day—

July 24, 1897—

when Mr. Morgan objected to the consideration of the resolution and raised a point of order, viz, that objection having been made the resolution, under clause 5, Rule XIV, must lie over one day for consideration.

The Vice President overruled the question of order and decided that the resolution, which provided for an adjournment of Congress, was a question of privilege and that the provision of Rule XIV was not applicable thereto.

From the decision of the Chair Mr. Allen appealed to the Senate; when, on motion of Mr. Aldrich that the appeal lie on the table, it was determined in the affirmative—yeas 36, nays 20.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I had hoped that some one who has been in this body longer than I would say something in relation to the policy, which seems to be questioned, of the President coming personally for the purpose of addressing the House and the Senate. I want to say this custom is not a new one, although it has been discarded for some time in the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States. Every governor of a State goes to both houses of the legislature and addresses them in person. Why does he do it? Because by so doing he impresses upon them the importance of the matter which he has to present to them.

Of course, it is something of considerable moment when an extraordinary session of Congress is called, an extraordinary occasion requiring the bringing of Senators and Representatives to Washington for the purpose of determining great political questions. When that has been done, is it possible that the President of the United States should not come here in order to impress his views upon the Members of the Senate and of the House? Ordinarily, when a President's message is read, who pays any attention to it? I have been a Member of the other House, and I have found that on many occasions, instead of Members of that body listening to the reading of such a message, they either had a pamphlet copy in their own hands, which they would partially read, or else they would simply walk out of the Chamber.

Very few messages indeed receive the strict attention which our Chief Executives hope they will receive. Consequently, when we consider the occasion, when we consider the fact that whatever the President has to say ought to be listened to, we can readily conclude that it is important that the President should deliver his message in person.

Though we find that a custom of a similar nature prevails in another nation, a monarchy, I do not see that this should deter our Chief Executive from using that means of bringing to the attention of the Congress of the United States the facts or reasons which he desires to impress upon its Members. It is democratic in the extreme, because it brings the President in personal contact with both Houses of Congress. When that occurs it should produce harmony, not discord.

For these reasons, it seems to me, it is a custom which, though it has been in disuse for some time with ill reason, in my judgment, should be renewed and revived in the interest of good government.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the precedent which the Chair read to the Senate I think I recall—I was in the Senate at the time, and I have no doubt I was one of those who voted to lay the appeal on the table—was a motion to adjourn; in substance, a motion to adjourn on that day, and a single objection carrying it over would, of course, have destroyed the motion. I do not think that is quite parallel to this case, and I am still unable to see that any privilege attaches to it or that the fact that it comes from the other House gives it any privilege.

I do not, however, care to protract the debate, Mr. President, but I want to say that I trust the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] did not imagine that in what I was saying there was any intention of criticizing the reversion to the practices of the first two administrations, which were abandoned 112 years ago. On the contrary, I have always had great admiration for those two Presidents and their methods; and it has interested me very much to hear renewed on the floor here to-day the old Federalist arguments about the dignity and the impressiveness of the President personally appearing before Congress.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I desire to inquire if the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] withdrew his request for unanimous consent?

Mr. STONE. The request for unanimous consent, as I understood, was determined by the ruling of the Chair that this was a question of privilege in the opinion of the Chair, and should be submitted without regard to the question of unanimous consent.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Then, there is no request for unanimous consent pending at the present time, as I understand it, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, as I understand, this resolution was introduced and the question was raised as to whether or not it was in order. The President of the Senate ruled that it was in order, and from that ruling there has been no appeal. It seems to me that all this discussion has been out of order, and I now move the previous question. [Laughter.]

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. If that motion requires a second, I desire to second it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think, as we are changing the rules of the Senate so rapidly, perhaps it would be as well to add the previous question to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas subsequently said (after the transaction of certain routine business which appears under its appropriate heading): Mr. President, I desire to present to the Senate an authority that I referred to in the few remarks I submitted on the general question, but which I did not have

at hand at that time. I referred to what took place in the Senate in the Forty-third Congress December 18, 1873. An epitome of the proceeding is reported in Gilfry's Precedents at page 364, and is as follows:

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate the following resolution received this day from the House of Representatives:

"*Resolved*, That when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, the 19th instant, they shall stand adjourned until Monday, the 5th of January next."

Mr. Edmunds objected to its consideration this day, and made the point of order that, being objected to under the twenty-sixth rule of the Senate, the resolution must lie over one day for consideration.

The President pro tempore (Matt H. Carpenter) overruled the point of order raised by Mr. Edmunds, on the ground that the twenty-sixth rule applied only to resolutions of the Senate; but that in the present case, being a resolution of the House of Representatives sent to the Senate for its concurrence, and having been laid before the Senate by the Chair, it was for the Senate to make of it what disposition it thought proper.

Mr. STONE. Which was the twenty-sixth rule?

Mr. LODGE. The same rule.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The same rule which the Senator from Missouri invoked, or at least to which he called attention.

I agreed most cordially with those who insisted that the resolution received from the House of Representatives, inviting the Senate to join that body in joint convention on to-morrow for the purpose of hearing the President's message read by himself, should be passed at once. I did not quite understand, however, why it should be deemed a privileged resolution, and without determining in my own mind whether it was or not I saw a perfectly plain and parliamentary way by which it could be considered at this time. I wanted to set myself straight, and to say that if I was wrong about this I was misled by a precedent made in the Senate and in which the Senate at the time acquiesced.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from Arkansas to produce a precedent and he has done so. The ruling of Mr. Carpenter, who was a very able Senator and a very able parliamentarian, is confined simply to the point that the rule in question does not cover anything except Senate resolutions.

I am not prepared immediately to admit that that ruling is a sound one. I think it is open to considerable question. But I do believe in the great principle here of stare decisis, so far as we can follow it; and I am very glad that the Senator from Arkansas disclaimed the proposition that this was privileged, because that, I think, would open the door to a great many very dangerous precedents.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I desire to say that when I raised the question I had no thought, and I think I said so at the time, of in any way objecting to the consideration of the resolution or to its adoption. I believed that this being a body governed by its own rules as to its procedure, it should adhere to them. I desired the resolution considered, and hence asked unanimous consent, thinking that that was the orderly and proper way to proceed.

My friend from Arkansas presents a precedent which the Senator from Massachusetts says would seem to confirm the view of the Chair that it was in order to submit it, notwithstanding the rule of the Senate to which I called attention. I acquiesced at the time. I did not appeal from the decision of the Chair. I accepted it.

All I desire to say is, that in what I said and did I had but one object in view—that was that the rules of the Senate might be absolutely observed. I accept the ruling of the Chair and support it, particularly in view of the authorities cited by the Chair itself and by the Senator from Arkansas, without having had opportunity to examine them.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 8, 1913, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *April 7, 1913.*

This being the day fixed in the proclamation of the President for the assembling of the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, the Clerk of the last House, Mr. South Trimble, called the House to order at 12 o'clock m.

The Chaplain of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second Congress, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who art the life and light of men, the inspiration of every generous impulse, high resolve, and noble endeavor, we thank Thee for the sublime heights reached and kept by our fathers in a Government whose foundations were laid in the inherent rights of men—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—which has come down to us multiplied a thousandfold in all that makes a nation great. Impress us, we beseech Thee, with the great responsibility it brings to us as individuals and as a people, that we may keep inviolate its sacred principles and march on to greater attainments. Let Thy spirit brood over the deliberations of the Congress now convened; fire the hearts of these Representatives with patriotic zeal and fervor; strengthen the hands of the Speaker of this House, that he may guide through all the intricate problems which may arise to the highest and best results, that the fruits of its labors may be to the good of all classes and conditions of our people.

Imbue our judiciary with wisdom, that their judgments may be true and righteous altogether.

Bless, guide, and protect the President of these United States and his advisors, that the interests of the Nation may be advanced at home and abroad; and thus may the coordinate branches of our Republic work together in harmony with Thee, that truth, justice, mercy, and righteousness may have their full fruition in a land of peace and plenty under the spiritual leadership of the Prince of Peace; and glory and honor and praise be Thine, O God our Father. Amen.

PROCLAMATION OF THE PRESIDENT.

The CLERK. The President's proclamation convening the extra session of Congress will now be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas public interests require that the Congress of the United States should be convened in extra session at 12 o'clock noon on the 7th day of April, 1913, to receive such communication as may be made by the Executive:

Now, therefore, I, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim and declare that an extraordinary occasion requires the Congress of the United States to convene in extra session at the Capitol in the city of Washington on the 7th day of April, 1913, at 12 o'clock noon, of which all persons who shall at that time be entitled to act as Members thereof are hereby required to take notice.

Given under my hand and the seal of the United States of America the 17th day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and thirteen, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and thirty-seventh.

[SEAL.] WOODROW WILSON.

By the President:

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN,
Secretary of State.

CALL OF THE ROLL BY STATES.

The CLERK. The official list of Members by States will be called, to ascertain if a quorum is present.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll of Members by States, and the following Members answered to their names:

ALABAMA.

George W. Taylor.
S. H. Dent.
Henry D. Clayton.
F. L. Blackmon.
J. Thomas Heflin.
Richmond Pearson Hobson.
John L. Burnett.
William Richardson.
Oscar W. Underwood.
John W. Abercrombie.

ARIZONA.

Carl Hayden.

ARKANSAS.

T. H. Caraway.
William A. Oldfield.
John C. Floyd.
Otis T. Wingo.
Henderson M. Jacoway.
Sam M. Taylor.
William S. Goodwin.

CALIFORNIA.

William Kent.
John E. Raker.
Charles F. Curry.
Julius Kahn.
J. I. Nolan.
Joseph R. Knowland.
D. S. Church.
Everis A. Hayes.
C. W. Bell.
William D. Stephens.
William Kettner.

COLORADO.

George J. Kindel.
H. H. Seldomridge.
Edward T. Taylor.
Edward Keating.

CONNECTICUT.

Augustine Lonergan.
B. F. Mahan.
Thomas L. Reilly.
Jeremiah Donovan.
William Kennedy.

DELAWARE.

Franklin Brockson.

FLORIDA.

Stephen M. Sparkman.
Frank Clark.
Emmett Wilson.
Claude L'Engle.

GEORGIA.

Charles G. Edwards.
S. A. Roddenbery.
Charles R. Crisp.
William C. Adamson.
William Schley Howard.
Charles L. Bartlett.
Gordon Lee.
Samuel J. Tribble.
Thomas M. Bell.
Thomas W. Hardwick.
J. R. Walker.
Dudley M. Hughes.

Burton L. French.

Martin B. Madden.
James R. Mann.
George E. Gorman.
James T. McDermott.
Adolph J. Sabath.
James McAndrews.
Frank Buchanan.
Thomas Gallagher.
Fred A. Britten.
Charles M. Thomson.
Ira C. Copley.
William H. Hinebaugh.
John C. McKenzie.
Clyde H. Tavenner.

Charles Lieb.
William A. Cullop.
William E. Cox.
Lincoln Dixon.
Ralph W. Moss.
Finly H. Gray.
Charles A. Korbly.

Charles A. Kennedy.
Irvin S. Pepper.
Maurice Connolly.
Gilbert N. Haugen.
James W. Good.
S. Kirkpatrick.

Daniel R. Anthony, jr.
Joseph Taggart.
Philip P. Campbell.
Dudley Doolittle.

A. W. Barkley.
Augustus O. Stanley.
R. Y. Thomas, jr.
Ben Johnson.
Swagar Sherley.
Arthur B. Rouse.

Albert Estopinal.
H. Garland Dupré.
Robert F. Broussard.
John T. Watkins.

Asher C. Hinds.
Daniel J. McGillicuddy.

J. Harry Covington.
J. Fred. C. Talbott.
George Konig.

Allen T. Treadway.
Frederick H. Gillett.
William H. Wilder.
S. E. Winslow.
John J. Rogers.
Augustus P. Gardner.
M. F. Phelan.
F. S. Deitrick.

Frank E. Doremus.
Samuel W. Beakes.
John M. C. Smith.
Edward L. Hamilton.
Carl E. Mapes.
Samuel W. Smith.
Louis C. Cramton.

Sydney Anderson.
W. S. Hammond.
Charles R. Davis.
Frederick C. Stevens.
George R. Smith.

Ezekiel S. Candler, jr.
Hubert D. Stephens.
Benjamin G. Humphreys.
Thomas U. Sisson.

James T. Lloyd.
William W. Rucker.
Joshua W. Alexander.
Charles F. Booher.
William P. Borland.
Clement C. Dickinson.
Courtney W. Hamlin.
Dorsey W. Shackleford.

Thomas Stout.

John A. Maguire.
C. O. Lobeck.
Dan V. Stephens.

E. E. Reed.

IDAHO.

Addison T. Smith.

ILLINOIS.

Stephen A. Hoxworth.
Claudius U. Stone.
Louis FitzHenry.
Frank T. O'Hair.
Charles M. Borchers.
Henry T. Rainey.
James M. Graham.
W. N. Baltz.
Martin D. Foster.
H. Robert Fowler.
R. P. Hill.
W. E. Williams.
L. B. Stringer.

INDIANA.

John A. M. Adair.
Martin A. Morrison.
J. B. Peterson.
George W. Rauch.
Cyrus Cline.
Henry A. Barnhart.

IOWA.

S. F. Prouty.
Horace M. Towner.
William R. Green.
Frank P. Woods.
George C. Scott.

KANSAS.

Guy T. Helvering.
J. R. Connelly.
George A. Neeley.
Victor Murdock.

KENTUCKY.

James C. Cantrill.
Harvey Helm.
W. J. Fields.
John W. Langley.
Caleb Powers.

LOUISIANA.

Walter Elder.
Lewis L. Morgan.
L. Lazaro.
J. B. Aswell.

MAINE.

Forrest Goodwin.
Frank E. Guernsey.

MARYLAND.

J. Charles Linthicum.
Frank O. Smith.
David J. Lewis.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Ernest W. Roberts.
William F. Murray.
Andrew J. Peters.
James M. Curley.
Edward Gilmore.
William S. Greene.
Thomas C. Thacher.

MICHIGAN.

Joseph W. Fordney.
James C. McLaughlin.
Roy O. Woodruff.
Francis O. Lindquist.
H. Olin Young.
Patrick H. Kelley.

MINNESOTA.

Charles A. Lindbergh.
Andrew J. Volstead.
Clarence B. Miller.
Halvor Steenerson.
James Manahan.

MISSISSIPPI.

Samuel A. Witherspoon.
B. P. Harrison.
P. E. Quin.
James W. Collier.

MISSOURI.

Champ Clark.
Richard Bartholdt.
W. L. Igoe.
L. C. Dyer.
Walter L. Hensley.
Joseph J. Russell.
P. D. Decker.
Thomas L. Rubey.

MONTANA.

John M. Evans.

NEBRASKA.

Charles H. Sloan.
S. R. Barton.
Moses P. Kinkaid.

NEVADA.

E. E. Roberts.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

R. B. Stevens.

NEW JERSEY.

William J. Browning.
J. Thompson Baker.
Thomas J. Scully.
Allan B. Walsh.
William E. Tuttle, jr.
L. J. Martin.

R. G. Bremner.
Eugene F. Kinkead.
Walter I. McCoy.
Edward W. Townsend.
J. J. Eagan.
James A. Hamill.

NEW MEXICO.

Harvey B. Fergusson.

NEW YORK.

Lathrop Brown.
Denis O'Leary.
Frank E. Wilson.
H. H. Dale.
James P. Maher.
William M. Calder.
John J. Fitzgerald.
D. J. Griffin.
J. H. O'Brien.
H. A. Metz.
Daniel J. Riordan.
Henry M. Goldfogle.
T. D. Sullivan.
Jefferson M. Levy.
Michael F. Conry.
P. J. Dooling.
J. F. Carew.
Thomas G. Patten.
Walter M. Chandler.
Francis Burton Harrison.
Henry George, jr.
Henry Bruckner.

J. A. Goulden.
Woodson R. Oglesby.
B. I. Taylor.
Edmund Platt.
George McClellan.
P. G. Ten Eyck.
James S. Parker.
Samuel Wallin.
Edwin A. Merritt, jr.
Luther W. Mott.
Charles A. Talcott.
George W. Fairchild.
John R. Clancy.
Sereno E. Payne.
Edwin S. Underhill.
Thomas B. Dunn.
Henry G. Danforth.
Robert H. Gittins.
Charles B. Smith.
Daniel A. Driscoll.
C. M. Hamilton.

NORTH CAROLINA.

John H. Small.
Claude Kitchin.
John M. Faison.
Edward W. Pou.
Charles M. Stedman.

Hannibal L. Godwin.
Robert N. Page.
Robert L. Doughton.
Edwin Y. Webb.
James M. Gudger, jr.

NORTH DAKOTA.

H. T. Helgesen.
George M. Young.

P. D. Norton.

OHIO.

Stanley E. Bowdle.
Alfred G. Allen.
Warren Gard.
J. Henry Goeke.
Timothy T. Ansberry.
Simeon D. Fess.
J. D. Post.
Frank B. Willis.
Isaac R. Sherwood.
Robert M. Switzer.
Horatio C. Claypool.

Clement Brumbaugh.
John A. Key.
William G. Sharp.
George White.
William B. Francis.
William A. Ashbrook.
John J. Whitacre.
Ellsworth R. Bathrick.
William Gordon.
Robert J. Bulkley.
Robert Crosser.

OKLAHOMA.

Bird S. McGuire.
Dick T. Morgan.
James S. Davenport.
Charles D. Carter.

Scott Ferris.
William H. Murray.
Claude Weaver.
J. B. Thompson.

OREGON.

Willis C. Hawley.
N. J. Sinnott.

A. Walter Lafferty.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William S. Vare.
George S. Graham.
J. Hampton Moore.
G. W. Edmonds.
Michael Donohoe.
J. W. Logue.
Thomas S. Butler.
Robert E. Difenderfer.
William W. Griest.
John R. Farr.
J. J. Casey.
Robert E. Lee.
John H. Rothermel.
W. D. B. Ainey.
E. R. Kiess.
John V. Lesher.
F. L. Dershem.
A. S. Kreider.

Warren Worth Bailey.
A. R. Brodbeck.
Charles E. Patton.
A. L. Keister.
W. N. Carr.
H. W. Temple.
M. W. Shreve.
A. Mitchell Palmer.
J. N. Langham.
W. J. Hulings.
Stephen G. Porter.
M. C. Kelly.
James F. Burke.
Andrew J. Barchfeld.
A. R. Rupley.
J. M. Morin.
A. H. Walters.
F. E. Lewis.

RHODE ISLAND.

George F. O'Shaunessy.
Peter G. Gerry.

Ambrose Kennedy.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

James F. Byrnes.
Wyatt Aiken.
Joseph T. Johnson.

David E. Finley.
J. W. Ragsdale.
Asbury F. Lever.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

C. H. Dillon.
Charles H. Burke.

Eber W. Martin.

TENNESSEE.

Sam R. Sells.
Richard W. Austin.
John A. Moon.
Cordell Hull.
William C. Houston.

Joseph W. Byrns.
Lemuel P. Padgett.
Thetus W. Sims.
Finis J. Garrett.
Kenneth D. McKellar.

TEXAS.

H. W. Vaughan.
Martin Dies.
James Young.
Sam Rayburn.
Jack Beall.
Rufus Hardy.
Alexander W. Gregg.
Joe H. Eagle.
George F. Burgess.

Robert L. Henry.
Oscar Callaway.
John H. Stephens.
James L. Slayden.
John N. Garner.
William R. Smith.
Hatton W. Sumners.
D. E. Garrett.

	UTAH.
Joseph Howell.	Jacob Johnson.
	VERMONT.
Frank L. Greene.	Frank Plumley.
	VIRGINIA.
William A. Jones.	Carter Glass.
E. E. Holland.	James Hay.
A. J. Montague.	Charles C. Carlin.
W. A. Watson.	C. Bascom Slemp.
E. W. Saunders.	Henry D. Flood.
	WASHINGTON.
William E. Humphrey.	J. A. Falconer.
A. Johnson.	J. W. Bryan.
William L. La Follette.	
	WEST VIRGINIA.
John W. Davis.	H. H. Moss, jr.
William G. Brown.	James A. Hughes.
S. B. Avis.	Howard Sutherland.
	WISCONSIN.
Henry A. Cooper.	John J. Esch.
Michael E. Burke.	E. E. Browne.
John M. Nelson.	Thomas F. Konop.
William J. Cary.	James A. Frear.
William H. Stafford.	Irvine L. Lenroot.
M. K. Reilly.	

WYOMING.

Frank W. Mondell.

ALASKA.

James Wickersham.

HAWAII.

Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole.

PORTO RICO.

Luis Muñoz Rivera.

	PHILIPPINES.
Manuel L. Quezon.	Manuel Earnshaw.

The CLERK. Four hundred and eight Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP.

The CLERK. The following statement showing the changes that have occurred since the regular election of Members of the Sixty-third Congress is presented for the information of the House: Hon. GEORGE S. LEGARE, first South Carolina district, died January 31, 1913; Hon. ALBERT SIDNEY BURLESON, tenth Texas district, appointed Postmaster General; Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, first Texas district, elected to United States Senate; Hon. JOHN WINGATE WEEKS, twelfth Massachusetts district, elected to United States Senate.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

The CLERK. The next business is the nomination and election of a Speaker.

Mr. PALMER. Two years ago, at the beginning of the Sixty-second Congress, when the House of Representatives had chosen its Speaker, he was presented to the Members by the minority leader in these words:

It is a great office, filled by a great man.

During his term in that office, the judgment of the American people has freely confirmed the high opinion which was then so generously expressed. He has filled that great office to the last inch of its specifications, to the credit of himself, to the honor of his party, and to the glory of our common country. [Applause.]

In his two years' service in the Speakership he has maintained what he had long ago won—the respect, the confidence, indeed the affection of the entire Nation. [Applause.] I am sure I voice the opinion of Democrats everywhere when I say that to his patriotic course in the conduct of that high office was due in large degree the people's confidence in his party which resulted in our great victory last November. [Applause on the Democratic side.] On behalf, therefore, of the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives, by the authority and direction of the unanimous action of the Democratic caucus, in the name of a grateful party in the Nation, I nominate for Speaker Hon. CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri. [Applause.]

The CLERK. Hon. CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri, has been placed in nomination. Are there further nominations?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Two years ago the Republicans of this House nominated for Speaker the Hon. JAMES R. MANN, of Illinois. [Applause.] I shall not at this time enter upon any eulogy of the party to which I belong. Its record has been made, and it will stand for the past and for the future. [Applause on the Republican side.] Nor shall I attempt to eulogize the candidate for Speaker whom we named two years ago. His record was made in this House before he was nominated for Speaker, and in his service as minority leader in the Sixty-second Congress he lived up to that record to the gratification of Republicans and Democrats alike. [Applause.] He has won a high place in the hearts of the American people. By direction of the Republican caucus I place in nomination as the choice of the Republican Members of this House the name of the Hon. JAMES R. MANN, Member elect from Illinois, as their candidate for Speaker of the Sixty-third Congress. [Applause.]

The CLERK. Hon. JAMES R. MANN, of Illinois, has been placed in nomination. Are there further nominations?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Clerk and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I have been commissioned to announce the organization and appearance of a new party in the American Congress. This party was born of the Nation's awakened sense of justice. Its principles are embodied in the Progressive national platform adopted at Chicago on August 7, 1912. The great purposes of its existence are to establish and maintain the actual and absolute rule of the people under representative forms of government [applause]; to eradicate and banish bossism forever from American public life; to create and foster social and industrial justice among all classes of our people; to create a nonpartisan tariff commission for the purpose of taking the tariff out of politics and placing it where it belongs—upon a scientific, nonpolitical basis; to establish an administrative commission to supervise industrial corporations engaged in interstate commerce as the Interstate Commerce Commission now supervises railways; to divorce big business from corrupt politics and subject corporate management to the same rules of legal discipline that govern the conduct of private citizens; to destroy sectionalism and promote political fraternity in the Nation by offering to all the voters of the land, men and women alike, from North, East, South, and West, a platform of principles and a medium of political expression that will be acceptable to them, and to re-create in the hearts of our fellow citizens everywhere love and veneration for early Democratic and early Republican ideals, to the end that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Again I wish to announce that we Progressives are not organized in this House for mere purposes of antagonism and obstruction. We have a definite program of our own, and we shall use every legitimate effort to accomplish its purposes. We shall inaugurate legislation in this body through measures embodying the principles of our national platform. We shall ask Democrats and Republicans to assist us in the passage of these bills, and we will invoke the wrath of the American people upon their heads if they fail to do so. [Laughter and applause.]

We shall at times be compelled to assume an attitude of opposition and resistance, for we will oppose with faces of flint and hearts of steel every nonprogressive, reactionary bill introduced.

Nevertheless, we believe that the true representative of the people should always bury his partisanship in his patriotism and that severe punishment should be administered to any public servant who seeks to derive partisan advantage at the expense of the welfare of his country. We therefore hereby pledge ourselves as Progressives to the support of any measures, from whatever source they come, that are designed to contribute to the prosperity of the people and to augment the glory and grandeur of the Republic.

And, finally, I have been commissioned to nominate a member of the National Progressive Party to be Speaker of this House and to preside over its deliberations during the sessions of the Sixty-third Congress. It affords me great pleasure to name a man who is a youth in years but a veteran in statesmanship, having served as a Member of this body during a full decade; a man who is courage and conscience incarnate, to whom the din of battle in the cause of righteousness is music to the ear; a knight-errant in politics, who enters the combats of the arena always with the spirit of apostleship in his heart and the song and shout of the crusader upon his lips; a true and steadfast friend who never betrays a trust, a brave and generous antagonist who strikes always above and never below the belt; a man who, in life and character, in achievements, hopes, and aspirations, is worthy of the past and prophetic of the future of the American Republic.

Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, the State of New York lifts its hat to the State of Kansas, and I nominate for the Progressive leadership of this body and for the Speakership of the American House of Representatives during the next two years that militant, aggressive, red-blooded Progressive from the West, VICTOR MURDOCK. [Applause.]

The CLERK. Are there any other nominations? If not, the nominations are closed. The following tellers are appointed to conduct the election: Mr. CALLAWAY of Texas, Mr. GOEKE of Ohio, Mr. AUSTIN of Tennessee, and Mr. STEPHENS of California, and they will please take their places at the Clerk's desk. The Clerk will call the roll.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote viva voce for Speaker.

The following is the vote in detail:

FOR MR. CLARK—272.

Abercrombie	Dickinson	Hughes, Ga.	Rainey
Adair	Dies	Hull	Raker
Adamson	Difenderfer	Humphreys, Miss.	Rauch
Aiken	Dixon	Igoe	Rayburn
Alexander	Donohoe	Jacoway	Reed
Allen	Donovan	Johnson, Ky.	Reilly, Conn.
Ansberry	Dooling	Johnson, S. C.	Reilly, Wis.
Ashbrook	Doolittle	Jones	Richardson
Aswell	Doremus	Keating	Riordan
Bailey	Doughton	Kennedy, Conn.	Roddenbery
Baker	Driscoll	Kettner	Rothermel
Barkley	Dupré	Key, Ohio	Rouse
Bartlett	Eagan	Kindel	Rubey
Bathrick	Eagle	Kinkead, N. J.	Rucker
Beakes	Edwards	Kirkpatrick	Russell
Beall, Tex.	Elder	Kitchin	Sabath
Bell, Ga.	Estopinal	Konig	Saunders
Blackmon	Evans	Konop	Scully
Booher	Fergusson	Korbly	Seldomridge
Borchers	Ferris	Lazaro	Sharp
Borland	Fields	Lee, Ga.	Sherley
Bowdle	Finley	Lee, Pa.	Sherwood
Bremner	Fitzgerald	L'Engle	Sims
Brockson	Fitzhenry	Lesher	Sisson
Brodbeck	Flood, Va.	Lever	Slayden
Broussard	Floyd, Ark.	Levy	Small
Brown, N. Y.	Foster	Lewis, Md.	Smith, Md.
Brown, W. Va.	Fowler	Lieb	Smith, N. Y.
Bruckner	Francis	Linthicum	Smith, Tex.
Brumbaugh	Gallagher	Lloyd	Sparkman
Buchanan	Gard	Lobeck	Stedman
Bulkley	Garner	Logue	Stephens, Miss.
Burgess	Garrett, Tenn.	Lonergan	Stephens, Nebr.
Burke, Wis.	Garrett, Tex.	McAndrews	Stephens, Tex.
Burnett	Gerry	McClellan	Stone
Byrnes, S. C.	Gilmore	McCoy	Stout
Byrns, Tenn.	Gittins	McDermott	Stringer
Callaway	Glass	McGillicuddy	Taggart
Candler	Godwin, N. C.	McKellar	Talbott, Md.
Cantrill	Goeke	Maguire, Nebr.	Talcott, N. Y.
Caraway	Goldfogle	Mahan	Tavenner
Carew	Gordon	Maher	Taylor, Ala.
Carlin	Gorman	Martin, N. J.	Taylor, Ark.
Carr	Goulden	Metz	Taylor, Colo.
Carter	Graham, Ill.	Montague	Taylor, N. Y.
Casey	Gregg	Moon	Ten Eyck
Church	Griffin	Morgan, La.	Thacher
Clancy	Gudger	Morrison	Thomas
Clark, Fla.	Hamill	Murray, Mass.	Thompson, Okla.
Claypool	Hamlin	Murray, Okla.	Townsend
Clayton	Hammond	Neeley	Tribble
Collier	Hardwick	O'Brien	Tuttle
Connelly, Kans.	Hardy	Oglesby	Underhill
Connolly, Iowa	Harrison, Miss.	O'Hair	Underwood
Conry	Harrison, N. Y.	Oldfield	Vaughan
Covington	Hay	O'Leary	Walker
Cox	Hayden	O'Shaunessy	Walsh
Crisp	Heflin	Padgett	Watkins
Crosser	Helm	Page	Watson
Cullop	Helvering	Palmer	Weaver
Curley	Henry	Pepper	Webb
Dale	Hensley	Peters	Whitacre
Davenport	Hill	Peterson	Williams
Davis, W. Va.	Hobson	Phelan	Wilson, Fla.
Decker	Holland	Post	Wilson, N. Y.
Deitrick	Houston	Pou	Wingo
Dent	Howard	Quin	Witherspoon
Dershem	Hoxworth	Ragsdale	Young, Tex.

FOR MR. MANN—111.

Ainey	Frear	La Follette	Roberts, Nev.
Anderson	French	Langham	Rogers
Anthony	Gardner	Langley	Scott
Austin	Gillett	Lenroot	Sells
Avis	Good	Lindquist	Shreve
Barchfeld	Goodwin, Me.	McGuire, Okla.	Sinnott
Bartholdt	Graham, Pa.	McKenzie	Slemp
Barton	Green, Iowa	McLaughlin	Sloan
Britten	Greene, Mass.	Madden	Smith, Idaho
Browne, Wis.	Greene, Vt.	Manahan	Smith, J. M. C.
Browning	Griest	Martin, S. Dak.	Smith, Minn.
Burke, Pa.	Hamilton, Mich.	Merritt	Smith, Saml. W.
Burke, S. Dak.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Miller	Stafford
Butler	Hawley	Mondell	Steenerson
Calder	Hayes	Moore	Stevens, Minn.
Campbell	Helgesen	Morgan, Okla.	Sutherland
Cramton	Hinds	Morin	Switzer
Curry	Humphrey, Wash.	Moss, W. Va.	Towner
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, Utah	Mott	Treadway
Dillon	Johnson, Wash.	Parker	Vare
Dunn	Kahn	Patton, Pa.	Volstead
Dyer	Keister	Payne	Wallin
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Platt	Wilder
Esch	Kennedy, R. I.	Plumley	Willis
Fairchild	Kent	Porter	Winslow
Farr	Kiess, Pa.	Powers	Woods
Fess	Knowland	Prouty	Young, Mich.
Fordney	Kreider	Roberts, Mass.	

FOR MR. MURDOCK—18.

Bell, Cal.	Hinebaugh	Lindbergh	Thomson, Ill.
Bryan	Hulings	Nolan	Walters
Chandler	Kelly, Pa.	Rupley	Woodruff
Copley	Lafferty	Stephens, Cal.	
Falconer	Lewis, Pa.	Temple	

FOR MR. COOPER—4.

Cary	Mapes	Norton	Young, N. Dak.

FOR MR. NELSON—1.

Cooper

At the conclusion of the roll call,

The CLERK said: The result of the vote is as follows: Total number of votes cast, 406. Mr. JOHN M. NELSON, of Wisconsin, received 1 vote; Mr. HENRY A. COOPER, of Wisconsin, received 4 votes; Mr. VICTOR MURDOCK, of Kansas, received 18 votes; Mr. JAMES R. MANN, of Illinois, received 111 votes; Mr. CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri, received 272 votes. A quorum being present, and Mr. CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri, having received a majority of all the votes, he is duly elected Speaker of the Sixty-third Congress. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. PALMER; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MANN; and the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. MURDOCK, are appointed a committee to wait upon the Speaker, notify him of his election, and escort him to the chair.

The committee appointed to conduct the Speaker elect to the chair having returned with him,

Mr. MANN. Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I have the pleasure to introduce and present to you as your choice for Speaker one of the noblest of men and one of the ablest of Speakers, the Hon. CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri. [Loud applause.]

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, profoundly grateful for reelection to the Speakership, the highest honor which you can bestow, I prize it especially because it was preceded by a unanimous nomination and is accompanied with the personal friendship and good will of every Member of the House. [Applause.] Your indorsement by this action of my conduct during my first term in this great station by giving me a second term is more precious than rubies. I hope to discharge the difficult, multifarious, and delicate duties of this position with absolute impartiality and to the satisfaction of all the Members and of all fair-minded people. Whatever success attached to my first term was due, very largely, to the unfailing kindness, courtesy, and good feeling of the Members toward each other and toward the Speaker. I hope that that line of action will continue through this Congress. Indeed, it is more necessary in this Congress than it was in the last one. The increase of the membership will render the duties of the Speaker very much more difficult than they were in the Sixty-second Congress. For the benefit of ourselves and for the good of the country, I hope the same rule of conduct will prevail.

Therefore I cordially invite the aid and assistance of all Members of the House, without respect to political affiliations, to aid in maintaining order, preserving decorum, and expediting business for the public welfare, to the end that our free institutions may be strengthened and perpetuated.

As this Congress is to be known more by its works than its words, I am ready to take the oath, and will ask Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland to administer it.

The oath of office was administered to the Speaker by Mr. TALBOTT.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the names of Members by States, and they will assemble in front of the Speaker's desk and take the oath of office.

MEMBER FROM THE TWELFTH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN.

When the State of Michigan was called:

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to object, and do object, to the swearing in of H. OLIN YOUNG, from the twelfth Michigan district. I do so on my responsibility as a Member of this House and because I am reliably informed the gentleman was not elected. I ask that the resolution be read.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make a point of order that at this time no such resolution is in order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained at this juncture.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. There are numerous precedents where the Speaker has the right to ask a challenged gentleman to stand aside.

The SPEAKER. That is true.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then we will have to start in at the end of the swearing in of the Members.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I simply make the point of order at this particular time that no such resolution is in order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] will stand aside.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an inquiry, if I may, of my colleague from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH], whether his objection to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] is as to his eligibility. So far the gentleman has objected to the swearing in of Mr. YOUNG upon his responsibility as a Member of Congress. That means nothing. I may object on my responsibility as a Member to the swearing in of anybody on the ground that he is not elected; but the gentleman must go further than

that before the Speaker asks a gentleman to stand aside, I think.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH] stated that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] had never been elected. That seemed to be his reason.

Mr. MANN. Well, I know; but that is always the contention of every contestant who contests a seat, where a contestee has the credentials.

The SPEAKER. That is true, too.

Mr. MANN. I think the House is entitled to know whether the objection is as to the eligibility of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] or as to the form of the certificate which has been presented to the Clerk of the House, or whether it is for any other reason that may be named.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARTLETT. I desire to be informed whether the Clerk has in his possession the credentials of the gentleman from Michigan, duly certified by the governor of that State, declaring that the gentleman was elected a Member of this Congress.

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to having the gentleman from Michigan stand aside. I am quite willing to ask unanimous consent to have that done as long as, apparently, we can not get any statement from my colleague that there is any objection to the eligibility of the gentleman from Michigan or to the certificate of his election, so that the matter may be passed upon later without putting the Speaker on record as having the right to require a Member to stand aside where no objection is made as to his eligibility to the House or no objection is made as to the form of the certificate.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I made a parliamentary inquiry of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will answer the parliamentary inquiry upon which the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] impinged. This certificate of Mr. YOUNG is signed by the secretary of state of Michigan, the State treasurer, and the commissioner of the State land office, constituting the board of State canvassers.

Mr. BARTLETT. Just a word, Mr. Speaker. I wish to state my position in relation to the matter. The point was raised and the precedent set in the Roberts case and other cases. I do not believe the Speaker, on the mere challenge of the right of a Member of this House to be sworn in, where that Member's certificate to membership is regular and unchallenged, ought to sustain that contention. However, if, as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, it is wished that the matter take that course and the gentleman from Michigan stands aside, I have no objection. But so far as I am concerned, as one Member of this House, I enter my protest, Mr. Speaker, and insist that the Speaker ought not to have the right to stand aside any Member from being sworn upon the mere suggestion of a Member who may or may not himself be sworn or whose own title to a seat may be at stake, in the face of the regular certificate of the governor of a sovereign State to the effect that that Member has been elected, the same as I have been, or the same as every other Member of this House has been elected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Georgia will pardon me a moment, as a matter of convenience to the House——

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman's convenience——

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] may stand aside and refrain from taking the oath until the oath has been taken by the other Members.

Mr. BARTLETT. I shall not object.

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. FITZGERALD. The request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] accomplishes the same result.

Mr. MURDOCK. It certainly does; but reserving the right to object, all the precedents which I can find say that the Speaker is entirely within his rights in asking a challenged Member to step aside temporarily while other Members are being sworn in. There are numerous precedents to that effect.

On December 5, 1881, at the organization of the House the Speaker was administering the oath to Members, and the State of Alabama being called——

Mr. FITZGERALD. I suggest that the gentleman either object or allow the request for unanimous consent to be granted.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think it is clearly within the right of the Speaker to ask the gentleman to step aside.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That may be, but if nobody objects to the request it does no harm and accomplishes the same result.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not trouble the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] or anybody else to read the precedents. The Chair has read them himself. There is no question in the world but what under the precedents the Speaker has the right to ask a Member to stand aside where there is any controversy about his right to take the oath; but the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] relieves that situation by asking unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] stand aside until the other Members are sworn in. Is there objection to the request?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan stood aside.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The Clerk resumed the call of States, and the oath of office was administered to the remaining Members, Delegates from Territories, and Resident Commissioners.

The SPEAKER. There are some Members who desire to affirm rather than to be sworn in. They will come forward.

Messrs. PALMER, BUTLER, and GRIEST affirmed.

MEMBER FROM THE TWELFTH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will now swear in the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] unless there is some resolution offered on the subject.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, and ask to have it read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois offers a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the prima facie right of Hon. H. OLIN YOUNG, of the twelfth district of the State of Michigan, to a seat in the Sixty-third Congress is objected to by a Member of this House; and

Whereas the Member so objecting as aforesaid informs the House on his responsibility as a Member, upon information and belief, that the election returns of the 14 counties composing the said twelfth district of Michigan show that said H. OLIN YOUNG, Republican candidate for Congress in said district, received a total of 18,190 votes and that William J. MacDonald, the Progressive candidate for Congress in said district, received a total of 18,433 votes, a plurality of 243 votes over said H. OLIN YOUNG; and

Whereas the State board of canvassers of the State of Michigan, arbitrarily and without authority of law, caused a certificate of election to be issued to said H. OLIN YOUNG, when in truth and in fact said certificate should have been issued to William J. MacDonald, who received a plurality of 243 votes as aforesaid; and

Whereas said State board of canvassers refused to count for said William J. MacDonald any of the votes cast for him in the county of Ontanagon, in said district, being 458 in number, upon the sole ground that the name of said William J. MacDonald appeared upon the official ballot in said Ontanagon County as "Sheldon William J. MacDonald"; and

Whereas, for the reasons aforesaid, the Member so objecting has further objected to the oath of office being administered to said H. OLIN YOUNG as a Member of the Sixty-third Congress; and

Whereas if the foregoing alleged facts are true it would be manifest injustice to permit the seating, even temporarily, of H. OLIN YOUNG on his certificate of election issued as aforesaid: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the question of the prima facie right of H. OLIN YOUNG to be sworn in as a Representative from the State of Michigan in the Sixty-third Congress, as well as his final right to a seat therein as such Representative, be referred to a select committee of nine Members of the House, to be appointed by the Speaker; and until such committee shall report upon and the House decide such question and right, the said H. OLIN YOUNG shall not be sworn in or permitted to occupy a seat in this House. And said committee shall have power to send for persons and papers and examine witnesses under oath in relation to the subject matter of this resolution, and shall have the right to report at any time. The expenses of said inquiry shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said committee, to be immediately available.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution, and upon that motion I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves the previous question on his resolution.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 27, noes 232.

Mr. MURDOCK. The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused, 17 Members, not a sufficient number, rising to second the demand.

Accordingly the motion for the previous question was rejected.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 1.

Whereas objection has been made to Hon. H. OLIN YOUNG, of the twelfth district of the State of Michigan, taking the oath of office as a Representative;

Whereas the objection made to the said H. OLIN YOUNG is based upon the assertion that the State board of canvassers of the State of Michigan arbitrarily and without authority of law caused a certificate of election to be issued to said H. OLIN YOUNG instead of to William J. MacDonald, whom it is asserted received a plurality of the votes cast in the election for Representative;

Whereas it appears that the certificate presented by the said H. OLIN YOUNG is in regular form and properly authenticated by the officials by statute duly designated; and

Whereas no objection is made to the said H. OLIN YOUNG taking the oath based upon any disqualification founded in the Constitution, the laws of the land, or the usages and practices of the House of Representatives;

Whereas a notice of contest of the right of said H. OLIN YOUNG to a seat in this House has been filed pursuant to law in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives on January 7, 1913; and

Whereas the right of the several parties to said contest should be thoroughly investigated and duly ascertained, and under the rules to be adopted and the usages of the House said contest will be promptly and thoroughly considered, investigated, heard, and determined:

Resolved, That the Speaker be authorized and directed forthwith to administer the oath of office to said H. OLIN YOUNG as a Representative.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the only difference, apparently, between the gentleman from Illinois and myself is as to whether Mr. YOUNG of Michigan shall now be permitted to take the oath as a Representative in Congress. He presents to the House credentials in proper form and duly authenticated by the officials designated by statute. In my opinion there is no sufficient objection made by the gentleman from Illinois to justify a refusal to administer the oath to the gentleman from Michigan as a Representative. I am of opinion that if this substitute had not been offered, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Illinois merely asserts that upon his responsibility he objects to the credentials, without pointing out any defect in them, and without pointing out any disqualification under the Constitution or the law or the practice of the House, the Speaker would be compelled to administer the oath.

For the action which I propose, however, there is a precedent of such a character that the House itself is justified at this time in emphasizing the practice to be pursued under conditions here presented.

I read from Hinds' Precedents:

A certificate regular in form and legally issued by a competent officer was honored by both Clerk and House, although the successor of that officer had issued conflicting credentials. On October 15, 1877, at the organization of the House, while the Members elect whose names had been placed on the roll by the Clerk were being sworn, Mr. Richard H. Cain, of South Carolina, was challenged and stood aside. On the succeeding day, after the disposal of the case of Mr. Joseph H. Rainey, of the same State, Mr. John B. Clarke, of Kentucky, offered the following:

"*Resolved*, That the question of the prima facie as well as the right of M. P. O'Connor against Richard H. Cain, contestants, respectively, claiming a seat in this House from the second district of South Carolina, be referred to the Committee on Elections, hereafter to be appointed. And until such committee shall have reported in the premises and the House has decided such question neither of said contestants shall be admitted to a seat."

In this case Mr. Cain had the regular certificate, as did Mr. Rainey, and the secretary of state (successor to the one who had issued the certificate) had issued an impeaching certificate.

In the debate it was urged that the law of elections laid down the principle that a certificate did not constitute a prima facie title to a seat in cases where there was a second impeaching certificate. In this case the same officer issued the first certificate, and also the certificate that impeached the first. It did not matter that the officer was not in the two cases the same person. Both certificates were from the secretary of state of South Carolina. It was not sufficient to say that one came from one political partisan and the other from another political partisan. Against this it was urged again, as in the case of Rainey, that the certificate was regular in form, in conformity with law, and must be followed.

The House, by a vote of yeas 181, nays 89, adopted the following substitute:

"*Resolved*, That Richard H. Cain be now sworn in as a Representative," etc.

The oath was accordingly administered to Mr. Cain.

That decision was based on the fact that having a certificate in proper form, duly authenticated, the subsequent certificate was not sufficient to impeach the certificate issued in conformity with the law. If that be not sufficient, how preposterous it would be to permit any Member of this House to rise and single out a Member elect of the House and upon the mere statement that upon his responsibility he objects to a certificate, which is in proper form, duly authenticated, prevent the administering of the oath until the House determined questions of fact and law as to the conduct of the State board of canvassers which may affect the title to the seat.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield for a question.

Mr. COOPER. I observe in listening to the gentleman's resolution that it says that there will be an early hearing and determination of this contest. Are the committees on election to be appointed in the near future?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman from New York will yield——

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield if my rights to the floor are preserved.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's rights will be preserved.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state that although I have not consulted with other members of the Ways and Means Committee who make up committees on this side of the House, recognizing the importance of this case and the questions involved, I think I am safe in saying for myself and those who are members of the committee on this side of the House and the Democratic caucus that a committee will be provided to dispose of this case in the regular way at an early date.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] permit me to say just one word in reply to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman would permit me to finish what I have to say. I have no knowledge of the merits of this case excepting what I have read from time to time in the press. I have no interest in either one of the persons contending for this seat except to have the person who is entitled under the law seated; but the right of Members elect, bearing proper certificates, to be sworn in is too important to be determined upon any mere partisan contention or for mere party advantage.

I simply wish to say one other thing. An attempt was made with the newly crowned leader—the "Symbol of the newly risen sun," I think, is the proper title—to arrange debate upon the resolutions to be offered, so that everybody who desired might be heard upon the questions involved, and at the conclusion of the discussion to have the House vote. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] suggested the time that his followers desired, which was perfectly satisfactory to those consulted on this side. The proposed arrangement provided for such discussion as might have been necessary upon the one or two or three sides of the question before the House would be called upon to act. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], however, later informed the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and myself and one or two others that upon consulting with his followers, the new Progressive Party declined to have any discussion of this matter, and proposed to move the previous question upon the resolution depriving a Member elect of the right to be sworn in——

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Just a moment—and the negotiations were necessarily broken off.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] some four years ago was one of those who paraded this country vociferously denouncing me as one who desired to have the rules of this House so framed as to deprive Representatives of their rights and of the opportunity fully and freely to express their opinions and to voice their views, and thus properly to represent their constituents in this House; and yet in the short space of four years I find him at the head of a new party which at its very initiation in the House of Representatives attempts to throttle debate upon one of the most important questions that can come before the House of Representatives. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield for a question.

Mr. MURDOCK. I suppose that the gentleman immediately upon the conclusion of his remarks now will demand the previous question, and thus cut off from debate everyone except himself. I was disposed to make agreement with the gentleman from New York in regard to time with knowledge of his former practices in mind.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MURDOCK. And now, if the gentleman will let me continue——

Mr. FITZGERALD. One moment—I will not, because the gentleman——

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will not yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. But the gentleman did yield to me for a question, and I have not yet gotten to my question. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. And the gentleman never will get to his question this time, Mr. Speaker, because I decline to yield further.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman does me a gross injustice when he says that he was making his arrangements with the knowledge of my former action in mind. I recall a memorable day in this House when the controversy was over the adoption of its rules, and I was the only Representative who secured the floor in his own right who had the opportunity to move the previous question and declined to take advantage of it. I could at that time have moved the previous question and I had the votes to adopt it, but I surrendered the floor when I had concluded my remarks and thus gave other Members an opportunity to be heard upon the propositions which I presented. Never before nor since then in the history of the House of Representatives had anybody so fortuitously situated as I was upon that occasion exhibited the self-sacrifice that I did at that time. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman wish to ask me a question?

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman wish to ask me a question?

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman says this——

Mr. FITZGERALD. No, no. Does the gentleman wish to ask me a question?

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman in making the assertion that at the time he refrained from ordering the previous question, although he had the votes to order it, mean to have the House understand that at that time he and the gentleman from Illinois, then a Member of Congress, the Hon. Joseph G. Cannon, had an agreement to vote down reform in the rules?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No, Mr. Speaker, I did not mean to make such an assertion. I merely expressed my confidence in the fact that the proposition I presented was so meritorious that I really expected it to receive the unanimous vote of the House. [Applause and laughter.]

I have never been able to understand why the gentleman from Kansas, professing to be such a persistent reformer of the rules, after having denounced so vehemently the amendments offered by me at that time, has never in the four years that have since elapsed suggested a single change in those amendments.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the gentleman will permit, he will before this session of Congress closes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman does propose amendments to the rules of the House before this session shall be closed, I indulge the hope that they will be designed to permit Members of the House to participate in its deliberations rather than to shut them out.

Mr. MURDOCK. They will not be designed to shut them out from the membership of the House.

Mr. HENRY. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] yield a moment, so that I can ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. If I do not lose the floor.

Mr. HENRY. I want to ask the gentleman from Kansas if he will not be candid enough to us to say that just prior to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH] offering this resolution pertaining to the election case he came to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and to me and suggested it was proper to move the previous question——

Mr. HINEBAUGH. The initiative in this agreement came from the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MURDOCK. The initiative in this agreement came from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], and not from me; and after I tried to arrange the matter I came back to them so that there would be no charge of bad faith, and so that we should expedite the business of the House and keep out of a seat in the House a gentleman who has no business in it——

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will not yield for such a statement. I decline further to be interrupted.

Mr. LAFFERTY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Is it not true that the gentleman from New York yielded to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] to ask the gentleman from Kansas a question——

Mr. MURDOCK. Without any interference by the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think the answer is implied to a question.

Mr. MURDOCK. I asked the gentleman to yield to me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may have asked a question even had he not moved the previous question.

Mr. LAFFERTY. The gentleman knows that is true.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Hereafter I trust that the gentleman's followers will be more willing to acquiesce in any arrangements made by the gentleman from Kansas when he negotiates on their behalf for time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Now, will the gentleman in fairness yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. I do not propose that these gentlemen shall attempt to set up a rule of conduct for the House and have their own way. I hope that hereafter when the gentleman representing these so-called "Progressives" is given the opportunity to have a full discussion of pending questions, when there is a disposition to grant the time desired they will take advantage of the opportunity, otherwise they will receive the same treatment they are about to receive now. Mr. Speaker, I now demand the previous question upon the resolution and the substitute.

Mr. MURDOCK. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] moves the previous question. The House will be in order. There could not be any more serious question than the right of a Member to have——

Mr. MURDOCK. Under the rules of the House, is there not in order, after the previous question has been ordered, 40 minutes' debate?

The SPEAKER. After it has been adopted. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 241, noes 35.

So the previous question was ordered

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The yeas and nays are demanded. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Twenty-two gentlemen have arisen in the affirmative—not a sufficient number—and the yeas and nays are refused. The question is on the adoption of the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MURDOCK. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 266, noes 26.

So Mr. FITZGERALD's substitute was adopted.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Twenty-seven gentleman have arisen in the affirmative—not a sufficient number—and the yeas and nays are refused. The vote is now on the resolution as amended by the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

The question was taken, and the resolution as amended was adopted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] will come forward and be sworn.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan appeared before the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] offers a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 3.

Resolved, That Hon. South Trimble, of the State of Kentucky, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Robert B. Gordon, of the State of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Joseph J. Sinnott, of the State of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That William M. Dunbar, of the State of Georgia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives; and

That Rev. Henry N. Couden, of the State of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the caucus of the Republican Members, I offer the following amendment by way of a substitute for the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Alexander McDowell, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Clarence H. Price, of the State of Kansas, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That George W. Denney, of the State of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That George F. Russell, of the State of Washington, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives; and

That Henry N. Couden, of the State of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the conference of the Progressive Party, I desire to introduce an amendment to the substitute.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That A. Nevin Detrich, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That Madison T. Owens, of California, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That C. B. Kegley, of Washington, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That George J. Larash, of Illinois, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That Rev. Henry N. Couden be, and he is hereby, elected Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to make a point of order, I shall not make it, owing to the lack of experience of the gentleman who offers the resolution, which is in violation of the statute which provides that the word "Resolved" in the resolving part of the resolution can only be inserted once, instead of many times.

The SPEAKER. The point of order would be well taken if it were made. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The question was taken, and the amendment to the substitute was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE].

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The officers elect of the House will come forward and receive the oath of office.

The officers elect presented themselves at the bar of the House, and the oath of office was administered to them by the Speaker.

SPECIAL MINORITY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

House resolution 4.

Resolved, That, until otherwise ordered, Joseph G. Rodgers be authorized to act as special employee of the House of Representatives and receive compensation at the rate of $1,800 per annum; that John H. Hollingsworth be authorized to act as special chief page and pair clerk and receive compensation at the rate of $1,800 per annum; that William Tyler Page be authorized to act as special messenger and assistant pair clerk and receive compensation at the rate of $1,800 per annum; that Bert W. Kennedy and Frank W. Collier be authorized to act as special messengers and receive compensation at the rate of $1,500 per annum; and that A. E. Chaffee be authorized to act as minority telephone messenger and receive compensation at the rate of $1,200 per annum; such employees to be at all times under the control of the Speaker of the House and subject to change at any time by the House as provided by law.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, these are the same employees that were provided for during the Sixty-second Congress, for the minority?

Mr. MANN. These are the same employees.

Mr. LLOYD. The same in number and the same in salary?

Mr. MANN. The same in number, the same in salary, and the same men provided for the minority during the last Congress.

I think it is fair to say that it is the understanding on my part, and I think on the part of gentlemen on the other side of the House, that another employee will be provided for the new party in the minority also.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. You mean the grand jury? [Laughter.]

Mr. LAFFERTY. Be careful that you are not indicted. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

SEATING OF MEMBERS.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members may be permitted to choose their own seats on the floor of the House: Hon. JAMES R. MANN, the Republican leader; Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE, of New York, the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means——

Mr. MANN. The "father of the House."

Mr. PALMER. The "father of the House"; also Hon. VICTOR MURDOCK, of Kansas, the Progressive Party leader; Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, prospective chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means; Hon. JOHN J. FITZGERALD, of New York, prospective chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; and Hon. ROBERT L. HENRY, of Texas, prospective chairman of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the persons named—Mr. MANN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Mr. HENRY—be permitted to select their seats.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask that the name of the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. TALBOTT, be added to that list. He is the ranking Member on that side of the House in length of service.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that in the last Congress the courtesy of choosing their own seats was extended to Mr. Cannon, of Illinois, the former Speaker; to Mr. Bingham, of Pennsylvania, who was then the "father of the House"; and to Mr. JONES, of Virginia, and Mr. TALBOTT, of Maryland, on account of their long service; and also to Mr. SHERWOOD, of Ohio.

Mr. MANN. Gen. SHERWOOD ought to be included in any proposition which is made to the House. [Applause.]

Mr. PALMER. The plan in this Congress, however, as I understand it, is to have all seats free, so that Members may sit where they wish. The only thing that is sought to be accomplished by this request is that the leaders of the three parties and the chairman and ranking members of the three most important committees of the House, which have the most business before the House, may be certain of their seats when they come upon the floor.

I understand that tables will be provided in front of the present benches, for the use of committees and of Members having business before the House, which, in addition to the tables now provided, will give ample room for papers and documents which Members addressing the House may desire to have before them.

Since there are to be no regularly assigned seats to every Member it did not seem necessary to extend the courtesy to those Members of the House who have been long in service.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the gentlemen designated in the resolution, if it is agreed to, be permitted to select chairs immediately behind these two tables?

Mr. MANN. I was going to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he would not add to his request for unanimous consent that in selecting the permanent seats the seats next to the table be not selected.

Mr. SHERLEY rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SHERLEY. I want to reserve the right to object, and I want to say that the idea that underlies it seems to be in conflict with the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PALMER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania would ask not to have these seats next to the tables selected, would not that obviate any question that the gentleman from Kentucky has in his mind?

Mr. PALMER. I am not certain that that would be a proper plan. For instance, the majority leader [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is seldom in his seat unless he is in charge of measures pending in the House, and upon such occasions he would doubtless desire to occupy a seat behind one of the tables.

Mr. MANN. Undoubtedly, and that is the very point. The commission which provided for the reseating of the Hall designed these tables primarily for committees that had charge of a bill on the floor of the House and those in opposition to the bill, so that the majority members of a committee in charge of a bill would have a table on that side of the House, and any gentlemen in opposition would have a right to have their papers on a table on this side of the House. Now, when the gentleman from Alabama is in charge of a bill he will have that table, and when the Committee on Appropriations is in charge of a bill they will want the table, and so would the Committee on Military Affairs, and other committees.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I will cut this discussion short by withdrawing the request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraws his request for unanimous consent.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Also:

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. JAMES P. CLARKE, of Arkansas, as President pro tempore of the Senate; James M. Baker, as Secretary of the Senate; and Charles P. Higgins, as Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Also:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed, to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

And that in compliance with the foregoing resolution the Vice President had appointed Mr. KERN and Mr. GALLINGER the committee on the part of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 2.

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected CHAMP CLARK, a Representative from the State of Missouri, as Speaker, and South Trimble, a citizen of the State of Kentucky, as Clerk, of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

NOTIFICATION TO THE SENATE.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 6.

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives is assembled; that CHAMP CLARK, a Representative from the State of Missouri, has been elected Speaker; that South Trimble, a citizen of the State of Kentucky, has been elected Clerk; and that the House is ready for business.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 7.

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed by the Speaker, on the part of the House of Representatives, to join with the committee on the part of the Senate, to wait on the President of the United States and notify him that a quorum of the two Houses is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed as the committee Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Mr. MANN.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 5.

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be 12 o'clock m.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE RULES.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 8.

Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second Congress be adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third Congress with the exception of Rule XXXI.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I have a resolution which I desire to offer as a substitute.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I have the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has the floor.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, the resolution just read contemplates the readoption of the rules of the former House as the rules of this House of Representatives with the exception of Rule XXXI. Upon reading Rule XXXI it will be found that it is the rule providing for the drawing of seats under the former rules of the House. It is now understood that the custom of drawing seats is to be abandoned since the rearrangement of the Hall of the House. Therefore it is not necessary to adopt that rule and it has been omitted.

This resolution only means that upon its adoption the rules of the former Congress shall govern us during this Congress until the House sees fit to make certain amendments, and I will be perfectly candid and say that it is my understanding that at a little later period of the session there will be certain amendments to some of the rules. The contemplated Committee on Rules has under consideration a number of vital and useful amendments, and there will be no disposition to keep the rules as now adopted in force without placing the necessary amendments in the rules. For instance, it is our intention to undertake to revise the rule providing for Calendar Wednesday, to make it more practical, and see if we can not evolve a more workable plan under that rule. Then there is a proposition to revise the rule in regard to the Calendar for Motions to Discharge Committees, and the Committee on Rules will take up that subject and will be glad to consider it with any of the Members of the House. The Committee on Rules will be glad to consider it with the representative of the new Progressive Party, or to consider any other amendment that he may have to propose to the rules, also with the leader of the minority, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. We will be glad to have their views. It is not necessary nor is it proper at this stage of the proceedings in the House to undertake to adopt any amendments until they have been thoroughly considered and digested by the appropriate committee, namely, the Committee on Rules. When they have been introduced and have been referred in the proper and regular way they will be taken up. It seems to me that this is the course that should be pursued at this time.

I will be glad now to yield to anyone who wishes to ask a question.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I yield for a question.

Mr. SIMS. Does the Committee on Rules contemplate considering some method by which we may secure a greater attendance in the House, so as to avoid the long time required in getting a quorum when the point of no quorum is made?

Mr. HENRY. The Committee on Rules will be glad to consider such a plan, and I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will present some of his views in regard to that question. If the gentleman has any plan in mind at this time, I would be glad to have him suggest it now while the House is in session.

Mr. SIMS. I do not want to take up the time of the House further than to ask the question as to whether such a plan is in contemplation.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. HENRY. I yield.

Mr. GARDNER. I hope before the gentleman from Texas moves the previous question that he will try to come to some agreement for debate upon his resolution. I speak partly for the minority leader, who has been forced to leave the floor to go to the White House as the messenger of this House. Personally I should like to have 10 minutes in which to make some suggestions. I think that the gentleman from Wisconsin wishes to make some suggestions. I have no doubt that members of the Progressive Party wish to make some suggestions. I have no objection to the passage of the gentleman's resolution. I accept fully his statement that the rules are to be revised, but I think this is a good opportunity, unless time presses, for those of us who are interested especially in the rules to be given an opportunity to say a few words.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the gentleman is entirely correct about that, and perhaps we can come to some agreement about debate. I think if we could make an arrangement to discuss the resolution for an hour it would be satisfactory, giving, say, 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] or to his side of the House, 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], representing the Progressive Party, and 20 minutes to the majority side. I merely make that suggestion, thinking that perhaps we may arrive at some agreement.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I think that on the Republican side we need half an hour.

Mr. HENRY. Does the gentleman from Kansas think he can get along with 10 minutes?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; we would like 20 minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the gentleman think that this side of the House ought to have fully as much as the Republican and Progressive sides have? It seems to me so.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. Certainly.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to ask my colleague what it is proposed to discuss?

Mr. HENRY. A resolution providing for the adoption of the rules of the Sixty-second Congress as the rules of the Sixty-third Congress.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I would like to ask the gentleman what is the purpose in striking out Rule XXXI?

Mr. HENRY. Section 31 provides for the drawing of seats, and I understand it is contemplated not to draw seats under the present arrangement.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are not quite ready to adopt the rule of socialism and own nothing. I should prefer to have a seat, even in the rear, which is my own, than to have a seat in which every man can sit down when I leave it. Therefore I would like to have section 31 in.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas ask unanimous consent for anything?

Mr. HENRY. I ask unanimous consent to arrange the time of debate, and I hope it will be agreeable to the other side. I

ask unanimous consent that this side of the House be allowed 30 minutes debate, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] 15 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Why not give us equal time?

Mr. COOPER rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] rise?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HENRY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] first.

Mr. COOPER. I desire to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], inasmuch as this is one of the most important questions to come before the House, if he will not agree to extend the time a little? I perhaps would like 10 minutes.

Mr. HENRY. Has the gentleman got a party by himself, too? [Laughter.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I have not any party, but I have a vote here for a constituency, the same as has the gentleman from Texas, and they are entitled to a hearing, the same as the constituency of any other gentleman, before this House. All I want is a reasonable opportunity.

Mr. HENRY. Can not the gentleman secure the time from one of his leaders? I do not know to which one he owes his allegiance.

Mr. COOPER. I am possibly not led as easily as the gentleman from Texas on this question.

Mr. HENRY. Under which flag is the gentleman fighting?

Mr. COOPER. Under these rules nobody leads me.

Mr. HENRY. I supposed the gentleman had a fourth party. [Laughter.]

Mr. COOPER. Not at all.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY]——

Mr. GARDNER. If the gentleman will make it 25 minutes that will just cover the amount of time for which there are requests on this side of the House.

Mr. HENRY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this side of the House be allowed 35 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] 25 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] 15 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right here, does the gentleman put our minority at disadvantage in the matter of time?

Mr. HENRY. It seems that this morning you were able to say all that you might be able to expect to say in the length of time which was used.

Mr. MURDOCK. We might be able to say more in our 15 minutes than the gentleman does.

Mr. HEFLIN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. HENRY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama unless he intends to ask for time for the woman's suffrage party.

Mr. HEFLIN. I want to say now that the gentleman is giving more time to the Progressive Party than the membership it possesses. They have 13 Members and they are now asking for 15 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is wrong in his information and conclusions.

Mr. GARDNER rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GARDNER. I can not put it in the form of a question.

Mr. HENRY. I yield only for something that seems like a question, then. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARDNER. I shall not object to an uneven distribution of time, because we ask only 25 minutes in which to discuss this question. If we are going to discuss this proposition from the point of view of the proportional number of Representatives in each party we are opening a far-reaching question. As a matter of fact, I believe that there should be an equal amount of time allowed for debates on the affirmative and on the negative side of this question.

The reason why I shall not object to only 25 minutes for this side of the House to discuss the question is because that is all the time we actually need. Acting, as I am, at the request of our leader, in his absence, I wish it understood that I make no admission that the Republican side of the House is entitled to any less time for debate than is the Democratic side.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the gentleman as to the division of time for debate on the affirmative and negative side. The same amount of time should be given to the minority as to the majority. Does not the gentleman think there should be an equal division of time among the minorities? [Laughter.]

Mr. HENRY. I do not think so. Modified by other circumstances, there may be.

Mr. GARDNER. Does the gentleman wish me to answer?

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly; I do.

Mr. GARDNER. Judging from what I have seen to-day, the Progressive Party approaches an entirely new question by first making up its mind.

Mr. MURDOCK. The new party does not do anything of the kind. It believes in an equitable division of time.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Do I understand it is a matter of understanding of the Committee on Rules that the request in this case is based upon the amendment, that 35 minutes is actually needed on the Democratic side and 25 minutes is all that is actually needed or requested on this side, or is that to be a rule to be laid down in the House that a proportional distribution of time shall be based on the question at issue?

Mr. HENRY. It is just a question of convenience at which they arrive.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] asks unanimous consent on this question that the Democrats shall have 35 minutes, the Republicans 25 minutes, and the Progressives 15 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman——

Mr. HENRY. I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. MURDOCK. Here is a serious proposition. At least, it is a serious one with us. One of the major propositions in the near future may be this very division of time. This is in the nature of things going to serve somewhat as a precedent. Now, is it not true that in a division of the time as between a majority and any number of a minority, with necessarily a like pressure upon both sides being had, there should be an equal division of time?

Mr. HENRY. This is not intended to be a precedent at all.

Mr. MURDOCK. But it is very apt to be, and I want to say to the gentleman that owing to the rules of the House—the peculiar rules that the gentleman is about to adopt—we are in the position not only of not having had time before they are adopted, but we may be cut out of a motion to commit after they are adopted; that is, if it is in the pleasure of the Chair; and so this is a precedent in which we are concerned.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. HENRY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the contention of the gentleman from Kansas is correct and this action is to be quoted as a precedent in the future, or relied upon as a precedent by the House, I shall myself object to the request made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], because I shall certainly insist at all times upon any material matter, when it is of importance to this House, that the majority of the House shall have one-half of the time. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, of course that is the intention. As I stated, we do not desire to make this a precedent. But inasmuch as I am warned from all sides that this side of the House will insist on having as much time as the two parts of the other side together, I shall make a request for unanimous consent that this side of the House be allowed 30 minutes' time, that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] shall have 15 minutes, that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] shall have 15 minutes, and that at the end of that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. GARDNER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BURKE] has already objected.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time may be divided so that 30 minutes shall be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], 25 minutes controlled by myself, and 15 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK]. I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that——

Mr. HENRY. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman is asking me to make that request?

Mr. GARDNER. No. I am making that request.

Mr. HENRY. I did not yield the floor for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BURKE] objected to the request.

Mr. GARDNER. He objected to the request of the gentleman from Texas, and then I took the floor in my own right.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows that, but the gentleman from Massachusetts could not take the floor in his own right until the gentleman from Texas yielded.

Mr. GARDNER. But the proposition of the gentleman from Texas had been negatived, and he would not have the floor for a new proposition.

The SPEAKER. This request for unanimous consent was a performance inside of the main one, upon which the gentleman from Texas had an hour.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas had not an hour. The rules have not been adopted giving him an hour.

Mr. HENRY. I decline to yield more time.

The SPEAKER. There is such a thing in the world as general parliamentary law.

Mr. GARDNER. But that is not included in general parliamentary law.

Mr. HENRY. I decline, Mr. Speaker, to yield further.

Mr. GARDNER. In fact, it is very doubtful, under general parliamentary law, whether he can yield at all. Four years ago the present occupant of the chair, in the famous fight alluded to a little while ago, refused to yield to anyone after he had once obtained the floor, for fear that he would lose it because the rules had not been adopted.

The SPEAKER. That is absolutely correct; but the rule is this, as the Chair understands it, that it takes unanimous consent to enable the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] to yield time. But he did have the right to yield to a question.

Mr. GARDNER. Precisely.

The SPEAKER. And he has yielded to a question, and that is all he undertook to yield to.

Mr. HENRY. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GARDNER. Precisely. But the gentleman from Texas has the floor to do what? To move, if he chooses to, the previous question or to debate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts whether the gentleman from Texas has not the right to debate his proposition before he moves the previous question?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; to debate the proposition before the previous question was moved; and, pending the moving of the previous question, he asked unanimous consent to make an arrangement about time. That unanimous consent was objected to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BURKE]. Thereupon I took the floor, the previous question not having been moved.

The SPEAKER. That proposition was simply incidental to the main proposition. The gentleman from Texas was trying to help you people out. That is the truth about it.

Mr. HENRY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard, and I decline to yield further at present.

Mr. GARDNER. But the gentleman has not the floor. The Chair has taken possession of the situation.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I have the floor and have never yielded it for a moment.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] will permit, the Chair will state that the gentleman from Texas had an hour. The Chair does not know what the gentleman from Massachusetts considers general parliamentary law, but the Chair will state what he considers general parliamentary law. In the main it is the rules of the last House. [Applause.]

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman wait until the Chair states this? Of course the Chair does not say that is all there is of general parliamentary law, but it is the last expression of the House of Representatives on what parliamentary law is. Now, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] got the floor for an hour, and he never yielded except for a question, and was still on his feet after this incidental matter was disposed of about the unanimous consent.

Mr. HENRY. Now, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. And the Chair thinks the gentleman from Texas is entitled to the floor.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Oregon rise?

Mr. LAFFERTY. I simply wish to aid the Chair, as he requested all Members to do a while ago, by saying that the precedent recites that the rules of the former House guide until the new rules are adopted.

Mr. HENRY. I decline to yield further.

Mr. Speaker, I have been endeavoring to give both sides of the House the opportunity to discuss this resolution. It never entered my mind for a moment that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] was engaging in parliamentary athletics in order to take the floor from under me. I have desired to make it possible for his side of the House to discuss this resolution, and for the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] and his colleagues to discuss it; but if there is to be any such spirit shown on that side of the House, I now demand the previous question on the resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his motion for a question, if there is to be no debate?

Mr. HENRY. I will withhold it.

Mr. LENROOT. I desire to ask the gentleman if he does not think the House at a later time should have some opportunity of considering all of the rules if it desires to do so; and may I ask the gentleman whether he will assure the House that if this resolution is adopted the Committee on Rules will, at a later time, give the House the opportunity of considering amendments to each and all of the rules?

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas will say this, that if Members desire to introduce amendments to every rule of this House, and those amendments are referred to the Committee on Rules, they will there be carefully and deliberately considered, with an abundance of time for each Member to present his views if he wishes to appear, and then the Committee on Rules will present a report to this House for its action, to adopt if it wishes to do so, or to vote it down if it desires to do so.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is to vote on the previous question.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts demands the previous question.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask for a division.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The yeas and nays are ordered. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to commit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon offers a motion to recommit.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Not to recommit, but to commit.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that is not in order now under general parliamentary law, the rules, or anything else.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Very well; I want to be heard on that question.

Mr. HARDWICK. I want to be heard, too.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY].

Mr. LAFFERTY. Referring to Rule XVII, under the title of "The previous question," it provides:

> There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered by a majority of the Members voting, if a quorum be present——

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the gentleman from Oregon reading from?

Mr. LAFFERTY. I am reading from the rules of the Sixty-second Congress which, under the precedents, govern this House until it adopts rules. That has been so held repeatedly.

The SPEAKER. It is in the discretion of the Chair to hear anybody he chooses to on any point of order.

Mr. LAFFERTY. And any authority that the Members desire to cite.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia made a point of order against the right of the gentleman from Oregon to make a motion to commit. The gentleman from Oregon will proceed.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Rule XVII provides:

> There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered by a majority of Members voting, if a quorum be present, shall have the effect to cut off all debate and bring the House to a direct vote upon the immediate question or questions on which it has been asked and ordered. The previous question may be asked and ordered upon a single motion, a series of motions allowable under the rules, or an amendment or amendments, or may be made to embrace all authorized motions or amendments and include the bill to its passage or rejection. It shall be in order, pending the motion for or after the previous question shall have been ordered on its passage, for the Speaker to entertain and submit a motion to commit, with or without instructions, to a standing or select committee.

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, this is a motion not to recommit but to commit the resolution of the gentleman from Texas to a select committee of seven Members, to be appointed by the Chair, with instructions to report the resolution back to the House with the following substitute, which I now ask to have read as a part of my remarks.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I desire to have the resolution reported.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that it is not in order to have the resolution reported.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Oregon wants it read as a part of his remarks.

Mr. SHERLEY. There are a lot of things that the gentleman may want to which he has no right. It is not in order to read the resolution when the question is as to whether such a motion is in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asked to have it read as a part of his remarks.

Mr. SHERLEY. But that does not make it in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. SHERLEY. He has the floor for the purpose of discussing the point or order, but not for the purpose of reading a motion which may or may not be in order.

Mr. MURDOCK. Would it not be possible for the gentleman from Oregon to read the resolution as a part of his remarks from his place on the floor?

Mr. SHERLEY. Not necessarily.

Mr. HENRY. The gentleman from Oregon is speaking by tolerance of the Speaker on the point of order, so long as the Speaker may choose to hear him, whether it be a minute or two minutes, but he can not go into the merits of the proposition at all until this point of order is decided. He proposes now not only to go into the merits but to offer a concrete proposition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood the gentleman from Oregon to ask that the document be read as a part of his remarks to throw light on the point of order.

Mr. HENRY. It might take two or three hours to read his document.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further at this time. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have sent to the Clerk's desk a motion to commit. I have read the rule under which I say the motion is in order, and as to whether this particular motion is that kind of a motion it is necessary to refer to the motion itself which I have sent to the Clerk's desk. I ask, therefore, to have my motion reported as a part of my remarks.

Mr. SHERLEY. But, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that when the gentleman rises to make a motion and his right to make that motion is challenged, that until his right to make the motion has been determined in the affirmative he has no right to have the motion read as a matter of right.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is inclined to think that that is correct. If the gentleman has anything more to say about his right to make a motion to commit, the Chair will hear him.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I simply state that the motion that I have offered is a motion to commit under the following language of the rule.

The SPEAKER. What is the rule?

Mr. LAFFERTY. I refer to the last sentence of Rule XVII.

The SPEAKER. That is as follows:

> It shall be in order, pending the motion for or after the previous question shall have been ordered on its passage, for the Speaker to entertain and submit a motion to commit, with or without instructions, to a standing or select committee.

Mr. LAFFERTY. That is all I have to say.

Mr. HARDWICK rose.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK].

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there is no question whatever that the point of order is good. The rules of general parliamentary law govern this House until it is organized, and certainly, although by analogy the rules of the last House might be applied as a part of general parliamentary law, they could have no application whatever when the proposition is to commit. In a body that has no committees, how can we commit to a committee?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. This is to commit to a special committee, not to a standing committee, and the rules of the House permit it.

Mr. HARDWICK. I thought at first it was to commit to the Committee on Rules, but it does not make any difference about that. Under general parliamentary law we have no special committees.

Mr. LAFFERTY. This is a committee to be appointed by the Speaker.

Mr. HARDWICK. And not only that, but the rule to which the gentleman refers applies only to the proposition to recommit, and that was put in there as a special privilege, that after the previous question was moved, the motion to recommit, under certain circumstances, would be in order. It seems to me that when we have no committees in this body a proposition to create committees is not in order pending a proposition that we shall determine what the general plan of organization is, and the pendency of the demand for the previous question thereon.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman's point seems to be that at this stage of the proceedings in the organization of the House there are no committees appointed.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is the idea.

Mr. MURDOCK. But as a matter of fact we have already appointed one committee to wait upon the President, and it is within the power of this body to appoint a select committee to consider the rules.

Mr. HARDWICK. We did that by unanimous consent, at least, implied.

The SPEAKER. If that contention of the gentleman from Georgia be correct, then we would have been tied up here until the end of the term if some gentleman desired to object.

Mr. HARDWICK. That may be true until we organized or adopted some rules to govern us.

The SPEAKER. And, further, that committee to wait upon the President was not appointed by unanimous consent.

Mr. HARDWICK. Then, if it is not true, Mr. Speaker, the only way in which it can be upheld is because it is a necessary part of the organization work of this House. The first thing in order is organization and the adoption of the rules. The proposition of the gentleman from Oregon, if in order now, might involve us in an endless snarl. How can we do that when the question is already pending whether or not we shall appoint all committees, because the rules provide for that?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman a question. If the rules of the last Congress are not general parliamentary law, then, under the proposition that he is arguing, what is general parliamentary law?

Mr. HARDWICK. General parliamentary law is entirely independent of the rules of the last Congress.

The SPEAKER. There must be such a thing—such an entity—as general parliamentary law. The gentleman from Georgia says that, according to general parliamentary law, this can not be done. Where is the authorization for that statement?

Mr. HARDWICK. It looks to me as though it comes from common sense. Motions must be determined one at a time, as they are made.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Political exigency.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Oklahoma rise?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I rise because I think I can make plain the proposition before the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. As this House stands now we have no written rules and we are working under general parliamentary law. General parliamentary law in America is such as has been modified by the practices of the House of Representatives. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY] introduced a motion which is sustained by the rules of the House, and which, under general parliamentary law, is a subsidiary motion.

The resolution provided a committee to which this could be sent, and it occurs to me that, under general parliamentary law as modified under the practice and rules of the House, the gentleman was in order when he introduced the resolution to commit to a special committee named in the resolution; therefore the point of order against him should not be sustained, since he is entirely in order. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Let us take this question first from the point of view of general parliamentary law without regard to the rules of the House. First a motion for the previous question is offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], and next a motion to commit is offered by the gentleman from Oregon. Under general parliamentary law the Chair would first put the motion which was first offered, to wit, the motion for the previous question. Certainly the gentleman from Oregon's motion could not be in order until the motion for the previous question had been dealt with, and I am by no means sure that it would be in order at all unless the previous question is negatived. Next let us take up the contention that we are proceeding under the rules of the last House of Representatives. Where do we find ourselves? The rules of the House give a certain definite order of precedence for permissible motions when a bill or resolution is under debate. The rules, for example, give to the motion to lay on the table a precedence over the motion for the previous question even though the latter motion comes first in point of time. In order of precedence first comes the motion to adjourn, next the motion to lay on the table, next the motion for the previous question. The motion to commit, the motion to postpone, and the motion to amend all must give way to the motions of higher precedence which I have enumerated. It is of no importance under the rules of

the House whether or not these motions are made before or after the other motions. In any case they must give way.

The Chair will recollect that when the immigration bill was up in the last Congress the motion to postpone was made. It was followed by a motion for the previous question and then by the motion to lay on the table.

Under the rules of the House, as a matter of fact, the Chair in putting the question was obliged exactly to reverse the order in which the motions were offered.

Under the rules the motion for the previous question takes precedence over the motion to commit or recommit or refer. That is undisputed. Now, there are two motions to recommit. One of them is the motion to recommit after the previous question is ordered on the passage of a bill. That is not the case in this instance. The previous question is not yet ordered. We are dealing, therefore, with the ordinary motion to recommit, which may be offered pending the motion for the previous question. It may be offered at the present time, without a doubt, but the previous question must be voted on first, because the previous question has a higher precedence under our rules than the motion to commit. If the previous question is voted down, then the question would recur on the motion of the gentleman from Oregon; that is, supposing him to be correct in his contention that the rules of the House, practically speaking, are in force. I have no precedent to cite, as the matter comes up unexpectedly.

The SPEAKER. Before anybody else proceeds let us get at the status of this matter.

Mr. CARLIN. That is exactly what I wanted to get at.

I think before the Speaker can rule upon this question he should get at exactly the status of the situation.

Now, what is before the House? It is a motion to adopt the rules of the Sixty-second Congress as the rules of this Congress, and upon that motion the previous question is moved. Now, after the previous question is moved it would be impossible to move an amendment; it would be impossible to move a substitute or a committal.

What have we before the House? We have a substitute for a set of rules that have been moved to be adopted under the guise of a motion to recommit.

Mr. LAFFERTY. That is the only way it can be done.

Mr. CARLIN. It provides practically for recommittal, for it provides for the report to be immediately made back to this House by the special committee adopting not the rules before the House by motion, but a substitute for those rules that are before the House by a motion. It can not be done. It is simply a parliamentary impossibility.

The SPEAKER. Why can it not be done?

Mr. CARLIN. For the reason that it is in violation of parliamentary practice. If you could not move to amend, and if you could not move to substitute, then the paper here is clearly subject to a point of order, because that is exactly what the gentleman moves to do. He moves to substitute a set of rules which he himself has drafted for the set of rules upon which debate has been closed by the previous question.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Speaker hear me for a moment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think this is a very fair statement of the situation: I call the attention of the Chair to clause 4 of Rule XVI, which provides:

> When a question is under debate no motion shall be received but to adjourn, to lay on the table, for the previous question (which motions shall be decided without debate), to postpone to a day certain, to refer—

And that is what the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY] moves, no matter what he calls it.

Mr. LAFFERTY. No; to recommit.

Mr. HARDWICK. I read further:

> To refer, or to amend, or postpone indefinitely; which several motions shall have precedence in the foregoing order.

In other words, the proposition that the gentleman makes under general parliamentary law does not take precedence of the motion made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], because it is made at a subsequent period of time. It is not in order under the rules of the House as a part of general parliamentary law, because it violates the precedence under which these several motions are in order. No matter what the gentleman calls his motion, it is a motion to refer.

The SPEAKER. There is not any question in the world about its being a motion to refer.

Mr. HARDWICK. Therefore the motion for the previous question, having been first made, must, under the general principles of parliamentary law, be first determined. On the other hand, if it be considered, as the Speaker suggests, that on this matter the rules of the last House constitute a part of the general parliamentary law that is to govern us, then under the clause of the rule I have cited the motion of the gentleman from Texas, demanding the previous question, takes precedence over the motion to refer made by the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the defect of the position of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY] lies in the assumption that all the rules of a previous House constitute the general parliamentary law. That is not, in my judgment, true. This has been held true, that where a practice has grown up in the House or where a rule has been made which is in accordance with what has been general parliamentary practice, then in considering what is the general parliamentary law the rules or practice of a former House will be considered. But to say that the rules of a former House are, as a matter of necessity, general parliamentary law——

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow me an interruption right there?

Mr. SHERLEY. Just a moment, until I finish a sentence. To say that the rules of a former House are, as a matter of necessity, parliamentary law is to say what is certainly and necessarily untrue, because there are a great many rules of the House which are made to fit particular conditions only, and to which they are adapted only because of those conditions. When the condition no longer exists the rule would be an absurdity. For example, we have rules in regard to committees which would manifestly be absurd now to invoke, because there are now no committees.

Now, going back to the question of general parliamentary law, I submit to the Chair this proposition, that the very purpose of the previous question is to cut off debate and to bring the House to the consideration of the particular motion upon which the previous question is moved.

I submit to the Chair the further proposition that the motion to refer, particularly the motion to refer with instructions, is under general parliamentary law a debatable motion. Therefore it follows that if it be in order, after the motion for the previous question, to make a motion to refer, which in turn is debatable, you have then destroyed the entire purpose of the motion for the previous question, and have made it absolutely null.

Now, the trouble with the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY] is that he is assuming that an arbitrary determination of precedence of motions, which is found in the rule that he recites, is the ordinary rule that existed under general parliamentary law. It was just because it was not the ordinary rule that the House passed that special rule. It was because without that special rule, after the motion for the previous question had been made, it would not have been in order to make a motion to recommit, with or without instructions, and it becomes in order by virtue of the special rule which was made to fit a particular case, and that case was not at all analogous to this. That was a case where a matter had been considered by a committee, considered then by the House, and was on its final passage, and in order that there might be presented an affirmative proposition desired by the other side, which was very different from the situation here.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. In just a moment. The question here arises where we are trying to adopt rules for the House. Now, the House ought to have a way of determining directly whether it wants to vote on that first affirmative motion. The only way it can do that is by voting up the previous question. The gentleman has his remedy, or, rather, the House has its remedy. If a majority of the House want to consider the proposition of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY], it has a very simple and expeditious way of doing it, and that way is by voting down the motion for the previous question. Then the gentleman from Texas will lose the floor and the gentleman from Oregon will obtain the floor as a matter of course, and then it will be in order to make his motion. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma for a question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask both gentlemen to suspend for a moment.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT.

Messrs. UNDERWOOD, FITZGERALD, and MANN, the committee appointed on the part of the House to wait on the President, appeared at the bar of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the committee appointed by the House to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the House is organized and to ask him whether he desires to communicate to the House, wish to report

that they have performed that duty, accompanied by a like committee from the Senate; and the President of the United States desires us to report to the House that he will be glad to deliver his message to the House in person to-morrow. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The committee is discharged.

THE RULES.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, will the gentleman from Oklahoma ask his question?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I submit to the gentleman, if the motion for the previous question should be put and carried, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY] having moved to commit to a special committee with instructions, would it violate the rule that debate is closed by the motion for the previous question if the vote was immediately taken upon that motion to commit without debate? I apprehend that the Chair would rule as the proper method that we should immediately go to a vote on the motion to commit to a committee with instructions. If that is voted down, then in that case we would immediately take the vote without debate upon the question submitted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman has asked me a question. I can illustrate it——

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma a question, and then he would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. The way this matter stands is this: The yeas and nays have been ordered on the motion for the previous question. Suppose the yeas have it, and the previous question is ordered; then, does the gentleman from Oklahoma contend that the gentleman from Oregon would have a right to make a motion to commit?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I contend that he has the floor, then, with the right to move to commit to a standing committee if there were one. But there being no standing committee, he has the right to move to commit to a special committee; and in view of the fact that the previous question had been carried, the vote would be taken immediately upon that motion to commit without debate, and if carried it disposes of the resolution. If it fail, then in that case you would take the vote upon the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] without debate.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the Chair will permit me, the motion to refer is a debatable motion. The fact that the gentleman says he does not think anybody will want to debate it has nothing to do with the parliamentary question. It is a debatable motion. The only way to cut off that debate would be to move the previous question upon it. But according to the gentleman's theory of the previous question it is not for the purpose of bringing the House to the consideration of the first matter. The trouble is, I repeat, that gentlemen confuse the order of precedence of motions under the rule of the last House—a rule passed for a specific purpose—with the order of precedence of motions under general parliamentary law; and I submit that the burden is upon them of showing that under general parliamentary law, after the motion for the previous question has been made, it is then in order to move to refer, which is the same as the motion to commit. Now, if that be so, you get to no objective, and the very purpose of a motion for the previous question is to bring the House immediately to the consideration of the motion upon which it is acting.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Kentucky a question. Suppose the Chair holds that the motion of the gentleman from Oregon is out of order, the yeas prevail in this vote for the previous question, and the previous question is ordered. Then does the gentleman from Kentucky think that the gentleman from Oregon has no right to make the motion?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think not; and that is the purpose of the previous question. His remedy is to vote down the previous question. You must not confuse his desire with his right. If he has not got votes enough, that is his misfortune.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Then, why would it not be the remedy of the minority to vote down the previous question on a tariff bill, and why should not they be excluded from a motion to recommit?

Mr. SHERLEY. Because in the wisdom of the House they sought by the adoption of a special rule to change the usual parliamentary law.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, we are doing business under general parliamentary law. We are not concerned with citations from antecedent rules of the House simply because those rules are not operative under present conditions. If the gentleman from Oregon had obtained the floor a little sooner than he actually did, it would have been in order for him to make a motion to commit, and in connection with and as a part of that motion to create a special committee. It is competent for this House, conforming to general parliamentary law, to do business in the way it prefers, and if a motion to commit is in order at any particular time, to create a special committee as a part of that motion. But the gentleman from Oregon allowed his opportunity to pass.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Oh, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Was there any time when the gentleman from Texas would have yielded for a motion to commit or refer?

Mr. SAUNDERS. That was the misfortune of the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. LAFFERTY. There was no opportunity.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That may be true.

Mr. LAFFERTY. The gentleman said I had the opportunity.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I said that the gentleman had missed his opportunity.

Mr. LAFFERTY. You can not miss an opportunity that you never had.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Will the gentleman let me make my statement in my own time, and in my own way. The gentleman said he had no opportunity. Be that as it may, the motion for the previous question precluded him from making his motion. I will put the case in that way if my friend prefers.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I understand that the Speaker has ruled that the motion can not be made.

The SPEAKER. No; the Speaker has made no such ruling.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The Speaker has made no ruling, and I am addressing myself to the very point of order before the House, namely, that the motion to commit is not now in order.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman from Virginia say about the precedence of these two motions?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I was on the point of stating that by reason of the fact that under general parliamentary law the motion for the previous question is a superior motion to a motion to commit, and the motion for the previous question having been made, the inferior motion can not be used to displace the superior motion and avoid its effect. I maintain that on this ground the motion of the gentleman from Oregon is out of order. It may be an unfortunate situation from his standpoint, but none the less his motion is not in order under general parliamentary law.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the question was asked during this debate this afternoon what was general parliamentary law, and, if I heard correctly, the Speaker responded that it was in large part determined and controlled by what were the rules and the practices of the House.

Mr. SHERLEY. Not in all particulars.

Mr. MURDOCK. No; but in a large part.

The SPEAKER. What the Chair said was that to a large extent he would accept the rules of the House of the Sixty-second Congress as general parliamentary law, on general parliamentary propositions. Now, what is the status of this matter? Is there any general parliamentary rule that gives a motion to commit precedence over a motion for the previous question where the motion for the previous question is made?

Mr. MURDOCK. By the rules and practice of the House, yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. But that is not the practice. That is a rule.

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, but it is the practice of the House.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withdraw my motion until the vote is put on the previous question. Then I shall renew it, with the permission of the House.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman takes me off my feet, I desire to say that this rule specifies that there shall be a motion to commit, pending or after the previous question has been ordered, with or without instructions, so that there is great latitude in this matter of a motion to commit. If the practice of the House determines parliamentary law generally, and it does in large part determine general parliamentary law, then we are entitled to make this motion.

The SPEAKER. Is not the universal rule with general or special parliamentary law that the motion for the previous question is superior to the motion to commit?

Mr. MURDOCK. There was a time in the world when it was; but it is not so to-day, because we have modified general parliamentary practice by the practices of this House.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, may I submit this authority?

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is nothing before the House except the motion for the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his motion, and the question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the order by which the yeas and nays were ordered and to take the vote by rising, without any other intervening motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to vacate the order by which the yeas and nays were ordered and to take the vote by rising, without any other intervening motion. Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas objects, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 244, nays 122, not voting 65, as follows:

YEAS—244.

Abercrombie	Dies	Igoe	Raker
Adamson	Difenderfer	Jacoway	Rauch
Alexander	Dixon	Johnson, Ky.	Rayburn
Allen	Donohoe	Johnson, S. C.	Reed
Ashbrook	Doughton	Keating	Reilly, Conn.
Bailey	Driscoll	Kettner	Reilly, Wis.
Baker	Dupré	Kindel	Richardson
Barkley	Eagan	Kinkead, N. J.	Riordan
Bartlett	Eagle	Kirkpatrick	Roddenbery
Bathrick	Edwards	Kitchin	Rothermel
Beakes	Elder	Konig	Rouse
Beall, Tex.	Estopinal	Konop	Rubey
Bell, Ga.	Evans	Korbly	Rucker
Blackmon	Fergusson	Lazaro	Russell
Booher	Ferris	Lee, Ga.	Sabath
Borchers	Fields	Lee, Pa.	Saunders
Borland	Fitzgerald	Lesher	Scully
Bowdle	FitzHenry	Lever	Seldomridge
Bremner	Flood, Va.	Levy	Sharp
Brockson	Floyd, Ark.	Lieb	Sherley
Brodbeck	Foster	Linthicum	Sherwood
Broussard	Fowler	Lloyd	Sims
Brown, W. Va.	Francis	Lobeck	Sisson
Bruckner	Gallagher	Logue	Slayden
Brumbaugh	Gard	Lonergan	Small
Buchanan	Garner	McAndrews	Smith, Md.
Bulkley	Garrett, Tenn.	McCoy	Smith, Tex.
Burgess	Garrett, Tex.	McDermott	Sparkman
Burke, Wis.	Gerry	McGillicuddy	Stedman
Burnett	Gilmore	McKellar	Stephens, Nebr.
Byrnes, S. C.	Gittins	Madden	Stephens, Tex.
Byrns, Tenn.	Glass	Maguire, Nebr.	Stone
Callaway	Godwin, N. C.	Mahan	Stout
Candler	Goeke	Martin, N. J.	Stringer
Caraway	Goldfogle	Metz	Taggart
Carew	Gordon	Montague	Talcott, N. Y.
Carlin	Gorman	Moon	Tavenner
Carter	Goulden	Morgan, La.	Taylor, Ark.
Casey	Graham, Ill.	Morrison	Taylor, Colo.
Church	Griffin	Moss, Ind.	Taylor, N. Y.
Clancy	Gudger	Murray, Mass.	Ten Eyck
Clark, Fla.	Hamill	Murray, Okla.	Thacher
Claypool	Hamlin	Neeley	Thomas
Clayton	Hammond	O'Brien	Thompson, Okla.
Collier	Hardwick	Oglesby	Townsend
Connelly, Kans.	Hardy	O'Hair	Tribble
Connolly, Iowa	Harrison, Miss.	Oldfield	Tuttle
Conry	Harrison, N. Y.	O'Leary	Underhill
Covington	Hay	O'Shaunessy	Underwood
Cox	Heflin	Padgett	Vaughan
Crisp	Helm	Page	Walker
Cullop	Henry	Palmer	Watkins
Curley	Hensley	Pepper	Watson
Dale	Hill	Peters	Weaver
Davenport	Holland	Peterson	Whitacre
Davis, W. Va.	Houston	Phelan	Williams
Decker	Howard	Post	Wilson, Fla.
Deitrick	Hoxworth	Pou	Wilson, N. Y.
Dent	Hughes, Ga.	Quin	Wingo
Dershem	Hull	Ragsdale	Witherspoon
Dickinson	Humphreys, Miss.	Rainey	Young, Tex.

NAYS—122.

Ainey	Donovan	Hinds	Miller
Anderson	Doolittle	Hinebaugh	Moore
Austin	Dunn	Hulings	Morgan, Okla.
Avis	Dyer	Humphrey, Wash.	Morin
Barchfeld	Edmonds	Johnson, Wash.	Moss, W. Va.
Bartholdt	Esch	Kahn	Mott
Barton	Fairchild	Keister	Murdock
Bell, Cal.	Falconer	Kelley, Mich.	Nolan
Britten	Farr	Kelly, Pa.	Patton, Pa.
Browne, Wis.	Fess	Kent	Payne
Browning	Fordney	Kiess, Pa.	Platt
Bryan	Frear	Knowland	Plumley
Burke, Pa.	French	Kreider	Powers
Burke, S. Dak.	Gardner	Lafferty	Roberts, Nev.
Butler	Good	La Follette	Rogers
Calder	Goodwin, Me.	Langham	Rupley
Campbell	Graham, Pa.	Langley	Scott
Cary	Green, Iowa	Lenroot	Shreve
Chandler	Greene, Mass.	Lewis, Pa.	Sinnott
Cooper	Greene, Vt.	Lindbergh	Slemp
Copley	Griest	Lindquist	Sloan
Cramton	Hamilton, Mich.	McKenzie	Smith, Idaho
Crosser	Hawley	Manahan	Smith, J. M. C.
Curry	Hayes	Mann	Smith, Saml. W.
Davis, Minn.	Helgesen	Mapes	Stafford
Dillon	Helvering	Martin, S. Dak.	Steenerson
Stephens, Cal.	Thomson, Ill.	Wallin	Woodruff
Stevens, Minn.	Towner	Walters	Woods
Sutherland	Treadway	Wilder	Young, N. Dak.
Switzer	Vare	Willis	
Temple	Volstead	Winslow	

NOT VOTING—65.

Adair	Gillett	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Shackleford
Aiken	Goodwin, Ark.	L'Engle	Smith, Minn.
Ansberry	Gray	Lewis, Md.	Smith, N. Y.
Anthony	Gregg	McClellan	Stanley
Aswell	Guernsey	McGuire, Okla.	Stephens, Miss.
Baltz	Hamilton, N. Y.	McLaughlin	Stevens, N. H.
Barnhart	Haugen	Maher	Sullivan
Brown, N. Y.	Hayden	Merritt	Sumners
Cantrill	Hobson	Mondell	Talbott, Md.
Carr	Howell	Nelson	Taylor, Ala.
Cline	Hughes, W. Va.	Norton	Walsh
Danforth	Johnson, Utah	Parker	Webb
Dooling	Jones	Patten, N. Y.	White
Doremus	Kennedy, Conn.	Porter	Young, Mich.
Faison	Kennedy, Iowa	Prouty	
Finley	Kennedy, R. I.	Roberts, Mass.	
George	Key, Ohio	Sells	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. ANSBERRY with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. AIKEN with Mr. MERRITT.

Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. MONDELL.

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. GREGG with Mr. PARKER.

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. MCLAUGHLIN.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. PETERS with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.

Mr. BROWN of New York with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. SMITH of Minnesota.

Mr. ASWELL with Mr. YOUNG of Michigan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the motion to recommit, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend on that proposition for a moment. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO-MORROW.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to offer a resolution arranging for a joint session of Congress for the purpose of receiving the President of the United States to-morrow. The reason I ask to interrupt the proceedings now is that the Senate is waiting for us to act upon the resolution.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I understand, of course, that immediately after its passage, we go back to the other business.

The SPEAKER. Certainly. Is there objection to the motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 1.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, the 8th day of April, 1913, at 12.30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was adopted.

THE RULES.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the——

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the motion which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the only matter now before the House is the original question upon which the previous question is ordered—the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY]—and that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY] is not in order.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, this question has been presented quite thoroughly and I do not desire to weary the Speaker or the House with remarks to any extent at this time. The question resolves itself into the single question as to whether this House is now governed by the rules of the last House. If general parliamentary law is in force in this House until rules shall be adopted, then the motion to recommit to a select committee to be appointed by the Chair at this stage is not in order. But if the recent ruling of the Speaker that until rules are adopted the rules of the last preceding House shall obtain, and includes all rules of the last preceding House, then under this ruling the motion would be in order. But it shall be in order, pending the motion or after the previous question shall be ordered on its passage, for the Speaker to entertain a motion to commit or recommit with reference to a proper committee.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY] seems to be reading from the same little almanac he read from a little while ago. Mr. Speaker, the House is proceeding now under general parliamentary law and not under the rules of the former Congress, because if it were proceeding under the rules of the former Congress it would not be possible to adopt those rules now, and the question we have just adopted was adopted under the general law of Jefferson's Manual. When I had the floor a moment ago, I moved the previous question. I read from page 185 of the Manual and Digest:

After the previous question shall have been ordered on the passage of a bill or joint resolution one motion to recommit shall be in order, and the Speaker shall give preference in recognition for such purpose to a Member who is opposed to the bill or joint resolution.

The gentleman refers to the rules of a former Congress, which are not in effect now.

When any question is before the House, any Member may move a previous question, "Whether that question (called the main question) shall now be put?" If it pass in the affirmative, then the main question is to be put immediately, and no man may speak anything further to it, either to add or alter.

The previous question being moved and seconded, the question from the Chair shall be, "Shall the main question be now put?" and if the nays prevail, the main question shall not then be put.

Mr. Speaker, in that regard the Rule XVI, clause 14, departed from the parliamentary law and superseded those principles to a certain extent.

If this resolution which I have offered, and upon which the previous question has been ordered, is adopted, then the rule will be in effect, and not until then. And that is all there is in the proposition until we have disposed of the resolution.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY] said that the question is whether the rules of the last House are still in force.

I think the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY] is somewhat in error as to his own position upon this question. There was a time when the rules of the House specifically provided that they should remain in force in the next House until the House had otherwise provided; and yet it was determined by the House that no rule adopted by one House would be binding in the next House inasmuch as the Constitution provides that the House shall make its own rules.

But, Mr. Speaker, pending the adoption of the rules of the House the general principles of parliamentary law are in force, and it has been frequently held that the best example of what is ordinary parliamentary practice is the practice and the rules of this body—the greatest parliamentary body on earth. [Applause.]

If I may, I will refer to a statement made by Mr. Speaker Reed, in which he said:

I believe in this country an assembly like this, coming together without special rules, would necessarily be remitted to the common parliamentary law, or what I should perhaps more properly call the common legislative law of the country, the foundation of which is found in Jefferson's Manual, and which has been modified by the general action of American legislative assemblies, especially by the action of this legislative body.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly plain that those portions of the rules which provide for the appointment of special committees are not general parliamentary rules or practice, generally speaking, but where, under the rules which have been in force in the House, there have been decisions by Speakers that certain rules of the House were to be considered as general parliamentary law in the absence of the adoption of specific rules, then that practice or those rules in the House have become general parliamentary law. And although my distinguished friend from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY] has failed to find the precedents which establish his proposition, I will endeavor to convey them to the Speaker unless he has already had them.

In Hinds' Precedents, section 6758, a question arose as to the right, after the previous question was ordered, to refer a matter to a committee, and the Chair held:

The practice of the House heretofore decided by the Chair will prevail in ordinary legislative proceedings, and the gentleman's motion to refer to the committee is in order, notwithstanding the previous question has been ordered.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry there?

Mr. MANN. In a minute I will.

Mr. SHERLEY. I wanted to make it in connection with the gentleman's precedent. Does the citation show at what stage in the House's history the question arose?

Mr. MANN. This was before the rules of the House were adopted.

Mr. SHERLEY. I wanted to find out whether that is clearly shown.

Mr. MANN. That was before the rules of the House were adopted, and we are not without distinguished Democratic authority on this subject. One of the greatest Speakers who ever illuminated parliamentary law in this or any other body was Speaker Crisp, of Georgia, whose son is an expert parliamentarian, and whom we are proud to welcome as a Member on the floor of the House. [Applause.] In the Precedents, in section 5604, volume 5, is the general heading:

Before the adoption of rules, while the House was acting under general parliamentary law, it was held that the motion to commit was in order pending the motion for the previous question or after it had been ordered on a resolution.

Under that I quote:

On August 8, 1893, before the adoption of rules, Mr. Charles T. O'Ferrall, of Virginia, called up a resolution providing that George F. Richardson "be now sworn in as a Representative in this Congress from the fifth district of the State of Michigan.

To this an amendment by way of substitute was offered, and upon the resolution and substitute the previous question was demanded.

Mr. Dingley, of Maine, moved to commit the resolution to a special committee of five.

Mr. O'Ferrall made the point of order that the motion of Mr. Dingley was not in order, inasmuch as the previous question had been demanded upon the resolution submitted by him.

The Speaker, Charles F. Crisp, of Georgia, overruled the point of order on the ground that under parliamentary law as indicated by the rules and practice prevailing in the House of the Congresses preceding the present, the motion to commit was in order pending the demand for the previous question or after the previous question is ordered on agreeing to the resolution.

That distinguished Speaker has decided the question that the motion to commit or the motion to recommit is in order under general parliamentary law, which is binding upon parliamentary bodies before it has been written into the specific rules of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY rose.

The SPEAKER. Before the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky, the Chair will ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] what is the paragraph containing the Reed ruling which the gentleman first read?

Mr. MANN. Section 6758.

The SPEAKER. No; that was Mr. Carlisle's statement.

Mr. MANN. Yes. Section 6763, on the next page following the Carlisle decision, is the Reed opinion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just read the two precedents cited by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and I agree with him that they are in point; but I beg to submit, with all proper humility, that the decisions were not well founded in reason.

I recognize the futility of undertaking to answer two such great authorities as Speaker Crisp and Speaker Carlisle——

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I would agree with the gentleman if this were a new proposition, that was not to be considered as general parliamentary law; but the question having been decided, that settles it.

Mr. SHERLEY. That raises another question which I wanted to come to. The gentleman admits, and I believe those who will study the philosophy of parliamentary law will admit, that the rules which are acknowledged are not the arbitrary judgments of individual men. They follow a well-known general fundamental idea, and that general fundamental idea is to give to a majority of the House control over any and every matter that comes before it, to enable that majority either to hear debate on a matter or to dispense with debate on a matter, to vote immediately on a question without amendment, or to vote on it after amendments have been proposed.

Now, the very meaning of the previous question was, "Shall the original question be put?"

In its original form the proposition was in those exact words, and it was held that where it was voted not to order the previous question—in other words, not to put the question—you could not subsequently consider the question during a session.

Then the previous question was held to mean "Shall the previous question be now put?" and it was held that when it was affirmatively voted, then the proposition was to now put the original question. When it was voted down, then the House was at liberty to proceed with other motions than the original one. That was the logic of it; that was the reason of it. It is the reason to-day for the previous question.

This House in previous Congresses, for the sake of giving to certain minorities opportunity to express in an affirmative way their views, have seen fit to allow the motion to refer or to commit, as gentlemen speak of it, to be made even after a vote for the previous question; but that was because of the condition

that surrounded the House after the adoption of rules which gave certain specific rights to majorities and to minorities. But under general law a ruling such as has been made, even though made by distinguished authorities, would deny to the previous question the very purpose for which it came into creation.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] says he would agree with me if this was an original proposition. We are then confronted with the question in this House whether these precedents shall be followed, because they are precedents. I believe I have a proper respect for precedent. I recognize that an adherence to it in a general sense is necessary for the stability of all law, parliamentary or other. But it is perfectly apparent that the effect of this motion, so far as present legislative action is concerned, will not be changed, no matter what the ruling may be, and I say that is apparent, because if gentlemen had ever been in a position to vote up their affirmative proposition they would have been in a position to have voted down the previous question a few minutes ago when they undertook to do it. They were not able to do that, and they will not be able to vote up their affirmative proposition. But we have an opportunity to get away from an illogical precedent at a time when the ruling will not affect the result in this House. It will not do to say that the previous question under general parliamentary law does not mean what it expressly says, because instead of using the old form, "Shall the original question now be put?" it uses the words "previous question." The House voted that the original proposal should be put——

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has recited the evolution of the previous question. The previous question formerly did mean something that it does not mean to-day. In the same way I want to point out that there was a day when the motion to lay a motion on the table was merely a temporary postponement of action, but to-day a motion to lay a proposition on the table is final. Now, the previous question has taken on through the years an entirely different nature than it had in the beginning. Does not the gentleman concede that there has been a modification of the original drastic nature of the previous question?

Mr. SHERLEY. No.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the former Speakers have so ruled, and the Speaker to-day has so held.

Mr. SHERLEY. If it was, there would not be the necessity for affirmative action. The very fact of the rule which the gentleman relies on, and the language of it, is evidence that the people who drew it recognized that without it the right would not exist. Now, if there be some reasoning that can be advanced in favor if it, all right; but what have we here? We have the distinguished authority of two great names, Speaker Crisp and Speaker Carlisle, both so holding, and no one stating why they so held.

I again submit, with a perfect consciousness that my effort will be in vain, that the ruling is contrary to the very purpose of the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky a question. The House found itself some years ago in a situation which it determined to rid itself of, and then, to get rid of the situation that it did not like, it made it imperative on the Speaker to recognize a Member of the minority preferably to make a motion to recommit after the third reading, even where the previous question has been ordered on a bill and all amendments to final passage. Now, is not the contention of the gentleman from Oregon analogous to that rule in this case?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not discussing, and I do not think it is fair to turn the question upon what rule ought to exist. The House has seen fit heretofore, and will see fit upon the adoption of the motion of the gentleman from Texas, to give to the gentleman from Oregon a right to make such a motion, but the question now before the Chair is whether in the absence of a rule he has such a right. I say that he has not, notwithstanding the precedents, because to say that he shall have the right is to deny the purpose of the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The rule about the motion to recommit was intended for the purpose of giving the minority the chance to have its proposition voted upon. If that is true, what is the reason the minority has not as much right to have it voted upon before the rule is adopted?

Mr. SHERLEY. There are many rights the minority has under the rules adopted by the House that it would not have under general parliamentary law. For instance, it may have the right under the rules to a certain numerical representation on committees, but under the general parliamentary law there is no rule by which the Chair would be compelled to give certain representations to the minority on committees.

The SPEAKER. Another question; the general parliamentary law has been decided by at least three great Speakers, Mr. Crisp, Mr. Reed, and Mr. Carlisle, to be the parliamentary law as modified by legislative experience in the United States. If that is true, does not a rule that has prevailed in the House a good while and the rulings upon it become a part of the general parliamentary law?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think if the statement of the Chair was true in its entirety it would, but I do not think it is true. I do not think the statement of Mr. Reed which was read by the gentleman from Illinois warrants so broad an assertion, but it states that certain practices of the House were indicative of parliamentary law. It does not imply that every rule of the House becomes a part of the parliamentary law, but may become a part of it because of the reason for it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair desires to call to the attention of the whole membership of the House the first two or three sentences in Jefferson's Manual:

> Mr. Onslow, the ablest among the speakers of the House of Commons, used to say "It was a maxim he had often heard when he was a young man from old and experienced members that nothing tended more to throw power into the hands of administration and those who acted with the majority of the House of Commons than a neglect of or departure from the rules of proceeding; that these forms as instituted by our ancestors operated as a check and control on the actions of the majority, and that they were in many instances a shelter and protection to the minority against the attempts of power."

Jefferson goes on to indorse that. The Chair would not feel that he is slavishly bound to follow the decisions of any Speaker, or even of all Speakers, if he were certain that he was right; but some things come to be a settled practice in this country. For instance, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the present occupant of the chair have frequently talked privately about the word "amendments" as used in the Constitution with respect to the power of the Senate to propose them to revenue bills which must originate in the House. The Senate has the right to amend revenue bills. Privately the gentleman and I agreed—and we agree now, no doubt—that that phraseology giving the Senate the power to amend a revenue bill never meant originally that the Senate should have the right to strike out everything after the enacting clause in a revenue bill and substitute an entirely new bill. Yet that very situation arose at the beginning of the first session of the last Congress, or shortly after it was organized. The gentleman from Illinois then raised that very point. The present occupant of the chair overruled his point, but stated in overruling it that if he had been the Speaker of the first House and that same point had been raised he would have sustained it, but that for 122 years the Senate had proceeded upon the theory—and the House had acquiesced in it—that the Senate had that power, and it became a settled practice.

As the Chair stated a while ago the House some years ago concluded that there ought to be a provision in the rules by which a Member by a motion to recommit could always get a vote upon his proposition. The Chair believes that is right, and he believes that all of these decisions by Mr. Speaker Carlisle, Mr. Speaker Crisp, and Mr. Speaker Reed are right. The first one—and by the way the Chair will state that it was the first thing that ever happened after he came into Congress 20 years ago—is the decision by Mr. Speaker Crisp on a point of order made by Mr. O'Ferrall, afterwards governor of Virginia. The Chair reads from Hinds' Precedents, volume 5, section 5604:

> On August 8, 1893, before the adoption of rules, Mr. Charles T. O'Ferrall, of Virginia, called up a resolution providing that George F. Richardson "be now sworn in as a Representative in this Congress from the fifth district of the State of Michigan."
>
> To this Mr. Julius C. Burrows, of Michigan, had submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute.
>
> Upon the resolution and substitute Mr. O'Ferrall demanded the previous question, the question being on ordering the previous question on the resolution submitted by Mr. O'Ferrall, including the amendment thereto proposed by Mr. Burrows.
>
> Mr. Nelson Dingley, jr., of Maine, moved to commit the resolution to a special committee of five, with instructions to report thereon within 10 days.
>
> Mr. O'Ferrall thereupon submitted the point of order that the motion of Mr. Dingley was not in order, inasmuch as the previous question had been demanded upon the resolution submitted by him, including the amendment thereto submitted by Mr. Burrows.
>
> The Speaker overruled the point of order on the ground that under parliamentary law as indicated by the rules and practice prevailing in the House of the Congresses preceding the present the motion to commit was in order pending the demand for the previous question or after the previous question is ordered on agreeing to the resolution.

The Speaker in that instance was Mr. Speaker Crisp, as level-headed a man as ever sat in this chair. It will be a long time before there are as many great names connected with one decision as there are with that one.

Quoting further from Hinds' Precedents, volume 5, section 6758:

Before rules are adopted the House is governed by general parliamentary law, but the Speakers have been inclined to give weight to the precedents of the House in modifying the usual constructions of that law.

Before the adoption of rules the motion to commit has been admitted after the ordering of the previous question.

On December 12, 1887, before rules had been adopted by the House, a resolution was presented relating to the certificate of election of Owen G. Chase, claiming to be elected a Delegate from the Territory of Cimarron.

Mr. Ransom Dunham, of Illinois, rising to a parliamentary inquiry, asked how the resolution could be in order.

The Speaker replied:

Under the general parliamentary law of the country, which permits the introduction of a proposition whenever a gentleman is recognized for that purpose, it is for the House, of course, to say what it will do with the proposition. It may refer it to a committee, lay it upon the table, or refuse to pass upon it in any shape.

Again, on the same day, the previous question was ordered on a resolution of inquiry relating to the examination of a certain harbor, which had been presented.

Mr. James H. Blount, of Georgia, having proposed a motion to refer the resolution, the Speaker said:

The practice of the House heretofore decided by the Chair will prevail in ordinary legislative proceedings, and the gentleman's motion to refer to the committee is in order, notwithstanding the previous question has been ordered.

That was a decision by Mr. Speaker John G. Carlisle, and certainly he ranks among the great Speakers.

It turns out that Mr. Speaker Reed's dictum, which agrees substantially with these two decisions, was made in an argument upon the floor of the House when he was not Speaker, but he took the same identical ground that these two great Speakers take, and so there are three.

The Chair overrules the point of order and recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY].

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the resolution reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk proceeded to report the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman was going to offer, or proposed to offer, a motion to refer. There is no such motion yet reported.

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair supposed.

Mr. LAFFERTY. The Clerk did not report the motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. LAFFERTY: I offer the following as a substitute for the pending resolution:

I move to commit the resolution to a select committee, to be appointed by the Speaker, to be composed of seven members, with instructions to report back to the House as a substitute therefor, together with the views and recommendations of said select committee, a resolution in substance as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second Congress, except Rule 31, be adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third Congress, with the following amendments thereto:

FIRST.

PROVIDING FOR YEA-AND-NAY VOTES AND A RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS IN ALL STANDING COMMITTEES.

[Matter stricken out is in brackets; new matter is in italics.]

Amend Rule XI by adding after clause 57 a new paragraph, to read as follows:

"*58. Each standing committee shall keep an exact record of the attendance of each of its members, and also of its proceedings, which record shall be open to public inspection at all reasonable times; and a record vote, upon the demand of any member of a committee, shall be had upon any motion to favorably report to the House for consideration any bill that has been pending before the committee for a period of 30 days or longer, and no motion to table the motion for such favorable report, or other proceeding to postpone or evade action thereon by the committee, shall be in order.*"

SECOND.

AUTHORIZING TWO MOTIONS TO RECOMMIT.

Amend clause 4 of Rule XVI to read as follows:

"4. When a question is under debate, no motion shall be received but to adjourn, to lay on the table, for the previous question (which motions shall be decided without debate), to postpone to a day certain, to refer, or to amend, or postpone indefinitely; which several motions shall have precedence in the foregoing order; and no motion to postpone to a day certain, to refer, or to postpone indefinitely, being decided, shall be again allowed on the same day, at the same stage of the question. After the previous question shall have been ordered on the passage of a bill or joint resolution [one motion], *not to exceed two motions* to recommit shall be in order, *preference being given, first, to the most numerous minority party, and, next, to the second most numerous minority party represented in the House*, and the Speaker shall give preference in recognition for such purpose to a Member *of such minority party* who is opposed to the bill or joint resolution."

Amend clause 1 of Rule XVII to read as follows:

"1. There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered by a majority of Members voting, if a quorum be present, shall have the effect to cut off all debate and bring the House to a direct vote upon the immediate question or questions on which it has been asked and ordered. The previous question may be asked and ordered upon a single motion, a series of motions allowable under the rules, or an amendment or amendments, or may be made to embrace all authorized motions or amendments, and include the bill to its passage or rejection. It shall be in order, pending the motion for, or after the previous question shall have been ordered on its passage, for the Speaker to entertain and submit [a motion to commit] *not to exceed two motions to commit*, with or without instructions, to a standing or select committee."

THIRD.

PROVIDING FOR THE READING OF BILLS THE THIRD TIME BY TITLE ONLY.

Change clause 1 of Rule XXI to read as follows:

"1. Bills and joint resolutions on their passage shall be read the first time by title and the second time in full, when, if the previous question is ordered, the Speaker shall state the question to be: Shall the bill be engrossed and read a third time? And, if decided in the affirmative, it shall be read the third time by title [unless the reading in full is demanded by a Member), and the question shall then be put upon its passage."

FOURTH.

PROVIDING FOR YEAS AND NAYS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE.

After clause 8 of Rule XXIII insert the following new paragraph:

"*9. The yeas and nays shall be taken in the Committee of the Whole House on any question, at the desire of one-fifth of the Members present, and such record vote shall be reported to the House and entered upon the Journal.*"

FIFTH.

LIMITING GENERAL DEBATE UPON PRIVATE BILLS TO TWO HOURS.

Amend clause 6 of Rule XXIV by adding thereto the following:

"*General debate upon bills considered under this rule shall be limited to two hours.*"

SIXTH.

LIMITING GENERAL DEBATE UPON BILLS CONSIDERED ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY TO TWO HOURS.

Amend clause 7 of Rule XXIV by adding thereto the following:

"*General debate upon bills considered under this rule shall be limited to two hours.*"

SEVENTH.

SETTING APART A SPECIAL ADDITIONAL DAY FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF PRIVATE BILLS.

After clause 8 of Rule XXIV add the following new paragraph:

"*9. On the last Thursday of each month, after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, it shall be in order to entertain a motion for the House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House to consider bills on the Private Calendar reported from the Committee on Claims, the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the Committee on the Public Lands. General debate upon bills considered under this rule shall be limited to two hours.*"

EIGHTH.

SETTING APART SPECIAL DAYS FOR MOTIONS TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEES.

Amend clause 4 of Rule XXVII to read as follows:

"4. Any Member may present to the Clerk a motion in writing to discharge a committee from further consideration of any public bill or joint resolution which may have been referred to such committee [fifteen] *thirty* days prior thereto. All such motions shall be entered in the Journal and printed on a calendar to be known as a Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees. [After the Unanimous Consent Calendar shall have been called on any Monday, and motions to suspend the rules have been disposed of] *On the second and fourth Tuesdays in each month, after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only*, it shall be in order to call up any such motion which shall have been entered at least seven days prior thereto. Recognition for such motions shall be in the order in which they have been entered. When such motion shall be called up the bill shall be read by title only prior to a second being ordered by tellers, and no such motion shall be entertained as to a bill or joint resolution the title of which contains more than 100 words; after the reading of the bill by title the motion shall not be submitted to the House unless seconded by [a majority by tellers] *one-third of the Members by tellers*. If such motion fails of a second, it shall be immediately stricken from the calendar and shall not be thereafter placed thereon. If a second be ordered, debate on such motion shall be limited to 20 minutes, one-half thereof in favor of the proposition and one-half in opposition thereto. Such motions shall require for adoption an affirmative vote of a majority of the membership of the House. Whenever such a motion shall prevail the bill so taken from the consideration of a committee shall thereupon be placed upon its appropriate calendar, and upon call of the committee from which any bill has been so taken it may be called up for consideration by any Member prior to any bill reported by said committee at a date subsequent to the discharge of said committee: *Provided*, No Member shall have upon such calendar more than two motions at the same time."

NINTH.

PROVIDING FOR A COMMITTEE ON EQUAL SUFFRAGE.

Amend Rule X by adding at the end of clause 1 a new paragraph to read as follows:

"*On Equal Suffrage, to consist of 15 Members.*"

Amend Rule XI by adding after clause 52 a new paragraph to read as follows:

"*All proposed legislation concerning equal suffrage; to the Committee on Equal Suffrage.*"

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard prior to anybody else being recognized.

The SPEAKER. Anybody has the right to move the previous question, if he can get recognition, under the rules.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I thought under the rules that I had the permission a while ago. If the gentleman yields the floor, except for the purpose of a very important question, where a gentleman offers a resolution, is he not entitled to be recognized for an hour before anybody is recognized to offer the previous question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The previous question has already been ordered. Section 6582 of Hinds' Precedents says a motion to recommit made after the previous question is ordered is not

debatable. The gentleman from Texas, moving the previous question, has shut off debate.

Mr. MANN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. MANN. Simply on the point of order which has been made.

The SPEAKER. There was not any point of order made.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman from Oregon claimed he was entitled to recognition to debate his motion to refer, and I was simply seeking to call the Chair's attention to the fact the previous question has been ordered on the original motion, which itself cuts off debate on the motion to refer but does not cut off an amendment.

Mr. LAFFERTY. The previous question having been ordered without debate on this motion, is not 40 minutes allowable under the rules?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is an incidental question.

Mr. LAFFERTY. It is not. It is a subsidiary question, which expedites the business of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY].

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 25, noes 229.

So the motion to commit was rejected.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Twenty-four gentlemen have arisen in the affirmative—not a sufficient number. The yeas and nays are refused. The question is on the resolution of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY].

The resolution was agreed to.

SWEARING IN A MEMBER.

Mr. CLINE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for about two minutes to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, a Democratic caucus has been called to meet in this Hall to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock. The call was issued at a time when it was believed there would be no session of the House to-morrow. Since the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has been adopted and the House will meet to-morrow, it will be impracticable to hold the caucus in this Hall until after the session of the House. I desire to announce, therefore, that while the caucus will be called to order, in pursuance of the call, at 11 o'clock in the morning, the chairman will immediately entertain a motion to recess or adjourn until after the meeting of the House, say, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

I make this announcement in order that members of the caucus need not take the trouble to come here at 11 o'clock, because, whether there is a quorum or not, the meeting of the caucus will be postponed until 3 o'clock, as indicated.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. BALTZ, by unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the House adjourn.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House resolution which I send up to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. SHERLEY. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 8, 1913, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a schedule of useless papers and documents in his department (H. Doc. No. 2); to the Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the excise board of the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 3); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HUGHES of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 1) to promote the efficiency of the Hospital Corps of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 2) providing for the erection of a public building at New Philadelphia, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 3) to amend section 2 of an act approved April 19, 1908, entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, and the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4) to provide for a United States bureau of Government supplies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5) to provide for the erection of a public building at Memphis, State of Texas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Bowie, State of Texas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Childress, State of Texas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Quanah, State of Texas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9) to establish an agricultural, plant, shrub, fruit and ornamental tree, berry, and vegetable experimental station at or near the city of Plainview, Hale County, in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 10) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 11) requiring any citizens of a foreign country who may apply for a copyright registration or for letters patent from the United States for an invention to pay to the United States for such copyright or patent the same amount of fees and be subject to the same laws, rules, and regulations relating to the registration of copyrights and the issuance of letters patent, and relating to the issuance and maintenance of copyrights and letters patent as the Government of such foreign country exacts by its laws and regulations from citizens of the United States in such cases; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 12) authorizing the establishment of a brigade post at Fort McPherson, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 13) for payment to the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. the $4,583.67 improperly collected under the act of August 5, 1909; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 14) to extend the provisions of the pension act of May 11, 1912, to the officers and enlisted men of all State militia and other State organizations that rendered service to the Union cause during the Civil War for a period of 90 days or more, and providing pensions for their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 15) to extend the provisions of the pension act of May 11, 1912, to the officers and enlisted men of all State militia and other State organizations that rendered service to the Union cause during the Civil War for a period of 90 days or more, and providing pensions for their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 16) providing for the labeling and tagging of all fabrics and articles of clothing intended

for sale which enter into interstate commerce, and providing penalties for misbranding; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 17) to repeal the duty on cotton ties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18) to encourage and promote commerce between the United States and foreign countries as relates to the wood-pulp and printing-paper industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20) to repeal the duty on cotton bagging; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 21) to provide an exclusive remedy and compensation for accidental injuries, resulting in disability or death, to employees of common carriers by railroad engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, or in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 22) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 23) providing for the discovery, development, and protection of streams, springs, and water holes in the desert and arid public lands of the United States, for rendering the same more readily accessible, and for the establishment of and maintenance of signboards and monuments locating the same; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24) for the purchase or construction of a launch for the customs service at and in the vicinity of Los Angeles, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the city of Los Angeles, Cal., certain public lands in California, and granting rights in, over, and through the Sierra Forest Reserve, the Santa Barbara Forest Reserve, and the San Gabriel Timberland Reserve, Cal., to the city of Los Angeles, Cal.," approved June 30, 1906; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26) providing for the establishment and operation of a Government owned and controlled line of steamers along the Pacific coast and through the Panama Canal, and making provisions therefor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27) to authorize the sale and issuance of patent for certain land to H. W. O'Melveny; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 28) to establish a fish hatchery and biological station at Canyon City, Randall County, Tex.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 29) to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 30) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Bethlehem, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 31) to permit the manufacture of denatured alcohol by mixing domestic and wood alcohol while in process of distillation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge in and for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 33) to erect a monument to the memory of John Summerfield Staples at Stroudsburg, Pa.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 34) authorizing the Shoshone Tribe of Indians residing on the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 35) to provide for paving with a proper material the Fort Crook Military Boulevard from Fort Crook Military Reservation to the south city limits of South Omaha, Nebr., so as to perfect a continuous paved highway from Fort Crook Military Reservation to Fort Omaha Military Reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 36) to regulate the pay of internal-revenue storekeepers, storekeeper-gaugers, and gaugers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 37) to grant honorable discharges to the quartermaster volunteers who served in the military service in the Civil War, and including their names in the roster of the Union Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 38) requiring banks, trust companies, and individual bankers in the District of Columbia to publish certain deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 39) to provide for an investigation of the collection and disposal of garbage, ashes, refuse, dead animals, and night soil in the District of Columbia, and employment of a competent sanitary engineer to report the latest approved methods for the disposal of same; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 40) to regulate the construction and operation of elevators in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 41) to repeal the duty on lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 42) granting to the Ozark Power & Water Co. authority to construct a dam across White River, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 43) providing for the purchase of an oil painting entitled "The death of Bvt. Lieut. Col. Alonzo H. Cushing"; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 44) to amend sections 5136 and 5137 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, known as the "national-bank act"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 45) providing for the branding and labeling of all cloths, knit fabrics, and manufactures of every description made wholly or in part of wool, and for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of such articles when misbranded, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEELEY: A bill (H. R. 46) for the erection of a public building at Larned, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 47) providing the order of procedure in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 48) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Northfield, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 49) to create a tariff statistical bureau; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 50) to amend section 17 of the act to regulate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 51) to make accessible to all the people the valuable scientific and other research work conducted by the United States through establishment of a national school of correspondence; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 52) to establish the Peter Lassen National Park in the Sierra Nevada Mountains in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 53) to set apart certain lands in the State of California as a public park to be known as the Mount Shasta National Park, in the Sierra Nevada Mountains, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 54) to further protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 55) to create a tariff commission and defining its powers and duties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 56) relating to sleeping cars in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 57) making an appropriation to M. C. Burke for tax liens held by him on property acquired by the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 58) to amend the act entitled "An act concerning carriers engaged in interstate commerce and their employees," approved June 1, 1898; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 59) providing for the use of tracts of land in forest reservations by fraternal and benevolent associations for sanitarium and camping-ground purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 60) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of the merchantable timber on the unallotted lands within the Bad River Indian Reservation, in the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 61) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 62) to establish 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 63) to facilitate prompt action on final proof on homestead entries; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 64) permitting suits against the United States for damages caused by vessels owned or operated by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 65) relating to the maintenance of actions for death on the high seas and other navigable waters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 66) to compel railroad corporations issuing mileage books to receive same for transportation on all lines owned, leased, or operated by such corporation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 67) to provide for a survey for the construction of a continuous waterway from Boston, Mass., to the coast of Maine; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 68) prohibiting officers or directors of a national bank receiving fees, brokerage, commissions, gifts, or other considerations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 69) to define the hours of labor of watchmen in Federal buildings; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 70) to make October 12 in each year a public holiday to be called "Columbus Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 71) making it unlawful for any society, order, or association to send or receive through the United States mails, or to deposit in the United States mails, any written or printed matter representing such society, fraternal order, or association to be named or designated or entitled by any name hereafter adopted, any word or part of which title shall be the name of any bird or animal, the name of which bird or animal is already being used as a part of its title or name by any other society, fraternal order, or association; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 72) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station on the Branford River, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 73) to protect fraternal organizations from infringement on their titles or names; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 74) for the relief of the trustee and parties who are now or who may hereafter become interested in the estate of James A. Chamberlain under the terms of his will; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 75) to establish a national aeronautical laboratory; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 76) providing for the regulation, identification, and registration of automobiles engaged in interstate commerce, and the licensing of the operators thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 77) to fix the sizes of baskets or other open containers of small fruits or berries; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 78) to amend an act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 79) for the extension of the post office over the entire business of public transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 80) for the establishment of an experimental auto-post-coach rural service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 81) providing for the expenditure of 25 per cent of the receipts from national forests for road and trail construction; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 82) dedicating 25 per cent of the proceeds from public lands to the construction and improvement of public roads; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 83) giving a new right of homestead entry to former homesteaders; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 84) to validate certain homestead entries; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 85) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Sundance, in the State Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 86) to provide for appeals from decisions of the Secretary of the Interior to the district courts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 87) granting locations and rights of way for purposes of irrigation and other beneficial use of water through the public lands and reservations of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 88) providing for an appropriation for an iron stairway from the foot to the summit of the "Devil's Tower" in the Devil's Tower National Monument; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 89) to provide for the erection of a public building at Newcastle, in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 90) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Green River, in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 91) to provide for the reorganization of the General Land Office; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 92) to extend the general land laws to the former Fort Bridger Military Reservation, in Wyoming; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 93) for the relief of settlers in township 32 north, range 66 west of the sixth principal meridian; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 94) for the restoration, under certain conditions, of lands included in power-site withdrawals; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 95) providing for the sale of grazing lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 96) making an appropriation for the destruction of predatory wild animals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 97) to establish a mining experiment station at Lander, in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 98) to compensate star-route carriers for additional work imposed on them and losses sustained through the establishment of the parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 99) for marking the site of old Fort Phil Kearney and the Wagon Box Fight; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 100) authorizing the Northern Arapahoe Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 101) for the erection of a public building at the city of Susanville, in the State of California, and appropriating moneys therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 102) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved February 20, 1907; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 103) to require common carriers engaged in interstate commerce by railroad to equip all locomotive engines used in interstate traffic in transportation of trains with headlights of not less than 1,500 candlepower and to provide a penalty for the violation of the same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 104) to establish a national park service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 105) authorizing the use of the reclamation funds in the construction of a bridge across Willow Creek, in Modoc County, Cal., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 106) making an appropriation for a series of thorough and elaborate investigations and experiments for the purpose of devising and perfecting a system of frost prevention in the citrus and deciduous fruit regions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 107) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish postal savings depositories for depositing savings at interest with security of the Government for repayment thereof, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 108) restoring to the public domain certain lands heretofore reserved for reservoir purposes, in Big Valley, in Lassen and Modoc Counties, and in Round and Pitt River

Valleys, in Modoc County, Cal.; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 109) for improvement of Sacramento River between Chico Landing and Red Bluff, Cal.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 110) making an appropriation for improving the Sacramento and Feather Rivers, Cal., continuing improvement, and for maintenance, including improvement above Sacramento to Red Bluff; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 111) for the support and education of the Indian pupils at the Fort Bidwell Indian School, California, and for repairs and improvements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 112) to allow the city and county of San Francisco, in the State of California, to construct storage reservoirs and other waterworks and accessory structures and to exchange land for reservoir sites in Lake Eleanor and Hetch Hetchy Valleys, in Yosemite National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 113) to establish a mining experiment station at Auburn, Placer County, Cal., to aid in the development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 114) appropriating money for the purpose of constructing an efficient and practical fish ladder over the Derby Dam, Truckee River, in Washoe County, Nev.; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 115) providing for second homestead and desert-land entries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 116) permitting the cooperative homesteading of public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 117) to amend the act of June 23, 1910, entitled "An act providing that entrymen for homesteads within the reclamation projects may assign their entries upon satisfactory proof of residence, improvement, and cultivation for five years, the same as though said entry had been made under the original homestead act"; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 118) making an appropriation for experiments and investigations and determining methods for the ferriting out and prevention of offenses committed against the property of permittees within the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 119) making an appropriation for the investigation and improvement of walnuts and walnut trees and methods of walnut production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 120) authorizing the War Department to station Federal troops in the national forests during certain times of each year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 121) granting a pension of $25 per month to certain widows of soldiers and sailors who served in the Civil War for a period of six months or more and who were honorably discharged therefrom or who died or were killed while so serving; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 122) authorizing the State of California to select public lands in lieu of certain lands granted to it in Imperial County, Cal., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 123) making an appropriation for investigating the food habits of North American birds and mammals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry, including experiments and demonstrations in destroying noxious animals, and for investigations and experiments in connection with rearing of fur-bearing animals, including mink and marten, and for use in the destruction of ground squirrels on the national forests in California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 124) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and settle certain accounts under the reclamation acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 125) for the relief of the owners of the Tioga Road, in the Yosemite National Forest Reserve, Cal.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 126) for the purchase of the Tioga Road, in the Yosemite National Forest Reserve, Cal.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 127) to amend an act approved February 24, 1905, for the protection of persons furnishing labor, materials, plant, and supplies for the construction of public works; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 128) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain lands to be used as a national sanitarium by the Sovereign Grand Lodge of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 129) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain lands to be used as a sanitarium by the Order of Owls; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 130), to repeal an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 131) concerning taxable costs in suits at law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 132) providing that questions of negligence and contributory negligence shall be submitted to the jury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 133) to authorize the Supreme Court to prescribe forms and rules and generally to regulate pleading, procedure, and practice on the common-law side of the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 134) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 135) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 136) to revive the right of action under the captured and abandoned property acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 137) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 138) to provide for the refunding of cotton tax; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 139) to constitute Dothan, in the State of Alabama, a port of delivery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 140) authorizing A. R. Killebrew to erect a dam across the Choctawhatchee River in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 141) for the maintenance and improvement of the Choctawhatchee River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 142) giving powers to national banks in addition to the powers contained in section 5136 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 143) to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 144) to set apart certain lands in the State of Oregon as a public park, to be known as the Saddle Mountain National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 145) to create a tariff board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 146) to distribute the surplus in the Treasury of the United States to the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia for the sole purpose of improving the roads therein; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 147) to construct a highway from the station in the town of Appomattox, Va., to the battle field of Appomattox and other points of interest near said battle field; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 148) to provide for the improvement of Willis River in Virginia; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 149) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 150) to provide for the improvement of Appomattox River, in Virginia; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 151) to repair a portion of the roadway to the national cemetery at Staunton, Va., and to keep said portion of said road in repair; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 152) to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of apples; to the Committee on the Census.

Also, a bill (H. R. 153) to amend an act for the protection and regulation of the fisheries of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 154) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Cumberland, Va., two cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 155) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Buckingham, Va., two cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 156) to establish agricultural extension departments in connection with the agricultural colleges and high schools in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 157) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Fincastle, Va., two cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 158) for the relief of the Virginia Military Institute, of Lexington, Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 159) to provide for the bringing of suits against the United States by Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maryland, South Carolina, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, and Rhode Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 160) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Buena Vista, Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 161) providing for the disposal of certain lands containing coal and other minerals within portions of the Indian reservations heretofore opened to settlement and entry in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 162) providing for the disposal of certain lands containing coal and other minerals within portions of Indian reservations heretofore opened to settlement and entry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 163) to amend section 2291 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended June 6, 1912; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 164) to repeal section 3 of an act providing for second and additional homestead entries, and for other purposes, approved April 28, 1904; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 165) excepting certain lands in Pennington County, S. Dak., from the operation of the provisions of section 4 of an act approved June 11, 1906, entitled "An act to provide for the entry of agricultural lands within forest reserves"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 166) providing for the issuance of patents to the owners of town lots purchased from the United States at auction sales in certain cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 167) to amend section 2297 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 168) providing for an appropriation to enable the Sioux Indians to employ a competent attorney to make certain investigations and report; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 169) to establish mining experiment stations, to aid in the development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 170) to amend an act approved May 30, 1910, entitled "An act to authorize the sale and disposition of a portion of the surplus and unallotted lands in Mellette and Washabaugh Counties in the Rosebud Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 171) to authorize the sale and disposition of the surplus and unallotted lands in Washabaugh County, in the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation to carry the same into effect; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 172) to regulate corporations engaging in interstate and foreign commerce, to create an industrial commission in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 173) requiring railway common carriers to receive and transport all express parcels and packages and to transact all express business in interstate commerce at reasonable rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 174) to provide an enlarged homestead; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 175) to provide for the erection of a public building at Barbourville, in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 176) making an appropriation for rebuilding the Old Wilderness Road, to be known as "The Boone Way," from Cumberland Gap, Tenn., to Boonesboro, Ky.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 177) to provide for the erection of a public building at Barbourville, in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 178) to authorize the Secretary of War to construct a lock and dam on Cumberland River, Ky., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 179) granting a pension to certain battalions of Kentucky State militia; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 180) to establish a fish hatchery at Ittabena, Miss.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 181) to prevent payment of special tax on retail liquor dealers under assumed or fictitious name, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 182) to increase the tax on beer and playing cards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 183) supplementary to the act of June 2, 1890, known as the antitrust act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 184) to provide for a survey and estimate of cost of a ship canal connecting the navigable waters of Niagara River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 185) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 186) to amend the copyright law passed March 4, 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 187) to protect owners of trade-marks, labels, and similar property; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 188) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 189) to appoint Bradley Winslow as colonel on the retired list of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 190) to amend section 2 of public law No. 336, approved August 24, 1912, entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 191) to do justice to the Home Guards of Scott County, Tenn., and to grant honorable discharges and pensions under existing pension laws; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 192) declaring such persons as were engaged in the operation and construction of the United States military railroads during the War of the Rebellion to have been a part of the Army of the United States and having a pensionable status in accordance therewith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 193) to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 12, 1900; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 194) to authorize the Postmaster General to establish a station, substation, or branch post office in certain communities; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 195) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in matter of the claim of Warham Easley; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 196) for increasing the salaries and for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 197) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of John G. Henson, guardian of Catherine J. Gilson (insane), and administrator of estate of Samuel L. Gilson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 198) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Clarissa H. Tipton, administratrix of Isaac Tipton, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 199) to incorporate the Colored Association of Railway Employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 200) to provide for the inspection of gas water heaters, gas ranges, gas radiators, gaslighting fixtures, and other gas appliances in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 201) to further amend an act approved August 13, 1894, entitled "An act for the protection of persons furnishing materials and labor for the construction of public works," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 202) authorizing and permitting M. C. McCanless, W. C. Hale, W. H. Mullins, John Loop, and E. M. Grant, their successors and assigns, to build and maintain dams and water-power development in and across Clinch River, in Grainger, Claiborne, and Hancock Counties, State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 203) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make and enforce regulations governing the installation of gas appliances in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 204) to amend section 107 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 205) to make certain funds applicable in the payment of expenses of encampments of the Organized Militia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 206) to pension the National Guards of East Tennessee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 207) to grant an honorable discharge to the members of Capt. William Bingham's company, National Guard of Tennessee, and directing the Secretary of the Interior to grant pensions to the members and widows and minor children of the members of said company; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 208) to grant an honorable discharge to the members of the late Union County company, National Guard of Tennessee, and directing the Secretary of the Interior to grant pensions to the members and widows and minor children of the members of said company; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 209) to fix the compensation of the surveyor of customs at Knoxville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

Also, a bill (H. R. 210) to increase the pensions of certain persons now on the pension roll under the general laws; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 211) to provide for the erection of a building for the Superivising Architect of the Treasury; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 212) to prohibit interstate carriers from transporting products of any factory or mine in which convicts are worked; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 213) for the benefit of Federal soldiers and State militiamen who were confined in Confederate military prisons during the Civil War of 1861 to 1865; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 214) to amend the act of Congress approved February 6, 1907, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 215) requiring the flag of the United States to be displayed at educational institutions to which officers of Army or Navy are assigned, at agricultural colleges or experiment stations receiving Government aid, and at ambassadors', ministers', consuls', and consular agents' offices; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 216) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the pensions of widows, minor children, etc., of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 217) to create in the War and Navy Departments, respectively, a roll to be known as the "Civil War officers' annuity honor roll," to authorize placing thereon with pay certain surviving officers who served in the Volunteer or Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War and who are not now on the retired list of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 218) to prevent the pollution of navigable rivers or other bodies of water under the control of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 219) to further amend an act approved August 13, 1894, entitled "An act for the protection of persons furnishing materials and labor for the construction of public works," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 220) to protect honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, or marines employed under the civil service who are rated as "good" from discharge or reduction from said service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 221) authorizing and permitting M. C. McCanless, W. C. Hale, W. H. Mullins, John Loop, and E. M. Grant, their successors and assigns, to build and maintain dams and water-power development in and across Clinch River, in Grainger, Claiborne, and Hancock Counties, State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 222) to reimburse depositors of the late Freedman's Savings & Trust Co.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 223) giving rural mail carriers holiday on the 25th day of December of each year; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 224) for the relief of soldiers of the War with Spain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 225) to provide for the erection of an Army and Navy hospital at Knoxville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 1632) granting cities and incorporated towns coal lands for municipal purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1633) granting certain coal lands to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1634) to establish the Rocky Mountain National Park in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1635) ceding to the city and county of Denver, Colo., certain lands for park purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1636) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Montrose, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1637) to acquire a site for a public building at Delta, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1638) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Durango, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1639) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Grand Junction, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1640) to acquire a site for a public building at Salida, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1641) to establish and maintain a fish-hatching and fish-culture station in Garfield County, State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1642) to establish and maintain a fish-hatching and fish-culture station in La Plata County, Colo.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1643) for the construction of a national road from Grand Junction, Colo., to and through the Colorado National Monument; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1644) to establish a mine rescue station and an experiment station for analyzing and testing coals, lignite, and mineral substances in western Colorado; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1645) to establish an agricultural experiment station on the western slope of Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1646) to establish a mining experiment station at Silverton, San Juan County, Colo., to aid in the development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1647) for investigations into the economical treatment of metalliferous ores; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1648) granting to the city of Black Hawk, Colo., the right to purchase certain lands for the protection of water supply; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1649) concerning the mineral springs of Colorado; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1650) granting to various States public lands to be sold under certain restrictions and the proceeds thereof used for the construction and improving of public highways; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1651) to authorize the issuance of absolute and unqualified patents to public lands in certain cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1652) establishing the Lincoln memorial highway from Boston, Mass., to San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1653) granting pensions to the surviving members and widows of members of the Forsythe Scouts; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1654) authorizing certain national banking institutions to make loans on real estate in certain cases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1655) relating to rights of way over public lands, forest and other reservations of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1656) allowing a second homestead entry in certain cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1657) to authorize the allowance of second homestead and desert entries; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1658) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for an enlarged homestead"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1659) to declare Lincoln's birthday a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1660) to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called "Columbus Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1661) to make the second Sunday in May of each year a public holiday, to be called "Mothers' Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1662) providing for appeals from decisions of the Secretary of the Interior to the Federal district court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1663) for the benefit of railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1664) to increase the compensation of rural letter carriers and granting them 30 days' leave per annum; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1665) to authorize popular subscriptions at all post offices for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and for publishing and mailing the same; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1666) to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to procure postal cars and contract for hauling them, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1667) providing for the expenditure of 25 per cent of the receipts from the national forests on road and trail construction; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1668) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize entry of the public lands by incorporated cities and towns for cemetery and park purposes," approved September 30, 1890 (26 Stats., 502); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1669) providing that any person who has heretofore made a homestead entry or entries and has failed from any cause to perfect his title to any lands embraced in such entry or entries may make a further homestead entry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1670) for the relief of the White River Utes, the Southern Utes, the Uncompahgre Utes, the Tabeguache, Muache, Capote, Weeminuche, Yampa, Grand River, and Uinta Bands of Ute Indians, known as the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians of Colorado; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1671) granting to the State of Colorado 1,000,000 acres of public land within the State for expenses incurred in suppressing Indian disturbances from 1865 to 1888, including the Ute war of 1887; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1672) pensioning the survivors of certain Indian wars from the year 1865 to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1673) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to more effectually suppress and prevent the spread of diseases of potatoes known as black scab and wart disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1674) to amend sections 5136 and 5137 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, permitting national banking associations to make loans on real-estate security and limiting the amount thereof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 1675) for the relief of the State of Florida: to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 1676) amending section 2 of an act entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War," approved April 19, 1908; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1677) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend sections 2291 and 2297 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to homesteads," approved June 6, 1912; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1678) to define and regulate investment companies authorized to use the mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1679) for a postal employees' compensation act; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1680) to repeal an act entitled "An act to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes," approved July 26, 1911; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1681) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across Red Lake River in township 153 north, range 40 west, in Red Lake County, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1682) for the relief of settlers who purchased land under the act of February 20, 1904; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1683) for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of imitated or misbranded articles of commerce and regulating the traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 1684) for the support and education of the Indian pupils at the Greenville Indian School, Cal., for repairs and improvements, to purchase and provide grounds, erect buildings and furnish the same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1685) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange lands for school sections within an Indian, military, national forest, or other reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 1686) providing for the selection of postmasters of first, second, and third class offices by post-office primary election; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1687) providing for presidential primaries; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 1688) for the erection of a residence for the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1689) relative to the rebuilding of levees on the Wabash River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 1690) providing for second homestead and desert-land entries; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1691) to regulate press associations engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 1692) to establish agricultural extension departments in connection with agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 1693) to provide for the expression by the qualified electors of the several political parties of the United States of their choice for nomination by their party for President of the United States, and to provide for the election of the delegates of said political parties to their respective national conventions; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 1694) to amend an act approved October 1, 1890, entitled "An act to set apart certain tracts of land in the State of California as forest reservations"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 1695) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish one condemned cannon to Bartleson Post, No. 6, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Illinois, at Joliet, Ill.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 1696) authorizing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of condemned cannon and cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 1697) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Weiser, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1698) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for an enlarged homestead"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 1699) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to loan money to farmers and taking certain securities therefor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 1700) to revise and amend the laws relating to patents; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HENRY: A bill (H. R. 1701) providing for publicity of contributions and expenditures for the purpose of influencing or securing the nomination of candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 1702) increasing the limit of cost fixed by act of Congress approved June 25, 1910, for enlargement, extension, etc., of Federal building at Bath, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 1703) for the relief of flood sufferers of Indiana; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 1704) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1705) to prevent common carriers from transporting the products of the labor of children under the age of 14 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 1706) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Caldwell, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 1707) to amend section 16 of "An act to amend the laws relating to American seamen, for the protection of such seamen, and to promote commerce," approved December 21, 1898; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1708) to extend the provisions of the act approved June 27, 1890, providing pensions for widows of officers and enlisted men who served in the United States Army and Navy during the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1709) to pension widows and minor children of officers or enlisted men who served in the War with Spain or the Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 1710) to prohibit the intermarriage of persons of the white and negro races within the District of Columbia, to declare such contracts of marriage null and void, to prescribe punishments for violations and attempts to violate its provisions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1711) to credit and pay to the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia all moneys collected under the direct tax levied by the acts of Congress approved, respectively, July 1, 1862, March 7, 1864, July 13, 1866, and March 2, 1867; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 1712) providing for the levying and collection of an inheritance tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 1713) to place on the free list cotton bagging and all fibers and fabrics used in the manufacture of cotton bagging, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 1714) to amend an act approved April 19, 1908, entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1715) granting restoration of pensions to certain remarried widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1716) to further increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 1717) to provide for participation by the Government of the United States in the National Conservation Exposition, to be held at Knoxville, Tenn., in the fall of 1913; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 1718) to require all transportation companies, firms, and persons within the District of Columbia to provide separate accommodations for the white and negro races, and to prescribe punishments and penalties for violating its provisions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 1719) for the erection of a public building at Woodland, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 1720) to amend the national banking laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 1721) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY: A bill (H. R. 1722) providing for the leasing and purchasing of suitable official residences for ambassadors and ministers in foreign countries, and for furnishing and equipping the same; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 1723) for the permanent improvement of the consular and diplomatic service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: A bill (H. R. 1724) to provide for purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Carson City, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 1725) to amend the act of June 27, 1890, the act of April 19, 1908, and other acts; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: A bill (H. R. 1726) appropriating the sum of $50,000 for the purpose of drilling and testing wells in Clark, Lincoln, and Nye Counties, Nev.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 1727) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of all public officers by the qualified electors of the several States and the respective districts thereof, other than the members of the President's Cabinet, ambassadors, ministers plenipotentiary, and consuls, and fixing their terms of office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 1728) to authorize the use of ordinary postage stamps on parcel-post packages; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1729) for the relief of postal employees injured in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1730) for a specially designed postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the signing of the treaty of Ghent; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1731) to extend the penny-postage rate on local delivery first-class mail matter to post offices where the system of free delivery is established; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1732) to provide for the erection of a memorial to Robert Fulton; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1733) to declare Lincoln's birthday a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1734) for the establishment of a fish-cultural station in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1735) to provide for the perpetuation of Memorial Day; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1736) granting pensions to Army teamsters of the War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1737) to provide for the monthly payment of pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also (by request): A bill (H. R. 1738) amending section 2 of the act of April 19, 1908, increasing the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant pensions to certain widows of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 1739) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 1740) to provide an appropriation of $400 for the paving of certain alleys

adjoining the United States post-office site at Watertown, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRIEST (by request): A bill (H. R. 1741) to construct a Lincoln memorial highway from the White House, Washington, D. C., to the battlefield of Gettysburg, in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Library.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 1742) for the erection of a memorial amphitheater in the Gettysburg National Cemetery, Gettysburg, Pa.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 1743) providing for the deposit of the funds of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 1744) to give the Court of Claims jurisdiction to hear and adjudge the claims for accrued and unpaid interest on those judgments heretofore rendered by the courts of the United States for claims arising under and provided for under the treaty of 1819 between the United States and Spain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIEST (by request): A bill (H. R. 1745) granting pensions to soldiers confined in so-called Confederate prisons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 1746) to revive and amend an act to provide for the collection of abandoned property and the prevention of frauds in insurrectionary districts within the United States, and acts amendatory thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1747) to extend to the veterans of the several Seminole Indian wars and to the widows of veterans of the several Seminole Indian wars the benefits of the act of Congress of February 6, 1907, and acts amendatory thereof; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 1748) to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called Columbus Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 1749) to prevent floods on the Mississippi River and improve navigation thereon; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 1750) providing for a graduated tax upon all incomes over and above $3,000 annually; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 1751) providing for the establishment of a national leprosarium; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: A bill (H. R. 1752) providing for the establishment of a Weather Bureau station at Las Vegas, Nev.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 1753) granting additional compensation to rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 1754) to pension widows and minor children of any officer or enlisted man who served in the War with Spain or Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOGUE: A bill (H. R. 1755) for the purchase of a site and to begin the construction thereon of a customhouse in the city of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 1756) to establish, equip, and maintain an agricultural experiment station near the town of Dorris, Siskiyou County, Cal., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 1757) to amend the national banking laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 1758) to increase pension for total deafness; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 1759) creating Port Washington, Wis., in the district of Milwaukee, a subport of entry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 1760) amending section 932 of chapter 89 of Title II of the Alaskan Civil Code and Code of Civil Procedure; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 1761) granting pensions to ex-prisoners of war; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 1762) authorizing the Tennessee Hydro Electric Co., its successors and assigns, to build and maintain and operate dams across Clinch and Powell Rivers, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 1763) to compensate and suitably recognize the services of Sergt. Maj. John Champe to the United States of America; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 1764) to establish a fish-cultural station in the county of Lincoln, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 1765) amending section 1 of the act of May 11, 1912, relating to pension of Civil War soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 1766) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 1767) to provide for the importation of cotton ties of iron or steel for the baling of cotton free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 1768) to confer on the Supreme Court of the United States appellate jurisdiction to review the decisions of the Supreme Court of the Canal Zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1769) to provide a commission to secure plans and designs for a bridge as a memorial of peace and union, to be known as the Grant-Lee Bridge, and to be constructed across the Potomac River from a point in the city of Washington near the site selected by law for a memorial to Abraham Lincoln to the national cemetery at Arlington, in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1770) to appropriate $10,000 to aid in the erection of a monument to the memory of the Cushing brothers—Alonzo Hersford Cushing, late of the Fourth United States Artillery; William Barker Cushing, late of the United States Navy; and Howard Bass Cushing, late of the Fourth United States Cavalry; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 1771) to reestablish the grades of admiral and vice admiral in the Navy of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1772) to pay the balance due depositors in the Freedman's Saving & Trust Co.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1773) to provide for the formation and regulation of corporations engaged in any form of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1774) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure medals for the Sixth Massachusetts Regiment, who were the first fully equipped soldiers to arrive, on April 19, 1861, for the defense of the city of Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1775) to provide suitable medals for officers and men of the Navy and Marine Corps who participated in certain engagements in the Civil War; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1776) providing that the statute of limitations shall not be interposed in any suit brought by any laborer, workman, or mechanic in the Court of Claims against the United States to recover wages claimed to be due him under the national eight-hour law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1777) for the recognition of services of a military nature rendered by certain civilians in the late War with Spain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 1778) to provide for pensions to widows and minor children of soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the War with Spain; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 1779) providing that one competent officer of the United States Navy, who shall be nominated by the Secretary of the Navy for the approval of the President, with two other competent persons appointed by the President, shall constitute a commission, to be known as the Labrador Current and Gulf Stream Commission, defining its powers and duties, and making appropriation for its expenses; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1780) authorizing 15 days' leave of absence with pay to per diem employees of the Lighthouse Service of the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1781) providing for the refund of certain duties incorrectly collected on wild-celery seed; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1782) to establish a fish-cultural station on Long Island, in the State of New York; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 1783) to provide for the disposition of the surface of phosphate lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1784) providing for the granting of certain lands to the various public-land States and Territories of the United States for the purpose of building roads and highways; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1785) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 2291 and section 2297 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to homesteads; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1786) reserving from the public lands in Idaho as a public park for the benefit of the people of the United States, and for the protection and preservation of the game, fish, timber, and all other natural objects therein, a tract of land herein described; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1787) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Grangeville, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1788) to amend an act to provide for an enlarged homestead, approved June 17, 1910; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1789) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Nampa, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1790) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Payette, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 1791) to establish land courts of the United States and an appellate land court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1792) to amend an act entitled "An act for the sale of timberlands in the States of California, Oregon, Nevada, and in Washington Territory," approved June 3, 1878; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1793) to provide for the conveyance of the forest reserves in the several States to the States wherein they are situated, in trust, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1794) providing for the appropriation of $100,000 for the completion of the surveys of public lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1795) to amend section 2301 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1796) to establish an assay office at Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1797) to authorize the establishment of fish-cultural stations on the Columbia River or its tributaries in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1798) to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission by giving to that body the power to fix reasonable rates based upon physical valuations, to be charged by all common carriers, subject to the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended, in the transaction of interstate business, and also giving to said commission the power to fix reasonable prices to be charged by persons or corporations when found to be exercising a monopoly in the interstate sale of any commodity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1799) extending the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission over railroads in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1800) providing for the validation of certain timber and stone entries; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1801) to authorize common carriers subject to the provisions of the act of June 29, 1906, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission," to issue free transportation to traveling secretaries of Young Women's Christian Associations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1802) making it the duty of any common carrier or street railway company engaged in interstate traffic or traffic inside the District of Columbia to furnish to the plaintiff or his attorney in any action for damages for alleged negligence the names of witnesses taken by the carrier or street railway company at or near the time and place of the alleged act of negligence or accident upon which such action is based; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1803) to create a minimum-wage commission for the District of Columbia and to provide minimum-wage schedules; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1804) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend sections 2291 and 2297 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to homesteads," approved June 6, 1912; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1805) to provide and regulate transportation and to establish a post road in Alaska and to furnish transportation and fuel for the Army and Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1806) to create the Alaska railway commission, to construct a Government railroad in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1807) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to provide for determining the heirs of deceased Indians, for the disposition and sale of allotments of deceased Indians, for the leasing of allotments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1808) to amend section 5 of an act of Congress approved August 18, 1894, entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," so as to provide for the regulation by the State or States in, through, or between which navigable rivers flow of the drawbridges now built or hereafter to be built across such rivers; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1809) to amend section 1 of the act approved March 26, 1908, providing for repayment of certain commissions, excess payments, and purchase moneys paid under public-land laws; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1810) to provide soldiers and sailors additional homesteads; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1811) limiting the hours of labor of female employees in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1812) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior within his discretion to exchange desert lands for lands within national-forest limits; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1813) limiting the hours of labor in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1814) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend sections 2291 and 2297 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to homesteads," approved June 6, 1912; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1815) for additional protection of the Bull Run Forest Reserve and the sources of the water supply of the city of Portland, in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1816) to extend additional time to bona fide homestead entrymen to complete residence and cultivation of their lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 1817) granting a pension to persons who are deaf or partially deaf from cause arising while in the military service of the United States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1818) to regulate the interstate transportation of immature calves; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1819) amending section 2 of an act entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War," approved April 19, 1908; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1820) providing for the erection of a monument at St. Joseph, Mich., commemorating the establishment of Fort Miami on the site of said city; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1821) to increase the pensions of those who have lost one eye or have become totally blind in one eye from causes occurring in the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1822) to provide campaign badges for officers, enlisted men, sailors, or marines who served honorably in the Spanish, Philippine, or China campaigns and who were not in the United States service on January 11, 1905; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1823) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Benton Harbor, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 1824) to pension widow and minor children of any officer or enlisted man who served in the War with Spain or Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 1825) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to pay a cash reward for suggestions submitted by civilian employees of the Navy Department for improvement or economy in manufacturing processes or plant; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 1826) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to make an examination of certain claims of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1827) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at the city of Cameron, in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1828) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at the city of Richmond, in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOBSON: A bill (H. R. 1829) to provide for auxiliary vessels for the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1830) to provide for an experiment in the improvement of certain highways by the Secretary of Agriculture in cooperation with the Postmaster General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1831) to encourage the development of the American merchant marine and to promote commerce and the national defense; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1832) to reduce the rates of customs duties imposed upon imports into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1833) to establish a council of national defense; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1834) providing for the construction, erection, maintenance, and operation of a dam across the Sipsey River, in Pickens County, Ala., for the purpose of the development of water power; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1835) to promote the efficiency of the Marine Band; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1836) to authorize the creation of a temporary commission to investigate and make recommendation as to the necessity or desirability of establishing a national aerodynamical laboratory, and prescribing the duties of said commission, and providing for the expenses thereof; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1837) to provide for a preliminary survey and estimates for the cost of construction of a Clay-Jackson memorial highway from Niagara Falls, N. Y., to New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1838) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1839) providing for the better protection of the lives of crew and passengers on seagoing vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1840) to provide for the construction, maintenance, and improvement of post roads and rural-delivery routes through the cooperation and joint action of the National Government and the several States in which such post roads or rural-delivery routes may be established; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1841) to provide for the survey of a highway from New Orleans to the Canadian border; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1842) to provide for the establishment of a memorial in celebration of a century of peace with England, in the form of an elementary utilitarian school for the practical education of the Anglo-Saxon mountaineers of the Southern Appalachian States—a memorial to Andrew Jackson and the patriots of the Southern Appalachian Mountains, whose brave services and victory at New Orleans in 1815 strengthened the treaty of Ghent and marked the beginning of a hundred years of peace; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1843) to promote the harmonious, coordinated development of the highways of the United States, with a minimum of waste, through the creation of the general highway board and of the general highway foundation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1844) to provide an education survey of the United States; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1845) to provide for a highway survey of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1846) to incorporate the Elementary Education Foundation; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 1847) to amend section 3716 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1848) for the construction of a rostrum in the national cemetery in the Presidio of San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1849) to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California to determine in equity the rights of American citizens under the award of the Bering Sea arbitration of Paris and to render judgment thereon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1850) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act fixing the compensation of certain officials in the customs service, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1909; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1851) to create in the War Department and the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as "the Civil War volunteer officers' retired list," to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1852) to diminish the expense of proceedings on appeal and writ of error or of certiorari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1853) to provide for payment of interest on judgments rendered against the United States for money due on public work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1854) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States for destruction of private property"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1855) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Court of Claims," and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, approved February 24, 1855; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1856) to amend section 4514 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1857) to reimburse the city and county of San Francisco, Cal., for moneys paid by said city and county to various persons upon judgment claims recovered by them against said city and county for damages inflicted to their property by soldiers of the United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1858) to provide for the transfer of criminal insane to the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 1859) authorizing insurance companies and fraternal beneficiary societies to file bills of interpleader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 1860) to amend section 2746 of the Revised Statutes, relating to additional compensation to the appraisers, deputy collectors, etc., at the port of San Francisco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1861) for the relief of volunteer officers and soldiers who served during the War with Spain and beyond the period of their enlistment; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1862) to adjust the lineal and relative rank of certain officers of the United States Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1863) to establish a fish-cultural station in the Nushagak region in Alaska; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1864) to amend an act entitled "An act extending the benefits of the marine hospitals to the keepers and crews of life-saving stations"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1865) to authorize the entry and patenting of lands containing asbestos under the placer-mining laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1866) to purchase a suitable site on the Pacific coast to be used as a range for small-arms target practice by the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1867) to amend an act entitled "An act to improve the efficiency of the personnel of the Revenue-Cutter Service"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1868) to provide for admissions to the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1869) to amend section 3221 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by section 6 of the act of March 1, 1879; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1870) to retire enlisted men, either in the Army or Marine Corps, after 25 years' service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 1871) to regulate the trial of contempt of courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1872) to admit, when imported into the United States, fresh beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and venison free of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1873) to make lawful certain agreements between employees and laborers and persons engaged in agriculture or horticulture, and to limit the issuing of injunctions in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 1874) to amend section 5 of an act to authorize advances to the reclamation fund and for the use and disposition of certificates of indebtedness in reimbursement therefor, and for other purposes, approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1875) to amend section 237 of an act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1876) extending the number of annual payments to entrymen and purchasers of water under reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1877) to amend an act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1878) to promote the safety of travelers and employees upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to adopt uniform rules for the operation of railroad trains and to use a uniform system of signals for authorizing the movement of railroad trains; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1879) to establish a mining experiment station at Moscow, Idaho, to aid in the development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1880) to provide for the erection of a schoolhouse for the detached Indians living in the Kootenai Valley, Idaho; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1881) authorizing the Forestry Service of the Department of Agriculture to cooperate with the University of Idaho in investigating the methods of obtaining the greatest economic use of timber grown in Idaho and other Northwestern States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1882) to protect the rights of women citizens of the United States to register and vote for the Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1883) authorizing the compensation of rural mail carriers or their heirs for injuries received while on duty; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1884) extending to the members of Capt. Henson's Company A, Stone County Missouri Militia, the provisions of the pension acts granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULKLEY: A bill (H. R. 1885) to authorize the coinage of 3-cent pieces and one-half cent pieces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1886) to amend sections 4931 and 4934 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1887) to authorize the coinage of 3-cent pieces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 1888) for the establishment of a bureau of public highways; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1889) for the erection of a public building at Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 1890) to regulate the commerce of certain corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 1891) requiring the United States Government to own its own post-office building in every county seat in the United States; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1892) to extend the franking privilege to the officers of the National Guard and Naval Militia; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1893) to provide for the erection of a statue or monument to the memory of Gen. John Sevier; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1894) to establish a fresh-water mussel hatchery on the banks of the Clinch River, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1895) for the relief of the survivors of the shipwreck of the steamboat *Sultana;* to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1896) to create a board to correct military records; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1897) to provide for the reduction of mileage to actual expenses of Representatives and Senators; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1898) to amend section 4875 of the Revised Statutes, to provide a compensation for superintendents of national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1899) providing for the marking and protection of the battlefield known as Fort Sanders, in Knox County, Tenn., and for the erection of a monument thereon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1900) to provide for the collection, transcription, and publication of material relating to the history of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1901) extending the benefits of the acts of June 27, 1890; May 9, 1900; and February 6, 1907, to the officers and enlisted men of Capt. David Beaty's company of independent scouts, Civil War, and to their widows and minor children; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1902) to authorize the location of a branch home for the widows of volunteer and regular soldiers and sailors at or near Knoxville, in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1903) to provide for the construction, maintenance, and improvement of post roads and rural delivery routes through the cooperation and joint action of the National Government and the several States in which such post roads or rural delivery routes may be established; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1904) to provide for an increased annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations, to be used in researches in home economics, and regulating the expenditure thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1905) to apply a portion of the proceeds of the sales of public lands to the endowment of schools or departments of mines and mining and to regulate the expenditure thereof; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1906) to amend sections 2304 and 2305 of the Revised Statutes of 1878, of an act providing for soldiers and sailors acquiring homesteads in public lands of the United States, and deductions of military and naval service from the time required generally to perfect title; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1907) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint, by selection, an additional major general of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 1908) to provide for the reconstruction and maintenance of the old national road from Cumberland, Md., to St. Louis, Mo., and extensions to the same, making it a continuous trunk-line road, of macadam or other permanent material, from New York City to the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 1909) providing for an increase of salary of the United States district attorneys for the northern and southern districts of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 1910) extending to the surviving officers and enlisted men, or their widows, who served in the Indian wars of the western frontiers of the several States and Territories the provisions of the pension acts of June 27, 1890, and February 6, 1907; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1911) extending to the members of the Forsyth Scouts the provisions of the pension acts of June 27, 1890, and February 6, 1907; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 1912) providing for a monument to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the women of the country at the time of the American Revolution; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1913) to amend the act of January 12, 1895, and the act of January 30, 1903, relating to the sale and distribution of the Congressional Record; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1914) to strike out books and pamphlets from the third class of mail matter and to include them as entitled to parcel-post rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1915) to amend act of June 29, 1906 (ch. 3592, sec. 3, 34 Stats., p. 596); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1916) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Corning, in the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 1917) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: A bill (H. R. 1918) legalizing certain conveyances heretofore made by the Central Pacific Railroad Co. and others within the State of Nevada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 1919) granting 50,000 acres of timbered land in national forest reserves to the State of Idaho for the construction of public roads and bridges; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 1920) to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 1921) to abolish the Commerce Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1922) to repeal that part of the act entitled "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912, which exempts vessels engaged in the coastwise trade from tolls at the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 1923) authorizing an appropriation for a dry dock at the Philadelphia Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 1924) to authorize further advances to the reclamation fund and for the issue and disposal of certificates of indebtedness in reimbursement therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1925) to establish land courts of the United States and an appellate land court of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 1926) to establish a fish-cultural station and mussel hatchery on the Wabash River, near Vincennes, Ind.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 1927) to authorize further advances to the reclamation fund and for the issue and disposal of certificates of indebtedness in reimbursement therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 1928) amending section 4132 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by section 5 of the act of August 24, 1912; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 1929) to prevent the use of the mails and of the telegraph and the telephone in furtherance of fraudulent and harmful transactions on stock exchanges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 1930) to encourage the American merchant marine and American commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 1931) for the protection of mail boxes and mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 1932) making it criminal to accept or offer gratuities in connection with loans, overdrafts, and purchases of stocks, bonds, or other securities by national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 1933) to limit the effect of the regulation of interstate commerce between the States in goods, wares, and merchandise wholly or in part manufactured, mined, or produced by convict labor or in any prison or reformatory; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 1934) to prevent the use of the mails and of the telegraph and telephone in furtherance of fraudulent and harmful transactions on stock exchanges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 1935) to regulate commerce with foreign countries and between the States, and to increase the facilities and efficiency of the postal service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 1936) to regulate procedure in fraud-order cases; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LEVY: A bill (H. R. 1937) to amend the national banking laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 1938) to provide that the heads of the executive departments may occupy seats on the floor of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 1939) to remove the charge of desertion on the rolls against officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Resolution (H. Res. 9) creating a committee of the House of Representatives to be known as the Committee on Equal Suffrage; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOBSON: Resolution (H. Res. 10) of inquiry into the conditions of the health and morals of naval stations and military posts; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Resolution (H. Res. 11) authorizing the printing and binding of the history of the United States navy yard at Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. AUSTIN: Resolution (H. Res. 12) providing for a special committee to investigate an alleged pool or combination; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: Resolution (H. Res. 13) to provide for binding farmers' bulletins; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 14) to extend the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COPLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 15) providing for the appointment of a committee to investigate and report whether it is practicable to install an electrical voting device in the House of Representatives for the purpose of recording the yea-and-nay votes of the Members; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LOBECK: Resolution (H. Res. 16) directing the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department to make inquiry as to prices paid for elevators used in Government buildings under control of the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Resolution (H. Res. 17) for the investigation by the Committee on the Public Lands of the manner in which the pending suits of the United States against the Oregon & California Railroad Co. are being conducted; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOORE: Resolution (H. Res. 18) relating to the seating arrangements of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 19) for appointment of a special committee to investigate certain commissions, boards, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOTT: Resolution (H. Res. 20) relating to the temporary and permanent indebtedness of the United States to foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution (H. Res. 21) amending the rules of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 22) amending the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Resolution (H. Res. 23) authorizing the Postmaster of the House to appoint four messengers; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 24) authorizing the Postmaster of the House to appoint messengers; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LENROOT: Resolution (H. Res. 25) making changes in the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MONDELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 2) for the relief of persons rendered homeless or destitute by flood or

fire in certain towns and cities in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 3) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 4) for the appointment of a commission to investigate the advisability and necessity of obtaining redwood-timber lands for the purpose of establishing the Redwood National Park in the Redwoods, Humboldt County, Cal.; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 5) to create and creating a joint committee to continue the consideration of the revision and codification of the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOBSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 6) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that the President and Vice President shall be nominated and elected by direct vote of the people of the several States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. AUSTIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 7) providing for the purchase of the home of Thomas Jefferson, at Monticello, Va.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 8) for the relief of the sufferers from mine explosion at Briceville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 9) for the appointment of a commission to investigate the status of the full-blood Indians of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 10) making the 12th day of February in each year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 11) to amend an act entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States or with the United States for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers," approved March 1, 1911; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOBSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 12) proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the sale, manufacture for sale, and importation for sale of beverages containing alcohol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 13) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that the President and Vice President shall be nominated and elected by direct vote of the people of the several States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 14) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURRY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 15) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 16) authorizing the Joint Committee on Printing to publish a bulletin of committee hearings; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. NEELEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 17) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that judges of certain inferior courts shall be elected by the electors of the several judicial districts, and shall hold their offices during a term of six years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAHN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 18) proposing an amendment to section 8, Article I, of the Constitution, in relation to trade-marks; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FERRIS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 19) authorizing the President of the United States to prepare for withdrawal of sovereignty of the United States, for the delivery of full possession, control, and government of the Filipino people, and to promote their future prosperity and independence by treaties of neutrality; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 20) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the levy and collection of an income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 21) recognizing "The Star Spangled Banner" as the official anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 22) to name the House Office Building Jefferson Hall; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HENRY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 23) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 24) concerning contracts with certain Indian tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving women the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 26) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States making the Federal judiciary elective and subject to recall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 27) authorizing and directing the President to eliminate certain nontimbered lands from forest reserves, reclamation projects, and withdrawals for power sites, and to restore such lands to entry under the homestead laws; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 28) directing the Attorney General to employ one resident attorney of the State of Oregon as associate counsel in prosecution of litigation pending in the United States court for district of Oregon relative to the forfeiture of lands held by the Oregon and California Railroad Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 29) directing that in the future expenditure of the reclamation fund the President shall giver a preference to those States that have heretofore contributed give preference to those States that have heretofore contributed more than they have received, until reimbursed; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 30) to create a commission which shall determine the advisability of establishing a "summer capital" of the United States and the location and cost of the same; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAKER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COPLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 32) authorizing the President of the United States to invite foreign Governments to participate in the naval parade that will mark the official opening of the Panama Canal in 1915; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FERRIS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 33) revoking Executive order of October 15, 1912, classifying fourth-class postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CULLOP: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 34) authorizing the Secretary of War to use tents and rations for the relief of destitute persons in the flood districts of the States of Ohio and Indiana; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RAKER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 35) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KORBLY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 36) for the relief of sufferers from floods in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FERRIS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 37) creating a commission to investigate the present methods employed in handling Indian affairs, terminating the treaty relations between the Government and the Indians, to promote industry and self-reliance among the Indians, and for the Indians' general advancement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 38) proposing an amendment to Article XI of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) for the relief of sufferers from floods in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 2) arranging for improvement in the American tobacco trade conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting an appropriation of $500,000 to acquire certain sea-fishing rights for the United States; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Massachusetts, favoring a law to make hours of labor uniform; to the Committee on Labor.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of New Mexico, asking the United States to participate in the celebration of the completion of the Rio Grande reclamation project, and invite the Republic of Mexico to participate; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting Congress to admit the Territory of Hawaii into the Union; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Wyoming, asking Congress to refund moneys to certain citizens of Wyoming, paid for land to which they can not secure title; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, requesting the United States Government to donate Boise Barracks to the State for a capitol site; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, urging legislation making men who served in the Kansas Militia during the War of the Rebellion pensionable; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of California, requesting such change in the postal savings laws as to allow investment of postal savings funds in school bonds; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of New Mexico, requesting removal of restrictions in the matter of settlement and entry of lands under the homestead law; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), memorial of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii, asking for a preliminary survey of the harbors of the west and south coasts of the island to determine the best location for a port; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also (by request), memorial of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting an appropriation for the improvement of the harbor of Nawiliwili, island of Kauai; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging the restoration of Monticello to a position of national dignity; to the Committee on the Library.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Colorado, urging legislation creating the Rocky Mountain National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Montana, urging legislation for a system of national highways to connect the Capital of the United States with the capitals of the several States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, favoring the permanent location and marking of the Old Oregon Trail from the Missouri River to Puget Sound; to the Committee on the Library.

Also (by request), memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring an international commission on the cost of living; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of South Dakota, asking that national forests and forest reserves remain in possession and under the control and administration of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Washington, urging Congress to provide fortifications and military defenses for Grays and Willapa Harbors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, urging Congress to improve the site of the Federal building in the city of Boise; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, urging Congress to investigate the grain-bag monopoly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, urging Congress to direct the Secretary of the Department of the Interior to investigate and determine what roads and bridges should be constructed in national land reservations in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Massachusetts, urging Congress to provide that berries, cherries, currants, and small fruits be sold by standard dry measure, and that baskets, boxes, etc., in which they are sold shall conform to said measure; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Wisconsin, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting polygamy and asking legislation for the enforcement of antipolygamy laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYAN: Memorial of the Legislature of Washington, urging the fortification of the harbors of Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Washington, urging an investigation of the Grain Bag Trust; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Washington, asking Congress to reclaim, repair, and keep the burial place of United States soldiers on the island of San Juan, State of Washington; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Washington, urging the official recognition of the Chinese Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Washington, favoring railroad construction and development of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Washington, favoring the early completion of the Celilo Canal and the Columbia and Snake Rivers to free navigation during 1915; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Washington, urging better life-saving equipment on Klipsen Beach, Wash.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Washington, urging Congress to continue Federal cooperation in the protection of the forested watersheds of navigable streams; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Washington, urging the establishment of a dry dock at the Puget Sound Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Washington, asking Congress to order a full and complete survey of Fidalgo Bay with Similk Bay, in Skagit County, Wash.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, urging the building of a Government road through National Park, Wash.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Washington, favoring an appropriation for the extension of surveys, and legislation affecting the same in the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the construction of a waterway to connect Fidalgo Bay with Similk Bay, Skagit County, Wash.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FRENCH: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho favoring the acquisition of Monticello as proposed by the Jefferson-Monticello Association; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring H. R. 5966, providing for the permanent location of, and for the marking and monumenting of, the old Oregon Trail; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring the payment of those who participated in the Indian wars for their services; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, for the transfer of 50,000 acres of timbered land in the national forests of the United States within the boundaries of the State of Idaho to the State for the purpose of creating a fund for establishing and maintaining good roads in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, asking for the investigation of roads and bridges which should be constructed and maintained in forest reserves and a sufficient appropriation made for the building and maintaining of all necessary roads and bridges in such forest reserves; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, providing for a resolution of protest to the General Land Office, Department of the Interior, against the abuses coincident to the system of employing special agents in homestead cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Memorial of the Legislature of South Dakota, providing for a resolution of protest to the General Land Office, Department of the Interior, against the abuses coincident to the system of employing special agents in homestead cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of South Dakota, asking Congress to amend the homestead laws so as to permit male minors over 18 years of age to make entry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, requesting the Congress of the United States to pass the McCumber bill, relating to the Federal inspection and grading

of grain entering into interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of South Dakota, requesting that the Constitution of the United States be amended so that the President of the United States shall hold office for six years and be ineligible for reelection; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of South Dakota, asking that Congress repeal the pact or so-called reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the construction of a waterway to connect Fidalgo Bay with Similk Bay in Skagit County, Wash.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, asking for the construction of an additional dry dock at Puget Sound Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the appropriation of the sum of $200,000 for the extension of surveys over all unsurveyed land in the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, protesting against the establishment of proposed new channel from Sand Island to Fort Canby, Wash.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the extension of the Government road in Rainier National Park, Wash.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the establishment of one boathouse with beach apparatus at Long Beach, about 7 miles south of the Klipsan Beach life-saving station; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the appropriation for the completion of the Celilo Canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the appropriation of money to reclaim and preserve the burying ground of soldiers on the island of San Juan, State of Washington; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the increasing of fortifications and military defenses on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring railroad construction and development of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the recognition of the Republic of China by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, asking that the War Department of the United States give the name of Fort Leilehua to the new fort now being constructed at or near the post now known as Schofield Barracks, Leilehua, Oahu; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Hawaii, asking that Congress direct and authorize the Secretary of War to cause to be made preliminary examination and survey of the harbors on the west and south coast of the island of Hawaii with a view to determining the best location for a port or ports on that coast; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, asking that Congress pass an enabling act toward giving statehood to that Territory; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, petitioning that Congress do not enact measures regulating or prohibiting traffic in intoxicating liquors within the Territory of Hawaii, but that such matter of legislation be left to the legislature of said Territory; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: Memorial of the State Legislature of Washington, relating to an appropriation to reclaim a burying ground on the island of San Juan; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of Washington, relating to the furnishing of one boathouse with beach apparatus equipment at Long Beach life-saving station and one at the intersection of Oysterville Road with the ocean beach, the same distance north of said station; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of Washington, relating to the construction of a waterway to connect Fidalgo Bay with Similk Bay and Skagit County, etc.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of Washington, relating to the recognition by the United States of China as a Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of Washington, relating to back taxes to be taxed by the State of Washington on property of railroads unsurveyed by the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of Washington, requesting that the present and existing Hanbury Channel, established by the War Department in 1893, be utilized, and protesting against a new channel; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of Washington, relating to the construction of an additional dry dock at the Puget Sound Navy Yard, Bremerton, Wash.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Washington, relating to State and Federal cooperation in forest-fire protection; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of Washington, relating to an investigation of the so-called Grain Bag Trust; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Washington, urging the recognition of the Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of Washington, relating to construction of State roads through national forest reserves at the expense of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of Washington, relating to urging the improvement of Grays and Wiliapa Harbors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging the United States to equip the Charlestown Navy Yard for building and repair of vessels of war; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring uniform legislation governing the sale of berries, cherries, currants, and other small fruits by standard dry measure; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. CALDER: Memorial of the Legislature of New York, asking that the customs ports of the State of New York be reestablished as existing before the Executive order abolishing them; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, relative to the equipment of the Charlestown Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of the Legislature of Rhode Island, expressing approval of the erection of a dry dock in Narragansett Bay; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Memorial of the Legislature of New York, urging the improvement of waterways along south side Long Island from Jamaica Bay to Peconic Bay, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of New York, asking Congress to increase the salaries and provide pensions for letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of New York, asking Congress to reestablish the custom ports of the State of New York; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 226) for the relief of Allen Place; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 227) for the relief of Henry Benson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 228) for the relief of William Roney; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 229) granting a pension to Henry C. Poe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 230) granting a pension to Elmer B. Pool; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 231) granting a pension to George Baxter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 232) granting an increase of pension to J. M. Dunham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 233) granting an increase of pension to John W. Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 234) granting an increase of pension to Ephriam Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 235) granting an increase of pension to Richard P. Wardell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 236) granting an increase of pension to John F. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 237) granting an increase of pension to William Blackstone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 238) granting an increase of pension to Chester Heiner, alias Justus Hahner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 239) granting an increase of pension to Alexander M. Rainey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 240) granting an increase of pension to Pleasant Wishon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 241) for the relief of the trustees of the Christian Church at Missouri City, Clay County, Mo.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 242) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to examine and adjust the accounts of William R. Little, or his heirs, with the Sac and Fox Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 243) granting a pension to Frank Newman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 244) granting a pension to Jonathan Budd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 245) granting a pension to Catharine Crockett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 246) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Fronfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 247) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Sanford F. Timmons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 248) granting a pension to Thomas West; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 249) granting a pension to Mary C. Kaiser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 250) granting a pension to Avis Coan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 251) granting a pension to Harry Adelbert Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 252) granting a pension to Mary Tagg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 253) granting a pension to Sarah J. Neighbor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 254) granting an increase of pension to David H. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 255) granting an increase of pension to William L. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 256) granting an increase of pension to Wilson S. Thorp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 257) granting an increase of pension to Simon Fockler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 258) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 259) granting an increase of pension to Frank S. McKee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 260) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Sells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 261) granting an increase of pension to William Ditto; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 262) for the relief of Lee T. Kitts; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 263) for the relief of David H. Marney; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 264) for the relief of William P. Douglass; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 265) for the relief of Samuel Lewis; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 266) for the relief of Joe S. Shipe; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 267) for the relief of R. M. Magill; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 268) for the relief of George T. Larkin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 269) for the relief of Clarrissa H. Tipton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 270) for the relief of the heirs of Robert Allcorn; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 271) for the relief of John M. Dailey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 272) for the relief of George Marion Gaut; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 273) for the relief of Charles Baum; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 274) for the relief of George T. Larkin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 275) for the relief of the city authorities of the city of Harriman, Roane County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 276) for the relief of Mrs. C. N. Carson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 277) for the relief of Joseph Black; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 278) for the relief of heirs of Dr. Hervey Baker, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 279) for the relief of Mary A. Shufeldt; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 280) for the relief of Frank B. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 281) for the relief of Walter Lee Christenberry; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 282) for the relief of Ramon R. Harrison; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 283) for the relief of William Spears; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 284) for the relief of Harry A. Claiborne; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 285) for the relief of Henry B. Jones; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 286) for the relief of Annie Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 287) for the relief of Isaac A. Duncan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 288) for the relief of Rev. William Jasper McGhee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 289) for the relief of George T. Larkin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 290) for the relief of the heirs of Henry Hommell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 291) for the relief of Joseph Roth; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 292) for the relief of Frank J. Roth; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 293) for the relief of Jeremiah Campbell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 294) for the relief of F. A. R. Scott; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 295) for the relief of James H. Galbraith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 296) for the relief of Marian B. Patterson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 297) granting a pension to Henry Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 298) for the relief of Martha V. Jones; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 299) for the relief of Sarah E. Cox; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 300) for the relief of Randall H. Trotter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 301) for the relief of Isaac Jenkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 302) for the relief of William J. Oliver; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 303) for the relief of James H. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 304) for the relief of Salada Moses; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 305) for the relief of George T. Larkin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 306) for the relief of E. L. George; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 307) for the relief of La Fayette McFarland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 308) for the relief of John Samsel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 309) for the relief of Thomas A. Hill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 310) for the relief of James Widener; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 311) for the relief of George Lane; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 312) for the relief of estate of Moses Camak, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 313) for the relief of the estate or heirs of William H. Turley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 314) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph A. Mabry; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 315) for the relief of the family of Railway Mail Clerk Bruce Hodge; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 316) to correct the military record of James H. Thompson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 317) to remove the charge of desertion against Sampson Carroll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 318) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Samuel Robbins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 319) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Samuel McKamey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 320) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Gilbert C. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 321) to correct the war record of Calvin Fielden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 322) to correct the military record of William H. Shillings; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 323) to correct the war record of G. W. Swanay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 324) to correct the military record of George A. Tillett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 325) to correct the military record of James H. Beal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 326) to correct the military record of James A. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 327) to correct the military record of L. D. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 328) to correct the war record of George Washington Pevyhouse; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 329) to correct the war record of Samuel Braden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 330) to correct the record of Roadman V. Burleson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 331) for the allowance of certain claims under the Tucker and Bowman Acts; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 332) to grant a discharge to Benjamin F. Cheatham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 333) to grant an honorable discharge to T. J. Murphy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 334) granting an honorable discharge and back pay to William C. Chandler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 335) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of Henry J. Kinzel; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 336) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Isaac Tipton, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 337) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of John G. Henson, administrator, etc.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 338) to remove the charge of desertion against George Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 339) to remove the charge of desertion against Alkanah Ballinger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 340) to remove the charge of desertion against David J. Collins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 341) to remove the charge of desertion against Pleasant M. Chapman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 342) to remove the charge of desertion against William Lawson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 343) to remove the charge of desertion against Ben Graves; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 344) to remove the charge of desertion against John C. White; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 345) to remove the charge of desertion against George W. Chambers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 346) to remove the charge of desertion against Creed F. Casteel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 347) to remove the charge of desertion standing against H. B. Jones; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 348) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Alexander English; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 349) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Samuel S. Caldwell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 350) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Gideon Taylor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 351) to remove the charge of desertion standing against George W. Mabry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 352) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Hugh Washam; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 353) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Thomas Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 354) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Henry Gregg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 355) to remove the charge of desertion standing against John St. Clair; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 356) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Mark Seiber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 357) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Jerry Fritts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 358) to remove the charge of desertion standing against William A. Morgan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 359) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Henry Wallace; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 360) to remove the charge of desertion standing against John W. Bennett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 361) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Ranson Fritts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 362) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Derious O. Bibee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 363) to muster John Curtis as captain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 364) to muster in and muster out Wilson W. Duncan, late of the Volunteer Army, Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 365) to muster out and grant an honorable discharge to Sampson McGhee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 366) granting a pension to Samuel Thomas Smith, alias Thomas Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 367) granting a pension to the minor heirs of Elisha Darity; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 368) granting a pension to Mattie R. Willoughby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 369) granting a pension to Nancy Lay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 370) granting a pension to Zack Amis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 371) granting a pension to Martha C. Rayfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 372) granting a pension to Elihu Wilburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 373) granting a pension to Nancy A. Robbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 374) granting a pension to Mary A. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 375) granting a pension to Lucy Artis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 376) granting a pension to Lewis Adkin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 377) granting a pension to Edward Goings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 378) granting a pension to Andrew Baird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 379) granting a pension to Othello T. Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 380) granting a pension to Sue C. Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 381) granting a pension to Frank Romines; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 382) granting a pension to Sarah Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 383) granting a pension to Nancy Ann Ray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 384) granting a pension to Serelda Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 385) granting a pension to Henry Kline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 386) granting a pension to Ada G. Northern; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 387) granting a pension to James M. Keeton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 388) granting a pension to D. W. Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 389) granting a pension to Anna Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 390) granting a pension to Thomas E. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 391) granting a pension to John H. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 392) granting a pension to James W. Mitchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 393) granting a pension to Sallie Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 394) granting a pension to Cynthia A. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 395) granting a pension to Mary E. Witt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 396) granting a pension to Daniel Cahill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 397) granting a pension to Martha Smithers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 398) granting a pension to George Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 399) granting a pension to Thomas Cheatham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 400) granting a pension to Polly Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 401) granting a pension to Benjamin Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 402) granting a pension to Joseph A. Bray; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 403) granting a pension to Malissa C. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 404) granting a pension to Frank Medlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 405) granting a pension to Alonzo Shootman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 406) granting a pension to Daniel Best; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 407) granting a pension to Helen Grant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 408) granting a pension to Francis M. Oglesby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 409) granting a pension to Jane Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 410) granting a pension to Polly A. Blair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 411) granting a pension to Jennie M. Dye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 412) granting a pension to R. H. Welch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 413) granting a pension to James C. Neil; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 414) granting a pension to Samuel H. Thacker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 415) granting a pension to Martha Talley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 416) granting a pension to Samuel Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 417) granting a pension to David M. Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 418) granting a pension to E. L. Watkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 419) granting a pension to Martha Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 420) granting a pension to John Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 421) granting a pension to Albert S. Kearney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 422) granting a pension to Addie Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 423) granting a pension to James Henson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 424) granting a pension to Mary A. Bronson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 425) granting a pension to Sarah J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 426) granting a pension to Lou E. Grill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 427) granting a pension to Katherine Vines; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 428) granting a pension to Margaret Jane Leonard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 429) granting a pension to John McGhee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 430) granting a pension to Burrell F. Badget; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 431) granting a pension to Flem B. Duncan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 432) granting a pension to Elizabeth Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 433) granting a pension to Alice Robertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 434) granting a pension to Swanzy N. Kennedy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 435) granting a pension to William H. Shillings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 436) granting a pension to James F. Pryor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 437) granting a pension to James C. Claxton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 438) granting a pension to Thomas Kehoe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 439) granting a pension to J. S. Grubb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 440) granting a pension to M. Belle Houk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 441) granting a pension to William Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 442) granting a pension to Sabra Shootman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 443) granting a pension to John L. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 444) granting a pension to William Hutcheson, alias William King; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 445) granting a pension to Frank C. Griffith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 446) granting a pension to Sarah Brimer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 447) granting a pension to George W. Edwards; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 448) granting a pension to Jesse L. Riggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 449) granting a pension to George Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 450) granting a pension to John Metler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 451) granting a pension to Wilson W. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 452) granting a pension to Masina Goodman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 453) granting a pension to George W. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 454) granting a pension to William G. Blanton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 455) granting a pension to Henry Dillard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 456) granting a pension to Louisa C. Chesney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 457) granting a pension to William May; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 458) granting a pension to Sarah J. Blair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 459) granting a pension to John R. Kerley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 460) granting a pension to Cleopatra Henshaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 461) granting a pension to Mary Meltabarger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 462) granting a pension to John W. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 463) granting a pension to Daniel R. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 464) granting a pension to George W. Hatcher; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 465) granting a pension to Harriet J. Knight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 466) granting a pension to Isaac Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 467) granting a pension to Robert G. Tindle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 468) granting a pension to Mitchell Fritts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 469) granting a pension to Jane Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 470) granting a pension to Mollie Carmichael; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 471) granting a pension to John T. Mockabee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 472) granting a pension to William R. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 473) granting a pension to Thomas Swallow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 474) granting a pension to James Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 475) granting a pension to George R. Weight; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 476) granting a pension to Jennie Adkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 477) granting a pension to James C. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 478) granting a pension to William H. Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 479) granting a pension to Jane Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 480) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Norwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 481) granting a pension to James C. Lynch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 482) granting a pension to Charles N. Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 483) granting a pension to James C. Tedford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 484) granting a pension to Mrs. D. C. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 485) granting a pension to Susan King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 486) granting a pension to Frank Tucker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 487) granting a pension to John H. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 488) granting a pension to Leatie Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 489) granting a pension to Eliza Early; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 490) granting a pension to William Jasper McGhee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 491) granting a pension to Jane Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 492) granting a pension to Henrietta E. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 493) granting a pension to Rachel Baird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 494) granting a pension to Sampson McGee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 495) granting a pension to Catherine Hartly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 496) granting a pension to Daniel Burkett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 497) granting a pension to Loyd Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 498) granting a pension to Alfred McCarter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 499) granting a pension to Addie Carmichael; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 500) granting a pension to Charles W. Donnelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 501) granting a pension to Harrison Henny; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 502) granting a pension to Harrison Henny; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 503) granting a pension to Mary Keith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 504) granting a pension to Harry Harwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 505) granting a pension to Emma McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 506) granting a pension to Laura Housley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 507) granting a pension to Frank Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 508) granting a pension to George A. Boring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 509) granting a pension to James P. McLain; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 510) granting a pension to Mary E. Cox; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 511) granting a pension to Nancy Lay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 512) granting a pension to Nancy A. Bumgardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 513) granting a pension to George M. D. Miser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 514) granting a pension to Sarah Donahoo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 515) granting a pension to Nancy E. Devault; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 516) granting a pension to Jane Gentry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 517) granting a pension to James M. Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 518) granting a pension to Pearl Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 519) granting a pension to Lawson J. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 520) granting a pension to Victoria Blanton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 521) granting a pension to George A. Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 522) granting a pension to Thomas Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 523) granting a pension to George A. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 524) granting a pension to Mike Cattarine; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 525) granting a pension to Tirza E. B. Hendricks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 526) granting a pension to Rachel M. McNeilly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 527) granting a pension to Benjamin Wardell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 528) granting a pension to Isaac B. Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 529) granting an increase of pension to Richard Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 530) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Goddard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 531) granting an increase of pension to John W. Fielden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 532) granting an increase of pension to George C. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 533) granting an increase of pension to John A. Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 534) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel T. Gourley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 535) granting an increase of pension to Daniel G. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 536) granting an increase of pension to Fletcher Lawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 537) granting an increase of pension to John Ridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 538) granting an increase of pension to James F. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 539) granting an increase of pension to Lewis T. Custer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 540) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Squibb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 541) granting an increase of pension to Moses R. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 542) granting an increase of pension to Andrew G. Kitts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 543) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Sexton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 544) granting an increase of pension to James C. McConnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 545) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hughett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 546) granting an increase of pension to Absalom P. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 547) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Arnold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 548) granting an increase of pension to James Richey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 549) granting an increase of pension to Louise Meyers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 550) granting an increase of pension to Richard Luttrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 551) granting an increase of pension to Richard Porterfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 552) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 553) granting an increase of pension to Matthew Bunch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 554) granting an increase of pension to James Ivy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 555) granting an increase of pension to Alexander R. Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 556) granting an increase of pension to Elisha Disney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 557) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Popejoy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 558) granting an increase of pension to Fannie S. Cross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 559) granting an increase of pension to James Finley Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 560) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 561) granting an increase of pension to Emanuel Pollard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 562) granting an increase of pension to John W. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 563) granting an increase of pension to William B. Seaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 564) granting an increase of pension to Rufus Conger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 565) granting an increase of pension to John Bullock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 566) granting an increase of pension to William H. Kidd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 567) granting an increase of pension to John W. Fielden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 568) granting an increase of pension to John H. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 569) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Edens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 570) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 571) granting an increase of pension to James Shelby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 572) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 573) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Hooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 574) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Squibb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 575) granting an increase of pension to A. J. Pedigo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 576) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 577) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Keeble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 578) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 579) granting an increase of pension to Christian Schaick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 580) granting an increase of pension to Maggie E. Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 581) granting an increase of pension to James M. Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 582) granting an increase of pension to James D. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 583) granting an increase of pension to Charles Davis, alias Charles Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 584) granting an increase of pension to John A. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 585) granting an increase of pension to Johniker L. Mynatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 586) granting an increase of pension to William J. Byerley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 587) granting an increase of pension to Ferguson Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 588) granting an increase of pension to Alex B. Tadlock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 589) granting an increase of pension to Orlin L. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 590) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 591) granting an increase of pension to Abner Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 592) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Dupes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 593) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 594) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 595) granting an increase of pension to William M. Boles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 596) granting an increase of pension to John Marney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 597) granting an increase of pension to Benjmin Cannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 598) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Cates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 599) granting an increase of pension to William Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 600) granting an increase of pension to George Hutchinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 601) granting an increase of pension to John H. Cross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 602) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Brooks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 603) granting an increase of pension to John M. Letsinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 604) granting an increase of pension to Hilery Humphery, alias Umphus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 605) granting an increase of pension to John Farmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 606) granting an increase of pension to William A. McClure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 607) granting an increase of pension to Emanuel Netherway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 608) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 609) granting an increase of pension to Joel Dotson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 610) granting an increase of pension to Jerome B. Hendricks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 611) granting an increase of pension to Julian Barger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 612) granting an increase of pension to John J. Duff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 613) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 614) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 615) granting an increase of pension to Nancy C. Kirk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 616) granting an increase of pension to Eli B. Miner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 617) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin H. Keith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 618) granting an increase of pension to Hazlewood A. C. Bradfute; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 619) granting an increase of pension to John Dunahoo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 620) granting an increase of pension to Luvernia Newport; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 621) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 622) granting an increase of pension to William R. Kidd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 623) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert Zachary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 624) granting an increase of pension to Linsey H. Fields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 625) granting an increase of pension to Thurman H. Rodeheaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 626) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 627) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Bales; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 628) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Devaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 629) granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Whitson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 630) granting an increase of pension to Walter Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 631) granting an increase of pension to Silas Arthur; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 632) granting an increase of pension to William G. Selvidge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 633) granting an increase of pension to Barnard J. Irwin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 634) granting an increase of pension to William C. Chandler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 635) granting an increase of pension to James M. Greer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 636) granting an increase of pension to Lycurgus Peltier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 637) granting an increase of pension to George Lawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 638) granting an increase of pension to William T. Sims; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 639) granting an increase of pension to Robert Brashears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 640) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Livsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 641) granting an increase of pension to George W. Carney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 642) granting an increase of pension to John H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 643) granting an increase of pension to Albert Varnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 644) granting an increase of pension to Richard N. Salomon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 645) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 646) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Edington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 647) granting an increase of pension to William A. Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 648) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 649) granting an increase of pension to Lewis M. Wester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 650) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 651) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Blevins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 652) granting an increase of pension to Peter O. Benham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 653) granting an increase of pension to William Roach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 654) granting an increase of pension to John M. Letsinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 655) granting an increase of pension to James McCulley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 656) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Bright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 657) granting an increase of pension to William W. Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 658) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Liggett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 659) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 660) granting an increase of pension to James Key; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 661) granting an increase of pension to John A. Collier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 662) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. W. Keller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 663) granting an increase of pension to Lewis M. Medlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 664) granting an increase of pension to William M. Murrin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 665) granting an increase of pension to Peter Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 666) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Hurtt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 667) granting an increase of pension to Celina Wilhite; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 668) granting an increase of pension to William G. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 669) granting an increase of pension to William H. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 670) granting an increase of pension to Charles Gentry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 671) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 672) granting an increase of pension to William L. Northern; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 673) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 674) granting an increase of pension to John W. Cheatham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 675) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Spangle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 676) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Covington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 677) granting an increase of pension to Christian Shores; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 678) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 679) granting an increase of pension to Spencer H. Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 680) granting an increase of pension to Henry Rigsby; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 681) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Roe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 682) granting an increase of pension to Richard Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 683) granting an increase of pension to Robert N. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 684) granting an increase of pension to Sarah S. Conway; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 685) granting an increase of pension to John A. McKelvey, alias Jackson Burk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 686) granting an increase of pension to Bruce Clifton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 687) granting an increase of pension to Annie Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 688) granting an increase of pension to Levi Summay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 689) granting an increase of pension to John A. Prosise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 690) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Blevins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 691) granting an increase of pension to John Lobach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 692) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 693) granting an increase of pension to Martin Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 694) granting an increase of pension to Jennie P. Gage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 695) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Pardue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 696) granting an increase of pension to Robert Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 697) granting an increase of pension to John W. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 698) granting an increase of pension to George R. West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 699) granting an increase of pension to John Patrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 700) granting an increase of pension to William P. Tutterow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 701) granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Angel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 702) granting an increase of pension to James W. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 703) granting an increase of pension to Theodore S. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 704) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 705) granting an increase of pension to Joel Thomason; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 706) granting an increase of pension to William A. Hutcheson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 707) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Blakley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 708) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Eckel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 709) granting an increase of pension to Jesse J. Riggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 710) granting an increase of pension to A. Kilen Graves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 711) granting an increase of pension to Alford Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 712) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Shields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 713) granting an increase of pension to W. A. Herrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 714) granting an increase of pension to James Vandergriff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 715) granting an increase of pension to James M. Lawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 716) granting an increase of pension to William N. Sexton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 717) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Ellison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 718) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Simmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 719) granting an increase of pension to Theodore S. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 720) granting an increase of pension to William McLane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 721) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 722) granting an increase of pension to Delos Odell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 723) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel Main; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 724) granting an increase of pension to Andrew L. Cassady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 725) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 726) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 727) granting an increase of pension to Adam T. Cottrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 728) granting an increase of pension to James W. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 729) granting an increase of pension to Henry Finger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 730) granting an increase of pension to George H. S. Messer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 731) granting an increase of pension to Hugh L. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 732) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Gibbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 733) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hubble; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 734) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Wyrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 735) granting an increase of pension to Josiah D. Mater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 736) granting an increase of pension to Andrew T. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 737) granting an increase of pension to John V. Mays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 738) granting an increase of pension to Luther Lively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 739) granting an increase of pension to John C. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 740) granting an increase of pension to Daniel S. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 741) granting an increase of pension to George W. Arms; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 742) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Leinart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 743) granting an increase of pension to Alexander McNabb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 744) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Bumgardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 745) granting an increase of pension to Pleasant Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 746) granting an increase of pension to Henry McMahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 747) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin St. Clair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 748) granting an increase of pension to John A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 749) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 750) granting an increase of pension to Godfrey D. Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 751) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Washam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 752) granting an increase of pension to James Eldridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 753) granting an increase of pension to John Hayden; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 754) granting an increase of pension to William Mooney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 755) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 756) granting an increase of pension to John Daugherty, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 757) granting an increase of pension to Cyrena M. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 758) granting an increase of pension to David C. Sparks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 759) granting an increase of pension to James S. Yarnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 760) granting an increase of pension to William N. Mabry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 761) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 762) granting an increase of pension to Caswell Seamore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 763) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Houston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 764) granting an increase of pension to Howell E. Freeland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 765) granting an increase of pension to William Lanallen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 766) granting an increase of pension to George W. Aldridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 767) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Bean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 768) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Rankin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 769) granting an increase of pension to Robert N. Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 770) granting an increase of pension to James Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 771) granting an increase of pension to John N. Fagan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 772) granting an increase of pension to Prior P. Baird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 773) granting an increase of pension to J. R. Doty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 774) granting an increase of pension to William W. Dunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 775) granting an increase of pension to John B. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 776) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Hubbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 777) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Galbreath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 778) granting an increase of pension to John Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 779) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 780) granting an increase of pension to Robert Crudgington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 781) granting an increase of pension to William M. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 782) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte J. Triplette Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 783) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 784) granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Beals; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 785) granting an increase of pension to Lewis M. Moses; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 786) granting an increase of pension to V. G. Farnham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 787) granting an increase of pension to Selena Brewer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 788) granting an increase of pension to David Hannam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 789) granting an increase of pension to Wyley Oglesby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 790) granting an increase of pension to William M. Ivans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 791) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Clawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 792) granting an increase of pension to Frazier McDonald; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 793) granting an increase of pension to Richard P. Chandler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 794) granting an increase of pension to Derris Gregg; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 795) granting an increase of pension to Barzilla T. Monday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 796) granting an increase of pension to Alfred M. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 797) granting an increase of pension to John Farmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 798) granting an increase of pension to James Eldridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 799) granting an increase of pension to William G. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 800) granting an increase of pension to Abner D. Rutherford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 801) for the relief of Irvin Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 802) granting a pension to Laura Hohlstein Hromatka; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 803) granting a pension to Rupert Haas; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 804) granting a pension to Herman J. Wacker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 805) granting a pension to Elizabeth Maurer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 806) granting a pension to Andrew J. Briggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 807) granting an increase of pension to Charles Bieger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 808) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Wolfe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 809) granting an increase of pension to Alvis C. J. Sick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 810) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Adamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 811) for the relief of Eulalie Shores; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 812) for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Sankey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 813) for the relief of Lena Schmieder; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 814) for the relief of Capt. George W. Murray; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 815) for the relief of Henry Hirschberg; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 816) to correct the military record of Abraham Hoover; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 817) to correct the military record of Nicholas Lochboehler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 818) granting a pension to Ed Schlueter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 819) granting a pension to James Spear; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 820) granting a pension to Eli Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 821) granting a pension to Clarence B. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 822) granting a pension to Douglas M. Weems; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 823) granting a pension to Mrs. Idus Chambers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 824) granting a pension to John G. Kimbrough; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 825) granting a pension to William Stephan, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 826) granting a pension to Byron J. Hunt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 827) granting a pension to Charles Lavender; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 828) granting a pension to Mamie R. Grant; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 829) granting an increase of pension to Edgar T. Lassiter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 830) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 831) for the relief of Philip Epstein, Mordecai David, Henry Stein, Julius Louis, and Herman Somers; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 832) for the relief of Mrs. S. A. Dunn, formerly Mrs. S. A. Mitchell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 833) for the relief of Pinkney Persons; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 834) for the relief of the heirs of Jordan Lyons, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 835) for the relief of the heirs of L. G. Brantley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 836) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of William N. Dickson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 837) for the relief of the heirs of R. W. Jemison; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 838) for the relief of the heirs of James Roberts, late of Jasper County, Ga.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 839) for the relief of the estate of Dr. J. M. Curry, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELL of California: A bill (H. R. 840) granting a pension to Alvah H. Mitchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 841) granting a pension to Mary E. Dougherty, widow, and the minor children of Frank Dougherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 842) granting an increase of pension to William S. Nash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 843) granting a pension to John Glaback; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 844) granting a pension to William A. Rappelye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 845) granting a pension to James M. Flynn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 846) granting an increase of pension to William C. Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 847) granting an increase of pension to Harrison D. Hickok; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 848) granting an increase of pension to William M. Deaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 849) granting an increase of pension to William H. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 850) granting an increase of pension to John Zollars; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 851) for the relief of the legal representatives of Napoleon B. Giddings; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BULKLEY: A bill (H. R. 852) granting a pension to Asher P. Anspacher; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 853) granting a pension to Anna Margaret Lynskey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 854) granting a pension to Millie B. Spooner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 855) granting a pension to Henry Sparman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 856) for the relief of Sophia Herbert; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 857) for the relief of Levi L. Conright; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 858) for the relief of Thomas E. Philips; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 859) granting a pension to Julia Ferber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 860) granting a pension to Emma Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 861) granting a pension to Mary J. Chambers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 862) granting a pension to Sarah E. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 863) granting a pension to Catharine Beard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 864) granting a pension to Mary Stultz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 865) granting a pension to Carl Roepke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 866) granting a pension to Jennie B. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 867) granting a pension to Emma Steele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 868) granting a pension to Mary Schmidt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: A bill (H. R. 869) granting a pension to Samuel Faust; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 870) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Strasburg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 871) granting an increase of pension to Elvin A. Estey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 872) granting an increase of pension to Edward J. Beach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 873) granting an increase of pension to Fannie S. Chambers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 874) granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 875) granting an increase of pension to James L. Ackley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 876) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Berg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 877) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Verhalen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 878) granting an increase of pension to Mathilda Albers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 879) granting an increase of pension to Ernest Heidenreiter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 880) to remove the charge of desertion against John L. Kelley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 881) granting an increase of pension to Annis Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 882) for the relief of Charles Wouters; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 883) for the relief of Charles W. Munn; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 884) granting a pension to Benjamin C. Condon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 885) granting a pension to Alexander Frazer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 886) granting a pension to William A. Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 887) granting a pension to Margaret C. Pruett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 888) for the relief of H. C. Hodges, H. A. Powell, John Smith, and Joseph Ridley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 889) for the relief of Mary F. Casey Tucker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 890) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Samuel J. Maund; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 891) granting a pension to Annie Dougherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 892) granting a pension to Adolphus N. Pacetty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 893) granting a pension to George H. Wasson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 894) granting an increase of pension to Ella M. Morrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 895) granting an increase of pension to Theodore R. Kuntz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 896) for the relief of E. A. Bryant; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 897) for the relief of John B. Dell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 898) for the relief of Frank A. Kopp; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 899) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas W. Moore and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 900) for the relief of James Easson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 901) for the relief of William G. Keats; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 902) for the relief of the city of Racine, Wis.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 903) for the relief of Milton S. Harrington; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 904) for the relief of William A. Persons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 905) for the further relief of Hans Peter Guttormsen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 906) for the relief of the heirs of Patrick Sullivan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 907) granting a pension to Richard Nelson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 908) granting a pension to Electa Paradise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 909) granting a pension to James J. Held; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 910) granting a pension to Frank M. Olson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 911) granting an increase of pension to Elbert E. Hill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 912) for the relief of Bruce C. Payne; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 913) for the relief of Andrew W. Sears, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 914) for the relief of John J. Helden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 915) for the relief of David Kirch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 916) for the relief of John Donnelly, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 917) granting an increase of pension to Roy E. Knight; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 918) granting an increase of pension to Hattie A. Vaughan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 919) granting an increase of pension to William Garvean; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 920) granting an increase of pension to John Hennings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 921) granting a pension to Albert C. Pringnitz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 922) granting a pension to Emma Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 923) granting a pension to Harriet Squier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 924) granting a pension to Charlotte McConnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 925) granting a pension to Nancy E. Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 926) granting a pension to Martha Pinnick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 927) granting a pension to Mary Wantz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 928) granting a pension to Kate M. Leach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 929) granting a pension to Mary McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 930) granting a pension to Sadie Barrett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 931) granting a pension to Wiley L. Edmonds; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 932) for the relief of John W. Canary; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 933) for the relief of John H. Bray; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 934) granting a pension to Edward L. Dodd; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 935) granting a pension to Herschel Spainhour; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 936) granting a pension to Samuel B. Ridgway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 937) granting a pension to James M. Vint; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 938) granting a pension to Martha Langley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 939) granting a pension to Susan Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 940) granting a pension to Jennie Bridwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 941) granting a pension to Sarah E. Dillon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 942) granting an increase of pension to Joel H. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 943) granting an increase of pension to James Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 944) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Burton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 945) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Kemp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 946) granting an increase of pension to James M. Kirk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 947) granting an increase of pension to John Keen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 948) granting an increase of pension to James E. Speake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 949) granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Orndorff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 950) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Neal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 951) granting an increase of pension to Reuben S. McLun; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 952) granting an increase of pension to John T. Langley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 953) granting an increase of pension to Clayborn Clements; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 954) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Asdell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 955) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Reeves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 956) granting an increase of pension to Mary Fields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 957) granting an increase of pension to James G. Bullock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 958) granting an increase of pension to John H. Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 959) granting an increase of pension to Granderson Elkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 960) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Summers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 961) granting a pension to Maud Fickert; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 962) for the relief of William H. Shannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 963) for the relief of Mrs. Andrew Riganopolous; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 964) to authorize the payment of the claim of Cynthia R. Ball; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 965) granting an increase of pension to Clarissa J. Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 966) granting a pension to Mary Nachbar; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DONOHOE: A bill (H. R. 967) to correct the naval record of John Halpin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 968) granting pensions to volunteer Army nurses of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 969) to correct the military record of Andrew Given, alias Dugan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 970) to correct the military record of Daniel Graeber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 971) to correct the military record of Timothy A. Maher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 972) to correct the military record of Thomas Logue; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 973) to correct the military record of James Lanahan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 974) to correct the military record of James Kane; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 975) to correct the military record of William H. Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 976) to correct the military record of Samuel Jackaway; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 977) granting an increase of pension to Bridget McAloon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 978) granting an increase of pension to Daniel F. Foley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 979) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Gentner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 980) granting an increase of pension to Richard Gennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 981) granting a pension to Charles E. Tipton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 982) granting a pension to John F. Cassedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 983) granting an increase of pension to Roland Savage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 984) granting a pension to Johanna F. Weand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 985) granting a pension to Patrick J. Costello; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 986) granting a pension to Arabella S. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 987) granting a pension to George C. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 988) granting an increase of pension to Gertrude Stroehline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 989) granting a pension to Gottfried J. Maier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 990) granting a pension to Anna Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 991) granting a pension to Angeline Hopkin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 992) granting a pension to Michael Arnold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 993) granting a pension to Ellen Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 994) granting a pension to Francis A. Gremmen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 995) granting a pension to William Costello; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 996) granting a pension to Albert F. Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 997) granting a pension to Edward J. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 998) granting a pension to Annie Hewson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 999) for the relief of William Mourer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1000) for the relief of Annie McColgan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: A bill (H. R. 1001) for the relief of the heirs of Myra Clark Gaines, deceased; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1002) for the relief of Thomas J. Woodward, surviving receiver of the New Orleans Towboat Association; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 1003) to correct the military record of Nicholas Lochboehler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1004) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William H. Harlow, alias John Deen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1005) to reimburse William Van Derveer, of Millboro, Va., for excess revenue taxes assessed against and collected from him; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1006) granting an increase of pension to Margaret H. Kerr; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1007) granting an increase of pension to Braden E. Fox; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1008) granting a pension to W. D. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1009) granting a pension to Columbus W. Bryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1010) granting a pension to Luther M. Southall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1011) granting a pension to Walter English; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1012) granting a pension to Emma L. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1013) for the relief of J. Terry Dillard; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1014) for the relief of Columbus W. Bryan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1015) for the relief of the estate of Peter Sheets, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1016) for the relief of J. Ballard Taylor; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1017) for the relief of Sarah J. Norcross; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1018) for the relief of the estate of John Anderson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1019) for the relief of the estate of Robert J. Hope, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1020) for the relief of the legal representatives of Thomas B. McClintic, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 1021) granting a pension to Bertha White; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1022) granting an increase of pension to William Boyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1023) granting an honorable discharge to Robert J. McConkey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 1024) granting a pension to Moses Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1025) granting a pension to John F. Keeton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1026) granting a pension to David Jewell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1027) granting a pension to Currency A. Gummere; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1028) granting a pension to Edward Flannery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1029) granting a pension to Ida De Portee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1030) granting a pension to Myron C. Close; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1031) granting a pension to John W. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1032) granting a pension to Frank Sanford Stirling; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1033) granting a pension to George W. Smith, alias George Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1034) granting a pension to Albert Seelig; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1035) granting a pension to William S. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1036) granting an increase of pension to Laura Kohlhase; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1037) granting a pension to Floyd L. Campbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1038) granting a pension to William H. Winters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1039) granting a pension to W. W. Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1040) granting a pension to William R. Trull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1041) granting an increase of pension to Albert Hagstrom; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1042) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1043) granting an increase of pension to Hans P. Nielson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1044) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Butt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1045) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1046) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Wheeler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1047) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Saint Jacques; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1048) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1049) for the relief of H. E. Johnson, John F. Shelley, Jane M. Johnson, and Duff Quinn; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1050) to provide for the relief of Anton Conyar and for the relief of the widow and minor children of James Kerr; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1051) for the relief of Peter W. Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1052) for the relief of Fred Larsen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1053) for the relief of Ruel Rounds; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1054) for the relief of Oliver P. Pring; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1055) for the relief of T. S. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1056) for the relief of Pierson Bros. & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1057) for the relief of EtLel M. Young; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1058) correcting the military record of Jonas O. Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1059) to correct the military record of James C. Simmons, alias James C. Whitlock; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1060) correcting the military record of Reuben Sewell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1061) to correct the military record of Aaron Kibler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1062) granting a patent to Joseph Robicheau; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 1063) granting a pension to Edward J. Prime; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1064) granting a pension to Elizabeth Northway; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1065) granting a pension to Sarah C. Colquhoun; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1066) granting a pension to John M. Upton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1067) granting a pension to John J. O'Neil; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1068) granting a pension to Olive H. Glines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1069) granting an increase of pension to Annette B. Wonson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1070) granting an increase of pension to Sarah K. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1071) granting a pension to Charles W. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also; a bill (H. R. 1072) granting an increase of pension to Sophronia Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1073) granting an increase of pension to Delia F. Homans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1074) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Millett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1075) for the relief of James Henry Payne; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1076) for the relief of Sarah J. Luscomb, widow of Lieut. Henry R. Luscomb; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 1077) for the relief of Newton Y. Wadsworth; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 1078) granting an increase of pension to John W. Scott; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1079) to recompense the heirs of Edward Maher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 1080) granting a pension to Edward D. Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 1081) for the relief of James W. Houser; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1082) for the relief of Timothy Ellsworth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1083) for the relief of Joseph I. York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1084) for the relief of John Laberdy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1085) for the relief of Myron Powers; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1086) for the relief of Joseph P. Binns, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1087) for the relief of Alonzo D. Cadwallader; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1088) for the relief of Park B. Chase; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1089) for the relief of Amanda Honert; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1090) for the relief of Alonzo D. Cadwallader; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1091) granting a pension to Wesley H. Crockett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1092) granting a pension to George W. Bannan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1093) granting a pension to Emilia Granger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1094) granting a pension to Frank Mead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1095) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Shook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1096) granting an increase of pension to Ova O. Nutting; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1097) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Linsley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1098) granting an increase of pension to Clara P. Schnader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1099) to correct the muster of Herman Haupt, late colonel and brigadier general of volunteers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1100) granting a pension to Jenette Babcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1101) granting a pension to Albert C. Sheldon; to the Committe on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1102) granting a pension to Nettie J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1103) granting an increase of pension to James M. Noble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1104) granting an increase of pension to Levi Haus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1105) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Woodruff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 1106) for the relief of John R. Bailey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1107) for the relief of Alonzo Lewis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1108) for the relief of Preston B. C. Lucas; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1109) for the relief of Peter Kenney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1110) for the relief of Pris R. Winslow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1111) for the relief of Daniel D. May; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1112) for the relief of Henry N. Penfield; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1113) for the relief of Henry M. Roberts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1114) for the relief of J. W. La Bare; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1115) to reimburse E. S. Abbott, the postmaster at Seaside, Oreg., for the loss by fire of postal savings cards and stamps; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1116) for the relief of Amos Dahuff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 1117) granting a pension to Anna E. Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOBSON: A bill (H. R. 1118) granting a pension to Sarah B. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1119) granting a pension to John McElroy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1120) granting a pension to Elza L. Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1121) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Cheek; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1122) granting an increase of pension to James T. Steele; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1123) granting an increase of pension to Neil Hughes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1124) granting an increase of pension to Lucy M. Hord; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 1125) granting a pension to Aaron B. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1126) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Pugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1127) granting an increase of pension to William J. Vandergrift; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1128) for the relief of Hiram B. Crowell and William H. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 1129) for the reinstatement of Lieut. Col. Constantine Marrast Perkins to the active list of the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 1130) for the relief of Bernard Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1131) for the relief of Edward S. Salomon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1132) for the relief of George W. Bell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1133) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Ormond M. Lissak; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1134) for the relief of H. Liebes & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1135) for the relief of Arthur G. Fisk; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1136) for the relief of Frank Klein; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1137) for the relief of the American Biscuit Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1138) for the relief of Helen Wakefield; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1139) for the relief of John Rothchild & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1140) for the relief of Piper, Aden, Goodall Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1141) for the relief of the legal representatives of Owen Thorne, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1142) for the relief of Mary Jordan, widow of Dennis Jordan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1143) for the relief of the Wilmerding-Loewe Co., of San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1144) granting a pension to Harry Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1145) granting a pension to Isabelle C. Woodward; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1146) granting a pension to Katherine S. Neeland; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1147) granting a pension to Althea J. Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1148) granting an increase of pension to James J. Walsh; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1149) granting an increase of pension to James Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1150) for the relief of former occupants of the present military reservation at Point San Jose, in the city of San Francisco, and to repeal an act entitled "An act to refer the claim of Jessie Benton Fremont to certain lands and improvements thereon in San Francisco, Cal., to the Court of Claims," approved February 10, 1893; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1151) granting a pension to Arrietta Newbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1152) granting a pension to Ella Whiteside; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1153) granting a pension to Ella M. Gaines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1154) granting a pension to James Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1155) granting a pension to Julius Oppenheimer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1156) granting a pension to Katherine M. McCarthy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. 1157) granting a pension to Ellen Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1158) granting a pension to Lillian P. Beaudin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1159) granting a pension to Shepherd Plummer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1160) granting a pension to Mary Burnet; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1161) granting a pension to Mary A. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1162) granting a pension to Mary English; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1163) granting a pension to Anna M. Spaulding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1164) granting a pension to Josiah George Swinney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1165) granting a pension to Mary E. Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1166) granting a pension to Raymond J. Blakiston; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1167) granting a pension to Hattie G. Parnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1168) granting a pension to William Deable; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1169) granting a pension to Susan E. Cline; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1170) granting a pension to Rose Butcher; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1171) granting a pension to Catherine J. Asmussen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1172) granting a pension to Samuel R. Thurston; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1173) granting an increase of pension to Edward Skahan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1174) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Harvey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1175) granting an increase of pension to Carrie W. Dibble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1176) granting an increase of pension to Fredericka B. Trilley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1177) granting an increase of pension to Fanny M. Smedberg; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1178) granting an increase of pension to Mary Carr; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1179) granting an increase of pension to Moses Frankel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1180) granting an increase of pension to Ida M. Fiala; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1181) granting an increase of pension to Charles Hummel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

Also, a bill (H. R. 1182) for the relief of John Brodie; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1183) for the relief of Robert A. Malloy; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1184) for the relief of Richard H. Grey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1185) for the relief of Ellen B. Monahan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1186) for the relief of Luke Rattigan; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1187) for the relief of Joseph L. Donovan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1188) for the relief of the estate of Julius Jacobs; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1189) for the relief of the legal heirs of A. R. Holzheid; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1190) for the relief of the legal heirs of Hector M. McDonald; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1191) authorizing the President to appoint Weldon B. Page a second lieutenant in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1192) authorizing the President to appoint Alexander Shiras Gassaway a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1193) for the relief of Drenzy A. Jones and John G. Hopper, joint contractors for surveying Yosemite Park boundary, and for damages for illegal arrest while making said survey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1194) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue a certificate of discharge in the true name of Herbert Horrell Webster, who enlisted in the Army under the name of Herbert Horrell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1195) for the relief of the Western Grain & Sugar Products Co. of California; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 1196) granting a pension to Melvin Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1197) granting an increase of pension to John T. Slackford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1198) granting an increase of pension to John J. Holland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1199) granting an increase of pension to William Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1200) granting an increase of pension to William Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 1201) granting an increase of pension to George W. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1202) granting an increase of pension to Julius Weddigen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 1203) for the relief of Amberson G. Shaw, a white man, providing for his enrollment and allotment of land with the Indians of the Rosebud Reservation, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1204) to correct the hospital record of Robert McFarland; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1205) granting a pension to John Klemann; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1206) granting a pension to Frank Lovewell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1207) granting a pension to George Uhl; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1208) granting a pension to Sophia F. C. Mather; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1209) granting a pension to Emily J. Walton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1210) granting a pension to William L. Judkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1211) granting a pension to John Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1212) granting a pension to Charlotte A. Hanna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1213) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Sageser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1214) granting an increase of pension to Jessie W. Bilyeu; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1215) granting an increase of pension to Reuben S. Manning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1216) granting an increase of pension to Robert Buckner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1217) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer D. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1218) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Jennings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1219) granting an increase of pension to Charles T. Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1220) granting an increase of pension to John W. Widdoes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1221) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1222) granting an increase of pension to William W. Thompson, alias Wallace Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1223) granting an increase of pension to John H. Dunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 1224) for the relief of Lewis Montgomery; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1225) for the relief of the Victor Land Co.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1226) for the relief of Robert F. Scott; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1227) to correct the military record of George W. Samson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1228) to correct the military record of John S. Wampler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1229) to correct the military record of John B. Buntin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1230) to correct the military record of George F. De Maranville; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1231) to correct the military record of Fred. W. Godfrey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1232) to correct the military record of William Cameron; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1233) granting a pension to Larkin Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1234) granting a pension to Nancy E. Tate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1235) granting a pension to Isaac McCumsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1236) granting a pension to Lawrence F. Hickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1237) granting a pension to Henry Lee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1238) granting a pension to William C. Hathaway; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1239) granting a pension to Edward O. Tripp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1240) granting a pension to Henry A. Ridgeway; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1241) granting a pension to William E. Reed; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1242) granting a pension to Mary E. Dager; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1243) granting a pension to Rebecca Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1244) granting a pension to Olive E. Rothrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1245) granting a pension to Katherine Barger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1246) granting an increase of pension to Rachel I. Holloway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1247) granting an increase of pension to John Beazan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1248) granting an increase of pension to William W. Bishop; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1249) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. McLean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1250) granting an increase of pension to Robert D. Rector; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1251) granting an increase of pension to Jen Rody Chauncey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1252) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor E. Garner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1253) to adjust the claims of certain settlers in Sherman County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 1254) granting a pension to Maria A. Ryburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1255) granting a pension to Edward C. McDowell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1256) granting a pension to Edward C. McDowell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1257) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Round; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1258) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cornell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1259) for the relief of Frederick Grasser; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1260) confirming titles of Deborah A. Griffin and Mary J. Griffin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 1261) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius A. Enterline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 1262) for the relief of Hugh P. Strong; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1263) for the relief of Frank Murray; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1264) granting an increase of pension to Gustav A. Haas; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1265) granting an increase of pension to Adam Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1266) granting a pension to Rachel Ross Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1267) granting a pension to James Lennon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1268) granting a pension to Hilda Furbom; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1269) granting a pension to Joseph Jiles; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 1270) waiving the age limit for admission to the Pay Corps of the United States Navy in the case of Evan Urner Rinehart; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 1271) granting a pension to Augustus E. Oberton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1272) granting a pension to Anna Gewinner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1273) granting a pension to Mary Horran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1274) granting a pension to John Devine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1275) granting a pension to Mary Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1276) granting a pension to Israel Wolf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1277) granting a pension to Erastus A. Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1278) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Dennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1279) granting an increase of pension to Anna A. Bolan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1280) granting an increase of pension to James Connelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1281) granting an increase of pension to William Coyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1282) granting an increase of pension to William Henry Wagenseller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1283) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. M. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1284) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Ann Eastman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1285) granting an increase of pension to Elijah B. Egan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1286) granting an increase of pension to Henry Burcham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1287) granting an increase of pension to Charles Britton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1288) granting an increase of pension to Barbara Wilkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1289) for the relief of Lavern Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1290) for the relief of Patrick Hughes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1291) for the relief of George Gardells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1292) for the relief of Edward Tighe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1293) to correct the military record of Hugh McCormick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1294) to correct the military record of Wade W. Barber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 1295) granting a pension to Walter E. Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1296) granting a pension to Rachel D. Barnes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1297) granting a pension to Jennette B. Jordan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1298) granting a pension to Joseph Delorme; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1299) granting a pension to Edmund R. Stearns; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1300) granting a pension to Charles F. Rollins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1301) granting a pension to Mary E. Bubier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1302) granting a pension to Samuel Willis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1303) granting a pension to Nina L. Eaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1304) granting a pension to Rosie Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1305) granting a pension to Georgianna L. Peabody; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1306) granting a pension to Alphonso Penley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 1307) granting an increase of pension to Philip George; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 1308) granting an increase of pension to Corydon G. Crafts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1309) granting an increase of pension to Eliza M. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1310) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1311) granting an increase of pension to David S. Knapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1312) granting an increase of pension to Rosa Prentiss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1313) granting an increase of pension to John Hanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1314) granting an increase of pension to James K. P. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1315) granting an increase of pension to Ansel G. Marston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1316) granting an increase of pension to Albert Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1317) granting an increase of pension to Moses King, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1318) to correct the military record of Eleazer W. Atwood; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1319) for the relief of Humphrey A. Owen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 1320) granting a pension to W. T. Goode; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1321) granting a pension to Frank Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1322) granting a pension to Vincent S. Drain; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1323) granting a pension to Monroe Flowers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1324) granting a pension to Frederick M. Ottmar; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1325) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Merriam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1326) granting an increase of pension to W. M. Dalton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1327) granting an increase of pension to La Salle Corbell Pickett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1328) granting an increase of pension to John F. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1329) granting an increase of pension to William J. Doyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1330) granting an increase of pension to H. W. Howe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1331) for the relief of Mary C. Mayers; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1332) for the relief of Thomas Brougham Baker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1333) for the relief of James T. Little; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1334) for the relief of James H. Rhodes & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1335) for the relief of John Inglis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1336) for the relief of Frank Kleiminger; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1337) for the relief of John M. Green; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1338) for the relief of the Chicago & Alton Railroad Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1339) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Edwin Crossan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1340) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William Birk; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1341) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William H. Gibson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1342) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of C. G. S. Mills; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1343) to correct the naval record of Ezekiel Downey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1344) to correct the military record of George F. Dewey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1345) to correct the military record of James E. C. Covel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1346) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George W. Lord; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1347) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frederick Frosch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 1348) for the relief of Olaf Nelson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1349) for the relief of John G. Witt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 1350) for the relief of John G. Mead; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1351) for the relief of Isaac Bettelyoun; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1352) for the relief of George H. Grace; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1353) for the relief of John H. Janssen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1354) for the relief of Mary Russell, Jesus Gallegos, William H. Babby, Sophia Gallegos, Richard C. Stirk, Manuel Martinez, Louisa Bianis, and Seberiano Sierra, of Pine Ridge, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1355) granting an increase of pension to George W. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1356) granting an increase of pension to John Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1357) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Emmitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1358) granting an increase of pension to Robert D. Giltner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1359) granting an increase of pension to Frank A. Van Fleet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1360) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Newell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1361) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1362) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 1363) for the relief of John E. Keys; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1364) for the relief of Henry Altman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1365) for the relief of Robert Foote; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1366) for the relief of Emory Scott Land; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1367) for the relief of Clarence D. Houck; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1368) for the relief of John S. Nix; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1369) for the relief of James M. Daniel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1370) for the relief of Harry H. Hall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1371) granting a pension to Chesley Goldsby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1372) granting an increase of pension to Benjamine F. Yelton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1373) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Hake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1374) granting an increase of pension to Edward L. Crail; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1375) granting an increase of pension to James McGiverney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 1376) granting a pension to William R. Pryor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1377) granting a pension to William A. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1378) granting a pension to Otho Peterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1379) granting a pension to Mary B. Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1380) granting a pension to Ben R. Barner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1381) granting a pension to Eli Leffler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1382) granting a pension to George B. Roach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1383) granting an increase of pension to Noah E. Wingate; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1384) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Spangler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1385) granting an increase of pension to John L. Gibson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1386) granting an increase of pension to John Hull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1387) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Dale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1388) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Bowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1389) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Dean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1390) granting an increase of pension to William A. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1391) granting an increase of pension to George S. West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1392) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Robison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1393) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1394) granting an increase of pension to James Casey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1395) granting an increase of pension to Barney Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1396) granting an increase of pension to Austin Lennen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1397) granting an increase of pension to William Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1398) granting an increase of pension to William G. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1399) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. Batson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1400) granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel Probus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1401) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Hull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1402) granting an increase of pension to Henry Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1403) granting an increase of pension to Harriet B. Gros; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1404) for the relief of George W. Anderson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1405) for the relief of Frank W. Tucker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1406) for the relief of Frank T. Green; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1407) for the relief of Willard Thompson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1408) for the relief of Ambrose D. Hunt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1409) for the relief of David A. Lindsay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1410) for the relief of James M. Blankenship; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1411) for the relief of the heirs at law of Isaac D. Armstrong, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1412) to correct the military record of Benjamin F. Davis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 1413) granting a pension to Lucy Anna Hodges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1414) granting a pension to Cornelius Medler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1415) granting a pension to Seymour McDonough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1416) granting a pension to William C. Benz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1417) granting an increase of pension to Frances P. O'Reilly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1418) granting an increase of pension to Horace W. Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1419) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1420) granting an increase of pension to James O. Ault; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1421) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Pluche; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1422) granting an increase of pension to George W. Earl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1423) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Bullard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1424) for the relief Isabella H. Silvey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1425) for the relief of Hansen & Dieckmann; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1426) for the relief of the estate of William D. Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1427) granting John G. Escudero an advance in grade on the retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELEY: A bill (H. R. 1428) granting a pension to Thomas Keeler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1429) granting a pension to Mary Griffith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1430) granting a pension to Samuel Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1431) granting a pension to Thomas Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1432) granting a pension to Martha J. Curry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1433) granting a pension to James W. Griffith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1434) granting an increase of pension to James Allensworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1435) granting a pension to Benjamin A. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1436) granting a pension to Mary A. Blake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1437) granting a pension to Parmelia R. Parris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1438) granting a pension to Margaret E. Oursborn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1439) granting a pension to Martha L. Manly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1440) granting an increase of pension to John M. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1441) granting a pension to Otto Haner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1442) granting an increase of pension to William J. Downin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1443) granting an increase of pension to Anderson R. Dodge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1444) granting an increase of pension to James M. White; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1445) granting an increase of pension to Philip M. Nuckles; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1446) granting an increase of pension to Charles Terbush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1447) granting an increase of pension to Taylor Lobdell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1448) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Edward W. Coberly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1449) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William Walters, alias Joshua Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1450) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John T. Lamar; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 1451) granting a pension to Cecelia J. Burton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1452) granting a pension to Thomas F. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1453) granting a pension to Cornelius O'Leary; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1454) granting a pension to Bert W. Abbott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1455) granting a pension to James H. Beattie; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1456) granting a pension to Margaret Gately; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1457) granting a pension to Celestia Watkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1458) granting a pension to Richard Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1459) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Gallagher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1460) granting an increase of pension to Mary Gorman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1461) for the relief of Maxwell Carpenter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1462) for the relief of William R. Boag; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1463) for the relief of Andrew Browning Atwell, alias Andrew Browning; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1464) for the relief of Albert S. Austin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1465) for the relief of Patrick H. Murphy, alias Henry Watson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1466) for the relief of Dennis J. Neagle; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1467) for the relief of Henry J. Hennigar, alias Edgar Swissberry; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1468) for the relief of William A. Gridley; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1469) for the relief of William W. Stewart; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1470) for the relief of Thomas C. Hyde; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1471) for the relief of John Hughes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1472) for the relief of the heirs of Edmund M. Phelan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1473) for the relief of John A. Gauley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1474) for the relief of John Daniel; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1475) to correct the military record of Thomas Kirwan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 1476) granting a pension to Alexander McWhorter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1477) granting a pension to Isom W. Foley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1478) granting a pension to Robert L. Abston; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1479) granting a pension to Silas G. Burkett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1480) granting a pension to John Storms; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1481) granting a pension to Bettie Howard Unthank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1482) granting a pension to Taylor Asher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1483) granting a pension to W. T. Meadors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1484) granting a pension to Robert Wombles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1485) granting a pension to Dempsey P. Wilder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1486) granting an increase of pension to Saley E. Bradshaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H R. 1487) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Cannon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1488) for the relief of Andrew P. Inabintt; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1489) for the relief of Daniel C. Hawn; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1490) for the relief of Jesse Powers; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1491) for the relief of Josiah E. Spurlock; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1492) for the relief of Sarah Ann Slaven; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1493) for the relief of John M. Bryant; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1494) for the relief of Dutton Davis, administrator of the estate of John Davis, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1495) for the relief of Mary Moles; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1496) for the relief of the heirs of John Davidson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1497) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel Griffis, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1498) for the relief of the heirs of George Humphreys, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1499) for the relief of the heirs of John Midcalfe, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1500) for the relief of the heirs of Caleb Mullins, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1501) for the relief of the heirs of John Ray, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1502) for the relief of the heirs of Elizabeth Wright, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1503) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Saunders, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1504) for the relief of the heirs of James T. Ashinhurst, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1505) for the relief of the heirs of Parks D. Brittain, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1506) for the relief of the heirs of Lewis M. Davenport, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1507) for the relief of the estate of Green Fitzgerald; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1508) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James Marlow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1509) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Amos Bennett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1510) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James W. Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 1511) granting a pension to Henry Sprick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1512) granting a pension to Jesse Blair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1513) for the relief of Robert T. Legge; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1514) for the relief of Bert Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1515) for the relief of W. W. Blood; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1516) for the relief of Thomas F. Howell; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1517) for the relief of George W. Cary; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1518) for the relief of William F. Stewart, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1519) for the relief of Stephen B. Fowler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1520) for the relief of William B. Fowler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1521) for the relief of Manley Beals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1522) for the relief of Lieut. (Junior Grade) F. N. Eklund, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1523) for the relief of James Diamond; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1524) to correct the military record of Francis M. Crow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1525) to correct the military record of Lorain Alfred Rogers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1526) to correct the military record of James Bowery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1527) to correct the military record of George F. Reid and to pay his widow, Isabella Reid, a pension; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1528) for the relief of T. A. Roseberry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 1529) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Patrick Hopkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1530) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Peter S. Beauchamp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1531) authorizing the payment to the widow of Dorence Atwater of compensation for services rendered the United States of America; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1532) for the relief of John G. Chapman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1533) for the relief of Charles H. Quackenbush; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1534) for the relief of George R. Curtis; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1535) for the relief of George W. Beach; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1536) to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas McCarty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1537) to remove the charge of desertion against Walter S. Goodrich; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1538) to remove the charge of desertion against Alonzo Derrick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1539) to remove the charge of desertion against Henry A. Lain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1540) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Gancy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1541) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James Lacey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1542) granting a pension to Verena Ray Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1543) granting a pension to Charles Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1544) granting a pension to Daniel A. Millard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1545) granting a pension to Charles Voos; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1546) granting a pension to Elmie Byington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1547) granting a pension to Walter J. Hawthorne; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1548) granting an increase of pension to Gould T. Hubbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1549) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1550) granting an increase of pension to George B. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1551) granting an increase of pension to Mary T. Frank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1552) granting an increase of pension to Francis L. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1553) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James Carey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1554) for the relief of the legal representatives or heirs of Paul Noyes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 1555) granting a pension to Edward Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1556) granting a pension to Sara M. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1557) granting a pension to Mary E. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1558) granting a pension to Isaac Griffith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1559) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Colgate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1560) granting an increase of pension to Franklin B. Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1561) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1562) to correct the military record of Albert S. Austin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1563) to provide for the repayment of the ransom of Ellen M. Stone; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1564) for the relief of Passed Asst. Surg. Paul Tonnel Dessez, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: A bill (H. R. 1565) granting an increase of pension to John Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1566) granting an increase of pension to William B. Peppard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1567) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Snipes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1568) granting an increase of pension to Abel E. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1569) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Herrmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 1570) for the payment of money to John H. Getter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1571) for the payment of money due Charles W. Hayden; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1572) for the payment of wages due to Frank Girard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 1573) granting a pension to Charles H. Reed; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1574) granting an increase of pension to William H. Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 1575) granting a pension to Emma L. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1576) granting a pension to Adolph Lalonde; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1577) granting an increase of pension to George W. Weller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1578) granting an increase of pension to James H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1579) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1580) for the relief of John R. Norris; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 1581) for the relief of Leo Müller; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1582) granting a pension to Markus Weiner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1583) granting a pension Herman Hoffman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1584) granting a pension to Gilbert Van Vorce; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1585) granting a pension to Harry E. Low; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1586) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Conkling; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1587) granting an increase of pension to Walter Keefe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1588) granting an increase of pension to James Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1589) granting an increase of pension to George H. Eldridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1590) granting an increase of pension to James E. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1591) granting an increase of pension to James F. Boyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1592) granting an increase of pension to John McDonald, alias John McHughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1593) granting an increase of pension to James K. P. Vance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1594) granting an increase of pension to Ralph E. Wands; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1595) granting an increase of pension to Salome A. Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1596) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Hatfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1597) granting an increase of pension to Laura Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1598) granting an increase of pension to Cyrena M. Hatfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1599) granting an increase of pension to David Y. Hale; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 1600) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Jay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1601) granting a pension to James M. Pauley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1602) granting an increase of pension to Tamma A. Lloyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1603) granting an increase of pension to Frisby D. Hutchinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1604) for the relief of Francis A. Land; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1605) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Gilman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1606) granting an increase of pension to Ellen J. Merritt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1607) granting an increase of pension to William H. Stebbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1608) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Raper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1609) granting a pension to Elizabeth Briggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1610) granting a pension to Sophronia E. Whipple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THACHER: A bill (H. R. 1611) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Tripp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 1612) granting a pension to Elizabeth Nazworthy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1613) granting a pension to Elmer Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1614) granting a pension to Amanda Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1615) granting a pension to Elizabeth Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1616) granting a pension to Mary Bullard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1617) granting a pension to Mary A. Millsap; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1618) granting a pension to Harriet A. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1619) granting a pension to Clara S. Ickis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1620) granting an increase of pension to William H. Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1621) granting an increase of pension to Wesley J. Banks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1622) granting an increase of pension to George Ingram; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1623) for the relief of Washington M. Knight; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1624) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John H. Jaques; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 1625) for the relief of Oscar Frommel & Bro.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 1626) granting a pension to Richard M. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1627) granting a pension to Emma B. Showalter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1628) granting a pension to Arminta Lary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1629) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan H. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1630) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel H. Mahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 1631) to adjust the claims of certain settlers in Sherman County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Fremont, Ohio, protesting against the passage of any legislation for a reduction of tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Tri-State Grain Dealers and Producers' Association, of Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan, favoring the passage of Senate bill 3, granting Federal aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of A. E. Witts and 50 other citizens, also Charles H. Forbes and 75 other citizens, of Tuscarawas County, Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation for the investigation of the alleged persecution of the editors of the Appeal to Reason; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

Also, petition of W. A. Himbaugh, president of the Coshocton Board of Trade; Hon. Joe L. McDowell, president of the Times Publishing Co.; Hon. J. W. Cassingham, former Member of Congress; Hon. J. C. Adams, former Ohio State senator; Judge C. B. Hunt; Hon. George W. Cassingham, mayor of Coshocton; Hon. C. B. McCoy; Hon. F. E. Pomerene; C. A. Lamberson; H. D. Beach; A. H. Thomson; Carl R. Herbig, R. T. Hunt; C. F. Gosser, pottery manufacturer, all of Coshocton, Ohio, protesting against a reduction of the present duty on crockery and pottery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Petition of the Georgia Woman's Suffrage Association, favoring the passage of legislation to amend the Constitution of the United States granting women the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, favoring the passage of legislation fixing the limit of eight hours per day for employees working on Government grants and franchises; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Burlington, N. J., and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Collingswood, N. J., favoring the passage of the Sims amendment to House bill 27876, providing for the closing of the Panama Exposition on Sundays; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Papers to accompany a bill granting a pension to Emma Steele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Emma Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of business men of Lake Preston and Desmet, S. Dak., favoring the passage of legislation compelling concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute their portion of the funds for the development of the local community, county, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, New York, N. Y., protesting against the passage of any legislation making an amendment to the Constitution which would extend suffrage to all women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of George John Kargl, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation to increase the tariff on printing and bookbinding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the United Hatters of North America, Local No. 8, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the passage of any legislation making a reduction in the duty on hats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Hanson-Jenks Co., New York, protesting against the passage of the proposed legislation to levy a duty on certain raw materials entering into the manufacture of perfumery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the International Brick, Tile, and Terra Cotta Workers' Alliance, Chicago, Ill., protesting against the passage of any legislation reducing the duty on floor and wall tile; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York Mercantile Exchange, New York, favoring the passage of legislation to remove the duty on butter, cheese, and eggs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Banner Milling Co., the Thornton & Chester Milling Co., and the Niagara Falls Milling Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., and the Chase-Hibbard Milling Co., of Elmira, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the new tariff bill to admit flour free and place a duty on wheat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Salts Textile Manufacturing Co., of New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation making at least 40 per cent difference between the duty of the raw and the manufactured products of mohair; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George Washington Council and Commodore Barry Branch, No. 310, of the American Continental League of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Root bill to repeal the free-tolls portion of the Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Ladies' Auxiliary, New York Zoological Society, favoring the passage of legislation for the adoption of the new tariff law intended to prohibit the importation of the plumage of wild birds for the use of milliners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Central Federated Union of Greater New York and vicinity, protesting against the passage of the proposed legislation for an increase in the internal-revenue tax on cigars on a sliding scale; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of citizens of Gooding County, Idaho, protesting against the passage of the Lever bill, permitting the sale of colored oleomargarine as butter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Pocatello National Forest Association, Malad City, Idaho, protesting against the passage of any legislation for the placing of the national forests under State control; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of M. Shortell & Son, Salem, Mass.; John H. Russ and Caleton & Hunt, Haverhill, Mass.; Nathan D. Dodge Shoe Co. and Bliss & Perry Shoe Co., Newburyport, Mass., protesting against the passage of legislation for any reduction of duty on footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of the Young Men's Christian Association of Lancaster, Pa., favoring the passage of legislation prohibiting the interstate shipment of opium and cocaine for illegal uses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Petition of Glendora Steirach and other residents of the third Oregon congressional district, favoring the passage of legislation preventing the further diversion of the waters of the Niagara River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Central Labor Council of Portland and vicinity, favoring the passage of legislation for the repeal of the Dick military law placing the State militia on the Army pay roll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOBECK: Petition of various improvement clubs of Omaha, Nebr., favoring the passage of legislation making an appropriation for the relief of the sufferers of limited and moderate means in Nebraska in the cyclone and tornado of March 23, 1913; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: Petition of the Farmers' Grain Dealers' Association of South Dakota, Watertown, S. Dak., protesting against the allowing of Canadian grain to enter the United States either in bond or at less than the regular freight rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Board of Trade of New York City, protesting against the passage of legislation for an increase in the amount of foreign articles which Americans returning from abroad may bring in free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Watertown Chamber of Commerce, Watertown, N. Y., protesting against the passage of legislation for the removal of duty on flour and leaving a duty on wheat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the International Brick, Tile, and Terra Cotta Workers' Alliance, protesting against the passage of legislation reducing the tariff on floor and wall tile; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rev. A. C. Loucks and others, of Lowville, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Sims amendment to House bill 27876, providing for the closing of the Panama Exposition on Sunday; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of Robert A. Hughes and others, of Carthage, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation for an investigation of the charges against the Appeal to Reason; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

Also, petition of the American Cutlery Co. and others, of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the passage of any legislation making a change in the present duty on table cutlery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Association for International Conciliation, favoring the passage of legislation for the immediate settlement of free-tolls clause in the Panama Canal act either by the rescinding of the clause, a mutual agreement, or by international arbitration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Pawtucket Chapter, favoring the passage of legislation for the construction of a memorial highway to Mount Vernon; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Rhode Island State Branch, Lodge No. 147, of the American Federation of Labor, favoring the passage of legislation making an amendment to the Sherman antitrust law exempting organizations of labor, etc., from same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Helen M. Barnbrook, Providence, R. I., and William Williams, Bristol, R. I., favoring the passage of legislation prohibiting the importation of the plumage of wild birds for the use of milliners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Rhode Island Woman Suffrage Association, Providence, R. I., protesting against the police protection of the women in the suffragettes' parade in Washington, March 3, 1913; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE: petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring the passage of the Sims amendment to House bill 27876, providing for the closing of the Panama Exposition on Sundays; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of the New Haven Chamber of Commerce, New Haven, Conn., protesting against the passage of the proposed legislation for the consolidation of the customs district of New Haven and of other cities of Connecticut; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

Also, petition of the Ladies' Auxiliary, No. 45, National Association of Letter Carriers, favoring the passage of the Hamill bill, providing a pension for the retirement of the aged and infirm civil-service employees; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the general executive committee of the Railway Business Association, favoring the passage of legislation for the adoption of the national budget as a method of regulating the receipts and expenditures of the National Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the International Typographical Union, favoring the passage of legislation making it unlawful for any person, for a cash consideration or any other, to circulate, either oral or printed, any statement that can not be substantiated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of New Britain, Conn., protesting against the passage of legislation to repeal portion of the Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: Petition of the Nevada Equal Franchise Society, protesting against the police protection of the women in the suffragette's parade in Washington March 3, 1913; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Nevada Bar Association, Reno, Nev., favoring the passage of pending legislation to simplify Federal procedure on the law side of the court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Fallon Chamber of Commerce, Fallon, Nev., and the Reno Commercial Club, Reno, Nev., favoring the passage of legislation relative to a grant by the United States to the State of Nevada of 1,000,000 acres of public lands, to be disposed of for the benefit of the State road fund; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of citizens of Elko, Nev., favoring the passage of legislation to prevent the parole of the Federal life prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Socialists of Churchill County, and Manhattan, Nev., favoring the passage of legislation to make an investigation of the indictment of Fred D. Warren and Eugene V. Debs, of the Appeal to Reason; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to William H. Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Philip George; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers accompanying bill granting a pension to Charles H. Reed; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of members of Commodore Barry Branch, No. 310, of the American Continental League, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Root bill to repeal the free-tolls portion of the Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the United Hatters of North America, Local No. 8, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the passage of any legislation for the reduction of tariff on hats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Central Federated Union of Greater New York and Vicinity, protesting against the passage of the proposed legislation to increase the internal-revenue tax on cigars on a sliding scale; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *April 8, 1913.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

ATLEE POMERENE, a Senator from the State of Ohio, appeared in his seat to-day.

THE JOURNAL.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I ask that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think the Journal of the first day of the session, at least, ought to be read, and I must object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection, and the Secretary will proceed with the reading of the Journal.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I do not see the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] in his seat. I was present at the time, and I do not recall that the Senator from Missouri objected to the consideration of the concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives, although it is so noted in the Journal.

Mr. SMOOT. He made a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I think he made a parliamentary inquiry, but my recollection is that he did not object to the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Missouri, Mr. President, simply submitted to the Chair the question whether the concurrent resolution could then be taken up, except by unanimous consent. He did not make a formal point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Journal will be corrected accordingly, and if there is no further objection the Journal will stand approved as corrected.

Mr. STONE subsequently said: Mr. President, as a matter of privilege, I desire to have the Journal corrected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state for the benefit of the Senator from Missouri that the Journal was ordered corrected.

Mr. STONE. I have just come into the Senate. My attention has been called to the matter. I do not know how it was corrected.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] had it corrected to correspond with what occurred yesterday.

Mr. STONE. I desired to make a statement and to have the Journal accordingly corrected. I did not object to the consideration of the concurrent resolution referred to, coming from the House. I merely raised the question of order as to whether under the rules of the Senate the resolution could be considered on yesterday without unanimous consent. The Chair held to the contrary, and I acquiesced. I do not care to have the Journal show that I objected to the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Journal has already been ordered corrected in accordance with the statement of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. Then my remarks are unnecessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Attention was called to the fact by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] in the absence of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. That is satisfactory.

IMPORTATION OF TEAS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the Senate resolution adopted on the 28th of February, 1913, calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit certain correspondence, rulings, reports, and orders relative to the importation into this country of green teas or colored teas, the Chair presents the original documents, which the Secretary of the Treasury says, in his judgment, should be furnished instead of any report. The papers will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended October 11, 1912, which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

DEMOTION OF WILLIAM HALL AND OTHERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication, dated March 3, 1913, from the then Postmaster General, Mr. Hitchcock, transmitting a supplementary list of papers from the Post Office Department relating to the demotion in 1911 of William Hall, E. H. Erwin, R. E. Erwin, J. J. Negley, and E. P. Rodman, clerks in the Railway Mail Service, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I present the certificate of the governor of Illinois certifying that Hon. JAMES HAMILTON LEWIS was duly elected by the Legislature of Illinois a Senator to represent that State in the United States Senate for the term of six years. I ask that the credentials may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the credentials.

The credentials of JAMES HAMILTON LEWIS, chosen by the Legislature of the State of Illinois a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1913, were read and ordered to be filed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of New Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint resolution 17, with regard to the international exposition and celebration to be held in El Paso, Tex., to commemorate the building and completion of the Elephant Butte Dam.

Whereas through the efforts of the Government of the United States, acting by and through the Reclamation Service, the largest irrigation enterprise in the United States, namely, the Rio Grande project or, as it is otherwise known, the Elephant Butte Dam, located 110 miles north of El Paso, Tex., and 90 miles north of Las Cruces, N. Mex., on the Rio Grande, in the fertile Rio Grande Valley, is to be completed during the year 1915; and

Whereas by virtue of such Rio Grande project thousands of acres of land will be reclaimed and made available for beautiful and attractive and productive orchards and homes; and

Whereas the people of El Paso County, Tex., and the people of the Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico are to hold a great irrigation and industrial exposition in El Paso in the year 1915 to commemorate the building and completion of the Elephant Butte Dam, at which celebration it is planned to officially open the floodgates of the great irrigation project; and

Whereas the said irrigation project is, in a sense, an international project, in this, that the same is being built by the Government of the United States, by virtue of a treaty with the Republic of Mexico, which treaty provides, amongst other things, that the said Republic of Mexico shall receive yearly from the said dam 60,000 acre-feet of water; and

Whereas it is appropriate that the United States should formally signify to the Republic of Mexico that the project is nearing completion and that the United States would welcome the participation of the Republic of Mexico in the celebration so as aforesaid to be held in El Paso, Tex.; and

Whereas it is fitting that the Government of the United States should participate in the said celebration because of the successful building of the greatest of the irrigation projects on the Rio Grande, which is commonly known as the American Nile, which project rivals the great English Assouan Dam on the Nile River in Egypt: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico (the Senate concurring therein), That a vote of thanks and appreciation is hereby extended by the State of New Mexico to the Government of the United States and to the officials of the Reclamation Service of the United States for their active interest in the needs of the State of New Mexico and for the energy and ability displayed by them in the conception and execution of the work upon said irrigation project; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, requested by the State of New Mexico to officially ask the Republic of Mexico to participate in the celebration and exposition to be held in said city of El Paso in the year 1915; and be it further

Resolved, That the State of New Mexico hereby extends a cordial invitation to the President of the United States to visit the Rio Grande Valley in the year 1915 during the holding of said celebration and exposition and to participate in the formal opening of the said irrigation project; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, requested to make an appropriation in the sum of $250,000 in order that the Government of the United States may participate in the said celebration; and be it further

Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this resolution shall be immediately made and sent by the secretary of state of New Mexico to the President of the United States and to the President of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to Senators ALBERT B. FALL, THOMAS B. CATRON, C. A. CULBERSON, and MORRIS SHEPPARD, and to Congressmen HARVEY B. FERGUSSON, CHARLES F. CURRY, and W. R. SMITH, and to the Director of the Reclamation Service of the United States.

I hereby certify that the word "the" interlined on eighth line of page 2 was placed there before signing.

E. C. DE BACA,
President of the Senate.
ISIDORO ARMIJO,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
ROMAN L. BACA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
FRANK STAPLIN,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Approved March 13, 1913.

WILLIAM C. MCDONALD,
Governor of New Mexico.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Antonio Lucero, secretary of state of the State of New Mexico, do hereby certify—

That I have carefully compared the annexed copy of joint resolution No. 17 of the Senate and House of Representative of the State of New Mexico in Legislature assembled, with the original thereof as filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of New Mexico on the 13th day of March, A. D. 1913, and that it is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have caused the seal of the State to be hereunto affixed.

Given under my hand at Santa Fe this 13th day of March, A. D. 1913, and in the one hundred and thirty-seventh year of the independence of the United States of America.

[SEAL.] ANTONIO LUCERO,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is necessary for the proper industrial and commercial development of the Territory of Hawaii that there shall be at least one suitable terminal port for the accommodation of vessels on each of the four principal islands—Hawaii, Maui, Oahu, and Kauai—of this Territory; and that, in view of the size and contour of the largest island, Hawaii, there should be one or more such ports on each side thereof; and

Whereas surveys, or surveys and improvements, have been authorized by the Congress for one such port on each of the islands of Maui, Oahu, and Kauai, and on the east side of the island of Hawaii, but not yet for any such port on the west and south side of the island of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made of the harbors on the west and south coast of the island of Hawaii with a view to determining the best location for a port or ports on that coast; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and the Delegate in Congress from Hawaii.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 8, 1913.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was this day adopted in the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii.

ERIC A. KNUDSEN,
President of the Senate.
JOHN H. WISE,
Clerk of the Senate.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 8, 1913.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was this day adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii.

H. L. HOLSTEIN,
Speaker House of Representatives.
EDWARD WOODWARD,
Clerk House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair presents a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington in favor of adequate fortifications and military defenses of the harbors of the Pacific coast. The memorial will be referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

Mr. JONES. I think it should go to the Committee on Military Affairs as it relates to fortifications.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF WASHINGTON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 11, passed February 11 and March 7, 1913, by the Thirteenth Legislature of the State of Washington, with the original enrolled copy of said joint memorial now on file in this office and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said original, and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington, at the capitol in Olympia, this 11th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 11.

To the President of the United States of America, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of War, and the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington:

We, your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Washington, the House concurring, assembled in regular session of the Thirteenth Legislature of the State of Washington, most respectfully represent and pray as follows:

Whereas the State of Washington has many wealthy cities and towns wholly dependent upon the national seacoast defense for protection from invasion from the Pacific Ocean; and

Whereas by the fourth biennial report of the State board of tax commissioners of the State of Washington the assessed valuation of all of the property in the State of Washington, taxable under the statutes of said State, appears to be $1,005,086,251; and

Whereas Grays and Willapa Harbors are wholly without military defenses of any kind or nature; and

Whereas the whole of Washington and Oregon is accessible from the Pacific Ocean through Grays and Willapa Harbors; and

Whereas the naval strength of the United States now stationed on the Pacific coast would be wholly inadequate, in case of threatened invasion, to properly protect the Pacific coast and repel any attempted invasion from the Pacific Ocean; and

Whereas petitions have been filed with Senator W. L. JONES, of the United States Senate Committee on Military Affairs, which petitions were signed by taxpayers of the States of Washington and Oregon, that the petitioners thereon represented $332,898,097, as appraised by the taxing officers of said States and duly certified by such taxing officers, praying that Grays and Willapa Harbors be fortified; and

Whereas many banking, milling, manufacturing, and coal mining corporations and wholesale merchants signed said petitions, whose assets could not be shown by certificates of the State board of tax commissioners of the States of Washington and Oregon, in addition to the amounts first above shown to be so verified by certificates; and

Whereas the following commercial bodies of the Northwest have, by resolutions duly and regularly adopted, found that the fortification of Grays and Willapa Harbors was a public necessity, to wit: Portland Chamber of Commerce, Portland, Oreg.; New Seattle Chamber of Commerce, Seattle, Wash.; Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce, Aberdeen, Wash.; Montesano Chamber of Commerce, Montesano, Wash.; Spokane Chamber of Commerce, Spokane, Wash.; Olympia Chamber of Commerce, Olympia, Wash; and the Centralia Chamber of Commerce, Centralia, Wash.; and

Whereas Gen. Marion P. Maus, commanding the department of the Columbia, United States Army, has recommended the fortification of Grays and Willapa Harbors in his last report: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Washington (the House concurring), That the President of the United States of America, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of War, and the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington be, and they are hereby, urged to take such action as will lead to the speedy planting of adequate fortifications and military defenses capable of repelling any attempted invasion through said harbors from the Pacific Ocean.

The secretary of state is hereby directed to immediately transmit a certified copy of this memorial to his excellency the President of the United States of America, to the honorable Secretary of War, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington.

Passed the senate February 11, 1913.

LOUIS F. HART,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house March 7, 1913.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Whereas the Sixty-second Congress of the United States of America, at the second session, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made and passed the following proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That in lieu of the first paragraph of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, and in lieu of so much of paragraph 2 of the same section as relates to the filling of vacancies, the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States:

"'The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof for six years, and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

"'When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided,* That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

"'This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.'"

Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, duly convened, That the said foregoing proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded by the governor of this State to the Secretary of State of the United States of America, at Washington, and to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the National Congress.

Approved March 7, 1913, 9.25 a. m.

L. B. HANNA,
Governor.
J. H. FRANCE,
Speaker of the House.
M. J. GEORGE,
Chief Clerk of the House.
A. T. KRABBEL,
President of the Senate.
W. D. AUSTIN,
Secretary of the Senate.

This certifies that the within bill originated in the House of the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota and is known on the records of that body as house bill No. 5.

M. J. GEORGE,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Filed in this office this 18th day of February, 1913.

THOMAS HALL,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
BISMARCK, N. DAK.

I, Thomas Hall, secretary of state of North Dakota and keeper of the great seal of said State, do hereby certify that the foregoing three pages, hereto attached, contain a true and correct copy of a joint resolution ratifying that amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the direct election of United States Senators, as passed by the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, which was approved by the governor on the 18th day of February, A. D. 1913, the original of which is now on file in my office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State at Bismarck, N. Dak., this 6th day of March, A. D. 1913.

THOMAS HALL,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of New Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 3, requesting Congress to pass an act to provide for the purchase of all land grants in New Mexico; place the land of said grants in the homestead class; segregate the mineral rights in said lands and place them under the United States mining laws for location and development; classify said lands into agricultural, grazing, timber, and mineral lands; and provide for the lease and sale of same.

Whereas the State of New Mexico has within its boundaries a number of large land grants which contain valuable agricultural, grazing, timber, and mineral lands, now owned and held by individuals and corporations, which are being offered for sale, and which ought to be developed, but which are being sold, subdivided, and developed too slowly; and

Whereas it is deemed advisable that New Mexico should provide for the immigration of more people to said State, and is also in need of more developed land on which to base and collect taxes for support of the county and State governments; and

Whereas the opening of such land grants would increase the population of the State very materially within a few years, and assist in building up and developing the State generally for the good of the people and the State government; and

Whereas said land grants are being offered for sale at reasonable prices in large acreage, but of which the individual settlers can not buy small parcels, and the State of New Mexico is unable to purchase said lands; and

Whereas the best part of New Mexico's mineral resources are contained within the boundaries of said land grants and are prohibited from being opened up and developed by prospectors and miners, and thereby the progress of the State is being greatly hindered: Now, therefore,

We respectfully pray, in the name of the people of the State of New Mexico, that the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America pass an act providing that the United States shall purchase the said land grants; that said lands shall be classified into agricultural, grazing, timber, and mineral lands; that such of said lands as may be deemed desirable shall be placed under the homestead laws and opened to the citizens of the United States for settlement; that provision shall be made for the lease and sale of the grazing and timber lands, if any of such lands are not placed in the homestead class; that all mineral rights in said land grants so purchased shall revert back to the United States of America, and said mineral lands shall be opened and subject to location and development under the United States laws and regulations; and that all such lands shall be classified and leased or sold to the people at what it cost the United States.

Resolved, That one copy of this memorial be sent to each, the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, by the secretary of state of New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of New Mexico, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Antonio Lucero, secretary of state of the State of New Mexico, do hereby certify that there was filed for record in this office at 10.05 o'clock a. m., on the 15th day of March, A. D. 1913, Senate joint resolution No. 20, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people, and, also, that I have compared the following copy of the same, with the original thereof now on file, and declare it to be a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of New Mexico, at the city of Santa Fe, the capital, on this 15th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] ANTONIO LUCERO,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint resolution 20, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people.

Whereas at the second session of the Sixty-second Congress of the United States of America a joint resolution was duly adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as follows, to wit:

"That in lieu of the first paragraph of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, and in lieu of so much of paragraph 2 of the same section as relates to the filling of vacancies, the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States:

"'The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof for six years, and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

"'When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate the executive authority of the State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

"'This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.'"

Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and the same is hereby, ratified, and that certified copies of this resolution be forwarded by the governor to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

E. A. MIERA,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
ISIDORO ARMIJO,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
ROMAN L. BACA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
FRANK STAPLIN,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Approved this 15th day of March, A. D. 1913.

WILLIAM C. MCDONALD,
Governor of the State of New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of South Dakota, ss:*

I, Frank Glasner, secretary of state of the State of South Dakota, do hereby certify that the annexed joint resolution, to wit, house joint resolution No. 23, was duly passed by the 1913 session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, approved by the governor, and is now in full force and effect.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota this 8th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] FRANK GLASNER,
Secretary of State.
By J. T. NELSON,
Assistant Secretary of State.

House joint resolution 23, declaring in favor of retention, control, and administration of the national forests and the forest reserves of the United States by the Federal Government.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring).

SECTION 1. That it is, and is hereby, declared to be the sense of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota that the national forests and forests reserves belonging to the United States, wherever located, should continue to be and remain in the exclusive ownership, possession, control, and administration of the Federal Government. That the policy of protection, conservation, and development of the National Federal resources embraced in said national forests and forest reserves can and will be best promoted and safeguarded and the public interests involved therein best subserved by such Federal retention of ownership, possession, control, and administration.

SEC. 2. That a copy of these resolutions be forthwith forwarded to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a resolution passed by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1913.

Resolution relative to the passage by the Congress of the United States of laws relative to the sale of small fruits.

Whereas there is now no uniform legislation in the United States governing the sale of berries, cherries, currants, and other small fruits by standard dry measure; and

Whereas at various seasons berries, cherries, currants, and small fruits are shipped from certain States for sale and distribution in other States; and

Whereas the same are shipped and sold in small boxes, baskets, or other receptacles which are not uniform in size or measure, but which are generally of less capacity than standard dry measure; and

Whereas it is desirable that such berries, cherries, currants, and small fruits be sold by standard dry measure, and that the boxes, baskets, or other receptacles in which they are to be sold shall contain standard measure: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby requests the Congress of the United States to pass laws and regulations which will provide that all berries, cherries, currants, and small fruits shall be sold in the United States by standard dry measure, and, further, that the baskets, boxes, or other receptacles in which they are sold shall conform to standard dry measure.

Resolved, That certified copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress and to each of the Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts.

In house of representatives, adopted March 17, 1913.
In senate, adopted in concurrence March 20, 1913.
A true copy.
Attest:

FRANK J. DONAHUE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it appears from investigation recently made by the Senate of the United States, and otherwise, that polygamy still exists in certain places in the United States, notwithstanding prohibitory statutes enacted by the several States thereof; and

Whereas the practice of polygamy is generally condemned by the people of the United States, and there is a demand for the more effectual prohibition thereof by placing the subject under Federal jurisdiction and control, at the same time reserving to each State the right to make and enforce its own laws relating to marriage and divorce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the application be made, and hereby is made, to Congress, under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States, for the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States whereby polygamy and polygamous cohabitation shall be prohibited, and Congress shall be given power to enforce such prohibition by appropriate legislation.

Resolved further, That the legislatures of all other States of the United States, now in session or when next convened, be, and they hereby are, respectfully requested to join in this application by the adoption of this or an equivalent resolution.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this application to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to the several Members of said bodies representing this State therein; also to transmit copies hereof to the legislatures of all other States of the United States.

THOMAS MORRIS,
President of the Senate.
MERLIN HULL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
A. C. TRETOW,
Acting Chief Clerk.
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Received March 26, 1913, 9.10 a. m.
J. S. DONALD, *Secretary of State.*

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of New Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 1, adopted by a unanimous vote of both House of Representatives and Senate of the State of New Mexico, March 13, 1913, memorializing the President and the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America to enact just and appropriate homestead and forest-reserve laws for the arid regions and to administer them with due regard to the rights of actual settlers, and asking for the restoration to the public domain of certain lands in New Mexico.

Whereas President Elect Woodrow Wilson, in a public address before the Chicago Association of Commerce, at Chicago, January 11, 1913, announced as follows:

"Natural resources must be conserved and also used for the common good.

* * * * * * *

"Until the business men of America make up their mind both to husband and to administer as if for others as well as for their own profit the natural resources of the country some of the questions ahead of us will be immensely difficult of solution.

"When the Government at Washington undertakes in the future to develop a policy of this sort the first thing it must know is the state of mind—psychology of the men that it is dealing with. That attitude must be declared open and transparent. Do you not see that it is your responsibility, not mine?

"I shall sit there and try to preside over the matter, but I shall know what to do only as I can judge the men I am dealing with. The moment their purpose is declared to be for the general interest and shown by their procedure to be for the general interest, then the whole atmosphere of suspicion will be dissipated and the Government will come to a normal relation with the citizens of the United States.

* * * * * * *

"This country is not going to grow rich in the future by the efforts of the men who already have got in. It is going to grow rich by the efforts of the men who have not yet got in. It is a truism to say that it is going to get rich by the efforts of the future generations after this generation is gone. The next generation is now struggling for a foothold, and the next generation finds it extremely difficult to get a foothold."

* * * * * * *

Whereas the national homestead act passed by the Thirty-seventh Congress, May 20, 1862, and going into effect on and after January 1, 1863, entitled "An act to secure homesteads to actual settlers on the public domain," to wit:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That any person who is the head of a family or who has arrived at the age of 21 years and is a citizen of the United States, or who shall have filed his declaration of intention to become such, as required by the naturalization laws of the United States, and who has never borne arms against the United States Government or given aid and comfort to its enemies, shall, from and after the 1st of January, 1863, be entitled to enter one-quarter section, or a less quantity, of unappropriated public lands: * * * *Provided*, That any person owning and residing on land may, under the provisions of this act, enter other land lying contiguous to his or her land which shall not, with the land so already owned and occupied, exceed in the aggregate 160 acres"; and

Whereas the sentiment and spirit expressed by President Elect Woodrow Wilson in the above language is in true harmony and accord with the evident object and purpose of the original homestead law of 1862 and in keeping with an enlightened and comprehensive understanding of what is meant by true and proper conservation of our natural resources and unalterably opposed to all forms of injustice and abuse toward the pioneers and early settlers who would undergo the hardships of establishing homes on the public domain and transforming the desert into gardens and orchards, making possible thousands of prosperous and happy homes for the people; and

Whereas our Federal land policy as administered by and through the Interior Department of the United States to that area or section situate west of the one hundredth meridian of west longitude, and known and designated as the arid regions of the United States, has for years been one of gross ignorance of actual conditions existing in said regions and has been almost continually mismanaged by commissioned, incapable, and incompetent subordinates, whose attempt to serve the public can best be described as inane, effete, academic, impractical, inequitable, unjust, farcical, humiliating, degrading, and insulting to our citizens and subversive of the public good; and

Whereas large forest reserves have been created within New Mexico, over 70 per cent of which contain no forests or merchantable timber whatever, but for the use and pasturage upon which the owners of sheep and cattle in the immediate vicinity are charged heavy rentals, which places them at a great disadvantage in competition with other such stock raisers who enjoy the privileges of free range; and

Whereas other large areas have been withdrawn from settlement for the purpose of classification as to whether or not it is coal, oil, or mineral land, and such classification delayed from time to time by the Interior Department, thus preventing the occupation and settlement of the land under the homestead and desert-land laws, except in a restricted and unsatisfactory manner, and preventing the settlement of larger areas of land; and

Whereas all of these reservations and withdrawals have greatly retarded the development of New Mexico, by preventing the residents and people of said State from securing the wood and pasturage which they have employed for generations, preventing the settlement of the State and the building of homes to a large extent, and has restrained the development of the State in its agricultural, horticultural, and other industries; and

Whereas large areas of land are withdrawn as part of reclamation projects which are not necessary to but which has been determined will not become a part of such projects, and the settlement and reclamation of such withdrawals thereby prevented; and

Whereas New Mexico's opportunity for expansion is grievously vexed and burdened by the present Federal land policy and practically all of the agricultural and grazing lands of some counties, particularly of San Juan and Rio Arriba, are occupied with national forests and unwise withdrawals of lands from the public domains under one pretense or another, thus preventing settlement and the development of the State's resources; and

Whereas your memorialists thoroughly and completely agree with President-Elect Woodrow Wilson in his expressed attitude as to what should be the policy of the Government toward reclamation, conservation, and homesteading the arid regions of the West and in restoring the spirit of the original homestead law of 1862 and in guaranteeing justice and fair treatment to the humblest pioneer and homesteader;

Now, therefore, your memorialists respectfully but earnestly pray for the passage of an act by Congress prohibiting the further withdrawal of the lands of New Mexico for any purpose whatever, and respectfully request the immediate restoration of all lands embraced within the several forest reservations of New Mexico which do not contain merchantable timber or are necessary to the administration of such reservations. That we respectfully request the immediate classification of lands now withdrawn for coal, oil, or other minerals pending classification, and the opening to entry of such portions as are found not to contain coal, oil, or minerals; be it further

Resolved, That all Government lands classified as coal lands should be open to entry or sale, under proper regulations, so that they may be developed, and persons taking up such coal lands be not subject to indictment; be it further

Resolved, That the United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from New Mexico are hereby requested to use their influence to remove the said restrictions and that the governor of New Mexico is hereby authorized and directed to appoint a committee of three representatives, citizens of New Mexico, not more than two from any one political party, to go to Washington, D. C., and aid our Senators and Representatives in presenting this joint memorial to President-elect Wilson and to Congress; and that the expenses of such committee of three be paid by themselves; be it further

Resolved, That the presiding officers of each house of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico are hereby directed to forward to President-elect Wilson of the United States and to the presiding officers and Members of the Senate and House of Representatives and to the governors and presiding officers of the Legislatures of the States of Arizona, Oregon, Washington, Colorado, Idaho, and Utah copies of this joint memorial.

E. C. DE BACA,
President of the Senate.
ISIDORO ARMIJO,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
ROMAN L. BACA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
FRANK STAPLIN,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, J. S. Donald, secretary of state of the State of Wisconsin and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of joint resolution No. 5, introduced as joint resolution No. 3, S. has been compared by me with the original enrolled act on file in this department, and that the same is a true copy thereof, and of the whole of such original enrolled act.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State at the capitol, in the city of Madison, this 21st day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

J. S. DONALD,
Secretary of State.

Joint resolution ratifying an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to popular election of United States Senators.

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-second Congress of the United States of America, at its second session, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That in lieu of the first paragraph of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, and in lieu of so much of paragraph 2 of the same section as relates to the filling of vacancies, and in lieu of all of paragraph 1 of section 4 of said Article I, in so far as the same relates to any authority in Congress to make or alter regulations as to the times or manner of holding elections for Senators, the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States:

"'The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

"'The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

"'When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election, as the legislature may direct.

"'This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.'"

Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same hereby is, ratified by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this joint resolution, certified by the secretary of state, be forwarded by the governor to the Secretary of State at Washington, and to the presiding officers of each House of the National Congress.

H. C. MARTIN,
President of the Senate.
F. M. WYLIE,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
MERLIN HULL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Received February 27, 1913, 4.10 p. m.

J. S. DONALD,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of New Hampshire, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, Edward N. Pearson, secretary of state of the State of New Hampshire, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true copy of joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution ratifying the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and America" (approved March 14, 1913), as engrossed in this office and in my custody as secretary of state.

In testimony whereof, I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the seal of the State, at Concord, this 18th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] EDWARD N. PEARSON,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, 1913.

Joint resolution ratifying the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in general court convened:

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-first Congress of the United States of America, at its first session, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislature of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution, namely, Article XVI:

"'The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.'"

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in general court convened, That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the General Court of the said State of New Hampshire; and further be it

Resolved, That certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded to the governor of this State, to the Secretary of State of the said United States, and to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the said United States.

WILLIAM J. BRITTON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
ENOS K. SAWYER,
President of the Senate.

Approved March 14, 1913.

SAMUEL D. FELKER, *Governor.*

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a telegram in the nature of a resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of Porto Rico, which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN JUAN, P. R., *March 2, 1913.*

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully I transmit the following resolution of the House of Delegates of Porto Rico:

The House of Delegates of Porto Rico considers it a very high honor for any human being of this world to be invested with American citizenship, but under present circumstances it prays that Congress take no action upon this matter without direct consultation and in accordance with the will of Porto Rican people, because there exist tendencies favorable and adverse to United States citizenship for the Porto Ricans. This resolution of the house of delegates does not affect its sentiments of adhesion and friendship toward the noble American people, but is inspired by its sentiments of respect and love for the natural sovereignty of the people of Porto Rico.

JOSE DEDIEGO, *Speaker.*

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a concurrent resolution passed by the General Assembly of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the harbor of Nawiliwili, on the island of Kauai, has been selected by the United States Engineers for improvement, and a project therefor has been approved by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the need of such improvement is urgent in the interest of commerce and shipping, the development of the island, and the convenience of its citizens and residents as well as of the traveling public: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be earnestly requested to appropriate and make available, as soon as may be, sufficient funds to enable the carrying out of the plan or project for the improvement of such harbor; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 10, 1913.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on March 10, 1913.

H. L. HOLSTEIN,
Speaker House of Representatives.
EDWARD WOODWARD,
Clerk House of Representatives.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 12, 1913.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted in the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on March 12, 1913.

ERIC A. KNUDSEN,
President of the Senate.
JOHN H. WISE,
Clerk of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 18, with the original thereof filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Oregon on the 27th day of February, 1913, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 27th day of February, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent that—

Whereas it appears from reliable information that the price of grain bags, wool bags, and jute cloth is excessive and unreasonably high; and

Whereas the jute crop for the year 1912 was as large as that of the year 1907 (the former high-water mark in the production of jute); and that there was carried over from last year several millions of grain bags, thus indicating that a shortage of raw material and reserved manufactured product can not be the cause of the recent high prices for bags; and

Whereas it is reported that the price of jute grain bags, wool bags, and cloth has been unreasonably advanced by a few large corporations and dealers of the Pacific coast, brought about by cornering the market and so manipulating the sale thereof that they have been able to force all prices to almost double that paid by consumers in previous years; and

Whereas it is believed these high and exorbitant prices exist by reason of the large corporations on the Pacific coast entering into an illegal combination in restraint of trade, and by using other artificial means which have enabled them to fix the price of jute grain bags, wool bags, and cloth at an exorbitant and unreasonable price and in violation of the laws of the United States, and thereby forcing the consumers to buy all jute products at a very high, exorbitant, and unreasonable price; and

Whereas it is estimated that the alleged jute bag and cloth trust has completely cornered and controlled the price of jute bags and cloth, enabling the trust to obtain enormous profits amounting to at least 50 per cent: Be it

Resolved, That your memorialists respectfully and earnestly petition and request the Congress of the United States to thoroughly investigate and probe the grain-bag monopoly existing on the Pacific coast, and should this probe and investigation disclose violation of the Federal laws, the proper officials of the United States be instructed to use all just means to punish such individuals, firms, or corporations, participating in any grain-bag monopoly, or illegal acts in violation of the Federal laws.

Adopted by the house February 26, 1913.

C. N. MCARTHUR,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate February 26, 1913.

DAN J. MALARKEY,
President of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Wilfred L. Gifford, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial No. 8, by Oversmith; passed the house February 21, 1913; passed the senate March 3, 1913; which was filed in this office on the 5th day of March, A. D. 1913, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 6th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1913, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and thirty-seventh.

[SEAL.] WILFRED L. GIFFORD,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 8.

To the honorable the Senators and Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas a large portion of the State of Idaho has been set aside by the United States Government and placed in forest reserves; and

Whereas it is necessary on the part of several counties of the State of Idaho, in which a part of the forest reserves are situated, to maintain and construct roads and bridges in such forest reserves; and

Whereas the cost of the construction and maintenance of such roads and bridges is a grievous burden upon the taxpayers of said counties, and there being no revenue derived by such counties from such forest reserves commensurate with such cost:

We therefore pray and earnestly urge that the Department of the Interior be required to make a thorough investigation of the roads and

bridges which should be constructed and maintained in such forest reserves, and a sufficient appropriation be made by the United States for the purpose of building and maintaining all necessary roads and bridges in such forest reserves.

The secretary of state is hereby instructed to forward copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and copies of the same to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This memorial passed the house of representatives on the 21st day of February, 1913.

C. S. FRENCH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This memorial passed the senate on the 3d day of March, 1913.

HERMAN H. TAYLOR,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 8 originated in the house during the twelfth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on the Library and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Wilfred L. Gifford, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate joint memorial No. 7, by Macbeth and Hart, relating to the restoration of Monticello, the home of Thomas Jefferson; passed the senate February 28, 1913; passed the house March 1, 1913; which was filed in this office on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1913, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 4th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1913 and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and thirty-seventh.

[SEAL.] WILFRED L. GIFFORD,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 7.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the members of the twelfth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, united by feelings of deepest affection and national bonds to Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of American Independence, heartily indorse the action of the Jefferson-Monticello Association in endeavoring to restore to a position of national dignity his home, Monticello, where he lived, died, and is buried—

The secretary of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and copies of the same to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This senate joint memorial No. 7 passed the senate on the 28th day of February, 1913.

HERMAN H. TAYLOR,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial No. 7 passed the house of representatives on the 1st day of March, 1913.

C. S. FRENCH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within senate joint memorial No. 7 originated in the senate during the twelfth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho

SUMNER C. BROWN,
Secretary of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Wilfred L. Gifford, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of House joint memorial No. 7, by Mason; passed the house February 21, 1913; passed the senate March 3, 1913; which was filed in this office on the 5th day of March, A. D. 1913, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 6th day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and thirteen and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and thirty-seventh.

[SEAL.] WILFRED L. GIFFORD,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 7.

To the honorable the Senators and Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent and petition as follows: That—

Whereas on the 19th day of April, 1911, there was introduced in the National House of Representatives House bill No. 5966, providing for the permanent location of and for the marking and monumenting of the old Oregon Trail from the Missouri River to the Puget Sound as a memorial to the brave and hardy pioneers whose hardships, suffering, and brilliant achievements saved the Oregon country, of which Idaho was a part, to the Union and opened the way for the further development of this vast territory: Now, therefore,

Your memorialists, in the name of and for the people of the State of Idaho, and speaking in behalf of all of the people living in the territory traversed by the old Oregon Trail, earnestly and respectfully petition and urge that said House bill No. 5966 be passed by Congress.

The secretary of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and copies of the same to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This memorial passed the house of representatives on the 21st day of February, 1913.

C. S. FRENCH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This memorial passed the senate on the 3d day of March, 1913.

HERMAN H. TAYLOR,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 7 originated in the House during the twelfth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Colorado, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF COLORADO,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Colorado, ss:*

I, James B. Pearce, secretary of state of the State of Colorado, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate joint memorial No. 4, by Senator Cross.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Colorado, at the city of Denver, this 27th day of February, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] JAMES B. PEARCE,
Secretary of State.
By THOMAS F. DILLON, Jr.,
Deputy.

Senate joint memorial 4.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, would respectfully represent that under and by direction of the Secretary of the Interior the Hon. R. B. Marshall, chief geographer of the department, recently visited Colorado to determine by personal observation whether there should be established in Colorado a national park.

That the said Marshall, following the said order, visited Colorado, and after a careful and painstaking examination of the country proposed to be included in said national park recommended the creation of the same.

That the people of Colorado desire that said park shall be established. It includes the highest mountain peaks in the State; the area is little adapted to either agriculture or grazing; its scenery for sublimity and grandeur is not excelled on the continent. Its location is easy of access to America's millions who seek health and recreation in the summer months, being situated in the front and main range of the Rocky Mountains.

We therefore urge that you pass an act creating the said Rocky Mountain National Park, adopting the metes and bounds as set forth in the report of said Chief Geographer Marshall to the Secretary of the Interior and embodying provisions as contained in a bill for an act creating the said park, prepared and introduced in the National House of Representatives for that purpose.

And this your memorialists will ever pray.

STEPHEN R. FITZGARRALD,
President of the Senate.
O. C. SKINNER,
Speaker of the House.

Approved, February 25, 1913, 8.09 p. m.

ELIAS M. AMMONS,
Governor of the State of Colorado.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of California, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assembly joint resolution 2, relative to requesting the United States Congress to authorize and direct the Postal Savings System to loan its funds to school districts.

Whereas under the act of Congress now in force, which establishes a Postal Savings System throughout the United States, there is no authority by which the board of trustees of said Postal Savings System is permitted to loan the funds of said system to the various school districts throughout the Nation; and

Whereas it appears that if such authority existed the school districts of this State and every State would be able thereby to obtain money directly from the funds of said Postal Savings System with more facility and at lower rates of interest; and

Whereas it appears that by their ability to borrow money more easily and under better conditions the school districts of this State and of every State will receive great benefits of economy, saving, and financial prosperity, which will consequently afford the rising generation of our Nation better education and development: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Senate and Assembly of the State of California hereby join in requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the act establishing the Postal Savings System in such manner as will authorize and direct the board of trustees of said Postal Savings System to invest the funds of said system in school district bonds of the various school districts of the several States, and that our representatives in the Senate and the House of Representatives of Congress do their utmost to further such legislation as will effect the above result; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the assembly to the President of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and a copy hereof to each Member of Congress and to each newly elected Member of Congress.

C. C. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
L. B. MALLORY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Received by the governor this 4th day of February, A. D. 1913.

ALEXANDER MCCABE,
Private Secretary to the Governor.

Filed with the secretary of state this 4th day of February, 1913.

Witness my signature and the seal of this office at Sacramento this 4th day of February, 1913.

[SEAL.]

FRANK C. JORDAN,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented resolutions adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1913.

Resolutions in favor of the establishment of an international commission on the cost of living.

Resolved, That the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, believing that the world-wide increase in the cost of living and the possibility of a continuance of this increase for an indefinite period is a matter of great importance, and believing that an international commission on the cost of living should be appointed to meet the urgent need to find a scientific basis for any reforms in this respect which can be accomplished by legislation, hereby approves of the effort to bring about such an international commission.

Resolved, That certified copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts.

In senate, adopted January 31, 1913.

In house of representatives, adopted in concurrence February 6, 1913.

A true copy.

Attest:

FRANK J. DONAHUE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 14 with the original thereof filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Oregon on the 27th day of February, 1913, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon. Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 28th day of February, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 14.

Whereas Harry Hill and other settlers known as the "Sherman County settlers" have suffered great damages by reason of the erroneous restoration to homestead settlement of certain lands in the State of Oregon by the Secretary of the Interior, from which lands said settlers were afterwards ousted as a result of a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, as set forth in the report made by Special Agent Thomas B. Neuhausen, of the Department of the Interior; and

Whereas the honorable Senate of the United States, on August 19, 1911, passed an act to adjust the claims of said settlers, and appropriating therefor the sum of $250,000; and

Whereas the Committee on Claims of the honorable House of Representatives of the United States has favorably reported a like bill for the settlement of the claims of said settlers, which is now pending on the Private Calendar of the House of Representatives as No. 123: Be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the honorable House of Representatives of the United States is hereby memorialized to pass the said bill for the relief of said settlers, and the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon are hereby urged to use their influence in behalf of the passage of the said bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon.

Adopted by the house February 26, 1913.

C. N. MCARTHUR,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate February 14, 1913.

DAN J. MALARKEY,
President of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of Wyoming, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Wyoming, ss:*

I, Frank L. Houx, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the following and hereto-attached copy of enrolled joint resolution No. 3, House of Representatives, State of Wyoming, has been carefully compared with the original, filed in this office on the 28th day of February, A. D. 1913, and is a full, true, and correct copy of the same and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 1st day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

FRANK L. HOUX,
Secretary of State.

By F. H. WESCOTT,
Deputy.

Enrolled joint resolution 3.

A joint resolution relating to the refunding of certain moneys, now lying in the Treasury of the United States, being paid therein by certain citizens of the United States, in attempting to make final proofs on the public domain, and memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass such legislation as may be necessary for the refunding of these moneys to those who have so paid them into the Treasury of the United States, and thereby relieving the distress caused to certain citizens of the United States by both denying patent on public lands for different causes and then retaining the money paid as provided by law preliminary to perfecting such proofs.

Whereas certain citizens of the United States have filed on portions of the public domain, pursuant to the several acts of the Congress of the United States providing for the filing on and for the making of final proof and the securing of patent on the said public domain of the United States so set apart for such purposes; and

Whereas these citizens, in attempting to make final proof previous to perfecting patents on the public domain filed on under the several acts of Congress providing for the securing of patents on the public domain, to wit, under the homestead act, the stone and timber act, the desert-land act, and the coal-land act, have been unsuccessful and for one cause or another have been denied patent; and

Whereas these citizens have paid different sums of money into the Treasury of the United States previous to their attempts to make final proofs, as provided by the acts of the Congress of the United States, and which proofs were unsuccessful and patents were denied; and

Whereas these moneys have never been refunded to the citizens who have so paid them into the Treasury of the United States previous to their unsuccessful attempts to make final proofs; and

Whereas both the failure to secure title to the lands on which these attempts to make final proof were made and the loss of the moneys so paid into the Treasury of the United States have wrought untold hardship and loss to these citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, memorialized and requested to enact such legislation as may be necessary for the refunding of these moneys so paid into the Treasury of the United States to the citizens so paying them in and thus relieve the hardship and loss which the withholding of these moneys is causing these citizens; be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies of this memorial and request be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Secretary of the Interior, asking their aid in bringing the object of this memorial and request before Congress and in securing from same adequate legislation for the purpose herein set forth; and be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies of this memorial and request be sent to the Senators from Wyoming in the Congress of the United States, viz, Hons. CLARENCE D. CLARK and FRANCIS E. WARREN, and our Representative in said Congress, Hon. FRANK W. MONDELL, asking them to use their best efforts to secure a favorable action upon the request embodied herein.

BIRNEY H. SAGE,
President of the Senate.
MARTIN L. PRATT,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 28, 1913, at 11 a. m.

JOSEPH M. CAREY, *Governor.*

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of Kansas, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House concurrent resolution 27.

Whereas 12,000 citizens of Kansas served as militiamen during the War of the Rebellion in suppressing Price raid and other warlike invasions and border disturbances; and

Whereas the men so serving were ordered into active service by Gen. Curtis under martial law and ordered into the State of Missouri in 1864 to repulse the invasion by Gen. Price's army, and they do not now have pensionable status under the United States pension laws, although they rendered valuable and valiant service in the preservation of the Republic: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring therein), That the Senators and Members of Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to propose and secure the passage of proper legislation by Congress fixing and establishing for such militiamen a pensionable status the same as though they had been regularly mustered into regular service and allowing to such men suitable pensions: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Members of Congress from this State.

I certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house and passed that body January 31, 1913.

W. L. BROWN,
Speaker of the House.
GEO. E. ROGERS,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Passed the senate February 5, 1913.

SHEFFIELD INGALLS,
President of the Senate.
BURT E. BROWN,
Secretary of the Senate.

STATE OF KANSAS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Charles H. Sessions, secretary of state of the State of Kansas, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a correct copy of the original enrolled resolution now on file in my office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my official seal this 6th day of March, 1913.

[SEAL.]

CHAS. H. SESSIONS,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of Illinois, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF ILLINOIS—1913 (REGULAR SESSION).

Senate joint resolution 12.

Whereas it appears from the investigation recently made by the Senate of the United States and otherwise that polygamy still exists in certain places in the United States, notwithstanding prohibitory statutes enacted by the several States thereof; and

Whereas the practice of polygamy is generally condemned by the people of the United States, and there is a demand for the more effectual prohibition thereof by placing the subject under Federal jurisdiction and control, at the same time reserving to each State the right to make and enforce its own laws relating to marriage and divorce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the application be made and hereby is made to Congress under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States whereby polygamy and polygamous cohabitation shall be prohibited and Congress shall be given power to enforce such prohibition by appropriate legislation.

Resolved, That the legislatures of all other States of the United States now in session, or when next convened, be, and they hereby are, respectfully requested to join in this application by the adoption of this or an equivalent resolution.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this application to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the several Members of said bodies representing this State therein; also to transmit copies hereof to the legislatures of all other States of the United States.

Adopted by the senate February 27, 1913.
Concurred in by the house March 12, 1913.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Illinois, ss:*

I, Harry Woods, secretary of state of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the foregoing joint resolution of the forty-eighth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, passed and adopted at the regular session thereof, is a true and correct copy of the original joint resolution now on file in the office of the secretary of state.

In witness whereof I hereunto set my hand and affix the great seal of State at the city of Springfield this 20th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] HARRY WOODS, *Secretary of State.*

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Wilfred L. Gifford, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial 9, by Johnston & Storey, to the Congress of the United States, the honorable the President of the United States, and the honorable the Postmaster General of the United States (passed the house February 21, 1913; passed the senate February 28, 1913), which was filed in this office on the 3d day of March, A. D. 1913, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 4th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1913, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and thirty-seventh.

[SEAL.] WILFRED L. GIFFORD,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 9.

To the Congress of the United States, the honorable the President of the United States, and the honorable the Postmaster General of the United States:

Your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represents that—

Whereas the State of Idaho has recently completed its new capitol building in Boise, therein, on a block of ground adjoining the block on which the Federal building is situated; and

Whereas the said capitol building, though in itself is a credit to the State, is located on a small tract of land and has very little frontage or approach; and

Whereas directly in front of said capitol building and grounds and immediately across the street therefrom there is a row of unsightly brick flats, known as the Collister Flats, occupying with the yard and outhouses thereof one-quarter of the block on which the said Federal building is located, and blocking and marring the view of the capitol and of the Federal building; and

Whereas the United States Government now owns three-quarters of the said block on which its said Federal building stands and lacks only the quarter block on which the said flats stand to give it a complete square of ground;

We therefore pray that the Congress of the United States and the proper executive authorities of the Federal Government do take such steps as shall be necessary, by purchase, condemnation proceedings, or otherwise, to secure the title to the said quarter block, to remove the flats therefrom, and to park the same, to the end that the view of the said buildings may be unobstructed and the Federal tract be made more sightly and be suitably enlarged for future growth and development: Be it

Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit a copy of this memorial to the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States and to our Representatives therein, to the Postmaster General, and to the President of the United States.

This house joint resolution passed the house of representatives on the 21st day of February, 1913.

C. S. FRENCH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house joint resolution passed the senate on the 28th day of February, 1913.

HERMAN H. TAYLOR,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial 9 originated in the house of representatives during the twelfth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

A. C. COGSWELL,
Assistant Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 3.

Petition to Congress to enact such legislation as will be necessary for the construction of a system of paved public highways connecting the capitols of the several States of the Union with the National Capitol and with each other, and also with the principal national parks.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress of the United States assembled:

Whereas a uniform system of national public highways or roads, connecting the capitols of the several States of the Union with the National Capitol at Washington and with each other, and also with the principal national parks, will vastly promote commerce between the several States and reduce the cost of transportation thereof, facilitate and cheapen travel and social intercourse between the people, discourage sectionalism, and render the entire people more cosmopolitan intellectually, morally, and politically; aid the farmer in marketing his produce, and make farm life more agreeable, attractive, and profitable; induce Americans to see and know America; beautify all parts of the Union; intensify industrial activities; encourage good road building throughout the continent, and bring the entire people countless blessings, conveniences, and joys known only to a highly developed country; and

Whereas to secure uniformity, thoroughness, and economy in construction, fitness, and adaptability of grades and avoidance of such local controversies in the selection of routes as would probably delay, if not defeat, the entire enterprise, and the cost of such a system of highways being beyond the probable financial resources of the several States, it would be necessary that it be constructed at the expense and under the supervision of the General Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (the house concurring), We, the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do hereby petition and earnestly pray the honorable Congress of the United States for the passage of legislation for the location and construction, under the supervision and by the General Government, of a system of national highways or roads which shall connect the capitols of the several States of the Union with the National Capitol at Washington and with each other, and also with the principal national parks; that such national highways be constructed on firm concrete bases with hard surfaces and as nearly dustless as possible; that they be located solely with regard to the greatest public good and feasibility of route and grades; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress provide in such legislation means of raising the necessary money for the location and construction of such national highway by the restoration of the internal-revenue tax of 1879 on tobacco, or in some other manner, as to it shall seem meet and proper, and that the location and construction of such system of highways be commenced, as means can be provided, throughout the country generally without giving priority to any sections or locations; and it is further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senate of the United States, and that copies of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the House of Representatives of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies thereof be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the State of Montana, with the request that they use every effort within their power to bring about a speedy action for the accomplishment of the ends and purposes herein indicated.

W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
A. D. MACDONALD,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 25, 1913.

S. V. STEWART, *Governor.*

Filed February 25, 1913, at 3.30 o'clock p. m.

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Montana, ss:*

I, A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 3, petitioning Congress to enact such legislation as will be necessary for the construction of a system of paved public highways connecting the capitols of the several States of the Union with the National Capitol and with each other, and also with the principal national parks, enacted by the thirteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 25th day of February, 1913.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 26th day of February, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a concurrent resolution passed by the General Assembly of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the citizens of Hawaii, previous to annexation of the islands by the United States, had established and maintained for more than 50 years an independent national government and thereby demonstrated their capacity for self-government under and equal to the responsibilities of a sovereign State; and

Whereas annexation by one of the great powers of the world was inevitable owing to the mere numerical weakness of such a small State and its inability to support armed defense on land and sea; and

Whereas immediately following the annexation of Hawaii by the United States Congress passed an organic law giving Hawaii the status of a Territory, that has been the traditional stepping-stone to statehood; and

Whereas under this form the citizens of Hawaii have conducted their government in a conservative, patriotic, and able manner, providing liberally in all manner for the development of the highest standards of American citizenship among all classes of the cosmopolitan population; and

Whereas Hawaii, the State, is as certainly the natural and ultimate destiny of these islands as was the annexation by and admission as an integral part of the United States of America; and

Whereas the record of our people of the present day, the evidences of their thrift shown in the wealth per capita, the proofs of their intelligence and ambition as shown by the small percentage of illiteracy among them are such as to command for them a respect and confidence equaling that accorded the citizens of any State in the Union: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, session of 1913 (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested and respectfully petitioned to pass an enabling act authorizing the citizens of the Territory of Hawaii to, and naming the date when they shall, elect delegates to a constitutional convention for the purpose of framing a constitution for the government of the State of Hawaii, the same to be in full force and effect when approved by Congress and the President in the manner and form usual to the admission of States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives at Washington, and to the Hon. JONAH K. KALANIANAOLE.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE
TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, February 26, 1913.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was finally adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on February 26, 1913.

H. L. HOLSTEIN,
Speaker House of Representatives.
EDWARD WOODWARD,
Clerk House of Representatives.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, February 25, 1913.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted in the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on February 25, 1913.

ERIC A. KNUDSEN,
President of the Senate.
JOHN H. WISE,
Clerk of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a concurrent resolution passed by the General Assembly of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Fisheries and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas pursuant to the terms of the organic act, being "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, all private fishing rights in the sea waters of Hawaii under Hawaiian law will shortly have been established; and

Whereas under said organic act the attorney general of the Territory was directed to bring condemnation proceedings against the owners of such private fishing rights to the end that the sea fisheries of Hawaii might be free to all citizens of the United States; and

Whereas none of such fishing rights have been condemned because of the paramount claims of other matters of greater public importance to the citizens of the Territory on the revenues of the Territory; and

Whereas the condemnation of such private fishing rights and payment for the same out of the revenues of the Territory would leave insufficient funds for the actual expenses of government in the Territory; and

Whereas the condemnation of these private fishing rights and the payment for the same is pursuant to an act passed by the Congress of the United States, and intended for the benefit of the citizens of the United States generally and not exclusively for the benefit of the citizens of the Territory: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), The Congress of the United States is hereby requested to appropriate the sum of $500,000 for the purpose of acquiring such sea fisheries from the private owners thereof for the benefit and enjoyment of all the citizens of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, at Washington, and to the Hon. JONAH K. KALANIANAOLE.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 8, 1913.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was this day adopted in the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii.

ERIC A. KNUDSEN,
President of the Senate.
JOHN H. WISE,
Clerk of the Senate.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE
TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 6, 1913.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was this day adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii.

H. L. HOLSTEIN,
Speaker House of Representatives.
EDWARD WOODWARD,
Clerk House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America did, on the 26th day of April, A. D. 1910, by joint resolution, provide for a special election in the Territory of Hawaii, submitting to the qualified electors of said Territory the following question, to wit: "Shall the legislature to be elected in November, 1910, be requested to pass at its first regular session a law prohibiting the manufacture or sale within the Territory of all intoxicating, spirituous, vinous, and malt liquors, except for medicinal and scientific purposes?"; and

Whereas at an election held on July 26, 1910, by virtue of said joint resolution, the said question so submitted was answered in the negative by a large majority of the legally qualified electors of the Territory; and

Whereas under the laws now in force in the Territory of Hawaii traffic in intoxicating liquors is controlled and regulated in a manner satisfactory to a large majority of the residents of the Territory; and

Whereas the passage by the Congress of the United States of America of any act relative to the traffic in intoxicating liquors within the Territory would constitute a departure from the principle of home rule of the Territories of the United States, and would likewise be an expression on the part of the Congress of the United States that the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii can not safely be intrusted with the exercise of powers specifically granted it by the organic act of the Territory of Hawaii: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and the same is hereby, respectfully petitioned to refuse the enactment of any measures either prohibiting or regulating traffic in intoxicating liquors within the Territory of Hawaii, and that any proposed legislation relative to such traffic be intrusted to the Legislature of said Territory of Hawaii; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE
TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 7, 1913.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on March 7, 1913.

H. L. HOLSTEIN,
Speaker House of Representatives.
EDWARD WOODWARD,
Clerk House of Representatives.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 8, 1913.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted in the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on March 8, 1913.

ERIC A. KNUDSEN,
President of the Senate.
JOHN H. WISE,
Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. JONES presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF WASHINGTON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 11, passed February 11 and March 7, 1913, by the Thirteenth Legislature of the State of Washington, with the original enrolled copy of said joint memorial now on file in this office, and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said original, and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington, at the capitol in Olympia, this 11th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 11.

To the President of the United States of America, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of War, and the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington:

We, your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Washington, the House concurring, assembled in regular session of the Thirteenth Legislature of the State of Washington, most respectfully represent and pray, as follows:

Whereas the State of Washington has many wealthy cities and towns wholly dependent upon the national seacoast defense for protection from invasion from the Pacific Ocean; and

Whereas by the fourth biennial report of the State board of tax commissioners of the State of Washington the assessed valuation of all of the property in the State of Washington taxable under the statutes of said State appears to be $1,005,086,251; and

Whereas Grays and Willapa Harbors are wholly without military defenses of any kind or nature; and

Whereas the whole of Washington and Oregon is accessible from the Pacific Ocean through Grays and Willapa Harbors; and

Whereas the naval strength of the United States now stationed on the Pacific coast would be wholly inadequate in case of threatened invasion to properly protect the Pacific coast and repel any attempted invasion from the Pacific Ocean; and

Whereas petitions have been filed with Senator W. L. JONES, of the United States Senate Committee on Military Affairs, which petitions were signed by taxpayers of the States of Washington and Oregon, that the petitioners thereon represented $332,898,097, as appraised by the taxing officers of said States and duly certified by such taxing officers, praying that Grays and Willapa Harbors be fortified; and

Whereas many banking, milling, manufacturing, and coal-mining corporations and wholesale merchants signed said petitions, whose assets could not be shown by certificates of the State board of tax commissioners of the States of Washington and Oregon, in addition to the amounts first above shown to be so verified by certificates; and

Whereas the following commercial bodies of the Northwest have by resolutions duly and regularly adopted found that the fortification of Grays and Willapa Harbors was a public necessity, to wit: Portland Chamber of Commerce, Portland, Oreg.; New Seattle Chamber of Commerce, Seattle, Wash.; Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce, Aberdeen, Wash.; Montesano Chamber of Commerce, Montesano, Wash.; Spokane Chamber of Commerce, Spokane, Wash.; Olympia Chamber of Commerce, Olympia, Wash.; and the Centralia Chamber of Commerce, Centralia, Wash.; and

Whereas Gen. Marion P. Maus, commanding the Department of the Columbia, United States Army, has recommended the fortification of Grays and Willapa Harbors in his last report: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Washington (the House concurring), That the President of the United States of America, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of War, and the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington be, and they are hereby, urged to take such action as will lead to the speedy planting of adequate fortifications and military defenses capable of repelling any attempted invasion through said harbors from the Pacific Ocean.

The secretary of state is hereby directed to immediately transmit a certified copy of this memorial to his excellency the President of the United States of America, to the honorable Secretary of War, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington.

Passed the senate February 11, 1913.

LOUIS F. HART,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house March 7, 1913.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Mr. JONES presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF WASHINGTON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 3, passed by the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Washington, with the original enrolled copy of said memorial now on file in this office and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said original and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington, at the capitol, in Olympia, this 19th day of March, A. D. 1913.

I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.
By J. GRANT HINKLE,
Assistant Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 3.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled (in the thirteenth regular session) represent and pray as follows:

Whereas during the interim between the years 1859 and 1872 United States troops were stationed on the island of San Juan, State of Washington, that several of the soldiers died and were buried in a burying ground during that period; that said burying ground has been entirely neglected, with fences falling down and stock running over the graves: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of the State of Washington, That the Congress of the United States be requested to make such an appropriation as is necessary to reclaim such graveyard, fence it properly, and keep it in repair.

Passed the house January 20, 1913.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate January 27, 1913.

LOUIS F. HART,
President of the Senate.

Mr. JONES presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF WASHINGTON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house concurrent resolution No. 18, passed by the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Washington, with the original enrolled copy of said resolution now on file in this office, and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said original and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington, at the capitol in Olympia, this 19th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.
By J. GRANT HINKLE,
Assistant Secretary of State.

House concurrent resolution 18.

Whereas the United States Government is preparing to construct a rock jetty on the north side of the entrance of the Columbia River, in the State of Washington, near Fort Canby; and

Whereas the War Department of the United States is about to call for bids from private contractors to furnish great quantities of stone to be delivered by water or rail at the Government receiving works at Fort Canby, Wash.; and

Whereas the War Department, in furtherance of this work, has adopted plans for the clearing out, dredging, and maintaining a new waterway or channel from the eastern end of Sand Island to Fort Canby, Wash., at large public expense; and

Whereas the dredging of said new waterway or channel as planned is designed for the public benefit, it will, in fact, be of no public benefit, but of great public cost for dredging and maintaining, and of benefit solely to any contractor who may deliver rock by water transportation to the receiving works at or near Fort Canby, and a corresponding handicap to any contractor bidding to furnish rock by means of rail transportation; and

Whereas the said new waterway or channel, if dredged and maintained as planned, will cause large public loss to the State of Washington in depriving it of the annual license fees and other taxes from about 50 fish traps situated within the line of the proposed new waterway or channel, and will injure the State of Washington and its citizens by endangering the successful maintenance of the Chinook salmon hatchery, on account of the large amount of dredged material that will be deposited in front of the entrance of the Chinook River; and will cause a loss of probably $150,000 in the value of about 50 fish traps included within the lines of said new waterway or channel and generally damage the fishing industry at or near Chinook, as a result of fouled and muddy waters from long-continued operation; and

Whereas it will tend to shift the boundary between the States of Oregon and Washington a mile northward into the territory of Washington: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the house, the senate concurring, does hereby protest against the establishing of the proposed new channel, and respectfully ask that the present existing and Hanbury Channel, established by the War Department of the United States in 1893, be utilized in transporting rock, if necessary for the north jetty, and for all other purposes of navigation; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the Representatives of the State of Washington in Congress.

Passed by the house February 17, 1913.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate February 19, 1913.

LOUIS F. HART,
President of the Senate.

Mr. JONES presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF WASHINGTON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 4 with the original enrolled copy of said joint memorial, passed by the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Washington, and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said original enrolled copy now on file in this office, and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington, at the capitol, in Olympia, this 19th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.
By J. GRANT HINKLE,
Assistant Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 4.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, being the thirteenth regular session, most respectfully represent and pray as follows:

Whereas that portion of the Washington coast line beginning at the mouth of the Columbia River and extending northward a distance of 30 miles has been the scene of numerous and fatal shipwrecks; and

Whereas the facilities for transportation of lifeboats and life-saving apparatus to and from the scene of such wrecks are at present inadequate; and

Whereas frequently many lives could have been saved had the United States Life-Saving Service been able to respond more quickly to the call for assistance, this being impossible at times through delay in the train service or through the high stage of the tides on the ocean beach: Wherefore

Your memorialists respectfully urge that one boathouse, with beach apparatus equipment, be established at Long Beach, about 7 miles south of the Klipsan Beach Life-Saving Station, and a similarly equipped boathouse established at the intersection of the Oysterville Road with the ocean beach, the same distance north of said station; that two be stationed at each boathouse and all be under the supervision and control of the keeper of the said Klipsan Beach Life-Saving Station.

Passed the house January 20, 1913.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate January 27, 1913.

LOUIS F. HART,
President of the Senate.

Mr. JONES presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF WASHINGTON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 2, passed by the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Washington, with the original enrolled copy of said memorial now on file in this office, and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said original, and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington, at the capitol, in Olympia, this 19th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.
By J. GRANT HINKLE,
Assistant Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 2.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the opening to the Panama Canal will bring to the Pacific seaboard a largely increased volume of waterway traffic, necessitating the thorough improvement of our waterways and the enlargement of our harbor and dockage facilities; and

Whereas the Columbia River and its tributaries constitute the greatest inland waterways system of the Pacific coast of America and the second greatest of the Nation; and

Whereas the preeminent importance of this waterway has been recognized by the National Government hitherto by large appropriations covering its improvement from its mouth inland; and

Whereas the volume of traffic tributary to the Columbia gateway virtually embraces, in actual freight carried or directly affected by its water craft, the entire coast business, inward and outward, of the Columbia and Snake River Basins (a territory almost 250,000 square miles in extent); and

Whereas the full benefits to be obtained from the operation of this waterway can only be secured by its complete and adequate improvement, we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States, at its present session, to appropriate the sum of $1,400,000 to be immediately available for the completion of the Celilo Canal and the opening of the Columbia and Snake Rivers to free navigation, this sum being in reality only an increase of $800,000 over the amount necessary to carry on this work on the continuous contract basis already in operation.

We urge upon Congress the importance of this appropriation in order to save the net sum of $100,000, according to the estimate of the United States Engineers in charge of this work.

We represent that the opening of the Celilo Canal and the Columbia and Snake Rivers to free navigation during the year 1915 will stimulate the building of municipal docks, the extension of feeder lines of railway, and the construction of steamboats, barges, etc., essential to the development of a vast traffic territory.

We further represent that the completion of these improvements at the time indicated will enable the people of the Pacific Northwest, both American and Canadian, to fittingly celebrate the opening of the Celilo Canal and the Columbia River in conjunction with the international ceremonies in honor of the Panama Canal in 1915, thus giving notice to the world of an all-water route from the ports of the world to the interior of western America and British Columbia.

Passed the house January 20, 1913.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate January 27, 1913.

LOUIS F. HART,
President of the Senate.

Mr. JONES presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF WASHINGTON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial 5 with the original enrolled copy of said memorial now on file in this office, as passed by the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Washington, and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said memorial and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington, at the capitol, in Olympia, this 19th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.
By J. GRANT HINKLE,
Assistant Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 5.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, being the thirteenth regular session, most respectfully petition as follows: That

Whereas by the construction of a waterway to connect Fidalgo Bay with Similk Bay, in Skagit County, Wash., and making the same a link for the purpose of navigation of what is termed the "inside passage" on Puget Sound, would eliminate the necessity of the local sound steamers and small craft of passing through Deception Pass and of exposing themselves to the sweep of the storms of the Straits of Juan de Fuca; and

Whereas such a waterway would not only complete a continuous inside and protected passage for freight and passenger traffic between what is known as the up-sound and down-sound cities of Puget Sound; and

Whereas by said improvement, to such craft as are compelled to seek the inside passage, the distance would be shortened approximately 10 miles; and

Believing that the convenience and safety of travel and traffic on Puget Sound would justify the making of such improvement:

Wherefore your memorialists respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to order a full and complete survey of such a project, together with maps, plans, etc., to determine its feasibility, and that said survey be also extended to cover the dredging of Cap Santa waterway in said Fidalgo Bay, which improvement would be contiguous to and incidental to the main project above mentioned.

Passed the house January 28, 1913.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate January 30, 1913.

LOUIS F. HART,
President of the Senate.

Mr. JONES presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF WASHINGTON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 7, passed March 4 and 12, 1913, with the original enrolled copy of said memorial as enrolled now on file in this office, and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said memorial and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington, at the capitol in Olympia, this 17th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.
By J. GRANT HINKLE.
Assistant Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 7.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas the State of Washington has established and is constructing a State highway from Willapa Harbor on the Pacific Ocean, through the city of Chehalis, in Lewis County, connecting with the national park State highway, already constructed from Tacoma to a connection with the Government road in Rainier National Park; and

Whereas the State has established and is constructing a highway from Walla Walla to North Yakima, and in Yakima County this highway has been completed to the east line of the forest reserve; and

Whereas the Government has already located a trail from the Government road in Rainier National Park to the highway from North Yakima at the east line of the forest reserve; and

Whereas the extension of the Government road through the national park and the forest reserve, approximately following the trail already located, will connect all portions of the State of Washington from the extreme southeast section to the southwest and northwest sections of the State, and will open the national park to easy access from all sections of the State:

Therefore your memorialists, the senate and house of representatives of the thirteenth legislature respectfully urge that said road through the national park and forest reserve be constructed at the earliest practicable date by the Government of the United States.

Passed the senate March 4, 1913.

LOUIS F. HART,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house March 12, 1913.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Mr. JONES presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF WASHINGTON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 12, passed February 11 and March 7, 1913, with the original enrolled copy of said memorial now on file in this office and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said original, and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington, at the capitol, in Olympia, this 17th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 12.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, respectfully request that—

Whereas the Sixty-first Congress of the United States, in the passage of the Weeks law, recognized the duty of the Federal Government to assist the States in protecting the forested watersheds of navigable streams; and

Whereas under the provisions of said law the Secretary of Agriculture allotted to Washington for the year 1912 the sum of $10,000 to be expended by the State forester in such protection, and it appears that because of lack of funds the Secretary is unable to continue the cooperation as fully as heretofore; and

Whereas this State possesses great forest resources, forest industries, and navigable streams, the protection of which is of vital importance; and

Whereas the State supports such protection through liberal appropriations by its legislature and great expenditure of private money and effort: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, earnestly petition and urge the Congress of the United States to continue Federal cooperation, as provided in section 2 of the Weeks law; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forthwith transmitted to the presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Senate and House committees on agricultural appropriations, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each Member of the Washington delegation in Congress.

Passed the senate February 11, 1913.

LOUIS F. HART,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house March 7, 1913.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Mr. JONES presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which was referred to the Committee

on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 9, passed January 31 and February 25, 1913, with the original copy of said joint memorial No. 9 as enrolled, now on file in this office, and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said original and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington. Done at the capitol at Olympia this 5th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 9.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas Puget Sound is the greatest inland body of water in America, extending from the Straits of Juan de Fuca inland and southward more than 100 miles; and

Whereas south of Puget Sound is the great arm of the ocean known as Grays Harbor, and on still farther south is Willapa Bay, and just beyond the great Columbia River, the second largest river in the United States emptying into the ocean; and

Whereas Puget Sound, Grays Harbor, Willapa Bay, and the Columbia River are all large navigable bodies of water and lead to many large and prosperous growing cities and communities and are surrounded by immense natural resources and a soil of unsurpassed fertility; and

Whereas because of these conditions and because of the immensity of the territory surrounding these bodies of water and tributary thereto we, your memorialists, believe there is destined to be therein the greatest and richest development of any section in the United States; and

Whereas, by an act of Congress approved March 3, 1909, Congress authorized and directed the Secretary of War to make preliminary examinations and surveys for an intracoastal canal for a continuous inland waterway from Boston, Mass., to the Rio Grande, your memorialists would request the same favors for an intracoastal canal from the Straits of Juan de Fuca inland through Puget Sound southwestward to Grays Harbor; thence south from Grays Harbor to Willapa Bay; thence south from Willapa Bay to the Columbia River; thence continuing the survey east and north along the Columbia River to the Canadian border to connect with the survey of the Canadian Government; and

Whereas for strategic purposes the Permanent Improvement Naval Board of the United States on October 10, 1889, did show the strategic value of such inland communication and natural value of inland canals to League Island naval docks on the Atlantic coast, such canal would be of actual value to the great naval dock at Bremerton, Wash., on the Pacific coast. That for the defense of a frontier threatened by an attack from without in the movement of troops sheltered water transportation affords many advantages over transportation by rail. Twenty-two ships, size of *Momus* (S. P. Co.), 16-foot draft, is equal to 958 passenger and freight cars; and for commercial purposes the ratio of cost and capacity of a double-track railroad to a canal of the proposed type are: Cost, about 1 to 5.6; capacity, about 1 to 12.8, and

Whereas, if such be the case, this inland waterway connecting these great aforementioned bodies of water would be not only of great commercial benefit and would mean not only a great saving in time in the arrival and departure of ships to and from the great cities on these bodies of water, but would also be of inestimable use and value to the United States in time of war for military and naval purposes:

Therefore, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Washington, in thirteenth biennial session convened, most respectfully urge upon you the desirability and the commercial and strategic possibilities of such a canal as heretofore suggested, and we would respectfully make this a request for a survey of a route for such a canal and for an investigation of the possibilities and feasibilities thereof.

Passed the Senate January 31, 1913.

LOUIS F. HART,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house February 25, 1913.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Mr. JONES presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF WASHINGTON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 10, passed February 11 and March 7, 1913, with the original copy of said joint memorial as enrolled, now on file in this office, and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said original and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington, at the capitol in Olympia, this 17th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.

By J. GRANT HINKLE,
Assistant Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 10.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas the Pacific coast and the possessions of the United States bordering on and lying in the Pacific Ocean are without proper or adequate naval protection; and

Whereas it appears impracticable to station a larger Navy on the Pacific coast until sufficient dockage facilities have been established for the proper care of additional ships; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Navy has recommended the building of an additional dry dock on the Pacific coast, such dry dock to be 1,000 feet long by 110 feet in width; and

Whereas the Secretaries of the Navy, since the construction of the dry docks at the Puget Sound Navy Yard, Bremerton, Wash., and all officers of the Navy who have examined the same, pronounce the site and conditions for a dry dock at this location unexcelled by any other localities in the United States; and

Whereas an additional dry dock can be built at Bremerton far below the cost of the same at any other point on the Pacific coast, or elsewhere, for that matter; and

Whereas the conditions for speedy and economic construction of an additional dry dock are excellent at Bremerton over any other point; and

Whereas the easy access by vessels to Bremerton, the depth of the water, the freedom of the waters from sediment to damage the valves and machinery of the vessels, the land-locked and storm-free conditions of the harbor, and the natural and easy means afforded for the safeguarding and the protection of this harbor at Bremerton make us—

The Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in the thirteenth legislative session assembled, petition you to provide at once for the construction of an additional dry dock at the Puget Sound Navy Yard on the scale as recommended by the honorable Secretary of the Navy.

To this end your memorialists will ever pray.

Passed the senate February 11, 1913.

LOUIS F. HART,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house March 7, 1913.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Mr. JONES presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF WASHINGTON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 18 passed February 21 and March 12, 1913, with the original enrolled copy of said memorial now on file in this office and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said original and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington, at the capitol, in Olympia, this 17th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 18.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, do most respectfully state, represent, and petition as follows:

Whereas the jute crop of 1912 is reported large, with a surplus of grain bags carried over, indicating that scarcity is not the cause of the prevailing excessive prices; and

Whereas the price of grain bags during 1912 was about 7 cents each until it was reported that the big companies were buying up the visible supply on the Pacific coast, after which time the price steadily advanced until bags reached 12½ cents each, with no plausible reason for the advance in price except the concerted action and manipulation of these strong companies; and

Whereas India is the chief source of supply and bags can not be shipped in time for harvest after about April 1, which affords an excellent opportunity to "corner the market"; and

Whereas Gov. Lister, in his message, stated that the profit on grain bags manufactured at the State penitentiary was practically 40 per cent for 1912, and as the prison sacks were sold about 2 cents each below the sack dealers' prices, this indicates that the dealers must have made a profit of 50 per cent and upward; and

Whereas the excessive price of these sacks is a great detriment to the agricultural interests of the Pacific coast:

Therefore your memorialists do urge Congress to make a thorough investigation of the so-called "grain-bag trust."

Passed the senate February 21, 1913.

LOUIS F. HART,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house March 12, 1913.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Mr. JONES presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF WASHINGTON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 12, passed by the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Washington, with the original enrolled copy of said memorial now on file in this office, and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said original and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington, at the capitol, in Olympia, this 19th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.

By J. GRANT HINKLE,
Assistant Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 12, relating to the taxation of unsurveyed lands within the State of Washington.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas by various acts of Congress the United States has heretofore granted to the Northern Pacific Railway each alternate section of land lying within 50 miles on each side of the right of way of the Northern Pacific Railway within the State of Washington; and

Whereas by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States the title to said land is vested absolutely in said corporation and its grantees; and

Whereas under the lieu-land acts of Congress the Northern Pacific Railway Co. and other land-grant railways have been permitted to relinquish granted lands falling within the limits of forest reservations and to select in lieu thereof equal areas within the public lands of the United States situated in the State of Washington; and

Whereas several million acres of valuable timber lands within the State of Washington are now held by the Northern Pacific Railway and other railway companies and by other corporations and individuals under the above-mentioned land grants and lieu-land acts of Congress; and

Whereas the greater portion of said lands so held by private corporations and individuals is still unsurveyed; and

Whereas by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States the State of Washington is prevented from levying any taxes whatsoever upon said lands until the same are surveyed and until the surveys are approved and accepted by the Department of the Interior of the United States; and

Whereas as a result of the conditions above mentioned approximately 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 acres of valuable lands within the State of Washington are now wholly exempt from taxation and have never been taxed in any sum whatsoever, although the same are held as private property and are mortgaged, sold, and conveyed in the same manner as other lands, and constitute to all intents and purposes private property; and

Whereas by reason of the conditions herein stated the State of Washington and the counties in which said lands are situated have lost an immense sum of money in taxes which should have been levied and collected upon said lands to the great detriment of the State of Washington and the counties above referred to; and

Whereas said unjust and inequitable situation has become unbearable and calls for immediate and effective relief on the part of the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore,

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Washington, in thirteenth biennial session convened, most respectfully urge upon you the urgent necessity of granting immediate and effective relief as follows:

1. By an act of Congress appropriating the sum of at least $200,000 to be used in the extension of surveys over all of the unsurveyed lands in the State of Washington to which legal or equitable title has passed from the United States to private or corporate ownership.

2. By an act of Congress appropriating the sum of at least $50,000 to cover the expense of approving and accepting the surveys of said lands as fast as the same are completed and directing the Department of the Interior to proceed forthwith to approve the surveys already made and to be made in the future.

3. By an act of Congress providing for the enforcement by the United States of the lien reserved to the United States upon the unsurveyed lands granted to the Northern Pacific Railway within the State of Washington to cover the cost of making the surveys of the same, and instructing and empowering the Department of the Interior to actively enforce said liens.

4. By an act of Congress authorizing and permitting the State of Washington to survey said unsurveyed lands within the State of Washington and to receive reimbursement of the actual cost and expense thereof from the United States.

5. By an act of Congress repealing or modifying the act passed in 1870, being Sixteenth Statutes at Large, 305, to the end that taxes may be levied by the State of Washington and by the various counties thereof against the unsurveyed lands situated therein, subject to the lien of the United States against said lands, to cover the cost of the survey thereof in making said lien of the United States superior and paramount to the lien of said taxes, in order that the unsurveyed lands now in private ownership may be rendered subject to taxation in the same manner and to the same extent that other private property is taxed.

Passed the house February 27, 1913.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate March 5, 1913.

LOUIS F. HART,
President of the Senate.

Mr. JONES presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF WASHINGTON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 13, passed by the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Washington, with the original enrolled copy of said memorial now on file in this office and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of original and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington at the capitol, in Olympia, this 19th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.

By J. GRANT HINKLE,
Assistant Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 13.

To Hon. Woodrow Wilson, President elect, Trenton, N. J.:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, respectfully petition—

That you make the matter of railroad construction and development in the Territory of Alaska a part of the subject matter of your first message to the Congress of the United States, and that if this is impracticable or inconvenient you send a special message to the Congress on the subject at your earliest convenience.

To this end we respectfully direct your attention to the report of the Alaska Railway Commission.

Passed the house February 25, 1913.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate February 26, 1913.

LOUIS F. HART,
President of the Senate.

Mr. JONES presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF WASHINGTON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 7, passed by the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Washington, with the original enrolled copy of said joint memorial now on file in this office and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said original, and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington, at the capitol, in Olympia, this 19th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.

By J. GRANT HINKLE,
Assistant Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 7.

To His Excellency the President, and to the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, do most respectfully state, represent, and petition as follows:

Whereas it has been the settled policy of the United States of America for over a century to encourage the establishment of orderly government all over the world;

Whereas the people of China have establish a Republic and it has been successfully and firmly sustained and upheld since it was proclaimed in its entirety the 12th day of February, 1912.

Now, therefore, your memorialists do hereby earnestly and respectfully petition and urge that the Republic of China be forthwith officially recognized by the Government of the United States, and that such recognition be extended without awaiting the action or concurrence of any other nation.

Passed the house January 31, 1913.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate February 11, 1913.

LOUIS F. HART,
President of the Senate.

Mr. PERKINS presented a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of California, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assembly joint resolution 2, relative to requesting the United States Congress to authorize and direct the Postal Savings System to loan its funds to school districts.

Whereas under the act of Congress now in force, which establishes a Postal Savings System throughout the United States, there is no authority by which the board of trustees of said Postal Savings System is permitted to loan the funds of said system to the various school districts throughout the Nation; and

Whereas it appears that if such authority existed the school districts of this State and every State would be able thereby to obtain money directly from the funds of said Postal Savings System with more facility and at lower rates of interest; and

Whereas it appears that by their ability to borrow money more easily and under better conditions the school districts of this State and of every State will receive great benefits of economy, saving, and financial prosperity, which will consequently afford the rising generation of our Nation better education and development: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Senate and Assembly of the State of California hereby join in requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the act establishing the Postal Savings System in such manner as will authorize and direct the board of trustees of said Postal Savings System to invest the funds of said system in school-district bonds of the various school districts of the several States, and that our representatives in the Senate and the House of Representatives of Congress do their utmost to further such legislation as will effect the above result: And be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the assembly to the President of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and a copy hereof to each Member of Congress and to each newly elected Member of Congress.

C. C. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
L. B. MALLORY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Received by the governor this 4th day of February, A. D. 1913.

ALEXANDER MCCABE,
Private Secretary to the Governor.

Filed with the secretary of state this 4th day of February, 1913.

Witness my signature and the seal of this office, at Sacramento, this 4th day of February, 1913.

[SEAL.]

FRANK C. JORDAN,
Secretary of State.

Mr. PERKINS presented a telegram in the nature of a resolution adopted by the Legislature of California, which was re-

ferred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CAL., *April 5, 1913.*

Hon. GEORGE C. PERKINS,
Senate, Washington, D. C.

I have the honor to hand you the following resolution:

Whereas owing to the lack of necessary rainfall during the past several months, the usual and necessary feed for stock has not been grown within the State of California; and

Whereas there are many thousands of sheep and cattle which are apt to suffer severely by reason of such lack of feed; and

Whereas many thousands of these animals will perish if some relief be not granted by the Department of Agriculture, granting permission under such terms and conditions as may be by it deemed proper to permit an increased number of stock and sheep to graze within the national forest and other Federal reservations: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and assembly jointly, That we request and urge the Senators and Congressmen of the State of California to use every possible effort to have the Department of Agriculture, or such other departments as may have jurisdiction of the subject matter, grant permission to the owners of stock and sheep within the State of California, to permit the said stock and sheep to feed and graze within national forest and other Federal reservations, under such terms and conditions as said department may deem proper; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be immediately telegraphed to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress and likewise to Hon. D. F. Houston, Secretary of Agriculture.

Adopted April 4.

L. B. MALLORY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. PERKINS presented resolutions adopted by the Labor Council of San Francisco, Cal., favoring an investigation into the labor conditions in West Virginia, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. STERLING presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. *State of South Dakota, ss:*

I, Frank Glasner, secretary of state of the State of South Dakota, do hereby certify that the annexed bill, to wit, senate joint resolution 29, was duly passed by the 1913 session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, approved by the governor, and is now in full force and effect.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota this 8th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

FRANK GLASNER,
Secretary of State.
By J. T. NELSON,
Assistant Secretary of State.

A joint resolution providing for a memorial to Congress, requesting that the Constitution of the United States be amended so that the President of the United States shall hold office for six years and be ineligible for reelection.

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring):

SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be, and the same is hereby, memorialized to submit to the States an amendment of section 1 of Article XI of the Constitution of the United States, providing that the President of the United States be elected to hold office for a term of six years and thereafter be ineligible for election to such office. To that end the Senators and Representatives are earnestly requested to lend their aid.

SEC. 2. The secretary of state shall, after the passage of this resolution by both houses, send a certified copy to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Mr. STERLING presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of South Dakota, ss:*

I, Frank Glasner, secretary of state of the State of South Dakota, do hereby certify that the annexed bill, to wit, house joint resolution 17, was duly passed by the 1913 session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, approved by the governor, and is now in full force and effect.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota this 8th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

FRANK GLASNER,
Secretary of State.
By J. T. NELSON,
Assistant Secretary of State.

House joint resolution 17, a joint resolution memorializing Congress to amend the homestead laws so as to permit male minors over 18 years of age to make entry.

Inasmuch as many young men 18 years of age and under 21 years of age are self-supporting;

And, further, inasmuch as the Canadian homestead laws permit male minors over 18 years of age to make homestead entry: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend the existing homestead laws to permit the male minors 18 years of age or over to make homestead entries under the same conditions as if they were over 21 years of age: *Provided*, That such minors shall not be eligible to make final proof and receive patents from the Government for such land until at least 14 months after having attained the age of 21 years has elapsed.

Mr. THOMAS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Arapahoe and Silverton, in the State of Colorado, praying that an investigation be made into the prosecution of the Appeal to Reason, a Socialist newspaper published at Girard, Kans., which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HITCHCOCK:

A bill (S. 384) to provide for the incorporation of 25 national reserve associations and establishing 20 of the same; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey:

A bill (S. 385) to amend section 1440 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 386) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth K. Norton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. POMERENE. I introduce a bill relating to bills of lading, being the same bill which was unanimously passed by the Senate August 21, 1912. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The bill (S. 387) relating to bills of lading was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 388) for the relief of Ella O. Richardson; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Georgia:

A bill (S. 389) to limit and define the powers of the judges of the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 390) providing for the levy and collection of an inheritance tax; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 391) to readjust the lineal rank of certain officers of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 392) to create in the War Department and Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as "the Civil War volunteer officers' retired list," to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 393) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Wallace O. Glazier; and

(By request.) A bill (S. 394) for the relief of James Butler and others; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 395) to provide for the investigation of controversies affecting interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(By request.) A bill (S. 396) for the relief of the estate of William Hemphill Bell; and

(By request.) A bill (S. 397) for the relief of C. L. de Muralt; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 398) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Boyne City, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 399) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Bradley;

A bill (S. 400) granting a pension to Dewitt C. Bush;

A bill (S. 401) granting an increase of pension to James W. Smith;

A bill (S. 402) granting a pension to Catherine M. Rogers;

A bill (S. 403) granting a pension to Elizabeth Epke;

A bill (S. 404) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Michael;

A bill (S. 405) granting an increase of pension to D. J. Hammond;

A bill (S. 406) granting a pension to Josephina Soleau;

A bill (S. 407) granting a pension to Ellen Fyanes;

A bill (S. 408) granting a pension to Ambrose A. Link;

A bill (S. 409) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Hemenway;

A bill (S. 410) granting an increase of pension to Rodney O. Hazen; and

A bill (S. 411) granting a pension to Belle Palmer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 412) granting to the civilian employees of the United States the right to receive from it compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment; and

A bill (S. 413) to grant relief to persons erroneously convicted in courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 414) for the erection of a public building at St. George, Utah;

A bill (S. 415) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Springville, in the State of Utah;

A bill (S. 416) to provide for the erection of an armory in the District of Columbia; and

A bill (S. 417) for the erection of a public building at Ephraim, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE:

A bill (S. 418) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin G. Barber;

A bill (S. 419) granting an increase of pension to Emma T. Barnes;

A bill (S. 420) granting an increase of pension to A. M. Barstow;

A bill (S. 421) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte B. Bentley;

A bill (S. 422) granting an increase of pension to Daniel R. Billington;

A bill (S. 423) granting an increase of pension to Anna Bond;

A bill (S. 424) granting an increase of pension to William H. Brewster;

A bill (S. 425) granting a pension to John H. Broadwell;

A bill (S. 426) granting an increase of pension to Leander Brown;

A bill (S. 427) granting a pension to Catherine M. Burdick;

A bill (S. 428) granting an increase of pension to Margaret M. Cady;

A bill (S. 429) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Carpenter;

A bill (S. 430) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Casavant;

A bill (S. 431) granting an increase of pension to Josephine F. Chester;

A bill (S. 432) granting an increase of pension to Anastasia Corcoran;

A bill (S. 433) granting an increase of pension to Ella G. Crawford;

A bill (S. 434) granting an increase of pension to Almantha Cunningham;

A bill (S. 435) granting an increase of pension to William Douglas;

A bill (S. 436) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Fowler;

A bill (S. 437) granting an increase of pension to William Gates;

A bill (S. 438) granting an increase of pension to David H. Geer;

A bill (S. 439) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Henry;

A bill (S. 440) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Hoxie;

A bill (S. 441) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Hunter;

A bill (S. 442) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Irons;

A bill (S. 443) granting a pension to Sarah C. Jaques;

A bill (S. 444) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Johnson;

A bill (S. 445) granting an increase of pension to Nettie L. Jones;

A bill (S. 446) granting an increase of pension to Genevieve L. Kennon;

A bill (S. 447) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Kilbourne;

A bill (S. 448) granting an increase of pension to James N. King;

A bill (S. 449) granting an increase of pension to Lottie E. Limont;

A bill (S. 450) granting an increase of pension to Eldred Mitchell;

A bill (S. 451) granting an increase of pension to Annie Nicholson;

A bill (S. 452) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Parkhurst;

A bill (S. 453) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Rawson;

A bill (S. 454) granting an increase of pension to Mary R. Robbins;

A bill (S. 455) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Roth;

A bill (S. 456) granting a pension to William H. Ryley;

A bill (S. 457) granting an increase of pension to Theodore E. Smith;

A bill (S. 458) granting an increase of pension to Lillie D. Thompson;

A bill (S. 459) granting an increase of pension to Frances A. Tubbs;

A bill (S. 460) granting a pension to Eliza F. Tucker;

A bill (S. 461) granting an increase of pension to James Turner;

A bill (S. 462) granting an increase of pension to William M. Whitaker;

A bill (S. 463) granting an increase of pension to Catherine T. Williams;

A bill (S. 464) granting an increase of pension to Minnie Wadsworth Wood; and

A bill (S. 465) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 466) relating to the use and occupation of lands of the United States for the development of water power, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Such bills usually go to the Committee on Commerce, and unless there is an intention to change the reference of all such bills this one had better take the usual course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state, for the benefit of the Senator from Arkansas, that the bill has been referred as it was in the preceding Congress.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Bills to authorize the construction of dams and the creation of water power have invariably gone to the Committee on Commerce. I move that the bill be so referred.

Mr. GRONNA. I have no objection to having the bill referred to the committee suggested by the Senator from Arkansas. I would just as soon have it go to the Committee on Commerce as to the Committee on Public Lands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be referred——

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Before that order is made, we should like to have the title of the bill again read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the title of the bill.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 466) relating to the use and occupation of lands of the United States for the development of water power, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, all those questions are involved in the general question of legislation concerning water power in the present state of the discussion of that subject; and general bills providing for the construction of dams in navigable streams, for instance, having a national feature, usually go to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. From the reading of the title it appears to me the bill has reference more to public lands than it has to water power.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Of course we can not tell exactly what is the text of the bill from the title, but the general——

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have the bill before me, and clearly it should not go to the Committee on Commerce. It provides:

That hereafter permits for the use and occupation of lands in national forests, national parks, Indian and other reservations, and the unreserved public domain of the United States may be issued, etc.

It pertains to lands along nonnavigable streams, and is a matter with which the Committee on Commerce has nothing to do. I think the bill ought to go to the Committee on Conservation of National Resources, and I make that motion.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, the bill is not such a one as I supposed. I thought it dealt broadly with the question of water power. I have not any desire to interfere with the service of any other committee, and I have no objection to the reference of the bill to any committee to which the author of it wants it to go.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say that I think the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] is mistaken. That bill has been before the Committee on Public Lands a number of times. It relates to the occupation of lands; it does not involve the preservation of forests or the preservation of Indian reservations, but relates to the occupation of lands in forest reserves and also in Indian reservations. I believe as it refers to the public lands it ought to go to the Committee on Public Lands, where it has heretofore been referred.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. In response to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], I think that while this bill has been before the Committee on Public Lands, as many similar bills have been before that committee, it is simply because the Committee on Conservation of National Resources has not been particularly active, in that it was almost impossible, I am informed, to get a quorum of that committee at the last session of Congress. Clearly the bill relates to a matter that concerns the conservation of national resources. It is a question of water power within national forest reserves and on the public lands. It is not a question of land at all under this bill; it is a question of the use of waters, the conservation of waters, the conservation of power. I do not wish to make the point as against the Public Lands Committee on the ground that it is not perfectly competent for that committee to take care of the subject, but I do make it on the ground that the other committee, having much less work to do, can probably give it much more attention.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that if it is a question of water or the use of water, neither the Committee on Public Lands nor any other committee of the Senate has a right to handle it; the States of this Nation have that right. It does not relate to the conservation of water, but to the privilege of granting and occupying certain public lands. The bill rightfully belongs to the Public Lands Committee, and I hope that is where it will go.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the reference of the bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA.]

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] has moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Conservation of National Resources.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I feel that it ought to go to that committee; but I am also a member of the Committee on Public Lands, and I shall make no further contention in regard to the matter. I withdraw the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is withdrawn; and, without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 467) to amend section 24 of the Judicial Code, approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 468) to amend section 9 of the act of June 25, 1910, entitled "An act to establish postal savings depositories for depositing savings at interest, with the security of the Government for repayment thereof, and for other purposes"; and

A bill (S. 469) to increase the compensation of rural mail carriers; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 470) for the relief of Rodger Caplette; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 471) to prohibit selling of intoxicating beverages in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

A bill (S. 472) to provide for the classification of the public lands of the United States;

A bill (S. 473) to provide for the disposal of coal and coal lands;

A bill (S. 474) to authorize the issuance of absolute and unqualified patents to public lands in certain cases;

A bill (S. 475) to authorize the disposal of phosphate, oil, asphaltum, or natural gas; and

A bill (S. 476) to provide for the sale of timber and timber lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 477) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as heretofore amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 478) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to provide for agricultural entries on coal lands," approved June 22, 1910; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 479) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 480) to prohibit the interstate shipment of impure seeds; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 481) granting a pension to William F. Niederriter;

A bill (S 482) granting an increase of pension to Charles Shattuck;

A bill (S. 483) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Swift; and

A bill (S. 484) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Harrison; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 485) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; and

A bill (S. 486) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 487) providing for the discovery, development, and protection of streams, springs, and water holes in the desert and arid public lands of the United States in the State of California, for rendering the same more readily accessible, and for the establishment of and maintenance of signboards and monuments locating the same; and

A bill (S. 488) to authorize the sale and issuance of patent for certain land to H. W. O'Melveny; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 489) for the relief of Ellen B. Monahan;

A bill (S. 490) for the relief of Richard H. Grey; and

A bill (S. 491) for the relief of W. A. Gara; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 492) to authorize the construction of a bridge across San Francisco Bay to connect the cities of Oakland and San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 493) to change the military record of Henry Clay Anderson from corporal to captain of staff, without pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 494) to establish a hydrographic station at Los Angeles, Cal.; and

A bill (S. 495) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of Frederick Marshall (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 496) making it unlawful to publish details of crimes and accidents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 497) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William M. Carroll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 498) to reimburse J. Mandelbaum & Sons, of Des Moines, Iowa, for certain duties paid in excess (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 499) authorizing the President to appoint Richard Hatton a pay inspector in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 500) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Wigger;

A bill (S. 501) granting an increase of pension to Robert F. Carter;

A bill (S. 502) granting an increase of pension to William F. Flemming;

A bill (S. 503) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Graft;

A bill (S. 504) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Coffman;

A bill (S. 505) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Boyer;

A bill (S. 506) granting an increase of pension to James H. Firman;

A bill (S. 507) granting a pension to Clarence W. Fallor;

A bill (S. 508) granting a pension to Bert E. Lockwood;

A bill (S. 509) granting an increase of pension to Ellis R. Douglas;

A bill (S. 510) granting an increase of pension to David R. Edmonds;

A bill (S. 511) granting a pension to Minnie A. Curtis;

A bill (S. 512) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Balfour;

A bill (S. 513) granting an increase of pension to Elias Palmer;

A bill (S. 514) granting an increase of pension to Miller C. Hunter;

A bill (S. 515) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Little;

A bill (S. 516) granting an increase of pension to William Rider;

A bill (S. 517) granting a pension to Tilford A. Steele;

A bill (S. 518) granting a pension to William H. Spencer;

A bill (S. 519) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Williams; and

A bill (S. 520) granting a pension to D. M. Rowland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 521) granting a pension to Elizabeth Kelly Steel; and

A bill (S. 522) granting a pension to Charles B. Haldeman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 523) granting an increase of pension to Albert E. Longman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 524) granting a pension to Roy E. Thoen;

A bill (S. 525) granting an increase of pension to James E. Stalker;

A bill (S. 526) granting a pension to Mabala M. Clark (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 527) granting an increase of pension to Jerome P. Patten (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN:

A bill (S. 528) for the relief of Capt. Frank Parker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona:

A bill (S. 529) granting lands to the State of Arizona for construction and maintenance of roads, highways, and bridges (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 530) to establish the Rocky Mountain National Park in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 10) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the time for the convening of Congress and commencement of the terms of the President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WORKS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 11) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators, the hour of 12.30 o'clock has arrived. Upon yesterday the Senate accepted the invitation of the House of Representatives to repair to its Hall at this time and listen to the communication of the President of the United States. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the order of the Senate.

Thereupon the Senate, preceded by its Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.

The address of the President of the United States this day delivered to both Houses of Congress is as follows:

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, gentlemen of the Congress, I am very glad indeed to have this opportunity to address the two Houses directly and to verify for myself the impression that the President of the United States is a person, not a mere department of the Government hailing Congress from some isolated island of jealous power, sending messages, not speaking naturally and with his own voice—that he is a human being trying to cooperate with other human beings in a common service. After this pleasant experience I shall feel quite normal in all our dealings with one another.

I have called the Congress together in extraordinary session because a duty was laid upon the party now in power at the recent elections which it ought to perform promptly, in order that the burden carried by the people under existing law may be lightened as soon as possible, and in order, also, that the business interests of the country may not be kept too long in suspense as to what the fiscal changes are to be to which they will be required to adjust themselves. It is clear to the whole country that the tariff duties must be altered. They must be changed to meet the radical alteration in the conditions of our economic life which the country has witnessed within the last generation. While the whole face and method of our industrial and commercial life were being changed beyond recognition the tariff schedules have remained what they were before the change began, or have moved in the direction they were given when no large circumstance of our industrial development was what it is to-day. Our task is to square them with the actual facts. The sooner that is done the sooner we shall escape from suffering from the facts and the sooner our men of business will be free to thrive by the law of nature—the nature of free business—instead of by the law of legislation and artificial arrangement.

We have seen tariff legislation wander very far afield in our day—very far indeed from the field in which our prosperity might have had a normal growth and stimulation. No one who looks the facts squarely in the face or knows anything that lies beneath the surface of action can fail to perceive the principles upon which recent tariff legislation has been based. We long ago passed beyond the modest notion of "protecting" the industries of the country and moved boldly forward to the idea that they were entitled to the direct patronage of the Government. For a long time—a time so long that the men now active in public policy hardly remember the conditions that preceded it—we have sought in our tariff schedules to give each group of manufacturers or producers what they themselves thought that they needed in order to maintain a practically exclusive market as against the rest of the world. Consciously or unconsciously, we have built up a set of privileges and exemptions from competition behind which it was easy by any, even the crudest, forms of combination to organize monopoly; until at last nothing is normal, nothing is obliged to stand the tests of efficiency and economy, in our world of big business, but everything thrives by concerted arrangement. Only new principles of action will save us from a final hard crystallization of monopoly and a complete loss of the influences that quicken enterprise and keep independent energy alive.

It is plain what those principles must be. We must abolish everything that bears even the semblance of privilege or of any kind of artificial advantage, and put our business men and producers under the stimulation of a constant necessity to be efficient, economical, and enterprising, masters of competitive supremacy, better workers and merchants than any in the world. Aside from the duties laid upon articles which we do not, and probably can not, produce, therefore, and the duties laid upon luxuries and merely for the sake of the revenues they yield, the object of the tariff duties henceforth laid must be effective competition, the whetting of American wits by contest with the wits of the rest of the world.

It would be unwise to move toward this end headlong, with reckless haste, or with strokes that cut at the very roots of what has grown up amongst us by long process and at our own invitation. It does not alter a thing to upset it and break it and deprive it of a chance to change. It destroys it. We must make changes in our fiscal laws, in our fiscal system, whose object is development, a more free and wholesome development, not revolution or upset or confusion. We must build up trade, especially foreign trade. We need the outlet and the enlarged field of energy more than we ever did before. We must build up industry as well, and must adopt freedom in the place of artificial stimulation only so far as it will build, not pull down. In dealing with the tariff the method by which this may be done will be a matter of judgment exercised item by item. To some not accustomed to the excitements and responsibilities of greater freedom our methods may in some respects and at some points seem heroic, but remedies may be heroic and yet be remedies. It is our business to make sure that they are genuine remedies. Our object is clear. If our motive is above just challenge and only an occasional error of judgment is chargeable against us, we shall be fortunate.

We are called upon to render the country a great service in more matters than one. Our responsibility should be met and our methods should be thorough, as thorough as moderate and well considered, based upon the facts as they are and not worked out as if we were beginners. We are to deal with the facts of our own day, with the facts of no other, and to make laws which square with those facts. It is best, indeed it is necessary, to begin with the tariff. I will urge nothing upon you now at the opening of your session which can obscure that first object or divert our energies from that clearly defined duty. At a later time I may take the liberty of calling your attention to reforms which should press close upon the heels of the tariff changes, if not accompany them, of which the chief is the reform of our banking and currency laws; but just now I refrain. For the present, I put these matters on one side and think only of this one thing—of the changes in our fiscal system which may best serve to open once more the free channels of prosperity to a great people whom we would serve to the utmost and throughout both rank and file.

I sincerely thank you for your courtesy. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

AMENDMENT TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $125,000 for the purchase of a site and construction of a wharf and buildings and purchase of the necessary equipment for a depot for the sixth lighthouse district, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. McCUMBER submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 10) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GRONNA submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 10) to reduce tariff duties and

to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution, which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That Mr. GOFF be assigned to service on the following committees: Claims, Conservation of National Resources, Military Affairs, Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, Pensions, Railroads, and University of the United States.

ALEXANDER MACKENZIE AND HENRY L. ABBOT.

Mr. TOWNSEND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 33), which was read and referred to the Committee on Claims:

Resolved, That the claims of Alexander MacKenzie, United States Army, retired (S. 5119), and Henry L. Abbot, United States Army, retired (S. 5120), now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same are hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

WATERWAYS OF CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. TOWNSEND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 32), which was read:

Resolved, That the President be, and he hereby is, respectfully requested to enter upon negotiations with Great Britain or the Dominion of Canada with a view to an international agreement for the concurrent or cooperative improvement of navigation in waterways used, or which can be used, in common for the commerce of Canada and the United States.

Mr. LODGE. I think that resolution ought to go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will say to the Senator that it was referred to the Committee on Commerce in the last Congress.

Mr. LODGE. It involves negotiations with a foreign power.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say that a similar resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce in the preceding Congress.

Mr. LODGE. It may have been referred to that committee in the last Congress, but I think clearly any measure involving a treaty with a foreign power should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I ask the attention of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] to the matter.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have no objection to its going to that committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CHEAT AND NEW RIVERS, VA. AND W. VA.

Mr. CHILTON. I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. It simply calls for documents and papers.

The resolution (S. Res. 30) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish to the Senate, if consistent with public interests, copies of all documents and papers in his office or under his control relating to the building of dams or reservoirs by private interests in the Cheat and New Rivers in the States of Virginia and West Virginia and copies of all correspondence had with his department relating thereto, together with copies of all rulings or permits, if any, issued or made by his department authorizing the building of any such dams or reservoirs.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not rise to object, but to suggest to the Senator from West Virginia to substitute the word "directed" for "requested." That is the ordinary language.

Mr. CHILTON. I accept that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

POLICEMEN'S AND FIREMEN'S PENSION ROLLS.

Mr. BRISTOW. I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 31) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, directed to furnish the Senate the names of all persons borne on the policemen's and firemen's pension rolls of the District, and to inform the Senate what employment such persons have, either in the service of the Government or in private life, and what compensation is received by each pensioner so employed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object to the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi objects, and the resolution will go over.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let it go to the proper committee.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 9, 1913, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *April 8, 1913.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art from everlasting to everlasting, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, our God and our Father, whose infinite wisdom, power, and goodness are everywhere apparent on land and sea and sky, incline our hearts to do Thy will that we may reflect those attributes in thought and deed.

Give us this day the bread that feeds the heart and strengthens the mind for the tasks before us, that we may live with Thee, in Thee, for Thee, and accumulate the wealth that never dies, and enjoy the heaven of the now by doing those tasks willingly, patiently, faithfully, moment by moment, hour by hour, with malice toward none, with charity for all. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER. There are several Members present this morning who were not here yesterday, and if they will come down in front of the Speaker's desk they may be sworn in.

Mr. KALANIANAOLE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. CURLEY, Mr. FAISON, Mr. WHITE, Mr. SHACKLEFORD, and Mr. MOSS of Indiana appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

The SPEAKER. The Chair requests that when Members rise to speak they announce their names and States. The Chair knows a good many of them, but he has not had an opportunity to become acquainted with or recognize the faces of all of them.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

House concurrent resolution 1.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, the 8th day of April, 1913, at 12.30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

JOINT SESSION OF SENATE AND HOUSE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement. During the joint session of the Senate and House about to be held 110 seats in front will be reserved for the Senate and the officers thereof.

The Chair will appoint a committee of three to wait on the President in the Speaker's room and escort him into the House. They will come in at this door on the left.

At joint meetings of the Senate and House the Vice President sits on the right of the Speaker. In this joint meeting the Speaker presides, because it is our invitation to the Senate.

The Chair desires to admonish the occupants of the galleries that they are here by the courtesy of the House, and that a very little conversation on the part of each one of 800 or 900 people makes a tremendous buzz and uproar. Therefore, as far as it is possible under the circumstances, during the proceedings, after the President comes in, the Chair expresses the desire that the occupants of the galleries refrain from conversation.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as the committee on the part of the House to escort the President into the Hall of the House.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House stand in recess until the hour of 12.30 p. m.

Mr. MANN. Make it 12.29.

Mr. CLAYTON. I will make it 12.25.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House stand in recess until 12.25 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.

At the expiration of the recess the House resumed its session.

At 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the Vice President of the United States and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Members of the House rose.

The Senate, preceded by the Vice President and by their Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Chamber.

The Vice President took the chair at the right of the Speaker and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. At the request of Vice President MARSHALL, I name Senators KERN, BACON, and GALLINGER as a committee to join with the House committee to go to the Speaker's room to escort the President into the Hall of the House.

At 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m. the President of the United States, escorted by the joint committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House and stood at the Clerk's desk, amid applause on the floor and in the galleries.

The SPEAKER. Senators and Representatives, I have the distinguished honor of presenting the President of the United States. [Applause.]

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, gentlemen of the Congress, I am very glad indeed to have this opportunity to address the two Houses directly and to verify for myself the impression that the President of the United States is a person, not a mere department of the Government hailing Congress from some isolated island of jealous power, sending messages, not speaking naturally and with his own voice—that he is a human being trying to cooperate with other human beings in a common service. After this pleasant experience I shall feel quite normal in all our dealings with one another.

I have called the Congress together in extraordinary session because a duty was laid upon the party now in power at the recent elections which it ought to perform promptly, in order that the burden carried by the people under existing law may be lightened as soon as possible, and in order, also, that the business interests of the country may not be kept too long in suspense as to what the fiscal changes are to be to which they will be required to adjust themselves. It is clear to the whole country that the tariff duties must be altered. They must be changed to meet the radical alteration in the conditions of our economic life which the country has witnessed within the last generation. While the whole face and method of our industrial and commercial life were being changed beyond recognition the tariff schedules have remained what they were before the change began, or have moved in the direction they were given when no large circumstance of our industrial development was what it is to-day. Our task is to square them with the actual facts. The sooner that is done the sooner we shall escape from suffering from the facts and the sooner our men of business will be free to thrive by the law of nature—the nature of free business—instead of by the law of legislation and artificial arrangement.

We have seen tariff legislation wander very far afield in our day—very far indeed from the field in which our prosperity might have had a normal growth and stimulation. No one who looks the facts squarely in the face or knows anything that lies beneath the surface of action can fail to perceive the principles upon which recent tariff legislation has been based. We long ago passed beyond the modest notion of "protecting" the industries of the country and moved boldly forward to the idea that they were entitled to the direct patronage of the Government. For a long time—a time so long that the men now active in public policy hardly remember the conditions that preceded it—we have sought in our tariff schedules to give each group of manufacturers or producers what they themselves thought that they needed in order to maintain a practically exclusive market as against the rest of the world. Consciously or unconsciously, we have built up a set of privileges and exemptions from competition behind which it was easy by any, even the crudest, forms of combination to organize monopoly; until at last nothing is normal, nothing is obliged to stand the tests of efficiency and economy, in our world of big business, but everything thrives by concerted arrangement. Only new principles of action will save us from a final hard crystallization of monopoly and a complete loss of the influences that quicken enterprise and keep independent energy alive.

It is plain what those principles must be. We must abolish everything that bears even the semblance of privilege or of any kind of artificial advantage, and put our business men and producers under the stimulation of a constant necessity to be efficient, economical, and enterprising, masters of competitive supremacy, better workers and merchants than any in the world. Aside from the duties laid upon articles which we do not, and probably can not, produce, therefore, and the duties laid upon luxuries and merely for the sake of the revenues they yield, the object of the tariff duties henceforth laid must be effective competition, the whetting of American wits by contest with the wits of the rest of the world.

It would be unwise to move toward this end headlong, with reckless haste, or with strokes that cut at the very roots of what has grown up amongst us by long process and at our own invitation. It does not alter a thing to upset it and break it and deprive it of a chance to change. It destroys it. We must make changes in our fiscal laws, in our fiscal system, whose object is development, a more free and wholesome development, not revolution or upset or confusion. We must build up trade, especially foreign trade. We need the outlet and the enlarged field of energy more than we ever did before. We must build up industry as well, and must adopt freedom in the place of artificial stimulation only so far as it will build, not pull down. In dealing with the tariff the method by which this may be done will be a matter of judgment exercised item by item. To some not accustomed to the excitements and responsibilities of greater freedom our methods may in some respects and at some points seem heroic, but remedies may be heroic and yet be remedies. It is our business to make sure that they are genuine remedies. Our object is clear. If our motive is above just challenge and only an occasional error of judgment is chargeable against us, we shall be fortunate.

We are called upon to render the country a great service in more matters than one. Our responsibility should be met and our methods should be thorough, as thorough as moderate and well considered, based upon the facts as they are, and not worked out as if we were beginners. We are to deal with the facts of our own day, with the facts of no other, and to make laws which square with those facts. It is best, indeed it is necessary, to begin with the tariff. I will urge nothing upon you now at the opening of your session which can obscure that first object or divert our energies from that clearly defined duty. At a later time I may take the liberty of calling your attention to reforms which should press close upon the heels of the tariff changes, if not accompany them, of which the chief is the reform of our banking and currency laws; but just now I refrain. For the present, I put these matters on one side and think only of this one thing—of the changes in our fiscal system which may best serve to open once more the free channels of prosperity to a great people whom we would serve to the utmost and throughout both rank and file.

I sincerely thank you for your courtesy. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

At 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m. the President retired from the Hall of the House.

Thereupon the Vice President and the Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns I ask unanimous consent that there may be ordered printed twenty-five hundred copies of the bill H. R. 10, the tariff bill, 500 copies for the use of the Ways and Means Committee and 2,000 copies to be distributed through the folding room for the use of Members. I understand the present print is exhausted, and that Members desire more copies.

Mr. MANN. I take it that that is the bill as it stands now, and that when the bill is reported there will be printed a plentiful supply. I will say to the gentleman from Alabama that there is now quite a demand for copies of this bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman from Illinois thinks that we need more copies at present, I will agree to enlarge the number in my request. If the gentleman thinks more are now needed, I will suggest that a larger number be printed.

Mr. MANN. I think it would be well to have 5,000 copies in addition to the 500 to go to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Speaker, I make the request that 500 copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means and 5,000 copies to be distributed through the folding room for the use of Members.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that there be printed 5,500 copies of the tariff bill.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Alabama will permit a further suggestion, these copies that go to the folding room now should be in the ordinary document form instead of the bill form, as they are much more convenient.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the type of the bill is still set, and it would cost very little to run off these additional copies in its present form. If printed in document form it would require to be set anew.

Mr. MANN. Very well.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if any provision has been made for printing a copy of the bill with an index?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from New York that the Democratic end of the Ways and Means Committee had prepared a handbook that explains the amendments in the bill, gives the imports and exports, the amount of the American production of each item, with the ad valorem rates

and real rates in the Payne bill, and the ad valorem equivalents and rates in this bill compared. By reason of a change of the text at the last moment it threw the paging of the index of the handbook out of place, and it had to be sent back to the printers to be reprinted and reindexed. It has delayed its coming in, but I hope to have it printed for the use of the Democratic caucus by to-morrow and expect to bring it in as a part of the report on the bill. I will say that gentlemen on that side of the House, of course, will be furnished with such copies as they need for their personal use immediately, and we will have it printed in larger numbers later on.

Mr. PAYNE. So that it will be available to the minority Members as soon as it is to the Members of the caucus.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Is this index in the pamphlet an index to the bill, or simply an index to the pamphlet?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is an index to the pamphlet. It is, however, really an index to the bill, because each paragraph in the bill is indexed in the handbook, and by referring to the handbook it will give one the paragraph number of the bill.

Mr. MANN. I take it, it would delay the reprint if the gentleman had to make an index to the bill to go with it. Of course, it is very convenient in sending out the bill to people who are interested in special things to have an index.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would prefer not to have the form changed until it is reported to the House.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that four years ago we prepared an index to the bill over one night, after the bill was introduced, and it proved very convenient to the Members. The sooner the index to the bill can be prepared, of course the greater facility Members will have in reaching the information they desire.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I am not a prophet and I can not tell in what particulars the bill may be amended by the Democratic caucus. Therefore I did not have the index made until the caucus on this side of the House had disposed of the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I had forgotten that the caucus would have any say about it or would change it.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire whether this handbook of which the gentleman speaks contains a comparative statement of the present duties and the proposed duties?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It will, when it comes out.

Mr. PAYNE. Would it not be well to provide for the printing of that at the same time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The committee has leave to print, and I think it will print enough copies for the use of the Members of the House. The final print to send out to constituents will be taken care of later.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that 5,500 copies of the tariff bill—H. R. 10—shall be printed, 500 for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means and 5,000 to go to the folding room. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT OVER.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, April 10, 1913, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 1940) to regulate the issue of securities by transportation, telegraph, and telephone companies engaged in interstate commerce, for the purpose of better protecting the people against unreasonable rates and charges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1941) establishing a hospital to be known as Chippewa Hospital of Minnesota and creating a board of governors, and providing for the operation thereof; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 1942) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Bryan, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1943) providing for the erection of a public building at Napoleon, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 1944) for the purchase of a site and erection thereon of a public building at Sullivan, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 1945) to extend free-delivery mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 1946) to amend section 1244, Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 1947) authorizing an appropriation for the Interparliamentary Union for International Arbitration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1948) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Brig. Gen. Nathaniel Lyon at St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1949) to perfect the title to land belonging to the M. Forster Real Estate Co., of St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1950) providing for the acquisition of a site and the erection of an immigration exposition building at the city of St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1951) for the purchase of the Oldroyd collection of Lincoln relics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1952) to provide for the erection of a statue at the Panama Canal to be symbolic of universal peace, and to appropriate money therefor; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1953) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the permanent military establishment of the United States," approved February 2, 1901; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1954) providing for the erection of a suitable memorial to Vasco Nuñez de Balboa in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1955) to create a board of river regulation and to provide a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers in aid of interstate commerce, and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection and for the beneficial use of flood waters and for water storage and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion and from forest fires and for the cooperation of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 1956) to extend the provisions of the act approved June 25, 1910, entitled "An act to further regulate interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting transportation therein for immoral purposes of women and girls, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1957) to establish the Lake Tahoe National Park in the States of California and Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RODDENBERY: A bill (H. R. 1958) to exclude undesirable aliens, further restrict undesirable immigration, improve steerage conditions, deport objectionable aliens, and provide for the better enforcement of the immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: A bill (H. R. 1959) to provide for purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Carson City, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1960) providing for the establishment of a Weather Bureau station at Las Vegas, Nev.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1961) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to experiment with the cultivation of grasses and other vegetation upon the arid public lands of Nevada; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 1962) to authorize James A. Gordon, Mark Gordon, Otis Gordon, Harry Gordon, and Alex Gordon, copartners, doing business as Gordon Bros. & Co., to construct a dam across the Little Fork River, in Koochiching County, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1963) to acquire a site and construct a public building at International Falls, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 1964) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Marshall, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARRISON of New York: A bill (H. R. 1965) making the 12th day of October in each year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1966) to amend an act entitled "An act to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes," approved February 9, 1909; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1967) to amend the act of October 1, 1890 (26 Stats., p. 1567), regulating the manufacture of smoking opium within the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 1968) to provide for the rental of premises in foreign countries for the use of the diplomatic establishments of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON of New York: A bill (H. R. 1969) to impose a tax upon the production, manufacture, sale, and distribution of certain drugs and providing for registration with the collectors of internal revenue of dealers in or producers of certain drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 1970) to amend section 5136 of the Revised Statutes of the United States permitting national banking associations to make loans on farm lands as security, and limiting the amount of such loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1971) to establish a fish hatchery in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1972) to regulate the shipping of live stock; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUPLEY: A bill (H. R. 1973) to increase the limit of cost of the public building authorized to be constructed at York, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1974) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the old post-office building and the site thereof at York, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 1975) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1976) restoring to the public domain certain lands heretofore reserved for reservoir purposes at the headwaters of the Mississippi River and tributaries; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1977) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Two Harbors, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1978) to provide for the construction of a public building at Duluth, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1979) to allot minor Indians of the Bois Fort Band of Chippewas, Minn.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 1980) for the establishment of a national park and acquiring national forests in the Mount Katahdin region of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 1981) to prevent obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbors and adjacent navigable waters of the city of Chicago, Ill., by dumping or otherwise, and to punish and prevent such offenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1982) to establish a fish-cultural station at or near the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 1983) to appropriate $10,000 to aid in the erection of a monument to the memory of the Cushing brothers—Alonzo Hersford Cushing, late of the Fourth United States Artillery; William Barker Cushing, late of the United States Navy; and Howard Bass Cushing, late of the Fourth United States Cavalry; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 1984) providing for the revision of the banking, coinage, and currency laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 1985) to authorize the county of Aitkin, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in Aitkin County, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1986) providing for taxation of and fixing the rate of taxation on inheritances, devises, bequests, legacies, and gifts in the District of Columbia, and providing for the manner of payment as well as the manner of enforcing payment thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 1987) to equalize the grant of lands to the State of Oklahoma for common schools with grants made to other States for such schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 1988) to except the ports of Bangor and Houlton, in the State of Maine, from the reorganization of customs-collection districts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: A bill (H. R. 1989) appropriating the sum of $50,000 for the purpose of drilling and testing wells in Clark, Lincoln, and Nye Counties; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 1990) to compensate the State of Oklahoma for the loss of revenue from nontaxable Indian lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 1991) to amend section 3 of an act entitled, "An act in reference to the expatriation of citizens and their protection abroad," approved March 2, 1907; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 1992) prohibiting the issuance of permits, license, or receipts for special tax authorizing the sale of intoxicating liquors in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 1993) to authorize the payment to the State of Oklahoma of an amount of money equal to 5 per cent of the proceeds of the sales of public lands lying within what was formerly Oklahoma Territory, on sales made between April 22, 1889, and November 16, 1907, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 1994) for the construction of a breakwater at Nawiliwili Harbor, island of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1995) to establish a national park in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 1996) for the protection and increase of State game preserves; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 1997) to establish a fish-cultural and biological station in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1998) for the acquirement of private sea fisheries in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1999) to provide for the construction of a revenue cutter for service in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2000) for the establishment of a lighthouse on the island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 2001) directing and authorizing the Treasurer of the United States to cause to be printed, signed, and ready for issue circulating notes for specified purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 2002) providing aids to navigation in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2003) to provide a lighthouse depot at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURDOCK: Resolution (H. Res. 26) instructing the Clerk of the House to present to the House all statements of campaign contributions and disbursements on file in his office and providing that they be printed; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Resolution (H. Res. 27) providing for an investigation touching the practicability of the study of Esperanto as an auxiliary language; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 3) providing for a Pan American commission for the geographical delimination of boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 40) to extend the invitation of Congress to the Interparliamentary Union and making an appropriation for the entertainment of its members; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 41) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 42) for the relief of sufferers from floods in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GARD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 43) for the relief of sufferers from the recent floods in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARKLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 44) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 45) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. FRENCH: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, for the establishment of a system of rural banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring the Weeks bill providing Federal protection for migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring a bill providing for the leasing of the remaining unappropriated public domain; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, for the retention of the military post at Boise, Idaho; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring the acquiring of the land adjoining the capitol buildings at Boise for a park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring appropriation for the completion of the Celilo Canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COOPER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, praying that steps be taken to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to prohibit polygamy, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, to transfer 50,000 acres of timberland now held within the boundaries of the State of Idaho to this State for the purpose of creating a fund for establishing and maintaining good roads in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, authorizing the Federal Government to secure title to certain land within the city limits of Boise, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, providing certain appropriations for the completion of Celilo Canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging compensation of Indian war veterans for services rendered; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, authorizing the President to appoint a commissioner to supervise the erection of monuments and markers and locate the general route of the Oregon Trail; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging enactment of legislation transferring to the State of Idaho the Boise Barracks Military Reservation in event of its abandonment as an Army post; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging the enactment of legislation which will permit of the organization of national land-mortgage banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring legislation authorizing the acquisition of Monticello by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging the bill providing for the leasing of the public domain be not enacted into law; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging the enactment of legislation providing necessary appropriations for the building and maintaining of roads and bridges in forest reserves in Idaho; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing Congress to pass a bill for the protection of trout in the Truckee River in their spawning season; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, joint and concurrent resolution of the Assembly of the State of Nevada relative to the grant by the United States to the State of Nevada of 1,000,000 acres of public lands to be disposed of for the benefit of a State road fund; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, urging an investigation of the so-called Grain Bag Trust; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, urging Congress to continue Federal cooperation relating to the forested watersheds of navigable streams; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THACHER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to pass laws and regulations providing for the sale and shipment of berries and small fruits to conform to the standard dry measure; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, relative to the equipment of the Charlestown Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing Congress to restore certain ports of entry abolished by order of former President Taft; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, urging the repeal of the reciprocity law of Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, requesting that the Constitution of the United States be amended so that the President of the United States shall hold office for six years and be ineligible for reelection; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing Congress to amend the homestead laws so as to permit male minors to make entry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing Congress in the matter of desert-land interests; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, senate joint resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota, favoring the passage of the McCumber bill relative to Federal inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution No. 13 of the Legislature of South Dakota, memorializing Congress to submit an amendment to section 1, Article III, of the Constitution of the United States, providing that judges of the Federal district courts shall hold their offices for stated terms, to be fixed by Congress, not less than 6 nor more than 12 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, senate joint resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota, petitioning the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate the freight rates on coal into the State of South Dakota from Wyoming and Montana, and to establish just freight rates on the same; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, urging a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLIN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging enactment of legislation increasing the pay of letters carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memoralizing Congress to reestablish the ports of entry recently discontinued; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, urging Congress to enact a law prohibiting the use of the parcel post for the mailing of cigarettes, snuff, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LEVY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing Congress to restore certain ports of entry abolished by order of former President Taft; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABATH: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, urging a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT: Resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the proposed improvement of waterways along the south side of Long Island from Jamaica Bay on the west to Peconic Bay on the east, including the cutting of a canal through Rockaway Peninsula between Jamaica Bay and Great South Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, protesting against the Executive order abolishing certain customs ports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER: Resolutions adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the passage

of laws by the Congress of the United States relating to the sale of small fruits; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Senate joint memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, asking Congress to investigate and institute proper steps to correct evils of the grain-bag monopoly existing on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, senate joint memorial of the Oregon Legislature, favoring legislation by Congress to make settlement of the claims of the Sherman County settlers; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, house joint memorial of the Oregon Legislature, asking Congress to appropriate to aid the development of the English-walnut industry, for which the State has appropriated $2,000 to establish an experiment farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 2004) for the relief of Charles E. Shenk; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2005) granting a pension to Mary Gary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2006) granting a pension to Moses G. Coates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2007) granting an increase of pension to James Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2008) granting an increase of pension to Perry A. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2009) granting an increase of pension to William H. Gump; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 2010) for the relief of the heirs of Julius P. Garesché, lieutenant colonel, United States Army; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARTON: A bill (H. R. 2011) granting an increase of pension to Lyra C. Garber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 2012) granting a pension to Thomas D. O'Shea; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 2013) granting an increase of pension to Eliza E. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 2014) granting an increase of pension to William H. Loomis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 2015) authorizing the President to appoint Richard Hatton as pay inspector in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 2016) granting a pension to Ellen Louise Tripp; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON of New York: A bill (H. R. 2017) for the relief of Leon Greenbaum; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 2018) for the relief of Sam Mana, owner of the schooner *Moi Wahine*, sunk in collision with a Government vessel; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2019) for the relief of the owners of the cargo laden aboard the schooner *Moi Wahine;* to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 2020) granting a pension to Norman Devol; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2021) granting a pension to Frederick R. Merchant; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2022) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca M. Liening; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2023) for the relief of Joseph A. Stevenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 2024) to correct the military record of James Burroes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2025) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Mount; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2026) granting an increase of pension to William H. Vance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2027) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Lafor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2028) granting an increase of pension to Michael McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 2029) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Nason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 2030) for the relief of the deacons of the Missionary Baptist Church, of Toone, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2031) for the relief of the Court Avenue Presbyterian Church, incorporated as the First Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 2032) granting an increase of pension to Dawson Drais; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 2033) granting a pension to Hattie E. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2034) granting a pension to Delila Peterman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 2035) for the relief of Barbara Edelbrock; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2036) for the relief of William E. Silvernail; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2037) granting a pension to Sarepta R. Durrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2038) granting a pension to Emma J. Goodrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2039) granting a pension to Kate Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2040) granting a pension to Charles N. Ashford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2041) granting a pension to Edward Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2042) granting a pension to Margaret E. Plummer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2043) granting a pension to Emma E. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2044) granting an increase of pension to S. P. Marlette; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2045) granting an increase of pension to Edwin B. Force; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2046) conveying certain lands to the T. R. Foley Co.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2047) granting a pension to Mary L. Reynolds; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 2048) granting a pension to S. B. Leamons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2049) granting a pension to Henrietta Gard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2050) granting a pension to Martha Jane Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2051) granting a pension to Presley F. Black; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2052) granting a pension to Sarah McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2053) granting a pension to Ella A. Robison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2054) granting a pension to George W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2055) granting a pension to Annie E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2056) granting a pension to Flora Predmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2057) granting a pension to Lida J. Paul; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2058) granting a pension to Ward Pine; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2059) granting a pension to Martha Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2060) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus W. Patch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2061) granting an increase of pension to Andrew C. McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2062) granting an increase of pension to Vincent Miley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2063) granting an increase of pension to Robert Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2064) granting an increase of pension to David H. Robey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2065) granting an increase of pension to John W. Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2066) granting an increase of pension to George C. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2067) granting an increase of pension to J. R. Stroup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2068) granting an increase of pension to John H. Sellers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2069) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Tillinghast; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2070) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2071) granting an increase of pension to William C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2072) granting an increase of pension to Ryerson J. Parkhurst; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2073) granting an increase of pension to Silas Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2074) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Burns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2075) granting an increase of pension to McPherson Bechtel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2076) granting an increase of pension to Barzallai H. Dershem; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2077) granting an increase of pension to James A. Dicus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2078) granting an increase of pension to William R. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2079) granting an increase of pension to John S. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2080) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Chipley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2081) granting an increase of pension to James P. Bodkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2082) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2083) granting an increase of pension to Peter N. Hardman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2084) granting an increase of pension to William G. Irwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2085) granting an increase of pension to James S. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2086) granting an increase of pension to John Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2087) granting an increase of pension to James W. Howell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2088) granting an increase of pension to William D. Grove; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2089) granting an increase of pension to James W. Fichthorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2090) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Eyman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2091) granting an increase of pension to Casper Laager; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2092) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Worrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2093) granting an increase of pension to Zachariah T. Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2094) granting an increase of pension to John Arnold; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2095) granting an increase of pension to John Gedling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2096) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Earhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2097) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Eichelberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2098) granting an increase of pension to James H. Estey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2099) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Wolverton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2100) granting an increase of pension to Eli Berreman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2101) granting an increase of pension to George W. Butters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2102) granting an increase of pension to James D. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2103) granting an increase of pension to William A. Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2104) granting an increase of pension to T. J. Lindsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 2105) granting an increase of pension to Ellen A. Clement; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2106) granting an increase of pension to Harriett E. Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 2107) granting a pension to Elizabeth Nazworthy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 2108) for the relief of Jabez Lumbert; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2109) for the relief of Cyrus Carpenter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2110) for the relief of J. E. Mintline; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2111) to correct the military record of Henry S. Hunter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2112) to correct the military record of Israel Boyer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2113) granting a pension to Charles E. Collard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALLIN: A bill (H. R. 2114) granting an increase of pension to Ira N. Haney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of the Licking County (Ohio) Equal Suffrage League and the Ohio Equal Franchise Association, favoring the passage of legislation making an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending suffrage to women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Wisconsin Retail Lumber Dealers' Association and William M. Webster, Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of legislation for the establishment of a 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the executive committee of the National Association of Real Estate Exchanges, Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring the passage of legislation intending to improve and beautify the city of Washington; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Wisconsin Peace Society, Madison, Wis., favoring the passage of legislation placing for settlement of the controversy with reference to the free-tolls portion of the Panama Canal act before The Hague tribunal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the National Association of Brass Manufacturers, of Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of legislation for a 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of Greater New York, protesting against the passage of legislation making any reduction in the present tariff on printing and bookbinding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: Petition of G. O. Sanborn and others, favoring the passage of legislation making an appropriation to construct a national highway in North Dakota, South Dakota, and other States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts: Petition of the New England Conference of Cigarmakers, protesting against the passage of any legislation reducing the duty on cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of the Woman's Club, Wallingford, Conn., and the Washington Wanaha Woolgrowers' Association, protesting against the passage of any legislation tending to destroy the present national system of forest control; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Clarkston, Wash., favoring the passage of legislation providing that it shall be a condition that the gates of the Panama Exposition shall be closed on Sundays before the payment of any and all appropriations in that act; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, favoring the passage of legislation making an investigation of the persecution of the editors and publisher of the paper Appeal to Reason; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of the general executive committee of the Railway Business Association, favoring the passage of legislation for the adoption of a national budget as a modern means of regulating the receipts and expenditures of the Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the International Typographical Union, favoring the passage of legislation making it unlawful for any person, for cash consideration or otherwise, to circulate, either oral or printed, any statement that can not be substantiated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Charles E. Collard; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *April 9, 1913.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

COE I. CRAWFORD, a Senator from the State of South Dakota; HENRY A. DU PONT, a Senator from the State of Delaware; and BOIES PENROSE, a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

THE ISTHMIAN CANAL (S. DOC. NO. 2).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, recommending that immediate action be taken by Congress for continuing the work of the armament of fortifications for the Isthmian Canal, and recommending the passage of a joint resolution to that effect, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CRAWFORD presented a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of South Dakota, ss:*

I, Frank Glasner, secretary of state of the State of South Dakota, do hereby certify that the annexed bill, to wit, house joint resolution 7, was duly passed by the 1913 session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, approved by the governor, and is now in full force and effect.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota this 4th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

FRANK GLASNER,
Secretary of State.
By J. T. NELSON,
Assistant Secretary of State.

House joint resolution 7.

A joint resolution memorializing Congress to repeal the pact or so-called reciprocity with Canada.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring):

SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, memoralized to repeal and reject the so-called reciprocity with Canada for the following among other reasons:

First. That the effect of the pact with Canada would be to decrease the price of real estate in the United States, to the great injustice of landowners and of farmers upon whom the prosperity of this country depends.

Second. Not only would a treaty or convention of reciprocity with Canada whereby farm products are admitted free seriously affect the real estate values of this country, but it would also reduce the prices of farm products, to the great detriment of those engaged in agricultural pursuits in this country.

Third. That the treaty is unfair, unjust, and discriminating against the agricultural interests of the United States, giving these interests practically nothing in return for what it deprives them of.

Fourth. That it will inure to the disadvantage, loss, and suffering of our producers without any prospect of cheaper manufactured products to the consumer.

Fifth. That the removal of the duty on wheat will accrue solely to the benefit of the miller, that of barley to the brewer, that of flaxseed to the linseed mills, and that of live stock, hogs, poultry, and dairy products to the packers and middlemen, and, while not benefiting the consumer, will mean a great loss to the producers.

Sixth. This pact, if agreed to, will retard and set back the progress toward a higher and better standard of farm life, which has become so noticeable during the recent prosperous times; it will tend to bring on again that struggle for existence so well remembered by our pioneer farmers—a struggle in which many went under; it will lessen the opportunities for a better education of our farmers' children, and thus encourage them in leaving the farm.

Seventh. It will lessen the purchasing capacity of our American producers to the extent of millions of dollars annually by depriving them of a legitimate and fair price for their products. All of this will represent a corresponding loss to the commercial interests of our country, as the farmer's profit invariably finds its way into all the channels of trade. Our commercial and manufacturing interests stand to lose as much in this way as they will gain by the expansion of their business.

Eighth. Our American farmers, by their thrift, energy, and frugality, have made this country what it is; they have made it possible for the great commercial interests to become wealthy and powerful; without the farmer this would be impossible. In view of this, our commercial interests should now stand by the farmer. To do otherwise lays them open to the charge of commercial greed and selfishness.

Ninth. The term "reciprocity" as applied to the Canadian treaty is a misnomer. Reciprocity means an equitable trade or exchange between two countries of products one country produces and the other does not, or which it produces only in insufficient quantities. We produce everything in this country that is produced in Canada.

Tenth. It constitutes an agreement made recently and without regard to any settled policies of our tariff laws. It means free trade for the farmer and protection for the manufacturer, and as such is discrimination in its rankest form.

Eleventh. That in trading off our home market of more than 90,000,000 people, a market that is and has been abundantly supplied by our own producers, a market that has been built up by American thrift and frugality and which, by every inherent right and heritage, belongs to our producers, for that of 8,000,000 Canadians, with its doubtful increased advantages to commercial and manufacturing interests, would not only be unfair and unjust to our own producers but foolish and reprehensible.

Twelfth. This proposed treaty, when divested of its sentimental features, can and will appeal only to those who are selfishly interested and who expect to gain thereby. As a whole, it will be a damage rather than a benefit to our country. We are opposed to its passage in any form which puts agricultural products on the free list and protects manufactured interests.

Thirteenth. The proposed pact would not reduce the cost of living. It would not benefit the laboring man, the mechanic, or artisan in the great cities, as the exorbitant prices paid by them for produce is not occasioned by the price received by the farmer, but is the result of the excessive charges made by the railroads and middlemen. The farmer only receives 25 per cent of the price paid by the consumer, while the transportation companies and middlemen receive the other 75 per cent.

Fourteenth. That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States and to each of our Senators and Representatives in the Congress.

Mr. GRONNA presented a memorial of members of the Woman's Study Club, of Kenmare, N. Dak., remonstrating against the transfer of the control of the national forests to the several States, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. MYERS presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 1.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas the settlers under the lower Yellowstone project, Montana and North Dakota, organized, under the supervision and direction of the Reclamation Service, the Lower Yellowstone Water Users' Association, a corporation, and executed and delivered a contract to said corporation subscribing for stock in said corporation, which empowered said corporation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to sell their homesteads and their lands unless the owners made application for water rights and complied with the provisions of the act of Congress of June 17, 1902; and

Whereas said contracts were entered into and executed with the understanding that the final estimated cost of the project was $30 per acre, and that the cost to them should not exceed that amount per acre on their holdings, and that the farm unit under said project was 160 acres; and

Whereas the provisions of the act of Congress of June 17, 1902, provided that the payments should be made with a view of returning to the reclamation fund the estimated cost of construction, and also that the farm unit should be fixed at the time the project is determined feasible by the Secretary of the Interior; and

Whereas the cost of construction of said project has exceeded the original estimated cost $750,000, increasing the cost thereof to the settlers to $42.50 per acre; and

Whereas many settlers prior to the initiation of said project have secured from the Government tracts of land embracing more than 80 acres, and the Secretary of the Interior by his ruling has required that such settlers reduce their holdings to 80-acre tracts, the same being adopted as the farm unit under said project, which said ruling the said settlers denounce as contrary to the provisions of the reclamation act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (the senate concurring), That we, the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States for the passage of necessary legislation, and the abrogation of unjust rulings, providing that the settlers under said Yellowstone project shall not be required to return to the reclamation fund an amount exceeding the original estimated cost of $30 per acre; and, further, that said settlers under said project who acquired from the Government prior to the initiation thereof tracts of land embracing more than 80 acres be permitted to hold the same under said project, not exceeding 160 acres each, and to acquire water rights thereunder for the whole of said holdings; further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of the Interior and our Senators and Representatives in Congress, with the request that they use their every effort to bring about speedy action for the accomplishment of the ends and purposes herein indicated.

A. D. MACDONALD,
Speaker of the House.
W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.

Approved February 25, 1913.

S. V. STEWART, *Governor.*

Filed February 25, 1913, at 1.10 o'clock p. m.

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Montana, ss:*

I, A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 1, petitioning Congress for the enactment of such legislation as will relieve the settlers under the lower Yellowstone project, enacted by the thirteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 25th day of February, 1913.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 25th day of February, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 4.

Petition to Congress to enact such legislation as will be necessary for the establishment and the maintenance of an agricultural building for the display of agricultural products.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress of the United States assembled:

Whereas the State of Montana desires to stimulate interest in and direct attention to agricultural pursuits, and we believe that an attractive display of agricultural products will render good results in the matter of the settlement and cultivation of unoccupied lands in Montana and other States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the senate and house concurring, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States for the passage of legislation providing for the establishment and maintenance, under the supervision and regulation of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, of an agricultural building in the city of Washington, D. C., for the permanent and conspicuous display of agricultural products of every kind and description from every State and Territory of the United States. That said building be kept open during business hours of all legal days and that an examination and inspection of said products be permitted by visitors from all parts of the world.

Resolved further, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state to the honorable Secretary of Agriculture of the United States and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

with the request that they use every effort within their power to secure the enactment of such legislation as is necessary to carry out the purposes herein expressed.

W. W. McDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
A. D. MACDONALD,
Speaker of the House.

Approved March 14, 1913.

S. V. STEWART, *Governor.*

Filed March 14, 1913, at 4.15 o'clock p. m.

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.
By COPELAND C. BURG,
Deputy.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Montana, ss:*

I, A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 4, petitioning Congress to enact such legislation as will be necessary for the establishment and the maintenance of an agricultural building for the display of agricultural products enacted by the thirteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 22d day of March, A. D. 1913.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 14th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 3.

Petition to Congress to enact such legislation as will be necessary for the construction of a system of paved public highways connecting the capitol of the several States of the Union with the National Capitol and with each other, and also with the principal national parks.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress of the United States assembled:

Whereas a uniform system of national public highways or roads, connecting the capitols of the several States of the Union with the National Capitol at Washington and with each other, and also with the principal national parks will vastly promote commerce between the several States and reduce the cost of transportation thereof, facilitate and cheapen travel and social intercourse between the people, discourage sectionalism, and render the entire people more cosmopolitan intellectually, morally, and politically; aid the farmer in marketing his produce, and make farm life more agreeable, attractive, and profitable; induce Americans to see and know America; beautify all parts of the Union; intensify industrial activities; encourage good road building throughout the continent, and bring the entire people countless blessings, conveniences, and joys known only to a highly developed country; and

Whereas to secure uniformity, thoroughness, and economy in construction, fitness, and adaptability of grades and avoidance of such local controversies in the selection of routes as would probably delay, if not defeat, the entire enterprise, and the cost of such a system of highways being beyond the probable financial resources of the several States, it would be necessary that it be constructed at the expense and under the supervision of the General Government: Now, therefore be it

Resolved (the house concurring), We, the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do hereby petition and earnestly pray the honorable Congress of the United States for the passage of legislation for the location and construction, under the supervision and by the General Government, of a system of national highways or roads which shall connect the capitols of the several States of the Union with the National Capitol at Washington, and with each other, and also with the principal national parks; that such national highways be constructed on firm concrete bases with hard surfaces and as nearly dustless as possible; that they be located solely with regard to the greatest public good and feasibilty of route and grades; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress provide in such legislation means of raising the necessary money for the location and construction of such national highway by the restoration of the internal revenue tax of 1879 on tobacco or in some other manner, as to it shall seem meet and proper, and that the location and construction of such system of highways be commenced as means can be provided throughout the country generally, without giving priority to any sections or locations; and it is further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senate of the United States, and that copies of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the House of Representatives of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies thereof be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the State of Montana with the request that they use every effort within their power to bring about a speedy action for the accomplishment of the ends and purposes herein indicated.

W. W. McDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
A. D. MACDONALD,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 25, 1913.

S. V. STEWART, *Governor.*

Filed February 25, 1913, at 3.30 o'clock p. m.

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Montana, ss:*

I, A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 3, petitioning Congress to enact such legislation as will be necessary for the construction of a system of paved public highways connecting the capitols of the several States of the Union with the National Capitol and with each other, and also with the principal national parks, enacted by the thirteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 25th day of February, 1913.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 26th day of February, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint resolution 5, relative to suspending entries on Flathead Reservation.

Whereas a large number of citizens, on what was formerly the Flathead Reservation in Montana, have presented filings on lands which are unoccupied and unallotted; and

Whereas said filings have been rejected and suspended by reason of the fact that the said land has not been classified or appraised; and

Whereas many of these settlers have made their applications several years ago and said applications have been rejected or suspended, awaiting the action of the department, which action has not yet been taken: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana does hereby protest against the dilatory action of the Department of the Interior, and does hereby demand that the said Department of the Interior take steps to immediately classify and appraise said lands, to the end that settlers may have proper filings accepted and that the land in question may be cultivated and become homes for citizens of the United States who have applied for and desire the same; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be presented to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from Montana.

A. D. MACDONALD,
Speaker of the House.
W. W. McDOWELL,
President of the Senate.

Approved February 25, 1913.

S. V. STEWART, *Governor.*

Filed February 25, 1913, at 1.10 o'clock p. m.

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Montana, ss:*

I, A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of House joint resolution 5, relative to suspending entries on Flathead Reservation, enacted by the thirteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 25th day of February, 1913.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 25th day of February, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 8.

A memorial to the Congress of the United States praying that the abandoned military post of Fort William Henry Harrison be ceded to the State of Montana.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialists, the senators and representatives of the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, respectfully represent to your honorable bodies the following facts:

First. That the military post heretofore known as Fort William Henry Harrison, situated near the city of Helena, county of Lewis and Clark, State of Montana, has been abandoned for military purposes and the reservation turned over to the control of the Secretary of the Interior, subject to the direction of the Congress of the United States.

Second. That the land upon which said military post is situated, together with the water rights appertaining thereto, was purchased by citizens of the State of Montana, at great expense, and donated to the United States Government upon the express understanding that the same should be used as a site for the maintenance of a military post, and the abandonment of said post will be an injustice to the citizens who donated said land and water rights.

Third. That the abandoned post consists of 1,200 acres of land, with appurtenances, water rights, and numerous buildings of recent construction in good repair; that if said buildings are permitted to remain unoccupied and unused for any considerable time they will become in a condition of disrepair, and in time be rendered valueless by reason of such nonuse.

Fourth. That the State of Montana has numerous State institutions, some of which are now filled to their utmost capacity, and that the buildings situated upon said reservation could be conveniently and profitably used by the State for some of its State institutions.

Wherefore your memorialists respectfully ask your honorable bodies, by appropriate legislative action, to cause to be transferred and conveyed to the State of Montana the said real estate, water rights, and buildings constituting said abandoned post.

And your memorialists will ever pray.

W. W. McDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
A. D. MACDONALD,
Speaker of the House.

Approved March 14, 1913.

S. V. STEWART, *Governor.*

Filed March 14, 1913, at 4.15 o'clock p. m.

A. M. ALDERSON, *Secretary of State.*
By COPELAND C. BURG, *Deputy.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Montana, ss:*

I, A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 8, praying that the abandoned military post of Fort Wil-

liam Henry Harrison be ceded to the State of Montana, enacted by the thirteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 14th day of March, A. D. 1913.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 25th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] A. M. ALDERSON, *Secretary of State.*
By COPELAND C. BURG, *Deputy.*

Mr. ASHURST. I present a memorial signed by various citizens of Arizona, which I ask may be incorporated in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLAGSTAFF, ARIZ., *April 3, 1913.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, the undersigned, members of the Coconino Cattle Growers' Association, respectfully urge that you strenuously oppose any bill which may be introduced in the United States Senate placing meat on the free list. Such a measure, if it becomes a law, would very seriously affect the cattle industry and indirectly other interests of the western country.

Your efforts in this direction will be appreciated by this association.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented a resolution adopted by the Assembly of the State of New York, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN ASSEMBLY, *February 10, 1913.*

Mr. Cuvillier offered for the consideration of the house a resolution in the words following:

Whereas by reason of the establishment of the parcel post and the increase of the United States mail the letter carriers are compelled to work longer, and their compensation is unequal in proportion to similar work of other public employees, and they are not subject to pensions after long and faithful service, though they are required to be men of the highest character, and they are exposed to the elements; and

Whereas it is the duty of the United States to protect these faithful employees in better compensation and a future maintenance in the way of pensions after long service—

Resolved (if the senate concur), That it is the sense of the legislature that the Congress should do all in its power to increase their compensation and provide a pension for the letter carriers, the same as provided for other faithful public servants in other departments of Government; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That our Representatives in Congress use their best endeavor in behalf of the betterment of letter carriers of the United States, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Postmaster General and the Representatives in Congress from the State of New York.

Said resolution giving rise to debate, ordered that the same be laid upon the table.

FEBRUARY 17, 1913.

By unanimous consent Mr. Cuvillier called up his resolution in relation to the pay of letter carriers and the parcel post.

Debate was had thereon.

Mr. Speaker put the question whether the house would agree to said resolution, and it was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered that the clerk deliver said resolution to the senate and request their concurrence therein.

FEBRUARY 18, 1913.

The senate returned the concurrent resolution in relation to pay of letter carriers and the parcel post with a message that they have concurred in the passage of the same without amendment.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of Albany, Office of the Clerk of the Assembly, ss:

I, George R. Van Namee, clerk of the assembly, do hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing record of proceedings of the assembly of February 10, 17, and 18, 1913, relative to the resolution therein set forth with the original thereof and that the same is a true transcript of said proceedings so far as the same relates to said resolution and of the whole thereof.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 24th day of February, 1913.

G. R. VAN NAMEE,
Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented a resolution adopted by the board of aldermen of New York, N. Y., favoring the construction of one of the proposed new battleships at the New York Navy Yard, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. DU PONT presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wilmington, Del., and a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Greenwood, Del., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the closing of the gates of the Panama Exposition on Sundays, which were referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 531) to set apart certain lands in the State of Oregon as a public park, to be known as the Saddle Mountain National Park;

A bill (S. 532) to amend an act granting to the Siletz Power & Manufacturing Co. a right of way for a water ditch or canal through the Siletz Indian Reservation, in Oregon; and

A bill (S. 533) to consolidate certain forest lands in the Ochoco National Forest, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 534) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Burke (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 535) granting a pension to Anna Miller (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 536) granting an increase of pension to Anna D. Pace;

A bill (S. 537) granting a pension to Alexander Weir; and

A bill (S. 538) granting a pension to Sarah A. Wess; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 539) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. L., p. 1133);

A bill (S. 540) for the relief of Joseph Hodges; and

A bill (S. 541) granting to the Emigration Canon Railroad Co., a corporation of the State of Utah, permission, in so far as the United States is concerned, to occupy, for a right of way for its railroad track, a certain piece of land now included in the Mount Olivet Cemetery, Salt Lake County, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 542) to provide for raising the volunteer forces of the United States in time of actual or threatened war; and

A bill (S. 543) to correct the military record of John T. Haines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 544) for the relief of the Virginia Military Institute, of Lexington, Va.; and

A bill (S. 545) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin S. Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 546) granting an increase of pension to Louisa A. Thatcher;

A bill (S. 547) granting a pension to George W. Shuck;

A bill (S. 548) granting a pension to Susan T. Saunders;

A bill (S. 549) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Pierson Porter;

A bill (S. 550) granting a pension to David A. Mitchell;

A bill (S. 551) granting a pension to Lurana M. Lowe;

A bill (S. 552) granting a pension to Mary Bottino;

A bill (S. 553) granting a pension to Mary Helen Harrison; and

A bill (S. 554) granting an increase of pension to Fanny Farley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 555) to provide a site and erect a public building at Chehalis, Wash.;

A bill (S. 556) to provide a site and erect a public building at Waterville, Wash.;

A bill (S. 557) to provide a site and erect a public building at Hoquiam, Wash.;

A bill (S. 558) to provide a site and erect a public building thereon at Centralia, Wash.;

A bill (S. 559) to provide a site and erect a public building at Blaine, Wash.; and

A bill (S. 560) to provide a site and erect a public building at Anacortes, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 561) to provide for the award of congressional medals of honor to officers and enlisted men of the naval service and officers and enlisted men of the revenue marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 562) increasing pensions of widows of the Civil War; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 563) granting a pension to Florence Bayler;

A bill (S. 564) granting an increase of pension to Annie S. Aul;

A bill (S. 565) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Patterson;

A bill (S. 566) granting an increase of pension to Clarinda M. Marks;

A bill (S. 567) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Burns;

A bill (S. 568) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Nichols; and

A bill (S. 569) granting a pension to Bella E. Timmens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 570) for the erection of a memorial amphitheater in the Gettysburg National Cemetery, Gettysburg, Pa.; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 571) to construct a Lincoln memorial highway from the White House, Washington, D. C., to the battle field of Gettysburg, in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 572) to increase the limit of cost of the public building authorized to be constructed at York, Pa.; and

A bill (S. 573) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the old post-office building and the site thereof at York, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 574) granting pensions to soldiers confined in so-called Confederate prisons; and

A bill (S. 575) amending section 2 of the act of April 19, 1908, increasing the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant pensions to certain widows of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 576) for the relief of Gabriel Campbell (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 577) authorizing the President to appoint an additional circuit judge for the fourth circuit; and

A bill (S. 578) to provide for the bringing of suits against the United States by Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maryland, South Carolina, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, and Rhode Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 579) providing for a minimum wage for female persons; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 580) to provide for the refund of duties on coal;

A bill (S. 581) providing for the refund of certain duties incorrectly collected on cutch; and

A bill (S. 582) to create a Tariff Board; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 583) incorporating the American Academy of Arts and Letters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 584) for the relief of the stockholders of the First National Bank of Newton, Mass.; and

A bill (S. 585) to indemnify the State of Massachusetts for expenses incurred by it in defense of the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 586) providing for homestead and desert-land entries for such persons as shall have lost, forfeited, or abandoned their former entries; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 587) relating to the disposal of coal and mineral deposits in Indian lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON:

A bill (S. 588) granting an increase of pension to Mary V. E. Mackrill;

A bill (S. 589) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Macklin; and

A bill (S. 590) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 591) granting an increase of pension to Jerusha Hayward Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

A bill (S. 592) granting an increase of pension to Robert T. Lucey (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 593) providing for the inspection and regulation of coal mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

A bill (S. 594) for the relief of James Belger and others; and

A bill (S. 595) for the relief of Drenzy A. Jones and John G. Hopper, joint contractors for surveying Yosemite Park boundary; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 596) to foster commerce between the United States and foreign countries by facilitating the reexportation in bond from ports of the United States of goods imported into the United States, duly entered for warehousing, and stored in bonded warehouses.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to inquire of the Senator from Louisiana whether the bill should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations or to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. RANSDELL. I think it should go to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BACON. What is the bill?

Mr. RANSDELL. It is a bill concerning goods in bonded warehouses. It provides that where the person wishes to take a part of them out, he may rebox them under Government supervision, and that it shall be done without the Government being put to any expense.

Mr. BACON. It should go to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 597) for the relief of the estate of Henry Ware, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 598) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend sections 2291 and 2297 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to homesteads," which was ordered to lie on the table.

A bill (S. 599) prohibiting Senators, Representatives, or Delegates from receiving compensation or acting as counsel in certain matters where the United States is interested, or for parties or corporations engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 600) extending the number of annual payments to entrymen upon reclamation projects; and

A bill (S. 601) to authorize further advances to the reclamation fund and for the issue and disposal of certificates of indebtedness in reimbursement therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 602) to accept a deed or gift or conveyance from the Lincoln Farm Association, a corporation, to the United States of America of land near the town of Hodgenville, County of Larue, State of Kentucky, embracing the homestead of Abraham Lincoln and the log cabin in which he was born, together with the memorial hall inclosing the same; and further to accept an assignment or transfer of an endowment fund of $50,000 in relation thereto; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 603) to provide for the acquiring of title to public lands classified as and carrying phosphate deposits; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 604) for the relief of Sarah A. Clinton and Marie Steinberg; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 605) granting a pension to Josephine M. Buck;

A bill (S. 606) granting an increase of pension to Louisa A. Brown;

A bill (S. 607) granting an increase of pension to Mary Boyington;

A bill (S. 608) granting a pension to Richard W. Berry;

A bill (S. 609) granting an increase of pension to Michael Barrett;

A bill (S. 610) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Bailey;

A bill (S. 611) granting a pension to Reinhard Anschentz;

A bill (S. 612) granting a pension to William Abernathy;

A bill (S. 613) granting a pension to Joseph Holtz;

A bill (S. 614) granting a pension to A. J. Henderson;

A bill (S. 615) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Hancock;

A bill (S. 616) granting a pension to Robert Hamilton;

A bill (S. 617) granting a pension to Robert Riley Lorton;

A bill (S. 618) granting an increase of pension to John Finegan;

A bill (S. 619) granting an increase of pension to James M. Fenning;

A bill (S. 620) granting an increase of pension to Harman Eastman;

A bill (S. 621) granting an increase of pension to Darwin Coykendall;

A bill (S. 622) granting a pension to Mary Coleman;

A bill (S. 623) granting a pension to James M. Woods;

A bill (S. 624) granting a pension to William E. White;

A bill (S. 625) granting an increase of pension to James M. Wells;

A bill (S. 626) granting a pension to Sarah R. Vancourt;

A bill (S. 627) granting a pension to Martin W. Sewall;

A bill (S. 628) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Ryan;

A bill (S. 629) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Roberts;

A bill (S. 630) granting a pension to Corrilla J. Robbins;

A bill (S. 631) granting a pension to George W. Perry;

A bill (S. 632) granting a pension to Elizabeth Parker;

A bill (S. 633) granting an increase of pension to Marsena De Witt McKane;

A bill (S. 634) granting a pension to Mary P. McIntire; and

A bill (S. 635) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. McGrew; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 636) for the relief of John Green and others, of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BACON:

A bill (S. 637) providing for the leasing and purchasing of suitable official residences for ambassadors and ministers in the countries herein named, and for furnishing and equipping the same; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 638) for the relief of William Liskey (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 639) for the relief of John M. Sutor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 640) for the relief of Eugene E. Colburn (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 641) for the relief of John I. Brown & Son and others; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 642) granting an increase of pension to John J. Byrne;

A bill (S. 643) granting a pension to Lulu W. Gallagher;

A bill (S. 644) granting an increase of pension to Laura Adam; and

A bill (S. 645) granting an increase of pension to Martha Summerhayes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 646) providing for the labeling and tagging of all fabrics and articles of clothing intended for sale which enter into interstate commerce, and providing penalties for misbranding; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 647) to amend an act entitled "An act for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Flathead Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all surplus lands after allotment," approved April 23, 1904 (33 Stat. L., p. 302), as amended by the act of March 3, 1909 (35 Stat. L., p. 796); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 648) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 649) for the establishment of a fish-cultural station in the State of Montana, near the city of Hamilton, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 650) to provide for the purchase of ground and the erection of a Weather Bureau observatory building at or near the Montana State University, at Missoula, Mont.; and

A bill (S. 651) to provide for the purchase of ground and the erection of a Weather Bureau observatory building at Billings, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 652) to place certain ex-acting assistant surgeons of the United States Army on the retired list of the United States Army; and

A bill (S. 653) for the relief of William O. Mallahan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 654) to accept the cession by the State of Montana of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Glacier National Park, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 655) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to survey the lands of the abandoned Fort Assinniboine Military Reservation and open the same to settlement;

A bill (S. 656) granting to the trustees of the Diocese of Montana of the Protestant Episcopal Church, for the benefit of "Christ Church-on-the-Hill," at Poplar, Mont., lots 5, 6, and 7, in block 30, town site of Poplar, State of Montana;

A bill (S. 657) to authorize the reservation of public lands for country parks and community centers within reclamation projects, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 658) giving the right to an additional homestead to all persons who have exhausted or who shall exhaust their original right of entry through the purchase of Indian lands; and

A bill (S. 659) to promote instruction in forestry in States and Territories which contain national forests; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 660) for the relief of Robert F. Scott;

A bill (S. 661) for the relief of the legal representatives of Thomas B. McClintic, deceased;

A bill (S. 662) for the relief of Col. Richard H. Wilson, Fourteenth Infantry, United States Army; and

A bill (S. 663) for the relief of Thomas G. Running; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 664) granting a pension to Daniel Morrissey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey:

A bill (S. 665) for the relief of John W. Barriger and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 666) granting to the State of Iowa all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land within the meander lines, as originally surveyed, of the lakes within said State.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It involves nothing but a question of law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be so referred, if there is no objection.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 667) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission," approved June 29, 1906; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. NELSON (by request):

A bill (S. 668) for the relief of Michael R. Morgan and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 669) for the relief of William Abbot and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 670) to grant to the State of Nevada 1,000,000 acres of land in said State for the use and benefit of said State in the building, repair, and maintenance of roads in said State; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. NEWLANDS:

A bill (S. 671) granting to the State of Nevada 500,000 acres of land in said State for the use and benefit of the University of Nevada; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 672) granting a pension to William H. Wolfe;

A bill (S. 673) granting a pension to Junius Thomas Turner;

A bill (S. 674) granting a pension to John T. O'Brien;

A bill (S. 675) granting an increase of pension to Alice I. Simpson; and

A bill (S. 676) granting a pension to John Kinney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 677) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Decatur, Miss.; and

A bill (S. 678) for the relief of the trustees of Evergreen Lodge, No. 77, Free and Accepted Masons, of Decatur, Miss.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 679) for the relief of George L. Neff; and

A bill (S. 680) for the relief of Henry States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 681) retiring Thomas Harrison, a clerk in the Naval Observatory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 682) placing C. T. Dulin on the retired list of the United States Army; and

A bill (S. 683) to place the name of Sergt. Herman C. Funk upon the officers' retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 684) for the relief of Fanny A. Crocker; to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

A bill (S. 685) to appoint James W. Keen as master's mate in the Revenue-Cutter Service and to place him as such upon the retired list; and

A bill (S. 686) to restore to the active list First Lieutenant of Engineers Henry O. Slayton, retired, United States Revenue-Cutter Service; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 687) for the relief of the heirs of L. A. Davis;

A bill (S. 688) for the relief of the estate of Frederick Heisinger;

A bill (S. 689) for the relief of Matilda Elizabeth West;

A bill (S. 690) for the relief of the Pacific Creosoting Co.; and

A bill (S. 691) for the relief of Simon M. Preston; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 692) granting an increase of pension to Charles Van Dusen;

A bill (S. 693) granting an increase of pension to Julius Nix;

A bill (S. 694) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Chidister;

A bill (S. 695) granting an increase of pension to John McMillin;

A bill (S. 696) granting an increase of pension to John F. Yarnell;

A bill (S. 697) granting an increase of pension to John Bailey;

A bill (S. 698) granting an increase of pension to Iselo Nicely;

A bill (S. 699) granting an increase of pension to James H. Ragsdale;

A bill (S. 700) granting an increase of pension to John N. Jones;
A bill (S. 701) granting an increase of pension to David A. Byers;
A bill (S. 702) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Fisher;
A bill (S. 703) granting an increase of pension to Anna B. Campbell;
A bill (S. 704) granting an increase of pension to James E. Bacon;
A bill (S. 705) granting a pension to Lucy Lowry;
A bill (S. 706) granting a pension to Mary E. Murphy;
A bill (S. 707) granting an increase of pension to Laban Pitzer;
A bill (S. 708) granting an increase of pension to William White;
A bill (S. 709) granting an increase of pension to William S. Patterson (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 710) granting an increase of pension to Silas Rouch (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 711) granting an increase of pension to William W. Mikels (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 712) granting an increase of pension to William F. Steward (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 713) granting an increase of pension to James F. Rankin (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 714) granting an increase of pension to William Redding (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 715) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius Cayton (with accompanying paper); and
A bill (S. 716) granting an increase of pension to Clinton Neligh (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—WENDELL P. HOOD.

On motion of Mr. LODGE, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the pension case of Wendell P. Hood (S. 8203. 62d Cong.) be, and the same are hereby, withdrawn, no adverse report having been made thereon.

RETIRED OFFICERS OF THE ARMY.

Mr. DU PONT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 35), which was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be requested to transmit to the Senate of the United States, as early as possible, the following information:

(1) The nature and character of the duties that retired officers of the United States Army may be detailed to perform under existing laws, regulations, and orders;

(2) The laws, regulations, and orders, if any, that define what is known as active duty on the retired list, and whether such laws, regulations, and orders permit officers on the retired list to apply for such duty; and

(3) The number of retired officers of the Army who have applied for active duty on the retired list since January 1, 1908, and the percentage of those applying who have been detailed on active duty on the retired list during this period.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. OVERMAN. I submit a resolution, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 36), as follows:

Resolved, That the United States Civil Service Commission be, and they are hereby, directed to furnish to the Senate the following information:

The laws, orders, and regulations by which the civil-service system was established and has been extended in the United States.

The number of employees and officers of the United States now employed in the different departments of the Government appointed through, and subject to, the civil-service law and regulations.

The number and names of the employees and officers of the United States now employed in the different departments of the Government who have been covered into the classified service by virtue of executive orders since January 1, 1900, together with the date and copy of each order.

The number and names of persons now in the classified civil service from each State and Territory and the District of Columbia, particularly the number of persons in the classified civil service from each State and Territory and the District of Columbia as differentiated from the number of such persons who have been appointed, also number and names of persons temporarily employed as differentiated from permanent employees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from North Carolina modify the resolution, if he will, so as to ascertain how many employees have been covered by executive order since the law was originally passed.

Mr. OVERMAN. Did the Senator from Kansas hear the third clause of the resolution read? That clause provides for furnishing the information as to those covered since 1900.

Mr. BRISTOW. I know; but I want to go back of 1900, to the beginning.

Mr. OVERMAN. All right; I have no objection to that.

Mr. BRISTOW. The resolution should provide for the information being furnished by years from the passage of the original law.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the Senator will offer such an amendment, I will accept it.

Mr. BRISTOW. I ask the Secretary to read the clause of the resolution to which I desire to offer an amendment.

The Secretary read as follows:

The number and names of the employees and officers of the United States now employed in the different departments of the Government who have been covered into the classified service by virtue of Executive orders since January 1, 1900, together with the date and copy of each order.

Mr. BRISTOW. The resolution provides for furnishing this information since January 1, 1900. I move to strike out the words "since January 1, 1900" and to insert in lieu the words "since the passage of the civil-service law"; and also to insert the words "by years" in the proper place.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Will that show when the employees were covered into the civil service?

Mr. BRISTOW. The date of each order will show.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina a question. It seems to me that he has omitted one feature of information that would be very valuable. I should like to know how many people are in the classified service who have been put there without any examination as to efficiency. I should like to have the resolution so amended as to insure obtaining the information as to how many have been appointed without an examination as to efficiency, and so forth. I should like the Senator to accept an amendment of that kind.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator from Virginia will permit me, the Executive orders will cover exactly the information which the Senator wants, because the employees that have been covered into the service by Executive order have come in without examination.

Mr. SWANSON. I think possibly some of the Executive orders provided for examinations.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the resolution covers every case. If the Senator will listen to the reading of it, I believe he will see that it covers every case of any person who has ever gone into the civil service.

Mr. SWANSON. All I desire is to have information as to what extent appointments have been made in the classified service without examination as to efficiency. If under the resolution that information will be furnished, I do not desire to have it amended; and the Senator from North Carolina assures me that the information will be furnished.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not see how a person could get into the service without examination, unless there was some Executive order issued to that effect. I have asked for a copy of the order and the name of the persons who were thus put into the classified service.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator thinks that that information will be easily obtained under the resolution?

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the resolution will cover all cases.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as I understand from the reading of the resolution it provides that the number of employees in the different departments should be ascertained. Does the Senator understand the resolution to cover the number in each of the different departments?

Mr. OVERMAN. In each of the different departments.

Mr. SMOOT. Or the whole number in the different departments?

Mr. OVERMAN. I have put it both ways so that there could be no question about it.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have the number in each of the different departments specified.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is exactly what I think the resolution covers.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I think this resolution is rather a complicated one and that it should go over.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have it read again.

Mr. JONES. I suggest that the resolution go over. It is a complicated and long resolution, and ought to be examined.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington object to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. JONES. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under objection of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. OVERMAN. I suppose as the resolution goes over under objection, it will be printed.

Mr. JONES. Yes; let it be printed.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask that it be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be printed.

FARM AND ORCHARD BIRDS.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from New Jersey will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 34), as follows:

Resolved, That the Public Printer be, and is hereby, authorized and instructed to cause to be printed 1,000 copies for each Senator of Bulletin No. 513, known as Fifty Common Birds of Farm and Orchard.

Mr. CLAPP. The resolution should read "for the use of Senators," not "for each Senator."

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I accept the suggestion. Let it read "for the use of each Senator."

Mr. CLAPP. The word "each" should be stricken out, and it should read "for the use of Senators."

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am prompted to present the resolution by the fact that the bulletin mentioned was furnished to each Senator to the number of 250 copies, I believe. It is a bulletin, very nicely illustrated, treating of distinct birds, commonly known as farm and orchard birds. I distributed my quota liberally throughout my own State among the libraries and some few to the schools. In almost every instance I have received letters from the librarians and many from the principals of the schools asking that I might send them at least 100 copies, as they thought it would do more to instruct the students and the general reading public as to birds and the necessity of maintaining and preserving them than almost any other means that could be devised.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, do I understand the Senator's purpose to be to have 1,000 copies of this document printed for each Senator?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That is my proposition. I felt that I should like to be as generous to other Senators as I was to myself, and I can find readily a place for a thousand copies in my little Commonwealth. Knowing the Senator's domain, I think he could do the same.

Mr. STONE. Then the Senator desires 96,000 copies printed?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, all right. I want a thousand for myself.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New Jersey a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Has it been ascertained what will be the cost of the proposed printing?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Not strictly; but I can say it is a comparatively small document, and the plates are already in the hands of the Public Printer. It is the plates that involve the cost and not the little matter of printing.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, before the Senate takes action on this question, I want to call attention to what it will ultimately lead. This provides for the printing of a bulletin issued by the Agricultural Department. I desire to say to the Senate that there is scarcely a department of the Government that has not asked time and time again for the printing of special bulletins issued by those departments.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That is true.

Mr. SMOOT. And the House and the Senate Committees on Printing have absolutely refused to assent to such requests, for this reason: The Agricultural Department, in the annual appropriation bill, is provided with $475,000 for printing and binding. If we now undertake to print extra copies of bulletins for them, Heaven only knows where it will end.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I can not imagine, Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. Wait till I get through, if the Senator please.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Very well.

Mr. SMOOT. There is not a Senator who has not had requests for the separate printing as a public document of some bulletin issued by some one or the other of the departments, but such requests have been universally refused. I say to the Senator now that if this resolution he has offered shall be agreed to by the Senate, there will be no end of similar requests made by all of the departments, and instead of confining themselves to the amount that is provided for in the appropriation bills for the printing and binding to each particular department, they will come to Congress and ask that such bulletins be printed as public documents and distributed instead of being printed and distributed out of their own funds.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have no desire, Mr. President, to overstep the bounds of propriety or to make any unreasonable demand; but I felt that inasmuch as the prevention of the destruction of agricultural crops throughout the length and breadth of our land is of so much importance and the flitting about of a multiplicity of birds would relieve us from much of that destruction, that this would be a fitting and proper resolution; but instead of asking for the immediate adoption of the resolution I will ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course to that, Mr. President, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

POLICEMEN'S AND FIREMEN'S PENSION ROLLS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 31, submitted yesterday by Mr. BRISTOW, as follows:

Resolved, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, directed to furnish the Senate the names of all persons borne on the policemen's and firemen's pension rolls of the District, and to inform the Senate what employment such persons have, either in the service of the Government or in private life, and what compensation is received by each pensioner so employed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Kansas if his resolution provides that the amount of pension in each case shall be stated as well as the compensation received when the person is employed in civil life?

Mr. BRISTOW. That was my intention.

Mr. GALLINGER. That ought to be definitely included. My attention was diverted from the reading of the resolution for a moment, and I should like to have it again read. If that is not included in the resolution it ought to be.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will again read the resolution.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the words "and the amount of pension each person receives" be inserted. They can well be inserted at any point in the resolution.

Mr. BRISTOW. I will be glad to have those words inserted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 4, after the word "District," it is proposed to insert "and the amount of pension each person receives," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, directed to furnish the Senate the names of all persons borne on the policemen's and firemen's pension rolls of the District, and the amount of pension each person receives, and to inform the Senate what employment such persons have, either in the service of the Government or in private life, and what compensation is received by each pensioner so employed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT TO SATURDAY.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, after consulting with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Saturday next.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Saturday, April 12, 1913, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *April 10, 1913.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, draw us by Thy holy influence to Thee that we may be partakers of Thy spirit, denizens of the kingdom of heaven; that we may glorify the work Thou hast given us to do and pass on our way rejoicing, with music in our voice, a smile on our face, and the warmth of a generous heart in the clasp of our hand. Receiving, giving, giving and receiving, spending and being spent in a willing service to our fellow men, and Thine be the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. HOWELL, of Utah, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has in his possession, and will deliver to the Clerk, communications from the proper authorities in the State of New Hampshire stating that they have

ratified the sixteenth amendment, and also from the States of North Dakota, New Mexico, and Wisconsin, stating that they have ratified the seventeenth amendment. [Applause.]

The following are the communications referred to:

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE,
Concord, March 25, 1913.

The honorable the Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a joint resolution of the New Hampshire Legislature, ratifying the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

Very respectfully,

EDWARD N. PEARSON,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, Edward N. Pearson, secretary of state of the State of New Hampshire, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true copy of joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution ratifying the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America" (approved March 14, 1913), as engrossed in this office and in my custody as secretary of state.

In testimony whereof I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the seal of the State, at Concord, this —— day of ——, A. D. 19—.

[SEAL.]

EDWARD N. PEARSON,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, 1913.

Joint resolution ratifying the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in general court convened:

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-first Congress of the United States of America, at its first session, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution, namely, Article XVI:

"'The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census of enumeration.'"

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in general court convened, That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the General Court of the said State of New Hampshire; and further be it

Resolved, That certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded to the governor of this State, to the Secretary of State of the said United States, and to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the said United States.

WILLIAM J. BRITTON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
ENOS K. SAWYER,
President of the Senate.

Approved March 14, 1913.

SAMUEL D. FELKER, *Governor.*

EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Madison, Wis., March 25, 1913.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Herewith inclosed please find a copy of joint resolution No. 5, introduced as joint resolution No. 3 S., ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the popular election of United States Senators, recently passed by both branches of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, together with the attached certificate of the Hon. J. S. Donald, secretary of state. Like copies of this joint resolution are to-day forwarded by me to the Hon. William Jennings Bryan and the Hon. THOMAS R. MARSHALL, pursuant to the terms of the resolution itself.

Please acknowledge that it has been received.

Respectfully, yours,

FRANCIS E. MCGOVERN,
Governor of Wisconsin.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, J. S. Donald, secretary of state of the State of Wisconsin and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of joint resolution No. 5, introduced as joint resolution No. 3, S., has been compared by me with the original enrolled act on file in this department and that the same is a true copy thereof and of the whole of such original enrolled act.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State, at the capitol, in the city of Madison, this 20th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

J. S. DONALD,
Secretary of State.

Joint resolution ratifying an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to popular election of United States Senators.

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-second Congress of the United States of America, at its second session, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That in lieu of the first paragraph of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, and in lieu of so much of paragraph 2 of the same section as relates to the filling of vacancies, and in lieu of all of paragraph 1 of section 4 of said Article I, in so far as the same relates to any authority in Congress to make or alter regulations as to the times or manner of holding elections for Senators, the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States:

"'The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

"'The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

"'When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election, as the legislature may direct.

"'This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.'"

Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this joint resolution, certified by the secretary of state, be forwarded by the governor to the Secretary of State at Washington and to the presiding officers of each House of the National Congress.

H. C. MARTIN,
President of the Senate.
MERLIN HULL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
F. M. WYLIE,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Received February 27, 1913, 4.10 p. m.

J. S. DONALD,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE,
Santa Fe, March 17, 1913.

To the Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Pursuant to instructions, I have the honor to transmit herewith joint resolution No. 20, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico, "ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people," approved March 14, 1913.

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM C. MCDONALD,
Governor of New Mexico.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Antonio Lucero, secretary of state of the State of New Mexico, do hereby certify that there was filed for record in this office at 10.05 o'clock a. m. on the 15th day of March, A. D. 1913, senate joint resolution No. 20, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of United States providing for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people; and also that I have compared the following copy of the same with the original thereof now on file and declare it to be a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of New Mexico at the city of Santa Fe, the capital, on this 15th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

ANTONIO LUCERO,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint resolution 20, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people.

Whereas at the second session of the Sixty-second Congress of the United States of America a joint resolution was duly adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as follows, to wit:

"That in lieu of the first paragraph of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, and in lieu of so much of paragraph 2 of the same section as relates to the filling of vacancies, the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States:

"'The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years, and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

"'When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate the executive authority of the State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

"'This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.'"

Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and the same is hereby, ratified, and that certified copies of this resolution

be forwarded by the governor to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

E. A. MIERA,
President of the Senate pro tempore.
ISIDORO ARMIJO,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
ROMAN L. BACA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
FRANK STAPLIN,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Approved this 15th day of March, A. D. 1913.

WILLIAM C. MCDONALD,
Governor of the State of New Mexico.

—

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Bismarck, N. Dak., March 6, 1913.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In obedience to the provisions of the joint resolution ratifying, on the part of the State of North Dakota, the amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the direct election of United States Senators, I herewith inclose to you a certified copy of the joint resolution as passed by both branches of the thirteenth legislative assembly of this State.

[SEAL.] L. B. HANNA, *Governor.*

A joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Whereas the Sixty-second Congress of the United States of America, at the second session, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made and passed the following proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That in lieu of the first paragraph of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, and in lieu of so much of paragraph 2 of the same section as relates to the filling of vacancies, the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States:

"'The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof for six years, and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

"'When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided,* That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

"'This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.'"

Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, duly convened, That the said foregoing proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded by the governor of this State of the Secretary of State of the United States of America, at Washington, and to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the National Congress.

Approved March 7, 1913, 9.25 a. m.

L. B. HANNA,
Governor.
J. H. FRAINE,
Speaker of the House.
M. J. GEORGE,
Chief Clerk of the House.
A. T. KRAABEL,
President of the Senate.
W. D. AUSTIN,
Secretary of the Senate.

This certifies that the within bill originated in the House of the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota and is known on the records of that body as house bill No. 5.

M. J. GEORGE,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Filed in this office this 18th day of February, 1913.

THOMAS HALL,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
BISMARCK, N. DAK.

I, Thomas Hall, secretary of state of North Dakota and keeper of the great seal of said State, do hereby certify that the foregoing three pages, hereto attached, contain a true and correct copy of a joint resolution ratifying that amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the direct election of United States Senators, as passed by the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, which was approved by the governor on the 18th day of February, A. D. 1913, the original of which is now on file in my office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State at Bismarck, N. Dak., this 6th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] THOMAS HALL,
Secretary of State.

ELECTION OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the election of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Rules, the Committee on Accounts, the Committee on Enrolled Bills, and the Committee on Mileage, and I send the names of the various Members to the Clerk's desk. I wish to state, Mr. Speaker, that the Democratic names in this list were suggested as the choice of the Democratic caucus. The names of the Republicans on the list come as the suggestion of the Republican leader, and the Progressives on this list are at the suggestion of the leader of the Progressive Party.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report first the Ways and Means Committee, as proposed.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee on Ways and Means.—Oscar W. Underwood, Alabama (chairman); Francis Burton Harrison, New York; Dorsey W. Shackleford, Missouri; Claude Kitchin, North Carolina; Henry T. Rainey, Illinois; Lincoln Dixon, Indiana; Cordell Hull, Tennessee; Winfield S. Hammond, Minnesota; Andrew J. Peters, Massachusetts; A. Mitchell Palmer, Pennsylvania; Timothy T. Ansberry, Ohio; John N. Garner, Texas; James W. Collier, Mississippi; Augustus O. Stanley, Kentucky; Sereno E. Payne, New York; Joseph W. Fordney, Michigan; Augustus P. Gardner, Massachusetts; J. Hampton Moore, Pennsylvania; Sydney Anderson, Minnesota; William R. Green, Iowa; and Victor Murdock, Kansas.

The SPEAKER. Are there any other nominations? If not, they will be considered as agreed to.

There were no other nominations, and the nominees were elected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next list of committee appointments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee on Rules.—Robert L. Henry, Texas (chairman); Edward W. Pou, North Carolina; Thomas W. Hardwick, Georgia; Finis J. Garrett, Tennessee; Martin D. Foster, Illinois; James C. Cantrill, Kentucky; Michael F. Conry, New York; Philip P. Campbell, Kansas; Irvine L. Lenroot, Wisconsin; Edwin A. Merritt, jr., New York; and M. C. Kelly, Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Are there any other nominations? If not, these are agreed to.

There were no other nominations, and the nominees were elected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next list.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee on Accounts.—James T. Lloyd, Missouri (chairman); William R. Smith, Texas; James A. Hamill, New Jersey; Michael F. Conry, New York; William S. Howard, Georgia; George J. Kindel, Colorado; John W. Abercrombie, Alabama; James A. Hughes, West Virginia; William W. Griest, Pennsylvania; James S. Parker, New York; and Roy O. Woodruff, Michigan.

The SPEAKER. Are there any other nominations?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, are remarks in order?

The SPEAKER. Nominations are in order, and remarks also, the Chair suspects.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I assume that I have control of the floor.

The SPEAKER. Of course the gentleman has.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] how much time he desires?

Mr. COOPER. Just three or four minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time lest, by maintaining silence, I might seem to acquiesce in the present method of appointing the committees of the House. I refer especially to the method approved at the recent Republican caucus and to-day being put in practice.

Three years ago there was a revolution on this floor, partly in protest against the practice of permitting the Speaker of this House to select the committees. That revolution was successful. The Speaker now is deprived of that power.

But an attempt is being inaugurated through the action of the Republican caucus to restore it to him, for that caucus nominated a candidate for Speaker and gave to that candidate the sole power to name the Republican members of committees.

I did not attend that caucus. I would not attend it, if there were no other reason than is found in the fact that a Member of the House who attends a caucus is considered as pledging himself in advance to abide by its decision, whatever it may be. I will not enter a secret meeting under any such pledge.

This view of the nature of a caucus has often been expressed here. Men have been punished by Speakers, by removal from committees and otherwise, for no other reason than that they refused to abide by a caucus decree.

A conference differs from a caucus. Men may well attend a conference—a meeting to which Representatives are free to go, with every desire to do what is best for their party, but, after

it is over, free to vote in the House as they believe, under their oaths, will be best for the country.

But the Republican caucus bound the votes of those in attendance and gave to one man—and, of course, I have no personal contest with him—the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the exclusive right to name the personnel of the committees, so far as concerns the Republicans of the House.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin believe that that is right?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]?

Mr. COOPER. I yield. No; I do not believe that it is right.

Mr. MADDEN. Neither do I.

Mr. COOPER. It is not right, and no man can convince to the contrary any candid, intelligent person familiar with conditions here under the old plan.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. In just one moment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the gentleman in his criticism of that manner of selecting committees, but I want to ask the gentleman this: Does he know that the Progressives met in an open, nonsecret conference, and that the entire conference selected the men whom they chose to name?

Mr. COOPER. I knew that.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman approve of that?

Mr. COOPER. I do. That is a very proper way. [Applause.] It is not only a very proper way, but it is the only proper way.

Mr. Speaker, I will read from the Washington Herald of April 13, 1911, a very significant editorial utterance:

> The experiment of appointing the committees of the House through a committee rather than by the Speaker seems thus far to have been successful. It has certainly removed complaint concerning the autocratic power of the Speaker. Instances have been numerous enough in the past when Speakers deliberately framed committees so as to coincide with their own personal views, regardless of public sentiment. This personal equation has been removed.

Observe that the Herald, a paper published in this city and familiar with the facts, declares that in numerous instances in the past Speakers have deliberately framed committees to carry out their own views regardless of public sentiment.

I have known—and we might just as well tell the truth about it——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. COOPER. I would like about two minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I know that the statement in the Herald editorial is absolutely true. In my somewhat extended experience as a Representative in Congress I have known Speakers deliberately to pack committees to defeat legislation demanded by the country—yes, demanded by a majority of the Speaker's own party on this floor.

A great writer and an able impartial observer has described the power of the Speaker under the old rules. Mr. Bryce, the ambassador from the Court of St. James to this country, in his splendid work, in many respects unrivaled as an analysis and study of American politics, discusses the Speaker's power under the old rules. Mr. Bryce says that under the rules of the House of Representatives a power is given to the Speaker—

> which in the hands of a capable and ambitious man becomes so far-reaching that it is no exaggeration to call him the second, if not the first, political figure in the United States, with an influence on the affairs of men and the course of domestic events superior in ordinary times to the President.

And now I beg the earnest attention of the Members of the House to another and powerfully suggestive statement of Ambassador Bryce:

> The disposal of committee assignments is a tremendous piece of patronage, by which the Speaker can attract support to himself and to his own section of the party, reward his friends and give politicians opportunity of arising to distinction, or practically extinguishing their congressional careers.

This is saying only what intelligent Members of prior Congresses know—that through the power to make committee appointments a Speaker can reward Members who do his bidding and punish those who do not.

If the gentleman from Illinois should be elected Speaker, with the sole power of recognition which he will have, and with the power to appoint the committees, what becomes of the individual independence of legislators on this floor? It goes glimmering, just as it did before under the old rules.

Gentlemen say that they entered the caucus, but reserved to themselves the right of independence in voting upon legislative matters before the House. Yes, but that means nothing, for if the Speaker is to appoint all of the committees, how are these gentlemen going to vote upon legislative matters that the Speaker and his committees do not permit to come upon the floor?

That sort of explanation does not deceive anybody who knows of what took place here formerly. For, as is set forth in the Herald editorial, committees were deliberately packed by Speakers to carry out their wishes, regardless of public sentiment. This being true, what does your reservation of legislative independence in voting upon measures amount to?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] desire any time?

Mr. MANN. No.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] desire any time?

Mr. MURDOCK. No.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask for a vote.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for three minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege in the recent Republican caucus to offer the resolution conferring upon the minority leader of this House the right to represent the Republican Party in selecting the minority representation on the various committees of this House.

I have served only a limited period in this House, but during those four years I think I have had an opportunity of carefully studying the conduct of the Hon. JAMES R. MANN, of Illinois. I believe that the Republican Party can trust him in the selection of its representatives on the various committees of this House. [Applause.] He has never faltered in the faithful discharge of his duty. He has never failed to measure up to the high standard of his colleagues in representing them as their leader. It will be time enough to offer these criticisms when our leader deserves them, but up to this good time he deserves—he is entitled to—and will receive the united support of the Republican Party in this House of Representatives.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I have only three minutes.

Mr. COOPER. You can get more time.

Mr. AUSTIN. If the gentleman from Wisconsin had an unfortunate experience with a late Speaker of the House of Representatives, that water has gone under the bridge. Let us forget our differences in the past and stand here united to fight the Democracy with their free-trade tariff bill that they are seeking to put on the statute books. We have had strife enough; we have had dissensions enough; we have had divisions enough in the Republican Party, and in the name of that party let us sink our differences in the past and be united in this Congress. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield to the gentleman from Kansas five minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] makes the very grave mistake of placing this matter upon personal grounds. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] did not make a personal attack upon the Republican leader, Mr. MANN. He was very careful not to do so. He was attacking the system, and he should attack the system. It has now been over two years since the old system passed and the Democratic Party adopted the new system. The new system has bettered things in many respects, and in other respects it has not bettered things; but, taking the change, by and large, the system the Democratic Party has given us in the House is infinitely better than Cannonism. [Applause.] Back of Cannonism at its height, I submit to all of you, was the power lodged in the Speaker under a system which permitted one man to have almost complete control over the personnel of committees. The Democrats have broken away from the old

system. I think they have departed from it for all time to come. They have a committee—the Ways and Means Committee—and that committee is empowered, as I understand it, by the Democratic caucus to select the standing committees of the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; but to recommend them to the caucus.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Ways and Means Committee having made up such names takes the list to the Democratic caucus for its approval. Is that correct?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Progressives have taken an advanced step. We have a committee on committees which recommends the selection of Members, and brings those recommendations back, not to a secret caucus, but to an open conference, and I submit to all the Members of this Congress on all sides of the proposition that that is eminently fair, and as the gentleman from Wisconsin has said, is the only fair way.

I want to say more particularly to the Republican Members this: You have adhered to a system which means if you should ever return to power that you will return to Cannonism. [Applause.] You have placed in the hands of your leader, Mr. MANN, the right to select your committees. If in the future you should become triumphant as a party you will go back to a system which this House discarded, and, waiving, if it is possible on an occasion like this, any partisan feeling and putting it purely from the viewpoint of an American citizen, I hope that we will never return to the old system. The old system did not make for good legislation, it was not good politics, and it was not good government. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield some time to me?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois three minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come when the Members of the House should be selected for committee work on account of ability, experience, and fitness for the special work to which they are to be assigned.

Careful consideration should be given to the ability and experience of every man serving in the House by some committee qualified to canvass the situation, and after that canvass has been made, because of both experience and ability, as well as integrity, men should, without relation to their length of service or their allegiance to so-called leaders, be placed in positions of responsibility where they will be able to do the most good for the people of the country. [Applause.] This fossilized habit of selecting men regardless of their qualifications or ability or experience, and regardless of whether they will work or not, but only because of their length of service and fealty to leaders, ought to be done away with. The people of the country are looking forward to the time when the House will be organized along the lines of the suggestions that I have just made; and for one, until such time arrives. I favor the selection of men for the various places on the committees by a committee of the various parties represented in the House, instead of by any one man as the representative of a party in the House. I do more. I think that every committee in the House ought to sit in open session [applause], and that all its acts should be subject to the scrutiny of the public and of the press. I believe that a record ought to be kept of what takes place in the various committees, and I am in favor of caucuses being held with open doors [applause], so that the people may understand. We ought to peopleize the Congress of the United States. If the people of the United States have confidence enough in a man to elect him to Congress, that man ought to justify that confidence by doing his work in the open where the people can see and understand it. In my judgment, one of the things that defeated Mr. Taft for the Presidency was that instead of having confidence in the Republicans, who elected him President of the United States, he could only find men for high places among the Democrats. [Laughter.] I told him more than once that if the Republican Party had confidence enough in him to elect him President, he ought to have confidence enough in the Republicans to name his men from the Republican ranks. I am a Republican, and I have no apology to make for my Republicanism. I am going to stand as a Republican, no matter how many isms there are in the country, and I am going to fight the Democrats every inch of the way. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] has criticized the manner of the nomination of the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means. I do not understand that the gentleman from Wisconsin intended any reflection whatever on the ability or fairness of the Republican floor leader in that connection. Lest some who are not fully acquainted with the gentlemen who were selected may be of the opinion, from what has been said, that there has been a mistake made in those selections, let me call the attention of the House to the fact that whatever the opinion of Members may be as to the manner of the nominations, the selections are such as should, in my opinion, receive the unqualified support of the entire House. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has suggested that Members should be selected not altogether by reason of seniority, but because of their ability and their fitness for the service to be performed. Two of the four new nominations of Republicans for the Committee on Ways and Means are men serving the beginning of their second term in the House. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] has not served a full term in the House. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] has served one full term. The other two gentlemen have served longer in the House, with distinction and with credit. Whatever we may think of the manner of the nominations, the selections themselves are most excellent; and whatever we may think of the manner in which selections should be made in the future, let us remember that at this time there is no official organization of Republican Members in the House to whom the duty of selecting Republican Members for that committee could be delegated. We have no committee on committees, and the only way in which the Members could have been selected for the Ways and Means Committee, other than the way in which they were selected, was by a caucus of the Republican Members. My good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] has suggested that he could not attend such a gathering, so that we would have been unfortunate had we selected them in that way in not having his valued presence. It seems to me, therefore, that under the circumstances, having selected six good men, true and faithful to the Republican doctrine of protection, it is hardly the time or the place to criticize the manner of their selection. I am thankful as a Republican that we have on this great committee four new men who may be depended upon to act in harmony with the worthy and splendidly qualified men who have heretofore served on the committee. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] knows more about the tariff than any man under the flag, and we have also the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], stalwart and true. Mr. Speaker, our party is to be congratulated that we have on the Republican side of the Committee on Ways and Means men who can be depended upon to stand as a wall of adamant against the advancing tide of Democratic free trade. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Alabama to yield me three minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Iowa three minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I apprehend that before the adjournment of the Sixty-third Congress gentlemen on that side of the House will have ample opportunity to apologize for their plan of appointing the standing committees of the House. Vicious as is the plan of allowing the Speaker of the House to appoint committees, the plan of allowing the Committee on Ways and Means to appoint these committees is still more vicious. Look at the situation as it presents itself to-day. The committees of this House are not appointed and they will not be until the tariff bill has been passed. The Committee on Ways and Means, or the majority members thereof, will not permit the appointment of committees until the Members on that side of the House have bowed down to their masters, the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, and voted for their tariff bill. The Democratic Party is now considering, not in an open caucus but in a secret caucus, under the five-minute rule—the second house, if you please—the Democratic tariff bill. The Democratic Members of the House know all too well that if they would secure the committee appointments which they seek they must vote for the tariff bill introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. They must vote for the program laid down by the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means. Now, Members must, by their votes for the Underwood bill, buy their committee assignments. I am sure that if the people of this country have resented the old plan of the Speaker appointing committees they will resent still more the present plan of our Democratic majority of permitting the Committee on Ways and Means to appoint the committees of this House.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to ask the indulgence of the House, but will the gentleman from Alabama kindly yield me four minutes more?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to close up the debate as we have a caucus this evening, but I will yield the gentleman four minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish gentlemen to get clearly in mind, especially the new Members of the House, what is well understood here by Members of prior Congresses, and that is

the distinction between a caucus and a conference. When the Vreeland currency bill was pending in the House five years ago the Republican Members of the House had a conference. That meeting was called as a conference, and at the meeting, before the transaction of any business, Mr. George Prince, then a Member from Illinois, rose and introduced the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted. I copied this from the report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of a speech made by Mr. Prince in the House, in which he read this resolution. I also attended that conference, and know that what Mr. Prince said was true. This is the resolution that was introduced and adopted:

Resolved, That this meeting, or any adjournment thereof, is only a conference and not a caucus, and shall not have the binding effect of a caucus, and that those who participate in its deliberations shall be absolutely free hereafter to act in accordance with their own judgment with reference to all matters considered before it.

This resolution declared that the meeting was a conference, and not a caucus, and should not have the "binding effect of a caucus." The resolution thus plainly recognized the well-understood difference between a conference and a caucus.

Every gentleman who attended the recent Republican caucus or any other caucus did it knowing that thereby he pledged himself in advance to abide the decision of that secret meeting.

Mr. Speaker, such an autocratic power as that described by the Herald and by Ambassador Bryce I had hoped was forever driven from the Congress of the United States, and I am amazed that, after the great struggle of three years ago, the Republicans of this House would now call a caucus upon the question of the adoption of the rules and of selecting a candidate for Speaker, and in that caucus give the candidate the power to appoint committees, and that then, after that power has been given to the man who will be the next Speaker, if we are successful at the next election, they should send out cards, one of which I received yesterday, calling for a conference on the tariff bill.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE]?

Mr. COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if he attended——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] has expired.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] yield to me one minute?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield one minute to the gentleman.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I happened to be one of the committee of three that called the Republican caucus to which the gentleman from Wisconsin has referred, and in view of his criticism of the matter I want to say that the caucus was called by direction of the Republicans of the Sixty-second Congress pursuant to a resolution that was adopted on the 28th of February. The chairman and secretary of the Republican caucus in the Sixty-second Congress were to retire, and did retire, on March 4, and therefore it was necessary to delegate a committee to call a caucus of the Republican Members of this Congress, and if the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] was not present when that caucus was held it was his fault. The committee that called the caucus in this Congress simply carried out the instructions received as I have stated, and there was no suggestion that the caucus be called a conference, but, on the other hand, the resolution was explicit that we were to call a caucus immediately preceding the convening of the Sixty-third Congress.

Mr. MANN rose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise for the purpose of explaining or apologizing. I have no apology to make for the recommendations I have made. It is true that the material on the Republican side is so plentiful that it sometimes becomes a work quite difficult to perform—to select men out of the wealth of that material. These gentlemen who do it in open caucus have to find somebody qualified to fill the places.

Mr. Speaker, after all, it is not so much the method of appointing committees as it is the final results of legislation. The Republicans of this House are quite well qualified to speak for themselves and for their principles. They are not required to send their leader to some one man in the country and receive his instructions as to legislation. [Applause on the Republican side.] They do not call upon the President or anybody else, in order to make up a tariff bill or other bills for them, as our Democratic friends do. [Applause on the Republican side.] Whoever will be selected for Republican places on the committees will be qualified to fill the places and to perform their functions without first asking either President Wilson or ex-President Roosevelt. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question——

Mr. LENROOT rose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, this discussion this morning has gone to the question of the system of appointing committees, and, as has been stated, I think, by every speaker, there is nothing personal in it. I only rise for the purpose of correcting, I think, one misapprehension that has been indulged in in the debate by some as to exactly what the situation is. It has been assumed by my colleague and friend from my own State, Mr. COOPER, that what has been done upon the minority side is synonymous with what is called "Cannonism," against which both he and I and many others have fought as long as we have been Members of this House. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to call his attention and the attention of the other Members of this House to the fact that there is this very wide distinction: That what has been done by the Republican minority amounts only to a nomination, and the House now is required to vote on these committees and elect them, which never was true under what was known as "Cannonism." And the old Members will bear me out that if the Members of this House four years ago had been permitted to vote on the committees appointed by the Speaker——

Mr. COOPER. Does not the gentleman know that the caucus has bound every Member on this side?

Mr. LENROOT. The caucus bound them four years ago, but they never could have been elected in this House, notwithstanding the action of the caucus at that time. I want to say that I am heartily in favor of the views of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], and I think the caucus should always ratify these selections; but in the duty imposed upon the minority leader, his power to recommend these nominations is not by virtue of his being a candidate for Speaker, but by virtue of his being made the floor leader of the minority. And neither the Republican Party nor any other party, when they elect a Speaker of this House, will ever again return to what has been known as "Cannonism," giving the Speaker the sole power of appointing committees of this House. I think it only fair to make the statement in order that this record that has been made this morning may be accurate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on electing these Members nominated for election to the Committee on Accounts.

The question was taken, and the nominees were elected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee on Enrolled Bills.—William A. Ashbrook, Ohio (chairman); Robert G. Bremner, New Jersey; L. Lazaro, Louisiana; S. Kirkpatrick, Iowa; Simeon D. Fess, Ohio; and Charles M. Thomson, Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Are there any other nominations? If not, these are elected.

There were no other nominations, and the nominees were elected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee on Mileage.—Warren Worth Bailey, Pennsylvania (chairman); James P. Maher, New York; Hatton W. Sumners, Texas; Charles A. Kennedy, Iowa; and Jacob Johnson, Utah.

The SPEAKER. Are there any other nominations? If not, without objection, these men are declared elected.

There were no other nominations, and the nominees were elected.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

TRAFFIC REGULATIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up any time, but I want to ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an editorial from the Evening Star, of this city, under date of yesterday, and to give notice that at the proper time I shall introduce a resolution to investigate the charges of the failure to enforce the laws of the District of Columbia, as stated in that editorial. I hope everybody will read it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] asks unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Evening Star of yesterday, which he sends to the Clerk's desk. Is there objection?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wish to inquire what is the subject matter of this editorial?

Mr. SIMS. I ask that it be read. It will take only a minute. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the editorial be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the editorial be read. Is there objection?

Mr. CAMPBELL. There is no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas does not know whether there is or not. [Laughter.] Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE TRAFFIC RULE BREAKERS.

The Star has been noting with some interest lately the manner in which the new traffic regulations are being enforced, especially in regard to the disposition of cases by the police and the courts, and it finds a striking lack of uniformity in the treatment of offenses suggestive of the need of a better understanding on the part of the traffic policemen and officers at station houses as to their duties and responsibilities. In yesterday's Star was given a list of the traffic cases during the past 24 hours, 45 in number, the charges ranging from driving a wagon to the curb on the wrong side to the collision of an auto with a pedestrian. The lowest penalty was $1 and the highest $10. The total amount of fines and collaterals was $181. Had all these cases been taken to court and all received the maximum fines prescribed by the law the aggregate of penalties would have been $1,800. In other words, the penalties imposed were about one-tenth of the maximum fines prescribed by the rules.

It may well be asked why these 45 offenders were allowed to escape so easily from the consequences of their violation of the rules. The answer is simple. It was because in 40 of the 45 cases the defendants forfeited collaterals deposited at the police stations. No attempt was made to bring them to court, the collateral being regarded as in the nature of a fine. Of the 40 collaterals 6 were for $1 each and 16 for $2. The average of the collaterals taken was $3.82½. In four cases a collateral of $10 was required, all of these being for speeding automobiles. Probably in most of these cases the court would have been justified in imposing the maximum penalty and the defendants were glad to be released on a smaller amount than they feared they would have to pay if they reported for trial.

The truth is these collaterals, taken in the 40 of 45 cases, are to be rated as no more than license fees for illegal driving and mooring and cycling. It is to be remembered that only a small percentage of traffic-rule violators are arrested. Those who regard the regulations as negligible under the present system of penalties are willing to take their chances. If every one caught were taken to court and fined to the limit there would be a much more wholesome respect for the law than there is at present. It is easy to overtake a collateral forfeiter with a court attachment. His license number is registered and, short of departure from the District, he can be brought to the bar in short order. With this advantage it is absurd to keep the law standing in its present terms and make no more practical attempt to enforce it.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, the Star is not given to making sensational statements, and the facts stated in an editorial in that paper is sufficient authority to warrant this House in making a thorough investigation of the absolute failure to execute the laws of Congress intended to save life and limb in this city. A deposit of one or two dollars to secure the appearance of an offender is so small as to suggest that his personal appearance is not wanted.

A number of years ago I introduced a bill and secured its passage by the House, which became a law limiting the speed of automobiles and all other vehicles in the District of Columbia and providing that parties violating that law for the first offense should be fined, for the second offense fined and imprisoned, at the discretion of the court, and for the third offense it was made mandatory to impose both fine and imprisonment.

Mr. Speaker, so far as I am advised, very few persons have been imprisoned under that law, and if no better attempt is made than is indicated by the editorial just read to enforce the speed laws, they had as well be repealed.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that few persons, in proportion to the number who are guilty of violating the speed laws and traffic regulations, are ever arrested, because it is a practical impossibility to have enough policemen engaged in looking after automobile speeders to arrest all who are guilty. But this fact does not authorize such a mere pretense of enforcing the law as is shown by the Star editorial. It is useless for Congress to pass good laws if those charged with their execution make a mere farce of them.

Mr. Speaker, Congress can pass laws that will end this sort of thing. We can make the machine liable for the fine and costs incident to violations of the law and authorize the seizure and sale of same, and that no automobile shall be operated in the District of Columbia with a speed capacity exceeding 15 miles per hour. With the broad streets and avenues in this city, with the absence of the numerous dray wagons that infest large jobbing and manufacturing cities, there is no excuse for the great number of accidents due to automobile speeding in the city of Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the printing of this editorial in the RECORD? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I make the motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARDNER. Was the rule making that a privileged motion adopted permanently, or only for the last Congress?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman is mistaken. The rule that was adopted in the last Congress was in reference to a recess. It is always in order to make a motion to adjourn to a definite time.

Mr. GARDNER. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that the motion that when the House adjourns it adjourn to meet on a day certain is not a privileged motion. I have no objection, of course, to that action, but I want to have the matter settled. It is one of the motions that used to be employed to filibuster with.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman wants to have the House come here to-morrow and adjourn, I have no objection.

Mr. MANN. Why does not the gentleman from Alabama ask unanimous consent?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, if the gentleman from Massachusetts wants to insist on the rule——

Mr. GARDNER. I have no desire to do that; but the gentleman from Alabama objected to it when the Chair translated his motion into a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Alabama will permit a suggestion, I am inclined to think myself that, there being nothing else in order before the House, the motion would be in order.

Mr. GARDNER. I will withdraw my point of order.

Mr. MANN. But without calling upon the Chair to rule upon that—because it may become important if that motion should be used at any time for filibustering purposes—I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that he ask unanimous consent.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] withdraws his point of order. The question is upon agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock p. m.) the House, pursuant to the order agreed to, adjourned until Monday, April 14, 1913, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War in reference to the appropriations for continuing work on the armament of fortifications in the Panama Canal Zone (S. Doc. No. 2); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of East Rockaway Inlet, Long Island, N. Y. (H. Doc. No. 4); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Huron Harbor, Ohio, with plan and estimate of cost of improvement (H. Doc. No. 5); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of the Mississippi River at Dresbach and Dakota, Minn. (H. Doc. No. 6); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of channel in Curtis Bay and in Patapsco River, Baltimore Harbor, Md., with plan and estimate of cost of improvement

(H. Doc. No. 7); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Rapid River Harbor, Mich., with a view to the removal of a bar at the entrance (H. Doc. No. 8); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

7. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of the mouth of Brazos River to Velasco, Tex. (H. Doc. No. 9); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of preliminary examination of inland waterway from Pensacola Bay, through Bay of La Launch, to the western shore of Wolfs Bay, Fla. and Ala. (H. Doc. No. 10); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Salina River, Ill. (H. Doc. No. 11); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

10. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of preliminary examination of Little Kanawha River, W. Va., from Creston to the head of practicable navigation (H. Doc. No. 12); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: A bill (H. R. 2115) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Elko, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2116) providing for the establishment of a Weather Bureau station at Ely, Nev.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2117) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Ely, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2118) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Las Vegas, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2119) to purchase lands and establish homes for the Washoe Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 2120) to establish a fish-cultural station on the Indian River, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2121) to prohibit the receipt of money by internal-revenue officials of the United States in payment of special taxes by dealers in intoxicating liquors, except in certain cases, and to provide punishments therefor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2122) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station on New River, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2123) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station on the St. Lucie River, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2124) to provide for a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station on the Miami River, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2125) providing that no order or rule of any department of the Government of the United States shall have the force and effect of a law of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2126) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station on the St. Johns River, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2127) to prevent heads of departments of the United States Government and all other Federal officials issuing any order or promulgating any rule which tends in any way to prohibit Government employees petitioning the Congress with relation to any matter relating to the public service, and prescribing penalties for its violation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2128) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station on Lake Okeechobee, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2129) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station on Lake Tohopekaliga, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 2130) to place on the retired list of the Army the names of the surviving officers who were mustered out under the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 15, 1870; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2131) granting pensions to volunteer army nurses of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 2132) to provide for the inspection of any parcel sent by mail which contains fruits, plants, trees, shrubs, nursery stock, grafts, scions, peach pits, cotton seed, or vegetables at point of delivery in any post office of the United States in any State that requests such inspection and where the requisite inspectors are provided by the States to perform such service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2133) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and residence of aliens in the United States, and to adopt the principle of probation in regard to aliens' right to remain in the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 2134) to provide for an addition to the post-office building at Haverhill, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2135) to provide badges and ribbons for officers and men now or formerly of the Volunteer and Regular Army who participated in engagements or campaigns deemed worthy of such commemoration; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: A bill (H. R. 2136) for the purchase of a site and to begin the construction thereon of a customhouse in the city of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2137) to provide for the survey of the Schuylkill River, Pa.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2138) to provide for the construction of a lighthouse and fog-signal station in the vicinity of Goose Island Flats, Delaware River, N. J.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 2139) to provide for the issuing of circulating notes of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOORE: A bill (H. R. 2140) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to recover the hull, guns, and other equipment of the U. S. frigate *Philadelphia*, now lying in the harbor of Tripoli, and making appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2141) to equip the U. S. S. *Adams* with electrical and wireless apparatus; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2142) legalizing cumulative voting for directors, managers, or trustees of corporations or associations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 2143) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1912; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2144) to amend section 863 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2145) to provide for the construction of a railroad in Alaska, to regulate transportation, and to furnish transportation and fuel for the Army and Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 2146) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1898; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2147) to provide for the purchase of ground and the erection of a public building thereon for an immigration station in the city of Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2148) to provide a site and erect a public building at Blaine, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2149) to provide a site and erect a public building at Anacortes, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2150) to increase the appropriation for a public building at Everett, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2151) to increase the appropriation for a public building at Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2152) to provide a site and erect a public building at Snohomish, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2153) to provide a site and erect a public building at Mount Vernon, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 2154) providing for the erection of a monument to Col. William Jennings at Fort Jennings, Ohio; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2155) providing for the erection of a monument to Gen. Anthony Wayne at Defiance, Ohio; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 2156) to authorize the payment of certain claims for damages sustained by prairie fire on the Rosebud Indian Reservation in South Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2157) regulating the payment of money to Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2158) for the erection of a public building at Milbank, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2159) to provide for the forfeiture of rights of way granted to railway companies across Indian lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PROUTY: A bill (H. R. 2160) creating an emergency currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 2161) for the improvement of the Harlem River, N. Y., with a view of straightening the channel at the curve near the Johnson Iron Works, authorized by the river and harbor act of March 3, 1909; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 2162) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the grades of commissioned chiefs and warrant officers of the Navy of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DILLON: A bill (H. R. 2163) to provide for the erection of a public building at Vermilion, in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2164) to provide for the acquiring of a site and the erection of a public building at Canton, in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 2165) to provide a site and erect a public building at Bremerton, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 2166) to regulate the sale of stocks, bonds, and other securities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 2167) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 2168) to create a tariff board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 2169) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Keyser, in the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 2170) providing for the establishment of a naval base on Narragansett Bay, in the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 2171) for the establishment of a currency board in connection with the Treasury Department of the United States and for the incorporation of associations of reserve and discount throughout the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 2172) to provide for the permanent establishment of town and village mail-delivery service at post offices of the second and third classes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 2173) to amend the act of April 19, 1908, relating to pensioning widows of soldiers, etc., of the Civil War and granting pensions to certain widows of enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the late Civil War, etc.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 2174) to provide for a permanent exhibit of the resources of the States of the Union in or near Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2175) amending section 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2176) to make October 12 of each and every year a public holiday in the District of Columbia, to be known as "Columbus Day"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2177) for the erection of a public building in the city of Carlinville, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2178) to authorize the Supreme Court of the United States to make rules of practice for courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2179) amending section 2 of an act entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2180) for the erection of a public building at Hillsboro, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2181) granting pensions to teamsters of the War of the Rebellion and Indian wars from 1861 to 1865, inclusive; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: A bill (H. R. 2182) to provide for an appropriation to exterminate pests destructive of the potato; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. L'ENGLE: Resolution (H. Res. 28) on precedence; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 29) changing Rules X and XI; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 30) changing clause 2 of Rule XIII; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 31) changing Rule XXXV; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HENRY: Resolution (H. Res. 32) creating a committee on post roads and amending Rules X and XI; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 33) creating a committee on public health and national quarantine and amending Rules X and XI; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GARDNER: Resolution (H. Res. 34) amending the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 35) authorizing the Speaker to appoint three counselors; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 36) amending the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOORE: Resolution (H. Res. 37) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to fully inform the House of Representatives of the financial interest of the United States in the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. MANN: Resolution (H. Res. 38) authorizing the Clerk of the House to pay to Anna M. Coultry, widow of P. L. Coultry, six months' salary and funeral expenses of said P. L. Coultry, late an employee of the House.

By Mr. FOSTER: Resolution (H. Res. 39) amending Rules X and XI; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 46) directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate and report on the use of the Jennings combination railroad tie upon railroads engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 47) granting relief to flood sufferers in Ohio; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 48) granting permission to the Woman's Titanic Memorial Association to erect a memorial structure in Potomac Park in the city of Washington; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MOORE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 49) authorizing and directing the Secretary of State to arrange an international conference to fix the maximum depth of rivers, harbors, and the approaches thereto; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 50) relating to printing speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, urging the enactment of certain homestead and forest-reserve laws for the arid regions; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SCULLY: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, urging the enactment of certain homestead and

forest-reserve laws for the arid regions; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DILLON: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, protesting against alleged abuses by the General Land Office coincident to the system of employing special agents in homestead cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial from the State of Wisconsin, relating to polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Memorial urging a law to permit the postal savings banks to loan funds to school districts; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GERRY: Memorial from the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, approving the erection of a dry dock for the construction and repair of vessels of the United States Navy in the waters of Narragansett Bay; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Washington, relating to back taxes to be taxed by the State of Washington on property of railroads unsurveyed by the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Washington, urging the establishment of two boathouses on the Pacific coast near Klipson Beach Life-Saving Station; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Washington, relating to the matter of railroad construction and development in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to the opening of free navigation on the Celilo Canal and Columbia and Snake Rivers during the year 1915; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Washington, urging the construction of a dry dock at the Puget Sound Navy Yard, Bremerton, Wash.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Washington, protesting against the establishment of the proposed new channel between Sand Island and Fort Canby, Wash.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Washington, relating to the construction of a waterway to connect Fidalgo Bay with Similk Bay in Skagit County, Wash.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 2183) granting a pension to Godfrey J. Andrist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2184) granting a pension to Elmo M. Kellar; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2185) granting a pension to Louisa M. Salim; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2186) granting a pension to Lucie Bostian; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 2187) granting a pension to Clara Sill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2188) granting a pension to Clara Fisher; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2189) granting an increase of pension to George W. Durkee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2190) granting an increase of pension to James K. Andrews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTON: A bill (H. R. 2191) granting an increase of pension to W. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 2192) granting a pension to Charles Devalut; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2193) granting a pension to Nora E. Singleton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2194) granting a pension to Edward Waldo; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2195) granting a pension to William L. Dines; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2196) granting a pension to John H. Shaw; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2197) granting an increase of pension to Ralph E. Truman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2198) granting an increase of pension to Oscar B. Zartman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2199) to remove the disabilities of William A. Pyle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 2200) for the relief of John Hood; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2201) for the relief of Willis B. Cress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2202) for the relief of Jacob Kesner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2203) for the relief of John Lyons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2204) for the relief of Lieut. Benjamin S. McDonald; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2205) for the relief of William D. Garner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2206) for the relief of John Edwards, alias John D. Edwards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2207) for the relief of Louis F. Upwright; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2208) for the relief of the county court of Berkley County, W. Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2209) for the relief of the estate of Jacob Custer, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2210) for the relief of the estate of John Burns, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2211) for the relief of A. J. Collett, administrator of the estate of Thomas Collett, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2212) for the relief of L. D. Corrick, administrator of the estate of William Corrick, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2213) for the relief of the employees of and the contractors who furnished castings to the United States armory at Harpers Ferry, Va., from January 1, 1861, to April 19, 1861, inclusive; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2214) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Mary E. Buckey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2215) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James W. Myers, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2216) for the relief of Margaret A. Timberlake; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2217) for the relief of Santford Brace; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2218) for the relief of Edward Tearney; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2219) for the relief of the heirs of Edmon Hill; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2220) for the relief of William D. Graham; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2221) for the relief of Hiram Smith and John R. W. Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2222) for the relief of Charles Price; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2223) for the relief of Andrew J. Weese; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2224) for the relief of George N. Campbell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2225) for the relief of Gideon C. Corley; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2226) for the relief of Thomas J. Lloyd; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2227) for the relief of John H. Chapman; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2228) for the relief of Hiram Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2229) for the relief of John Whittington; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2230) for the relief of Dennis A. Litzinger; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2231) for the relief of F. J. James; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2232) for the relief of Joseph R. Brown; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2233) for the relief of Frances Arbogast, widow of Allen Arbogast; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2234) for the relief of the heirs of James L. Pyne, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2235) for the relief of the heirs of Evaline Davis; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2236) for the relief of the heirs of Lydia A. Hockensmith, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2237) for the relief of the heirs of Henry Sturm, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2238) for the relief of the heirs of Henry Harris, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2239) for the relief of the board of education of the Harpers Ferry school district, of Jefferson County, W. Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2240) for the relief of the heirs of Jesse Phares, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2241) to correct the military record of and grant to Benjamin Myers Nuzum an honorable discharge; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2242) for the relief of the heirs of Elias W. Phares, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2243) for the relief of the heirs of Archeles Stanley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2244) for the relief of the heirs of Alexander Stalnaker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2245) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin Ryan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2246) for the relief of the heirs of John S. Chenoweth; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2247) for the relief of the heirs of Isaac Clifford; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2248) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas G. Flagg, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2249) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin Grayson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2250) for the relief of the heirs of William Ewing, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2251) for the relief of the heirs of James L. Geaslen, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2252) for the relief of the heirs of William A. Griffin, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2253) for the relief of the heirs of Charles A. Dinkle, heir of John F. Dinkle and J. Daniel Dinkle; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2254) for the relief of the heirs of Bryson Hamilton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2255) for the relief of the heirs of John M. Corley; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2256) granting a pension to Mary C. Wyckoff; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2257) granting a pension to Charles H. Payne, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2258) granting a pension to George A. Loughery; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2259) granting a pension to Lydia A. Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2260) granting a pension to J. S. Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2261) granting a pension to George Simpson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2262) granting a pension to Joseph K. Jefferys; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2263) granting a pension to Mary E. Paugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2264) granting a pension to M. M. Sayers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2265) granting a pension to Mary C. Tattersall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2266) granting a pension to John Todd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2267) granting a pension to George Sorrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2268) granting a pension to Hiram Metcalf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2269) granting a pension to George Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2270) granting a pension to Frances Haring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2271) granting a pension to Lucy A. Layman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2272) granting a pension to Sabina O. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2273) granting a pension to A. H. Dolly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2274) granting a pension to Stocton Sponseller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2275) granting a pension to Christian Wilhelm; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2276) granting a pension to Lucinda Phares; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2277) granting a pension to James L. McClanahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2278) granting a pension to John B. Page; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2279) granting a pension to Hiram Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2280) granting a pension to Virginia Hendrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2281) granting a pension to Charles H. Keefer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2282) granting a pension to Mary C. Kines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2283) granting a pension to John A. McCauley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2284) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Penrod; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2285) granting a pension to Ellen Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2286) granting an increase of pension to Pryor Guseman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2287) granting an increase of pension to John L. MaGill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2288) granting an increase of pension to J. E. Murdock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2289) granting an increase of pension to John B. Sandy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2290) granting an increase of pension to James H. Michael; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2291) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Landers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2292) granting an increase of pension to William F. Knisell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2293) granting an increase of pension to James Forsyth Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2294) granting an increase of pension to Helen B. Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2295) granting an increase of pension to John F. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2296) granting an increase of pension to William T. McBee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2297) granting an increase of pension to George A. Porterfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2298) granting an increase of pension to James Stonebraker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2299) granting an increase of pension to Eleam Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2300) granting an increase of pension to John O. Shears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2301) granting an increase of pension to C. C. Stemple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2302) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2303) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2304) granting an increase of pension to Solomon S. Simpkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2305) granting an increase of pension to David H. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2306) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Guseman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2307) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Locke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2308) granting an increase of pension to Marshall Canfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2309) granting an increase of pension to John McWilliams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2310) to correct the military record of Urias Bolyard, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2311) to correct the military record of and grant to J. W. Mankins an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 2312) for the relief of Rathbun, Beachy & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2313) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to approve allotments to Joseph Ellis, jr., and Lydia Irene Simmons; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2314) for the relief of Allen Edward O'Toole and others who sustained damage by reason of accident at Rock Island Arsenal; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 2315) for the relief of Lieut. Commander Jerome E. Morse, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 2316) for the relief of William S. Shacklette; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2317) for the relief of the estate of Antonia Sousa, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2318) for the relief of Bella Crounse and other heirs of the estate of James Bell, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2319) to transfer Capt. Armistead Rust from the retired to the active list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 2320) granting a pension to Catherine C. Weeks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2321) for the relief of Patrick Powers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2322) for the relief of Leonard Seis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 2323) to incorporate the East Washington Suburban Railway Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2324) for the relief of Thomas W. Moore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 2325) granting a pension to Roy Vest Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 2326) granting a pension to Thomas B. Kneedler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2327) granting a pension to Edward Coffee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 2328) for the relief of heirs of Wiley Jackson Kiser, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 2329) granting a pension to Mary R. Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2330) granting a pension to Francis I. Helm, alias Francis Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2331) granting a pension to Celestia Betts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2332) granting a pension to Ann E. Cummings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2333) granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Barrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2334) granting an increase of pension to Helen E. Stowal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2335) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Rynders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2336) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Butts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 2337) granting a pension to Mary E. Rush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2338) granting a pension to Barney Gordon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2339) granting a pension to Deborah R. Isherwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2340) granting a pension to Laura Boysen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2341) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Irons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2342) granting an increase of pension to Abel Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 2343) granting a pension to Ruth E. Hering; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2344) granting a pension claim to Joseph Hunter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2345) granting a pension to John Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2346) granting a pension to Elizabeth Tripp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2347) granting a pension to Cora Edith Tanner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2348) granting a pension to Antony Folee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2349) granting a pension to Samantha L. Draper; to the Committee an Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2350) granting an increase of pension to Achilles Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2351) granting an increase of pension to David Turpin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2352) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Mullen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2353) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Van Deusen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2354) granting an increase of pension to George Howarth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2355) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Schell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2356) granting an increase of pension to John W. Cummings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2357) granting an increase of pension to James F. Pocklington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2358) granting an increase of pension to Susan H. Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2359) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Lyerly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2360) granting an increase of pension to Mary W. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2361) granting an increase of pension to Herman Bohlmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2362) for the relief of John Pilcher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2363) to remove charge of desertion standing on the rolls against W. H. Mounce; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2364) removing the charge of desertion against William H. H. Edwards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2365) to remove the charge of desertion now standing on the records against John F. Harbaugh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2366) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Kreiser and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2367) for compensation for the nursing and treatment of sick soldiers of the United States by St. Johns Hospital at Springfield, Ill.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2368) authorizing the Secretary of War to place the name of Joseph F. Ritcherdson on the rolls of Company C, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and issue him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 2369) for the relief of Shelby County, Ky.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2370) for the relief of the estate of John Wesley Eubanks; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 2371) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph H. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2372) granting a pension to Albert G. Jenkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2373) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Adcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2374) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2375) granting an increase of pension to William F. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2376) granting an increase of pension to Byron C. Knapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2377) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John H. Hubbard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 2378) granting a pension to Sena Shoppart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2379) granting an increase of pension to Lester W. Bacon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2380) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Burch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 2381) providing for the homestead entry of certain lands in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2382) granting a pension to John Yoder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2383) granting a pension to Lou Pedigree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2384) granting an increase of pension to Henry Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2385) granting an increase of pension to Jacob B. Sheid; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2386) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2387) granting an increase of pension to Edwin C. Manning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2388) to correct the military record of C. W. Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2389) for relief of Philip Cook; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2390) to reopen and extend certain letters patent granted to Richard B. Painton; to insert certain claims in said letters patent dated May 9, 1899; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 2391) granting a pension to Carrie Lourenia Briney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2392) granting a pension to Sarah E. Couch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2393) granting an increase of pension to John R. Stumpf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2394) granting an increase of pension to John A. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2395) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Bish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2396) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Stiles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2397) granting an increase of pension to Martha Ann Louther; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2398) granting a pension to Jacob Freudenberger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2399) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Mekailek; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2400) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Sellers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2401) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2402) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Carroll, alias Peter Carl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 2403) granting an increase of pension to Maria Klock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2404) granting an increase of pension to Richard Cullen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2405) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo I. Gage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2406) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Kundinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE: A bill (H. R. 2407) for the relief of the Pennsylvania Engineering Co., of the city of Philadelphia; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2408) for the relief of the widow of William F. McNamara; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2409) for the relief of the American Fire Insurance Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., and others; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2410) granting an increase of pension to Edgar Duffield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2411) fixing the date of reenlistment of Gustav Hertfelder, first-class fireman, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PROUTY: A bill (H. R. 2412) granting a pension to Charles Fuhry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2413) granting a pension to Peter Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2414) granting a pension to Fannie W. MacVey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2415) granting an increase of pension to William T. Painter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2416) granting an increase of pension to Joshua S. Osbourn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2417) granting an increase of pension to Stephen B. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2418) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2419) granting an increase of pension to John M. Cochran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2420) granting an increase of pension to John L. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2421) granting an increase of pension to Simon N. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2422) granting an increase of pension to John A. Vermeulen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2423) granting an increase of pension to John Willis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 2424) for the relief of the estate of William Thomas Lowe; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUPLEY: A bill (H. R. 2425) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hummelbaugh; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2426) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure suitable memorial tablets to commemorate the valor and patriotism of the Worth Infantry and York Rifles, who were the first fully armed and equipped soldiers to do active service in response to President Lincoln's call for 75,000 volunteers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 2427) for the relief of James Cassidy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2428) for the relief of Charles E. Malm; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2429) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas Reed; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2430) granting a pension to Margaret Roddy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2431) granting a pension to Clara E. Jordan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2432) granting a pension to Mary Petrik; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2433) granting a pension to Israel Buckowsky; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2434) granting a pension to Gustav J. Tichy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2435) granting a pension to Joseph Truka; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2436) granting an increase of pension to Frank G. Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 2437) for the relief of J. L. Jones; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2438) for the relief of the heirs of Edwin R. Gaines; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2439) for the relief of Martha Arnold and others; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 2440) for the relief of the county court of Allen County, Ky.; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of sundry business men of Fulton, Bowling Green, Hannibal, Perry, Frankford, New London, Louisiana, Center, Vandalia, Laddonia, Aux Vassa, Troy, Elsberry, Winfield, Matinsburg, and Bell Flower, Mo., favoring the passage of legislation compelling concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute their portion of the funds for the development of the local community, county, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of sundry citizens of Buffalo Gap, S. Dak., favoring the passage of legislation relative the relief of the settlers of the arid lands of South Dakota; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the National Association of Brass Manufacturers, Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of a bill for a 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the American Association of International Conciliation, favoring the passage of legislation for the immediate settlement of the controversy on the free-tolls portion of the Panama Canal act, either by the rescinding of the clause, an agreement reached through the channels of diplomacy, or by international arbitration before The Hague court; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the International Brick, Tile, and Terra Cotta Workers' Alliance, Chicago, Ill., protesting against the passage of legislation reducing the present tariff on floor and wall tile; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Hosiery Manufacturers Legislative Committee, New York City, protesting against the passage of legislation making any change in the present duty on hosiery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Bernhard Stern & Co., Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of legislation placing flour on the free list and at the same time a duty on wheat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the Syracuse Gardens Co., New York, protesting against the passage of any legislation changing the present tariff on vegetables, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Stationers' Association of New York, protesting against the passage of legislation preventing the fixing of prices by the manufacturers of patent articles; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Fred Gretsch Manufacturing Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the passage of legislation reducing the present tariff on musical instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of New York State, protesting against the passage of any legislation making a reduction of the present tariff on printed matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of sundry business men of Mission Hill, Avon, Wagner, Tyndall, Geddes, Parker, Salem, Hartford,

Humboldt, Montrose, Monroe, Canastota, Hurley, Tea, Baltic, Canton, Fairview, Centerville, Hudson, Menno, Marion, Lesterville, Corsica, Tripp, Scotland, Freeman, Platte, Yankton, Sioux Falls, Gayville, Jefferson, Elk Point, Meckling, and 41 other towns of South Dakota, favoring the passage of legislation compelling concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute their portion of the funds for the development of the local community, county, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Belle Fourche Valley Water Users' Association, favoring the passage of legislation for investigation and relief of the water users in Belle Fourche Valley; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of the Brookings Commercial Club, Brookings, S. Dak., favoring the passage of legislation granting Federal aid for the improvement of agricultural pursuits; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GERRY: Petition of the Rhode Island Woman Suffrage Association, protesting against the inadequate police protection given the suffrage parade in Washington, March 3, 1913; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Appalachian Mountain Club, protesting against the passage of legislation transferring the control and ownership of the national forests to the States wherein they lie; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of G. Andrews and Gertrude Carley, of Newport, R. I., favoring the passage of a bill for Federal protection of migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Cigar Makers' Unions, Providence, R. I., No. 10, and Pawtucket, R. I., No. 94, protesting against the passage of legislation making an increase in the internal revenue on cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Rhode Island State Branch of the American Federation of Labor, favoring the passage of legislation exempting voluntary labor organizations from the provisions of the Sherman antitrust law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Mills Bros., of Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of legislation for the placing of pineapples on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Rocky Mountain Ore Producers, Salt Lake City, protesting against the passage of legislation making a reduction on the duty on lead; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George Bhoth and 150 other residents of Copenhagen, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation providing for the closing of the Panama Exposition on Sundays; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of Tampa, Fla., protesting against the passage of legislation for the reorganization of the customs service as affecting Florida; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Hosiery Manufacturers' Legislative Committee, New York City, protesting against the passage of legislation making any change in the present duties on hosiery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Cotton Underwear Manufacturers' Tariff Committee, protesting against any change in the present duty on cotton underwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of Greater New York, protesting against the passage of legislation making any reduction in the present duty on printed matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: Petition of the New York Mercantile Exchange, favoring the passage of legislation for the removal of the tariff on butter, cheese, and eggs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the United Hatters of North America, Local No. 8, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the passage of legislation reducing the tariff on hats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: Petition of the California Club of California, favoring the passage of legislation making an appropriation for the suppression of the white-slave traffic; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Reno Commercial Club, Reno, Nev.; the Chamber of Commerce of Las Vegas, Nev.; W. B. Graham, Ely, Nev.; and L. F. Adamson, Carson City, Nev., favoring the passage of legislation making a grant of 1,000,000 acres of land for creation of a road fund; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RODDENBERY: Petition of the Atlantic Association of Credit Men, favoring the passage of legislation making an immediate reform in the present banking system of the United States Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of the Cotton Underwear Manufacturers' Tariff Committee, protesting against the passage of any legislation changing the present tariff on underwear, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local No. 211, Atlantic City, N. J., favoring the passage of legislation fixing the limit of eight hours per day for employees working on Government grants or franchises; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Richardson Scale Co., Passaic, N. J., protesting against the passage of legislation placing sugar on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the United Hatters of North America, Local Union No. 17, Orange, N. J., favoring the passage of legislation making an increase of the present duty on hats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hugo Reisinger, making a supplemental and reply brief relative to electric-light carbons and tariff on same; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Primos Chemical Co., Primos, Pa., protesting against the passage of legislation making any reduction in the present tariff on metals and alloys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Hall Printing Press Co., Dunnellen, N. J., protesting against the passage of legislation reducing the present duty on printing presses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the International Brick, Tile, and Terra Cotta Workers' Alliance, Chicago, Ill., protesting against the passage of any legislation making a reduction in the tariff on floor and wall tile; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the United Hatters of North America, Locals Nos. 13 and 14, of Newark, N. J., favoring the passage of legislation making an increase in the tariff on hats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of sundry citizens of Rochester, Mich., favoring the passage of legislation looking into the offer of Theodore Munger relative to his offer to reduce the high cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of the Sacramento (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the passage of legislation placing sugar on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation making an appropriation for the purpose of experimenting with methods for avoiding unnecessary loss to the fruit raisers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the passage of the proposed legislation for reduction of customs on California products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation for strengthening and improving the military and naval forces along the entire Pacific coast line; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation for the purpose of installation of additional light and fog stations on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *April 12, 1913.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The VICE PRESIDENT being absent, the President pro tempore (Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas) took the chair.

NATHAN P. BRYAN, a Senator from the State of Florida, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday last was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GRONNA presented a memorial of members of the Minot Art Club, of North Dakota, and a memorial of members of the Minot Musical Club, of North Dakota, remonstrating against the transfer of the control of the national forests to the several States, which were referred to the Committee on Conservation of National Resources.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Harvey and McVille, in the State of North Dakota, praying for a reduction in the duty on sugar, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from Joseph Ullman, Gordon & Ferguson; Lanpher, Skinner

& Co.; McKibbin, Driscoll & Dorsey; A. Albrecht & Son, D. Bergman & Co., H. Harris Co., E. Slowik Co., E. Sundvist Co., G. H. Lugsdin Co., T. W. Stevenson Co., B. R. Menze Co., McMillan Fur Co., the Northwestern Hide & Fur Co., Bermon Bros., Anderson Bros., and the Mack May Co., all of St. Paul, in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the imposition of a duty on raw furs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Duluth and Mankato, in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I present a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of Utah, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A joint resolution relative to aid from the Government of the United States for industrial education and the inauguration and establishment of a national university and department of education.

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

Whereas the perpetuity of our form of government depends on the intelligence of a free and independent electorate and the ability of the people to meet the obligations of good citizenship in every sphere of human endeavor; and

Whereas the people of the several States, firm in this belief, have established and maintained at great cost public school systems, including normal and technical schools and universities, for the education and training of the youth of the Republic; and

Whereas the preservation of and the progress made under our free institutions have been largely due to the education and training thus given; and

Whereas there exists throughout the land a growing demand for more instruction in branches that will prepare pupils for industrial pursuits; and

Whereas as results of education among the people are the mutual benefits conferred upon all by an ideal American citizenship, so the expense attending its achievement should be proportionately shared by the Nation and the several States; and

Whereas the National Government should directly aid by a per capita appropriation to such grammar, secondary, and technical schools in the several States as furnish instruction in industrial branches prescribed by Congress and by inaugurating and endowing at Washington, D. C., a national university to head the educational system of the Union; and

Whereas the time is at hand in our history when the cause of education should be advanced to a paramount position in the Government of the United States by the creation of a department of education and the appointment of a secretary thereof with a seat in the Cabinet: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives jointly, That our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives requested to use all honorable means to secure the aid set forth in the foregoing preamble and also the inauguration and establishment of a national university and department of education at Washington, D. C.; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit a certified copy of these resolutions to the President of the United States, the President and Speaker, respectively, of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, the Commissioner of Education, and to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress; be it further

Resolved That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, further directed to transmit a like copy to the governor and superintendent of public instruction, respectively, of each State, and also the presiding officers of the respective houses of the legislature of each State.

HENRY GARDNER,
President of the Senate.
WM. J. SEELY,
Speaker of the House.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF UTAH,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, David Mattson, secretary of state of the State of Utah, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint resolution No. 8, of the Tenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Utah, with the original thereof as filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Utah, on the 10th day of March, 1913, and that it is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Utah.

Done at Salt Lake City, Utah, this 10th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] DAVID MATTSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of Utah, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF UTAH,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, David Mattson, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the attached is a full, true, and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 2, asking an appropriation of 1,000,000 acres of arid lands for the benefit of veterans who performed services in the Indian wars of the Territory of Utah and the widows of such veterans, and for the improvement of public roads of the State of Utah, as appears of record in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 4th day of April, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] DAVID MATTSON,
Secretary of State.
By T. L. HOLMANS, *Deputy.*

A memorial asking an appropriation of 1,000,000 acres of arid land for the benefit of veterans who performed services in the Indian wars of the Territory of Utah and the widows of such veterans, and for the improvement of public roads of the State of Utah. A memorial from the governor and Legislature of the State of Utah to the President, the Senate, and House of Representatives of the United States.

To the President of the United States and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

The governor and the Legislature of the State of Utah respectfully petition that there be donated to the State of Utah 1,000,000 acres of public land, nonmineral, unallotted, and arid, within the State of Utah, to be sold by the State under such rules as Congress may prescribe, the proceeds to be applied equally for the following purposes:

First. For the benefit of the veterans who rendered actual services in any of the Indian wars of the Territory of Utah in the regular militia of the Territory or the widows of such veterans.

Second. For the improvement of the public roads of the State of Utah.

Your memorialists represent that under the provisions of chapter 55, session laws of Utah, 1909, the legislature of this State provided for and created a board of commissioners to be known as commissioners of Indian war records, and by such act provided that such board should ascertain the names of the persons who were members of any organization performing military duty during any of the Indian wars or expeditions against the Indians, or who performed the duty of home guards as members of any organization doing military duty during the time of any Indian war or expedition in the Territory of Utah, and to ascertain the character of the services rendered, and the duration of the same.

That by the provisions of the foregoing act the facts relating to such services are to be determined by the said board of commissioners upon evidence produced before it, and upon affidavits of at least two reputable witnesses in each case; that from the record so provided and as now completed it appears that there are now surviving 2,500 of such veterans, or widows of such veterans, and from such record it appears that such services covered a period of years, the aggregate time being 609,521 days.

Your memorialists further represent that such services made possible the reclamation and settlement, not only of the lands now included within the State of Utah but of the lands included within the adjoining States; that these veterans have been seeking relief from Congress for several sessions last past, but have so far signally failed in receiving any aid whatever.

Your memorialists keenly realize the debt of gratitude that is due to the veterans and to the widows of the veterans who performed such valuable services in the development and settlement of this country, and respectfully submit that financial aid should now be extended to them and that it would be a most proper act on the part of Congress to set aside for such purpose, out of the public lands within this State, 500,000 acres.

Your memorialists further represent that by means of bond issue, appropriations from the general fund of the State, and by appropriations from the funds of the respective counties of the State during the biennium of 1911–12 there has been expended in the improvement of the public highways of this State more than $1,000,000, and that the present legislature of this State has provided for an expenditure during the coming biennium for such purposes approximately a like amount, $50,000 of which is to be expended upon what is known as the Midland Trail, and which is to be a part of the transcontinental highway now projected. The building up of the territory within this State which will necessarily follow the extension and improvement of the highways throughout the State will be a benefit, not only to the people within this State but also to the people of the United States, and to your memorialists it seems most proper that the Government should aid in such work by contributing from the public lands within this State the amount herein asked to be appropriated for such purpose.

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be engrossed and forwarded one each to the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives, to Senator REED SMOOT, Senator GEORGE SUTHERLAND, Congressman JOSEPH HOWELL, and Congressman JACOB JOHNSON with the request that Utah's congressional delegation use every legitimate effort to cause the provisions of this memorial to be enacted into law by the Congress of the United States.

Approved March 19, 1913.

WILLIAM SPRY, *Governor.*
HENRY GARDNER,
President of the Senate.
WM. J. SEELY,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:
[SEAL.] DAVID MATTSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of Utah, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF UTAH,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, David Mattson, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the attached is a full, true, and correct copy of house joint memorial 2, memorializing the Members of Congress to enact into law the pending Crago pension bill, as appears of record in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 4th day of April, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] DAVID MATTSON,
Secretary of State.
By T. L. HOLMAN, *Deputy.*

To the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the governor and Legislature of the State of Utah, respectfully represent that—

Whereas there are now living in Utah several hundred veterans of the Spanish-American War, and the widows and orphans of veterans who offered their lives in their country's services during said war; and

Whereas the State is always fully cognizant of the splendid service rendered by the Utah batteries and other military commands of which Utah boys were members; and

Whereas the widows and orphans of veterans of the late war in this and other States are without pension or support of any kind from the Government, notwithstanding the benefits of this kind are extended to veterans of earlier wars; and

Whereas there is pending in Congress the measure called the Crago pension bill, which places the widows and orphans of the Spanish-American War veterans on the pension rolls; and this measure is now in committee of the Senate; and it is very urgent that this measure be passed at the present session of Congress, in justice to the families of Spanish War veterans, living and dead: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the governor and Legislature of the State of Utah, respectfully memorialize the Members of Congress to enact into law the pending Crago pension bill.

Approved March 19, 1913.

WILLIAM SPRY, *Governor.*
HENRY GARDNER,
President of the Senate.
WM. J. SEELY,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:
[SEAL.] DAVID MATTSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. GOFF presented memorials of sundry citizens of Kimball, Huntington, Good Will, Gilliam, Elkhorn, and Anawalt, all in the State of West Virginia, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation prohibiting any society, fraternal order, or organization from sending through the mails any written or printed matter representing such society, etc., which is already being used as a part of its title or name by any other society or fraternal organization, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHILTON. I present a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of West Virginia, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint resolution 22.

Whereas what is known as the Home Guard soldiers of this State were called into active service of this State on behalf of the preservation of the Union in the late Civil War between the States; and

Whereas these soldiers did good and valuable service in the time of most extreme danger and peril, leaving their homes and during their service endured extreme hardships under adverse circumstances, and in most instances their services in the preservation of the Union were as valuable as that of the soldier enlisted in the Regular Army of the United States; and

Whereas they are now all old, infirm, and feeble, and unable to work to support themselves in such a manner as they should be cared for, and many of them are poor and disabled from said service; and

Whereas our National Government has not provided for them or recognized their services in any of the pension laws of the United States as heretofore passed by Congress, it is just and right that these old surviving veterans, their widows and orphans, should have a right to some consideration in the pension laws of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia, That our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States be requested and instructed to use all urgent and diligent means to secure any proper pension law extending the benefit to such West Virginia State troops and Home Guards as served 60 days in said service and were honorably discharged, the same as United States soldiers, and that the secretary of state to furnish each of our representatives in Congress a copy of these resolutions.

Adopted by the house of delegates February 8, 1913.

JOHN GUY PRICHARD,
Clerk of the House of Delegates.

Adopted by the senate February 18, 1913.

JOHN T. HARRIS,
Clerk of the Senate.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA:

I, Stuart F. Reed, secretary of state of the State of West Virginia, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution 22, adopted by the Legislature of West Virginia February 18, 1913.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the said State, at the city of Charleston, this 8th day of April, 1913.

[SEAL.] STUART F. REED,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CHILTON. I present a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of West Virginia, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Claims.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

Senate joint resolution 4.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of West Virginia memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law Senate bill 6247 and to provide for the payment to West Virginia of the sums of money due the State from the disposition of the lands ceded by Virginia to the United States March 1, 1784, and to carry out the trust embodied in said cession of Virginia to the United States.

Whereas on the 20th day of October, 1783, Virginia authorized a cession of the northwest territory to be made to the United States, and on March 1, 1784, her deed of cession was completed, whereby Virginia yielded to the Congress of the United States, for the benefit of said States, all right, title, and claim which the said Commonwealth had to the territory northwest of the River Ohio, subject to the conditions annexed to the said act of cession; and

Whereas the following were the proceedings of Congress which occurred on March 1, 1784, in and about said cession:

PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS.

March 1, 1784, Virginia, through her Delegates in the Continental Congress—Thomas Jefferson, Samuel Hardy, Arthur Lee, and James Monroe—completed the act of cession, the following proceedings being had in Congress:

"On motion of Mr. Howell, of Rhode Island, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the General Assembly of Virginia, at their session commencing on the 20th day of October, 1783, passed an act to authorize their Delegates in Congress to convey to the United States, in Congress assembled, all the right of that Commonwealth to the territory northwest of the River Ohio; and

"Whereas the Delegates of said Commonwealth have presented to Congress the form of a deed proposed to be executed pursuant to the said act, in the words following:

"'*To all who shall see these presents:*

"'We, Thomas Jefferson, Samuel Hardy, Arthur Lee, and James Monroe, the underwritten Delegates for the Commonwealth of Virginia in the Congress of the United States of America, send greeting:

"'Whereas the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, at their sessions begun on the 20th day of October, 1783, passed an act entitled "An act to authorize the Delegates of this State in Congress to convey to the United States, in Congress assembled, all the right of this Commonwealth to the territory northwestward of the River Ohio," in these words following, to wit:

"'Whereas the Congress of the United States did, by their act of the 6th day of September, in the year 1780, recommend to the several States in the Union having claims to waste and unappropriated lands in the western country a liberal cession to the United States of a portion of their respective claims for the common benefit of the Union; and

"'Whereas this Commonwealth did, on the 2d day of January, in the year 1781, yield to the Congress of the United States, for the benefit of said States, all right, title, and claim which the said Commonwealth had to the territory northwest of the River Ohio, subject to the conditions annexed to the said act of cession; and

"'Whereas the United States, in Congress assembled, have, by their act of the 13th of September last, stipulated the terms on which they agree to accept the cession of this State, should the legislature approve thereof, which terms, although they do not come fully up to the propositions of this Commonwealth, are conceived, on the whole, to approach so nearly to them as to induce this State to accept thereof, in full confidence that Congress will, in justice to this State for the liberal cession she has made, earnestly press upon the other States claiming large tracts of waste and uncultivated territory the propriety of making cessions equally liberal for the common benefit and support of the Union.

"'*Be it enacted by the general assembly*, That it shall and may be lawful for the Delegates of this State to the Congress of the United States, or such of them as shall be assembled in Congress, and the said Delegates, or such of them so assembled, are hereby fully authorized and empowered, for and on behalf of this State, by proper deeds or instrument in writing, under their hands and seals, to convey, transfer, assign, and make over unto the United States, in Congress assembled, for the benefit of said States, all right, title, and claim, as well of soil as jurisdiction, which this Commonwealth hath to the territory or tract of country within the limits of the Virginia charter situate, lying, and being to the northwest of the River Ohio, subject to the terms and conditions contained in the before-recited act of Congress of the 13th day of September last; that is to say, upon condition that the territory so ceded shall be laid out and formed into States, containing a suitable extent of territory, not less than 100 nor more than 150 miles square, or as near thereto as circumstances will admit; and that the States so formed shall be distinct republican States and admitted members of the Federal Union, having the same rights of sovereignty, freedom, and independence as the other States. That the necessary and reasonable expenses incurred by this State in subduing any British posts or in maintaining forts and garrisons within and for the defense, or in acquiring any part of the territory so ceded or relinquished, shall be fully reimbursed by the United States; and that one commissioner shall be appointed by Congress, one by this Commonwealth, and another by those two commissioners, who, or a majority of them, shall be authorized and empowered to adjust and liquidate the account of the necessary and reasonable expenses incurred by this State which they shall judge to be comprised within the intent and meaning of the act of Congress of the 10th of October, 1780, respecting such expenses; that the French and Canadian inhabitants and other settlers of the Kaskaskies, St. Vincents, and the neighboring villages who have professed themselves citizens of Virginia shall have their possessions and titles confirmed to them and be protected in the enjoyment of their rights and liberties; that a quantity not exceeding 150,000 acres of land, promised by this State, shall be allowed and granted to the then colonel, now Gen. George Rogers Clark, and to the officers and soldiers of his regiment who marched with him when the posts of Kaskaskies and St. Vincents were reduced, and to the officers and soldiers that have been since incorporated into the said regiment, to be laid off in one tract, the length of which not to exceed double the breadth, in such place on the northwest side of the Ohio as a majority of the officers shall choose, and to be afterwards divided among the said officers and soldiers in due proportion according to the laws of Virginia; that in case the quantity of good land on the southeast side of the Ohio, upon the waters of the Cumberland River and between the Green River and Tennessee River, which have been reserved by law for the Virginia

troops, upon continental establishment, should, from the North Carolina line bearing in farther upon the Cumberland lands than was expected, prove insufficient for their legal bounties, the deficiencies should be made up to the said troops in good lands to be laid off between the Rivers Scioto and Little Miami, on the northwest side of the River Ohio, in such proportion as have been engaged to them by the laws of Virginia; that all the lands within the territory so ceded to the United States and not reserved for or appropriated to any of the beforementioned purposes or disposed of in bounties to the officers and soldiers of the American Army shall be considered as a common fund for the use and benefit of such of the United States as have become, or shall become, members of the confederation or federal alliance of the said States, Virginia inclusive, according to their usual respective proportions in the general charge and expenditure, and shall be faithfully and bona fide disposed of for that purpose and for no other use or purpose whatsoever: *Provided*, That the trust hereby reposed in the Delegates of this State shall not be executed unless three of them, at least, are present in Congress; and

"'Whereas the said general assembly, by the resolution of June 6, 1783, had constituted and appointed us, the said Thomas Jefferson, Samuel Hardy, Arthur Lee, and James Monroe, Delegates to the said Commonwealth in Congress for one year from the first Monday in November then next following, which resolution remains in full force:

"'Now, therefore, know ye that we, the said Thomas Jefferson, Samuel Hardy, Arthur Lee, and James Monroe, by virtue of the power and authority committed to us by the act of the said General Assembly of Virginia before recited, and in the name and for and on behalf of the said Commonwealth, do by these presents convey, transfer, assign, and make over unto the United States, in Congress assembled, for the benefit of the said States, Virginia inclusive, all right, title, and claim, as well of soil as jurisdiction, which the said Commonwealth hath to the territory or tract of country within the limits of the Virginia charter situate, lying, and being to the northwest of the River Ohio, to and for the uses and purposes and on the conditions of the said recited act. In testimony whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names and affixed our seals in Congress the 1st day of March, in the year of our Lord 1784, and of the independence of the United States the eighth.'

"*Resolved*, That the United States, in Congress assembled, are ready to receive this deed whenever the Delegates of the State of Virginia are ready to execute the same.

"The Delegates of Virginia then proceeded and signed, sealed, and delivered the said deed, whereupon Congress came to the following resolution:

"'*Resolved*, That the same be recorded and enrolled among the acts of the United States in Congress assembled;' and

"Whereas by said proceedings the State of Virginia granted to the United States the territory embracing the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, part of Minnesota, amounting to one hundred and seventy million (170,000,000) acres of land; and

"Whereas said cession of the State of Virginia to the United States of America was not an absolute gift, but the same was upon expressed conditions, as follows, to wit, the same being set out in the clause of the act of Virginia and in the deed of cession:

"'That all land within the territory so ceded to the United States and not reserved or appropriated to any of the before-mentioned purposes, or disposed of in bounties to the officers and soldiers of the American Army, *shall be considered as a common fund for the use and benefit of such of the United States as have become or shall become members of the confederation or federal alliance of the said States, Virginia inclusive, according to their usual respective proportions in the general charge and expenditure, and shall be faithfully and bona fide disposed of for that purpose and for no other use or purpose whatsoever;*' and

"Whereas West Virginia, until the 20th day of June, 1863, was a part of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and upon said 20th day of June, 1863, was formed into the State of West Virginia; and

"Whereas the United States, after said grant went into effect, expressly recognized that said grant was not absolute in its terms, but was upon conditions; and

"Whereas the conditions of said grant were not carried out as specifically set out in the act of the General Assembly of Virginia and in the deed of cession, and said land was not used for the benefit of all of the States, as expressly provided for in said act of cession, but Congress appropriated 38,868,212 acres of land and practically $3,000,000 derived from the sale of these public lands to the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and the same were used entirely and absolutely for local purposes within said States for the construction of schools, canals, roads, and other local purposes therein, thus in no manner carrying out the reservations in said deed of cession. The value of said land so donated to local uses, at the price at which said lands were fixed per acre, would make the value of said donation for local purposes for said States, contrary to the terms of said deed of cession, amount to $80,695,078; and by the action of the United States, in reference to said conditional cession, one-fifth of the land conveyed by Virginia under such conditional cession has been disposed of and Virginia has derived no use and benefit for the same, Virginia's proportion in the general charge and expenditure being about one-seventh of the whole, giving her interest in the lands not applied as directed by the deed at about one-seventh of the whole; and

"Whereas Senate bill 6247, to provide for the bringing of suits against the United States by Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maryland, South Carolina, New Hampshire, North Carolina, and Rhode Island, has been introduced in the Senate of the United States by WILLIAM E. CHILTON, a Senator from West Virginia, for the purpose of allowing each of the said States to institute a suit in the Court of Claims in and about the matters arising from said cession; and

"Whereas West Virginia, being part of the original Commonwealth of Virginia, is directly interested in the adjustment of Virginia's reserve interest in the lands ceded to the United States March 1, 1784: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of West Virginia (the House of Delegates concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact said bill into law, allowing an adjustment of the sums of money due the State of West Virginia derived from the disposition of the lands ceded by Virginia to the United States March 1, 1784, in contravention of the terms of the said cession to the Government of the United States, and that the just proportion of the amount justly due the State of Virginia be held for the use and benefit of the State of West Virginia, and that the Senators and Representatives of the State of West Virginia in the Congress of the United States be requested to use all honorable efforts to bring about the action of the Congress of the United States, so that the rights of West Virginia in the premises may be protected, and that her part of the sums of money above set out shall be paid to her under and according to the terms of the convention aforesaid between Virginia and the United States."

Adopted by the senate January 30, 1913.

JOHN T. HARRIS,
Clerk of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of delegates January 31, 1913.

JOHN GUY PRICHARD,
Clerk of the House of Delegates.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA:

I, Stuart F. Reed, secretary of state of the State of West Virginia, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of senate joint resolution No. 4, adopted by the Legislature of West Virginia January 31, 1913.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the said State at the city of Charleston, this 8th day of April, 1913.

[SEAL.]

STUART F. REED,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CHILTON. I present a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of West Virginia, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House concurrent resolution 8.

Memorial of the Legislature of West Virginia to the Congress of the United States asking that West Virginia be divided into three Federal districts for judicial purposes, and that an additional district, to be known as the central judicial district, be created.

Whereas the population of the State of West Virginia has greatly increased since the division of the State into two judicial districts and the establishment of the southern United States district court of said State; and

Whereas the wealth and other interests of said State have increased more rapidly than the population; and

Whereas transportation lines and other public service corporations have also vastly increased within said period, so that it is necessary that additional facilities for transacting the business of the public in the district court of the United States within said State should be increased, to the end that the people may have their controversies speedily settled with the least possible cost and delay: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and the same is hereby, respectfully petitioned and memorialized to create within said State an additional Federal district court, and that it be located in and have jurisdiction over the territory extending from the eastern to the western line through the center of said State, to include such territory and population as proportionately to divide said State into three sections, to be known as the northern, central, and southern districts; and that a judge and such other officials necessary to properly equip said court be appointed to discharge the duties thereof; and thus the legislature will ever pray.

Adopted by the house of delegates February 8, 1913.

JOHN GUY PRICHARD,
Clerk of the House of Delegates.

Adopted by the senate February 13, 1913.

JOHN T. HARRIS,
Clerk of the Senate.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA:

I, Stuart F. Reed, secretary of state of the State of West Virginia, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of house concurrent resolution No. 8, adopted by the Legislature of West Virginia February 13, 1913.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the said State, at the city of Charleston, this 8th day of April, 1913.

[SEAL.]

STUART F. REED,
Secretary of State.

Mr. BRISTOW presented petitions of sundry citizens of Iola, Walnut, South Mound, Erie, Americus, Parker, and Fort Scott, all in the State of Kansas, praying for an adjustment of the pay of railway mail clerks on account of the conditions brought about by the parcel-post law, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of McPherson, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sale of opium and cocaine, excepting for medicinal uses, which was referrred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Everett, Mass., favoring the adoption of a 1-cent letter postage on first-class mail matter, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of members of the faculty of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, praying for the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal law exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. BRADLEY presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Kentucky, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. McLEAN presented resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of New Haven, Conn., remonstrating against the consolidation of the customs districts in the State of Connecticut into one district, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Equal Franchise League, of Greenwich, Conn., favoring the adoption of

an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

PROTECTION AND PRESERVATION OF BIRDS.

Mr. ROOT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred Senate resolution 25, requesting the President to propose an international convention for the protection of birds, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 717) to correct the military record of Thomas Smart; and

A bill (S. 718) to correct the military record of Charles K. Bond, alias Kimball W. Rollins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 719) regulating the use of names by fraternal orders; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 720) to establish a system of wireless telegraphy in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on the Philippines.

A bill (S. 721) authorizing the State Department to deliver to Charles B. Hagadorn a gift from the Government of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 722) granting an increase of pension to Mary Lotty (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 723) granting an increase of pension to Julia M. Lynch (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 724) placing certain positions in the Post Office Department in the competitive classified service, and changing the salaries of postmasters at first and second class post offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

A bill (S. 725) to correct the military record of Aaron S. Winner;

A bill (S. 726) to correct the military record of Lorenzo Brown;

A bill (S. 727) to correct the military record of Joseph Gorman; and

A bill (S. 728) to correct the military record of Nathaniel Monroe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 729) granting a pension to Wenzel Patzelt;

A bill (S. 730) granting a pension to Thomas Noble;

A bill (S. 731) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Cook;

A bill (S. 732) granting an increase of pension to Jason O. Keeney;

A bill (S. 733) granting an increase of pension to Jacob C. Yorty;

A bill (S. 734) granting a pension to Ada Hess;

A bill (S. 735) granting an increase of pension to James Adams; and

A bill (S. 736) granting an increase of pension to William Liebhart; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey:

A bill (S. 737) prohibiting the use of fish traps or other device for impounding fish in waters in and adjacent to Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 738) to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries or occupational diseases in the course of their employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Georgia:

A bill (S. 739) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint Cassius E. Gillette a lieutenant colonel in the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Wyoming:

A bill (S. 740) to promote and encourage the construction of wagon roads over the public lands of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 741) to correct the military record of Clayton H. Adams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 742) authorizing the Northern Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, residing on the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 743) granting a pension to Alfred E. Zemp;

A bill (S. 744) granting an increase of pension to Mary R. Kendall; and

A bill (S. 745) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hiler (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN:

A bill (S. 746) for the relief of Capt. Frank Parker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 747) to limit United States judges to declaring the law when charging juries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 748) for the relief of Mrs. Thomas G. Prioleau and others, heirs at law of Thomas G. Prioleau, deceased; and

A bill (S. 749) for the relief of St. John's Episcopal Church, at Winnsboro, S. C.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 750) for the relief of Dora D. Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama:

A bill (S. 751) to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 752) for the proper observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 753) granting an increase of pension to John A. Shannon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 754) for the relief of Jacob M. Cooper; and

A bill (S. 755) to correct the military record of William A. Blades; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 756) granting a pension to Sarah Childress; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 757) to provide for the disposal of certain lands in the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 758) providing for the improvement of Sullys Hill National Park; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GOFF:

A bill (S. 759) for the relief of the county courts of Marion and Monongalia Counties, W. Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 760) to create the coast guard by combining therein the existing Life-Saving Service and Revenue-Cutter Service; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 761) to extend the time for certain homesteaders to make entry or establish residence upon their lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 762) to pay an award in favor of the heirs of John W. West, deceased; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GALLINGER (by request):

A bill (S. 763) to incorporate the National Christian Congress Association of America; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 764) granting an increase of pension to Barzilla B. Jones;

A bill (S. 765) granting an increase of pension to David P. De Tar; and

A bill (S. 766) granting a pension to Jennie L. Luppie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 767) granting permission to the city of Marshfield, Oreg., to close Mill Slough, in said city; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 768) for the relief of August Donnerberg;

A bill (S. 769) for the relief of the estate of J. E. Bruce, deceased;

A bill (S. 770) for the relief of Thomas Coyle and Bridget Coyle and their legal representatives; and

A bill (S. 771) for the relief of George R. Campbell, Milton B. Germond, and Walter D. Long (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 772) granting a pension to William S. Curtis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 773) to establish a primary election for the nomination by political parties of candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

A bill (S. 774) to amend section 1014 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 775) to make an appropriation for the removal of the body of Lieut. Col. George Pomutz from St. Petersburg,

Russia, to Arlington Cemetery, Va.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 776) granting pensions to soldiers, sailors, and marines confined in Confederate prisons; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 777) to amend section 985 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

Mr. POMERENE. This bill is presented as it passed the Senate at the last session. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 778) for the relief of the heirs of John W. Graves; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 779) to correct the military record of John L. O'Mara and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 780) for the relief of Thomas Drury and others; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 781) granting a pension to Jane C. Watkins;

A bill (S. 782) granting a pension to William S. Shaffer; and

A bill (S. 783) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Tibbens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 784) to place Lieut. Col. Junius L. Powell on the retired list of the Army with the rank of brigadier general (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 785) to relinquish, release, and quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to certain lands in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 786) for the relief of the trustees of the Sageville Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Sageville, Lauderdale County, Miss.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PERKINS:

A bill (S. 787) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange lands for school sections within an Indian, military, national forest, or other reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 788) for improvement of the Sacramento River and tributaries, Cal.;

A bill (S. 789) to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 790) to authorize the improvement of Santa Barbara Light Station, Cal., including a fog signal and a keeper's dwelling;

A bill (S. 791) to provide for improvements at the Santa Cruz Light Station, Cal.; and

A bill (S. 792) to authorize the establishment of a light and fog-signal station on or near North Farallon Island, Cal.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 793) granting a pension to Napoleon B. Dixon; and

A bill (S. 794) granting an increase of pension to Fredericka Trilley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 795) relating to the money reserves of national banking associations and to authorize such associations to make loans on real estate security in certain cases; and

A bill (S. 796) authorizing national banking associations to make loans on real estate security in certain cases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 797) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 798) to correct the military record of John Berrisford;

A bill (S. 799) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Inglis;

A bill (S. 800) for the relief of John Miller; and

A bill (S. 801) to correct the military record of Calvin O. Tyler, alias John Wood; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 802) for the relief of F. W. Tyler;

A bill (S. 803) for the relief of the firm of Herreid Bros.;

A bill (S. 804) for the relief of William E. Culkin; and

A bill (S. 805) for the relief of Mary E. Lovell; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 806) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Richardson;

A bill (S. 807) granting a pension to Jane Gascoigne;

A bill (S. 808) granting a pension to Emelia McNicol;

A bill (S. 809) granting an increase of pension to John McConnell;

A bill (S. 810) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. White;

A bill (S. 811) granting an increase of pension to Andrew A. Kelly;

A bill (S. 812) to amend the pension laws of the United States;

A bill (S. 813) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Lucken;

A bill (S. 814) granting an increase of pension to Lydia M. Salisbury; and

A bill (S. 815) granting an increase of pension to Angelia L. Shaw; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 816) to provide water for the irrigable lands of the Yakima Indian Reservation, State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 817) to authorize the city of Everett, Wash., to purchase certain lands for the securing, establishment, maintenance, and protection of a source of water supply for said city;

A bill (S. 818) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1898; and

A bill (S. 819) providing for the homestead entry of certain lands in the State of Washington, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 820) for the relief of volunteer officers and soldiers who served in the Philippine Islands beyond the period of their enlistment; and

A bill (S. 821) authorizing the Secretary of War to relieve the Washington-Oregon Corporation, as far as he may deem advisable in the public interests, from certain conditions in an act entitled "An act granting to the Washington-Oregon Corporation a right for an electric railroad, and for telephone, telegraph, and electric transmission lines across the Vancouver Military Reservation, in the State of Washington," approved August 9, 1912; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 822) providing for the survey and commencement of construction of a road in the Olympic Forest Reserve; and

A bill (S. 823) appropriating $100,000 to be used by the Forest Service in constructing a road from the town of Glacier to Mount Baker, in the Mount Baker Forest Reserve; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 824) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Fisheries.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 825) to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications; to the Committee on Printing.

A bill (S. 826) to establish a national park service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 827) relating to bills of lading; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 828) for the relief of Peter Gannon (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 830) granting an increase of pension to William Ramsey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona:

A bill (S. 831) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Mason; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 832) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

A bill (S. 833) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

A bill (S. 834) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 835) for the relief of John Dalton; and

A bill (S. 836) for the relief of Thomas Huggins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 837) granting a pension to Thomas Baxter;

A bill (S. 838) granting an increase of pension to Barney L. Bull;

A bill (S. 839) granting a pension to Mabel F. Coen;

A bill (S. 840) granting a pension to Effie M. Crail;

A bill (S. 841) granting a pension to Virginia C. Crawford;

A bill (S. 842) granting a pension to William S. Davidson;
A bill (S. 843) granting an increase of pension to Brazil Van Dusen;
A bill (S. 844) granting a pension to James B. Gillick;
A bill (S. 845) granting a pension to Maria L. Graves;
A bill (S. 846) granting a pension to Lucina C. Hatch;
A bill (S. 847) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Higby;
A bill (S. 848) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Hurlburt;
A bill (S. 849) granting an increase of pension to Jens C. Jensen;
A bill (S. 850) granting a pension to Ella S. Kyes;
A bill (S. 851) granting a pension to Charles A. Barthrop;
A bill (S. 852) granting a pension to Fred T. Macomber;
A bill (S. 853) granting an increase of pension to Lucy M. Martin;
A bill (S. 854) granting an increase of pension to Carrie A. Miller;
A bill (S. 855) granting a pension to Patrick Moore;
A bill (S. 856) granting an increase of pension to Eldridge Morse;
A bill (S. 857) granting a pension to Sarah E. Muzy;
A bill (S. 858) granting a pension to Blanche Packard;
A bill (S. 859) granting an increase of pension to Anna L. Phillips;
A bill (S. 860) granting an increase of pension to Martin B. Richardson;
A bill (S. 861) granting a pension to Ottiwell M. Roberts;
A bill (S. 862) granting an increase of pension to William L. Sapp;
A bill (S. 863) granting an increase of pension to Millard F. Shaw;
A bill (S. 864) granting a pension to Mary Standifer;
A bill (S. 865) granting a pension to George A. Torchio;
A bill (S. 866) granting an increase of pension to John M. Turner;
A bill (S. 867) granting an increase of pension to Annie A. Voigt; and
A bill (S. 868) granting a pension to Commodore P. White; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 869) to amend "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 870) relating to the reclamation and irrigation of arid lands;
A bill (S. 871) relating to the reclamation and irrigation of arid lands;
A bill (S. 872) relating to the reclamation and irrigation of arid lands;
A bill (S. 873) relating to the reclamation and irrigation of arid lands;
A bill (S. 874) relating to the reclamation and irrigation of arid lands; and
A bill (S. 875) relating to the reclamation and irrigation of arid lands; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 876) for the relief of William M. Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) directing the Secretary of War to lay out and survey a road in the Mount Baker Forest Reserve and to submit an estimate of the cost thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 14) to donate a 4-pound cannon to the State of Mississippi (with accompanying papers); and
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 15) for the relief of Edward L. Keyes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

INTERSTATE TRADE COMMISSION.

By Mr. NEWLANDS:

A bill (S. 829) to create an interstate trade commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, regarding this bill I wish to say that it was introduced by me during the last Congress; it was considered by the Interstate Commerce Committee and amended and perfected by it, but was not reported to the Senate by the committee, the committee having come to the conclusion that it would not report any bill, but would make simply a general report upon the subject matter of trusts and combinations in which the members of that committee would give their individual views. That report was presented by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] during the closing days of the last session and included the approving, qualifying, or differing views of other Senators, including my own views, in which I continued to urge, as I had for many years, the creation of a trade commission for the enforcement of the Sherman Act and other legislation relating to trusts and monopolies. I introduce this bill as a measure perfected by the committee, but not as a measure having its favorable indorsement. No final vote was had in the committee upon it. I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that order will be made.

The bill (S. 829) to create an interstate trade commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill (S. 829) to create an interstate trade commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall be referred to and cited as the interstate trade commission act. Corporations a majority of whose voting securities is held or owned by any corporation subject to the terms of this act are referred to herein as subsidiaries of such holding or owning corporation.

SEC. 2. That there is hereby created a body to be known as the interstate trade commission, which shall consist of three members, of whom no more than two shall belong to the same political party. The commission shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the terms of such commissioners so first appointed shall be three, six, and nine years, respectively, and shall be so designated by the President in making such appointments; and thereafter all the commissioners shall hold office for the term of nine years and shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Vacancies shall be filled by like appointment and confirmation for the unexpired term. Each member of said commission shall receive a salary of $10,000 a year. The office of the commission shall be at Washington, in the District of Columbia, but the commission may hold meetings elsewhere when necessary and convenient.

SEC. 3. That the Bureau of Corporations is hereby transferred to and merged in said commission, and all of the powers, duties, records, papers, and funds belonging or pertaining to the Bureau of Corporations shall hereafter belong and pertain to the interstate trade commission, and all the officers and employees of said bureau shall thereupon be officers and employees of the interstate trade commission. The said commission shall also have a secretary, a chief clerk, and such clerks, inspectors, examiners, experts, messengers, and other assistants as from time to time may be necessary and as may be appropriated for by Congress.

SEC. 4. That all corporations engaged in commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, excepting common carriers, shall from time to time furnish to the commission such information, statement, and records of their organization, business, financial condition, conduct, and management, and the organization, business, financial condition, conduct, and management of their subsidiaries, at such time, to such degree and extent, and in such form as may be prescribed by the commission; and the commission at all reasonable times, or its duly authorized agent or agents, shall have complete access to all records, accounts, minutes, books, and papers of such corporations and their subsidiaries, including the records of any of their executive or other committees. Failure or neglect on the part of any corporation subject to this act, or of any of its subsidiaries, to comply with the terms of this section within such time after written demand shall have been made upon such corporation by the commission requiring such compliance, as shall be fixed by the commission, shall constitute a misdemeanor, and upon conviction such corporation shall be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 for every day of such failure or neglect.

SEC. 5. That the information so obtained shall be public records, and the commission shall from time to time make public such information in such form and to such extent as it may deem necessary.

SEC. 6. That the district courts of the United States, upon the application of the commission alleging a failure to comply with any order of the commission or alleging a failure to comply with or a violation of any of the provisions of this act by any corporation subject thereto, shall have jurisdiction to issue a writ or writs of mandamus or injunction or other order enforcing such order of the commission or commanding such corporation, its officers and employees, to comply with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. That for the purposes of this act the commission shall have the power to require by subpœna the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all books, papers, contracts, agreements, documents, or other things of every kind and nature whatsoever relating to any matter under investigation by the commission. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing, and in case of disobedience to a subpœna the commission, or any party to a proceeding before the commission, may invoke the aid of any court of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents under the provisions of this section.

And any of the circuit courts of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpœna issued to any corporation subject to the provisions of this act, or other person, issue an order requiring such corporation, or other person, to appear before said commission (and produce books, documents, and papers, if so ordered) and give evidence touching the matter in question, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. The claim that any such testimony or evidence may tend to criminate the person giving such evidence shall not excuse such witness from testifying.

The testimony of any witness may be taken at the instance of a party in any proceeding or investigation pending before the commission by deposition at any time after the inquiry is instituted. The commission may also order testimony to be taken by deposition in any proceeding or investigation pending before it at any stage of such

proceeding or investigation. Such deposition may be taken before any person authorized so to do by the commission, and who has power to administer oaths.

Any person may be compelled to appear and depose, and to produce documentary evidence, in the same manner as witnesses may be compelled to appear and testify and produce documentary evidence before the commission as hereinbefore provided. Such testimony shall be reduced to writing.

Witnesses whose testimony is taken under the provisions of this act shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like service in the courts of the United States.

No person shall be excused from attending and testifying, or from producing books, papers, documents, or other things before this commission or in obedience to the subpœna of the commission, whether such subpœna be signed or issued by one or more of the commissioners on the ground or for the reason that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to criminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture. But no natural person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he may testify under oath or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, before said commission in obedience to a subpœna issued by it in a proceeding instituted upon its own initiative: *Provided*, That no person so testifying shall be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying. The purpose of this provision is to give immunity only to natural persons who under oath testify in response to a subpœna of the commission in an inquiry instituted by the commission.

SEC. 8. That the said commission shall, on or before the 1st day of January in each year, make a report, which shall be transmitted to Congress. This report shall contain such information and data collected by the commission as it may deem of value in the determination of questions connected with the regulation of commerce, together with such recommendations as to additional legislation relating thereto as the commission may deem necessary.

SEC. 9. That any person willfully making or furnishing to said commission any statement, return, or record required by this act, when knowing such statement, return, or record to be false in any material particular, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

SEC. 10. That in case a final decree shall be issued against any corporation under the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, or under sections 73 to 77, inclusive, of "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," which became a law August 27, 1894, the court entering such decree may, in its discretion, refer to the commission its decree, with instructions to take evidence, consider such facts, and report to the court the findings as to method of dissolution or reorganization as the commission shall consider best fitted to carry out such decree; if a reorganization takes place under a decree, the commission shall inform itself respecting the reorganization, and if it is of the opinion that it is not in harmony with the decree it shall, through counsel, inform the court for such action as the court may take.

SEC. 11. That the said commission may at any time, upon complaint of any person or corporation, or upon its own initiative, or upon the request of the Attorney General, or of the corporation affected, investigate any corporation subject to the provisions of this act, for the purpose of determining whether such corporation has been guilty of a violation of the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, or under sections 73 to 77, inclusive, of an "Act to reduce taxation," etc., which became a law August 27, 1894, or of any of the provisions of this act, and may hold such hearings and take such evidence as it may deem necessary; and in case the commission shall find that such corporation has been guilty of a violation of the provisions of said acts or of this act it shall make a finding, stating the facts and prescribing the acts, transactions, and readjustments necessary in order that said corporation may thereafter comply with the terms of said acts and of this act, and shall transmit a copy of the said finding in full to such corporation. If within 60 days after transmitting said finding, or such extension thereof as shall be given by the commission, the corporation shall not have complied with the terms of the finding, and shall not have performed the acts prescribed as necessary to make it comply with the said acts or with this act, the commission shall report the fact of noncompliance to the Attorney General, together with a copy of such finding, for his action under the said acts or of this act. But the commission may, if it deems it proper, report the facts to the Attorney General without calling upon such corporation for compliance with said acts or with this act.

Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to prevent or interfere with the Attorney General in enforcing the provisions of the act to protect commerce, etc., approved July 2, 1890.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. BRISTOW submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $500 to pay the expenses incurred in connection with the death of and transportation to the place of interment of the body of Charles Woodyard, of Baldwin, Kans., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GORE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $300,000 in aid of the common schools in the Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Seminole Nations in Oklahoma during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 39), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized during the Sixty-third Congress to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for its use, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee or any subcommittee thereof may sit during the sessions of the Senate.

SUBWAY ELECTRIC MONORAIL.

Mr. STONE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 41), which was read and referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and is hereby, directed to inquire and report to the Senate under and by what authority the so-called electric monorail passing through the subway connecting the Capitol with the Senate Office Building was constructed, the cost to the Government of the construction, and such other information as may be necessary to fully advise the Senate with respect to the premises.

2. That said committee inquire and report to the Senate whether some other methods of conveyance than those now in operation between said Office Building and the Capitol, more economical and comfortable, can not be provided, or whether all conveyances for that purpose should not be discontinued.

PAINT CREEK COAL FIELDS, WEST VIRGINIA.

Mr. KERN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 37), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That a committee of three Members of the Senate be appointed by the President of the Senate to make a thorough and complete investigation of the conditions existing in the Paint Creek coal fields of West Virginia for the purpose of ascertaining—

First. Whether or not a system of peonage is maintained in said coal fields.

Second. Whether or not access to post offices is prevented, and if so, by whom.

Third. Whether or not the immigration laws of this country are being violated, and if so, by whom.

Fourth. If any or all of those conditions exist, the causes leading up to such conditions.

Fifth. Whether or not the Commissioner of Labor, or any other official or officials of the Government, can be of service in adjusting such strike.

Sixth. Whether or not parties are being convicted and punished in violation of the laws of the United States.

Said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby empowered to sit and act during the session or recess of Congress, or of either House thereof, at such time and place as it may deem necessary; to require by subpœna or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of papers, books, and documents; to employ stenographers to take and make a record of all evidence taken and received by the committee and keep a record of its proceedings; to have such evidence, record, and other matter required by the committee printed and suitably bound; and to employ such assistance as may be deemed necessary. The chairman of the committee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses. Subpœnas for witnesses shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee thereof. The claim that any testimony or evidence given may tend to incriminate the person giving such evidence shall not excuse such witness from testifying, but such evidence or testimony shall not be used against such person on the trial of any criminal proceedings except in prosecuting for perjury committed in giving such testimony. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any questions pertinent to the investigation herein authorized, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 nor less than $100 and imprisonment in a common jail for not more than one year nor less than one month, as provided in section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The expenses thereof shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers ordered by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERKS.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 38), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committees on Coast and Insular Survey; on Enrolled Bills; on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture; on Expenditures in the Departments of Commerce and Labor; on Expenditures in the Department of State; on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game; on National Banks; on Public Health and National Quarantine; on Woman Suffrage; to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service; on Indian Depredations; on the Mississippi River and its Tributaries; on Pacific Railroads; and on Transportation and Sale of Meat Products be, and they are hereby, authorized to employ one assistant clerk each, at $1,440 per annum, to be paid from "Miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 40), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for its use; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate; and that expenses contracted hereunder shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

PROHIBITION OF SMOKING IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

Mr. TILLMAN. I submit the following resolution, which I ask may be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 42), as follows:

Resolved, That Rule XXXIV be amended as follows:

Strike out the period at the end of the first clause and insert a semicolon, and then add the following: "no smoking shall be permitted at any time on the floor of the Senate, or lighted cigars be brought into the Chamber."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As the resolution proposes to amend the rules, it will lie over.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules, as there is a similar resolution pending before that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution can only be so referred by unanimous consent. The Chair understands the Senator from North Carolina to ask unanimous consent that the resolution be referred as he requests. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SILK INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 3).

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a brief article, taken from the New York Commercial of April 10, 1913, on the silk industry in the United States, which I ask shall be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire presents a paper which he asks unanimous consent may be printed as a public document. Unless there is objection, such will be the order. The Chair hears none.

PUBLICATION OF CRIMES AND ACCIDENTS.

Mr. WORKS. I desire to give notice that on next Thursday, immediately after the conclusion of the routine morning business, I shall submit some remarks on clean and reliable journalism, in support of the bill (S. 496) making it unlawful to publish details of crimes and accidents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, morning business is closed. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a former day, which the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 36) submitted by Mr. OVERMAN on the 9th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the United States Civil Service Commission be, and they are hereby, directed to furnish to the Senate the following information:

The laws, orders, and regulations by which the civil-service system was established and has been extended in the United States.

The number of employees and officers of the United States now employed in the different departments of the Government appointed through, and subject to, the civil-service law and regulations.

The number and names of the employees and officers of the United States now employed in the different departments of the Government who have been covered into the classified service by virtue of Executive orders since the passage of the civil-service law, together with the date and copy of each order.

The number and names of persons now in the classified civil service from each State and Territory and the District of Columbia, particularly the number of persons in the classified civil service from each State and Territory and the District of Columbia as differentiated from the number of such persons who have been appointed, also number and names of persons temporarily employed as differentiated from permanent employees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. As suggested by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] when this resolution was last before the Senate, I do not think, as I then said, that it exactly covers the point that the Senator from Virginia then made. I therefore move to amend the resolution, on page 2, by adding, after the word "employees," in line 8, the following:

The number of civil-service employees who have been promoted for causes other than upon their records for efficiency.

The number and names of laborers who have been promoted to clerkships without regard to their records for efficiency to do clerical work.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments proposed by the Senator from North Carolina will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the resolution, the following words:

The number of civil-service employees who have been promoted for causes other than upon their records for efficiency.

The number and names of laborers who have been promoted to clerkships without regard to their records for efficiency to do clerical work.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the resolution the object of obtaining the names as well as the number of these employees and also to ask him whether he has considered the size and the number of volumes that it will take to print all the names for which he calls in the resolution? It seems to me, if I have any understanding about the number of these employees, that it will take a good many volumes to print the names and to distinguish one class from another. I do not understand that there is any provision contained in the resolution for an appropriation to cover that expense or for the extra clerks who will be required to compile the information.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the Civil Service Commission has been busy since this resolution has been introduced, and I think the Senate ought to "call the bluff." I send to the desk a letter sent here by the Civil Service Commission, in which they say that to obtain this information will cost about $29,000. If it does cost $29,000, or if it costs even $50,000, I think Senators ought to know the facts. I think everybody wants to know them. In order to do justice to the Civil Service Commission, I ask that the letter of its president be read and that the accompanying exhibits be printed in the RECORD, together with the letter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the letter which he sends to the desk may be read and that the accompanying exhibits be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the letter, as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1913.

Hon. LEE S. OVERMAN,
United States Senate.

SIR: The commission notes with concern certain features of S. Res. 36, regarding the executive civil service. Some of the information can be readily supplied, and the commission is desirous of affording all the information possible. The furnishing of the laws, orders, and regulations by which the civil-service system was established and has been extended is a matter of ready compilation. The number of employees and officers now employed in the different departments of the Government appointed through and subject to civil-service laws and regulations is printed in the appendix of the commission's twenty-ninth report. (See Exhibit A, herewith.)

The commission has published in its annual reports, as required by the civil-service act, the name of each employee appointed in the classified service by Executive order, waiving any requirement of the rules in his behalf, and these names and Executive orders can be readily furnished. If, however, it is the intention of the last two paragraphs of the resolution to call for the names of all persons in the classified service, by States, who owe their appointment to examination under the civil-service rules, as distinguished from those who were already in the service when the rules were extended to cover their positions, the preparation of this information for 297,472 individuals will be a task of great magnitude, similar in extent and fully equal in cost to the preparation and printing of the Official Register, for which it was necessary in 1909 to expend $28,489.20 for clerical work, and for which a large number of clerks were required to perform the necessary compilation, this being exclusive of the cost of printing the Register, which was $27,487.76 additional. The percentage of persons in the classified service who entered the service without examination is rapidly diminishing, now being 21.4 per cent. The commission in its twenty-ninth report, now in press, is presenting tables (Exhibit A) showing by States and departments, in Washington and elsewhere, the number and per cent of classified employees now in the service who entered the service through examination and through classification.

The civil-service act of January 16, 1883, classified clerks at $1,200, $1,400, $1,600, and $1,800 in the several departments and employees in post offices and customhouses having as many as 50 employees, a total of less than 14,000. This was the original extent of the classified service. When the act took effect every one of the employees was covered into the classified service without examination under the civil-service act of 1883, and this has been true of every classification since that time. The per cent of persons in the classified service who were appointed through examination for several years was very small, but has gradually increased, until now 78.6 per cent of all those in the classified service have entered through competitive examination under the civil-service act and by this commission, the per cent at Washington being 66.3 and elsewhere 80.2, and this process continued will in a few years make the number of persons in the service without examination negligible. The commission transmits herewith a statement showing the various extensions of the classified service and the number of persons brought into the service without examination by each such extension. (See Exhibit B.)

The commission begs your indulgence in one particular. Its entire force is now working an hour beyond the regular office hours, owing to the pressure of work. Work of the commission, which should be strictly current, is now months in arrears. It is hoped that if this additional information shall be called for your resolution will carry some appropriation for a temporary force, to enable the commission to give the desired information in a satisfactory manner, without embarrassing it in the performance of its regular duties.

By direction of the commission:
Very respectfully,

JOHN C. BLACK, *President.*

DEAR SENATOR: We will do all we can and as soon as we can; but you should know our predicament and you can then decide whether you wish to push the resolution in its present shape or otherwise.

Truly, yours,

JOHN C. BLACK.

The exhibits referred to are as follows:

EXHIBIT A.

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES WHO ENTERED THE SERVICE BY EXAMINATION AND CLASSIFICATION.

From July 16, 1883, to the present time appointments to vacancies in the classified service have been through competitive examinations; but the persons occupying positions at the date of their classification have been covered into the classified service. For many years the number appointed through examination amounted to a very small share of the entire service, but has steadily increased until now the official force is mainly composed of those who were appointed through examination.

On February 15, 1912, according to service-record cards in the files of the commission, there were 224,665 employees in the competitive

classified service. Of these 176,666, or 78.6 per cent, entered through examination, and 47,999, or 21.4 per cent, entered through classification. The number of employees in Washington was 25,860, of whom 17,150, or 66.3 per cent, were appointed through examination, and the number outside of Washington was 198,805, of whom 159,516, or 80.2 per cent, were appointed through examination and 19.8 per cent through classification. These figures indicate that over three-fourths of all classified competitive employees at present in the service entered through competitive examination, two-thirds of those in Washington and four-fifths of those outside having entered thus.

The Civil Service Commission leads all Government establishments in Washington in the matter of employees who entered the service through examination, 88.5 per cent having so entered. The Interstate Commerce Commission follows with 82.8 per cent; Department of Agriculture, 78.8 per cent; Navy Department, 74.8 per cent; Post Office Department, 70.3 per cent; Treasury Department, 69.1 per cent; Interior Department, 67.9 per cent; Isthmian Canal Commission, 67.1 per cent; State, War, and Navy Department Building, 62 per cent; Department of Justice, 61.4 per cent; State Department, 60 per cent; Department of Commerce and Labor, 57.3 per cent; Government Printing Office, 56.2 per cent; Smithsonian Institution, 53.2 per cent; and War Department, 52.7 per cent.

Outside of Washington the Interstate Commerce Commission has 97.1 per cent who entered through examination; Agriculture, 90.9 per cent; Civil Service Commission, 86.4 per cent; Post Office, 82.5 per cent; Navy, 80.5 per cent; Interior, 79.5 per cent; War, 75 per cent; Commerce and Labor, 69.7 per cent; Treasury, 66.7 per cent; Isthmian Canal Commission, 58.3 per cent; and Justice, 49 per cent.

Considering the Washington and field branches of each department and independent office in their entirety, the percentages of employees appointed through examination are as follows: Civil Service Commission, 88; Agriculture, 87.6; Interstate Commerce Commission, 86.8; Post Office, 82.3; Navy 78.9; Interior, 74.5; War, 72.9; Treasury, 67.4; Commerce and Labor, 66.4; State, War, and Navy, 62; Isthmian Canal Commission, 59; Government Printing Office, 56.1; Smithsonian Institution, 53.3; Justice, 52.7.

The following table contains more extended information regarding the methods by which the present employees of the Government entered the service:

Statement showing by departments and independent offices, in Washington, D. C., and outside, the number and per cent of competitive classified employees in the service Feb. 15, 1912, who entered by examination and by classification.

IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Department or office.	Examination.		Classification.		Total.
	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	
State	117	60.0	78	40.0	195
Treasury	4,828	69.1	2,163	30.9	6,991
War	896	52.7	805	47.3	1,701
Navy	709	74.8	239	25.2	948
Post Office	1,630	70.3	690	29.7	2,320
Interior	3,319	67.9	1,569	32.1	4,888
Justice	127	61.4	80	38.6	207
Agriculture	1,713	78.8	461	21.2	2,174
Commerce and Labor	965	57.3	719	42.7	1,684
Interstate Commerce Commission	376	82.8	78	17.2	454
Isthmian Canal Commission	57	67.1	28	32.9	85
Civil Service Commission	138	88.5	18	11.5	156
Waterways Commission			1		1
Government Printing Office	2,012	56.2	1,571	43.8	3,583
Smithsonian Institution	183	53.2	161	46.8	344
State, War, and Navy Building	80	62.0	49	38.0	129
Total	17,150	66.3	8,710	33.7	25,860

OUTSIDE WASHINGTON, D. C.

Treasury	10,879	66.7	5,440	33.3	16,319
War	12,167	75.0	4,055	25.0	16,222
Navy	1,988	80.5	483	19.5	2,471
Post Office	119,769	82.5	25,363	17.5	145,132
Interior	5,084	79.5	1,313	20.5	6,397
Justice	238	40.9	248	51.0	486
Agriculture	5,346	90.9	534	9.1	5,880
Commerce and Labor	3,215	69.7	1,398	30.3	4,613
Interstate Commerce Commission	169	97.1	5	2.9	174
Isthmian Canal Commission	622	58.3	444	41.7	1,066
Civil Service Commission	38	86.4	6	13.6	44
Smithsonian Institution	1				1
Total	159,516	80.2	39,289	19.8	198,805

ENTIRE SERVICE.

State	117	60.0	78	40.0	195
Treasury	15,707	67.4	7,603	32.6	23,310
War	13,063	72.9	4,860	27.1	17,923
Navy	2,697	78.9	722	21.1	3,419
Post Office	121,399	82.3	26,053	17.7	147,452
Interior	8,403	74.5	2,882	25.5	11,285
Justice	365	52.7	328	47.3	693
Agriculture	7,059	87.6	995	12.4	8,054
Commerce and Labor	4,180	66.4	2,117	33.6	6,297
Interstate Commerce Commission	545	86.8	83	13.2	628
Isthmian Canal Commission	679	59.0	472	41.0	1,151
Civil Service Commission	176	88.0	24	12.0	200
Waterways Commission			1		1
Government Printing Office	2,012	56.1	1,571	43.9	3,583
Smithsonian Institution	184	53.3	161	46.7	345
State, War, and Navy Building	80	62.0	49	38.0	129
Total	176,666	78.6	47,999	21.4	224,665

EXHIBIT B.

EXTENSIONS OF THE CLASSIFIED SERVICE SINCE JAN. 16, 1883.

PRESIDENT ARTHUR.

Jan. 16, 1883, to Mar. 3, 1885.

(Approximate.)

Classified by the first order of classification	13,924
Extensions of classification	1,449
By growth of the service to Mar. 3, 1885—4 post offices, each attaining 50 employees	200
Number of places classified Mar. 3, 1885	15,575

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND (FIRST TERM).

Mar. 4, 1885, to Mar. 3, 1889.

Extensions of classification:	
United States Civil Service Commission, Mar. 1, 1888	8
Revisions of departmental classifications, June 29, 1888	1,931
Railway Mail Service, Dec. 31, 1888, to take effect May 1, 1889	5,320
By growth of the service, 1885 to 1889:	
16 post offices, each attaining 50 employees	800
Miscellaneous growth	3,698
Number of places classified Mar. 3, 1889	27,330

PRESIDENT HARRISON.

Mar. 4, 1889, to Mar. 3, 1893.

Extensions of classification:	
School employees and physicians, Indian service, Apr. 13, 1891	626
United States Fish Commission, May 5, 1892	140
Weather Bureau, Jan. 5, 1893	314
548 free-delivery post offices, Jan. 5, 1893	7,610
By growth of the service, 1889 to 1893:	
10 post offices, each attaining 50 employees	500
Other miscellaneous growth	1,345
Number of places classified Mar. 3, 1893	37,865

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND (SECOND TERM).

Mar. 4, 1893, to Mar. 3, 1897.

Extensions of classification:	
In the Department of Agriculture (Bureau of Animal Industry and Weather Bureau), May 24, 1895	787
In the Department of the Interior, July 25, 1894	2
In the Post Office Department, Nov. 2 and Dec. 3, 1894	43
Messengers and watchmen in all departments, Nov. 2, 1894	868
Firemen in all departments, June 15, 1895	94
Census employees (act of Congress of Mar. 4, 1895)	90
Internal-Revenue Service, Dec. 12 1894	2,939
Government Printing Office, June 13, 1895	2,709
Pension agencies, July 15, 1895	505
Indian service at large, May 11, 1894	89
Customhouse service, Nov. 2, 1894	1,527
Indian agency and school employees, Mar. 20, 1896	743
Revision of rules of May 6, 1896—	
Executive office	21
Civil Service Commission—	
Laborers performing classified duty	2
State Department—	
Laborers performing classified duty	7
Allotment force under superintendent State, War, and Navy Department Building	17
Treasury Department—	
Laborers performing classified duty	192
Mints and assay offices	828
Revenue-Cutter Service	161
Life-Saving Service	1,992
Lighthouse Service	2,270
Marine-Hospital Service	451
Steamboat-Inspection Service	151
Subtreasuries	260
Immigration Service	161
Special Treasury agents	36
Special customs inspectors	56
Chinese inspectors	36
Immigrant inspectors	71
Shipping commissioners	54
Special Treasury employees	33
Field force, Coast Survey	46
Internal-revenue agents	20
Custodian and janitor service	704
Construction of public buildings	112
Internal-Revenue Service, deputy collectors	899
Miscellaneous positions	201
War Department—	
Laborers performing classified duty and miscellaneous	270
Engineer Department at large	4,377
Ordnance Department at large	1,389
Civilian employees at Army and department headquarters	173
Various military park commissions	58
With Medical, Subsistence, and Quartermaster's Departments	492
Department of Justice—	
Laborers performing classified duty and miscellaneous (including 98 assistant attorneys excepted from examination)	121
Penitentiary, Fort Leavenworth, Kans	66
Clerks to district attorneys	57
Office deputy marshals and clerical assistants	204
Post Office Department—	
Mail-bag repair shop	157
Mail-lock repair shop	49
Laborers performing classified duty	25
Navy Department—	
Laborers performing classified duty and miscellaneous	119
Clerks at navy yards and naval stations	701
Naval Academy	12
Navy pay officers	32

Extensions of classification—Continued.
Revision of rules of May 6, 1896—Continued.
Navy Department—Continued.

Marine Corps	13
Increase of Navy	63
Interior Department—	
Laborers performing classified duty	96
District land offices	199
Offices of surveyors general	216
Alaska school service	32
Architect of Capitol force	65
Government Hospital for the Insane	455
Freedmen's Hospital	70
Miscellaneous offices	92
Indian Service	3,278
Pension examining surgeons	4,120
Department of Agriculture—	
Laborers performing classified duty	98
Miscellaneous	17
Department of Labor—	
Laborers performing clerical duty	3
Fish Commission—	
Laborers performing classified duty	15
Miscellaneous	4
Interstate Commerce Commission	137
Smithsonian Institution	227
Post Office service	449
Government Printing service, laborers performing classified duty	10
Internal-Revenue Service	310
By growth of the service:	
26 post offices given free delivery	67
2 customs ports attaining 20 employees	52
Miscellaneous growth	1,394
Number of places classified Mar. 3, 1897	76,826

PRESIDENT M'KINLEY.

Mar. 4, 1897, to Sept. 13, 1901.

Extensions of classification:	
Classification on July 27, 1897, of customs ports having less than 5 employees	57
Classification of men enlisted to man and equip vessels in the Coast and Geodetic Survey (act of June 6, 1900, and regulations)	54
Additions of positions and employees properly subject to classification, but omitted from original lists	191
Temporary employees in Navy Department made permanent under special rule of Jan. 20, 1899	134
Temporary employees serving on May 29, 1899, and made permanent by Executive order of that date	1,221
Yeomen in Navy Department classified under special rule May 24, 1900	26
Employees of Florida board of health transferred to Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service Aug. 1, 1901	32
By growth of the service:	
War Department, Porto Rico, clerks and messengers, May 1, 1900	17
Treasury Department, Porto Rico, May 1, 1900	172
Post Office Department—	
Classified in new building at Washington, D. C., by adoption of positions	23
241 post offices given free delivery from Mar. 3, 1897, to June 30, 1901, estimated number	1,596
3 post offices in Porto Rico given free delivery May 1, 1900	54
Engineer Department, classification of employees of Monongahela Navigation Co by transfer of property to the Government	69
Total classified to Sept. 13, 1901	80,472
Deductions by withdrawal from classification	385
	80,087

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT.

Sept. 14, 1901, to Mar. 3, 1909.

Field services, War Department, reincluded Nov. 18, 1901	1,888
Rural Free Delivery Service, clerks, route inspectors, special agents, messengers, etc., Nov. 27, 1901	342
Rural Free Delivery Service, carriers	6,009
Temporary war emergency employees transferred to classified service by act of Congress, Apr. 28, 1902	850
Census Office employees classified July 1, 1902, by act of Mar. 6, 1902	837
Temporary employees at insular naval stations absolutely appointed, Feb. 11, 1903	34
Positions made competitive by revision of the rules on Apr. 15, 1903	118
Employees in post offices given free delivery from July 1, 1901, to Mar. 3, 1900	1,658
One clerk to act for each pension agent during his absence, made competitive Aug. 10, 1903	18
War Department employees in Philippines classified under order of Mar. 1, 1904	430
Employees made competitive by consolidation of small post offices	28
Indian agents classified under Rule II, section 9	29
Employees of Isthmian Canal Commission, order of Nov. 15, 1904	562
Substitute watchmen, Government Printing Office, order of Nov. 29, 1904	46
Forest Service, General Land Office, Dec. 17, 1904	548
Laborers assigned to classified duties, orders of Jan. 12 and Mar. 30, 1905	1,283
Laborers classified in field services, order of Feb. 24, 1906	1,051
Cashiers, deputy collectors, and deputy naval officers in the Customs Service, Nov. 23, 1904	426
Employees of the Juneau customhouse, Jan. 24, 1905	29
Special agents and inspectors, Land Service, Mar. 3, 1905	90
Cashiers and finance clerks in post offices, Mar. 30, 1905	353
Employees of the Immigration Service in contiguous foreign territory, Mar. 31, 1905	157
Skilled laborers to act as messengers in lieu of laborers in the General Land Office, appropriated for by legislative act of Mar. 13, 1904	6
Special agents of Census Office specifically transferred by above act	13
The deficiencies act, approved Mar. 3, 1905, made appropriation for employment in the Indian Office of five persons who had been paid out of tribal funds of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations	5
Others transferred by act of Congress	5
Feeders in mints treated as classified at request of department	10
Detailed enlisted men, continued as civilians	3
Officers of a chartered cutter retained when a Government cutter went into commission	2
Employees of Indian warehouses, Nov. 11, 1905	34
Assistant assayers, Dec. 7, 1905	11
Employees of fifth internal-revenue district of North Carolina, June 21, 1906	70
By change from contract to regular employment in Post Office Department	1
Laborers doing classified work in Bureau of Fisheries, July 17, 1906	55
Deputy collectors of internal revenue transferred from excepted to competitive class, Nov. 7, 1906	1,099
Laborers in Boston customhouse, May 10, 1907	33
Clerks in quartermaster's department at Honolulu, June 26, 1907	2
By appropriations under new designations for laborers	22
Clothing examiners, Philadelphia, Quartermaster's Department, order of Sept. 23, 1907	2
Employees in Geological Survey, order of Dec. 7, 1907	136
Chief clerks, weigh clerks, assistant melters and refiners, and assistant coiners, Mint and Assay Service, transferred to competitive class Feb. 4, 1908	23
Physicians retained when State quarantine stations came under national control	4
Persons appointed under exceptions from examination under denatured-alcohol act, classified by expiration of exception	102
Employees in purchasing department, Isthmian Canal Commission, Oct. 3, 1908	8
Employees appointed without examination, under misapprehension, order of Oct. 9, 1908:	
Union Agency service	129
Additional farmers	127
Employees of the Five Civilized Tribes Commission	112
National park employees	41
Transcribers of records and plats, General Land Office	27
Employees in penitentiaries	32
Clerks in offices of district attorneys	32
Miscellaneous	27
Positions excepted under paragraph 11, Subdivision VI of Schedule A, decreased from five to three, Nov. 30, 1908	2
Fourth-class postmasters made competitive by amendment of paragraph 4, Subdivision V of Schedule A, Nov. 30, 1908	15,488
Army Transport Service, Dec. 3, 1908	117
Order of Aug. 12, 1907	2
Office deputy marshals, Mar. 2, 1909	175
Classification by change in status of position	2
Penitentiary, Fort Leavenworth, under order of May 29, 1899	5
3 clerks and 9 additional members of the Board of Pension Appeals, Interior Department, classified by act approved May 22, 1908	12
By consolidation of mission school with Uintah School	5
Number of places classified Mar. 3, 1909	114,853

PRESIDENT TAFT.

Classification by act of Congress in effect July 1, 1909:	
Engineer, schooner *Grampus*	1
Attendant, Military Academy	1
Consolidation of Jemez mission school with Government day school	2
Under order of May 6, 1896	1
Under order of Feb. 24, 1906	3
Orders of Jan. 12 and Mar. 30, 1905	3
By change in status of positions	4
Order of June 26, 1907, Honolulu	2
Laborers classified as watchmen in the New York customhouse (order of June 29, 1909)	153
Laborers classified as laborers in New York customhouse (order of Aug 5, 1909)	29
Extension of city delivery service to post offices from Mar. 4, 1909, to June 30, 1909	136
Same from June 30, 1909, to June 30, 1910, 55 post offices	162
Classification by changes in appropriation acts	5
Oilers in Quartermaster's Department at Large (order July 28, 1909)	23
Private secretaries and cashiers in assay offices (order Apr. 4, 1910)	15
Solicitor to the collector at the port of New York	1
Laborer classified in the New York customhouse (order Aug. 8, 1910)	1
Laborers classified in New York customhouse (order Sept. 14, 1910)	29
Positions of assistant postmasters in post offices classified under order of Sept. 30, 1910, effective Dec. 1, 1910	2,229
Positions of clerks in post offices classified under order last above	1,344
Positions of substitute clerks classified under same order	205
Classification in Philippines under order of Mar. 1, 1904	5
Laborers classified under order of Mar. 30, 1905	3
Laborers classified under order of Feb. 24, 1906	7
Classification under order of Oct. 9, 1908	3
Classification by consolidation of mission school with Indian school	2
Classification by increase of pay	15
Office of deputy classified under order of Mar. 2, 1909	1
Classified for long and meritorious service over seas under order Aug. 12, 1907	2
Permanent appointment, under order of May 29, 1899	1
Classification under order of May 6, 1896	5
Classification by adoption of position	1
By extension of city delivery to 11 post offices, 1910, Dec. 1 to June 30	36

Clerks in charge of stations (post office), amendment May 26, 1911	55
Paymasters, customs, New York, amendment June 12, 1911	2
Skilled laborer instead of driver, office Secretary of Commerce and Labor (legislative act Mar. 4, 1911)	1
Clerks to superintendents, Life-Saving Service, sundry civil act Mar 4, 1911 (Min. Aug. 9, 1911)	12
Army Transport Service, order Dec. 3, 1908 (Min. Mar. 15, 1911)	1
Positions paid from tribal funds, Indian Service, classified under order of Oct. 9, 1908 (Min. June 28, 1911), about	1,000
Classification by adoption of position:	
Sacred Heart Mission School (Min. Oct. 5, 1911)	7
St. Patrick's Mission School (Min. Nov. 18, 1911)	11
Public Health Service, Louisiana Quarantine (Min. Apr. 27, 1912)	1
Coast and Geodetic Survey, switchboard operator (Min. May 27, 1911)	1
Classified for long and meritorious service over seas under order Aug. 12, 1907 (Min. Oct 11, 1911, and Jan. 4, 1912)	2
Classification, order Nov. 11, 1905, Indian warehouse (Min. Nov. 3, 1911)	1
Storekeeper under order Mar. 1, 1904 (Min. Nov. 7, 1911)	1
By consolidation of post office (Min. Apr. 2, 1912)	1
Change in appropriation and order of Aug. 24, 1912, State Department	14
Change in appropriation, superintendent of melting and refining in mints at Denver, Philadelphia, and San Francisco (act Aug. 23, 1912)	3
Special employees, Internal-Revenue Service (order Aug. 24, 1912)	52
Experts and agents, Agriculture, order Aug. 26, 1912	115
Fourth-class postmasters (order Oct. 15, 1912), about	36,236
Total additions under President Taft apart from growth	41,950
Withdrawals as below	391
Net additions to Oct. 16, 1912	41,559
Withdrawals from competitive class from Mar. 4, 1909, to Oct. 16, 1912.	
Chief law officer, Reclamation Service (Dec. 10, 1909)	1
Superintendent of construction, Corregidor, P. I. (July 9, 1909)	1
Chief post-office inspector (Jan. 4, 1910)	1
Additional special agents, Land Office (Aug. 6, 1909)	3
Temporary histopathologist, Government Hospital (Mar. 23, 1910)	1
Secretaries in military parks (Feb. 8, 1910)	2
Assistant secretary in military park (Apr. 12, 1910)	1
Scouts, buffalo keepers, and park rangers (Min. Jan. 11, Jan. 14, and Mar. 15, 1910)	31
All employees at leprosy station, Molokai, Hawaii (Sept. 24, 1909)	7
Laborers acting as openers and packers, Hawaii (July 12, 1910)	5
Field assistants for reconnoissance parties, Forest Service (Sept. 24, 1910), about	125
Specialist in higher education, Bureau of Education (July 1, 1910)	1
Temporary machinists in Census Office (order Dec. 29, 1909)	45
Paymasters' clerks acting as principal clerks to storekeepers at navy yards (Dec. 2, 1910)	12
Employees under the Navy Department:	
In Island of Guam (Jan. 26, 1911)	22
In Island of Samoa (Feb. 21, 1911)	3
Miners under Bureau of Mines (Jan. 30, 1911)	21
Clerks actually on duty with each assistant paymaster, United States Marine Corps (Apr. 3, 1911)	5
Assistant to secretary in office of Secretary of the Interior (Apr. 21, 1911)	1
Army paymasters' clerks given military status by Army act of Mar. 3, 1911 (Min. Oct. 17, 1911)	90
Recognition of classification withdrawn (Min. Jan. 9, 1912)	1
Inspectors with confidential duties, Interior Department (Apr. 10, 1912)	3
Clerk, District of Columbia sinking fund, not now regarded as in executive civil service (Min. Aug. 19, 1912)	1
Officers to aid in important drafting work, State Department (Aug. 24, 1912)	8
Total withdrawals	391

COMPARISON OF EXTENSIONS BY ADMINISTRATIONS.

President Arthur	15,573
President Cleveland	11,757
President Harrison	10,535
President Cleveland (second term)	38,961
President McKinley	3,261
President Roosevelt	34,766
President Taft to Oct. 16, 1912	41,559
Total	156,412

The above does not show the number of persons in the classified service, as increase by mere natural growth has not been included. The number of positions subject to examination as reported to June 30, 1912, was 236,061.

On December 7, 1912, the President classified navy yard artisans, the estimated number being 25,000.

As stated above, the number of positions subject to examination on June 30, 1912, was 236,061. Including the above extension, natural growth of the service, etc., the number at the present time (April 11, 1913) is about 300,000.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, it will be noted from that letter that most of the information asked for can be readily furnished without much expense. The only expense will be that involved in furnishing the names of some 297,000 persons, showing who they are, where they are located, and from what States they hail. I am told that a great many people are on the rolls claiming to be, for example, from North Carolina, who never saw North Carolina. If Senators could see the names of these persons they would know that they are not always charged to the right State, and that some of them are fraudulently there. I want to say that if one-tenth of what I have heard since I have introduced this resolution and what I have read from people who seem to know about the administration of the affairs of the civil service is true, it bears out the charge I have heard that its administration is a fraud. I do not make that charge; but I say if one-half that is said is so, there ought to be an investigation by the committee appointed to look into such matters, to wit, the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

It is said in the letter which has been read at the desk that it will cost $29,000 to furnish those names. That would be 10 cents a name. Some Senators know that we can secure the names of persons in our own States, where they are scattered all up and down the State, for about 1 cent each.

The names involved in this inquiry are right here on the records, and why it should cost 10 cents each merely to copy the names, I can not understand. I believe it can be done for $2,900, or a cent a name. That is the only difference between the commission and myself.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, does not the Senator realize that the information he is asking for really requires an inquiry as to the individuals named? It is not merely copying the names. If it merely involved copying a list of names you might get it for a cent a name.

Mr. OVERMAN. It only asks for the name and the State from which the employee is appointed; and that is on the record.

Mr. BRISTOW. And when he was appointed, and whether he took an examination.

Mr. OVERMAN. Well, that is all on the record.

Mr. BRISTOW. It will take some time to ascertain the facts in regard to the individual names.

Mr. OVERMAN. John Smith, North Carolina, examined so and so, and date; that is all that is required.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] is perfectly right; no doubt there will have to be an inquiry made as to every name. I know, so far as the State of Utah is concerned, that there are persons under the civil service and accredited to Utah who never saw Utah, just as in the case reported by the Senator of North Carolina and perhaps of every State in this Union; but if you will inquire you will find that such employees made affidavits that they were from those particular States. In such cases it will furnish no information to the Senate to have a copy of the records of the Civil Service Commission sent to it.

Mr. POMERENE. If I understood the Senator from Utah correctly, he stated that there were on this list, accredited to the State of Utah, the names of many persons who had never seen the State of Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; a few.

Mr. POMERENE. He also stated, if I understood him correctly, that this record was made up from affidavits which were filed. Do I understand the Senator to mean that false affidavits have been filed?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should have said that the applications, instead of the affidavits, showed that the persons were from those States. I really am not informed as to whether they are now required to make affidavits or whether they did make affidavits in years past as to whether they were from a particular State or not; but I do know that the applications require the name of the State in which they live.

Mr. POMERENE. Do I understand that men who are now occupying positions in the civil service have made applications in which they have made misstatements as to the facts?

Mr. SMOOT. I so understand, and understand that that is the case in all of the States. Therefore, Mr. President, if this information is given just as shown by the records, it will not convey to the Senate the information it desires. There will have to be an investigation of all the names to find out whether the statements as to residence are true or are not true.

Mr. OVERMAN. We can make an investigation after we get the names and know who they are and see them on the rolls.

Another thing, if the Senator will permit me. It will be a very easy matter for the Civil Service Commission to comply with this resolution. It is not going to require all of this expense. They can send to the heads of the departments for the information. They can send to the Navy Department, for example, and the Navy Department in 24 hours or in a week can furnish them the name of every person in that department, without any expense to the Civil Service Commission. They have the records also. So it is not going to cost all this amount, in

my opinion. I do not believe it will cost over $2,000. But suppose it does cost $50,000?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I desire the Senator to yield simply for a suggestion. While it may be true that, in response to this resolution, we would not get information that would be accurate or correct, because it might appear from the rolls that A, B, C, and D were accredited to Utah and did not belong to Utah, we would still acquire some very valuable information, to wit, that A, B, C, and D were guilty of falsehood and misrepresentation in order to procure an office. Does not the Senator agree with me that any man who is guilty of that sort of conduct is unworthy of office and ought to be discharged for cause at once?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if I had not been interrupted but had been allowed to proceed, I should have stated frankly that I do not care whether this information costs $29,000 or more. I am not complaining as to its cost. It certainly ought to be investigated. I think, however, that in the annual report that will be made by the commission all the information asked for in the resolution will be furnished, with perhaps the exception of the 294,000 names. As this will require the expenditure of money, the resolution ought to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Not at all, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution on its face does not call for the expenditure of any money.

Mr. OVERMAN. Not a dollar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Some such information as that may be communicated to the Senate by the committee to which it is referred. There is nothing on the face of it, however, that calls for the expenditure of public money. It may be that the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment may find they can make the investigation without the expenditure of any money. However, that is a matter for the Senate. Before any money is taken out of the Treasury, the resolution, or some application for action under it, must be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator from Utah knows very well that if there is a deficiency it can be cared for in an appropriation bill. That is the way those things are done. If information comes from the heads of departments that they have not sufficient funds to carry out the orders of Congress, the Appropriations Committee investigates it and gives them a sufficient amount to cover the matter.

Mr. SMOOT. That does happen every year, Mr. President; there is no question about that. But this is a resolution that is offered in the Senate, and its adoption is asked without reference to a committee, I understand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, if the resolution were going to the appropriate committee I would not have anything more to say; but if the adoption of the resolution is asked, I think the question ought to be decided as to whether it should not go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that the request for immediate consideration was made when the resolution was introduced, and at the suggestion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] it went over, and it now comes up regularly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is properly before the Senate now, having come over from Wednesday. The Senator from North Carolina has offered sundry amendments, which have been read to the Senate. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendments. I only want to suggest that the resolution as drawn makes no draft upon the contingent fund of the Senate. It requires the Civil Service Commission to furnish certain information. If that necessitates the expenditure of money, it will be provided in an appropriation bill. It has nothing to do with the contingent fund of the Senate. It would not go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate in any event.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I think a statement ought to be made in this connection. The presentation of this resolution, of which I am in favor, and especially the discussion of it, might be construed as a reflection upon the Civil Service Commission. The RECORD is quite generally read; and I think the statement ought to be put in the RECORD now that the commission are in no way to blame for the fact that clerks are accredited to States to which they do not belong. That is not a matter for the commission to investigate. They take the application; they accept as correct the statement as to residence. While we all understand that, the public might not. For that reason I make this statement for the RECORD, so that no criticism may attach to the commission on that account.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am so thoroughly in sympathy with the general purpose of the resolution that I hesitate even to express a dissent from the part now under debate. I think there is no subject that more imperatively demands a revision than the law which relates to the executive civil service.

While I was chairman of the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment I spent some time in an effort to codify the law upon the subject. It is in dire confusion; and I applaud the attempt on the part of the Senator from North Carolina to bring some order out of the chaos that now exists.

I want very much to see the law so amended that the Executive shall not have the power either to exempt any individual from the operation of the civil-service law or to cover classes into the civil service. That ought to be determined by the law. It is a power that never ought to have been delegated to the Executive.

I trust, therefore, that there will be a persistent and continuous effort made to correct the law in this respect and bring it into harmony with its original spirit.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I believe it never has been contended that the civil-service law gives the Executive that power; but it is found in some other statute, to which I can not refer the Senator at the present moment.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from New Hampshire is quite right about that.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have read that statute several times, and I have been constrained to feel that there may well be some question as to whether it gives the sweeping power that Presidents have exercised in putting into the classified service thousands and thousands of men and women who underwent no examination.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have the gravest doubt about it, and I always have had; but, nevertheless, it is a power that has been exercised many times in the past. I have no doubt that from the standpoint of the Executive it was exercised for the public good; but so long as we have ordained a competitive civil service, Congress ought to declare what classes of employees shall be drawn into it.

The difficulty with regard to the distribution of appointments in the civil service has not been the fault of the Civil Service Commission. Until within two years the applicant was not required to hold an actual residence in the State from which he made his application and to which he was accredited. About two years ago—possibly three years ago—the law was amended so as to require actual residence of a year in the State from which the applicant alleged that he came, and there has been no real difficulty since that time.

I rose primarily to say that I hope the Senator from North Carolina will reflect upon the value of the 300,000 names sought by this resolution. It will cost a great deal of money; but that is not the real objection I have to it. It is a list that changes every day, every month, and it will be of no consequence at all within a very short time after it is received.

From my examination of the subject, I think the Senator from North Carolina can reach every point which he desires to reach, and which I hope he will reach, without asking for the names of all the employees in the classified civil service.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Iowa says. If he will draw an amendment which will carry out his idea and mine, and give us the information which we desire without calling for these names, I shall certainly accept it and be glad to have it adopted. I do not want to expend money unnecessarily; and if the Senator will suggest how it can be done at less cost, I shall be obliged to him.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I simply wish to ask a question. Is it not the purpose to send the resolution to a committee, after the amendment offered to it by the Senator is accepted, so that

amendments like that of the Senator from Iowa may be considered and it may be reported back here after some deliberation by the committee? It seems to me that that ought to be done, because of the importance of the subject and the necessity for using care in the phraseology of the resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not see why we can not perfect the resolution here, Mr. President. The Senator from Iowa has suggested that the desired result might be accomplished without spending this money; and if he can draw an amendment which will bring that about, I shall be glad to accept it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am not prepared to write, upon the moment, an amendment that I think would answer the object of the Senator from North Carolina. There are in the archives of the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment a great many papers that I think would be of value in reaching the point we all have in mind. While I hesitate to do it, I suggest a reference of the resolution to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment. I have no doubt that, after conference with the Senator from North Carolina, that committee could very speedily report a resolution that would accomplish all that we desire to accomplish.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Since a question has arisen as to the apportionment of the names to States from which the people did not come, I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina whether there is a law affecting that matter, and apportioning them to the States, so many to each? What is the rule on that subject?

Mr. OVERMAN. There is no rule about it. My idea is that when we have the information we shall see that hundreds and hundreds of men are now on the rolls by fraud that ought to be turned out because they got into the service in that way.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The specific point upon which I want information is this: In the apportionment of employees in the executive civil service are they apportioned to the several States by some rule or law?

Mr. OVERMAN. As the Senator from Iowa has said, three years ago we passed a law requiring that that should be done thereafter; but prior to three years ago it was not done.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. But now there is a law apportioning them according to the States?

Mr. OVERMAN. There is, now.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Therefore, if on referring to the roll we should find that certain individuals were accredited to States to which they did not belong, they would be removed from the roll, and that State would be given its quota of bona fide applicants?

Mr. OVERMAN. It would then be possible to correct the evil.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] was the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment; he knows more about this matter than any other individual on the floor of the Senate, and I adopt his suggestion. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina asks that the resolution, with the pending amendments, be referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the amendments I offered have not been adopted, and I should like to have that done before the resolution is referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They can be referred to the committee, together with the resolution, and be considered by it.

Mr. JONES. I desire to ask also that an amendment that I wanted to offer may be referred to the committee with the resolution. The amendment is, after the word "order," in line 16, to add "and the number affected by each order."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment suggested by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 16, after the word "order," it is proposed to insert:

And the number affected by each order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unless there is objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington will be referred to the same committee to which the resolution and the pending amendments have been referred. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY.

Mr. KERN. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it shall stand adjourned until next Tuesday, at 12 o'clock meridian.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed. What is the further pleasure of the Senate?

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, April 15, 1913, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 12, 1913.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Franklin P. Colcock, of South Carolina, to be collector of customs for the district of Beaufort, in the State of South Carolina, in place of Robert Smalls, whose term of office expired by limitation July 31, 1910.

Andrew H. Evans, of Texas, to be collector of customs for the district of Saluria, in the State of Texas. Mr. Evans was appointed under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

THIRD ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE.

Dudley Field Malone, of New York, to be Third Assistant Secretary of State, vice Chandler Hale, resigned.

COUNSELOR FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

John Bassett Moore, of New York, to be counselor for the Department of State, vice Chandler P. Anderson, resigned.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Rhydon M. Call, of Florida, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Florida, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice John M. Cheney, whose recess appointment expired March 4, 1913.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

J. L. Camp, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the western district of Texas, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Charles A. Boynton, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

William J. McDonald, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Texas, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice George H. Green, resigned.

John H. Rogers, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Bert J. McDowell, recess appointee, resigned.

MEMBER OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

Col. Lansing H. Beach, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as member of the Mississippi River Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1879, entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a Mississippi River Commission for the improvement of said river from the Head of the Passes near its mouth to its headwaters," vice Col. William T. Rossell, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be relieved.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICER.

Col. Hugh L. Scott, Third Cavalry, to be brigadier general from March 23, 1913, vice Brig. Gen. Edgar Z. Steever, retired from active service March 22, 1913.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be second lieutenants with rank from March 25, 1913.

Harold Melville Clark, of California.
Clarence Ferdinand Ellefson, of Wisconsin.
Harold Thompson, of Washington.
Richard Bronaugh Barnitz, of Texas.
Raymond Morris, of the District of Columbia.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Howard Eager, of Maine, to be second lieutenant, with rank from March 25, 1913.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be second lieutenants with rank from March 25, 1913.

John Charles Palmer Bartholf, of New York.
James Perry Cole, of Louisiana.
Robert Harwood Barrett, of Virginia.
Ernest Joseph Carr, of Minnesota.
Patrick James Hurley, of New Hampshire.
Colin Kingsley Lee, of Missouri.
Donald Robert McMillen, of Pennsylvania.
Hugh Broadus Keen, of Virginia.
Ora Mathias Baldinger, of Virginia.

CHAPLAIN.

Rev. William Richard Arnold, of Indiana, to be chaplain with the rank of first lieutenant from April 8, 1913, vice Chaplain Edward R. Chase, Thirteenth Infantry, who died December 26, 1912.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

SIGNAL CORPS.

Maj. George O. Squier, Signal Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from March 17, 1913, vice Lieut. Col. Frank Greene, retired from active service March 16, 1913.

Capt. Walter L. Clarke, Signal Corps, to be major from March 17, 1913, vice Maj. George O. Squier, promoted.

CAVALRY ARM.

Capt. Lawrence J. Fleming, Sixth Cavalry, to be major from March 16, 1913, vice Maj. Charles W. Farber, Eighth Cavalry, retired from active service March 15, 1913.

First Lieut. William E. W. MacKinlay, Eleventh Cavalry, to be captain from March 16, 1913, vice Capt. Lawrence J. Fleming, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Gordon Johnston, Fifteenth Cavalry, to be captain from March 27, 1913, vice Capt. Edwin A. Hickman, First Cavalry, detailed in the Signal Corps on that date.

Second Lieut. Verne R. Bell, First Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 16, 1913, vice First Lieut. William E. W. MacKinlay, Eleventh Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Henry W. Baird, Fifth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 27, 1913, vice First Lieut. Gordon Johnston, Fifteenth Cavalry, promoted.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Lucien G. Berry, Fourth Field Artillery, to be colonel from March 16, 1913, vice Col. Alexander B. Dyer, Fourth Field Artillery, retired from active service March 15, 1913.

Maj. William Lassiter, Field Artillery, unassigned, to be lieutenant colonel from March 16, 1913, vice Lieut. Col. Lucien G. Berry, Fourth Field Artillery, promoted.

Capt. Manus McCloskey, Third Field Artillery, to be major from March 16, 1913, vice Maj. Otho W. B. Farr, Fifth Field Artillery, detached from his proper command.

Charles Dudley Daly, late second lieutenant in the Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant of Field Artillery, with rank from March 5, 1913.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Capt. Albert G. Jenkins, Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from March 7, 1913, vice Maj. James A. Shipton, detached from his proper command. (This officer was nominated to the Senate March 10, 1913, for promotion with rank from March 2, 1913, and his nomination was confirmed March 15, 1913. This nomination is submitted for the purpose of correcting the date of rank of the nominee.)

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. John S. Parke, Infantry, unassigned, to be colonel from April 4, 1913, vice Col. Samuel W. Dunning, Infantry, unassigned, detached from his proper command.

Capt. Lewis S. Sorley, Fourteenth Infantry, to be major from March 11, 1913, vice Maj. Benjamin C. Morse, Infantry, unassigned, promoted.

Capt. William M. Morrow, Fifth Infantry, to be major from March 15, 1913, vice Maj. Dwight E. Holley, Eleventh Infantry, retired from active service March 14, 1913.

First Lieut. Ward Dabney, Twenty-first Infantry, to be captain from March 16, 1913, vice Capt. Arthur Cranston, Sixth Infantry, resigned March 15, 1913.

First Lieut. Paul M. Goodrich, Eleventh Infantry, to be captain from March 19, 1913, vice Capt. Wilson B. Burtt, Twentieth Infantry, detailed in the Signal Corps on that date.

First Lieut. Frank H. Kalde, Sixth Infantry, to be captain from April 3, 1913, vice Capt. Isaac A. Saxton, Twenty-sixth Infantry, retired from active service April 2, 1913.

First Lieut. William W. Taylor, jr., Twelfth Infantry, to be captain from April 5, 1913, vice Capt. Walter B. Elliott, Infantry, unassigned, retired from active service April 4, 1913.

Second Lieut. Charles L. Wyman, Twenty-eighth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 16, 1913, vice First Lieut. Ward Dabney, Twenty-first Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edward H. Teall, Twenty-sixth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 19, 1913, vice First Lieut. Paul M. Goodrich, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John W. Lang, Ninth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from April 3, 1913, vice First Lieut. Frank H. Kalde, Sixth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. George T. Everett, Fifteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from April 5, 1913, vice First Lieut. William W. Taylor, jr., Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

Richard Grady, a citizen of Maryland, to be a dental surgeon in the Navy for duty at the United States Naval Academy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 4th day of March, 1913, in accordance with a provision contained in an act of Congress approved on that date.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *April 14, 1913.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our heavenly Father, always present and ever ready to help those who seek Thy help, impart unto us plenteously of Thy grace, that with courage and fortitude we may live our convictions, according others the same right to think and act their convictions that we claim for ourselves; that with open minds and hearts we may give and take with perfect urbanity, and pass on to the larger life, in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 10, 1913, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER. There are certain Members here who desire to be sworn in. If they will present themselves, the oath of office will be administered to them.

Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. NELSON, Mr. SUMNERS, and Mr. GRAY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. WALLIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a paper, and ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a paper which the Chair undertands consists of certain tables touching the tariff question. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The tables referred to are as follows:

Tariff comparisons based on handbook issued by the Ways and Means Committee.

DYES.

	1890, Wilson bill.	1905, Dingley bill.	1910, Payne bill.	1912, Payne bill.	Underwood bill.
Average rate.....per cent.	25	30	30	30	30
Imports	$729,583	$1,690,549	$1,818,310	$2,069,627	$2,070,000

SINGLE YARNS OF JUTE NOT FINER THAN 5 LEA OR NUMBER.

Average rate.....per cent.	30	29.24	32.38	29.00	15
Imports	$41,408	$50,020	$233,915	$74,357	$82,500

SINGLE YARNS MADE OF JUTE FINER THAN 5 LEA OR NUMBER.

Average rate.....per cent.	30	35	35	35	25
Imports	$41,408	$17,635	$43,566	$10,178	$11,260

COTTON THREAD AND YARNS.

Average rate.....per cent.	27.85	34.20	32.18	31.54	19.29
Imports	$850,061	$2,170,136	$4,289,008	$4,013,926	$4,386,000

SINGLE YARNS MADE OF FLAX OR MIXTURE OF ANY OF THEM, NOT FINER THAN 8 LEA OR NUMBER.

Average rate.....per cent.	35	41.39	23.31	22.89	15
Imports	$455,695	$205	$75	$342	$380

SAME, FINER THAN 8 LEA OR NUMBER AND NOT FINER THAN 80 LEA OR NUMBER.

Average rate.....per cent.	.....	40	40	40	25
Imports	.....	$73,917	$71,177	$148,661	$162,500

SAME, FINER THAN 80 LEA OR NUMBER.

Average rate.....per cent.	.....	15	15	15	10
Imports	.....	$21,464	$69,220	$51,961	$70,000

Tariff comparisons based on handbook issued by the Ways and Means Committee—Continued.

YARNS WHOLLY OR IN PART OF WOOL.

	1896, Wilson bill.	1905, Dingley bill.	1910, Payne bill.	1912, Payne bill.	Underwood bill.
Average rate.....per cent.	89.90	93.69	82.38	79.44	20
Imports	$1,031,077	$123,721	$326,886	$59,470	$600,000

COTTON CLOTH.

Average rate.....per cent.	41.62	38.54	42.13	42.74	26.44
Imports	$4,944,125	$8,217,735	$9,681,846	$7,638,631	$10,645,000

CLOTHING, AND ARTICLES OF WEARING APPAREL WHOLLY OR IN PART OF WOOL.

Average rate.....per cent.	47.97	82.20	81.31	79.56	35
Imports	$3,748,782	$1,691,751	$1,776,236	$2,190,202	$4,000,000

SHIRTS AND DRAWERS—COTTON.

Average rate.....per cent.	50	61.44	59	60.27	25
Imports	$523,403	$612,889	$520,222	$361,567	$700,000

CARPETS—AUBUSSON, AXMINSTER, CHENILLE, MOQUETTE.

Average rate.....per cent.	40	69.46	62.09	64.62	35
Imports	$258,975	$38,178	$62,760	$65,864	$90,000

CARPETS—SAXONY, WILTON, TOURNAY.

Average rate.....per cent.	40	74.07	70.14	69.38	30
Imports	$128,057	$44,090	$40,711	$23,307	$30,000

CARPETS—BRUSSELS, FIGURED OR PLAIN.

Average rate.....per cent.	40	79.57	76.29	69.45	25
Imports	$143,165	$14,705	$8,222	$2,290	$10,000

CARPETS—VELVET AND TAPESTRY.

Average rate.....per cent.	40	63.74	62.46	62.05	30
Imports	$102,350	$45,495	$41,058	$68,338	$90,000

CARPETS—TAPESTRY BRUSSELS.

Average rate.....per cent.	42.50	61	64.41	83.53	20
Imports	$24,513	$121	$187	$225	$4,000

CARPETS—TREBLE INGRAIN.

Average rate.....per cent.	32.50	58.41	64.34	60.94	20
Imports	$17,745	$11,000	$1,075	$8,942	$25,000

CARPETS—WOOL DUTCH AND TWO-PLY.

Average rate.....per cent.	30	57.88	62.50	55.32	20
Imports	$14,045	$2,270	$22	$430	$1,000

CARPETS OF EVERY DESCRIPTION WOVEN WHOLE FOR ROOMS, AND ORIENTAL BERLIN, AUBUSSON, AXMINSTER, AND SIMILAR RUGS.

Average rate.....per cent.	40	62.74	60.57	58.10	50
Imports	$258,975	$2,708,744	$4,392,786	$3,761,059	$4,000,000

SKINS FOR MOROCCO—TANNED, UNFINISHED.

Average rate.....per cent.	10	10	5.37	5	5
Imports	$3,170,447	$2,231,409	$1,824,222	$1,972,130	$2,000,000

SKINS FOR MOROCCO—FINISHED.

Average rate.....per cent.	20	20	15.88	15	15
Imports	$73,735	$105,900	$95,869	$64,801	$60,000

GLOVES.

Average rate.....per cent.	25.38	32.58	49.52	44.15	31.77
Imports	$6,609,232	$4,899,794	$7,755,239	$7,841,830	$9,166,000

PIANOFORTE AND GLOVE LEATHER.

Average rate.....per cent.	20	20	20	20	10
Imports	$695	No data.	$1,695,418	$1,708,572	$2,000,000

BROOMS.

Average rate.....per cent.	20	40	40	40	15
Imports	$12,000	$1,192	$4,390	$4,229	$6,000

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter written by the Hon. William Randolph Hearst to the editor of the Washington Post, appearing in the Washington Post of April 14.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by publishing a letter written by the Hon. William Randolph Hearst and published in the Washington Post of April 14.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] objects.

Mr. MANN. We will get it in the RECORD later, all right.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an article on the subject of pensions to mothers with dependent children.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by publishing an article on the subject of pensions to dependent widows and their children.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to suggest this to the House, at a time when my action can not be construed as being in any sense personal: I think there has been a great abuse in the use of the RECORD, and as far as I can as an individual Member, I want to prevent the use of the RECORD for purposes other than what seem to be its proper purposes. Where there are extensions of remarks, or where there are articles directly relating to matters before the House, and about which gentlemen have spoken, I see no objection; but touching matters which tend to make the proceedings appear to be something they are not, and to deceive the public as to what occurs on the floor, I shall in the future object.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. DYER. I will state to the gentleman that I am sure he will not object to this, because it is an article on public pensions to mothers with dependent children, concerning which there is now in many States a movement to provide for such pensions.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no objection to publishing, when the House sees fit, various articles on various subjects as documents, but I do think that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ought to be kept as a method of showing the proceedings of this House, and ought not to be abused to the extent it has been in the past.

Mr. DYER. I heartily agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Considering that the House is now meeting only twice a week and adjourning over for three days at a time, there is very little in the RECORD, the business of the House being transacted in a secret Democratic caucus. In view of that fact, does not the gentleman think that, in the ordinary amenities of the situation, it is permissible for members of the minority, who are awaiting the pleasure of the Democratic caucus, to print things in the RECORD that may be instructive and interesting?

Mr. SHERLEY. In so far as the gentleman's question is meant seriously——

Mr. MANN. It is meant seriously.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think it is desirable that the RECORD should show the proceedings of Congress.

Mr. HARDWICK. And nothing else.

Mr. SHERLEY. And that it ought not be padded with a lot of matter which individual Members may think important and which may or not be important.

Mr. MANN. Since the RECORD does not now show the proceedings of Congress, as the proceedings of the House at the present time are not being published, because they are taking place in a secret Democratic caucus, does not the gentleman think members of the minority ought to be allowed the courtesy of inserting other things in the RECORD?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am glad to see that the time has arrived when the gentleman from Illinois admits that Republicans do not count in the House of Representatives. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. We do not count at all in the Democratic caucus.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman is undertaking to confuse the proceedings of the caucus with the proceedings of the House.

Mr. MANN. No; it is the Democrats who are undertaking to confuse the Democratic caucus with the House. It is not this side of the House at all. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SHERLEY. The trouble with the gentleman from Illinois is that he finds himself loath to admit that any situation is proper in which he is not allowed full sway to speak.

Mr. MANN. Well, very likely it would add very much to the interest of the proceedings of the Democratic caucus if anyone from this side of the House could be admitted to its deliberations. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to this request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky objects, and that is the end of it.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Speaker, prior to the organization of the Sixty-third Congress a number of Members of Congress here in the city organized to obtain funds for the relief of the flood sufferers. I ask unanimous consent to publish a statement of funds collected and the disbursements of that committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. BARTLETT. Let us hear what it is.

Mr. KENT. I ask that it be read for information; it is only four lines in length.

Mr. BARTLETT. No; that gets it into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman's paper refer to?

Mr. KENT. It is a statement of the funds raised among the Members of the House for the sufferers by flood and the disposition of this fund. It is only four lines long.

Mr. LANGLEY. That has nothing to do with the proceedings before the House. Why does not the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] object?

Mr. BARTLETT. I will object, and that will save the gentleman from Kentucky from objecting.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of woman suffrage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of woman suffrage. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, that I may not be misunderstood, I know from the practice of the gentleman that his remarks will be so indicated that it will be evident that they are inserted under the leave to print.

Mr. MONDELL. They will.

Mr. SHERLEY. With that understanding, I do not object.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MADDEN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask the Speaker if he will state to the House under what rule of the House a Member reserves the right to object and then goes on to discuss the merits of the question?

The SPEAKER. That has been the practice ever since the Chair has been in the House—for 18 years.

Mr. MADDEN. Under what rule?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know.

Mr. LANGLEY. Under the rule of immemorial usage.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Illinois wants an opinion from the Chair, the Chair thinks that debate under the reservation to object is frequently employed to the waste of time.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what I think.

The SPEAKER. There is no rule about it; it is a practice that has grown up in the House.

Mr. MADDEN. Then I am going to reserve the right from now on to insist on a strict enforcement of the rule as to propositions of this kind.

The SPEAKER. All the gentleman has to do is to demand the regular order.

Mr. MADDEN. I demand the regular order now.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I reserved the right to object; I have not objected.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands the regular order, and that is equivalent to a demand for the putting of the question whether there is objection. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT OVER.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to.

RECOGNITION OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. AUSTIN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. AUSTIN. I rise to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is it a privileged resolution?

Mr. AUSTIN. I will have to ask the Speaker to determine that after it is read.

The SPEAKER. The resolution is not privileged, and will have to take the usual course under the rule.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Tennessee having been recognized by the Speaker——

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Tennessee was not recognized.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee has not been recognized. The Chair asked him distinctly for what purpose he rose.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Tennessee having arisen and addressed the Speaker, no one else having addressed the Speaker, under the rules of the House is not the gentleman from Tennessee entitled to recognition?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. MANN. There being no regular order of business before the House?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee arose, and the Chair may possibly have said "The gentleman from Tennessee" before he asked him for what purpose he rose. The whole statement is to be taken together. The Chair asked him for what purpose he rose.

Then the gentleman sent up the resolution, and the Chair, having in mind the Unanimous Consent Calendar, obtained the resolution from the Clerk and read enough of it to determine that it was not a privileged resolution. The Chair then announced that it would take the usual course and must go through the basket.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution might properly be put in the basket, but the Speaker will remember that at this time there is nothing before the House which takes precedence of anything else that I know of, unless it be a motion to adjourn.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. As there are a great many new Members present, the Chair will take the privilege of stating that at the end of the Sixtieth Congress, according to his recollection, the House established a Calendar for Unanimous Consent. One day last summer there were several matters pressing here in which the Government was financially interested, and on which, if they were not put through, the Government would lose money because of the deterioration of work. The Chair at that time stretched the rule sufficiently to let in four or five of those things. Then a distinguished Member of the House rose and protested against the proceedings and wanted to know if we were going back or relapsing into the bad situation which he alleged had existed heretofore. The Chair then announced that we were not going to do anything of the sort. Since then the Chair has been very careful about recognizing gentlemen to bring up matters that ought not to be brought up under that rule.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to hold the Speaker to any strict accountability for recognizing the gentleman when he intended to ask for what purpose the gentleman rose, before he recognized him.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think that if the gentleman from Illinois would rise, for instance, and the Chair would then ask for what purpose the gentleman rose, that he would thereby recognize the gentleman from Illinois until he found out whether he was entitled to be recognized. At first to-day the Chair did not do that, and several gentlemen obtained in that way recognition for matters which they had no right to bring up; but afterwards the Chair adopted the old procedure of propounding a question that was very unpopular here for awhile, namely, for what purpose the gentleman rose. The Chair thinks that is the only orderly way to proceed.

Mr. MANN. I quite agree with the Chair, although I remember the Chair held a different opinion about that when he sat on the floor. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair has learned something in the lapse of time. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. The Speaker, then, is getting ahead of his party.

ANNA M. COULTRY.

Mr. HARRISON of New York and Mr. LLOYD rose.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from New York to withhold his motion for a moment.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Very well.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 38 (H. Rept. 3).

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized to pay, out of the contingent fund, to Anna M. Coultry, widow of P. L. Coultry, late an assistant foreman of the folding room of the House, a sum equal to six months of his salary as such employee and an additional amount, not exceeding $250, for the funeral expenses of said P. L. Coultry.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Coultry, a House employee, died in the early days of March last. This is the usual resolution that is adopted in the event of the death of a House employee, whereby the widow is paid an amount equal to six months of the deceased's salary, and funeral expenses, not exceeding $250.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

MESSENGERS FOR POSTMASTER OF HOUSE.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 24 (H. Rept. 2).

Resolved, That the Postmaster of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint seven messengers, who shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House at the rate of $100 per month from and including the 1st day of April, 1913, during the first session of the Sixty-third Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Missouri if this is the usual resolution or the usual number of extra employees that is provided for the postmaster?

Mr. LLOYD. This is the usual number. It is the number we always have during the regular sessions of Congress. It is not provided for in the appropriation bill, because the appropriation bill did not provide for the extra session of Congress. There are some amendments to this which I desire to have the Clerk report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 4, after the word "and," strike out the word "included" and insert the word "after."

Line 5, after the word "thirteen," insert the word "and."

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendments is to provide that these individuals may receive pay from the 1st day of April. The resolution is intended to provide that pay, but it is so worded that there is doubt as to whether or not it does it. The purpose of the amendments is to make sure. These individuals have been at work since the 1st day of April, and the membership of the House—nearly all of it—was here and the services needed to be rendered. They were rendered by these individuals.

Mr. MANN. If the individuals rendered the services, I do not know that anyone can object, although I think there were comparatively few Members of Congress present on the 1st day of April.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amended resolution.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 23 (H. Rept. 1).

Resolved, That the Postmaster of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint four messengers, who shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House at the rate of $100 per month during the first session of the Sixty-third Congress.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, this provides for four messengers in the House post office. Three of those will be new employees or appointees. Under the regulations heretofore, we have provided by House resolution for one messenger, but three additional messengers are needed because of the addition to the membership in the House and because of the necessity for the use of the Maltby Building. The purpose of this resolution is to provide mail facilities for those Members who are at the Maltby Building.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. What are the duties of the three employees just provided for in the prior resolution at $125 per month?

Mr. LLOYD. They are provided for at $100 a month.

Mr. MANN. I thought the prior resolution provided for them at $125.

Mr. LLOYD. No; in both the rate is fixed at $100 a month.

Mr. MANN. Are the duties the same?

Mr. LLOYD. They are similar duties.

Mr. MANN. There is no distinction?

Mr. LLOYD. None whatever.

Mr. MANN. Except that the three are not carried in the annual appropriation bill for the regular session?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. And this one messenger heretofore has been paid out of the contingent fund?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes, sir; and this now provides that the four shall be so paid.

Mr. MANN. Does the Maltby Building require the additional three messengers?

Mr. LLOYD. The postmaster insists that it does. He has one man over there who has charge of the stamps and registered letters and that kind of work, and two other men, one of whom receives mail and the other distributes it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's committee has not yet become liberal enough to provide for the delivery of mail in the Capitol Building itself, I believe?

Mr. LLOYD. No, sir. The gentleman from Illinois and myself occupy the same position, along with the Speaker. Our mail is not delivered to us at all.

Mr. MANN. We have to go and get our mail.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. There are some compensating advantages, however.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. HELM rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HELM. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] a question, if he will yield.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes, sir.

Mr. HELM. I have had some difficulty, and I think it is quite generally true that mail that passes through the post office, where it is of real value, such as these United States maps and some kinds of books, often goes astray. I have had so many instances of that kind that I seldom, if ever, give an order for the mailing or delivery of one of those large maps without having to put a registered stamp on it. Is the gentleman from Missouri familiar enough with the situation to know where that fault lies?

Mr. LLOYD. No, sir; I am not. But if the gentleman can point out where the fault lies——

Mr. HELM. That is what I am trying to find out——

Mr. LLOYD. And if the fault lies with any appointee of this House of Representatives, I think we will take steps pretty quickly to get rid of the individual responsible for the wrongdoing.

Mr. LANGLEY. I will say to my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] that I think the fault is due to the fact that there is a Democratic administration of the House post office. That is the reason it is not running smoothly. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. LLOYD. I beg the gentleman's pardon. We had the same trouble under the Republican administration of the House.

Mr. BARTLETT. We had more trouble under the Republican administration. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. I never heard of it.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM]?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes, sir.

Mr. HELM. Judging from the remarks of my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], and the remarks in response thereto by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], it seems that this is no new thing, and I judge from what has occurred here that in the matter that I have brought to the attention of the gentleman from Missouri I am not the only victim. I further conclude that in this matter that I have inquired about there are others who are in the same boat as myself, who have had the same trouble and experience that I have had. It is a condition that ought to be remedied in some way, it occurs to me.

Mr. LLOYD. So far as "the gentleman from Missouri" is concerned, I may say that I have never heard, during the administration of the House by the Democrats, of the nondelivery of maps.

Mr. HELM. What I have said has reference to the former régime; I have no such trouble under this régime; but I am afraid that something of that kind may occur hereafter.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri whether, under his observation, he considers that the mail at the House Office Building is delivered as early as it should be? My room in the House Office Building is located on the third floor, and according to my observation for some months past my mail is delivered there by 9.15 o'clock in the morning. If a Member has his mail sent to his hotel, it will arrive there at something like 7.30 o'clock in the morning. Does not the gentleman think there is a possibility that in the operation of the postal service under the control of the administration of this House the mail should be delivered to the House Office Building earlier than 9.15?

Mr. LLOYD. It could be arranged for; but I think it has been the custom to have it delivered, for a number of years past, at that time.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I do not want to bring up invidious comparisons. I am more interested in the service than in a comparison, but my recollection is that heretofore, at least before the last two years, our mail was delivered to the House Office Building much earlier than it is at the present time.

Mr. LLOYD. If there are any complaints about the service of the post-office department of the House, the Committee on Accounts will be glad to have them presented. If there is anything that ought to be remedied, and can be remedied, it shall be done.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I desire to make a suggestion——

Mr. LLOYD. I am speaking authoritatively when I make that statement.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. As a Member of the House, I desire to suggest that the delivery of mail to Members, often relating to the business of the day's session, at their offices at 9.15 in the morning is a very tardy delivery, and I should like to ask the gentleman whether that can not be improved upon.

Mr. LLOYD. I will make inquiry about it and see whether it can be done, and if it is the desire of the Members of the House to have an earlier delivery we shall have it earlier.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman note my desire for an earlier delivery?

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. How many Members are at present domiciled in the Maltby Building?

Mr. HOWARD. Forty-four.

Mr. LLOYD. Forty-four, I understand.

Mr. HAMLIN. I should like to know why it is that those of us who are officing in the Capitol can not have our mail delivered to us.

Mr. LLOYD. We are supposed to be a select class. Ordinarily the man who finds himself in the Capitol is connected with a committee, and he is supposed to have a messenger to send and get his mail.

Mr. HAMLIN. That is a very rash presumption, so far as the majority of us are concerned. We find ourselves without a messenger, and at the present time we find ourselves without any committee. There are about a dozen or 15 of us, I think, who are officing in the Capitol. If 45 are entitled to have 4 men deliver their mail to them——

Mr. LLOYD. Three.

Mr. HAMLIN. Three—why are we not entitled to at least one, so that we can get our mail? It seems to me that is hardly fair.

Mr. LLOYD. I think that will adjust itself so that there will be no trouble about that later on.

Mr. HAMLIN. All right. With that assurance, I will not press the matter.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The SPEAKER. There are three or four bills that have been put into the basket without the names of any Members attached to them. The Clerk will read the titles of the bills, and the Members who put them in the basket can put their names on them.

The Clerk read the titles of the following bills:

A bill authorizing the extension of First Street east, and for other purposes.

A bill to authorize the extension of Twenty-fifth Street SE. and of White Place.

A bill granting an increase of pension to Frederick C. Hammeter.

A bill to pension widow and minor children of any officer or enlisted man who served in the War with Spain or Philippine insurrection.

The SPEAKER. This last bill is the one that had Mr. Crago's name attached to it. Mr. Crago is no longer a Member of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. MARTIN of New Jersey was granted leave of absence for one week, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order previously agreed to, adjourned until Thursday, April 17, 1913, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the chairman of the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Park Commission inclosing a letter from the superintendent of the park relative to the appropriations for said park (H. Doc. No. 13); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Missouri River at St. Joseph, Mo., with a view to preventing a diversion of the river through Lake Contrary and contiguous lakes (H. Doc. No. 14); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of Jackson Creek Bar, Va., with a view of cutting through same to provide a harbor at Deltaville (H. Doc. No. 15); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of Lake Worth Inlet, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 16); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of Cape Fear River, below Wilmington, N. C., with a view to securing a depth of 20 feet to quarantine station (H. Doc. No. 17); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on examination and survey of Anclote River, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 18); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

7. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of Choctaw Bayou, Tensas Parish, La. (H. Doc. No. 19); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

8. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of Black River, Ark., near Buttermilk Bank (Bend), with a view of protecting the bank in the interests of navigation (H. Doc. No. 20); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

9. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of harbor at Great Salt Pond, Block Island, R. I. (H. Doc. No. 21); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of New River, Dade County, Fla., from head of navigation to its outlet in the Atlantic Ocean, with a view to creating a deep-water harbor for seagoing vessels (H. Doc. No. 22); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

11. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of Dutch Island Harbor, R. I., with a view to removal of rocks

now obstructing approach channel (H. Doc. No. 23); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on examination and survey of Newbegun Creek, N. C. (H. Doc. No. 24); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

13. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of harbor at Elk Rapids, Mich. (H. Doc. No. 25); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

14. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of Charlevoix Harbor, Mich., with a view to an increased depth between Lake Michigan and Pine Lake (H. Doc. No. 26); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

15. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on examination and survey of north and south forks of Tred Avon River, Md. (H. Doc. No. 27); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

16. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of San Luis Obispo Harbor, Cal., with a view to removal of rocks and other obstructions (H. Doc. No. 28); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

17. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Hampton Creek, Va., with a view to making this river deeper and more suitable for anchorage and use of boats and vessels (H. Doc. No. 29); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

18. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Buffalo Harbor, N. Y., with a view to increasing the width of the entrance of the inner harbor to 400 feet by removing the Government south pier at the mouth of Buffalo River; also, with a view to increasing the width of Black Rock Harbor and the entrances thereto (H. Doc. No. 30); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

19. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of Fox River, Wis., with a view to determining what repairs or extensions, if any, should be made to the levee at Portage, Wis., in the interests of navigation and to prevent injury to the Government works on Fox River, consideration being also given to the question of cooperation on the part of the State of Wisconsin and other local interests in the repair, extension, and maintenance of such levee (H. Doc. No. 31); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 2441) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 2442) granting certain lands of the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash., to the Washington Historical Society; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 2443) granting to the State of Utah 1,000,000 acres of public land within the State, to reimburse the State for expenses incurred in suppressing Indian disturbances from 1865 to 1868; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2444) to amend section 2325 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to mineral lands; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2445) pensioning the surviving officers and enlisted men of the Utah volunteers employed in the defense of the frontier settlements of the Territory of Utah against Indian depredations during the years from 1865 to 1868, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2446) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Nephi, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2447) providing for the establishment and maintenance of a Weather Bureau station at Brigham City, Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2448) to provide for the refunding of certain moneys illegally assessed and collected in the district of Utah; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2449) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Utah; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2450) providing for the establishment of a Weather Bureau station at Provo, Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2451) to extend the provisions of the act of June 27, 1902, entitled "An act to extend the provisions, limitations, and benefits of an act entitled 'An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk war, Cherokee disturbances, and the Seminole war,' approved July 27, 1892"; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 2452) to enlarge, extend, remodel, etc., post-office building at Battle Creek, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 2453) making appropriation for payment of certain claims, in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims, reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts, and under the provisions of section No. 151 of the act approved March 3, 1911, commonly known as the Judicial Code; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2454) making appropriation for payment of certain claims of churches and fraternal organizations for property destroyed during the Civil War, in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims, reported under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1887, commonly known as the Tucker Act; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 2455) to amend the naturalization laws by providing for the naturalization of aliens who have served in the War of the Rebellion, War with Spain, Philippine insurrection, or one regular enlistment in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2456) to provide a temporary home in the District of Columbia for ex-Union volunteer soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2457) to give preference in the civil service to those persons who have been honorably discharged from the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2458) to provide for the appointment of an additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2459) to provide campaign badges for officers and enlisted men of the Army who served honorably in the Spanish, Philippine, or China campaigns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2460) to require that the printing of records which is done under the supervision of the clerks of the United States courts shall be let annually upon competitive bids; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2461) to provide for the examination, determination, and certification by the Interstate Commerce Commission as to the competency of roadmasters, foremen, and other employees of common carriers by railroad subject to the act to regulate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2462) appropriating $30,000,000 for the purpose of maintaining, raising, and protecting against future floods the levees on the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2463) to appropriate $15,000 out of the funds in the United States Treasury to the credit of the Cherokee Indians to pay Charles M. Rice, of St. Louis, and his associates for legal services; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2464) for erecting a suitable memorial to Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman, United States Army; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2465) providing for the appointment of a commission to be known as the commission on salaries and allowances of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 2466) amending section 2 of an act entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc.,

and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War," approved April 19, 1908; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 2467) to provide for preference relating to appointment in the civil service by giving preference to certain ex soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 2468) to pension widows and minor children of officers or enlisted men who served in the War with Spain or Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2469) relating to the money reserves of national banking associations and to authorize such associations to make loans on real estate security in certain cases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTON: A bill (H. R. 2470) for purchasing a site for the erection of a public building at Red Cloud, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2471) for purchasing a site and erecting a public building at Superior, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2472) for purchasing a site for the erection of a public building at Minden, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 2473) to construct and equip a light vessel for the South Pass entrances to the Mississippi River, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2474) to repeal an act approved March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to amend section 3 of an act entitled 'An act to regulate the liens of judgments and decrees of the courts of the United States,' approved August 2, 1888"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2475) providing for the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the battle of New Orleans, fought on the field of Chalmette on January 8, 1815, providing for the erection of a suitable memorial thereof, and making an appropriation for that purpose; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 2476) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Purcell, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 2477) to amend proviso in meat-inspection law concerning products prepared according to directions of foreign purchasers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 2478) to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by requiring the use of the block system by common carriers engaged in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2479) to promote the safety of travelers on railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to strengthen the construction of day or passenger coaches, mail cars, chair, smoking, and combination cars, and tourist sleepers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2480) to amend an act to establish a bureau of immigration and naturalization and to provide for a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States, approved June 29, 1906, as amended in section 4 by the act approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2481) to provide for the investigation of controversies affecting interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2482) to establish a fish hatchery in the seventh congressional district in the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 2483) to declare Mill Slough, in the city of Marshfield, Oreg., a nonnavigable waterway of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: A bill (H. R. 2484) granting public lands to the city of Fallon, Churchill County, Nev., for municipal purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 2485) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 2486) to repair a Government levee at Jeffersonville, Ind.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 2487) to limit and define the powers of the judges of the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 2488) to prescribe the conditions under which corporations may engage in interstate commerce and to provide penalties for otherwise engaging in the same; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 2489) to make it unlawful for certain Federal officeholders to serve as delegates in a convention called to nominate a President of the United States or other elective United States officers; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 2490) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to promote safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 2491) to provide for the selection and qualification of grand and petit jurors in the eastern division of the southern district of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUPRE: A bill (H. R. 2492) to make improvements to the aids of navigation and establish new aids on the Mississippi River below New Orleans, La., at a cost not to exceed $50,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 2493) providing for the payment of certain claims of the State of California growing out of the Indian wars; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 2494) to investigate illiteracy among the adult population of the United States and the means of eliminating or reducing the same; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 2495) to provide for the establishment and regulation of bonded districts at the ports of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 2496) to amend section 15 of the act to regulate commerce as amended June 29, 1906, and June 18, 1910; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 2497) to provide water for the irrigable lands of the Yakima Indian Reservation, State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 2498) for the control and regulation of the waters of the Niagara River above the Falls of Niagara, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 2499) to regulate congressional caucuses, conferences, and similar party organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 2500) providing for the survey and commencement of construction of a road in the Olympic Forest Reserve; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2501) authorizing the Secretary of War to relieve the Washington-Oregon Corporation, as far as he may deem advisable in the public interests, from certain conditions in an act entitled "An act granting to the Washington-Oregon Corporation a right for an electric railroad, and for telephone, telegraph, and electric transmission lines across the Vancouver Military Reservation in the State of Washington," approved August 9, 1912; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 2502) making it unlawful for any society, order, or association to send or receive through the United States mails, or to deposit in the United States mails, any written or printed matter representing such society, fraternal order, or association to be named or designated or entitled by any name hereafter adopted, any word or part of which title shall be the name of any bird or animal the name of which bird or animal is already being used as a part of its title or name by any other society, fraternal order, or association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 2503) to relinquish, release, remise, and quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States of America to all lands entered by or set apart to certain Creek Indians or their heirs or representatives under certain private acts of Congress, and also all claims and demands on the part of the United States for the use and occupation of any of said lands for any damage done thereto and for timber taken therefrom; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FITZHENRY: A bill (H. R. 2504) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 2861) authorizing the extension of First Street NE., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2862) to authorize the extension of Twenty-fifth Street SE. and of White Place; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 2863) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Norman, Cleveland County, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 2864) to be known as the Daughters of the American Revolution old trails act, to provide a national ocean-to-ocean highway over the pioneer trails of the Nation, thus making a continuous trunk-line macadam road from the site of Jamestown, Va., and from the city of New York, N. Y., to the city of Washington, D. C.; thence by way of St. Louis, Mo., to Gardner, Kans., and there to branch, one branch leading through Santa Fe, N. Mex., the other branch leading from Gardner, Kans., through Kearney, Nebr., to Olympia, Wash.; also to aid the States through which the highway herein described as the National Old Trails Road shall run in extending, constructing, rebuilding, and repairing same; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOWLER: Resolution (H. Res. 40) requesting certain information concerning the Weather Bureau; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution (H. Res. 41) providing for consideration of sundry civil and Indian appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: Resolution (H. Res. 42) for a reprint of the soil survey of the New Orleans area, Louisiana; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 43) referring to publication of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SIMS: Resolution (H. Res. 44) to amend the rules; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 45) to amend the rules of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POU: Resolution (H. Res. 46) to amend paragraph 2 of Rule XXIII; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 47) to amend paragraph 1 of Rule XV; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. AUSTIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 51) providing for a monument to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the women of the country to the cause of the Union during the Civil War; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 52) congratulating the people of China on their assumption of the powers, duties, and responsibilities of self-government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOWLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 53) to appropriate $2,000,000 to relieve the homeless and helpless occasioned by recent floods in Illinois; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LIEB: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 54) for the relief of sufferers from floods in Gibson County, in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 55) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver a condemned cannon to the Army and Navy Union, United States of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Memorial of the Legislature of New Mexico, favoring the enactment of just and appropriate homestead laws for the arid regions; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Memorial of the Legislature of California, urging legislation to permit the grazing of sheep on national forest and other Federal reservations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SINNOTT: Memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, regarding appropriation for a walnut experiment station at McMinnville, Oreg.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of the Legislature of California, requesting Congress to authorize and direct the postal savings system to loan funds to school districts; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SCULLY: Memorial from the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, advocating a change of the United States navy yard from Brooklyn to the waters of New York Bay on the shore of New Jersey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BRYAN: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Washington, proposing an intercoastal canal from the Straits of Juan de Fuca inland through Puget Sound southwestward to Grays Harbor; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. DALE: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relating to homestead and forest reserve laws for the arid regions; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Washington, proposing an intercoastal canal from the Straits of Juan de Fuca inland through Puget Sound southwestward to Grays Harbor; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. DILLON: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing Congress to amend the homestead laws so as to permit male minors over 18 to make entry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, praying for the repeal of the reciprocity act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, requesting that the Constitution of the United States be amended so that the President may be elected for a term of six years and be ineligible for reelection; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Washington, relating to the recognition of China as a Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Washington, relating to an appropriation to reclaim a burying ground on the island of San Juan; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Washington, relating to State and Federal cooperation in forest-fire protection; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Washington, relating to an investigation of the so-called Grain Bag Trust; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 2505) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Converse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2506) granting an increase of pension to Calvin M. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2507) granting an increase of pension to William Knight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2508) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Rachley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 2509) granting a pension to Richard H. Cutter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2510) granting a pension to Margaret A. Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2511) granting a pension to Virginia M. Mills; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2512) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Billingslea; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2513) granting a pension to Harvey Swanston; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2514) granting a pension to Elizabeth McDowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2515) granting an increase of pension to William T. Mahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2516) granting an increase of pension to Andrew De Veau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 2517) granting a pension to Avis C. Vail; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 2518) granting an increase of pension to Curtis A. Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 2519) granting a pension to Charles I. Trowbridge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2520) granting an increase of pension to John McWilliams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: A bill (H. R. 2521) granting a pension to William H. Mayo; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 2522) for the relief of Robert Rogers and Augustus Mackenzie; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 2523) granting a pension to Kate Lynch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2524) granting a pension to Patrick Harkin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2525) granting a pension to Thomas Kent; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2526) granting a pension to Elizabeth Muller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2527) to place on the retired list the name of Aaron I. Comfort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 2528) granting a pension to Annie Dougherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2529) for the relief of George Killeen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 2530) granting an increase of pension to Anna O. Stanton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 2531) granting an increase of pension to Edward L. Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 2532) granting a pension to John H. Bostick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2533) granting an increase of pension to George Baldey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2534) for the relief of Mrs. John W. Austin; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2535) for the relief of W. W. Lamberton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2536) for the relief of John Streckfus; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2537) for the relief of heirs of Francis M. Fisk; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2538) for the relief of the estate of John Carr, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2539) for the relief of the estate of Hypolite Abadie, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2540) for the relief of the estate of Philip Felix Herwig, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2541) for the relief of legal representative of George E. Payne, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2542) for the relief of the estate of John Pemberton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2543) to restore the endowment of the Judah Touro Almshouse, of New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2544) to remove the charge of desertion against Joseph Henry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2545) to remove the charge of desertion against Henry W. Ross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2546) to remove the charge of desertion against Joseph K. Haggett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 2547) granting a pension to Clarinda Pike; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2548) granting a pension to Paul Heineman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2549) granting a pension to Cordelia Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2550) granting a pension to Anna Burhman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2551) granting a pension to William Tepe, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2552) granting a pension to Caroline Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2553) granting a pension to Emilie S. Buder; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2554) granting a pension to Patrick Burke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2555) granting a pension to Henry Briggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2556) granting a pension to Elijah Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2557) granting a pension to Freda Burow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2558) granting a pension to Margaret Cassidy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2559) granting a pension to Horace Clive Gray; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2560) granting a pension to John G. Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2561) granting a pension to Josephine C. Nixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2562) granting a pension to John J. Ledford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2563) granting a pension to Lincoln Mothersbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2564) granting a pension to Tony Judd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2565) granting a pension to Wilbur K. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2566) granting a pension to Oscar Grear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2567) granting a pension to Thomas Payne; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2568) granting a pension to Joseph W. Blackburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2569) granting a pension to Thomas F. Hassett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2570) granting a pension to Palmyra Sherman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2571) granting a pension to Fritz Wilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2572) granting a pension to Daniel J. Begley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2573) granting a pension to Joseph Donnelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2574) granting a pension to Jesse H. Wade; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2575) granting a pension to Laura Hilgeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2576) granting a pension to Joseph Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2577) granting a pension to Celsus G. Gross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2578) granting a pension to Helen Mathews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2579) granting a pension to Mary A. Laurient; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2580) granting a pension to Mary Gonter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2581) granting an increase of pension to C. L. Stevenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2582) granting an increase of pension to James M. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2583) granting an increase of pension to Martin Schubert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2584) granting an increase of pension to Julius Bonger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2585) granting an increase of pension to John F. Nixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2586) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Messick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2587) granting an increase of pension to Margaret M. Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2588) granting an increase of pension to Harvey S. Page; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2589) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Houlihan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2590) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Frank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2591) granting an increase of pension to David F. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2592) granting an increase of pension to Charles Bieger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2593) granting an increase of pension to Mary Westerfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2594) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2595) granting an increase of pension to Lawrence Ring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2596) granting an increase of pension to Adam Zimmerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2597) granting an increase of pension to William Martin Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2598) granting an increase of pension to Edward P. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2599) granting an increase of pension to John H. Edge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2600) granting an increase of pension to Alice W. T. Groesbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2601) granting an increase of pension to John H. Helser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2602) granting an increase of pension to John A. Spann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2603) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Connor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2604) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. McDonough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2605) granting an increase of pension to John Fritz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2606) granting an increase of pension to James M. Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2607) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Messick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2608) granting an increase of pension to Henry Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2609) for the relief of Camille Noel Dry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2610) for the relief of James Bartlett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2611) for the relief of Thomas S. McKee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2612) for the relief of James Clarkson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2613) for the relief of John Dieter; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2614) for the relief of Aaron B. Van Pelt, alias Benjamin Van Pelt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2615) for the relief of Charles W. Howard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2616) for the relief of John H. Drosselmeier; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2617) granting an increase of pension to Florida Kennerly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2618) for the relief of Bartholomew Buckley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2619) for the relief of John H. Rheinlander; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2620) for the relief of John A. Wanless; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2621) for the relief of C. M. Perkins; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2622) for the relief of John A. Kress; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2623) for the relief of Isaac W. Harding; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2624) correcting the hospital record of Edward J. Wehrle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2625) to correct the military record of Patrick J. Carmody; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2626) to correct the military record of Allen Barnes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 2627) to appoint James W. Keen master's mate in the Revenue-Cutter Service and to place him as such upon the retired list; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 2628) granting an increase of pension to James H. Hurt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2629) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Dobson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2630) for the relief of John Kelly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2631) for the relief of Augustus Poole; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2632) for the relief of William E. Culin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2633) for the relief of the widow of Michael Ryan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2634) to place the name of Brig. Gen. Timothy C. Moore upon the officers' retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 2635) for the relief of the Georgia Railroad & Banking Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2636) for the relief of the estate of Charles Evans, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2637) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mary A. Cameron and John Cameron, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 2638) granting a pension to Elizabeth Thurston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2639) granting a pension to Marcia J. Dewey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2640) granting a pension to Rachel Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2641) granting a pension to Elmen E. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2642) authorizing the President to reinstate Joseph Eliot Austin as an ensign in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2643) granting an increase of pension to Louis K. Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2644) granting an increase of pension to Lucien A. McWithey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2645) for the relief of H. A. M. Steen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 2646) for the relief of R. De Atley & Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2647) for the relief of the heirs of Lindley Abel, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 2648) granting a pension to Sadie J. Jennings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 2649) for the relief of A. P. Holcomb and the heirs of Samuel Thompson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 2650) granting a pension to Charles A. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2651) granting a pension to Margaret L. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2652) granting a pension to Gertrude M. Farrar; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2653) granting a pension to Charles A. Holmes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2654) granting a pension to William Trots; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2655) granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2656) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Domingos; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2657) granting an increase of pension to Adelia Inman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2658) for the relief of Thomas Bingham; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2659) for the relief of Marraton Upton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2660) for the relief of R. S. Thornton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2661) for the relief of Harlan W. Jenks; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2662) for the relief of Andrew J. Lawrence; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2663) for the relief of Patrick G. Dollard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2664) for the relief of Albert C. Waltenspiel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2665) for the relief of William Richard Hogg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2666) for the relief of John Vreeland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2667) for the relief of the legal representatives of Parker S. Rouse, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2668) for the relief of the heirs of Ellery B. Wilmar; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2669) for the relief of the widow and the heirs of Samuel A. Bishop; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2670) for the relief of the Western Distilleries of Agnew, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2671) for the reimbursement of the legal representatives of James Harvey Dennis for moneys expended by the said James Harvey Dennis for the improvement of the Tennessee River; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 2672) granting an increase of pension to Nelson J. Weller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 2673) granting a pension to William L. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2674) granting a pension to Mary E. Ferrell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2675) granting an increase of pension to J. L. Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2676) granting an increase of pension to John W. Vandergriff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2677) granting an increase of pension to Canton A. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2678) granting an increase of pension to George W. D. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2679) for the relief of E. D. Judkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2680) for the relief of the estate of David Wise; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2681) for the relief of Andrew J. McWhirter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2682) for the relief of Charles Lowe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2683) for the relief of Joseph B. McGee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2684) for the relief of the heirs of John G. Burris; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2685) authorizing the Secretary of War to award the congressional medal of honor to Arnold Delffs, late private, Company H, Fifth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 2686) granting a pension to Matilda Robertson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2687) granting a pension to Samuel A. Sellars; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2688) granting a pension to George B. Haight, alias William Riley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2689) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Gunn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2690) granting an increase of pension to M. Z. Sims; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2691) granting an increase of pension to John A. Grant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2692) for the relief of R. B. Quay; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2693) for the relief of James Lafferty; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2694) for the relief of Daniel M. Frost; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2695) for the relief of Daniel F. Cahoon; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2696) for the relief of Thomas Haycock; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2697) to correct the military record of Thomas Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2698) providing for the military status of John Gray; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2699) to reimburse George Heiner, postmaster at Morgan, Utah, for loss of postage stamps; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 2700) for the relief of Edward S. Farrow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2701) for the relief of Charles Hellyer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2702) for the relief of the widow and children of John W. Geering; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2703) for the relief of Drenzy A. Jones and John G. Hopper, joint contractors, for surveying Yosemite Park boundary; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2704) granting an increase of pension to William C. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 2705) for the relief of Davis C. McGee; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2706) granting an increase of pension to Herman F. Bonorden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2707) granting an increase of pension to David L. Brewer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 2708) granting a pension to Nancy J. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2709) granting a pension to Erastus M. Daily; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2710) granting a pension to Millie E. Dressler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2711) granting a pension to Daniel M. Moyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2712) granting a pension to John R. Brennan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2713) granting a pension to John Dowdy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2714) granting a pension to Sabina O'Donnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2715) granting a pension to Albert A. Shollenberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2716) granting a pension to Mary Ellen Bousman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2717) granting an increase of pension to Patrick F. Heenan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2718) granting an increase of pension to John Drobel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2719) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bartolet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2720) removing the sentence of dishonorable discharge from the military record of Isaac Purnell and granting him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2721) to correct the military record of Christian Reichert; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2722) to correct the military record of Thomas J. Rose; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2723) to correct the military record of William S. Russell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2724) to correct the military record of John Berger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2725) to correct the military record of Alfred Trainer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 2726) granting an increase of pension to Asa Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 2727) for the relief of the legal representatives of Joshua Curtis; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 2728) for the relief of George P. Heard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 2729) granting a pension to Sarah C. Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2730) granting an increase of pension to Emil G. Herman; to the Committee on Invalid Pension.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2731) granting an increase of pension to Michael Qinlan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2732) granting an increase of pension to Margaret S. McNiff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 2733) authorizing J. A. Matheny, of Colony, Wyo., to make homestead entry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 2734) granting a pension to Lucy A. Rhykerd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2735) granting an increase of pension to Frank J. Stupp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2736) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Munson B. Sparks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 2737) granting a pension to Jesse H. Ringgold; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2738) granting an increase of pension to Hattie E. Rayburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2739) granting a pension to James T. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2740) granting an increase of pension to Tamson E. Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2741) granting a pension to Charles M. Baughman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2742) granting an increase of pension to John M. Barkley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2743) granting an increase of pension to Richard Hudnall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2744) for the relief of Joseph Fries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 2745) granting a pension to Mary G. Doyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 2746) granting a pension to Roy B. Wilcox; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2747) granting a pension to Isaac A. Wampler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2748) granting a pension to John R. P. Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2749) granting a pension to Mary A. Swaggerty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2750) granting a pension to Stanley S. Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2751) granting a pension to Shelby T. Shipley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2752) granting a pension to William C. Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2753) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2754) granting a pension to Calvin D. Sartin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2755) granting a pension to Murray Peirce; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2756) granting a pension to Bascom M. Meyers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2757) granting a pension to Nancy J. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2758) granting a pension to James G. Kuhnert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2759) granting a pension to John W. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2760) granting a pension to James A. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2761) granting a pension to Minta Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2762) granting a pension to Eugene Jobe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2763) granting a pension to John R. Janes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2764) granting a pension to Daniel P. Hensley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2765) granting a pension to Charlie Forbes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2766) granting a pension to Barneybass Eastridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2767) granting a pension to Ulysses Drinnon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2768) granting a pension to Aaron W. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2769) granting a pension to Thomas C. Crow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2770) granting a pension to Rebecca Creswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2771) granting a pension to Mary E. Constable; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2772) granting a pension to John K. Bowman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2773) granting a pension to Daniel M. Blevins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2774) granting a pension to Ed. G. Beal; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2775) granting a pension to William P. Barlow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2776) granting a pension to W. M. Balch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2777) granting a pension to John H. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2778) granting a pension to Walter Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2779) granting a pension to William L. Guffee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2780) granting a pension to W. B. Gass; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2781) granting a pension to Pierce B. Boyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2782) granting a pension to James D. Miles; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2783) granting a pension to John Depew; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2784) granting a pension to Thomas McCavan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2785) granting a pension to Christopher H. Dippre; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2786) granting a pension to Richard H. Humphries; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2787) granting a pension to Jesse L. Renfro; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2788) granting a pension to George W. Burleson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2789) granting a pension to Lewis H. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2790) granting an increase of pension to John J. Wolfe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2791) granting an increase of pension to James White; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2792) granting an increase of pension to William C. Tilley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2793) granting an increase of pension to Jacob N. Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2794) granting an increase of pension to Worley H. Stepp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2795) granting an increase of pension to D. K. Rowe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2796) granting an increase of pension to Calloway Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2797) granting an increase of pension to John K. Ricker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2798) granting an increase of pension to Daniel H. Parrott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2799) granting an increase of pension to Alfred T. Moreland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2800) granting an increase of pension to Aaron M. McCown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2801) granting an increase of pension to Edward McClellan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2802) granting an increase of pension to Henry Lethco; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2803) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Laughters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2804) granting an increase of pension to James R. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2805) granting an increase of pension to Sherman G. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2806) granting an increase of pension to William J. Ingle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2807) granting an increase of pension to John R. Holt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2808) granting an increase of pension to William T. Higgins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2809) granting an increase of pension to George W. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2810) granting an increase of pension to James Goulden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2811) granting a pension to Ollie Frazier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2812) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2813) granting an increase of pension to Della A. Cooter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2814) granting an increase of pension to William Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2815) granting an increase of pension to William A. Charles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2816) granting an increase of pension to John Carver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2817) granting an increase of pension to Hugh H. Campbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2818) granting an increase of pension to John F. Burrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2819) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Burrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2820) granting an increase of pension to Alexander R. Blazer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2821) granting an increase of pension to Johnathan N. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2822) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2823) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McCloud; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2824) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Gulley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2825) for the relief of the estate of John H. Stout, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2826) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William Raines; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2827) for the relief of James B. Leedy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2828) for the relief of Nathan H. Howard, administrator of the estate of W. G. Howard, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2829) for the relief of the estate of Adam B. Fullen, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2830) for the relief of R. N., A. T., and F. F. Dosser; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2831) for the relief of Robert H. Donnelly; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2832) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James H. and Benjamin Covington, heirs of Daniel Covington, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2833) for the relief of Arthur Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 2834) granting a pension to Eliza C. Spears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2835) granting a pension to Lizzie M. O'Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2836) granting a pension to Winifred B. Shanks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2837) granting a pension to Amanda Boyden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2838) granting a pension to Mrs. M. Lightner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2839) granting a pension to Emma M. Leonard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2840) granting a pension to Loretta Strouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2841) granting a pension to George Abblerback; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2842) granting an increase of pension to Fannie E. Newberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2843) granting an increase of pension to Archie E. Booth; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2844) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Collar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2845) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Milbourn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2846) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester Rumsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2847) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2848) granting an increase of pension to James M. Fink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2849) granting an increase of pension to Stephen H. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2850) granting an increase of pension to George B. Hewitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2851) granting an increase of pension to Cyrenous Dailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2852) granting an increase of pension to John Ehret; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2853) for the relief of Martha H. Hamlin; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2854) restoring the name of Sarah E. Wilson to pension roll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2855) restoring the name of Harriet S. Upright to the pension roll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2856) restoring Jane A. Keck to the pension roll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 2857) granting a pension to Daniel J. Strout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TUTTLE: A bill (H. R. 2858) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth K. Norton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 2859) granting an increase of pension to Estelle H. Wholley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 2860) for the relief of Mary J. Webster; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Va., favoring the passage of legislation for an immediate reform in the present banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also (by request), petition of Alice Paul and other women assembled at a meeting at the Columbia Theater, Washington, D. C., also the Woman's Suffrage Association of Racine, Wis., favoring the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States enfranchising the women of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Va., favoring the passage of legislation making an immediate reform in the present national banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pitman, N. J., favoring the passage of legislation providing for the closing of the Panama Exposition on Sundays; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Collar, Cuff, and Shirt Manufacturers of Troy, N. Y., and vicinity, protesting against any change in the present duties on collars and cuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Association of Tanners, Chicago, Ill., favoring a reduction of the duties on leathers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Benjamin Young, Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the reduction of the tariff on the manufactures of harness and saddlery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Wisconsin Wholesale Grocers' Association, Milwaukee, Wis., asking that if the tariff on sugar is reduced that the law shall immediately go into effect; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Central Labor Union of Indianapolis, favoring the passage of legislation for an investigation of the conditions of labor in the mining districts of West Virginia; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Wisconsin Peace Society, favoring the passage of legislation repealing the free-tolls section of the Panama Canal act or the submitting of same to The Hague tribunal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the New York Mercantile Exchange, New York, N. Y., favoring the placing of butter, cheese, and eggs on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Milwaukee Association of Credit Men, Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the passage of legislation for making an immediate reform in the present national banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the Columbia Knitting & Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis., asking that a separate clause in the tariff schedule be given the manufacturers of fancy knitted woolen goods and that a protective duty be put on same; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. L. Salzstein, general agent New England Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston, Mass., protesting against the passage of the legislation taxing life insurance policies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Cutlery Co., Chicago, Ill., and other manufacturers, protesting against the reduction of the tariff on table cutlery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Vilter Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the reduction of the tariff on beet sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Bernhard Stern & Sons, Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 8177, known as the Federal feeding-stuff law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of Robert M. Morse and other citizens of Greater Boston, and the executive council, Massachusetts Board of Trade, favoring the passage of legislation repealing the free-tolls portion of the Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of Snyder & Wheeler, New York, N. Y., protesting against the proposed duty on ivory nuts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Ellison & Ellison, New York, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the proposed legislation for placing typewriters on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Leo H. Hirsch & Co., New York, N. Y., protesting against the proposed reduction of duty on pearl buttons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Va., favoring the passage of legislation making an immediate reform in the present banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Edward W. Allen, president of the Life Underwriters' Association of New York, and Charles H. Strauss, general agent, New England Mutual Life Insurance Co., protesting against the passage of legislation taxing life insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Van Duzer Extract Co., New York, N. Y., protesting against the increase of duty on vanilla beans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of the Master Stone Masons' Association, St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of legislation for a 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Va., favoring the passage of legislation making an immediate reform in the present banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the American Sugar Bureau, Washington, D. C., favoring the removal of the Dutch-standard clause in the sugar schedule; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the adoption of the national budget as a modern means of regulating the receipts and expenditures of the National Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union, No. 61, La Crosse, Wis., protesting against an increase of the internal revenue on cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Va., favoring the passage of legislation for making an immediate reform in the present banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation making an appropriation for preventing the destruction of fruit by frost; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, Cal., approving the aims and purposes of the Army League of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring the passage of legislation for the installation of additional light and fog stations on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Retail Butchers' Association, San Francisco, Cal., and the Alameda County Butchers' Exchange, favoring the passage of legislation making a revision in the present tariff duties on meats and cattle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, San Francisco, Cal., protesting against passage of any legislation for the United States intervening in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation for making an

investigation of the labor condition in West Virginia; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation providing for the building of a home in Washington, D. C., for the widows of soldiers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Santa Barbara County, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation for Federal aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation making an investigation of the condition of labor in West Virginia mining districts; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 2727) for the relief of A. W. Curtis; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEVY: Petition of the Board of Trade of Tampa, Fla., protesting against the reorganization of the customs service as affecting Florida; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York Association of Biology Teachers, favoring the passage of legislation prohibiting the importation of aigrettes, plumes, etc., of wild birds for the use of milliners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the United Hatters of North America, Local No. 8, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against any reduction in the present duties on hats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York Mercantile Exchange, New York, N. Y., favoring the removal of the duty on butter, cheese, and eggs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Stationers' Association of New York, protesting against the passage of legislation prohibiting the fixing of prices by the manufacturers of patent goods; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MADDEN: Petition of importers, dealers, and manufacturers of leaf tobacco, St. Louis, Mo., and Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of legislation for the repeal of section 29, act of 1909, and suggesting a substitute for same; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of the National Shoe Tariff Committee, protesting against the placing of boots and shoes on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Snyder & Wheeler, New York, protesting against the proposed duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on vegetable ivory nuts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George C. Lewis, attorney, Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of legislation for the payment of the Norton claims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: Petition of citizens of New York, N. Y., protesting against any change in the present tariff on boots and shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of the Old Bridge Enameled Brick & Tile Co., Old Bridge, N. J.; the Atlantic Tile Manufacturing Co., Matawan, N. J.; No. 3, C. Pardee Works, Perth Amboy, N. J.; Matawan Tile Co., Matawan, N. J.; Agriculture Tile & Paint Co., Maurer, N. J.; and the Ostergaard Tile Works, Perth Amboy, N. J., protesting against any reduction of tariff on tile; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Brotherhood of Operative Potteries, Trenton, N. J., and Local Union No. 35, Trenton, N. J., protesting against any reduction of tariff on earthenware and pottery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Standard Underground Cable Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; relative to the proposed change of duties on lead-covered wires and cables for telephones, telegraph, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also petition of the Joseph Dixon Crucible Co., Jersey City, N. J., protesting against any reduction of the duties on lead pencils; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the John Reilly Co., Newark, N. J., protesting against the passage of the proposed bill for placing patent and enamel leather on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the German-American Stoneware Works, New York, N. Y., protesting against any reduction of the duties on stoneware; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of the Senate of the State of Michigan, protesting against the reduction of the tariff on sugar beets or wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Petition of the Milwaukee Association of Credit Men, Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the passage of legislation making an immediate reform in the present banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of W. A. Beck, E. M. Kelly, J. Leach, J. Stolz, C. S. Gillett, P. H. Miller, L. F. Moore, J. F. Dalton, J. C. Thorne, George Y. Scott, W. R. Reeves, M. D., E. Halloran, William P. Rouse, F. G. Tuttle, Charles Bouchard, Sheldon A. Allen, R. Rhyner, E. R. Towt, H. R. Lamb, J. A. Vollmer, R. E. Jack, jr., I. R. Riley, F. A. Anderson, C. E. Gomez, M. M. Pierson, Nellie M. Perry, C. E. Allen, Julius Schloarr, Henry Heer, A. P. Madsen, J. F. Fitzgerald, J. M. Coleman, E. L. Scott, Mathew Schadeck, R. F. Allen, J. R. Morrill, A. Boyd, Tracy McKinley, George E. Stactler, Leo Schlyter, William Davis, C. A. Harrington, C. B. Jared, Peter R. Heer, W. B. Goodrick, M. D. Guhrrfeed, Joseph L. Goodrick, H. C. Grotheer, John B. Kelley, Aleen Bushnell, John Rowe, Carl A. Hanson, Joseph Darrell, L. L. Putnam, J. S. Maclean, O. L. Dunbar, B. S. Johnson, J. M. Waterhouse, J. W. Jessen, W. P. Levy, T. Connor, W. F. Johnston, N. R. McBride, John A. Lofdahl, Joseph Rhymer, J. S. Woods, W. H. Lake, J. M. Favell, D. M. Bernt, J. A. Graton, George Harlowe, O. M. Hisceman, R. A. Wilson, F. E. Miles, F. S. Johnson, W. Blackie, E. C. Young, W. I. Tibbals, Anton Johnson, J. E. Fagorthey, E. H. Staber, W. J. Hatch, Hugh Forden, Andrew Hoffer, E. Seegelken, Harry Hatch, Andrew Jensen, J. D. Kalar, and P. H. Schmidt, of Spreckels; M. M. Purkiss, F. J. Pratt, W. H. Hamelmson, M. Rose, G. N. Ash, W. E. Marsh, S. Clauson, C. J. Hardman, Harry Parnell, W. J. Buck, F. R. Smith, F. McFarland, F. J. McCoy, G. C. Derter, F. J. Conaty, James A. Armstrong, Albert J. Reid, A. M. Vazquez, Sydney Barbettini, Henry R. Gewe, Andrew H. Werberg, R. W. Bennett, A. Palmer, J. A. Litenberg, Farrest Arnold, Frank L. Gray, J. P. Deleau, H. V. Halcomb, E. J. Parrish, H. L. Anderson, J. Avington, W. M. Goggin, A. M. Charvoz, F. H. Hawkins, I. M. Brush, P. Cigalotti, W. F. Breene, J. R. Rogers, A. R. Rains, Charles Valenzuela, Elsie M. Bennett, J. G. Willet, C. A. Olsen, and G. W. Moore, of Betteravia; Fred Barlow, J. G. Conover, R. Joy, R. Garside, Theodore Cosseboom, Pedrono Bros., O. P. Bardin, Conrad A. Storm, Charles L. Pioda, S. J. Klett, William Tetrick, L. Nissen, Paul Tavernetti, Joseph W. Warth, J. V. Britton, Ross Nissen, P. Pedrazzi, J. J. Harkins, Peter Bonde, W. H. Bentley, Hans Bruen, J. M. Hughes, Peter Madsen, W. H. Paulsen, John Hunter, A. J. Bramers, F. Avilla, Titus Panziera, and T. C. Closter, of Salinas; Mrs. M. Davilla, A. Vielsen, William Alps, Enos Henricks, Mrs. Legue, J. G. Rose, Fred Lassen, E. Darling C. S. Burr, E. C. Bunker, Hazel Riley, Lucy Brown, M. Petersen, H. Braun, J. P. Ivers, George Roderick, N. M. Boyou, and E. N. Manitou, of Alvarado; W. T. Powell, Ernest H. Gibson, R. E. Easton, L. J. Morris, L. F. Chandler, R. W. Brown, M. D., Joe Brass, jr., Samuel Gray, A. L. Smith, A. R. Jones, and T. C. Nauc, of Santa Maria; G. F. Bayes and L. P. Euchsen, of Soledad; C. H. Pardee, of Watsonville; H. W. Bodie and W. E. Murray, of San Francisco; D. Thornton, Parmdee & Barshwiger, and the H. Hecker Co., of Gilroy; N. C. Briggs, N. C. Briggs, jr., Thomas Flint, and Robert P. Stephenson, of Hollister; J. M. Sims, of San Luis Obispo; C. B. Scott, of Artesia; Albert Sheuler, of Santa Barbara; and F. D. Marshall, of Guadalupe, all in the State of California, protesting against reduction of present tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THACHER: Petition of Hon. John D. Long and other citizens of Hingham, Mass., favoring the repealing of the free-tolls portion of the Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILDER: Petition of the Fitchburg (Mass.) Woman's Club, favoring the passage of legislation making an appropriation for the suppression of the white-slave traffic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of J. A. Runyan and 35 other citizens of Union County, Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation providing for the closing of the Panama Exposition on Sundays; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Steubenville, Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation for a 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the New York Association of Biology Teachers, favoring the passage of legislation prohibiting the importation of aigrettes, plumes, etc., of wild birds for the use of milliners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Stationers' Association of New York, protesting against the passage of legislation prohibiting the fixing of prices by the manufacturers of patent goods; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Champlain Silk Mills, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the proposed reduction of tariff on combed silk; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Va., favoring the passage of legislation making an immediate reform in the present banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *April 15, 1913.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

WILLIAM P. DILLINGHAM, a Senator from the State of Vermont, and LUKE LEA, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Tennessee, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF TENNESSEE.
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, R. R. Sneed, secretary of state of the State of Tennessee, do hereby certify that the annexed is a true copy of house joint resolution No. 48, being a joint resolution ratifying an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my official signature and by order of the governor affixed the great seal of the State of Tennessee at the department in the city of Nashville this 12th day of April, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] R. R. SNEED, *Secretary of State.*

House joint resolution 48.

A joint resolution ratifying an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-second Congress of the United States of America, at its second session, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, passed a resolution submitting to the several States the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

"*Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That in lieu of the first paragraph of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, and in lieu of so much of paragraph 2 of the same section as relates to the filling of vacancies, the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States:

"'The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

"'When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of each State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

"'This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.'"

Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee, That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee; and further be it

Resolved, That certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded by the governor of this State to the Secretary of State at Washington and to the presiding officers of each House of the National Congress.

Adopted, April 1, 1913.

W. M. STANTON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
NEWTON H. WHITE,
Speaker of the Senate.

Approved, April 4, 1913.

BEN W. HOOPER, *Governor.*

Mr. NEWLANDS presented a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Nevada, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assembly joint and concurrent resolution 4.

Ratifying the amendment to section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America.

Approved February 19, 1913.

Whereas both houses of the Sixty-second Congress of the United States of America, at its second session, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America, in the following words, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution, providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That in lieu of the first paragraph of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States and in lieu of so much of paragraph 2 of the same section as relates to the filling of vacancies the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

"'The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

"'When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

"'This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.'"

Therefore be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of Nevada (the Senate concurring), That said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same hereby is, ratified by the Legislature of the State of Nevada.

That certified copies of this preamble and joint and concurrent resolution be forwarded by the governor of this State to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the presiding officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

STATE OF NEVADA, *Department of State, ss:*

I, George Brodigan, the duly elected, qualified, and acting secretary of state of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full, and correct copy of the original assembly joint and concurrent resolution ratifying the amendment to section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America, approved February 19, 1913, now on file and of record in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of State at my office in Carson City, Nev., this 20th day of February, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] GEO. BRODIGAN, *Secretary of State.*
By J. W. LEGATE, *Deputy.*

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Territorial Legislature of Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 1.

To the President of the United States and the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

The Senate and House of the Territorial Legislature of Alaska memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States for the repeal of the law entitled "An act extending the time in which to file adverse claims and institute adverse suits against mineral entries in the District of Alaska," approved June 7, 1910 (36 Stat., 459), which law applies to Alaska only, and allows 8 months additional to the 60-day period of publication in which to adverse applications for mineral patents in Alaska. Three years of experience have demonstrated that such law is wholly unnecessary and serves no useful purpose, but, on the contrary, it imposes additional delays upon an already tedious procedure and places unreasonable burdens upon those who seek in good faith to develop our mineral lands. No good reason exists for such special legislation in Alaska. The conditions in this Territory warrant every possible effort to simplify the procedure and to expedite such applications instead of imposing additional delays and unnecessary burdens as is done by this objectionable and unjust law.

In many cases the long delay of the present law causes an additional year's assessment work under the law providing for yearly assessments of $100 to be performed upon each claim located.

Adopted by the senate March 26, 1913.

L. V. RAY,
President of the Senate.

Concurred in by the house April 1, 1913.

EARNEST B. COLLINS,
Speaker of the House.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *District of Alaska, ss:*

I, William L. Distin, secretary of the District of Alaska, do hereby certify that the above is a full, true, and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 1 of the Alaska Territorial Legislature.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of Alaska, at Juneau, this 2d day of April, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] WM. L. DISTIN,
Secretary of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Arizonia, which was referred to the Committee on the Library and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 1.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the First Legislature of Arizona, in special session convened, respectfully represent:

That the title and possession of Monticello, the home place of Thomas Jefferson, is vested in Mr. LEVY, a private citizen of the State of New York, and the place is now practically in a state of ruin and decay;

That the title to the grave of Jefferson, wherein lie the remains of the author of the Declaration of American Independence and those of his beloved wife, and which grave is embraced within a space about 100 feet square of the grounds of Monticello, is vested in the descendants of Jefferson;

That access to the grave of Jefferson is open to his descendants, but not to the general public, except upon the payment of a fee to Mr. LEVY, thus commercializing one of the most sacred spots in America; but no admission to the house of this great apostle of humanity is allowed to any person:

Now, therefore, it is peculiarly appropriate that this place should not be in private ownership; and it is peculiarly appropriate that Monticello, the home in life as it is the home in death of this great American, should be the common heritage of the people of this country.

It is especially fitting now for the people of the United States to obtain this hallowed place, that they may keep and beautify and adorn it as a shrine to which every lover of liberty may go at will to pay his tribute of respect: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, urged to enact such legislation as may be necessary to vest in the United States the title and possession to the home and grave of Thomas Jefferson; and

Resolved further, That a copy of this memorial and these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the representatives of Arizona in Congress, and that our representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to do all in their power to accomplish the enactment of such legislation.

Passed the Senate April 7, 1913, by a vote of 17 ayes, — noes, — absent, 2 excused.

M. G. CUNNIFF,
President of the Senate.

March 22, 1913. Read third time in full and passed by the following vote: 29 ayes, 3 nays, 1 absent, 2 excused.

H. H. LINNEY,
Speaker of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of Local Union No. 335, Boilermakers' International Union, of Grand Junction, Colo., praying for the appointment of competent men as Federal boiler inspectors; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I present a resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE, STATE OF MICHIGAN,
Lansing, Mich., April 9, 1913.

Hon. CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: By direction of the senate, I hand you herewith copy of the resolution this day adopted by the senate relative to proposed changes in the tariff.

Very respectfully,
DENNIS E. ALWARD,
Secretary of the Senate.

Senate resolution 72.

Whereas there are located and have been in operation in the State of Michigan during recent years 17 beet-sugar factories, which factories represent an investment of about $12,000,000, and which factories have paid out to the farmers of the State of Michigan during recent years about $7,000,000 per annum for sugar beets; and

Whereas the beet-sugar industry in the State of Michigan employs a large amount of labor, both in raising sugar beets and in manufacturing said beets into sugar, and said industry has resulted in largely increasing the value of the farm lands in the State of Michigan, and any injury to said beet-sugar industry in this State would be a serious blow to the State; and

Whereas the sheep and wool industry in this State is an important one, the number of sheep now owned by the farmers of Michigan being approximately two and one-half millions, and their value more than $10,000,000; and

Whereas both the beet-sugar industry and the sheep and wool industry above mentioned are of great importance to the farmers of the State of Michigan, as well as to other classes of its people, and any reduction of the tariff upon either sugar or wool would be a great blow to both said industries, and a great injury not only to the farmers of the State, but also to the laboring classes: Therefore be it

Resolved by the State Senate of the State of Michigan, That the President and the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, respectfully requested not to take off or reduce the tariff upon sugar or upon wool, as by so doing they will be striking a heavy blow at the State of Michigan; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be mailed by the secretary of the senate to each of our United States Senators, to each of our 13 Representatives in Congress, and to the President of the United States.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the senate this 8th day of April, 1913.

DENNIS E. ALWARD,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. NEWLANDS presented a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Nevada, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assembly joint and concurrent resolution 9.

Joint and concurrent resolution of the Assembly of the State of Nevada, relative to a grant by the United States to the State of Nevada of 1,000,000 acres of public lands to be disposed of for the benefit of a State road fund, approved March 15, 1913.

Whereas good roads and highways are fundamentally an economic necessity affecting directly and indirectly all industry and commerce, intrastate and interstate, and the social and economic welfare of the citizens of this State and its sister States; and

Whereas the State of Nevada is the sixth State in the Union in the amount of its area, and contains a smaller number of inhabitants than any of its sister States, and contains thousands of miles of roads, with limited means of building and maintaining the same, and by reason thereof is unable to construct new roads and to accomplish the equally important task of maintaining them after they are constructed or improved; and

Whereas the improvement of the present roads in the State of Nevada and the construction of new roads necessary to its economic welfare, and the maintenance of both after construction, will require a vast sum of money: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of Nevada (the Senate concurring), That we urge our Representatives in Congress to earnestly request the Congress of the United States to enact a proper legislative grant to the State of Nevada of 1,000,000 acres of unoccupied and unappropriated nonmineral lands of the United States for the benefit of a State road fund of the State of Nevada. That such grant be a floating grant and the land thereby granted to be sold and disposed of under the same terms and conditions as the grant heretofore made of 2,000,000 acres for the benefit of the public schools of this State; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to our Representatives in Congress and to the President of the United States.

STATE OF NEVADA, *Department of State, ss:*

I, George Brodigan, the duly elected, qualified, and acting secretary of state of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full, and correct copy of the original substitute for Assembly joint and concurrent resolution 7, relative to a grant by the United States to the State of Nevada of 1,000,000 acres of public lands, to be disposed of for the benefit of a State road fund, approved March 15, 1913, now on file and of record in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of State, at my office, in Carson City, Nev., this 20th day of March, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

GEO. BRODIGAN, *Secretary of State.*
By J. W. LEGATE, *Deputy.*

Mr. NEWLANDS presented petitions of the Commercial Club of Reno, the Chamber of Commerce of Las Vegas, the Chamber of Commerce of Fallon, and of sundry citizens of Carson City, Reno, and Yerington, all in the State of Nevada, praying that 1,000,000 acres of the public lands be granted to the State of Nevada for the creation of a road fund, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Nevada Bar Association, held at Reno, Nev., favoring the enactment of legislation to simplify Federal procedure on the law side of the court, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the executive committee of the Nevada State Equal Franchise Society, remonstrating against the treatment accorded the participants in the woman-suffrage parade held in Washington, D. C., on March 3, 1913, which was referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. McLEAN presented resolutions adopted by the Business Men's Association of Hartford, Conn., remonstrating against the consolidation of the customs districts in the State of Connecticut into one district, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Springfield, Greater Boston, Winchester, Watertown, Lexington, and Medford, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Panama Canal law exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a petition of members of the National Woman's Temperance Union, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the closing of the Panama Exposition grounds on Sundays, which was referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

He also presented resolutions adopted by members of the Woman's Suffrage Association of Racine, Wis., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

TARIFF DUTY ON SUGAR.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I have been receiving hundreds of communications from my own State and from other places protesting against placing sugar on the free list. A great many of these communications are merely formal in their character, and they might as well not have been sent.

Some of the most earnest appeals for protection that have come to me are from the Hawaiian Islands. I have here a letter from Right Rev. Henry B. Restarick, bishop of the Episcopal Church in Honolulu, on that subject. I have known Mr. Restarick for a good many years. At the time I went to California, 30 years ago, or very soon thereafter, he was the rector of the Episcopal Church in the city of Los Angeles. He has been in Honolulu for a good many years and is familiar with conditions in the islands. He is a man of high character, of superior intelligence, and a keen sense of right and justice. His letter contains, I think, most valuable information on this subject. For that reason, Mr. President, I ask that the letter may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONOLULU, HAWAII, *March 26, 1913.*

The Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
Senator from California, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will remember me as rector of St. Paul's Church, San Diego, and my relations with you have always been pleasant. I wish to write you in regard to the proposed reduction or abolition of the duty on raw sugar.

I have been a resident of the islands nearly 11 years. I know every one of the sugar plantations by personal inspection. I know all the managers; I know also the condition of the laborers in the islands.

I hope, therefore, that you will bear with me for a statement in regard to the matter, because a large reduction in the tariff would absolutely ruin these islands. The sugar industry was built up owing

to the reciprocity treaty under Kalakaua. Many of the sugar plantations never paid a cent on the stock until years after the venture of planting was made. Two plantations known to me, Olaa and McBryde, have never paid in the 12 or 15 years of their existence one cent on the stock, and have had difficulty in meeting the interest on their bonds. There is no other crop which can be raised on the Hawaiian Islands on the lands now occupied by sugar. Most of the land previous to the sugar industry was comparatively barren, and much of it would not feed a cow to the acre. It was covered with brush and weeds and some grass. Immense sums of money have been spent by the corporations for irrigation purposes. Many of the ditches and irrigation systems have cost half a million dollars. Take one plantation—Ewa. A few years ago their pumping from artesian wells cost them for coal $1,000 a day. That has been reduced since they have used oil. In a few years, when sugar is high, there may be large profits; but when there is drought, there are none. I know of one plantation, Pahala, on the island of Hawaii, where the leaf hopper destroyed the entire crop; where they expected 22,000 tons, they got less than 2,000. Other plantations were affected by the loss of a third of the crop.

It must be remembered, also, that the plantations are not owned by individuals. I meet Army officers and Navy officers occasionally who still think that Spreckels owns most of the plantations in the islands. As a matter of fact there are no Spreckels interests here in any plantation. That is why the Spreckels interests want free sugar, so that they can buy Java and Philippine sugar free of duty. The stocks in the sugar companies are widely distributed. There is hardly a teacher or a clerk in the islands that does not own shares in some company. With the exception of two small plantations, there are none that are owned by individuals. The stocks are for sale in small blocks—5 and 10 shares can be purchased. If some men have gotten rich here, it has been by ventures of faith, by hard work, and by ability to take advantage of circumstances. The sons of the old Congregational ministers were almost always educated in the United States, and most of them were college men. When the reciprocity treaty was signed they took advantage of the situation, and many of them are wealthy.

I wish to say to you that nowhere in the world where I have been are the managers of large corporations so generous in the support of all church, charitable, and benevolent institutions as the people here, nor did I ever see anywhere in any industries the consideration, the kindliness, and the good feeling there is here between the employer and the employee.

It must not be thought that we have cheap labor here. I consider that on the whole it is a highly paid labor, far higher than it is in most of the States of the Union. The lowest paid of any Portuguese, Spanish, or Russian laborer is $22 a month, house rent free, water free, doctor and hospital free, fuel free. The Japanese and other workers on the plantations send large sums of money home. I have said that the lowest wages are $22 a month, but most of the labor is done now on the contract system, and a great many men in cutting cane or planting make from $35 to $40 a month, in addition to the free house and the other things mentioned above.

There is another thing to be remembered. That is that the Orientals who have come here have come in touch with western civilization, and while neither Japanese nor Chinese are coming now, yet those who are here are learning western ways and being enlightened with western ideas. We of our church have nearly 50 boys studying in universities in China and the United States. The late Provisional President of China was five years in one of our church schools. The chief justice under the empire was also from our school here, afterwards a graduate of Cambridge, England. The mining engineer of a Province in China is also another of our boys, after graduating at Columbia. A Chinese woman of great intelligence told me that our Honolulu boys had revolutionized the university at Shanghai, not only by teaching them sports and giving them western ideas, but by teaching them patriotism. The late revolution in China really sprang from Honolulu.

I have gone into details in rather a rambling way that you may judge of the importance of this "crossroads of the Pacific."

As I said before, no crop can be substituted for sugar. We can and do produce pineapples, but there is only a limited demand for them. We can and do produce coffee, but we can not compete with Brazil. We can send a certain number of bunches of bananas to San Francisco, but we can not compete with Central America. If the duty on sugar is materially reduced, most of the white people will have to leave the islands, and Hawaii will be ruined as Jamaica was by the action of the British Government in the early part of the last century. I have no financial interests whatever in sugar. I do not own one share of sugar stock, and I am independent for my salary upon the people here, but I know the United States thoroughly and know the situation here. Hawaii is a melting pot for the nations and races, and, as Prof. Blackman, of Yale, says, people of different races are living together in Hawaii on terms of more intimacy and kindly relationship than anywhere else in the world. It is a serious thing not only for Colorado and California and other places in regard to the beet-sugar industry, but it would simply paralyze industry of every kind in the islands. It seems to me that because of the treaty of reciprocity and annexation that the United States owes something to these islands. We imported $28,000,000 worth of goods from California last year—hay, grain, horses, mules, and general supplies. It would be a considerable loss to California if these were stopped. The Hawaiian-American Steamship Line depends entirely for its return cargoes upon Hawaiian sugar, and with free sugar this line would have to go out of business. So would the Matson Line. In fact, American steamship lines may be counted as those which do business with the Hawaiian Islands, as there are very few which go elsewhere.

It will be interesting for you to know that there is no poorhouse or county farm in the islands. The poor are taken care of by private benevolence. There is a splendid hospital free to all who need it, and a large endowment. There is a home for old people and incurables at no expense to the Territory. There are homes for old women and old men, created and endowed by private benevolence. You may live in Honolulu a long time without seeing a beggar. The Americans who have made money here are democratic, generous, and patriotic. To destroy the industry of the islands would be a far-reaching calamity, because, as "Crossroads of the Pacific," our civilization, our educational institutions and our Americanizing influence goes far and wide.

Let me give you one point: Two men who had been in Cuba told me in 1907 that they would wager anything that Cuba would be annexed in five years. They told me that they had been all over Cuba, and the American Sugar Co. was buying up every piece of available land and that they were so anxious for free sugar that they would seek to bring about a revolution that would necessitate annexation. I told them that I did not believe it; that the people of the United States would not stand for the annexation of that number of Spanish-Americans and negroes. They were quite positive that it was going to be done. The American Sugar Co. is now back of this movement for free sugar because they know positively that they would make the profit and that the consumer would have to pay just as much as he does now, and that the revenue of over $50,000,000 a year would be lost to the Treasury of the United States.

I believe that if the frauds of the American Sugar Co. had not been exposed, that they would have endeavored to have carried out their scheme for the annexation of Cuba.

As soon as the beet-sugar industry and the Hawaiian and Louisiana sugar industries are knocked out by taking off the tariff, the world's sugar supply would be so affected that, in my opinion, sugar would go up in price instead of down.

Asking your pardon for this long letter, and with kindest regards,

Faithfully, yours,

HENRY B. RESTARICK,
Bishop of Honolulu.

P. S.: I would add to the above, that in accordance with the desires of the authority at Washington the planters and sugar men here have spent large sums in trying to get white labor. All incomes above a certain amount are levied on by an income tax for the bringing in of white labor. But, of course, under the laws of the United States any contract with such labor is impossible, and many of them take a free trip from Portugal, Spain, or Russia to the Hawaiian Islands, and some of them before they have done a stroke of work go on to San Francisco, and many more when they have worked here a few months. They have used the assistance of the Territorial Government (given through the money derived from the income tax) to get this far on their way to California.

Again, Alaska canners and others have had frequent agents here to get the labor away—Filipino, Portugese, Spanish, and Russian.

If people would only consider that the Tropics produce staple articles, such as sugar, coffee, and so on, and that the production of these articles need a certain class of labor, and that the Hawaiian Islands are in the Tropics and have to compete in the production of sugar with Java, Cuba, and other countries, which could increase their production indefinitely and have no restrictions as to labor, it would readily be seen that the tariff taken off would mean the ruin of these islands from a commercial point of view.

Two Congressmen here, on separate occasions, have said to me: "These large holdings must be broken up, and the people must have the land." One of the men was from Kansas. I said to him, "Why do not you break up your big farms?" "And besides," I asked, "what would you produce on these lands if divided up?" Of course, he could not tell, nor can anyone else. I have been all over these islands and know all about homesteads and small holdings, but there is not a white man living who could make his living expenses from the land. Many have tried, and all have failed. When a homestead is taken up the man works on the plantation for a living and uses his small homestead as a side issue. There is not much tillable land on the islands anyway, for they are all mountainous in the middle and the strips around the sea are the fertile parts.

In speaking of wages, I did not mean that the Japanese got $22 a month. They get about $18, with room or house, fuel, doctor, etc.

In addition to their wages the Planters' Association have an agreement that each year they will give to all employees a certain percentage of the earnings of the plantation. Last year being a good one, with large crops and high prices, this addition was 13 per cent, which increased the wages of all considerably.

A man from California recently said to me: "I saw women working on the plantations, and they told me they only got $14 or $15 a month." I said to him: "Did you ever hear of the women in Pennsylvania working on the coal dumps for less money when you think that these women get so many things free?" "Moreover," I said, "those Japanese women are married, and they are working simply because they like work and to add to the family income, so that they can send more money home to Japan or save it for investments here. The work is light hoeing, and as they were used to working in the fields in their own country it is no hardship."

H. B. R.

PROPOSED TARIFF LEGISLATION.

Mr. WORKS. I present a telegram in the nature of a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Corona, Cal., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORONA, CAL., *April 12, 1913.*

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

At a meeting of the Corona Chamber of Commerce held on Friday evening, April 11, 1913, at 8 p. m., the following resolution was passed and secretary instructed to wire same to you at Washington, D. C.:

Whereas the proposed new tariff bill, which was introduced into the House of Representatives April 7, 1913, by the Hon. OSCAR UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, and which is now before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House for consideration, reduces the customs rates on a great number of California products to such a degree that in several instances it will have the inevitable result of seriously crippling if it does not absolutely destroy great interests upon which depend large numbers of people and the public welfare of the State; and

Whereas the present reading of the proposed tariff bill indicates that California has been more severely dealt with than other States of the Union, and its products more severely and unnecessarily exposed to foreign competition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Corona Chamber of Commerce, That an earnest protest is hereby made against the adoption of the tariff bill in its present form and with its severe discrimination against the products of the State of California.

Resolved, That this protest be mailed to the Hon. CHAMP CLARK, OSCAR UNDERWOOD, and the California Senators and Representatives in Congress with the request that they use their utmost endeavors to have the proposed tariff bill amended so that it shall deal more justly with California and Pacific coast products.

SANGER E. FRENCH,
Secretary Chamber of Commerce.

LOSS OF STEAMSHIP "TITANIC" (S. DOC. NO. 8).

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, a year ago the steamship *Titanic* went down in mid-ocean, having on board 2,223 persons, when she collided with an iceberg. Fifteen hundred and seventeen human lives were sacrificed in that great disaster. The United States promptly took action looking to an inquiry into the causes which led to the wreck of the *Titanic*, and has taken steps to afford possible remedies and to provide further for the safety of life at sea.

I think on this occasion it would be well for us to take stock of what has been accomplished in that regard. I inquired of the Secretary of Commerce and requested that he submit a statement upon the subject, and he has very kindly responded. I believe it would be instructive and helpful to have this information as to what has been done up to this time in promoting safety of life at sea available to all and in some public, permanent form.

I therefore request that the letter from the Secretary of Commerce to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I would suggest to the Senator from Florida that he ask to have the letter also printed as a document, for the use of Senators.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am perfectly willing to add to the request that the letter be printed in the RECORD and also as a public document.

There being no objection, the letter was orderd to be printed as a document and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 10, 1912.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR FLETCHER: It affords me pleasure to reply to your inquiry of the 8th instant as to what has been done or is being done with reference to the international conference and also in promoting safety to life at sea.

You will recall that the magnitude of the disaster which occurred on April 15, 1912, forced thoughtful men on either side of the Atlantic to the conclusion that the real problem presented called for international solution, and that such a solution could be reached satisfactorily only after searching inquiry into all the conditions affecting the safety of ocean travel. This thought found immediate utterance in the British press and the German Emperor was prompt in summoning his technical advisers to determine the attitude which Germany should take toward a problem which all recognized could not be settled by any one nation. The first measure, however, dealing with the subject in comprehensive detail was the joint resolution introduced on April 18 by Mr. ALEXANDER, of Missouri, chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives. This resolution has been the basis of action at home and has helped to shape action abroad.

After informal consultation, London has been deemed the most suitable and convenient place for the assemblage of the conference, and by common consent the British Government will take the lead in determining the date, which will probably be late in the coming summer or early in the autumn.

PRELIMINARY WORK.

In the meantime technical committees of the most competent men have been making painstaking studies in Great Britain and Germany of matters which must be determined at the conference. I need scarcely remind you of the great amount of time and effort which you and your colleagues of the Senate Committee on Commerce and the members of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries devoted during the last session to some of these subjects. Indeed, it must be gratifying to you, as it is to all who served in the Sixty-second Congress, to recall that within a fortnight after it assembled on December 4, 1911, and weeks before the steamship *Titanic* left her builder's hands, committees of both branches of Congress had begun work on legislation relating to the safety of ocean navigation and were well advanced toward the solution of problems to the existence of which the attention of the rest of the world was turned abruptly on April 17, 1912.

The preparations for the conference have so far advanced that the British Government has proposed an informal consultation at London in June or July between representatives of the technical committees at work in Great Britain and those who will be qualified to express with some technical precision the views held in the United States. Toward this end the British Government late last December sent informally to Washington Mr. George E. Baker, representing the British Board of Trade. He submitted to my predecessor, Secretary Nagel, and to members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, invited to meet at the department, the revised British regulations concerning lifeboats which subsequently were put into effect. I welcome this opportunity to express my appreciation of the efforts of Secretary Nagel to promote the international conference and to endenvor to secure adequate preparation on the part of the United States for the performance of our share of the work.

I regret that during the pressure of the closing days of the late session of Congress and the general and intense interest attending the change of administration and of the control of Congress the appropriation of $10,000 to make our necessary preliminary arrangements failed to secure the approval of the conference committee on the general deficiency bill. I am entirely confident, however, that Congress at an early date will vote the money needed for the purpose.

The time remaining for preparation is short, and very much hard work must be done. For this reason I have already undertaken, subject to appropriation by Congress, to organize technical committees to study in this country the subjects covered by the Alexander resolution, which in essentials are similar to the lines of inquiry followed for some months by the British expert committees.

HULLS AND BULKHEADS.

Had there been lifeboats for all on board, the great loss of life on the *Titanic* could have been averted. We may perhaps be allowed the sad satisfaction of contemplating that while she carried boats for only 1,040 persons, our own rules then existing would have required a similar vessel with a like complement of passengers and crew to have carried lifeboats for 2,367. I do not overlook the fact, however, that the circumstances attending this calamity were exceptional, and that in many cases, when the sea runs high, the launching of lifeboats is difficult, if not impossible. We must go more thoroughly into the subject if we are to meet adequately the perils of the sea.

I am disposed to believe that the following utterance, a few weeks after the loss of the ship, by the late Sir William H. White, points out the most important and the most difficult problem to which we should address ourselves:

"When calmer consideration of the subject becomes possible it will be seen that the question of boat equipment, important as it undoubtedly is, must be treated as subordinate to that of efficient water-tight subdivision. Possibly the time is approaching when shipowners will concur in action by which such subdivision shall be made the subject of legislation on lines to be agreed upon by the board of trade and themselves. In view of the experience gained in connection with legislation for the load lines of merchant ships it is permissible to hope that if such action is taken it may be of an international character; and that arrangement would undoubtedly be most advantageous if it could be made."

The subject of the efficient water-tight subdivision of hulls of vessels has been under consideration now for over 10 months by a committee of some of the most eminent authorities in the United Kingdom; and in Germany the excellent bulkhead and hull regulations of the Seeberufs-genossen-schaft, framed after two years' inquiry following the sinking in 1895 of the German S. S. *Elbe*, are being thoroughly revised.

Meanwhile the *Olympic*, sister ship of the *Titanic*, has had her hull entirely reconstructed, so far as bulkheads and double skin are concerned.

Nearly 2,000,000 passengers cross the Atlantic annually to and from the United States. By far the greater part of these are either American citizens or those who seek to take up their homes here. The American delegates to an international conference must meet the most highly trained minds of Europe on the subject of ship construction, which is of direct interest to our people. I am sure, therefore, that it is prudent to endeavor to secure now the strongest possible American advisory committee on this phase of the subject.

I wish to organize a committee on which shall be represented the American Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers, the American Society of Naval Engineers, and the technical schools which offer instruction in naval architecture and marine engineering, such as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the University of Michigan, the Leland Stanford Junior University, Cornell University, and the Stevens Institute of Technology. I have also requested the principal shipbuilding companies which build ocean passenger steamers to suggest to me names of those most competent to express the views of shipbuilders on this subject. The American passenger-ship owners on the Atlantic and on the Pacific, respectively, have been asked to name those most competent to express their views; and I have also invited Mr. William Livingstone, president of the Lake Carriers' Association, to suggest a name that will carry authority throughout the marine interests of the Great Lakes. The American Record of Shipping, generally known as American Lloyds, has also been invited to participate; and I have also designated Mr. J. Bernard Walker, editor of the Scientific American, with whose instructive work, An Unsinkable *Titanic*, you are doubtless acquainted. To this committee I have asked the Secretary of the Navy to add an officer of the construction corps of that department, for although the hulls of battleships and ocean passenger steamships are designed to meet quite different conditions, I wish to avail myself of the high technical knowledge and standing of the members of this corps. Of course, the Steamboat-Inspection Service of the Department of Commerce will be represented. Suggestions will be welcomed from other sources, for the above list is not meant to be exclusive.

EFFICIENT OFFICERS AND CREWS.

In the last analysis the efficacy of all material precautions against marine disasters depends on the efficiency of the officers and crew who handle the ship and all that goes with it. Superficially, uniform international regulations prescribing standards of efficiency of officers and men may seem difficult to establish and maintain, but I am confident that if the subject be approached in the proper spirit an international agreement on at least some essential points may be reached. I am confirmed in this opinion by the knowledge that the provision for efficient lifeboat hands included in the seamen's bill—upon which the committees of the Senate and the House spent so much time and study at the last session—is acceptable in principle to the British authorities, and, indeed, in substance resembles the recommendation of the British committee which considered the subject of lifeboats, their manning and equipment. Already the laws of Germany, Norway, the Netherlands, and France are in advance of our laws in prescribed tests of the vision of lookouts, adequate rest for those required to stand watch, and sanitary conditions of the forecastle and the engine room; and in so far as the seamen's bill would have raised standards in these respects, its failure to receive Executive approval on March 4 is a matter for general regret. All the work done by Congress at the recent session as well as foreign laws and regulations will be available for the use of the committee on efficiency of officers and crews which is being formed. I have asked the American Association of Masters, Mates, and Pilots to propose a suitable deck officer, the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association to propose a suitable representative of the engine-room staff, and Mr. Andrew Furuseth, president of the International Seamen's Union of America, has been also requested to serve on this committee. The maritime exchanges and chambers of commerce of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Portland, Oreg., and Seattle have been requested to propose captains of trans-Atlantic and trans-Pacific Ocean passenger steamers, respectively, in active service or retired, to serve on the committee, and I trust that American shipowners on the Atlantic and Pacific will agree upon representatives of their views on the subject. With the cooperation of the Secretary of the Treasury I hope to secure the advice of officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service and of the Public Health Service. This last service, through the marine hospitals and because of its visual tests of licensed officers, is acquainted with the physical condition of officers and crews in our merchant service. Here also the list is not meant to be exclusive; light from any source will be welcome.

RADIOTELEGRAPHY.

You helped to frame the acts of Congress concerning radiotelegraphy and aided in the ratification of the Berlin and London radiotelegraphic conventions, so I need not tell you that on this subject the legislation of the United States, in principle and in most of its provisions, already has been accepted, or bids fair soon to be accepted, as the basis for the international prescription and regulation of this far-

reaching agency for the promotion of safety at sea. You will, I am sure, allow me to take this opportunity to recall that the principle of a constant wireless watch on ocean passenger steamers (two operators) as a measure of Government regulation, to which there is now no dissent, was first proposed by my colleague, the Secretary of State, Hon. William J. Bryan, in November, 1911. Our own act of June 24, 1910, has been amended in accord with this suggestion, and at the international radiotelegraphic conference last June in London 31 countries approved the principle of a constant wireless watch, at least in the case of large passenger steamers, as a measure of international regulation. The same convention also provides for auxiliary apparatus for use in event of the failure of the ship's main power plant, as does our act of July 23, 1912. So far as radiotelegraphy is concerned, the work, from our point of view, before an international conference will be mainly the adjustment of minor differences between our regulations and those which may be suggested by other powers so as to secure uniformity. To prepare for this work I have requested the wireless companies furnishing operators and apparatus for ship and coast stations and the shipowners concerned to propose the names of suitable experts who may confer with the Commissioner of Navigation and representatives of the Naval Radio Service and the Bureau of Standards.

AIDS AND PERILS TO NAVIGATION.

You have doubtless noted that the Secretary of the Treasury has already dispatched two revenue cutters to the North Atlantic to maintain alternately a patrol north of the spring and summer tracks of transatlantic steamships and to give wireless notice of perils from ice, a service performed last year by two scout cruisers of the Navy. During his December visit here, Mr. Baker, of the British Board of Trade, inquired informally whether our Government would cooperate in endeavors which the British Government contemplated, to make a thorough scientific study, covering several years, of ice movements in the North Atlantic and simultaneously to provide warnings to ships of approaching ice. The British Board of Trade and transatlantic companies have already sent the Antarctic exploring ship *Scotia*, equipped with powerful radio apparatus to give ice warnings, and with a scientific staff and equipment to study ice movements and meteorological conditions in the regions of early ice appearance. The Hamburg-American Line has also, in behalf of German companies, announced its cooperation with patrol work.

Thus the way is prepared for an agreement on this subject at the international conference on safety at sea. In the meantime I have requested the Secretary of the Treasury to allow Capt. Commandant Berthoif, of the Revenue-Cutter Service, who has had long experience in the Arctic, to serve on a committee on aids and perils to navigation, which will consider ice and other problems. The same committee will also consider transatlantic steamship lanes, on which a British committee already has reported, and I have requested, through the Secretary of the Navy, the cooperation of the Hydrographic Office. The London radiotelegraphic convention, ratified by the Senate on January 22, 1913, provides for the wireless dissemination of meteorological reports, and I have asked the Secretary of Agriculture for the help of the Weather Bureau on this committee, which under the Alexander resolution will be requested to consider systems of reporting and disseminating weather reports and information relating to aids and perils to navigation. The Maritime Exchanges of New York and Philadelphia and the Boston Chamber of Commerce have been asked to unite on the name of the captain of an ocean passenger steamship and also on the name of a representative of their organizations for duty on this committee.

I know of no other body of men brought so frequently and continuously into contact with the varied perils of North Atlantic navigation from the Grand Banks to Nantucket as the captains of the deep-sea fishing fleets of New England, so I particularly desire to secure the services of a member of the Gloucester Master Mariners' Association. But it will be unreasonable to ask for the services of many of those whose experience and knowledge are needed unless Congress shall provide for their necessary expenses while engaged in work to enable this country to offer intelligent advice, perform intelligent work, and secure rational results at an international conference in which all our people, rich and poor, have so much at stake.

Atlantic yachting forms so large a part of our national maritime life that I have asked the yacht clubs, through the New York Yacht Club, to be represented on this committee. The Lighthouse Bureau has wide experience with submarine bells, high-powered lights, and similar apparatus, of which I shall avail myself through its representative.

LIFEBOATS AND DAVITS.

The loss of the steamship *Titanic* led to an immediate demand for lifeboats and life rafts for all on board, and that principle is now generally recognized by regulation or the voluntary action of shipowners. The subject, however, is not as simple as it might seem at first blush, because the use of davits and other means of putting such boats over the ship's side, of lowering them fully loaded, or lowering passengers into them when afloat, as well as stowage on deck, which may affect the ship's stability, all offer difficulties. The Steamboat-Inspection Service has already done much good work in these lines, and the regulations recently approved will, I trust, prove effective. As already stated, the new British regulations on the subject were informally laid before my predecessor and members of the Senate and House committees especially concerned before they were put into effect abroad. Good progress has thus been made toward agreement on this subject, but its importance warrants consideration of all details. The rescue work of the Life-Saving Service and of the Revenue-Cutter Service is carried on mainly with lifeboats, often under conditions of peril, and I have asked the Secretary of the Treasury for the cooperation of skilled officers of those services with the Supervising Inspector General of the Steamboat-Inspection Service in preparing in detail a statement of American views on this subject. I have also requested the shipowners and the shipbuilders to name men, representing their views, to work with the officers mentioned.

FIRE PROTECTION.

The Alexander resolution wisely provided that the United States should lay before nations the subject of protection against fire at sea, which, to my mind, is of equal importance with subjects that have attracted more general notice. Loss of life from this source is, of course, much less frequent than in the days of wooden vessels. On the other hand, the inflammable character of many cargoes, which under the lower modern freight rates can be carried, gives opportunity for spontaneous combustion, creating a risk almost unknown in earlier days. In trying to meet adequately this requirement of the joint resolution, I am asking for the services of expert representatives of the National Board of Marine Underwriters, the National Board of Fire Underwriters, and also of the Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Companies, whose tests, I am aware, are applied mainly to apparatus used on shore but whose experience will be valuable. I also count on securing technical advice from the Patent Office when needed and on the committee to study fire conditions on shipboard, and shall, of course, include a representative of the Steamboat-Inspection Service charged more immediately with the approval and supervision of existing fire-fighting appliances.

LIABILITY OF SHIPOWNERS.

You recall that in January, 1912, the Senate ratified the Brussels international convention unifying certain rules regarding assistance and salvage at sea, and subsequently Congress enacted legislation to give it effect. One of the provisions of the convention and of the statute prescribes that every master is bound, so far as he can do so without serious danger to his vessel, crew, and passengers, to render assistance to everybody found at sea in danger of being lost, and failure to render such assistance subjects the delinquent master to heavy penalties. The obligation imposed by humanity has thus been strengthened by statutory requirement. The question of limitation of the liability of shipowners has taken large proportions in the thoughts of men here and abroad since the disaster of last April. It was already a topic set apart for consideration by the Brussels international conference on the unification of maritime law. In view of its increased importance, the Belgian Government decided to postpone until September of this year the international maritime law conference, which will be quite apart from the London conference, to consider this subject. Congress has already made the necessary appropriation for the expenses of a delegation of men of the highest legal attainments to represent the United States at this conference, and the Secretary of State and myself have already invited the Hon. A. J. Montague, of Richmond, Va., and Edwin W. Smith, Esq., of Pittsburgh, Pa., to continue to represent the United States at the conference, and have secured the services of the Hon. Henry Galbraith Ward, United States circuit judge of the second circuit. The composition of the delegation will probably be completed soon, and Secretary Bryan and myself will arrange for consultation with the delegation at Washington, so that the attitude of the United States on this difficult subject may be carefully and fully determined.

Yours, very truly,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD, *Secretary.*

OVERFLOW OF THE GREAT MIAMI RIVER, OHIO.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, during the recent floods in the State of Ohio the city of Dayton, among our growing cities which suffered, was particularly stricken. In the city of Dayton, with a population of perhaps 125,000 people, 14,000 homes were flooded. Nearly all the business portion of the city was inundated. Lives were lost and property to the estimated value of more than $100,000,000 was destroyed.

The cause was primarily the excessive fall of water. Secondarily, it was due to the condition of a navigable stream, the Great Miami River. This condition was due in part to the fact that bridges had been constructed across the river the abutments of which encroached upon the channel of the stream, and great piers were builded in the midst of the stream, thereby lessening the channel and increasing the opportunity for the damming up of the river. The city council of Dayton feel that the National Government should have given more attention to the construction of those bridges, and that the channel of the stream should be changed.

The other day the city council adopted a preamble and resolution in the nature of a petition addressed to the Congress of the United States, looking to ultimate relief against the possibility of a recurrence of floods of this character. I send the preamble and resolution, in the form of a petition, to the desk, and ask that it be read and referred to the Commerce Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

A resolution offered for consideration to the council of the city of Dayton, State of Ohio.

Whereas the Great Miami River is controlled as a navigable stream by the Federal Government, it is the duty of the Government to examine plans for all bridges and to prevent the channel from being encroached upon by private interests; and

Whereas the Government has failed to perform its obligation in regard to the inspection and supervision of our waterway and is thus directly responsible, in our opinion, to the people of Dayton for the great calamity from which they are now suffering; and

Whereas the neglect of the Government in this instance has resulted in a great loss of life and a monetary loss to Dayton of more than $100,000,000, through the disastrous forces with which we are too weak to cope; and

Whereas the Federal Government should not continue its neglect of this condition, but should at once appropriate a sufficient amount of money to place the city of Dayton beyond the liability of another disaster such as that through which we have just passed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the council of the city of Dayton, State of Ohio, That we now respectfully demand some just reparation from the Government for the neglect from which we are suffering; this demand is made because it is just, and because we are entitled to that protection which the Federal Government affords and gives to all cities located along navigable waterways; and

That we now petition the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient funds to cut a new channel for the Great Miami River and to supervise the work of cutting this new channel; and

That the clerk of council be, and he is hereby, directed to certify copies of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by council, April 9, 1913.

WM. D. HUBER,
President of Council.

Attest:

WAYNE G. LEE,
Clerk of Council.

I hereby approve the foregoing resolution this 11th of April, 1913.

EDWARD PHILIPPS,
Mayor of the City of Dayton, State of Ohio.

I, Wayne G. Lee, clerk of council of the city of Dayton, State of Ohio, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution duly adopted by the city council at a special meeting had and held in the council chamber of the city of Dayton, State of Ohio, on the 9th day of April, A. D. 1913, and which is duly recorded in minute book C–I, page 435, of the records of the council of said city of Dayton, State of Ohio.

[SEAL.] WAYNE G. LEE,
Clerk of Council, City of Dayton, State of Ohio.

ACTING ASSISTANT DOORKEEPER CARL A. LOEFFLER.

Mr. KERN. From the Committee on Privileges and Elections I submit the following unanimous report. I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana presents a report from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which will be read.

The Secretary read the report (No. 3), as follows:

Mr. President, your Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom were referred the verbal charges made on the floor of the Senate on the 13th of March, 1913, against the official conduct of Carl A. Loeffler, Acting Assistant Doorkeeper of the Senate, having considered and fully investigated such charges and the facts upon which the same were based, unanimously report:

First. That there is no evidence showing any official misconduct on the part of the said Loeffler.

Second. That the Senate should make no further investigation of such charges.

Your committee asks to be discharged from further consideration of the matter so referred to them and that the whole subject be indefinitely postponed.

JOHN W. KERN, *Chairman.*

Mr. KERN. Inasmuch as the report is unanimous, and as an act of justice to the young man against whom the charges were made, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report that I may move its adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KERN. I move that the report of the committee be adopted.

The motion was agreed to.

FRED N. WEBBER.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contigent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 29, to pay Fred N. Webber, jr., a sum equal to six months' pay of his late father, Fred N. Webber, sr., a Senate policeman, to report it back favorably, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 29, submitted by Mr. BRADLEY on the 7th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to Fred N. Webber, jr., son of Fred N. Webber, sr., deceased, late a Senate policeman, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I move to amend the resolution by inserting "twelve" instead of "six," making the allowance of pay for 12 months in lieu of 6 months. I do this because the Senate set a precedent at the close of the last session fixing one year's salary as the amount voted to the widow of a deceased Sergeant at Arms, and I see no reason why there should be a discrimination against an employee who received a much smaller salary than did he.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will not be adopted by the Senate. Perhaps the worst thing that any legislative body can do is to follow a wrong precedent. Both the Senator from Kansas and I, as members of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, opposed the amendment which granted 12 months' pay to the family of the deceased Sergeant at Arms. Simply because something has been done which was, both in his opinion and in mine, a wrong thing to do, is no reason why it should be followed by making the wrong universal with regard to all the employees of the Senate.

In my opinion the whole system of paying the families of Senators and employees when they happen to die, for time which they have not served, on this earth at any rate, is wrong; but it is a custom, and has been for a long time, to grant 6 months' pay to the family of a deceased Senator or a deceased employee. During the last session we went beyond precedent to some extent and granted 12 months' pay to the family of one of the employees of the Senate. I do not mean by saying that we went beyond precedent to some extent that there never had been any precedent at all for it. There had been three or four bad precedents, which ought to have been "honored in the breach" rather "than the observance."

I hope the amendment will be voted down, and I hope the resolution as reported by the committee will be passed.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will yield, I desire to say that I am in absolute harmony with his views as to what ought to be done. I opposed with what vigor I could the precedent that was set in the payment to the family of a higher officer of the Senate a full year's salary, but it seems to me to pay to the family of an officer who has received a salary of five or six thousand dollars a year a full year's salary and then refuse to pay to the family of just as faithful an employee who received, say, a thousand dollars a year a full year's salary and to cut his family down to six months' salary, is an unjustifiable and indefensible discrimination.

I do not want to set any precedent of allowing 12 months' pay in such cases. I do not believe in it. I tried to prevent it before, though I could not; but I want the Senate to be consistent, to do one thing or the other, so as to treat the families of its deceased employees alike. That is the reason why I made the motion to amend, and I hope if the amendment is voted down that action will be observed as a precedent in the future.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not think there is really any difference between the Senator from Kansas and myself, except that he seems to think the proper way to right a wrong is to do another wrong thing just like it. I want the Senate to pursue a consistent course, and I want to make it consistent by going back to the regular practice of allowing six months' pay to families of deceased employees until such time as possibly the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate may destroy the whole system.

Mr. President, I have finished what I have to say, and I ask for the adoption of the resolution as reported.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, as a member of the committee that passed upon this resolution I voted against it, because I do not believe that the practice involved is good; but the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] has proposed an amendment which, it seems to me, if it should be adopted as a precedent, will make the practice still worse. Six months' pay is surely enough to give to the families of deceased employees of the Senate. In fact, it seems to me that the law which prescribes the exact amount of compensation to Senators and Representatives and employees of Congress is really what ought to be adhered to. Inasmuch, however, as the practice has heretofore been that which is proposed in the pending resolution and this case has occurred while that practice remained, I do not know that I shall now object, although I did vote against the resolution in committee; but to add six months' more salary in the case of the death of an employee seems to me is going far beyond what we ought to do, and I hope the Senate will vote down the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW].

The SECRETARY. In line 5, before the word "months," it is proposed to strike out "six" and to insert "twelve."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I simply desire to say a word about this question, because I want my own position to be clear. With great reluctance I yielded to the report as made. I do not believe the Senate is justified in appropriating money beyond the salary due at the time of death in any case, and I stated to the committee I would prepare a bill to that effect, in order that this practice might be terminated. It is not justifiable, in my opinion. It is a mere grant of largess; it is a devotion of the people's money to an illegal purpose. It never should have been the custom; the custom should not longer prevail; but it seemed, in view of the fact that the custom has heretofore existed, rather an invidious thing to do, to stop the operation of the custom as to a particular man whose relatives are to receive this reward, the death having already occurred. So I was content then, and am content now, to see this particular resolution pass in the form reported by the committee; but I shall introduce at my earliest convenience a bill to stop the practice, and I shall ask the Senate to consider it.

With reference to the position taken by the Senator from Kansas, it seems to me that its logic is that if a legislative body has ever made a mistake it must continue to make that mistake, and the greater the mistake the more incumbent is the duty to perpetuate it. That is really not the position of the Senator from Kansas. What he desires to do, I think, is to impress upon the Senate the evil of this practice. The lesson having been given and the expresssion of opinion having been very full,

I think his amendment ought to be voted down, and that we ought to give six months' pay in this instance and then cease this practice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs upon the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. WILLIAMS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably, with an amendment, Senate resolution 26, and I submit a report (No. 4) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution; and there being no objection, the Senate proceeded to its consideration.

The amendment of the committee was, in line 4, after the word "stenographer," to insert "at a price not to exceed $1 per printed page," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a price not to exceed $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate, and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I inquire if that is an amendment reported by the committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that that will involve an expense perhaps greater than would be incurred by hiring a stenographer regularly by the day. The amendment, I understand, proposes to fix the rate of compensation at $1 per printed page.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the present law provides just what is proposed by the amendment, except that the present law stipulates that the rate of compensation shall not exceed $1.25 per printed page. We have here reduced the rate to a dollar per printed page.

By the way, I want to say in this connection that it was stated to the committee that during a contested-election case a stenographer, paid at the rate fixed by law—$1.25 per printed page—made nearly $50 a day in reporting the hearing. It was thought that the rate fixed by law could not be affected or repealed except by law, but that in a matter merely concerning a Senate committee the committee could fix the maximum rate, provided it did not exceed the maximum fixed by law. We therefore reduced it from $1.25 to $1 per printed page.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am fully aware that the law provides that the rate shall not exceed $1.25 per printed page, and I am quite in harmony with the amendment so far as it goes; but I want to ask the Senator——

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from Utah will pardon me just a moment, I will state for the benefit of the Senate that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate has appointed a subcommittee to look into the entire matter of the payment of stenographers for reporting hearings, and so forth, to examine the House system and to examine other systems, and see if we can not inaugurate a better system than the one which now prevails. The Senator is aware of the fact that over in the House they have a certain number of men, called committee stenographers, who are borne upon the roll at an annual salary, and who are detailed from time to time to attend committees and report hearings.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I was fully aware of that, and I thought at this particular time it was opportune to call attention to that fact, because I think such a system would save the Senate committees a great deal of money. I am fully aware of just what the Senator says—that many of the stenographers reporting committees of the Senate have made perhaps as high as the Senator says, $50 a day. It would be much better for the Senate to employ certain stenographers and have the committees use those stenographers. I believe that would be cheaper——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am inclined to think that the House system is better than ours.

Mr. SMOOT. And that is the reason why I brought up the question. I thought perhaps it could be arranged in this resolution, but if not——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would rather this resolution would not be complicated with that matter——

Mr. SMOOT. If not, I shall not object to the resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Because we have appointed a subcommittee to investigate and make a full report. I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, just a word. The Committee on the District of Columbia has employed stenographers from time to time, and they have been paid the usual rate of $1.25 per printed page. There ought not to be any discrimination as between the employment by committees and employment under the general law, but very likely that can not be corrected now. I am inclined to think that a dollar a page is a sufficient compensation, and inasmuch as we have no regularly employed stenographers upon whom we can call to do this work, I hope the resolution will pass as the Senator from Mississippi has reported it.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT.

Mr. CHILTON. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 577) authorizing the President to appoint an additional circuit judge for the fourth circuit. It is a bill of only five lines, and as it refers to a purely local matter I am going to ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I desire to explain that it provides for the appointment of an additional circuit judge in the fourth circuit, a circuit which is the only one in the United States limping along with two circuit judges. The need for an additional judge has been great for a number of years, and in the Sixty-second Congress a bill similar to the one now reported was passed, but for some reason it failed of passage in another place. I think the bill should be passed, and I hope there will be no opposition to its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill reported by him from the Committee on the Judiciary. Is there objection?

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I must object. What are we going to do after the 1st of July with the four circuit judges who are now serving as judges of the Commerce Court? Why can not one of them be assigned to this work?

Mr. CHILTON. I hope the Senator will not endeavor to send one of them to West Virginia or to the fourth circuit.

Mr. BRISTOW. Well, there are four of them who will have to be assigned somewhere. What are we going to do with them?

Mr. CHILTON. That is not our affair, Mr. President. Of course, though, if the Senator objects the bill can not be considered.

Mr. BRISTOW. I think we have a surplus of circuit judges now, or will have after the 1st of July.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, this bill was passed by the Senate during the last Congress, and the Senator did not object then, although the same condition regarding the judges to whom he refers was present then that is present now.

Mr. BRISTOW. Well, I have been lectured this morning for undertaking to perpetuate a bad precedent, and so——

Mr. CHILTON. I voted with the Senator after he was lectured, and I did not join in the lecturing. I went the Senator one better. I voted for his amendment when he did not vote for it himself.

Mr. BRISTOW. Of course, I regret to object to anything that the Senator from West Virginia may desire, but I feel constrained, until we know what is to become of the four surplus circuit judges who will be on our hands after the 1st of July, to object to creating any more.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, I merely want to say to the Senator that he ought to have considered that when he was voting to create extra judges for almost every other circuit in the United States except the fourth circuit. I hope the Senator will now consider this proposition. It is not an idle matter; the fourth circuit is really suffering for an additional judge. It needs him. There is so much business there that it really can not be transacted without another circuit judge. I think the Senator is making a mistake now in interposing the objection.

Mr. BRISTOW. I understand if there is a crowded condition of business there, judges can be assigned to attend to that business for a couple of months at any rate, and there will be four circuit judges on our hands on the 1st of July, and what are we going to do with them?

Mr. CHILTON. That is a matter for the Senate to determine; it is not for me to answer. I only know that the Congress of the United States has been treating the fourth judicial circuit very badly for a number of years, and I want the Senate to correct the situation by taking the same action that it took at the last session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas insist upon his objection?

Mr. BRISTOW. I certainly must; yes.

Mr. GOFF. I desire to ask the Senator from Kansas not to object, and to state that there are reasons why he should not. That was my motive in rising. Am I too late for that?

Mr. BRISTOW. Of course I regret very much to oppose the Senators from West Virginia in this matter, but I shall have to insist upon my objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. GOFF. The Senator probably would not do so if he heard the facts to the contrary.

Mr. BRISTOW. The facts can be presented when the bill is up for consideration, and amendments can be offered to it at that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill will go to the calendar.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR CONNECTICUT.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. From the Committee on the Judiciary, I report back favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 281) providing for an increase of salary of the United States attorney for the district of Connecticut, and I submit a report (No. 2) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was, in line 5, after the word "of," to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act the salary of the United States attorney for the district of Connecticut shall be at the rate of $4,000 a year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I did not object to the consideration of the bill, but I should like to have a little explanation from the Senator from Connecticut as to why this change in the salary should be made.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, a similar bill was passed by the Senate at the last session of Congress, and it was unanimously reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee in the House, but failed of action by the House itself. The present salary of the United States attorney for the district of Connecticut is $2,500. The whole State, containing a million and a quarter people, is one district. The business of the office has increased greatly in recent years. Both Judiciary Committees, that of the House and that of the Senate, have thought the salary ought to be increased so as to put it on a par with the salaries paid in other States similarly situated.

I will ask that the report be printed in the RECORD, as it explains the whole matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

The report (No. 2) submitted this day by Mr. BRANDEGEE is as follows:

Mr. BRANDEGEE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report, to accompany S. 281:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 281) providing for an increase of salary of the United States attorney for the district of Connecticut, having had the same under consideration, unanimously recommend that the bill do pass with the following amendment: On line 5, after the word "of," strike out "$5,000" and in lieu thereof insert "$4,000."

The State of Connecticut comprises one judicial district with a population of 1,114,756, and the law provides for the holding of court at New Haven and Hartford. The present salary of the United States attorney for this district is $2,500, with no allowances for assistance except $350 a year for a clerk. The district has increased more than 400,000 in population since the salary was fixed at $2,500, and your committee believe that at present it is wholly inadequate, and a comparison of the salaries paid in the other districts and number of cases in which the United States is a party can only justify such a conclusion. It was represented to your committee by those familiar with the duties of the United States attorney for this district that the number and importance of the cases in which the United States is a party have very largely increased.

The salaries paid the United States attorneys, their assistant attorneys, and clerks in the New England districts are as follows:

Maine, $3,000; assistant attorney, $1,200; clerk, $600.
New Hampshire, $2,000; clerk, $500.
Vermont, $3,000; clerk, $840.
Massachusetts, $5,000; assistant attorneys, $8,600; clerk, $3,760.
Rhode Island, $2,500; assistant attorney, $1,500; clerk, $750.
Connecticut, $2,500; clerk, $350.

The clerk was paid in 1911 $4,939.60. The salary of the marshal for this district is $2,500.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. On Saturday last I introduced a bill (S. 737) prohibiting the use of fish traps or other device for impounding fish in waters in and adjacent to Alaska. At my request the bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce. I have since been informed that the proper committee is the Committee on Fisheries. I reintroduce the bill and ask that the reference be corrected.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey:

A bill (S. 877) prohibiting the use of fish traps or other device for impounding fish in waters in and adjacent to Alaska; to the Committee on Fisheries.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 878) to provide for the appointment of a district judge in the northern and southern judicial districts in the State of Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 879) to regulate the employment of minor children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 880) for the relief of heirs of Winston Morris, deceased;

A bill (S. 881) for the relief of heirs or estate of John Mills, deceased;

A bill (S. 882) for the relief of the estate of Francis Mayerhoff;

A bill (S. 883) for the relief of heirs or estate of Jesse Mabry, deceased;

A bill (S. 884) for the relief of the heirs, devisees, and legatees of Willis Lowe, deceased;

A bill (S. 885) for the relief of Harry P. Lee, John M. Lee, and the heirs of Nathaniel W. Lee;

A bill (S. 886) for the relief of Mrs. E. A. Lanier and estate of N. B. Lanier, deceased;

A bill (S. 887) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Kuykendall;

A bill (S. 888) for the relief of heirs or estate of Eunice Hurdle, deceased;

A bill (S. 889) for the relief of James K. Hamblen;

A bill (S. 890) for the relief of the estate of Gladney, Gardner & Co.;

A bill (S. 891) for the relief of heirs or estate of Benjamin Garrett, deceased;

A bill (S. 892) for the relief of the estate of J. M. Fortenberry, deceased;

A bill (S. 893) for the relief of Mrs. P. A. Eskridge;

A bill (S. 894) for the relief of Clarissa Duncan and Charles E. Duncan;

A bill (S. 895) for the relief of the estate of Mary Dean, deceased;

A bill (S. 896) for the relief of the estate of Enos Davis, deceased;

A bill (S. 897) for the relief of heirs or estate of E. C. Cornelius, deceased;

A bill (S. 898) for the relief of the heirs of J. B. Clark;

A bill (S. 899) for the relief of the heirs of Louis Cato, deceased;

A bill (S. 900) for the relief of Maria Elizabeth Burnett;

A bill (S. 901) for the relief of the estate of R. C. Bumpass, deceased;

A bill (S. 902) for the relief of the heirs of J. L. W. Bullock, deceased;

A bill (S. 903) for the relief of the heirs of U. H. Buck, deceased;

A bill (S. 904) for the relief of the estate of Capt. John Belino, deceased;

A bill (S. 905) for the relief of Louis T. Barnes;

A bill (S. 906) for the relief of Mary Maynor;

A bill (S. 907) for the relief of heirs of James Porter, deceased;

A bill (S. 908) for the relief of the estate of William Richards, deceased;

A bill (S. 909) for the relief of the estate of Joseph S. Rogers, deceased;

A bill (S. 910) for the relief of the estate of Phereby R. Sheppard;

A bill (S. 911) for the relief of M. T. Sigrest;

A bill (S. 912) for the relief of heirs or estate of W. R. Smith, deceased;

A bill (S. 913) for the relief of the estate of William Penn, deceased;

A bill (S. 914) for the relief of the heirs of Joshua Nicholls;
A bill (S. 915) for the relief of the heirs of W. H. Sneed, deceased;
A bill (S. 916) for the relief of heirs or estate of Louis Summers, deceased;
A bill (S. 917) for the relief of W. W. Warren, administrator of the estate of Jackson Warren, deceased; and
A bill (S. 918) for the relief of the estate of Nevin Phares; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 919) granting an increase of pension to Agnes E. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. BRYAN:
A bill (S. 920) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes"; and
A bill (S. 921) to repeal section 3 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900"; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.
By Mr. NEWLANDS:
A bill (S. 922) providing for an increase of salary of the United States marshal for the district of Nevada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
A bill (S. 923) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.
A bill (S. 924) to authorize the inclosure of certain lands in the State of Nevada containing dangerous quagmires; to the Committee on Public Lands.
A bill (S. 925) authorizing the preparation and submission to Congress of a plan for the gradual acquisition of parks and playgrounds in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.
By Mr. BACON:
A bill (S. 926) for the relief of the Georgia Railroad & Banking Co.; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.
A bill (S. 927) to make lawful certain agreements between employees and laborers, and persons engaged in agriculture or horticulture, and to limit the issuing of injunctions in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
A bill (S. 928) for the restoration of Park Howell, late captain, to the Medical Corps of the Army of the United States; and
A bill (S. 929) to promote the efficiency of the Hospital Corps of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 930) for the relief of the estate of Epenetus Heath, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. LIPPITT:
A bill (S. 931) granting an increase of pension to William A. Munroe;
A bill (S. 932) granting a pension to Margaret L. McDermott;
A bill (S. 933) granting an increase of pension to Carrie H. Chace;
A bill (S. 934) granting an increase of pension to Horace P. Lester;
A bill (S. 935) granting an increase of pension to Nancy M. Vinton;
A bill (S. 936) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Harris;
A bill (S. 937) granting a pension to Sarah B. Potter;
A bill (S. 938) granting an increase of pension to Harriet N. Crowell;
A bill (S. 939) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Taylor;
A bill (S. 940) granting a pension to Mary W. Gross;
A bill (S. 941) granting an increase of pension to Josiah D. Hunt;
A bill (S. 942) granting an increase of pension to Charles Hatfield;
A bill (S. 943) granting an increase of pension to Flora Annis;
A bill (S. 944) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Spencer;
A bill (S. 945) granting an increase of pension to Amanda M. Dixon;
A bill (S. 946) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Cady;
A bill (S. 947) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Jennison;
A bill (S. 948) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Tillinghast; and
A bill (S. 949) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Reynolds; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. JONES:
A bill (S. 950) providing for the adjustment of the claims of the States and Territories to lands within national forests; to the Committee on Public Lands.
A bill (S. 951) to provide for the formation of banking corporations for carrying on the business of banking in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories.
A bill (S. 952) awarding a medal of honor to George Murphy, late private, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
A bill (S. 953) extending the provisions of the bounty-land law of March 3, 1855, to persons who participated in the Indian wars of the United States prior to April 12, 1861; to the Committee on Public Lands.
A bill (S. 954) forbidding the use of spurious currency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.
A bill (S. 955) validating and confirming conveyances of lands made by allottees on the Yakima Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.
A bill (S. 956) to increase the pensions of the blind who served in the War with Mexico, the Civil War, and the War with Spain; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. KENYON:
A bill (S. 957) to define and punish lobbying; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.
A bill (S. 958) to require hours of rest for employees on railroads; to the Committee on Education and Labor.
By Mr. KERN:
A bill (S. 960) for the relief of Richard Brady;
A bill (S. 961) for the relief of James M. Blankenship;
A bill (S. 962) for the relief of Edgar A. Darling;
A bill (S. 963) for the relief of Israel Sturges;
A bill (S. 964) for the relief of John Lynch;
A bill (S. 965) for the relief of George Peyton; and
A bill (S. 966) for the relief of William M. Burns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 967) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Merrill;
A bill (S. 968) granting an increase of pension to James F. McGrew;
A bill (S. 969) granting an increase of pension to James H. Meekin;
A bill (S. 970) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Loughry;
A bill (S. 971) granting an increase of pension to Emmett Langston;
A bill (S. 972) granting an increase of pension to Emmett Langston;
A bill (S. 973) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Leonard;
A bill (S. 974) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Kennedy;
A bill (S. 975) granting an increase of pension to Calvin W. Keefer;
A bill (S. 976) granting an increase of pension to Richard F. Jacks;
A bill (S. 977) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Stauter;
A bill (S. 978) granting a pension to W. H. Padgett;
A bill (S. 979) granting an increase of pension to Ryland W. Darnall;
A bill (S. 980) granting a pension to John T. Drinkwater;
A bill (S. 981) granting an increase of pension to Milton Cobler;
A bill (S. 982) granting a pension to Sarah L. Craig;
A bill (S. 983) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Carr;
A bill (S. 984) granting an increase of pension to Robert F. Catterson;
A bill (S. 985) granting a pension to Robert T. Burton;
A bill (S. 986) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Havens;
A bill (S. 987) granting a pension to Omar E. Brown;
A bill (S. 988) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Brubaker;
A bill (S. 989) granting an increase of pension to Josiah L. Burton;
A bill (S. 990) granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Butler;
A bill (S. 991) granting a pension to Watson Nickelson;
A bill (S. 992) granting a pension to William H. Albert;

A bill (S. 993) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Armstrong;

A bill (S. 994) granting an increase of pension to George W. Allen;

A bill (S. 995) granting an increase of pension to Edward W. Anderson;

A bill (S. 996) granting a pension to Oscar C. Shull;

A bill (S. 997) granting a pension to Rose E. Umholtz;

A bill (S. 998) granting an increase of pension to Robert Posey;

A bill (S. 999) granting an increase of pension to Cass M. Peterson;

A bill (S. 1000) granting an increase of pension to Schuyler C. Pool;

A bill (S. 1001) granting a pension to Benaldine Smith Noble;

A bill (S. 1002) granting a pension to Durance R. McFeely;

A bill (S. 1003) granting an increase of pension to William E. McGee;

A bill (S. 1004) granting an increase of pension to William Woodford Mitchell;

A bill (S. 1005) granting an increase of pension to William H. Moore;

A bill (S. 1006) granting an increase of pension to William H. Sumption;

A bill (S. 1007) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Baughman;

A bill (S. 1008) granting an increase of pension to Enoch Medsker;

A bill (S. 1009) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Burk;

A bill (S. 1010) granting an increase of pension to Zachariah V. Purdy;

A bill (S. 1011) granting an increase of pension to Rachel B. Purdy;

A bill (S. 1012) granting an increase of pension to James Roberts;

A bill (S. 1013) granting an increase of pension to George W. Shreeve;

A bill (S. 1014) granting a pension to Rose A. Doyle;

A bill (S. 1015) granting an increase of pension to James Edwards;

A bill (S. 1016) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Everson;

A bill (S. 1017) granting an increase of pension to Alfred H. Fodrea;

A bill (S. 1018) granting an increase of pension to Frances F. Godown;

A bill (S. 1019) granting a pension to Delia E. Godfrey;

A bill (S. 1020) granting an increase of pension to James H. Goldsborough;

A bill (S. 1021) granting a pension to Mary F. Gaddie;

A bill (S. 1022) granting a pension to William Howell;

A bill (S. 1023) granting a pension to Anna Hohndorff;

A bill (S. 1024) granting an increase of pension to Mathew Isaacs;

A bill (S. 1025) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Jared; and

A bill (S. 1026) granting a pension to Lewis C. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

A bill (S. 1027) to provide for an enlarged homestead; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1028) prohibiting the issuing of revenue stamps to and the receiving of a special tax upon distilled spirits and fermented liquors from persons designing to sell such spirits and liquors for use as a beverage in any State or Territory, or subdivision of any State or Territory, in which the sale of distilled spirits and fermented liquors for use as a beverage is prohibited by law; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1029) granting an increase of pension to Annie Shannon (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1030) granting an increase of pension to Norman P. Wood (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 1031) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama:

A bill (S. 1032) to amend section 1342 and chapter 6, title 14, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 1033) for the relief of certain Shawnee and Delaware Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1034) to prevent the transportation interstate of adulterated commercial feeding stuffs for live stock and poultry, and providing a penalty for the violation of the act; to the Committee on Manufactures.

A bill (S. 1035) for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia; and

A bill (S. 1036) to amend an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1037) providing means for making effective the law relating to the publicity of campaign contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

A bill (S. 1038) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to permit exchanges of lands of Osage allottees, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1039) to adjust and settle the claims of the loyal Shawnee and loyal Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Indians;

A bill (S. 1040) for the relief of the Ottawa Indian Tribe of Blanchard Fork and Rouch de Boeuf;

A bill (S. 1041) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Osage Nation of Indians against the United States;

A bill (S. 1042) for the relief of the Miami Indians; and

A bill (S. 1043) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Ponca Tribe of Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON:

A bill (S. 1044) for the relief of Byron W. Canfield; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1045) for the relief of Erskine R. K. Hayes; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1046) granting a pension to Mary J. Thomas;

A bill (S. 1047) granting an increase of pension to Emily B. Smith;

A bill (S. 1048) granting a pension to Jennie E. Howell;

A bill (S. 1049) granting a pension to Ellen C. Beam;

A bill (S. 1050) granting an increase of pension to Mary McClure;

A bill (S. 1051) granting an increase of pension to Pauline G. Murphy;

A bill (S. 1052) granting a pension to Louise W. Stegman; and

A bill (S. 1053) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Myers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STONE:

A bill (S. 1054) to establish a national aeronautical laboratory; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 1055) for the relief of the county of Barton, State of Missouri;

A bill (S. 1056) for the relief of the estate of George Patterson, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1057) for the relief of the county of Boone, State of Missouri; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 1058) for the relief of Dommick Taheny and John W. Mortimer (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1059) for the relief of George M. Bryan (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1060) fixing the date of reenlistment of Gustav Hertfelder, first-class fireman, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1061) for the relief of Thomas Amick;

A bill (S. 1062) for the relief of David Steers (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1063) for the relief of Philip Cook;

A bill (S. 1064) for the relief of Thomas Miller; and

A bill (S. 1065) for the relief of John C. Barrett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1066) granting an increase of pension to George V. Shaffer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1067) granting a pension to Margaret Crawford Irwin;

A bill (S. 1068) granting a pension to Mary A. Mussey (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1069) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Strayer;

A bill (S. 1070) granting an increase of pension to George Fox;

A bill (S. 1071) granting a pension to William Wesley Blaine;

A bill (S. 1072) granting a pension to Amelia Harmon;

A bill (S. 1073) to pension certain soldiers and nonenlisted men who served in the War of the Rebellion;

A bill (S. 1074) granting a pension to Florence Sparrow; and

(By request.) A bill (S. 1075) extending the benefits of the general pension laws to the members of the Eighth, Twentieth, Twenty-sixth, Twenty-seventh, Twenty-eighth, Twenty-ninth, Thirtieth, Thirty-first, Thirty-second, and Thirty-third Regiments, the several batteries of Artillery, the several troops of Cavalry, and the several independent companies which comprised the Pennsylvania Volunteer Militia, otherwise known as the emergency men, who were called into service by the President of the United States of America, officered by United States officers, and sworn into the service of the United States for an indefinite period, the same as if they had been in the service of the United States for a period of 90 days or more; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 1076) concerning baggage and excess baggage carried by common carriers in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and common carriers while engaged in commerce between the States and between the States and foreign nations, and prescribing the duties of such common carriers in reference thereto while so engaged, defining certain offenses and fixing the punishment therefor, and repealing all conflicting laws; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1077) to extend the provisions of the act of June 27, 1902, entitled "An act to extend the provisions, limitations, and benefits of an act entitled 'An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk War, Cherokee disturbance, and the Seminole War,' approved July 27, 1892"; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 1078) to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to establish postal savings depositaries for depositing savings at interest with the security of the Government for the repayment thereof, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1079) to correct the military record of Showers Nelson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1080) granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Smith;

A bill (S. 1081) granting an increase of pension to Walter Smith;

A bill (S. 1082) granting an increase of pension to John Yonker;

A bill (S. 1083) granting a pension to William Llewellyn; and

A bill (S. 1084) granting a pension to J. W. Jewell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAPP:

(By request.) A bill (S. 1085) to supplement an act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraint and monopolies, as approved July 2, 1890; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1086) for erecting a suitable memorial to John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 1087) authorizing the exchange of certain lands within the Fishlake National Forest, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 1088) to make Oklahoma City, Okla., a subport of entry under the jurisdiction of the surveyor of customs at Kansas City, Mo., and extending the privileges of the seventh section of the act of June 10, 1880, thereto; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 1089) for the relief of the estate of T. J. Semmes, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1090) for the relief of the estate of John Pemberton, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 1091) to transfer the Pacific Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1092) granting a pension to Louise Amy (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1093) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Tinstman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions:

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 1094) to promote the efficiency of the Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 1095) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Schantz (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 1096) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Parmelee (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1097) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Rice (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1098) granting an increase of pension to Flora L. Cummings (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEWLANDS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 16) regarding the Panama Canal tolls; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 17) granting permission to the Woman's Titanic Memorial Association to erect a memorial structure in Potomac Park, in the city of Washington; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 18) for the relief of destitute persons within the State of Alabama in the districts devastated by the recent floods and storms; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWEN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) proposing a method of amending the Constitution of the United States by establishing constitutional majority rule; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY AND WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide compensation for accidental injuries, resulting in disability or death, to employees of railroad companies. I desire to say just a word, with the indulgence of the Senate, with reference to it.

This is a bill which was before the Senate at the last session, and passed by a vote of 64 to 15, and in an amended form passed the House by a vote of 218 to 81, as I recall it. In the preparation of this draft of the bill I have adopted most of the House amendments. Some of them I have not adopted. The principal amendment which I have not adopted is that which provides for a 5 days' waiting period instead of a 14 days' waiting period, as provided in the Senate bill. I have restored the Senate provision in that respect. The House amended the bill so as to provide for a maximum salary upon which the computation of compensation was to be made of $120 per month.

In the bill that I have introduced I have taken off the maximum altogether, simply providing for a minimum salary, upon which the computation of half wages is to be made, of $50 a month, so that the minimum compensation under this bill, if passed, will be $25 a month, and there will be no maximum whatever. I have thought best to do that, because I think if we restore the provision with reference to the waiting period to 14 calendar days instead of 5 calendar days, the aggregate of the amount which will be saved by doing that will justify us in taking off the maximum. The 9 days which will be saved, applied to all of these employees, will amount in the aggregate to a considerable sum, while it will amount to a very trifling sum to each individual.

The policy of this sort of legislation is primarily to take care of the serious accidents, the calamities; and by cutting out these trivial injuries we will save a large sum of money to apply to the more serious injuries.

I ask, Mr. President, that 5,000 additional copies of the bill be printed, 2,000 of which shall be for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, and 3,000 for the document room. I make that request because this bill applies to some seventeen hundred thousand railroad employees. There has already been a demand for many copies of it, and there will be a demand for a large number of copies.

The bill (S. 959) to provide an exclusive remedy and compensation for accidental injuries, resulting in disability or death, to employees of common carriers by railroad engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, or in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The Senator from Utah asks that 5,000 additional copies of the bill be printed, 2,000 for the use

of the Committee on the Judiciary, and 3,000 for the Senate document room. If there be no objection, that order will be made.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. BRYAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 10) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CUMMINS. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 10) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes. I ask that the amendment be printed and referred to the Committee on Finance, and that it also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CUMMINS to the bill H. R. 10, viz: Add to paragraph 552 the following:

"*Provided, however*, That none of the foregoing meats shall be imported into the United States from any foreign country unless and until the President, after due investigation, has found and proclaimed that the government of any such foreign country has established and is maintaining a system of meat inspection which is the substantial equivalent and is as efficient as the system established and maintained by the laws of the United States in the Department of Agriculture; and especially that the system of such foreign country provides for the examination of all cattle, sheep, swine, and goats, before they are allowed to enter into any slaughtering, packing, meat canning, rendering, or similar establishment in which they are to be slaughtered and the meat or meat products thereof are to be used for food; and

"*Provided further*, That no meat imported into the United States from any foreign country shall be sold in the United States until it is examined and inspected, after arrival and before sale, by inspectors appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture; and the provisions of an act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, relating to post-mortem examinations and inspections of the carcasses and parts thereof of cattle, sheep, swine, and goats, are hereby made applicable to carcasses, parts thereof, and meats so imported into the United States from any such foreign country."

OIL AND GAS LANDS OF OSAGE NATION.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter an order authorizing the return to the Secretary of the Interior of certain papers relating to the leasing of oil and gas lands of the Osage Nation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed order will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Ordered, That the papers relating to the proposed leasing of oil and gas lands of the Osage Nation, Oklahoma, with rules and regulations, etc., forwarded to the Senate by the Secretary of the Interior in response to Senate resolution 485, Sixty-second Congress, third session, agreed to February 28, 1913, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate and returned to the Secretary of the Interior for the files of his office.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if there has been any action taken upon the resolution?

Mr. OWEN. No action was taken upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the order will be made.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the resolution ought to be amended by inserting the words "no action having been taken upon the resolution."

Mr. OWEN. It is simply an order returning the papers which are now on file in the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection at all to the order, but it ought to state that no action has been taken upon the resolution.

Mr. OWEN. The original resolution simply called for the papers, and no action was necessary. I have no objection to those words being added.

Mr. SMOOT. I think, though, the amendment ought to be made, because that is the usual form—"no action having been taken upon the resolution."

Mr. OWEN. Let there be added to the order the words "no adverse report having been made thereon."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, those words will be added, and the order as amended will be agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERKS TO SENATORS.

Mr. JONES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 44), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That each minority Senator not the chairman of a committee be, and he is hereby, authorized to employ one assistant clerk, at $1,440 per annum, to be paid from "miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

SENATE RESEARCH BUREAU.

Mr. OWEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 45), which was read and referred to the Committee on the Library:

Resolved, That there is hereby established the research bureau of the Senate, to be located in, or as near as practical to, the Senate room in the Library of Congress. The duties of the staff of the said bureau shall be (1) to brief legislative issues for the Senate committees whenever so requested, the work to include bill drafting; and (2) to assist the Senate conference committees whenever so requested. Rules for the operation of the bureau shall be formulated by the majority leader.

Second. Under the said rules the bureau shall be in charge of an expert in political science, political economy, and social science in general, who shall be elected by the Senate, and receive a salary of $———— per year. The appointments within the bureau shall be under a competitive system, the aim of which shall be to secure the services of those who are best fitted to do the work. The confirmation of appointments shall be by the majority leader. At the start the number of employees in the bureau shall be the expert in charge, one expert assistant, and a stenographer. The salaries shall be adjusted to efficiency and be fixed by the director of the bureau.

SOIL SURVEY OF ESCAMBIA COUNTY, FLA.

Mr. BRYAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 46), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That there shall be reprinted 1,000 additional copies of the Soil Survey of Escambia County, Fla., for the use of the Senate document room.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 47), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized during the Sixty-third Congress to send for persons and papers, and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for its use, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee or any subcommittee thereof may sit during the sessions of the Senate.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 48), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That there be printed together in pamphlet form, for the use of the Senate document room, 1,000 copies of an act entitled "An act for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874, and an act entitled "An act to provide a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia," approved June 11, 1878.

CLAIMS OF COLOMBIA.

Mr. HITCHCOCK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 50), which was read:

Whereas there has been published in Colombia what purports to be an official version in Spanish of the minutes of a conference between the American minister to Colombia and the minister of foreign affairs of Colombia, held February 15, 1913, at Bogota, together with a memorandum then presented by the American minister outlining the terms of a proposed settlement and arbitration of certain claims of Colombia against the United States, which proposals the Colombian minister of foreign affairs then and there rejected, according to said published minutes: Therefore, in order that the Senate may be fully informed,

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to transmit to the Senate a copy of the minutes of said conference between the American minister to Colombia and the Colombian minister of foreign affairs, together with a copy of the memorandum offer then submitted by the United States, as well as copies of all correspondence between the two countries not heretofore submitted to the Senate and relating to the claims of Colombia against the United States, including also a copy of the report made to the State Department September 30, 1912, by the American minister to Colombia and mentioned in said memorandum.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, in explanation of the resolution I desire to say that something over a year ago I offered and the Senate passed a resolution calling upon the President to present to the Senate copies of all correspondence which had passed between the United States and Colombia relative to the claim of Colombia against the United States arising out of the secession of Panama in November, 1903.

The Senate passed the resolution, but the President returned it to the Senate later with a letter from the Secretary of State to the effect that it was not deemed expedient at that time to send the correspondence of recent years to the Senate, for the reason that certain negotiations were then pending, and a report from the minister of the United States was expected. It appears now that the report has been received; that negotiations have been had at Bogota, and that Colombia received certain proffers from the United States amounting, as I am told, to something over $25,000,000, which were rejected by Colombia. I think the time has arrived when the Senate and the country should be advised of the character of the proposition made and the present status of the negotiations between the two countries on this important question. I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

GOVERNMENT EXPRESSAGE ON LAND-GRANT RAILROADS.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I send to the desk a resolution which I ask to have read for the information of the Senate, and then I will ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 49) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate whether or not payments have been from time to time made out of public moneys to express companies for the transportation of property of the United States over lines of railway companies which received grants of land from the Government upon the express condition that such lines "shall be and remain a public highway for the use of the Government of the United States, free of toll or other charges upon the transportation of property or troops of the United States; and the same shall be transported over said roads at the cost, charge, and expense of the corporations or companies owning or operating the same, when so required by the Government of the United States," or conditions of like import.

And the Secretary of the Treasury is further directed, in case payments for transportation of property of the United States over such land-grant railroads have been made to express companies, to report to the Senate the authority for making such payments and the extent to which the practice of making them has been followed.

CONFERENCE REPORTS ON TARIFF MEASURES.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to give a notice, and I send it to the desk to be read, with the accompanying resolution (S. Res. 43).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Pursuant to the rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice that on Thursday, the 17th day of April, or the next session of the Senate, I will offer a resolution proposing the adoption of an additional standing rule. A copy of the resolution and rule is attached hereto.

Resolved, That there shall be added as one of the standing rules of the Senate the following, to wit:

"When the report of a conference committee upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon a bill proposing to change duties upon imports from a foreign country into the United States is under consideration by the Senate there shall be, upon the request of any Senator, a separate vote on any point or item of disagreement concerning which there is a recommendation that the Senate recede in whole or in part."

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, in pursuance of the rules of the Senate, the notice that I have given must lie on the table until the next meeting of the Senate, and it can then be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The notice and accompanying resolution will lie on the table.

INTERNATIONAL IRRIGATION CONGRESS (S. DOC. NO. 6).

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a public document proceedings of the International Irrigation Congress of October, 1912, containing certain resolutions adopted by that congress and the constitution adopted by it.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada if that has not already been printed as a public document.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is my recollection that the Senator from Utah was to make that motion, but that in the pressure of business near the close of the last session it was not done.

Mr. SMOOT. I may be mistaken, but if my memory serves me aright it is now a public document. I can find out in a few moments, however.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will then withhold the request until the Senator from Utah ascertains the fact.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection at all to the printing, and if I did not ask that it be printed as a public document I intended to do so. I will let the Senator know in a very few minutes.

Mr. NEWLANDS subsequently said: I learn from the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] that he was mistaken in the impression that the matter referred to a few moments ago has already been printed as a document. I ask unanimous consent that it be published as a document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not care to object to this request, but it does seem to me that we have to draw the line somewhere in the matter of printing public documents, and it should not be done without some thought or understanding as to the expense. I have no doubt the Senator makes the request in perfect good faith, and perhaps the paper ought to be printed; but I think it is due to the Senate, due to the public, and due to everyone that such matters should be referred to the committee which has in hand this sort of business. There is a Committee on Printing which, when matters of this kind are referred to it, has an investigation made as to the cost of the printing, and then we get an idea as to whether it is advisable to print the different papers that are offered to be printed.

I think it is a bad precedent to insist that we should print whatever is asked to be printed at any time without any regard to what the expense may be and the number of copies required, or anything of that sort.

I wish the Senator would allow the request to be referred, so that we may have it understood that such matters shall go to the committee which is charged with the business of ascertaining the cost and the necessity of printing matters as public documents.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state to the Senator from Florida that this paper comprises a pamphlet of four or five pages. It represents the resolutions passed by the International Irrigation Congress at its session last fall and the action of that Congress relating to a new constitution enlarging its scope.

The congress has already received the recognition of the Congress of the United States by two appropriations regarding its meetings. Those meetings are of national consequence and cover a subject matter of great interest. This has been a very potential organization in the formation of public opinion regarding the method of dealing with our waters.

Of course if the Senator from Florida insists that the matter shall go to the committee, I will have to yield, but the public importance is so obvious and the expense is so trivial I hope the Senator will not press his objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from Florida objects.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not yet quite catch the request of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The request is for unanimous consent for the publication as a public document of the matter referred to.

Mr. FLETCHER. I realize the importance of the subject to which the Senator has referred, and I will not make an objection now. I do, however, insist that the proper course is to refer such requests to the Committee on Printing. I do not object to the Senator's request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, it will be so ordered.

REPORT OF PARK COMMISSION.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the report of the Park Commission of the District of Columbia, a very valuable publication, has been several times reprinted, but it is now practically out of print. Many calls are being made for that publication.

I present a condensed form of that report. It is considerably abbreviated. I would like to have from five to ten thousand copies of it printed, but will ask that the document be referred to the Committee on Printing for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The publication, with the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire, will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

INCOME-TAX PROVISION OF THE TARIFF BILL (S. DOC. NO. 4).

Mr. CLAPP. I make a request for the publication of 2,000 copies of section 2 of House bill No. 10. It is the section which relates to the income tax. Requests are being made for it, and there is no use to print the entire bill in order to comply with the requests.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of a Senate document of the last Congress. At the last Congress I submitted to be printed as a Senate document the Constitution of the United States with annotations. There has been such a demand for it that the edition has been exhausted. I ask now that it be printed with corrections to date as a Senate document and that 1,500 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? If not, it will be so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY.

Mr. KERN. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BACON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

REORGANIZATION OF CUSTOMS SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 7).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was

read and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

On August 21, 1912, and October 19, 1912, there were appointed by the President, in accordance with the authority granted to him to reorganize the customs service, Winfield T. Denison, Esq., an Assistant Attorney General; William Loeb, jr., Esq., collector of customs at New York; and Felix Frankfurter, Esq., law officer of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, as a committee to inquire into the procedure, practice, and administrative methods of the Board of United States General Appraisers.

I transmit herewith the report of this committee on these subjects.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 15, 1913.*

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, April 17, 1913, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 15, 1913.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

William H. Osborn, of North Carolina, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of Royal E. Cabell, resigned.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE.

John E. Osborne, of Wyoming, to be Assistant Secretary of State, vice Huntington Wilson, resigned.

AMBASSADOR.

Walter Hines Page, of New York, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain, vice Whitelaw Reid, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

H. Snowden Marshall, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, vice Henry A. Wise, whose term has expired.

SURVEYOR GENERAL OF OREGON.

Edward G. Worth, of Portland, Oreg., to be surveyor general of Oregon, vice George A. Westgate, term expired.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Samuel Butler, of Marysville, Cal., to be receiver of public moneys at Sacramento, Cal., vice John C. Ing, term expired.

Lee A. Ruark, of Del Norte, Colo., to be receiver of public moneys at Del Norte, Colo., vice Julius H. Weiss, term expired.

William A. Maxwell, of Brighton, Colo., to be receiver of public moneys at Denver, Colo., vice Hugh Taylor, term expired.

Samuel B. Berry, of Grand Junction, Colo., to be receiver of public moneys at Montrose, Colo., vice William C. Blair, whose term will expire April 26, 1913.

Sam Mothershead, of Burns, Oreg., to be receiver of public moneys at Burns, Oreg., vice Frank Davey, term expired and resigned.

Nolan Skiff, of Halfway, Oreg., to be receiver of public moneys at La Grande, Oreg., vice Colon Eberhard, term expired.

L. A. Booth, of Prineville, Oreg., to be receiver of public moneys at The Dalles, Oreg., vice Louis H. Arneson, term expired.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Ouias C. Skinner, of Montrose, Colo., to be register of the land office at Montrose, Colo., vice Bryson P. Blair, term expired.

John H. Bowen, of Glasgow, Mo., to be register of the land office at Springfield, Mo., vice Cornelius N. Van Hosen, deceased.

James F. Burgess, of Lakeview, Oreg., to be register of the land office at Lakeview, Oreg., vice Arthur W. Orton, whose term will expire May 31, 1913.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

S. J. Griffin to be postmaster at Cullman, Ala., in place of John F. Sutterer, removed.

Richard D. Williams to be postmaster at Opelika, Ala., in place of Dallas B. Smith, deceased.

ALASKA.

Minnie E. Swineford to be postmaster at Ketchikan, Alaska, in place of A. Zilpah Hopkins, resigned.

ARKANSAS.

Mrs. L. H. Hall to be postmaster at Pocahontas, Ark., in place of Hiram L. Throgmorton, resigned.

J. E. Pringle to be postmaster at Hoxie, Ark., in place of Alexander Jackson, resigned.

CALIFORNIA.

John A. Rollins to be postmaster at Tulare, Cal., in place of William P. Ratliff, resigned.

COLORADO.

Eva B. Hamilton to be postmaster at Stratton, Colo., in place of J. A. Smith, resigned.

Thomas Ryan to be postmaster at Salida, Colo., in place of Michael J. Guerin, resigned.

FLORIDA.

Arthur B. Brown to be postmaster at Fort Pierce, Fla., in place of William L. Keefer, resigned.

Charles E. Kettle to be postmaster at Hastings, Fla., in place of R. C. Harris, resigned.

Elmer J. Roux to be postmaster at Fernandina, Fla., in place of Oliver S. Oakes, deceased.

GEORGIA.

Stephen D. Cherry to be postmaster at Donaldsonville, Ga., in place of William E. Perry, resigned.

M. S. Cornett to be postmaster at Lawrenceville, Ga., in place of William C. Cole, resigned.

ILLINOIS.

James M. Nunamaker to be postmaster at Greenup, Ill., in place of Joseph G. Greeson, resigned.

M. O. Scott to be postmaster at Neponset, Ill., in place of Charles M. Carpenter, resigned.

INDIANA.

William E. Aydelotte to be postmaster at Sullivan, Ind., in place of Arthur A. Holmes, deceased.

John Davidson to be postmaster at Lyons, Ind., in place of Charles T. O'Haver, deceased.

William Kostbade to be postmaster at Hobart, Ind., in place of Harry C. Linkhart, deceased.

Willard S. Pugh to be postmaster at Greenfield, Ind., in place of George W. Duncan, deceased.

KANSAS.

Jefferson Dunham to be postmaster at Little River, Kans., in place of James W. Crawford, deceased.

William A. Matteson to be postmaster at Abilene, Kans., in place of Richard Waring, deceased.

KENTUCKY.

John C. Carrithers to be postmaster at Taylorsville, Ky., in place of William H. Stratton, deceased.

Ernest W. McClure to be postmaster at Leitchfield, Ky., in place of William A. Wallace, deceased.

Mary Alice Sweets to be postmaster at Bardstown, Ky., in place of John B. Weller, resigned.

LOUISIANA.

Charles De Blieux to be postmaster at Natchitoches, La., in place of J. Ernest Breda, deceased.

William G. Chapman to be postmaster at Lake Arthur, La., in place of Robert B. Johnson, resigned.

H. H. Schindler to be postmaster at Sulphur, La., in place of John J. Drost, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS.

George T. McLaughlin to be postmaster at Sandwich, Mass., in place of Charles E. Brady, resigned.

MICHIGAN.

Fred B. Carr to be postmaster at Dundee, Mich., in place of Charles H. Pulver, resigned.

Edwin C. Maxwell to be postmaster at Carleton, Mich., in place of Cash B. Herman, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI.

Elijah T. Butler to be postmaster at McComb, Miss., in place of Seth W. Collins, removed.

C. W. Carr to be postmaster at Newton, Miss., in place of Henry C. Majure, resigned.

Samuel W. Pendarvis to be postmaster at Magnolia, Miss., in place of Alfred T. Leggett, resigned.

MISSOURI.

Edward H. Moran to be postmaster at Clarksville, Mo., in place of William L. H. Silliman, deceased.

William G. Pike to be postmaster at Martinsburg, Mo., in place of Edwin W. Pritchett, resigned.

M. W. Spurling to be postmaster at Higbee, Mo., in place of John P. Rankin, deceased.

MONTANA.

Roy M. Corley to be postmaster at Stevensville, Mont., in place of William E. Baggs, removed.

William Crofft to be postmaster at Chouteau, Mont., in place of William Cowgill, resigned.

NEBRASKA.

Frank Cox to be postmaster at Sutherland, Nebr., in place of Castillo M. Reynolds, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

David V. Cahalane to be postmaster at Charlestown, N. H., in place of Fred H. Perry, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA.

John Galyen to be postmaster at Belfield, N. Dak., in place of Roswell C. Davis, resigned.

Arthur L. Menard to be postmaster at Wilton, N. Dak., in place of Merton W. Woodworth, resigned.

OHIO.

John Q. Baker to be postmaster at Middletown, Ohio, in place of Edmund L. McCallay, resigned.

John C. Gorman to be postmaster at Ironton, Ohio, in place of Jeremiah Davidson, removed.

Albert Schnell to be postmaster at Morrow, Ohio, in place of Adolphus D. Haney, resigned.

Charles Warnke to be postmaster at Huron, Ohio, in place of William H. Tyler, deceased.

Elias D. Warren to be postmaster at Fairport Harbor, Ohio, in place of Thomas M. Irwin, deceased.

OREGON.

Arunah Longwell to be postmaster at Echo, Oreg., in place of E. R. Ware, resigned.

J. A. McMorris to be postmaster at Condon, Oreg., in place of John F. Reisacher, resigned.

Frank S. Myers to be postmaster at Portland, Oreg., in place of Charles B. Merrick, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Cornelius Allen to be postmaster at Dubois, Pa., in place of John B. Hess, deceased.

William C. Kreider to be postmaster at Mauch Chunk, Pa., in place of Edwin F. Luckenbach, deceased.

Christian S. Lichleiter to be postmaster at Elk Lick, Pa., in place of Albert B. Lowry, resigned.

TENNESSEE.

John E. Conner to be postmaster at Chattancoga, Tenn., in place of William S. Raulston, resigned.

Samuel W. McKinney to be postmaster at Etowah, Tenn., in place of John Rains, resigned.

TEXAS.

Thomas Durham to be postmaster at Wellington, Tex., in place of William B. Kirby, resigned.

Tom H. Hood to be postmaster at Wortham, Tex., in place of George C. Ross, resigned.

R. H. Newton to be postmaster at Midlothian, Tex., in place of John S. McEldowney, removed.

D. A. Paulus to be postmaster at Hallettsville, Tex., in place of William J. Miller, resigned.

J. W. Shaw to be postmaster at San Diego, Tex., in place of Vidal Garcia, resigned.

Ira J. Wright to be postmaster at Mission, Tex., in place of C. W. Frick, resigned.

VIRGINIA.

P. W. Pugh to be postmaster at Broadway, Va., in place of James M. Williams, removed.

WEST VIRGINIA.

J. Garland Hurst to be postmaster at Harpers Ferry, W. Va., in place of William L. Erwin, resigned.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *April 17, 1913.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday last was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the Senator elect from the State of Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], whose credentials have heretofore been presented and filed, is now present and ready to take the oath of office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator elect will present himself at the desk for the purpose of taking the oath of office.

Mr. LEWIS was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. SHERMAN, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. LODGE. I offer a resolution placing the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] on sundry minority committees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Mr. SHERMAN be appointed a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia in place of Mr. LIPPITT, resigned; of the Committee on Canadian Relations in place of Mr. CUMMINS, resigned; of the Committee on Privileges and Elections in place of Mr. OLIVER, resigned; of the Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in Executive Departments in place of Mr. SMOOT, resigned; of the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department in place of Mr. BRISTOW, resigned; of the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard in place of Mr. BURTON, resigned; of the Committee on Forest Reservations and Protection of Game in place of Mr. POINDEXTER, resigned.

POLICEMEN'S AND FIREMEN'S PENSION ROLLS (S. DOC. NO. 10).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 10th instant, certain information relative to the names of all persons borne on the policemen's and firemen's pension rolls of the District, etc., which, on motion of Mr. GALLINGER, was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair presents a concurrent resolution adopted by the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii, which will be referred to the Committee on Finance and printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I understand that that is a memorial of a legislature.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is a memorial of the Legislature of Hawaii.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. It occurs to me that it should be read.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. All right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorial will be read if the Senator from Wyoming desires.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. To have it printed in the RECORD is sufficient.

The memorial was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

Whereas a special session of the Congress of the United States has been called by the President for the purpose of revising tariff duties; and

Whereas the commercial life of the Territory of Hawaii and almost its entire population is dependent on the sugar industry in said Territory, in which industry there is at present invested more than one hundred and fifty millions of dollars; and

Whereas a material reduction of the tariff duty on sugar will work incalculable harm to the industry, and the abolition of the said duty will actually destroy the same and impoverish the thousands whose savings are invested therein, or whose business or employment is dependent thereon; and

Whereas in the past eight years in addition to the amount derived from taxes, it has been necessary to borrow money upon bonds of the Territory to the amount of $6,844,000 in order to provide funds for necessary improvements; and

Whereas out of the total annual taxes assessed upon real and personal property and upon incomes the receipts from which for the year 1912 amounted to $2,702,533.07, the sum of $1,758,544.39 was paid directly by sugar estates as shown by the returns on file, being 65 per cent of said taxes, and there was paid by the industries directly dependent upon sugar an estimated amount of 20 per cent of the same, making an aggregate of 85 per cent of the entire receipts of the Territory derived from the sources above specified; and

Whereas any substantial tariff change would deprive this Territory of said portion of its revenue, which could not be replaced from other sources, and the Territory would be unable to meet its current necessary expenses: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That we de respectfully petition the Congress not to reduce the present duty on sugar; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 31, 1913.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was finally adopted in the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on March 31, 1913.

ERIC A. KNUDSEN,
President of the Senate.
JOHN H. WISE,
Clerk of the Senate.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 1, 1913.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was finally adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on April 1, 1913.

H. L. HOLSTEIN,
Speaker House of Representatives.
EDWARD WOODWARD,
Clerk House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Territorial Legislature of Alaska, which was referred to the Com-

mittee on Territories and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 2.

To the President and Congress of the United States:

Be it resolved by the Legislature of Alaska, That the following memorial be sent to the President and Congress, with the request that as early action as possible compatible with public business be taken thereon:

We respectfully represent that by the organic law creating the Territory of Alaska, approved August 24, 1912, in section 3 thereof the Legislature of Alaska is prohibited from in any manner interfering with the laws of the United States "providing for taxes on business and trade."

We further represent that by the same enabling act the Legislature of Alaska is further prohibited in section 9 thereof "to fix and impose any tax or taxes upon railways or railway property in Alaska" for the period of five years from the date of said act.

With the wisdom of the above inhibition the entire people of Alaska, we declare, is in full accord, because the prosperity and further development of Alaska depends upon a wise solution of the problems of transportation.

We further represent that the provisions of "An act making further provisions for a civil government for Alaska," approved June 6, 1900, in section 29 thereof a license tax is imposed by the United States, as follows: "Railroads, $100 per mile per annum on each mile operated."

We further represent that because of the requirement of the payment of such license or tax a great hardship is imposed on miners and prospectors in various mining districts of the Territory, notably Kougarok and Solomon River precincts in the Seward Peninsula. During the season of 1912 the license was not paid and the railroads were not operated, except by dogs and mules pulling small tram cars.

We therefore request Congress to remit the license tax of $100 per mile per annum on all railroads in the Seward Peninsula until August 24, 1917.

Adopted by the senate March 20, 1913.

L. V. RAY,
President of the Senate.

Concurred in by the house April 2, 1913.

EARNEST B. COLLINS,
Speaker of the House.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *District of Alaska, ss:*

I, William L. Distin, secretary of the District of Alaska, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of senate joint memorial 2 of the Alaska Territorial Legislature.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of Alaska, at Juneau, this 4th day of April, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] WM. L. DISTIN,
Secretary of Alaska.

Mr. THOMAS presented a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Colorado, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 22.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, would respectfully represent that under and by direction of the Secretary of the Interior the Hon. R. B. Marshall, chief geographer of the department, recently visited Colorado to determine by personal observation whether there should be established in Colorado a national park.

That the said Marshall, following the said order, visited Colorado, and after a careful and painstaking examination of the country proposed to be included in said national park, recommended the creation of the same.

That the people of Colorado desire that said park shall be established. It includes the highest mountain peaks in the State; the area is little adapted to either agriculture or grazing; its scenery for sublimity and grandeur is not excelled on the continent. Its location is easy of access to America's millions who seek health and recreation in the summer months, it being situated in the front and main range of the Rocky Mountains.

We therefore urge that you pass an act creating the said Rocky Mountain National Park, adopting the metes and bounds as set forth in the report of said Chief Geographer Marshall to the Secretary of the Interior, and embodying provisions as contained in a bill for an act creating the said park, prepared and introduced in the National House of Representatives for that purpose, and hereby declare the willingness of the State of Colorado, upon the passage of a congressional act establishing said park, to cede jurisdiction in the manner customary in such cases.

And this your memorialists will ever pray.

That the secretary of the senate is hereby instructed to transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the United States, and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress a copy of this resolution.

STEPHEN R. FITZGANARD,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

MARK A. SKINNER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS presented resolutions adopted by the Trades and Labor Assembly of Colorado, remonstrating against the tyranny of using State and National troops and the declaring of martial law whenever and wherever working people are on strike for better working conditions, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SMOOT. I present a petition signed by 150 citizens of the Cherokee Nation, praying for the payment of the award made to the heirs of John W. West, deceased. I ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and that the body of the petition, omitting the signatures, be printed in the RECORD.

The petition was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and, there being no objection, the body of the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Petition for the payment of the award made to the heirs of John W. West, deceased.

To the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned citizens and members of the Cherokee Nation, respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to authorize the payment, without further delay, of the award made by the commission appointed, pursuant to the seventh article of the treaty of 1846, out of the funds now standing to the credit of the Cherokee Nation in the Treasury of the United States, said award being made May 25, 1883, and approved by the Secretary August 29, 1883, reaffirmed by decision of Secretary Teller September 16, 1884, and again reaffirmed by decision of Secretary Lamar April 26, 1886, together with interest thereon, as provided for in the award since October 30, 1843.

This award was made by Commissioners John Q. Tufts, acting for the United States, and D. W. C. Duncan, a Cherokee citizen, acting for the Cherokee Nation. We believe that the action of our commissioner in approving this award was binding upon the nation, and that the failure of our nation to pay the award is a reproach to the honor of both the Cherokee Nation and the United States. To avoid a continuation of such reproach the payment of said award is by your petitioners demanded.

The United States has dealt fairly and equitably with the Cherokee Nation. On our claim arising in part out of the same treaty, where the principal sum was $1,111,111, we secured judgment in the Court of Claims, which was affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States (202 U. S., 101), for more than $5,000,000. As our nation has been allowed interest on its claims, there is no justification for our refusing to pay interest on this award regularly and duly made, the binding force and effect of which no honest man can question.

Mr. KENYON presented a petition of the Farmers Grain Dealers' Association of Iowa, praying for the creation of a commission to investigate and determine the cost of production and cost of preparation for distribution of the leading cereals, cattle, hogs, and sheep, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I send to the desk a telegram from Thomas R. Cutler, of Salt Lake City, Utah, with reference to the tariff duty on sugar, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD, without reading, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *April 16, 1913.*

Senator GEORGE SUTHERLAND,
Washington, D. C.:

Utah-Idaho Sugar Co., Amalgamated Sugar Co., Lewiston Sugar Co., join in plea for full and complete hearings to be given to every industry by Finance Committee on tariff bill. Late hearings by Democratic Ways and Means Committee were absolutely incomplete. Western interests in sugar, wool, etc., are especially interested. Tariff bill H. R. 10 would cause widespread suffering and, as far as sugar is concerned, would close up our factories and play into the hands of the refiners of foreign sugars.

THOMAS R. CUTLER.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a petition of sundry citizens of Galesburg, Kans., praying for an adjustment of the pay of railway mail clerks on account of the conditions brought about by the parcel-post law, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of Mayor John F. Hurley and 46 other citizens of Salem, William H. Lewis and 37 other citizens of Boston, and Elwyn G. Preston and 119 other citizens of Boston, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. GOFF presented a memorial of the National Window Glass Workers' Local Union of Weston, W. Va., and a memorial of the National Glass Workers' Local Union of Clarksburg, W. Va., remonstrating against any reduction in the duty on window glass, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Quinnimont, Raymond City, Welch, and Winona, all in the State of West Virginia, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation prohibiting any society, fraternal order, or organization from sending through the mails any written or printed matter representing such society, etc., which is already being used as a part of its title or name by any other society or fraternal organization, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SPEECH OF MR. JUSTICE HOLMES.

Mr. LODGE. I ask for a reprint of Senate Document 1106. It is a speech by Mr. Justice Holmes, and the print is entirely exhausted. I have many inquiries for copies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not rise to object, but I should like to know what the document is.

Mr. LODGE. It is a document already printed by the Senate. It is a short speech made by Mr. Justice Holmes last February. The edition is entirely exhausted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On what subject was the speech?

Mr. LODGE. It was on the general subject of the judiciary, I think.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection to the order being made.

Mr. LODGE. It has already been printed as a document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the order to print will be made.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS (S. DOC. NO. 11).

Mr. LODGE. I ask to have printed as a Senate document the correspondence between the secretary of state for foreign affairs of Great Britain and our State Department in regard to Panama Canal tolls. It has been published, but never printed as a Senate document, and there is a great demand for copies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? If there is no objection, it will be so ordered.

HEARINGS ON TARIFF BILL.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I have received numerous telegrams and letters in reference to hearings or proposed hearings on the tariff. There are very many people in the United States who feel that they have never been given an opportunity to be heard on the proposed bill, and that they are entitled as a matter of right to a hearing on a question which so vitally affects them.

I rise at this time for the purpose of asking the majority whether it proposes to permit hearings on the tariff bill which is to be considered by the Finance Committee hereafter. I notice that the chairman of the Finance Committee is not present, but other members of that committee are here. I would like to be able to answer my correspondents correctly in reference to a matter which is of such great importance to them. They feel that there must be a misunderstanding of the industrial situation in this country on the part of the Democratic majority and they would like to be heard.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] seems not to be in his seat, nor the senior member, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. I am the next ranking member, and I will give an answer to the Senator's question to the best of my ability.

While the committee has never passed a resolution to that effect, I am satisfied that the majority of the committee consider hearings absolutely unnecessary. The Committee on Ways and Means of the House gave very full hearings, and the Finance Committee of the Senate in the last Congress had a long series of hearings. Prior to that, in connection with the Payne-Aldrich bill, the hearings were dragged out at infinite length. The Government Printing Office has printed a multiplicity of stuff in the shape of hearings. I am satisfied that the majority of the committee do not desire to have any hearings. That is my opinion.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President——

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator from Michigan permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. On behalf of the minority members of the Finance Committee I desire to inform the Senator from Michigan that they intend to make a very vigorous request that the majority shall grant hearings. Of course, there is no tariff bill before the Senate at the present time, but when the measure comes over here the Republican members of the Finance Committee will, as far as I know, be unanimous in requesting hearings in compliance with the thousands of requests which we are all in receipt of every day from manufacturers and persons interested in the tariff that such hearings be granted.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will yield.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I simply desire to ask a question of the Senator from Pennsylvania. Is he speaking also for the Members of the Progressive Party who are upon the Finance Committee?

Mr. PENROSE. I am speaking for the Republicans or the minority members of the Finance Committee. I can not say that I speak for everyone, for I have not had an opportunity to confer with all of them; but I have talked with most of them within the last two or three days.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely wanted to add to what I have already said that, speaking for myself and I think for others, it seems best for the country that such tariff legislation as shall be enacted shall be enacted as speedily as possible, and we should not engage in the consideration and hearing of Tom, Dick, and Harry who apply to be heard before the committee. The business of the country is to a certain extent being held up, the importations are being affected and to some extent suspended, and it brings around, as things of that sort always do, a considerable degree of uncertainty in the minds of those who want to purchase goods. The country has heard from every man who wanted to be heard. During the last three or four years Congress has been having more tariff hearing than upon any other sort of business.

It has seemed to us that—

> If it were done, * * * then 't were well
> It were done quickly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I rise to make a suggestion to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Representatives of almost every industry in my State—and they are very numerous—have written to me urgently requesting that they shall be given an opportunity to be heard in reference to the pending tariff bill. They are men of substance, of standing, of integrity; and I suggest to the Senator from Mississippi that it was rather unfortunate that he should have referred to them as Tom, Dick, and Harry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why, Mr. President, these gentlemen may be all that; but if we open the doors to hearings generally, not only they, but Tom, Dick, and Harry can also knock and be admitted.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is wrong about that. The committee can restrict the number who shall be heard representing each industry, but they surely ought to be given some opportunity to present their case.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have never known the committee to refuse to hear everybody who came.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have known it to be done.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will ask the Senator from New Hampshire this question: What proportion of these people who want to be heard have already been heard?

Mr. GALLINGER. They may have been heard on some other bill, possibly; but I do not recall the fact that there has been any hearing on this particular bill on the part of the Ways and Means Committee of the other House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Has there been any change in the industrial condition of the country that would make the facts they testified to formerly untrue now?

Mr. GALLINGER. There certainly has been a change in the rates named in this bill as compared with the rates in other bills; there are very serious changes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Are not these rates, taken upon the whole, pretty much the rates that were sent to the Senate last year by the other House and considered then, after very full hearings?

Mr. GALLINGER. I confess that I have been unable to discover that to be a fact. Industries are threatened with extinction in this bill that were reasonably protected in the other bill. The other bill was bad enough, but this bill is infinitely worse.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There have been some changes, especially with regard to wool, sugar, and some other few things; but upon the whole, I take it, the Senator from New Hampshire will agree with me that the bills are about the same.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I do not care to engage in a tariff discussion this morning; we will have opportunity for that in the future; but I do want to say that I think the country will be interested to learn the attitude of the majority and minority members of the Finance Committee of the Senate in reference to this question. The manufacturers and the farmers of the country want to be heard on this bill. Of course, if the majority sees fit to exclude them from a hearing, the minority is powerless, and as one member of the minority I am willing that that matter shall go to the country precisely as has been suggested by the Senator from Mississippi, leaving the responsibility for refusing hearings upon the Democratic majority.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it is not a question of refusing to hear the manufacturers and farmers of the country. The position which I take is that we have heard them; that during

the last session of Congress, both with regard to the tariff bills which were then sent here from the other House and with regard to the Canadian reciprocity bill, so called, there were very extensive hearings; all those matters were gone into; and every interest in the country that desired to do so sent men here to be heard. Those men were heard, and what they said is in print. If there has been no change in the industrial condition of the country, what they said in the nature of facts—and it was only the communication of facts that would have any weight with the committee—the facts could not have changed in the meantime. If they testified to the truth then, what they have testified to as printed is still the truth. There has been no change in the industrial condition of the country to make a change in the testimony necessary.

Mr. GALLINGER. It might be shown, Mr. President, on another hearing that there has been a serious change; that importations from foreign countries under the existing law have greatly increased in certain lines of industry, and hence that further reductions in duties should not be made.

Again, the Senator from Mississippi alludes to the reciprocity matter. Why, Mr. President, we had some reciprocity offered to this country in the bill of the last Congress, but we have not any reciprocity at all in this bill. It is coolly proposed to give away everything to Canada in this bill; we are getting nothing whatever in return. So that question presents a new aspect, and it would be well for us to hear some of the farmers of this country in reference to that feature of the so-called Underwood bill. There have been material changes, both as regards the manufacturing industry and the agricultural industry, and these men ought to have some opportunity to present their views. To deny them that right does not commend itself to the Republican members of the Finance Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hope, Mr. President, that in saying what I have said the Senate will understand that I have been speaking for myself and merely giving my judgment as to what will be the action of the majority; but I think myself justified in drawing that inference and coming to that conclusion from private conversations with members of the majority. There has been no organized action either on the part of the committee or by the members of the majority.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words before yielding the floor further. I said, to begin with, that I had received hundreds—perhaps they amount to thousands—of petitions in the form of letters and telegrams from business men who are interested in the prosperity and the continued prosperity of this country. They have felt that they have never had an opportunity to be heard on the questions peculiarly involved in the pending tariff bill.

If I understand the attitude of the Democratic Party correctly, not only as demonstrated by the bill that is now pending before the other House, but also from the late message to Congress by the President of the United States, there is no proposition to maintain even "a tariff for revenue only." The clear idea is to go to a free-trade basis in this country, either now or in the immediate future. The country so understands it. No such proposition has been pending before Congress since the Civil War. The President does not attempt to hide his free-trade purpose. The Senator from Mississippi feels that if this deed is to be done it is perhaps well to do it quickly and to do it in the dark. But is haste the principal thing to be considered in tariff making? Is it not important to consider the nature of the bill itself and how it will affect industries which are vital to the prosperity and happiness of the people? Can the Finance Committee have too much information on a matter so greatly important? Will publicity embarrass them in their work?

I am not in favor of delaying a consideration and determination of the tariff; I realize that the Democratic Party are charged with the responsibility of legislation; but while I am perfectly willing that they should assume that responsibility in almost any way that they shall see fit, yet I feel that I am not fulfilling my duty to my constituents unless I ask the Democratic majority to at least give a fair consideration to the needs of the people of the State of Michigan. I do not believe that the men who are petitioning the Congress are actuated entirely by selfish purposes. I believe they feel that the proposed action is going to be their undoing, and I agree with them on that. I hope I am mistaken, but I think that the least that the majority can do in this case is to give hearings to the men who are deeply interested in these schedules.

It is not true, Mr. President, that this bill is a copy of the old bill. It is not true that the same principles are involved in it as were involved in its predecessors. It seems to me that even Senators on the other side who are actuated by a patriotic desire to serve their country ought at least to be willing and anxious to obtain all the facts which are possible to be obtained.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a question. I take it that the Senator from Michigan does not deny that upon this identical bill the Ways and Means Committee of the other House has given abundant hearings——

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do deny that, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That those hearings have been published, and that these very people from the Senator's State were before the committee, and were heard for the most part.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is not my understanding.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the use of printing their testimony twice?

Mr. TOWNSEND. It is not my understanding, Mr. President, that there were full hearings had before the Ways and Means Committee of the other House. I know there were men in this city from the State of Michigan who came down here with the purpose and desire to be heard by the Ways and Means Committee, and they were told that the time was limited; that they could not be heard; and they were restricted in some cases to 15 minutes in which to present their propositions on this great subject. Many who came here could not be heard at all. I submit, Mr. President, that that is not a hearing.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Michigan will yield to me, I should like to ask him if, in addition to their time being limited to 15 minutes, a very large proportion, in many cases, of that 15 minutes was not taken up by questions that were asked by members of the Ways and Means Committee in such manner that the witnesses were not allowed and not permitted to give their testimony as they would have liked to have done?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Quite so; and that is the complaint that has been made. Furthermore, the bill is being made now in secret caucus, and no witness who appeared before the House committee could have anticipated what the bill as finally reported would be. Certainly no one could have even guessed what the administrative features would be; but now, after a thorough understanding by the country of what is incorporated in the House bill, there is a better opportunity to obtain information directly on the matters involved than could have been had heretofore. So, I am pleading for hearings by the people, who are quite as patriotic as are any Members of this body and who are much more vitally interested in our fiscal policy, because that policy may mean industrial life or death to them, according as that policy is wise or otherwise.

Mr. LANE. I should like to ask the Senator a question, if he will allow me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LANE. I understood the Senator to refer to a large number of telegrams which he had received in relation to the tariff measure.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Senator understood correctly.

Mr. LANE. Letters and telegrams protesting against the contemplated action of the majority party. I also understood the Senator to say that the action of the party was now being taken in secret, and that it would not be known what the facts were. I wish to ask the Senator if he is receiving large numbers of telegrams and letters from consumers or whether they are merely from the class of producers and manufacturers?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, in this country there is not a great difference between producers and consumers. They are all consumers, and every able and competent person should be a producer. But if by consumers the Senator from Oregon means laboring people, I will say, for his information, that I have received letters and telegrams from some labor organizations asking that the House bill be not passed because, in their judgment, it would be detrimental to American labor. The Senator himself will undoubtedly hear later from this same source. Laborers can not be placed exclusively in the consuming class. They are the great producers of the world, and you must not close the door of American opportunity to them.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I simply desire to ask a question for information. Is it a fact that any hearings of any length have been given upon the tariff question and the rates of the pending bill before the present Ways and Means Committee of the House?

Mr. STONE. Before the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee there were extended hearings on this very bill. I have in my office now five published volumes of those hearings embodying verbal statements and printed briefs submitted to the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. May I ask the Senator were not those hearings rather upon a bill that was indeterminate in its

character? And is it not a fact that the present bill that is being considered, as I understand from the Senator from Michigan, in secret caucus, was not introduced in the House of Representatives until April 7 of the present year, and since that bill has been introduced there have been no hearings of any sort either by the majority or by the minority or by the full committee?

Mr. STONE. I do not think there have been hearings since the present House bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means—none that I know of—but there were extended hearings before the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee during the preparation of the bill.

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator uses the term "extended hearings." Of course our estimate of the word "extended" is entirely relative. Does the Senator consider it an "extended hearing" to give one day to each schedule upon which ordinarily it would take several weeks to have adequate hearings, and to restrict persons representing thousands of employees and millions of dollars of investment to 15 minutes, the time allowed them being largely taken up by questions addressed to them? Does he consider a hearing on a measure which is not in existence an "extended hearing," when impressions were conveyed to manufacturers and to employees that certain lines of policy would be adopted and then schedules were announced and published, such as the cotton schedule, that came like a bolt from a clear sky upon the interests affected? Does he consider it reasonable that the cotton people should not be permitted to have a hearing when a schedule has been placed before the country entirely different from any schedule which they had reason to expect?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

Mr. PENROSE. If the Senator will excuse me for one moment, I will stop. After the bill is introduced the Democrats in the House of Representatives, by a large majority, solemnly decree that the proceedings shall be secret, and for some time practically three-fourths of the House of Representatives have been legislating in secret caucus, so that the American people have no official information as to the details of the transaction or the reasons or arguments leading to the conclusions embodied in the bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri allow me to ask a question of the Senator who has just taken his seat?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. WARREN. I should like to ask the ex-chairman of the Committee on Finance whether the tariff bills which have been under consideration heretofore contained the same provision as to the date on which they should take effect as the measure now pending in the other House? As I understand, the present bill is to take effect on the day following its signature by the President. Was that true of the former bills which were under consideration?

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator means the Democratic tariff bills that were offered in the last Congress?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. PENROSE. I do not remember whether they were to go into effect at once or not.

Mr. WARREN. My remembrance is that they were not to go into effect at once, and former tariff bills have not taken effect immediately on their enactment. That alone is a part of the problem that ought, in my judgment, to have been considered and evidence taken of those who are interested on both sides—the consumers, the manufacturers, and the farmers. The Wilson-Gorman bill passed in August, 1894, but as to Schedule K it did not become effective until the following July, nearly 11 months. The bill of last year, 1912, regarding that same Schedule K was not to become effective until January 1, 1913, and the same was true as to the bill relating to cotton; it was not to become effective until about 6 months after its passage. There are other features of the bill that are entirely new even to the Members of the majority of the House of Representatives. They knew nothing of the bill until it was presented after the hearings were all over. The bill is a stranger to everybody except the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, one more point, and I am done, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me. During the last two Congresses the majority of the Finance Committee have never refused a hearing to anybody; and at the request of the then minority on numerous occasions, particularly when the cotton schedule was being considered, extensive and patient hearings were given to representatives of southern industries, who desired to be heard on measures then pending.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, just why this matter has been injected at this time upon the Senate is not difficult to imagine. It is not pertinent to any business before the Senate. The question as to hearings will, of course, be determined by the Committee on Finance. The present occasion affords some opportunity for Senators on the other side to expand their vocal chords, perform a political vaudeville stunt, and get some attention by way of denouncing a revenue measure which has not even been considered by the House of Representatives, and which, therefore, under the Constitution, can not now be before the Senate. In other words, the manifest purpose is to create some kind of adverse public sentiment in advance. It is a political maneuver by distinguished and very adroit politicians.

Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] said that this bill fell like a clap of thunder from a clear sky, astounding the industrial interests of the country. I have no doubt that the bill produced some astonishment and some apprehension. It always happens that when we come to a proposal to reduce tariff taxation, to pare down a little the injustices of tariff schedules that have been built up in the interest of special classes having a sort of political partnership with the Republican Party, that those special interests feel and express astonishment and apprehension—naturally so. This always happens. But that is no reason why the mandate of the American people should not be executed, or why the Democratic Party should not go resolutely forward to reform abuses; and that is what we intend to do.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] said that in the hearings had, only 15 minutes was given to particular schedules or items in schedules.

Mr. TOWNSEND. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Michigan did not say quite that.

Mr. STONE. What did he say?

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Senator from Michigan said that witnesses were not allowed, in many cases, over 15 minutes. I did not say that whole schedules were confined to 15 minutes. I said that witnesses were given only 15 minutes in many cases—not time enough to present their views.

While I am on my feet, may I ask the Senator for information on another subject?

Mr. STONE. Let us dispose of this subject while we have it in hand.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It is one that the Senator has just passed. Did I understand the Senator from Missouri to say that the Democratic Party, or the Democratic Members of the Senate, had received the mandate of a majority of the American people on this question?

Mr. STONE. Yes; I said that.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The election record does not so show.

Mr. STONE. Yes; I said that we have a mandate from a majority of the American people to revise the tariff downward.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Did the Senator take that mandate from the last election?

Mr. STONE. From the last election.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does the Senator maintain that the Democratic Party received a majority of the votes at that election?

Mr. STONE. No; but I do mean to say that the Democratic Party received a very substantial plurality, and that the Progressive Party was also demanding a substantial downward revision of the tariff, and the vote received by the two constituted a large majority of the American electorate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does the Senator understand that the progressive element of the American people, or the Progressive Party, was for free trade as enunciated in this bill?

Mr. STONE. Nobody is for free trade. Why does the Senator speak of free trade? I am not speaking for free trade. The Democratic Party is not for free trade, but it is against a tariff system that enables special interests to plunder the great body of the American people almost at pleasure.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Is the Senator opposed to the free-trade items in the bill?

Mr. STONE. To some of them, perhaps; not to all of them. But does the Senator desire now to go into a discussion of the items of this bill in detail?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No.

Mr. STONE. If he does, I shall decline to accommodate him. We will take up the bill when we get it before the Senate in proper form.

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; I simply wanted to understand the Senator as he went along.

Mr. STONE. The Senator's question could not elicit information from anyone, unless he intended to open up the entire tariff discussion now, and that purpose he disclaims.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield for one moment, in order that the RECORD may be set straight as to this question of hearings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. FLETCHER. The actual facts are that the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives had a regular calendar of assignments for the hearings on this bill while it was being shaped, beginning January 7 and continuing to and through February 1, practically one month. I have in my hand the various calendars and assignments of those hearings, giving the name of the witness, what he represented, his address, the items in respect to which he appeared, and the time given. So these hearings were actually extended over a period of nearly one month by the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator before what committee those hearings were held?

Mr. FLETCHER. The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Of what Congress?

Mr. FLETCHER. The Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The last Congress.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Sixty-second Congress?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Do the same members constitute the Committee on Ways and Means of this Congress that formulated this bill? Was this bill formulated in the Sixty-third or the Sixty-second Congress?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have just stated that these hearings extended from January 7 to February 1. While the present members of the committee were not all members of it at that time, the present members of the Ways and Means Committee are gentlemen sufficiently qualified to read and understand the English language, and those hearings were all printed.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The hearings to which the Senator refers, then, are hearings held during another Congress, before another Ways and Means Committee, which was composed of different people, and on another bill?

Mr. FLETCHER. There were only a few changes, as I understand.

Mr. STONE. The personnel of the Ways and Means Committee of this Congress is substantially that of the last Congress.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I rise simply to make an explanation.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, if I am going to say anything at all, I shall have to ask Senators not to interrupt me so much.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator refuse to yield?

Mr. JONES. I simply wanted to suggest that there are five new members of the committee.

Mr. STONE. Five out of seventeen are new members.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] says that 15 minutes only was accorded to many witnesses. I have sat in the Finance Committee and heard hearings. Ordinarily 15 minutes is as much as or more time than is accorded to any single speaker. When you take up the tariff bill for hearings, it rarely happens that any gentleman appearing before the committee comes to discuss a schedule as a whole. He comes to address himself to some particular item in or part of the schedule.

For example, if we had the metals schedule before the committee and hearings were being had, how many men would undertake to discuss the entire metals schedule? You would have some gentlemen talking about lead ores, some about other ores, some about this branch and some about that branch of steel and iron manufactures, and so on. No one would undertake to discuss the schedule as a whole, because no one would likely be familiar with or directly interested in all the detailed items of the schedule.

That being true—and it is true—if you gave every man 15 minutes, and many came to speak on the various items, the hearings would be extended into weeks and even into months. When we had the hearings on the so-called Canadian reciprocity bill I think fully two months of time was absorbed by those hearings. They have been printed. Those books are accessible to every Senator. When the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill was being prepared there were hearings in the House, and hearings before the Republican members of the Finance Committee of the Senate. There are volumes of testimony, so called, and these books filled with statements made by interested parties, and all of recent origin, are all accessible to everybody. Mr. President, the hearings on the Payne-Aldrich bill were only four years ago, or thereabouts. We have had hearings within the present year covering the items of this bill while it was in course of preparation. We have had hearings in the interim between these two dates—volumes of them, as I have said.

On yesterday, in conjunction with another member of the Finance Committee, I had a hearing on the plate-glass schedule in my committee room, and a very interesting hearing it was. The gentlemen who appeared before us, voluntarily and on their own motion, represented opposing interests. One represented the manufacturers of plate glass—among them being the president, secretary, and counsel of a manufacturing establishment—and upon the other a gentleman representing one of the largest plate-glass importing establishments of the country.

These gentlemen sat down at the table in front of us or around us. We held an old-fashioned conversational "seance." We discussed plate glass in all its phases from beginning to end.

Mr. GALLINGER rose.

Mr. STONE. Wait a moment until I finish this statement. We kept this up in a kindly conversational way for several hours. There was little of resentment among the antagonists before us—only now and then a flash, but nothing to disturb the sweet harmony of the occasion. We continued this interchange of views for nearly the whole of yesterday afternoon, just to oblige these gentlemen. All of them seemed anxious to talk.

What did it amount to? All of them had already submitted briefs or made statements before the Ways and Means Committee of the House; that is, before the very men who formulated the bill now pending in the House.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me?

Mr. STONE. In a moment. These gentlemen appeared before us and made statements; they filed their briefs with us as they had with the Ways and Means Committee, and they practically followed the briefs and statements they made before the Ways and Means Committee. In what they said to us in the three or four hours of our conference was but substantially a repetition of what each had said to the members of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. STONE. If the Senator will allow me a second, I will; but I wish to finish this statement.

What was said at this hearing yesterday was all taken down. I had a reporter there—Mr. Galt, one of the Senate committee reporters, and a very capable man, as all of you will admit. Every word of the hearing was taken down, and what was said can be compared with the statements made by the same gentlemen, pro and con, before the Ways and Means Committee. You will find there is no substantial difference.

From what I have said, I draw this conclusion: If the Senate should conclude to give hearings to the plate-glass industry, for example, and if we should open the door, as the Senator from Michigan would have us, and let the representatives of all plate-glass manufacturers throughout the country come in and be heard, and then have the importers come in and be heard, and then have the retail interests come in and be heard, and then, if possible, have the consuming interests come in and be heard, it would take us a week or more to cover that one item in that one schedule.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that would be an impossible waste of time if we expect to pass a tariff bill. If this were new there would be something to it, but we have time and again gone over and over this ground. We have had tariff hearings after tariff hearings, too often multiplied, year in and year out. It seems to me that two or three or four months of the time of the Senate should not be occupied by the Finance Committee in listening to a mere repetition of things that have already been said and printed even more than once in public documents.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me now?

Mr. STONE. I will.

Mr. GALLINGER. I beg to suggest, Mr. President, that I can conceive of nothing more charming than for any gentleman to sit on one side of a table and talk to the genial and witty Senator from Missouri on the other side. I have no doubt that that little interview was a very delightful affair. The Senator speaks of it as a "seance." I am gratified to know that a reporter was present, and that the "seance" has been written up in some form.

I should like to ask the Senator if the rest of us are to be given permission to see exactly what was said on that occasion? Is it to be printed?

Mr. STONE. I hope so.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a new idea to me——

Mr. STONE. I hope it will be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER. I trust the Senator will see that it is printed.

Mr. STONE. I hope it will be printed. The Senator is a member of the Finance Committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. STONE. It will be written out in type, and the Senator will have the benefit of reading it, if he wishes, and of comparing it with the statements made by the same gentlemen before the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. But the old-fashioned way was that I, as a member of the Finance Committee, would have been invited to any hearing that was held. It is a new idea to me that two members of the majority of the Finance Committee will hold hearings in a committee room and that the rest of us will have no opportunity to know what was said or done during that hearing.

I do not doubt that such so-called hearings may be profitable to the Senator and to his colleague, whoever he may have been, but really it would have been interesting to me to have witnessed that delightful interchange of views as between the Senator and the gentlemen who appeared representing a very great industry in the United States. Having been denied that pleasure, I repeat that I hope the interview will be printed.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, of course this was not an authorized interview or hearing.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. STONE. I hope the Senator——

Mr. O'GORMAN. I think we might well go on with the regular order of business.

Mr. STONE. This is the regular order. I hope the Senator will permit me to reply to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The hearing was not by order of the Committee on Finance. Manufacturers come to me frequently, and I suppose they go to other Senators, to confer. It so happened that recently on the same day gentlemen representing opposing interests in the plate-glass business called to see me. They did not come at the same time; they were not together. They did not come to my office together nor come to this conference together. In fact, they never did "get together." I suggested to them that I thought it might be valuable if gentlemen representing opposing sides, who desired to talk to me, should come and talk at the same time; that I would like to hear both sides at once by men speaking face to face.

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator from Missouri permit a suggestion?

Mr. STONE. In a moment. We had this friendly conversational conference. There was nothing combative or exciting about it. A competent reporter took down all that was said. I was impressed by the fact that the statements made before us on yesterday were substantially a repetition of what was said by the same people before the Ways and Means Committee a month or six weeks before.

Mr. PENROSE. I have a question to ask which may relieve this situation. If the minority can not get the majority of the Finance Committee to grant hearings, perhaps we can get a promise from the Senator from Missouri to hold hearings daily with a reporter. If the Senator is willing to continue this personal investigation, I have a large number of constituents and visitors every day whom I will be glad to refer to him.

Mr. STONE. No; I decline.

Mr. PENROSE. Is this the last hearing the Senator is to hold or is he to continue these hearings?

Mr. STONE. I think it is the last I will hold. I gave three hours to that one, and if I should give like time to every item of all the three or four thousand items in the bill, I could never hope to finish my task.

Mr. PENROSE. One more question and I am through. I have likewise been the recipient of visits from glass manufacturers, and listened to their tale of woe. I am curious to know whether after the four hours' recital of the hardships under which they will labor when this tariff bill becomes a law the story made any impression on the mind of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. Oh, yes; it made a distinct impression in a way.

Mr. PENROSE. Then will the Senator come around to a higher rate of duty on plate glass?

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I respectfully insist on the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is demanded. If there are no further petitions or memorials, reports of committees are in order.

PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM.

Mr. OVERMAN. I report back from the Committee on Rules Senate resolution No. 4, and submit a report thereon, which I ask that the Secretary may read, in order that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] may be heard upon the report before action is taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina presents a report from the Committee on Rules, which will be read.

The Secretary read the report (No. 5), as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred Senate resolution 4, having considered the same, report the resolution back to the Senate with the recommendation that each subhead contained therein be referred for consideration to the proper committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter, to wit:

That section 2, relating to tariff and taxation, be referred to the Committee on Finance.

That section 3, relating to interstate-commerce matters, be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

That section 4, relating to interstate exchange, be referred for consideration to the newly created Committee on Banking and Currency.

That section 5, relating to public lands and natural resources, be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

That section 6, relating to military expense and auxiliary Navy, be referred for consideration to the Committees on Military and Naval Affairs, respectively.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. Is this matter in order at this stage of the proceedings?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the report of a committee. It is in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not know that we had reached reports of committees.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, on the 17th day of March I offered in this body a resolution providing for a legislative program covering certain questions relating to the tariff, to interstate commerce, to the conservation of our natural resources, to the regulation of our rivers, and to the diminution of military and naval expenses. The purpose of that resolution, as stated at the time——

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I desire to ask what matter is before the Senate at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A report of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. McCUMBER. Is it before the Senate with unanimous consent for its present consideration?

Mr. OVERMAN. Naturally the report will take its place on the calendar.

Mr. McCUMBER. I object to its consideration.

Mr. OVERMAN. But the Senator from Nevada wishes to be heard on the report.

Mr. McCUMBER. Some of us have been waiting for a long time to get through with the routine business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota object to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. McCUMBER. I object to its consideration until after we get through with the morning business.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will, of course, defer to the convenience of Senators in the interest of morning business.

Mr. McCUMBER. There will be plenty of time to discuss it afterwards.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be placed on the calendar.

ASSISTANT CLERKS OR MESSENGERS TO SENATORS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 15, to authorize the employment of an assistant clerk to certain committees, to report it with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and I submit a report (No. 6) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution reported by the committee will be read.

The Secretary read the substitute, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Coast and Insular Survey; on Enrolled Bills; on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department; on Expenditures in the Departments of Commerce and Labor; on Standards, Weights, and Measures; on Expenditures in the Department of State; on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game; on National Banks; on Public Health and National Quarantine; on Geological Survey; to Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands; on the Mississippi River and its Tributaries; on Pacific Railroads; on Railroads; on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard; on the University of the United States; on Woman Suffrage; to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service; on Indian Depredations; on Transportation and Sale of Meat Products; on Engrossed Bills; on the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians; on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress; on Private Land Claims; on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments; on Revolutionary Claims; on Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia, on conference of the minority of the Senate, be, and they are hereby, authorized to employ one assistant clerk each, at $1,200 per annum, to be paid from "miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law: *Provided*, That if any of the committees recited

above already have three employees the resolution shall not apply to them, except that this proviso shall not apply to the conference of the minority of the Senate.

Mr. OLIVER. Reserving the right to object to present consideration——

Mr. JONES. I am going to ask that the resolution shall go over.

Mr. OLIVER. While I am on the floor I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether that committee has considered the resolution offered some time ago by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] relating to the allowance of additional help to Senators who are not chairmen of committees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That resolution is pending before the committee, but no definite action has thus far been taken upon it. We have thought proper at this time to go only so far as the majority went with us when we were the minority. They gave merely extra help to certain minority committees. We have provided in this resolution for every minority committee, doing better by you than you did by us. When we were in the minority, I, for one, and a great many of us, had to get along with two employees. That was all you gave us then. What the committee will do with that resolution finally when it comes to act on it definitely I am not now prepared to say.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask that the resolution be read again?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is the same resolution the Senator saw this morning.

Mr. WARREN. I saw only a part of it.

Mr. PENROSE. The resolution goes over.

Mr. SMOOT. Before the resolution goes over on objection, I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if he will not allow one amendment to be made at this time. Instead of "assistant clerk" I suggest to insert "messenger." I will state the reason why I make the suggestion. It seems to me it would be rather inconsistent to have an assistant clerk at $1,200 and a messenger at $1,440, and it would be just as well to have a messenger at $1,200.

Mr. LODGE. Let the resolution go over and be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So far as I am concerned, I see no objection to the amendment suggested by the Senator from Utah. It does seem to be rather incongruous to be paying a man whom you call an assistant clerk $1,200, while you pay a man whom you call a messenger $1,440. I do not see that it will affect the resolution in the slightest degree. What we are reaching out after is to give the Senators an extra employee, and we have concluded that that employee shall be paid $1,200 a year. It does not make any difference materially whether you call him assistant clerk or messenger. If the Senator from Utah chooses to offer the amendment, I shall not oppose it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Mississippi whether all the majority committees have a messenger at $1,440.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Most of the majority committees have. The substance of this will be that the minority committees will have a clerk at varying salaries, running up, some of them, as high as $2,500, and then another employee at $1,440, who is now called a messenger, and then they will have this additional employee at $1,200. By the way, I will just say that my own committee, which is going to be made a working committee, has no more help than that, and several of the working committees will have no more help. I see no objection to the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Utah, if he chooses to offer it.

Mr. SMOOT. I offer that amendment.

Mr. WARREN. There are several branches of this matter, and I ask that the resolution may go over.

Mr. SMOOT. I will withdraw the suggestion now and offer the amendment when the resolution comes up in regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. GALLINGER and Mr. JONES. And printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be printed.

Mr. JONES. I desire to state that unless the resolution I offered the other day is acted upon by the committee before this matter comes up again, I shall expect to offer that resolution as an amendment, but making the amount $1,200 instead of $1,440.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This matter has been acted upon by the committee. It is before the Senate on a favorable report from the committee.

Mr. JONES. I offered the resolution the other day, and, in conformity to the resolution that the Senator introduced, I proposed that assistant clerks of certain Senators should be paid $1,440. I would be perfectly willing to amend my resolution by making the amount $1,200. So if that resolution should not be acted upon by the committee before this matter comes up——

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the Senator's resolution?

Mr. JONES. It proposes to give to each member of the minority not the chairman of a committee an extra employee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hope the Senator from Washington will not attempt to complicate this matter with that. That will bring us into a field of discussion. The other side did not give each member of the minority an extra employee when you were in the majority, and I do not know but that there would be objection to it upon this side. All that you did was to give the chairmen of the minority committees three men. To some of them you did not even give three men. I hope that the matter will be permitted to be considered by the committee upon its own merits and be brought up as a separate proposition and not be complicated with this question.

Mr. JONES. I simply desire to suggest——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall feel compelled to resist the amendment.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask that the resolution may go over.

Mr. JONES. I had the floor, I understood.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not understand that anyone has the floor against an objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Washington had the floor, and I interrupted him with his permission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. JONES. I merely want to suggest to the Senator from Mississippi that I think the two propositions are really germane the one to the other, because every Senator must concede that the fact that a Senator is chairman of a committee does not bring him any more work and does not make him any more work at all. When we were in the majority we may not have allowed to Senators the additional help, but I do not know whether you asked for more help. I wish to say that I have always been in favor of allowing a Senator what he actually needed to do the necessary business. I think that is what we ought to have. The Senator says that they have gone further already in this matter than we went. I am simply asking them to go a little further and give us what I think is absolutely necessary. I do not want any more help than is necessary to do the official work that comes to us, but I do think we ought to have this help. I did not want to have the matter now brought before the Senate considered by it until there would be an opportunity to present this other proposition to the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon one more interruption, he says he simply wants each Senator to have the aid that is necessary to do his work. Hitherto Senators have managed to do their work, and tolerably well, I take it—I manage to do mine, I know—under a less generous dispensation of aid than this gives them, and I think we had better accept this when it comes up. It is not now under discussion, however.

Mr. JONES. I simply want to suggest, Mr. President——

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, the order of the introduction of bills has not been reached?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not yet been reached.

Mr. PENROSE. I have some bills that I should like to have an opportunity to introduce when that order is reached.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, some days ago I gave notice of my intention to submit some remarks to the Senate to-day, but I am beginning to think that there is a conspiracy on foot to prevent me from submitting those remarks. I feel constrained, under the circumstances, in justice to myself, to call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are still in order.

REPORT OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION (S. DOC. NO. 9).

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Printing, to which the subject was referred, reported the following resolution, submitted a report (No. 7) thereon, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to (S. Res. 51):

Resolved, That the Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended October 11, 1912, be printed, with the accompanying illustrations, as a Senate document, together with the letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution transmitting said report in accordance with the provisions of an act to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, approved February 20, 1896.

CHARLES B. HAGADORN.

Mr. STONE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 721) authorizing the State Department to deliver to Charles B. Hagadorn a gift from the Government of Mexico, submitted an adverse report (No. 8) thereon, which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

SPURIOUS CURRENCY—CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. JONES. A few days ago I introduced a bill (S. 954) forbidding the use of spurious currency, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance. I move that the committee be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 1099) granting an annuity of $100 to officers and enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps who have been awarded medals of honor for gallantry in action and other soldier-like qualities under acts of Congress, and authorizing the President of the United States to make rules and regulations for carrying the act into effect;

A bill (S. 1100) granting an annuity equivalent to $50 per month to officers and enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps who have attained the age of 65 years and have been, or may hereafter be, awarded medals of honor for gallantry and heroism involving great personal peril, and authorizing the President of the United States to make rules and regulations for carrying the act into effect; and

A bill (S. 1101) for the relief of the survivors of McLean's Pennsylvania Regiment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1102) for the relief of George L. Thomas;

A bill (S. 1103) for the relief of Louisa Weaver; and

A bill (S. 1104) for the relief of Cecelia Barr; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1105) granting an increase of pension to Frank P. Haas (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1106) granting a pension to Eliza Wilson;

A bill (S. 1107) granting a pension to Edward M. Stevens;

A bill (S. 1108) granting an increase of pension to William Spotts;

A bill (S. 1109) granting a pension to Frederick Wagner (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1110) providing for the retirement of noncommissioned officers, petty officers, and enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for the efficiency of the enlisted personnel;

A bill (S. 1111) granting a pension to Minerva H. Perry (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1112) granting an increase of pension to Albert Schroeder;

A bill (S. 1113) to pension widows and minor children of officers or enlisted men who served in the War with Spain or Philippine insurrection;

A bill (S. 1114) granting a pension to James A. Stine;

A bill (S. 1115) granting a pension to Margaret Montgomery;

A bill (S. 1116) granting an increase of pension to Delight R. Allen (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1117) granting an increase of pension to James M. P. Brookens;

A bill (S. 1118) granting a pension to Lucy M. Cooke;

A bill (S. 1119) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Boyd;

A bill (S. 1120) granting a pension to Charles L. Greene;

A bill (S. 1121) granting a pension to Ida E. Carter; and

A bill (S. 1122) granting a pension to Fannie M. Carey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 1123) to establish a commission to be known as the National Forest Demonstration and Experimental Commission, and to make an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1124) for the relief of G. L. Taneyhill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1125) for the relief of the heirs of Ann Gregory, deceased;

A bill (S. 1126) for the relief of John E. Semmes, receiver of the Columbian Iron Works & Dry Dock Co., of Baltimore, Md.;

A bill (S. 1127) for the relief of Samuel H. Walker;

A bill (S. 1128) for the relief of Frederick J. Ernst (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1129) for the relief of the estate of George Lloyd Raley;

A bill (S. 1130) for the relief of the heirs of William Hickey, deceased;

A bill (S. 1131) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Loker; and

A bill (S. 1132) for the relief of the trustees of the Quinn African Methodist Episcopal Church, of Frederick, Md.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1133) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth McLaughlin;

A bill (S. 1134) granting a pension to Golda M. Morrison; and

A bill (S. 1135) granting a pension to Mary Meade Sands; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 1136) to provide for a commission to investigate commissions and to make recommendations concerning the same; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 1137) to revive the right of action under the captured and abandoned property acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1138) to prescribe the conditions under which corporations may engage in interstate commerce and to provide penalties for otherwise engaging in the same; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1139) to establish a drainage fund and to provide for the reclamation of swamp and overflowed lands in certain States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1140) to reimburse T. C. Barrier, postmaster, Philadelphia, Miss., for registered money stolen in transit; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1141) providing for competitive designs for a naval monument in the Vicksburg National Military Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1142) providing for a monument to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the women of the country at the time of the American Revolution; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 1143) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and adjudicate claims for the taking of private property and damages thereto as the result of the improvement of the Mississippi River for navigation; and

A bill (S. 1144) to aid in construction of levees and embankments on the east side of the Mississippi River in Warren, Jefferson, Adams, and Wilkinson Counties, Miss.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1145) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and adjudicate claims for the taking of private property and damages thereto as the result of the improvement of the Mississippi River for navigation; and

A bill (S. 1146) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Elizabeth Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 1147) for the relief of Alfred Ale, alias James Howard;

A bill (S. 1148) to correct the military record of Maj. Robert G. Smither, United States Army, retired;

A bill (S. 1149) to correct the military record of Seth Watson (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1150) for the relief of Nathan Mendenhall; and

A bill (S. 1151) to remedy in the line of the Army the inequalities in rank due to the past system of regimental promotion; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1152) for the relief of Thomas J. Keith; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1153) granting a pension to David R. Todd;

A bill (S. 1154) granting an increase of pension to William Holdaway;

A bill (S. 1155) granting an increase of pension to Charles Morritz;

A bill (S. 1156) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Allen;

A bill (S. 1157) granting an increase of pension to George A. Marks;

A bill (S. 1158) granting an increase of pension to Seth Watson; and

A bill (S. 1159) granting a pension to Demmie Inman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 1160) for the relief of Isaac J. Reese; and

A bill (S. 1161) to credit certain officers of the Medical Department, United States Army, with services rendered as acting assistant surgeons during the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1162) allowing credit in computing the pay of any officer of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps for service while in the Revenue-Cutter Service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1163) to incorporate the Greater Washington Poultry & Pigeon Club, of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 1164) for the relief of Charles Ashwell and others;

A bill (S. 1165) for the relief of Capt. Frederick G. Lawton, United States Army;

A bill (S. 1166) for the relief of Capt. James Ronayne, United States Army; and

A bill (S. 1167) for the relief of Capt. N. F. McClure, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1168) granting an increase of pension to John Enright; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JACKSON:

A bill (S. 1169) to promote and encourage the building of modern public highways by granting aid thereto under certain conditions; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1170) to extend the provisions of section 4631, title 54, "Prize," of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and of the act approved June 8, 1874, in relation to prize money to fleet officers; and

A bill (S. 1171) for the relief of Samuel Henson; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1172) granting a pension to Martha A. Rea; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 1173) for the relief of the city of Pueblo, Colo.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 1174) for the relief of William Walters, alias Joshua Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey:

A bill (S. 1175) to remove the charge of desertion on the first enlistment of Daniel B. Stone, alias Nelson Davis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1176) to acquire certain land in Washington Heights for a public square, to be known as Columbia Square; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 1177) providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives and Senators in the Congress of the United States and presidential electors are to be voted for and elected, and limiting the amount of campaign expenses; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 1178) to make an appropriation for the strengthening and construction of levee or levees at and near the city of Cairo, Ill.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1179) for the relief of Edward N. McCarty; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1180) for the relief of William Thomas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1181) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Denny; and

A bill (S. 1182) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Chapman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1183) authorizing and directing the Director of the Geological Survey to cause to be made a complete topographic and hydrographic survey of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 1184) for a complete soil survey of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1185) prohibiting changes in size and color of currency without consent of Congress; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANE:

A bill (S. 1186) for additional protection of the Bull Run Forest Reserve and the sources of the water supply of the city of Portland, in the State of Oregon (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 1187) for the relief of Frederick Zichendraft;

A bill (S. 1188) for the relief of Dudley Simms; and

A bill (S. 1189) for the relief of William Schindler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1190) granting relief to persons who served in the Military Telegraph Corps of the Army during the Civil War;

A bill (S. 1191) granting an increase of pension to Mahala E. Warmoth;

A bill (S. 1192) granting an increase of pension to Aaron B. Waggoner;

A bill (S. 1193) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Wells;

A bill (S. 1194) granting an increase of pension to John W. Wareham;

A bill (S. 1195) granting an increase of pension to Henry Whitinger;

A bill (S. 1196) granting an increase of pension to William Willis;

A bill (S. 1197) granting a pension to Sarah Thomas;

A bill (S. 1198) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Taylor;

A bill (S. 1199) granting an increase of pension to John Smith;

A bill (S. 1200) granting an increase of pension to Phillip T. Simmonds;

A bill (S. 1201) granting an increase of pension to Josephus Steller; and

A bill (S. 1202) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Stout; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 1203) for the relief of Indians who have taken allotments on the public domain, and their respective families and descendants; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1204) for the relief of Daniel Butland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 1205) granting an increase of pension to John Ogan;

A bill (S. 1206) granting an increase of pension to Conrad L. Gabrielson;

A bill (S. 1207) granting an increase of pension to Emily J. Walton; and

A bill (S. 1208) granting a pension to Edwin R. Gibson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 1209) granting a pension to Thomas S. Garen;

A bill (S. 1210) granting an increase of pension to B. E. Benton;

A bill (S. 1211) granting a pension to B. E. De Vall; and

A bill (S. 1212) granting a pension to Stephen Konicka; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 1213) to provide for the refunding of certain moneys illegally assessed and collected in the district of Utah; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1214) to amend sections 2380 and 2381, Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1215) to enlarge the Grand Canyon game refuge; to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

By Mr. GOFF:

A bill (S. 1216) for the relief of Oakley Randall; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1217) granting a pension to George W. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 1218) construing the provisions of section 2 of the pension act of June 27, 1890, and section 1 of the act of February 6, 1907; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 1219) providing for the holding of regular term of district court at Durango, Colo.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1220) to increase the limit of cost of the public building authorized to be constructed at Durango, Colo.; and

A bill (S. 1221) for the erection of a public building at Montrose, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 1223) granting a pension to William C. White; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

A bill (S. 1224) to regulate the filing and hearing of protests filed by agents of the United States against the acceptance of proofs of residence and cultivation made by and the issuance of patents thereon to homestead entrymen; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1225) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station at a point in the eastern portion of the State of South Dakota to be selected by the Secretary of Commerce (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 1226) to enable the President to propose and invite foreign Governments to participate in an international conference to promote an international inquiry into the causes of the high cost of living throughout the world and to enable the United States to participate in said conference; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 1227) for the relief of Charles R. Crosby; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMOOT:
A bill (S. 1228) for the relief of Henry N. Bird;
A bill (S. 1229) for the relief of John F. Wilkinson;
A bill (S. 1230) for the relief of Lachoneus Barnard;
A bill (S. 1231) for the relief of Lemuel H. Redd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 1232) to provide for the erection of a public building at American Fork, Utah; and
A bill (S. 1233) to provide for the erection of a public building at Nephi, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
A bill (S. 1234) granting a pension to Charles O. Farnsworth;
A bill (S. 1235) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Liddle;
A bill (S. 1236) granting an increase of pension to Charles Crismon;
A bill (S. 1237) granting a pension to Elizabeth Garland (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1238) granting a pension to John H. Kidd (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1239) granting an increase of pension to Maria Howell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:
A bill (S. 1240) to establish the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on the Library.
A bill (S. 1241) to correct the military record of Joseph Hawkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 1242) granting a pension to Chester A. Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:
A bill (S. 1243) directing the issuance of patent to John Russell; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JAMES:
A bill (S. 1244) for the relief of the trustees of Bloomfield Lodge, No. 57, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Bloomfield, Ky.; the trustees of the town of Bloomfield, Ky.; and the trustees of the Bloomfield graded common schools of Bloomfield, Ky.;
A bill (S. 1245) for the relief of Lexington Lodge, No. 1, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Lexington, Ky., and the Grand Lodge Ancient Free and Accepted Masons of the State of Kentucky;
A bill (S. 1246) for the relief of the fiscal court of Bourbon County, Ky.;
A bill (S. 1247) for the relief of Shelby County, Ky.;
A bill (S. 1248) for the relief of the estate of William Thomas Lowe; and
A bill (S. 1249) for the relief of the estate of William J. Sailing, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRADLEY:
A bill (S. 1250) for the relief of the estate of Leopold Harth, deceased;
A bill (S. 1251) for the relief of the estate of James E. Morgan, deceased;
A bill (S. 1252) for the relief of J. Will Morton and the estate of Clarissa H. Morton, deceased;
A bill (S. 1253) for the relief of the Louisville Trust Co., administrator of the estate of Emily Oldham, deceased;
A bill (S. 1254) for the relief of the estate of R. G. Potter, deceased;
A bill (S. 1255) for the relief of the estate or heirs of Philip P. Phillips, deceased;
A bill (S. 1256) for the relief of the estate of James Sayre, deceased; and
A bill (S. 1257) for the relief of the estate of John M. Abbott, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 1258) granting a pension to Mariam Norris (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1259) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel J. Smith; and
A bill (S. 1260) granting an increase of pension to Alfred H. McPheron (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:
A bill (S. 1261) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Sageville, Lauderdale County, Miss.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:
A bill (S. 1262) authorizing 15 days' leave of absence with pay to per diem employees of the Lighthouse Service of the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.
A bill (S. 1263) for the relief of James P. Ruggles and others; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 1264) granting an increase of pension to William H. Wheeler; and
A bill (S. 1265) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Buckley; to the Committee on Pensions.
A bill (S. 1266) for the relief of Edward Byrne (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 21) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that the President shall hold office for one term of six years and that the President and Vice President shall be elected by direct vote of the people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DR. FRIEDRICH FRANZ FRIEDMANN.

Mr. HUGHES. I introduce a bill, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that has hardly ever been done in the Senate, and I think I shall have to object.

Mr. HUGHES. I should like to have the bill read. I understand, of course, that objection can be made to its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title.

The bill (S. 1222) authorizing and directing the board of medical supervisors of the District of Columbia to issue to Friedrich Franz Friedmann, without examination, a license to practice medicine and surgery in the District of Columbia, was read twice by its title.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will have to object to unanimous consent being given to have the bill acted upon at this time. There are pretty serious questions involved in it. I ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator from New Hampshire to object?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will have to object to the present consideration of the bill. I should like to look into it and consult some of the medical men of the District concerning it. It is a serious matter. It proposes to suspend existing law.

Mr. HUGHES. The whole matter is serious. The disease which this doctor is engaged in fighting is an extremely serious matter.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. My object in laying the bill before the Senate was to see if we could not get away from objections raised by certain members of the medical fraternity and from the attitude of distrust and suspicion which seems to characterize the gentlemen who are representing the Government in their dealings with this scientist. I have been the recipient of countless letters, telegrams, telephonic communications, and personal requests from men who are standing on the brink of the grave who feel that perhaps their lives may be saved if they are permitted to take this treatment. Dr. Friedmann himself seems to be under the impression that he is absolutely under the control of the Federal service in this matter, and he thinks he is operating under the same sort of governmental supervision that he would be compelled to operate under in Germany. At his request I have introduced the bill. I regret very much that the Senator from New Hampshire thinks it necessary that the consideration of this matter should be delayed, when his single objection perhaps will mean the loss of the lives of men, women, and children who are eager and anxious to take all the risks, real or fancied, in connection with this treatment.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HUGHES. I do.

Mr. STONE. I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey——

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I again call for the regular order, since objection is made to the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have read a letter which I have received bearing upon the subject matter of the bill I just introduced.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I object to the reading of a letter on this subject. I do not want to pronounce this man a faker, but I think the Senate is going out of its way to give him advertisement. He may be a quack, for all I know. I have direct information that the reputable physicians of the country look with considerable doubt upon his maneuvers, and that reputable medical journals criticize the Congress of the United States for the semiofficial recognition which they have

already given him. I was surprised and shocked when I saw that a Senate document had been printed on his alleged cure. Were it not that the incident was past and closed, I had intended calling the attention of the Senate to the gross impropriety of recognizing a questionable "cure" by an official advertisement of that character. This is not an occasion for maudlin sentiment; it is a practical proposition whether the lives of thousands of people may not be threatened by a "cure" which is purely based on quackery and fraud.

Mr. STONE. I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey if Dr. Friedmann intends to charge $25 for each treatment?

Mr. HUGHES. I have absolutely no information on that subject.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. HUGHES. I did not presume to ask Dr. Friedmann about that. I asked him if he would practice in the District of Columbia if given permission, and he said he would.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is demanded. If there be no further bills and joint resolutions, concurrent and other resolutions are in order.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $2,500 for the purchase of a library for the Federal prison at Atlanta, Ga., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. KENYON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $200,000 due to the estates of deceased colored soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War and which was in the hands of the Commissioner of the Freemen's Bureau and have been repaid into the Treasury of the United States, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for support and civilization of the Indians at Fort Belknap Agency, Mont., including pay of employees, from $20,000 to $25,000, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. THOMAS. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and, if it is in order, I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado submits a resolution and asks unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 55), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Woman Suffrage, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for its use, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the said committee or any subcommittee thereof may sit during the sessions of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I think the resolution under the law has to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

ESTATE OF WILLIAM E. PRESSEY.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 56), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to the executor of the estate of William E. Pressey, late messenger at the card door of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT AND LIVE-STOCK INSURANCE.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 52), which was read and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the report to the British Board of Agriculture and Fisheries of an inquiry into agricultural credit and agricultural cooperation in Germany, with some notes on German live-stock insurance, by J. R. Cahill, which was presented to both Houses of Parliament of Great Britain, be printed as a Senate document, together with the accompanying illustrations and letter.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS.

Mr. O'GORMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 57), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interoceanic Canals is hereby authorized to employ one assistant clerk, at $1,800 per annum, to be paid from "miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

AVENUE OF THE PRESIDENTS.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 53), which was read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be, and hereby is, empowered to investigate and report by what authority of law and under whose direction the name of Sixteenth Street was changed to Avenue of the Presidents.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES.

Mr. PITTMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 54), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Territories, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized during the Sixty-third Congress to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee and to have the same printed for its use, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF ANTITRUST ACT.

Mr. THOMAS. I desire to give notice that on Monday next, at the close of the routine morning business, I shall address the Senate upon the bill (S. 112) to restore section 1 of the act of Congress of July 2, 1890, chapter 647, Twenty-sixth Statutes at Large, to its original form as enacted, by striking out the words "unreasonable or undue," inserted therein by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

CONFERENCE REPORTS ON TARIFF MEASURES.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I offer the resolution attached to the notice I gave on Tuesday last and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Rules. I had intended to submit some observations with it; but in view of the great delay which the Senator from California has suffered, I will not do so, but ask its immediate reference to the committee.

The resolution (S. Res. 43) was referred to the Committee on Rules, and is as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be added as one of the standing rules of the Senate the following, to wit:

"When the report of a conference committee upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon a bill proposing to change duties upon imports from a foreign country into the United States is under consideration by the Senate there shall be, upon the request of any Senator, a separate vote on any point or item of disagreement concerning which there is a recommendation that the Senate recede in whole or in part."

PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, it was my desire to continue the discussion of the report of the Committee on Rules regarding a legislative program. I understand that the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] has given notice that he will address the Senate to-day. I will ask the Senator from California whether it would meet his convenience if I should conclude my remarks regarding the report of the Committee on Rules now or defer them until after his remarks?

Mr. WORKS. I should be greatly obliged to the Senator from Nevada if he would defer until I have submitted some remarks of which I gave notice.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Then, Mr. President, at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from California I shall take up the discussion of the report of the Committee on Rules on a proposed legislative program.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada whether he intends to ask any action upon that report to-day. I do this because a number of Senators might leave the Chamber, thinking that there would be no other business attended to.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not know whether I shall ask action or not. The probability is that I shall.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, Mr. President, if action is going to be asked upon this matter, I object to it, because I want it to go to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being objection, the report goes to the calendar.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall object to the consideration of the report, and let it go to the calendar, if the Senator is going to ask for action upon it to-day. I have no desire to stop the Senator from speaking upon it, but I certainly do not want any action taken upon it to-day.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I will defer taking up this matter until the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from California. Meanwhile I shall consider as to my course of action regarding it.

Mr. NEWLANDS subsequently said: I desire to give notice that on Monday next, during the morning hour, I shall address the Senate on the resolution (S. Res. 4) providing for a legislative program during the extra session.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it shall be until Monday next at 12 o'clock meridian.

The motion was agreed to.

PUBLICATION OF CRIMES AND ACCIDENTS.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I ask that Senate bill No. 496 be read and laid before the Senate for discussion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 496) making it unlawful to publish details of crimes and accidents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WORKS April 8, 1913, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any person, corporation, or association to print or publish in any newspaper or other publication in the District of Columbia an account of any murder, or alleged murder, or any other actual or alleged crime, suicide, or other accident, injury, or tragedy of any kind wherever the same may have been committed or happened, or alleged to have been committed or happened, other than a mere statement of the fact that such a crime, tragedy, or accident has happened or is alleged to have happened, without details or comments of any kind with respect to such crime, accident, or tragedy, or in respect of, or about, any person connected with or related to or alleged to be or to have been connected with or related to the same.

SEC. 2. That any person, corporation, or association who shall violate any of the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be fined not less than $500 nor more than $5,000, to which may be added imprisonment in the District Jail or Workhouse for not exceeding one year.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, during the first session of the last Congress I introduced a bill, Senate No. 3221, making it unlawful to publish in the District of Columbia details of crimes, accidents, and tragedies. The bill was not pressed by me for consideration by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which it was referred, and was not acted upon. I have again introduced it at this session.

That something should be done to elevate the standard of journalism in this respect in this country, not only in the public interest but in the interest of the great profession of journalism itself, must be obvious to all observant and discriminating people. I have introduced this bill as one means of attracting public attention to the evils growing out of the indiscriminate publication of information that is detrimental to the morals of the people, distracting and fear inspiring in its tendencies, degrading to the journalistic profession, and in every way poisonous and deleterious in its effects both upon publishers and readers of it. This is one phase of the subject to which I desire to attract the attention of the Senate and the country. Another phase of newspaper work that should challenge attention, by the mere mention of it, is the well-known want of reliability of journalistic news and information.

What I am about to say is not inspired by any sense of ill will toward newspapers or their reporters or publishers. I have no personal grievances against either. I have had my share of misrepresentation and abuse from newspapers, but I am glad to say that it has left in my mind no sense of malice, hatred, or desire to reciprocate in kind. I take it that if a newspaper misrepresents or unjustly assails me it can do me no harm, and that if it tells the truth about me I have no reason to complain. So I am not at war with any publication. What I have to say is not in any sense directed at individuals. It is intended to assail a custom that has grown up of publishing objectionable matter in newspapers and other publications and to call for relief from conditions resulting from such journalism. In this effort I should have the support of all high-minded newspaper men who have right ideals of the duty they owe to themselves and their country. Indeed, I know there are newspaper men who are doing a much greater work for the advancement and elevation of their profession in this respect than I can do by anything I may say here to-day—much more than can be done by any law or laws that can be enacted by State or Nation in the endeavor to suppress objectionable publications. It is to that higher class of journalists that we must look for the ultimate remedy for these evils.

The newspaper is a great and powerful influence in a free country like ours, where the press is free and untrammeled. That influence may work for good or evil. The publisher of a newspaper takes upon himself responsibilities of the highest order. He may make his publication an influence and support for the very best in private and public life. It finds its way into the homes of the people and may be an inspiration and uplift that can do more than almost any other force to purify thought, elevate manhood and womanhood, direct the steps of the young to a higher standard of purity and righteousness, elevate citizenship, inspire young and old to a better understanding of the obligations of citizenship in a free Republic like ours, and a higher and more unselfish patriotism. Such should be the mission of every publication.

That some of our newspaper men are not living up to this high ideal of true journalism none, I believe, will be more ready to admit than journalists themselves, and none, I am very sure, would be better pleased than they to remedy the evils that have resulted from a departure from the higher standard.

Mr. President, I noticed with some interest the comments that were made by the newspapers upon the bill introduced by me. Most of them, I think, were inclined to treat it lightly. Some of them were disposed to treat it as a joke while kindly commiserating its author. Still others went beyond the mere terms of the bill and treated seriously the broad questions to which it at least attracted attention.

I do not wonder that the bill should have excited the ridicule of the man who looked upon it as nothing more than an attempt to check, by law, the publication of such objectionable matter as is mentioned in it. No one realizes more fully than I do that without the help of the newspaper workers themselves such legislation as this bill proposes will be futile as a means of accomplishing the beneficial results its author has in mind. Newspapers are published for profit. They will print what their readers want and will pay for. With altogether too many of them it is a purely commercial question. So regarded, it is only a question whether a paper which publishes such matter as this bill proposes to prohibit is a better seller and will secure a wider circulation and more advertisements than one that publishes only legitimate news.

Whether people do want this kind of news or not is one of the questions to be considered, looking at journalism as nothing higher than a means of making money. Newspaper men maintain that they furnish this kind of news because the people want it and will have it, and therefore it is the only way of maintaining their publications on a paying basis. If this is true, it is certainly a melancholy fact. If it is untrue, it is a grave charge to make against the American people. Undoubtedly it is true of some people. But I am convinced that the masses of the people who support the newspapers would prefer to have such news omitted and many people do not read the newspapers and exclude them from their homes because of this objectionable matter.

But, assuming that the greater number of people really want their papers to publish such stuff, who is responsible for this depraved appetite for deleterious and hurtful news? The men who publish the newspapers should seriously ask themselves that question and act accordingly. I know, Mr. President, that all these things are matters of dispute. They may well be so, because neither the one assertion nor the other respecting them is susceptible of proof. They are almost entirely matters of speculation.

In the consideration of this question we will have to distinguish between the legal question of privilege or the liability to individuals for false publications and that of the publication of matter which is objectionable because of its tendency to poison the minds of the public, whether true or false, or generally deleterious news unfit or injurious in its character. In order that I may be better understood, let me point out some of the publications that should be suppressed by law. Chief of these is the publication of the details of crime. If a crime is committed anywhere in the country, it is published with greater or less particularity and detail in every town where a newspaper is printed. The more horrible and atrocious the crime the greater the space given to it and the more specific and minute the details that are given. This so-called news, that should on every account be suppressed, is spread before the readers of the newspapers all over the country with flaunting and alluring headlines to attract attention. It is read by millions of people, young and old alike. But, unfortunately, it does not stop there. The lives of the participants in the crime, both the perpetrator of it and his victim, are laid bare to the world. It is not confined, either, to the immediate parties concerned, but their innocent and stricken friends and relatives are hunted down, and the alleged history of their lives, more often than not false and distorted, is given out to the world. This seems to be a particularly attractive field for the average newspaper correspondent if anyone remotely connected with the unfortunate affair happens to be a man or woman of promi-

nence and well known to the public. It gives spice and interest to a "story" that should never be told and advertises the newspaper as one of great enterprise. The sensational newspaper, of which there are altogether too many, "features" this kind of news and congratulates itself on the opportunity that a dreadful crime or fearful accident gives it to exploit its unparalleled facilities for gathering the news and its unequaled enterprise in furnishing it to its readers. It boasts that it spares no expense in its efforts to supply the public with what it assumes the people want.

A few instances will suffice to show the extent to which this effort to supply the morbid and criminal classes with news that panders to the taste for the horrible and immoral and makes more criminals and causes more crimes than almost any other influence has been carried.

We need not go back very far or very far away from the Capital of the Nation to find some of the most appalling instances of this kind of journalism. Something like a year ago a most atrocious and cruel murder was committed in the near-by State of Virginia. A young woman, married and belonging to a highly respectable family, was brutally murdered. Her young husband, who was out driving with her at the time she was shot, and who likewise was of good family, was soon suspected of the crime, was arrested, tried, and executed for the murder of his young wife. From the time the crime was committed until it was expiated by the life of its perpetrator, the news of the crime in all its details, the lives of the victim and her slayer, and those of their innocent and suffering relatives, near and distant, were published day after day for weeks. The papers, or most of them, were full of it. One would think that the bare statement of the facts would have been enough, but they were amplified and distorted, and alleged facts fabricated and sent out as the truth about it. The pictures of everybody concerned that could be obtained were printed over and over again. The infamy of the thing was enhanced in a way that should have aroused the indignation of all decent people. There was a woman in the case who had, it was claimed, broken up the home of this young couple and brought one to a tragic and the other to a felon's death. The details of this woman's life and her relations with the murderer were published and amplified upon and distorted. And to crown it all, the photographs of the wife, the mistress, and the husband and murderer were published together, the man appearing between the two. Could one conceive of a more brutal and inexcusable piece of so-called journalism than this? Think what it must have meant to the innocent and agonized parents of both the husband and the wife! I can not conceive of anything more fiendish and inhuman than this in the way of newspaper printing.

Mr. President, this is only a very imperfect description of the extent to which some newspapers went in this one instance. It does not half picture the extent to which the published news and fiction relating to it went, or the enormity of the offense against innocent people to whom the crime had brought sorrow and shame, or the injury that was done by poisoning the minds of the readers of these papers with their offensive and horrible recitals of a brutal crime and the immorality that preceded and brought it about.

This is only one out of thousands of like cases. It has been specifically mentioned here because of the flagrancy of the publications relating to it and because it took place so recently that it is fresh in the minds of newspaper readers. The crime was a most distressing one even to think about. The publication of the revolting details of all of the circumstances connected with it, paraded before the readers of such newspapers as made these publications, was most shocking.

The mere mention that such a crime had been committed was enough. To go further was an offense against the common rules of decency. It was calculated to arouse the worst passions of men. The reading of it could do no possible good. It was wholly inexcusable and revolting, looking at it from any point of view. If there is any real desire of any of the readers of the newspapers of this country to read such deleterious and offensive stuff, it should be one of the highest duties of a journalist not to feed any such morbid sense, but to correct it and suppress any such news as detrimental to health and morals and unfit to be published or read. No greater wrong can be done by a great newspaper than to pander to such an appetite and thus create and continue a demand for such news.

Mr. President, however serious such an offense may be as affecting the individual reader, it is even more serious as affecting the newspaper men who gather and publish such news. They live constantly in an atmosphere of crime and immorality. Their purpose is to trace down and send out to their fellow men the details of misconduct of every kind. They live in it, think about it, and give it out to others in all its horrible forms. Their minds are filled with thoughts of immorality, crime, and human tragedies, misfortunes, and misery. The newspaper reporter must dive into this sea of crime and corruption and dress it in such form as to attract the readers of the paper. To make it attractive and readable he adds to the horrors of it, pads it with false and more attractive matter to render it more sensational. He haunts the homes of everybody connected with the crime, shadows them day after day, and publishes facts and falsehoods about them in order to embellish his "story" and make it still more attractive. The kodak man is his aid and abettor. What is lacking in the written story is made still more graphic and sensational by pictures of everybody connected with the crime. Reporters and kodak men thrust themselves into the privacy of the home, snap the unwary unawares, write up imaginary stories about people concerned or connected, directly or indirectly, with the crime—the innocent, suffering, and sorrowing along with the guilty. They seem to lose all sense of decency or of respect for the rights of others in their eager quest for what should be unreadable news and the desire to furnish copy for a newspaper that seems to have lost all sense of decency and propriety in its dealings with the affairs of other people, often of the most sacred kind.

Mr. President, what a life this is for any man to lead. It makes one shudder to think about it. And most of the men who are instrumental in this wholesale poisoning of the minds of our people are young men, often mere boys. It is appalling to think of such a school of vice, falsehood, and violation of the sacred rights of others. It can not but be degrading in the utmost degree. No man can live in such an atmosphere and not suffer from its poisonous impurities. He not only suffers from it himself, but he is constantly instilling it into the minds of others.

Mr. President, I have referred to one case merely as an illustration of the general course of journals that deal with such news. The papers are full of such matter day after day. Some of them feature it and make it chief among all others. Some publish the fact that a crime has been committed without embellishment or exaggeration. Such a course is to be highly commended. There are many just and high-minded journalists in this country who deprecate sensational and objectionable news as earnestly and as strongly as I do. They would rejoice to see a complete reform in this respect. To such as these the bill I have introduced would be welcome if it could be enforced. Its enforcement would depend largely upon the attitude of the newspapers toward legislation of this kind. That many journals deplore these methods and such news is evident from the sentiments they have expressed. Here is an editorial on the subject from one of the leading newspapers on the Pacific coast:

BARRED IN NEW YORK.

Moved by a proper regard for public decency and morality, the commissioner of licenses in New York City has notified the managers of the 600 or more moving-picture shows in that town that the Henry Clay Beattie case must not be made the subject of any of their exhibitions.

The prohibition was made complete. "No moving pictures or other views representing scenes from the trial of Henry Clay Beattie, jr., for the murder of his wife, or in any way connected with the case," are to be exhibited under penalty of the revocation of the license of the place in which they are shown. The action of the license commissioner was most commendable. He has made a wise use of the authority with which he is vested.

Morally speaking, the publication of all the wretched details of that crime is as indefensible as the exhibition of moving pictures purporting to portray them. Let offenders present such specious excuses as they will, setting forth the obligation that rest upon them to "print the news"—they are governed by greed, and to coin a profit do not hesitate to offend against decency. They pander to depraved tastes and instincts, being moved by their own cupidity and their pocket revenues, that are won at the cost of morality.

Inasmuch as there will always be publishers whose itch for gain and contempt for decency, left unrestricted, would lead them to pollute the public mind by magnifying and exploiting every story of hate and murder, lust and passion, it is probable that laws eventually must be enacted for the protection of the community. Offenders will loudly protest against an invasion of the freedom of the press, but freedom was never a warrant for license. Newspapers that print lottery advertisements are excluded from the mails, as are publications containing obscene pictures, but no one pretends that the freedom of the press has sustained any injury therefrom.

Similarly newspapers that convert themselves into gazettes of crime, that seize with eager haste on every salacious happening and exploit it to its last sensational detail, magnifying and emphasizing every disgusting obscenity and degenerate phase of abandoned life, should be debarred from the mails. Were they so debarred, the freedom of the press would suffer the least injury and the cause of morality would be immeasurably advantaged.

So far, Mr. President, I have spoken only of the publication of the details of crimes; but the manner of treating accidents is almost as bad. It is quite as bad in many if not most respects. Take the late disaster to the steamship *Titanic* as an example. It was an accident that cost many lives and brought sorrow to many homes in this country and beyond the sea. Before it was possible for anyone not on the ship to know anything more than the simple but appalling fact that the ship

had been lost the papers throughout the whole country were full of stories of the most sensational character about it—stories that were without foundation and wholly false. The truth of these stories, if they had, in fact, been true, could not have been known to the newspapers that gave them out. They were a horrible injustice and cruelty to the agonized friends and relatives who were waiting anxiously to know the truth, besides the false impressions made upon the minds of others that could never be erased. There could have been no object in all this other than to make money. Extras were put out almost hourly in all of the large cities containing these false and misleading stories that no doubt thousands of people who still have some faith in the correctness of news given out by the papers are still believing, some of them wholly unjust as well as misleading. But even this spurious matter, published as mere conjecture and speculation and without any knowledge of its truth, was not the worst. After the facts began to be known, and when some degree of accuracy was attainable, the unwarranted and wholly false stories manufactured for sensational effect continued to be published. One of the passengers on the ill-fated ship, who lived for some time after the disaster, declared long after all the stories about it had been published that most of them were false. These never have been and never will be corrected.

The extent to which many of the newspapers of the country are devoted to the publication of such hurtful stories as these, which can not justly be called news, is appalling to think about. In one issue of one of the papers published in this city about the time this bill was introduced by me appeared no less than 54 separate accounts of murders, suicides, accidents, and other tragedies happening all over the country. Most of them were occurrences in which none of the readers of this particular journal could have any personal interest. Their publication could be justified or excused only on the ground that its readers want that kind of news. I give here the headlines appearing in this issue of the paper relating to each—not all the headlines, but only the first one or two in each case. In many cases there were others of a most startling kind, and the body of the articles published contained, in some instances, the most objectionable details of these occurrences. The principal headlines in the several cases are as follows:

Washington woman injured—Lies in hospital 36 hours before she is identified.
Shoots wife as burglar—Man probably fatally wounds mate, who closed window.
Shot down in own home—William Stewart killed by his guest during quarrel, police say.
Sees her sister shot—Wife is then felled with gun and husband flees—Posse on trail of fugitive—New York woman probably fatally wounded in family quarrel near Pocomoke City, Md.—Alleged assailant, brother of railway superintendent, may not be taken alive.
Slays brother with stone—Aged men fight to finish, ending 30-year feud.
Body of Merritt arrives—Battleship North Carolina brings victim of marine explosion.
Find loot in women's room—Police charge wholesale shoplifting in 12 different towns.
Offers to sell his tongue—Man in jail would aid girl hurt in auto crash.
Two children save her—Girl of 9 and boy of 10 rescue woman from drowning.
Sea victims' diary found—Messages carved on a hatch cover tell of agonies of castaways—Flotsam reports deaths of shipwrecked men and bears note of farewell to loved ones.
Tugboat is sunk by liner—Collision in East River cuts small craft in two.
Battle in Liverpool—Strikers, soldiers, and police fight for three hours—Succeed in moving supplies.
Falls from yacht; drowns—Arthur W. Yates strikes head on side of boat, then sinks.
Dig to save three in mine—Rescuers work frantically for freedom of comrades—Urged by faint tappings.
Knocks woman senseless—Mrs. C. Toney awakes to find burglar at bedside—Blow from negro follows—Robbed of $37 she had under pillow—Whole police force after him.
Jealous; slays girl—W. H. Sabens kills woman who was to marry another—Shoots at self, but misses—Ada Haynes, 22 years old, had feared former sweetheart, her friends say, ever since she decided to wed New York man—Murderer is caught in Pennsylvania Avenue.
At 9 she is expert thief—Little dimpled girl picks 13 pockets in space of 2 hours.
Woman takes carbolic acid—Mrs. E. M. Frederer removed to hospital, and will recover, doctors say.
Waitress, 17, is missing—Sister of Miss Lucy Dillon asks police to try and find her.
Chase over three States ends—Ex-cashier charged with fraud is captured after week.
Not in a land deal—One Senator denies the tale two "promoters" tell—Detectives after the facts.
Mrs. Owen confident—Alleged kidnaper of Harris girl protests innocence.
Five cable workers perish—Boat is capsized in Frazee River by swift current.
Posse gives up man hunt—Day's hunt is fruitless—Victim of shooting near death.
Three slashed with razor—Two men may die of wounds inflicted during quarrel with merchant.
New scalp a failure—Miss Houghton must return to Emergency Hospital.
Man lost in Atlantic City—Claims to be brother of millionaire—Stays with police.
Hog tears his hand—Enraged animal severely injures man carrying it—Unusual case, doctors say.
Seeks daughter and man—Father asks police to find Florence Cochrane and I. Leatherwood.
Beattie's trial near—Jury likely to be selected by end of this week—Inquiry to begin to-morrow.
Capt. Howard shoots self—Grandson of Revolutionary general not expected to live—Baltimore resident, a Confederate veteran, suffered from nervousness.
Shoots mother who rewed—Boy's bullets also wound a little Philadelphia girl.
Three men bitten by dog—Patrolmen kill animal after an exciting chase.
Bride of three days dead—Wife of Roanoke farmer stricken with fatal malady.
Run down by an auto.
Her tale reveals murder—Woman charges that companion was slain in mountains.
Launch sinks; 18 in peril—Officers and seamen of battleships have narrow escape.
Wife keeps hubby's date—With infant in one arm, she pummels rival at ferryhouse.
Shot dead in motor boat—Mysterious killing may have been caused by stray bullet.
Human chain saves three—Exhausted men rescued at Atlantic City by fellow bathers.
Burglars at Narragansett—J. W. Converse, of Philadelphia, robbed of $700 while dining.
Lassos autos in street—Man tries out stage act, but is captured and tried.
Says captive shot keeper—Anonymous letter informs woman husband kidnaped—Missing man is alleged to have gone insane, killed member of band, and escaped.
Brother's blood fails to save him.
Boasts of jail escape—Policeman overhears William Douglas and rearrests him—"I'd like to see any officer get me again," his last words while free.
His head in the mail—Midhat Pasha slain, and letter says at late Sultan's order.
Explain loss of memory—Malady due, London doctors say, to strain of modern life.
Shields slayer as he dies—Abbe Guibault shot down in his home in France—Mystery surrounds murder which the victim could but would not explain—Neighbor's gun used.
Mystery in beauty's death—Inquiry may be made concerning Mlle. Lanteime's drowning.
Girl tries to bury herself—Broken hearted because lover rejected her after tramping 200 miles.
Dead from explosion of engine boiler.

Think of such a collection of crimes, immoralities, scandals, and terrible accidents being served up to its readers by a newspaper in one of its issues. And this issue was by no means an exceptional one of this or other newspapers, some of them regarded as among the leading journals of the country. People who read the newspapers are served with such shocking and degrading matter in every issue of the paper that comes daily into their homes. In some there are more and some less than the number given above, but the one I have taken as an example presents a fair average of impure and otherwise objectionable news items of the metropolitan journal of the time.

Mr. President, time will not permit me to go into the details of such offenses of the newspapers against the rules of decency and propriety. It is unnecessary. They are known to every newspaper reader. They are the subject of very general unfavorable comment on the part of respectable people, who feel that they must read the papers in order to keep up with the times. Such readers do not read these objectionable articles, but in trying to sort out the legitimate news they can not escape the glaring and offensive headlines that precede such matter, and it is next to impossible to keep them from the younger members of the family who do not realize, as they do, the dangerous and poisonous nature of such news.

The feeling against such publications was strongly expressed in a letter of December 13, 1908, addressed to the newspapers of New York City, signed by men of standing and prominence, in which it was said:

The aim of securing newspapers for our homes which shall at all times be free from lewd or suggestive articles detrimental to morals, offensive to decency, and damaging to self-respect is one which all admit to be desirable. Some might perhaps say that it is possible to enjoy it at all times by simply buying only good newspapers. But, unfortunately, there come periods when overweening public interest and unworthy public curiosity provoke the editors of even some of the best of our journals to overstep the mark and to lay before us and the modest home circle, including the tender children of the schools, libidinous details of criminality which are revolting even to men charged with the punishment of those who prey upon society. We attempt to escape it and close our door to it for a short period, only to find that to keep in touch with our usual social or business needs we must continue our patronage of a journal which we are ashamed to bring home. Then our school children or others must have the objectionable articles and detestable headlines thrust upon their sight in the public conveyances or other places. Each editor escapes censure by claiming that all his brother editors will surely present the same matter, and he can not be exceptional.

The community—all communities—were shocked by the long-continued revelations of the Thaw case, set forth in bold type. We are now promised another of similar character by reason of the approach of certain sensational murder trials, during the course of which, as we have been credibly informed, material more interesting to the prurient mind, and consequently more dangerous to the home and more disgusting to the self-respecting man, is about to be presented in court.

It is believed by good authorities that a respectful protest presented early enough to the press by men of serious character, representing heavy responsibilities in the care of their own children or children confided to them by the duties of their positions in life, will meet with an immediate and sympathetic response, resulting in such careful editing of this and similar news matter that no harm shall be done to the reading community by indecently offensive suggestion.

It is felt that with such views support will be obtained throughout the whole country. Several editors have already expressed their intention of observing even greater care than in the past over news matter of this kind in their columns. You are therefore asked to give this movement your editorial support.

Mr. President, there is another phase of the question I am discussing, but not covered by the bill, that calls for serious consideration and unqualified condemnation, and that is the unreliability of the newspapers, their misrepresentations, unjust coloring of alleged news, the faking or manufacturing of accounts of events or alleged events, and the like. Nothing connected with newspaper work has done more than this to lose the papers the confidence of the public and destroy their influence. The inaccuracy of newspaper accounts of proceedings of public bodies and the acts and sayings of men in public life has become proverbial. The public is constantly misinformed and deceived and public men misrepresented, their positions on public questions misstated, often willfully and maliciously, and accounts given as actual occurrences that never took place, but have been concocted as a readable story that may be interesting as fiction. Unfortunately it is not published as fiction but as fact, and often about public matters of grave importance. Such journalism is a violation of the duty a newspaper owes to its readers. It is continuously and persistently deceiving the people who pay for it on its implied obligation to supply them with the news, with facts and not fiction wrongfully put out as facts. It is a grave wrong to the individual who is misrepresented, misquoted, and often persistently and willfully put in the wrong without reason or excuse. An aggravated case of this kind of unreliable and unfair journalism may be found in what the newspapers printed about the pretended make-up of the Cabinet of the newly elected President of the United States. Men were named with perfect assurance as being decided upon as members of the Cabinet, and conversations and consultations between the President elect and his alleged advisers and what had been said about supposed aspirants for these high places, good and bad, were given day after day, as if the newspaper writers had been present and heard what was said. Of course people who knew what was going on understood that all of these publications were purely imaginary and without foundation in fact, but many readers did not, and took them seriously. But the fact that such publications are false is not the worst of it. Sometimes they are willfully and maliciously false. In other cases they are intended to be embarrassing to public men written about, and often have that effect and do great injustice.

But, Mr. President, this is only one instance out of hundreds where many newspapers are reckless, insincere, untruthful, and wholly unreliable. They have suffered greatly from this manner of dealing with the public and with public affairs. They have lost the confidence and very generally the respect of their readers. Journalism, which should be one of the highest and most trusted professions, has suffered immensely in public esteem from this character of journalism on the part of some of its members. Men in public life are misrepresented and misquoted habitually by some newspaper writers; the facts about public questions are distorted, colored, and often misstated; the reading public is deceived and misled about public affairs and public men, and if such papers were believed the most serious results might follow from such unreliable and mendacious journalism.

Mr. President, I am glad to say that the better class of journalists do not approve of this kind of so-called journalism and are striving to protect their profession and their newspapers from its blighting effect. Here is an evidence of it taken from one journal which condemns it in unmeasured terms:

In these days of competitive sensationalism in the newspaper field it sometimes seems as if all consideration for the home life of the people has been lost sight of in the efforts made by the newspapers to outdo each other in reporting the scandalous and salacious details of some case which happens to be on trial or in the exploitation of some crime that has been committed. Because we are condemning the evil itself rather than the persons concerned, we refrain from mentioning the name of any city or paper; but it is to be deplored that such a condition seems to exist in one of our principal cities at the present time, and the only excuse offered in defense of it is that the publishers believe their patrons desire to read such stuff. This, however, is scarcely to be considered flattering to the community as a whole, and in proof that the desire for "news" of this kind is not unanimous, in this particular city at least, we quote the following resolutions, which were adopted by one of its leading women's clubs, and all other women's clubs were asked to indorse:

"Whereas certain daily papers in this city are continually giving in revolting detail the accounts of crimes and scandals, setting forth the same in the most conspicuous manner; and

"Whereas if these papers are received into our homes, the filthy and demoralizing news above referred to must come under the eyes of our children: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Home Study Club, That we protest against the moral wrong being done our children, ourselves, and the whole city by the debased journalistic ideals at present dominating the publishers of these papers, and we ask that they who are responsible for the publication of such news as is suggestive of evil and demoralizing to all who read it adopt a higher standard of morality and decency for their papers, if they hope to have them remain in our homes."

In addition to this courteous yet emphatic protest, the matter has been taken up by some of the ministers of the city, one of whom said from his pulpit:

"How are you and I going to protect the minds and morals of our growing boys and girls if we put that sort of thing within their reach? We all remember what earnest objections our people made to our reading the old yellow dime novels when we were young, and if we will stop a moment to consider the psychology of the thing we will see how much worse it is to give our children daily access to the most degrading facts of actual life as published by these newspapers. If you have any doubt on this point, just stop for a moment and ask yourself what you would think of me if I were to gather your boys and girls together and put such stuff into their hands as fit literature for them to read.

"When we criticize the newspapers for these things we are constantly reminded that they are commercial enterprises and must give the people what they want in order to command circulation. Since that is the case, Christian men and women can best impress the newspapers with what they want by some form of commercial treatment. Many of you men are patrons of the advertising columns of these newspapers; and if you see fit to do so you can very quickly let the publishers know what your disapproval of their news columns means, for it is the publishers who are directly responsible for the present situation. By refusing to read their papers as long as they follow their present policy, and by refusing to patronize them, you can make the most effective protest against this kind of journalism."

In common justice, however, it should be stated that one of the newspapers of the city, a paper which had the courage to announce in a recent issue that at the expiration of existing contracts no more advertisements of beer, liquor, or cigarettes would be accepted, in commenting on these protests says:

"Nor do these public protests reflect in full the disgust of many thousands of respectable citizens who give vent to their feelings in private conversation whenever the press is mentioned. Yet these people are not seeking a quarrel with the press out of hand. Many of them entertain a mystic fear of newspapers; some of them cling to a faith in the moral integrity of the press that amounts to a childlike affection. Nor do they ask that legitimate news be suppressed. They only ask that the news be presented in such form that it will not corrupt the young nor spread crime and immorality among the ignorant.

"Under sufficient pressure we think the newspapers will come to that way of handling news; and that pressure will be sufficient when the people who demand clean journalism can demonstrate to the newspapers that they are better worth considering than the people who demand unclean journalism. An 'epidemic of crime' is in the first instance largely an epidemic of the bespangled and bejeweled publicity of crime."

Nor should it be inferred, in citing the conditions which prevail in this particular section, that it is by any means an isolated instance. It is unfortunate that this pandering to morbid and vicious tastes is so nearly universal that anything in the way of protest stands out in vivid contrast. For instance, a prominent metropolitan newspaper had this to say about a recent murder case which was largely exploited by the press:

"The mushy sentimentality of which this case has furnished a somewhat extreme illustration is a more serious element in our national life than most people realize. In the matter of homicide itself we have no doubt that it constitutes one of the chief reasons of our country's most unenviable prominence. * * * No sooner does a case figure conspicuously in the newspapers than it is turned over in every conceivable way on its sentimental side, and the monstrousness of the crime lost sight of in the "human interest" of the criminal. The wrecker of banks is a staunch comrade and a dead-game sport; the wife murderer is not half bad when you get to know him."

The time was when space in newspapers was too valuable for anything save the most important news and that briefly told, but the lessened cost of production that has made possible the modern newspaper at a popular price has not worked altogether for the good of the public; the choice of reading matter wherewith to fill its columns has not always been wisely made, and this evil has grown with the years.

Another leading newspaper, in commenting on the bill introduced by me, has this to say:

No one deplores more sincerely the frequency of crime than the conscientious publishers of first-class newspapers or regrets the necessity of the constantly recurring publications of descriptions of these events. It may be that there are newspapers that take pleasure in killings and other forms of crime for the sake of the appeal to the morbid minds of those who delight in narrations of tragedy, but the general run of American newspapers can not be so classed.

The term "general run of American newspapers" used by this editorial writer is rather indefinite. And the guarded statement that it may be that there are newspapers that "take pleasure" in publishing the details of crimes is significant and wholly fails to meet the evil of which I am complaining. It is not alone the newspapers that "take pleasure" in it that publish such objectionable news. Many of them publish it against their judgment and sense of right and decency and only because of their belief that the people want it, and to make money. Such newspapers are the most dangerous of all. They are generally publications of standing and a degree of influence. They join with the sensational and distrusted newspapers in these publications and thus give them an appearance of respectability and proper journalism that they do not deserve. Such journals if they should leave such publications to newspapers known to belong to the class designated "sensational," could do much to break up this custom of printing such news and advance the interest and elevate the standard of their profession immeasurably.

It is not alone the better class of journalists and newspapers that are endeavoring to protect themselves from such violations of the rules of true journalism, but the people generally are rebelling against and denouncing it, and many civic organizations are entering their protest against it in the interest of morality and civic righteousness.

The National Ethical Press Association in a letter on the subject has this to say:

This association was formed with the object of promoting clean journalism and the cause of newspapers which strive to publish unbiased news. In our first effort to interest public servants in our work—in an effort to induce them to see that there is a legislative power which can be used to protect the public—we addressed a special committee of the Legislature of Illinois, and later the members of the legislature itself.

The particular point we tried to make was that a certain class of newspapers now published in this country were not giving either the public or public servants a just deal through the manner in which the present important and official news is published.

Later we addressed the Subcommittee of Privileges and Elections of your body and after that the full committee, sending to them copies of our correspondence and arguments presented to the Illinois Legislature.

There is a popular demand throughout the Nation, among private citizens as well as public men, for authentic, uncolored information as to public affairs. The people wish to read unbiased news as to matters of Government, which directly affect their daily life. This demand is based upon the fact that many of our leading newspapers, not all, print official proceedings of the Government, of State legislatures, and municipal bodies, not as those proceedings actually take place, but distorted, discolored, to suit the private ends of the publishers.

The Council of Jewish Women have appointed a national committee on purity of the press. In a circular issued by this committee it is said:

At the triennial convention of 1908 this department was formally recognized as one of the activities of the council.

Our protest against the publication of indecent, criminal, sensational, and otherwise objectionable news matter as presented in the circular letter appended has received many indorsements alike from individuals and organizations. Many have expressed their appreciation of our having started a campaign for a cleaner journalism and have promised cooperation. Many articles and editorials have appeared commenting strongly on the evils of the modern press. Thus do we observe that the necessity for this work we have initiated is rapidly becoming apparent to thinking people. As newspapers are widely circulated, the influence of our work will reach beyond the bounds of any one locality.

As it is only through concerted action that a strong public opinion can be formed, we appeal to all sections to take an active interest in this prophylactic work, aiming as it does, to prevent the continuance and further extension of a harmful practice and its consequence. Since editors claim that they merely supply the demand of their readers, it devolves upon us to create a strong public sentiment for a cleaner journalism.

One of the good women connected with this work wrote me soon after I introduced the bill under discussion, as follows:

I was delighted to see in last night's Star that you had introduced a bill for "Suppressing the publication of crime in the newspapers." It is a subject in which I am much interested, upon which I have written and thought—hopelessly—for months. I belong to the "Council of Jewish Women." Am chairman of the local section on "Purity of the press." If our society can in any way aid your efforts at reform in the daily and weekly papers that publish so much that is pernicious to the rising generation, I would be most happy to aid you to the extent of our power.

In some of the States statutes have been enacted to meet this growing evil. The following act passed by the Legislature of Indiana is a fair sample of the efforts made in that way:

An act prohibiting the publication or sale of pernicious literature, and providing for punishment for the violation of the same.

SECTION 1. *Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana*, That it shall be unlawful for any person to sell, or offer for sale, or to print or publish, or to *bring into this State* for the purpose of selling, giving away, or otherwise *disposing* of, or to *circulate* in any way, any paper, book, or periodical, the chief feature or characteristic of which is the record of the commission of crime, or to display by cut or illustration crimes committed, or the acts or pictures of criminals, desperadoes, or of men or women in lewd and unbecoming positions or improper dress.

SEC. 2. That any person guilty of violation of this act shall be fined not less than $10 and not more than $200.

Missouri and Kansas have similar statutes.

Now, Mr. President, what is the remedy for this evil that is poisoning the minds of the readers of the newspapers, contaminating the atmosphere with its impurities, and leading the young into lives of immorality and crime by its attractive and misleading suggestions? The one effective and sure remedy lies with journalists and newspaper publishers themselves. They can, if they will, so discountenance and condemn such unworthy and hurtful journalism and stand for clean and reliable effort, by both precept and example, that the practice will soon be made so odious that such newspapers will not be read and will not pay. Another remedy rests in the hands of the readers of such newspapers. If the men and women who really believe in clean, reliable, and respectable journalism only had the moral courage to refuse to read such newspapers, or to advertise in them, this would have the same effect. But this can not be done by one or a few persons here and there. It must be a concerted effort by the many. If the various organizations that are opposing impure journalism would only induce their own members to take this stand and abide by it, the good work would be commenced in an effective way. Besides the impression it would have on unworthy newspapers, it would be an example and an education to others who are protesting against the kind of news they are getting through so many of the newspapers.

Still another remedy is by the enactment of laws forbidding such publications under penalty. Any such effort meets at once the cry that it is in violation of the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution provides:

Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech or of the press.

This provision of the Constitution should be so construed as to give full effect to its terms. The freedom to speak and write one's views on any and every subject, especially subjects affecting the public welfare, should be carefully and effectually preserved and protected. This is a privilege that should be held sacred in a country like ours. But there are other rights and privileges on the part of the public that should be just as sacredly observed and as carefully protected. So the real question is, How far can an individual newspaper trespass upon the rights and liberties of the public and claim immunity under this provision of the Constitution? As it affects the individual who is unjustly assailed by a newspaper he has his remedy at law in an action for damages, which may be regarded as sufficient remedy for the wrong done him. But when publications are detrimental to the public in general, as in the cases I have been considering, the question is an altogether different one. Can the Constitution be so construed as to protect a newspaper that habitually publishes obscene and other matter detrimental to the public morals and tending to make criminals and incite to crime? Is it an abridgment of the liberty of a newspaper to forbid it to publish such stuff?

The Government has gone so far as to prohibit the sending of such matter through the mails, and this law has been enforced in many cases. Of course, this is not to prohibit the publication, but in most cases it has that effect. Besides, to prohibit the sending of a newspaper containing such news through the mail is to abridge the freedom of publication.

It is well for the liberty of the people that censorship of the press is no longer allowed in this country. It was this that the Constitution was intended to prevent. But to censor the press and thereby say what shall and what shall not be published is one thing, and to make one responsible for a violation of the privilege thus secured to him is quite another thing. The very fact that the right to publish what one pleases without abridgment exists is the strongest possible reason for making the publishers of news liable for abusing their right and privilege. This liability has always been recognized and enforced. The newspaper may publish what it pleases about an individual, but if its publication is false and injurious it is liable both civilly and criminally. This no one will deny. And, sir, I maintain that if a newspaper publishes matter that is deleterious and poisonous to the minds of its readers, thus violating the rules of good morals and decency, it should be made criminally liable for this offense, an offense far more important and hurtful than the libel of the individual and upon precisely the same principle. There should be this difference, however: Proof of the truth of the matter is always a defense to an action for libel by the individual. It should not be so in all cases, where the prosecution is for publishing any matter injurious to health or morals or against public policy. Often a publication of the truth may be more injurious and more reprehensible than that of falsehood or fiction.

Mr. President, this brings us face to face with the great question of the police power of a State and the extent to which that power may be enforced to protect the public. It is a broad field. It has given rise to much important litigation and hundreds of decisions, many of them at variance with each other. As to the general scope of the power, Mr. Freund has this to say in his work on Police Power:

That freedom of speech and press does not mean freedom from responsibility for the abuse of that freedom appears not only from the history of the right but from express constitutional provisions to that effect. Above all, the constitutions do not legalize libel and slander of other persons, against which the remedies provided for by the common law may be applied. So, also, there is no doubt that speech and press may not be used to corrupt public morals, and obscene or profane utterances by word of mouth, in writing, or in print may be made punishable offenses. In Missouri and Kansas statutes have been upheld punishing the sale of newspapers largely devoted to the publication of scandal, lechery, and immoral conduct.

For some unaccountable reason the notion prevails that greater latitude is given a newspaper than any other vehicle for conveying information without responsibility for what it says. This claim was put at rest by an early case in New York, reported in Second Hill, at page 513. In response to a claim of

this kind in defense of the editor of a newspaper, the court said:

We were also told that if the law were not thus indulgent some legislative relief might become necessary for the protection of this class of citizens. Undoubtedly if it be desirable to pamper a depraved public appetite or taste, if there be any such, by the republication of all the falsehoods and calumnies upon private character that may find their way into the press—to give encouragement to the widest possible circulation of these vile and defamatory publications by protecting the retailers of them—some legislative interference will be necessary, for no countenance can be found for the irresponsibility claimed in the common law. That reprobates the libeler, whether author or publisher, and subjects him to both civil and criminal responsibility. His offense is there ranked with that of the receiver of stolen goods, the perjurer and subborner of perjury, the disturber of the public peace, the conspirator, and other offenders of like character.

Objectionable exhibitions by means of moving pictures are not only subject to prosecution, but they are rigidly censored and suppressed. While the newspapers were publishing the shocking and otherwise objectionable details of the celebrated Beattie murder case and illustrating them with photographs and pictures, the proprietors of moving-picture shows were, in many cities, expressly forbidden to exhibit pictures of the very same things. No one seemed to doubt either the power to suppress such exhibitions by these places or the wisdom or propriety of it. In fact, the course taken was very generally commended, and for good reason. But at the same time the newspapers of the country were allowed, without molestation, to do the very same thing in a much more injurious way and to the detriment of millions more people.

The question naturally arises whether such publications as I have been talking about are so injurious and hurtful as to warrant the interference of the lawmaking power to prevent them. A very interesting dissertation on this subject will be found in a little book by Frances Fenton entitled "The influence of newspaper presentations upon the growth of crime and other antisocial activity." The author undertakes, in a systematic way, to show the percentage of newspaper space given to objectionable news, the character of it, and its effect by evil suggestion, and otherwise, upon crime and criminals and public morals, and concludes with these general observations on the subject:

III. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES OF THE NEWSPAPER.

1. The newspaper is a tremendous influence in the community. Its stimuli reach an enormous number of persons and reach them frequently and insistently. It should, therefore, be an educative and dependable medium. Its possible educative value has scarcely been realized. Suggestive antisocial matter should be excluded from it. This does not mean that all mention of antisocial matters should be excluded. It is desirable that the public should be informed on all matters which they can assist in improving. But the news which gives them the information should not be couched in terms or presented in forms and details which make it criminally suggestive or factually misleading. It is possible to deal with antisocial matters in such a manner as to minimize the possibility of suggestion to antisocial activity by confining the treatment to bare statements of fact by selecting such facts only as are necessary to constructive action in the matter. It is likewise possible to use all of the media which contribute so largely to antisocial results in gaining increased social results. Many of these methods constitute a technique ready-made for educative purposes. Large type, vivid and picturesque writing, illustrations, colored type, diagrams, etc., are just as easily the media of social as of antisocial suggestion, and when the content conveyed by them is of a social character they are indispensable for readers who are fatigued or who read in poor light.

2. There are, however, strong forces working against such changes as have been suggested at the present time. Commercial influences operating upon the policy of newspapers serve to suppress facts important to the public. Any accident, theft, crime, which is likely to react unfavorably on the buying public is not coupled with the name of the firm with whom it occurs. For example, if an accident occurs in a State Street department store in Chicago, whether due to fault of the company or to some other cause, the newspapers do not mention specifically where it occurred, because such mention hurts the store's trade.

The newspaper is also accustomed to play up or distort facts when such a course pays. An example of this is to be found in the fact that while the opera Salome was under fire in Chicago and not yet suspended some of the Chicago papers, and likewise Cleveland papers (for which city the opera was booked after Chicago), took the side of the opera and minimized its suggestiveness.

The fact that the newspapers work for a margin of sales also strongly influences their policy in printing antisocial matter. There is a circulation which can be pretty definitely counted upon, i. e., a certain number of people buy papers constantly for the news, regardless of the content. Beyond this, featuring, doctoring, and faking draw a wide circle of buyers who would not otherwise be attracted. For example, the sporting section is usually printed on colored paper and placed on the outside of the evening paper for the purpose of attracting this margin of sales among a class who are not generally interested in the political and social news of the day. Likewise there are girls who would not buy a conservatively gotten-up paper, i. e., one dealing with the essential and standard facts of life presented in an uncolored and dependable manner, who will buy a copy which bears the caption in large red type, *Turns revolver upon woman—Shoots self.*

In short, advertising columns and pecuniary reward muzzle the news columns and distort and color the facts which they contain, thus destroying their accuracy and utility and leading to antisocial presentations. When any argument is made for the control of newspaper presentations, however, it is met by the time-honored appeal to freedom of discussion. But, as an answer to this appeal, it should be remembered (1) that, as a matter of fact, the public does not get freedom of discussion in the newspaper. It gets discussion which is strictly censored in the ways mentioned above, in large part by special interests and the desire for gains at the cost of the public; and (2), that as a principle freedom of discussion is useful and desirable only when it secures advantageous social results. Freedom of discussion apart from its results is not in itself a worthy end.

(3) Endowed and public-owned newspapers have been proposed as remedies for the present evils springing from a system of private-owned newspapers. While public-owned newspapers might secure the kind of news which is desirable—at least in some respects—they are such a far-off contingency that it is more practical to consider proposals which can be put into operation more quickly. The endowed newspaper, as an adequate solution of the problem, is at present as impracticable as the public-owned newspaper. It would moreover be but a partial relief so long as private-owned newspapers were in the field.

(4) Therefore, it is important to consider methods possible at present.

(a) We need new and adequately enforced laws defining strictly the power of newspapers to deal with news, laws analogous to those already in operation in regard to the use of the mails, billboards, etc. Such laws would, as a matter of fact, in many cases be mere formulations of practices already in vogue. Courts, both in the United States and England, have already shown their power to restrain newspapers from, or to punish them for, detailing certain types of antisocial facts.

(b) Judges should recognize in their decisions the facts already known regarding antisocial suggestion.

(c) Public opinion needs to be educated to secure support for constructive legislation along this line and to support such laws as we have or as may be made.

(d) Further investigation of the relation of newspaper suggestion and other suggestion to crime and other antisocial activity should be made, and public officials, such as probation officers, juvenile court judges and other judges, superintendents of institutions, etc., should be encouraged and required to keep records of cases of such connection. In this way a better basis for activity regarding the newspapers could be established.

Another interesting paper on the subject, showing especially the extent to which the space given in the leading and standard newspapers to scandals, crimes, and the like, will be found in an article by John Gilmer Speed, in volume 15 of the Forum, entitled "Do the newspapers give the news?"

In the course of the article the author says:

Suppose we examine representative New York newspapers of 12 years ago and compare them with the same papers of this year. For example, we will take the Sun, the World, Times, and Tribune of Sunday, April 17, 1881, and compare them with the same papers of Sunday, April 16, 1893. I wish to remark here that I selected this date in April merely by chance and not because I was aware of anything in the papers of that day making them at all extraordinary. Indeed, it may be that they were more commonplace than usual, for it happened that the day before there were no "carnivals of crime" or "bloody butcheries" anywhere within telegraphic reach. The Sunday Sun and World of the date given in 1881 were each 8-page, 7-column papers. The Tribune had 12 pages of 6 columns each, and the Times 16 pages of 7 columns each. Men remarked 12 years ago that these were very large papers; but on the corresponding Sunday of 1893 the Tribune was just twice as large, having 24 pages of 6 columns each; the Times had 20 pages with 7 columns each; the Sun had 28 pages of 7 columns each; and the World 44 pages of 8 columns each. This was expansion in earnest. But if the quality of the reading matter had not suffered by this expansion, and if it were not bad before the expansion began, then probably no one has the right to complain.

For the purpose of comparing the various kinds of subjects treated in the papers of the different dates I have made the following table:

Columns of reading matter in New York newspapers, Apr. 17, 1881, and Apr. 16, 1893.

Subject.	Tribune, 1881.	Tribune, 1893.	World, 1881.	World, 1893.	Times, 1881.	Times, 1893.	Sun, 1881.	Sun, 1893.
Editorial	700	700	475	400	600	500	400	400
Religious	200	.....	75	.....	100	.....	50	100
Scientific	100	75	.....	200	100	.....	.....	250
Political	300	375	.....	1,050	100	400	100	350
Literary	1,700	500	100	200	1,800	1,200	575	600
Gossip	100	2,300	100	6,350	50	1,675	200	1,300
Scandals	.....	150	.....	150	100	250	.....	200
Sporting	100	650	250	1,600	300	1,000	50	1,750
Fiction	.....	700	150	650	100	150	.....	1,150
Historical	250	250	275	400	250	150	425	1,400
Music and drama	250	400	150	1,100	400	700	.....	350
Crimes and criminals	.....	50	.....	600	.....	100	.....	.....
Art	100	100	300	300	200	.....	25	125

The true significance of this table, of course, lies in the percentage relation of the different subjects to the total number of columns printed. Thus while the Times on this particular Sunday in 1881 contained 18 columns of literary matter, or 16 per cent of the total space in the whole paper, the literary matter in the corresponding Sunday of this year is 12 columns, or only 9.6 per cent of the total space. The "gossip" in the Times in 12 years increased from four-tenths of 1 per cent of the total space to eleven and seven-tenths of 1 per cent of the space—that is, from one-half a column it had grown during the 12 years to 16½ columns. The religious matter had dropped from one column in 1881 to nothing in 1893. Scientific matters decreased exactly in the same way; while the scandals, which filled only one column in 1881, now needed two columns and a half to hold them. The sporting news grew from 3 to 10 columns; art criticism dropped from 2 columns to nothing.

In the Sun of 1881, on the particular Sunday alluded to, there were no scandals printed; on the corresponding Sunday of 1893 the scandals filled 2 columns of the paper, or about 1 per cent of the total space, and the gossip increased from 2 to 13 columns. The literary matter in the Sun remained about the same, while more space was given to religious, scientific, and art subjects.

The Tribune in 1881 has 2 columns of religious matter and not a line in 1893. The scandals, however, which were nothing in 1881, had increased to a column and a half, while the gossip had grown from 1 column to 23, and so filled more than 16 per cent of the space of the paper. Sporting, too, grew from 1 column to 6½ columns, while in both years editorial comments and art criticism remained the same.

The World in 1881 had no scandals and only a column of gossip. In 1893 the scandals filled a column and a half and the gossip 6¾ columns. The music and drama in the former year required a column and a half, while 11 columns were used in 1893. It is likely that fully 8 of these 11 columns devoted to music and the drama should be credited to gossip. In 1881 the World had no stories of crimes and criminals; in the paper of April 16, 1893, 6 columns were devoted to these subjects.

In an article by Charles Emory Smith, one of the noted newspaper men of the country, in the Independent, defending the newspapers and condemning a libel law passed by the Legislature of Pennsylvania, he has this to say of the objectionable features of present-day journalism:

Freedom of the press undoubtedly degenerates at times into license. We have seen invasions of the sanctity of private life which are wholly deplorable and unjustifiable. We have seen newspapers intrude into the sacred realm of purely domestic concerns and drag out that which should remain behind the veil for sensational effect or the salacious delectation of an eager public. In the fretful race of competition there has probably been too much disposition to regard everything which Argus eyes can detect as the legitimate subject of the remorseless news gatherer. The public are quite as much at fault as the newspapers. This tendency to seize upon personal affairs and to exploit them in picturesque style ministers to a popular taste which is as old as mankind. There ought doubtless to be some reform of newspaper ethics, and the surest path to it would be an anterior reform of human nature itself.

This quotation reveals the excuse for the newspapers that the people want that kind of sensational news. I am coming to that a little further along.

Another excuse, as it relates to the publication of particulars of crimes, is that it is an aid to the detection and conviction of the criminals. That, also, I will come to later.

There are a few, fortunately a very few, who justify the publication of obscene literature, not because it is demanded by the people, but upon the broad ground that it is a right that should not be abridged and is actually beneficial. A book entitled "Obscene Literature and Constitutional Law" is a conspicuous and unworthy example of this kind. It is written by Theodore Schroeder, who gives himself the title of "Legal counselor to the Medico-Legal Society of New York." As the purveyor of obscene and poisonous literature it is one of the worst of its kind. It gives the substance of many of the worst and most obscene books that have been excluded from the mails under the law I have mentioned. I wonder how this book escaped the vigilance of the Post Office Department. In the estimation of the writer of it nothing can be too vile and indecent to publish, if only it claims to be educational, especially if it emanates from the Medico-Legal Society, of which he is counselor. A very fair estimate of the book and the perverted mind of its author may be reached by reading the following passage in the preface:

My numerous smug friends, who pride themselves on their "eminent respectability," often reproach me gently for my extensive advocacy of freedom of speech and press, and of uncensored mails and express. To defend the right of all humans to an opportunity to know all there is to know, even about the subject of sex, to the polluted minds of my "pure" friends, is to defend an "uncleanness"—not at all unclean so far as it relates to their own bodies, but "unclean" to talk and read about—not "unclean" as to any acts or facts in their own lives, but "unclean" only to admit a consciousness of those facts. I reluctantly confess that all such hypocritical moral cant or diseased sex sensitiveness arouses in me the most profound contempt of which my phlegmatic nature is capable. Perhaps that is *one* reason why I was impelled to do this uncompensated and unpopular work, and sometimes to do it in a manner that is devoid of tact, according to the judgment of those who dare not countenance robust frankness.

Among other things the author maintains that the constitutionality of the act of Congress, or other similar State statutes, against sending obscene matter through the mails has never been passed upon by the courts, although hundreds of convictions have been affirmed. He takes this broad ground:

The postal laws against "obscene" literature are void under the constitutional prohibition against the abridgment of freedom of speech and of the press. Likewise all similar State legislation is void under State constitutions.

Of course, the prohibition against sending obscene matter through the mails is not a direct provision against the publication of such matter. But it is an abridgment of the freedom of publication by depriving the publisher of the use of the mails as a means of such publication, a right granted to others, and denied to him only because of the objectionable nature of the matter offered by him.

So, Mr. President, the principle involved is precisely the same, whether we forbid the use of the mails to distribute such matter to the public or impose a penalty for the printing and publication of it. In either case, if the freedom of the press gives the constitutional right to publish the poisonous criminally suggestive and deleterious matter that I am condemning, then both the law now on the statute book denying the use of the mails for such publications and the one proposed by me are an abridgment of that right and void as a violation of the Constitution.

It must be obvious that I can not take up the time of the Senate in any lengthy discussion of this constitutional question, important as I conceive it to be, or with a critical review of the cases bearing upon it. But any discussion of it without reference to some of the leading cases would be incomplete and unsatisfactory. So I hope the Senate will bear with me while I consider a very few of the many decisions of the courts dealing with the question.

In United States *v.* Harrison (45 Fed. Rep., 414) Phillips, judge, has this to say:

THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE ACT OF CONGRESS.

It is next objected that the act of Congress under which this indictment was founded is in contravention of the first amendment of the Federal Constitution, which declares that "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech or of the press." Counsel has urged this objection with such force and vigor of reasoning as to entitle it to serious consideration under other conditions than those which exist. The constitutionality of the act in question has been affirmed by the court of last resort in the case of Ex parte Jackson (96 U. S., 727). It is true the direct question there presented was as to that branch of the statute denying the use of the mails to lottery circulars, etc., but the opinion of the court proceeds on the theory that the provision of the statute respecting lotteries is so closely allied to that declaring obscene literature nonmailable matter that it must rest upon the same principle, and thereupon proceeds to discuss the latter feature of the statute and to uphold its constitutionality. Until overruled this decision must control the action of this court. In view, however, of the fact that the defendant places so much stress along the line of his entire defense on the liberty which should be accorded to the press, it may as well be said here as elsewhere that it is a radical misconception of the scope of the constitutional protection to indulge the belief that a person may print and publish *ad libitum* any matter, whatever the substance or language, without accountability to law. Liberty in all its forms and assertions in this country is regulated by law. It is not an unbridled license. Where vituperation or licentiousness begins the liberty of the press ends. While the genius of our institutions of government accords the largest liberality in the utterance of private opinion and the widest latitude in polemics, touching questions of social ethics, political and domestic economy, and the like, it must ever be kept in mind that this invaluable privilege is not paramount to the golden rule of every civilized society, *sic utere tuo ut non alienum laedas*—"so exercise your own freedom as not to infringe the rights of others or the public peace and safety." (2 Story Const., sec. 1888.) While, happily, we have outlived the epoch of censors and licensors of the press, to whom the publisher must submit his matter in advance, responsibility yet attaches to him when he transcends the boundary line where he outrages the common sense of decency or endangers the public safety. As said by that eminent jurist, Judge Story (Id., secs. 1884–1887):

"There is a good deal of loose reasoning on the subject of the liberty of the press, as if its inviolability were constitutionally such that, like the King of England, it could do no wrong and was free from every inquiry and afforded a perfect sanctuary for every abuse; that, in short, it implied a despotic sovereignty to do every sort of wrong without the slightest accountability to private or public justice. Such a notion is too extravagant to be held by any sound constitutional lawyer with regard to the rights and duties belonging to governments generally or to the State governments in particular. If it were admitted to be correct, it might be justly affirmed that the liberty of the press was incompatible with the permanent existence of any free government * * * In short, is it contended that the liberty of the press is so much more valuable than all other rights in society that the public safety—nay, the existence of the Government itself—is to yield to it? It would be difficult to answer these questions in favor of the liberty of the press without at the same time declaring that such a license belonged and could belong only to a despotism and was utterly incompatible with the principles of a free government."

This is an admirable and concise statement of the law on the subject. Other interesting cases bearing on the question are the following:

United States *v.* Bennett (16 Blatch., U. S. C. C., 338); State *v.* Van Wye (136 Mo., 272); In re Banks (56 Kans., 242); State *v.* Sykes (28 Conn., 224); State *v.* Faulds (17 Mont., 140); State *v.* Shepherd (177 Mo., 205); Riley *v.* Lee (88 Ky., 603); Pavesich *v.* New England Life Insurance Co. (122 Ga., 190); State *v.* McKee (73 Conn., 18; 49 Law Rep. An., 542).

The question is discussed and the correct rule laid down in State *v.* Van Wye (136 Mo., 227), in which the court said:

The constitutionality of the act of 1891 already quoted is assailed because it is claimed to be in contravention of section 14 of the bill of rights of Missouri. That familiar section ordains that "No law shall be passed impairing the freedom of speech; that every person shall be free to say, write, or publish whatever he will on any subject, being responsible for all abuse of that liberty; and that in all suits and prosecutions for libel the truth thereof may be given in evidence."

* * * * * * *

"The liberty of the press," says Lord Mansfield, in King *v.* Dean of St. Asaph (cited in note to 3 T. R., 431), "consists in printing without any previous license, subject to the consequence of the law." Lord Ellenborough defines it in Rex *v.* Cobbett (29 Howell's State Trials, 49), in this way: "The law of England is a law of liberty, and, consistently with this liberty, we have not what is called an *imprimatur;* there is no such preliminary license necessary. But if a man publish a paper, he is exposed to the penal consequences, as he is in every other act, if it be illegal."

Thus understood the provision in our bill of rights was adopted substantially in the constitutions of several States of our American Union and in the Federal Constitution. Says Judge Cooley: "It must be evident from these historical facts that liberty of the press, as now understood and enjoyed, is of very recent origin; and commentators seem to be agreed in the opinion that the term itself means only that liberty of publication without the previous permission of the Government, which was obtained by the abolition of the censorship." (Cooley on Constitutional Limitations (6 Ed.), p. 516; Hallam's Const. History of England, ch. 15; De Lolme's Const. of England, 254; 4 Blackstone's Com., 151; Story on Const., sec. 1889; 2 Kent., 17, et seq.; Rawle, Constitution, ch. 10.)

The constitutional liberty of speech and of the press, as we understand it, simply guarantees the right to freely utter and publish whatever the citizens may desire and to be protected in so doing, provided always that such publications are not blasphemous, obscene, and scandalous in their character so that they become an offense against the public, and by their malice and falsehood injuriously affect the character, reputation, or pecuniary interests of individuals. The constitutional protection shields no one from responsibility for abuse of this right. To hold that it did would be a cruel libel upon the bill of rights itself. The laws punishing criminal libel have never been deemed an infringement of this constitutional guaranty. Equally numerous and strong are the decisions that obscene publications are without the protection of this provision of our constitution.

Another concise statement of the law on the subject may be found in In re Banks (56 Kans., 242), as follows:

It is contended that said chapter 161 is void, because in contravention of section 11 of the bill of rights, which reads:

"The liberty of the press shall be inviolate; and all persons may freely speak, write, or publish their sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of such right; and in all civil or criminal actions for libel the truth may be given in evidence to the jury, and if it shall appear that the alleged libelous matter was published for justifiable ends the accused party shall be acquitted."

The act under consideration was not passed to prevent the publication of libels nor to suppress papers indulging in such publications, but to prevent the publication and sale of newspapers especially devoted to the publication of scandals and accounts of lecherous and immoral conduct. Without doubt, a newspaper the most prominent feature of which is items detailing the immoral conduct of individuals, spreading out to public view an unsavory mass of corruption and moral degradation, is calculated to taint the social atmosphere, and by describing in detail the means resorted to by immoral persons to gratify their propensities tends especially to corrupt the morals of the young, and lead them into vicious paths and immoral acts. We entertain no doubt that the legislature has power to suppress this class of publications without in any manner violating the constitutional liberties of the press.

What is meant by "liberty of the press" and the extent to which the lawmaking power may go in preventing objectionable matter from being published are very well stated in the opinion of the court in State v. McKee (73 Conn., 18), in the following language:

The primary meaning of "liberty of the press," as understood at the time our early constitutions were framed, was freedom from any censorship of the press; from "all such previous restraints upon publications as had been practiced by other Governments and in early times here to stifle the efforts of patriots toward enlightening their fellow subjects upon their rights and the duties of rulers." (Commonwealth v. Blanding, 3 Pick., 304, 313.) But this fundamental guaranty goes further; it recognizes the free expression of opinion on matters of church or state as essential to the successful operation of free government, and it also recognizes the free expression of opinion on any subject as essential to a condition of civil liberty. The right to discuss public matters stands in part on the necessity of that right to the operation of a government by the people; but, with this exception, the right of every citizen to freely express his sentiments on all subjects stands on the broad principle which supports the equal right of all to exercise gifts of property and faculty in any pursuit in life—in other words, upon the essential principles of civil liberty as recognized by our Constitution. Every citizen has an equal right to use his mental endowments as well as his property in any harmless occupation or manner, but he has no right to use them so as to injure his fellow citizens or to endanger the vital interests of society. Immunity in the mischievous use is as inconsistent with civil liberty as prohibition of the harmless use. Both arise from the equal right of all to protection of law in the enjoyment of individual freedom of action, which is the ultimate fundamental principle. This truth is plainly expressed in the language of section 3 and of section 5. The liberty protected is not the right to perpetrate acts of licentiousness or any act inconsistent with the peace or safety of the State. Freedom of speech and press does not include the abuse of the power of tongue or pen any more than freedom of other action includes an injurious use of one's occupation, business, or property.

* * * * * * *

The notion that the broad guaranty of the common right to free speech and free thought contained in our Constitution is intended to erect a bulwark or supply a place of refuge in behalf of the violators of laws enacted for the protection of society from the contagion of moral diseases belittles the conception of the constitutional safeguards and implies ignorance of the essentials of civil liberty.

Mr. President, no discussion of this question would be complete without some reference to the kodak and the cartoon. They have become a part—and a very important part—of the facilities of the modern newspaper in its effort to instruct, inform, and please the reading public.

They have their valuable uses and are not to be condemned or despised except for their excesses and abuses. The kodak often furnishes in picture form a much clearer understanding of conditions than can be done by written description. The cartoon has been a powerful instrument in exposing wrongdoing by bringing the wrongdoer to the attention of the public and holding him there. Besides, both of these newspaper adjuncts furnish harmless entertainment and pleasure to many newspaper readers.

But, Mr. President, no part of the work of a newspaper can be or has been more grossly unfair, obtrusive, and objectionable in many ways than the operation of the kodak and cartoon. The newspaper reporter forces himself into the privacy of the home and the affairs of men and mercilessly exposes them to the world without reason, in violation of the right of privacy on the part of the citizen and often in opposition to the plainest rules of decency and common respect for the feelings of others. The kodak man follows in the wake of the reporter and, in open violation of the same rules, snaps the pictures of the persons, homes, and places of business of all persons connected with the particular matter that is to be worked up into a sensational story for public reading. Then comes the cartoonist with distorted pictures intended to ridicule, humiliate, and disgrace the individual that the newspaper has undertaken to dissect. It is a combination that has more of inhuman brutality about it than almost any other power of the present day. It has brought discord, unhappiness, and ruin to many households, driven thousands of innocent people to despair, sometimes to death by their own hands, led many to crime, others to disgrace and sorrow, degraded the minds of the millions of newspaper readers, lowered the standard of citizenship, convicted hundreds of innocent men and women of crimes of which they were not guilty, and stultified and disgraced the newspapers that have indulged in such practices.

But, Mr. President, this is not to say that the newspaper or the kodak or the cartoon should be suppressed. I have only been pointing out their abuses, all of which should be corrected to make them useful and valuable instruments in the hands of men for the education, instruction, and edification of their fellow men. It is the wrongful use of all of these that I complain of. The caricatures of men in public and private life for malicious, selfish, or other ulterior purposes so frequently resorted to by the newspapers through the cartoonists are inexcusable and a disgrace to the papers and their publishers. It is beneath the dignity and in violation of the obligations of the true journalist. The unblushing effrontery of some of the kodak men in intruding themselves into the privacy of others and in displaying to the world the most sacred things is sometimes shocking, even revolting, in the extreme.

Within a very short time, I, in company with other Members of this body, was in attendance at the funeral of a distinguished officer of the Government, and a man who was held in the highest esteem by all who knew him and in peculiarly sincere and warm affection by his relatives and friends. It was an occasion of great solemnity and an exhibition of unusual respect and affection for the distinguished dead. It was marred by the persistent and unseemly efforts of a number of kodak men to secure pictures of what was being done and of the people present. As the body was removed from the church, followed by the mourning family and others, these men were swarming like ghouls, snapping pictures here and there, some of them perched on the steps and other higher projections of the church, wherever they could gain a footing, plying their trade over the heads of the crowds of people who were there to do honor to the memory of their friend and fellow citizen. To me it was a shocking and humiliating spectacle that I shall not soon forget. This, Mr. President, is one of the striking cases of the abuse of this very proper means of supplying information to the public. Unfortunately, it is only one of many that have gone far to discredit this legitimate calling and give the men engaged in it the unenviable title of "kodak fiends."

The abuses on the part of the cartoonists are much the same. To my mind, one of their worst offenses is the treatment of the President of the United States. Whoever he may be, and whatever his personality, the office itself should be respected and protect its occupant from such caricatures of him as are altogether too common. I often wonder what other countries must think of a people who will allow their Chief Magistrate to be subjected to such treatment.

Mr. President, there is another agency for the distribution of news that should not be overlooked in the consideration of this question. The Associated Press sends out broadcast over the whole country such news as should never see the light of day. Indeed, it seems to select such items as are most sensational and least important or useful. If a Member of this body addresses the Senate and discusses serious and important questions that the country should know about, but in connection with it attacks or criticizes anyone else, or says anything that is regarded as sensational, it is the latter and not the former that is selected and telegraphed out. This gatherer and distributor of the news rarely misses anything of the sensational kind in its work. Its accounts of crimes, suicides, accidents, divorce proceedings, and other matters of no importance and which should never be published, crowd the telegraph wires to the exclusion of legitimate and useful news.

Doubtless the excuse for this is that it is that kind of news that its newspaper patrons want and therefore it must be furnished. In turn the newspaper publishers justify themselves by saying it is the kind of news that their readers want. Perhaps the newspaper side of it can be better stated by the New York World, one of the great metropolitan journals of the coun-

try. On the 27th day of December, 1912, that paper carried this editorial:

Our sober-minded contemporary, the Wall Street Journal, is distressed at the World's misguided methods of presenting to its readers the news of the day:

"It is apparent, even to a casual reader, that the aim of the World—and the case of other journals is not far removed—is to present the 'news' to its readers in a highly sensational aspect. Take, for example, and just as a chance selection, the headlines of December 13, flaring, wild, extravagant. We are told in large capital letters that the 'Police are scared by woman's exposé of graft on vice'; that 'Luring husband away, wife tries to kill woman'; that 'Stock Exchange winks at all manipulations'; that 'Daughter is in a plot, her father says,' and so on *ad nauseam*. All of which may be true, but where is the tremendous import of it all?'

The World brazenly admits the soft impeachment and rises to explain its misconduct. "The tremendous import of it all" is that the vast majority of perfectly wholesome and normally intelligent men and women are a great deal more interested in the flesh-and-blood doings, springing from flesh-and-blood motives of flesh-and-blood human beings than they are in theories of economics, problems of governments, perplexities of diplomacy, or complexities of banking and currency.

No sane man doubts that the latter class of questions is of infinitely greater importance than the former class of stories. And yet, the fact remains that out of one thousand people nine hundred and ninety-nine are infinitely more interested in the woman who tried to kill the other woman than they are in the rival merits of the Aldrich and Fowler currency measures. And as long as the vast majority of perfectly worthy people prefer to read about the dramatic, the mysterious, the romantic, the comic, the tragic in human affairs, rather than the important, the World is not in the least ashamed of giving them what they want to read as fully and as prominently as it gives them what they ought to read. The World tries to balance the two types of news, avoiding an appeal to morbidness on the one hand and an appeal to intellectual priggishness on the other. We regret that our poor effort in this direction is unsatisfactory to our fastidious contemporary. All we can say is that we are doing our modest best, according to our humble lights.

Mr. President, either this is a serious libel on the vast majority of "perfectly wholesome and normally intelligent men and women" of America or we need to elevate the standard of "normal intelligence." I prefer to believe that the World is mistaken in its estimate of its own readers. I am afraid that great journal is mistakenly catering to and increasing the numbers of its unintelligent and abnormal readers. That this is just what many newspapers are doing is made clear by the following extract from an article by Edward Alsworth Ross in volume 105 of the Atlantic Monthly, entitled "The suppression of important news":

Most of the criticism launched at our daily newspapers hits the wrong party. Granted they sensationalize vice and crime, "play up" trivialities, exploit the private affairs of prominent people, embroider facts, and offend good taste with screech, blare, and color. But all this may be only the means of meeting the demand, of "giving the public what it wants." The newspaper can not be expected to remain dignified and serious now that it caters to the common millions instead of, as formerly, to the professional and business classes. To interest errand boy and factory girl and raw immigrant it had to become spicy, amusing, emotional, and chromatic. For these blame, then, the American people.

So, according to this learned gentleman, this kind of news is published for the edification of the "errand boy, factory girl, and raw immigrant." This certainly makes one feel more comfortable. It is not the intelligent reader, seeking information, that wants such news, but the ignorant and more often disreputable and criminal class that want to be fed on the details of crime, immorality, accidents, and sensational news of all kinds. If so, it is certainly not creditable to American journalism.

There is still another excuse offered for the publication of the details of crimes. It is maintained that it is a means of detecting and preventing crime. I do not believe either of these claims. I have no doubt that more innocent men have been convicted of crime by this sort of journalism than the number of guilty ones who have been convicted of their crimes by such methods. It has more frequently than not been an embarrassment to officers whose duty it is to detect criminals and bring them to justice. It often conflicts with the courts in their efforts to enforce the law, and in every respect is a hindrance rather than a help to the authorities in the attempt to bring the perpetrators of crime to justice. In an article in the seventeenth volume of the Green Bag, by Clarence Bishop Smith, entitled "Newspapers and the jury," the writer has this to say on the subject:

It needs no argument to prove that the newspaper is an unqualified evil, in so far as it affects the trial of crime. Since the abolition of public executions it has been the policy of the law to hide all sensational details connected with the punishment of criminals. The object of most newspapers is just the reverse of this. By picturesque methods they seek to make their readers see every incident from the conception of the crime in the brain of the man on trial down to the jury's verdict and the crime's punishment, if there be punishment. Consequently the newspapers must always come in conflict with the courts. They are, however, here to stay and we must meet the situation. We can not curb the freedom of the press or prevent the public from reading accounts of crime which ought not to be published, but we should recognize these various dangers arising from changing social conditions and study to minimize them. While the influence of the newspaper is subtle, it is very strong and may easily impair our trial system almost without our knowing it. For this reason the subject deserves the consideration of the bench and bar.

But, Mr. President, besides the fact that this excuse is not well founded it is not sincere, if we judge by the course of the newspapers themselves. They do not publish such news only where the criminal is unknown or undetected; they publish it indiscriminately, whether the perpetrator of the crime is known or unknown. We have had conspicuous proof of this very recently. On last Christmas eve, here in Washington, the Capital of this Nation, a good woman was brutally outraged. Her assailant was detected and arrested on the spot. There was no call for the publication of the details of this revolting crime. There was every reason why they should have been suppressed. No one could be benefited by their publication. They were calculated to arouse the most dangerous of passions in the minds of the ignorant and criminal classes. No respectable person would desire to read them. A just consideration for the feelings of the poor woman who had been so humiliated by being made the victim of such a crime should have stayed the pen of the man who wrote the story. But assuming, I suppose, that it was the kind of news that their readers wanted, the papers published the sickening details of it, filling columns of space. The relations and antecedents of the parties were ferreted out and made public; the description of the crime in all its details was published and the nauseous details of the condition of the clothing of the participants, the bloodstains and the like, were wound into the threads of this disgusting and sensational story. Was there any excuse for it? None whatever. The very publication of it disproved the sincerity of the claims made in justification of such journalism. If it be true that a majority of the readers of the papers that published this so-called news wanted that kind of news, it should be the highest aim and purpose of the right kind of newspapers to withhold it from its morbid and unwholesome readers, not only in their interest and in the interest of its more wholesome-minded readers, who do not want it, but in justice to itself.

Mr. President, there is another and more pleasing side to this important question. I have pointed out as best I could the evils of bad and unwholesome journalism. Surely they are serious enough to challenge the attention of all normal and wholesome-minded people. But the newspaper will continue to exist. Rightly conducted it is a great educator. Its facilities for spreading and disseminating news good or bad and sentiments pure and impure exceed all other means of reaching the public. A well-conducted newspaper, containing useful and educational news truthfully told, is a powerful instrument for the spread of information and the education of the public mind. Such newspapers, once the reliability of their news and the purity of their character are established, are most powerful influences for good in any community. Individual character and public sentiment are elevated and purified by such journalism. Disbelief in and suspicion of present-day journalism have become proverbial.

If newspapers tell the truth, it is not believed, because of the almost if not quite universal distrust of them, born of their general unreliability. The journalists who have brought the newspaper to this discreditable pass have much to answer for. What a splendid work they might have done for humanity by making the newspaper a truthful index of current events and useful knowledge, the vehicle for pure and lofty sentiments, and the prosecutor of evil and the defender of good. There are newspapers that are earnestly striving to reach such a standard of true and useful journalism. They are doing a wonderful work. They are, to some extent, leavening the lump of coarse and unreliable journalism and helping to educate the public mind to a just appreciation of a real newspaper. The opportunity of such a newspaper as an educator of the public mind is boundless, but it is an opportunity that has been sadly neglected in the effort to make money and the seeming desire to pander to the lowest and most vicious instincts of humanity.

Mr. President, the bill I have introduced will probably never become a law. The cry will be raised that it is an effort to muzzle the press and censor the news, and this is usually all powerful when it is raised for the protection of the newspapers, although other purveyors of information, through the moving pictures and otherwise, appeal to it in vain. This is a discrimination in favor of the newspaper that finds no justification in law or justice. It has been my main purpose to call the attention of the country to one of the greatest, most powerful, and most corrupting evils and influences of the present age. It is an evil which I admit can not be overcome by law. It must be met by a better and purer public sentiment that will demand cleaner and more reliable journalism. This better and more exalted sentiment may and probably will find expression in legislative enactments in the several States from time to time as the sentiment grows, as it surely must if our civilization, moral purity, and civic righteousness are to be maintained. Federal

legislation on the subject must of necessity be limited in its scope and effect. It would mean more as an example and as a national expression of condemnation of corrupt and unreliable and approval of clean journalism and a powerful stimulant of a better and more exalted public sentiment on the subject than as a practicable, enforceable penal or restrictive law. Let us hope, Mr. President, that public sentiment will soon so improve that restrictive laws will not be needed.

Mr. President, I have endeavored to present this important question with entire frankness and with malice toward none and charity for all newspapers. If it be true that the intelligent people demand impure and deleterious news, as some of the newspapers declare, conditions will inevitably grow worse and worse unless their mental food is changed. A depraved appetite grows on what it feeds upon. Such news increases the morbid desire for the sensational, the impure, and the horrible. Intelligent men and women cleanse their bodies, but fill their minds with impurities far more dangerous and degrading than an unwashed body. A pure mind makes a wholesome and healthy body. Purity of thought and conscience on the part of the people as a whole will make this country great and prosperous in the truest sense. The man who helps to make the public mind impure, whether he be a journalist or not, is a dangerous man and an enemy to the best interests of his country.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 20 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 21, 1913, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 17, 1913.

DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS.

William J. Harris, of Georgia, to be Director of the Census in the Department of Commerce, vice E. Dana Durand.

GENERAL APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Jerry B. Sullivan, of Iowa, to be general appraiser of merchandise, to fill an existing vacancy.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

William W. Roper, of Pennsylvania, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, in place of Fred P. Vincent, resigned.

AUDITOR FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

Robert W. Woolley, of Virginia, to be Auditor for the Interior Department, in place of Howard C. Shober, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Herbert H. Manson, of Wisconsin, to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Wisconsin, in place of Frank L. Gilbert, superseded.

FISCAL AGENTS OF THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

The Right Hon. Sir Edgar Speyer, Bart., P. C., and the Messrs. Henry Oppenheimer, Henry William Brown, Henry Gordon Leith, James Speyer, and Eduard Beit von Speyer, trading under the name, style, and firm of Speyer Bros., at London, England, to be special fiscal agents of the Navy Department at that place.

JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT.

Robert W. Jennings, of Alaska, to be judge of the district court of the District of Alaska, to be assigned to Division No. 1, vice Thomas R. Lyons, whose term will expire at the close of May 3, 1913.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Clarence L. Reames, of Oregon, to be United States attorney for the district of Oregon, vice John McCourt, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Benjamin F. Sherrell, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas, vice Phil E. Baer, recess appointee, resigned.

RECORDER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE.

Lucius Q. C. Lamar, of Mississippi, to be recorder of the General Land Office, vice Henry W. Sanford, to be transferred.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Frank O. Williams, of Kalispell, Mont., to be register of the land office at Kalispell, vice Andrew W. Swaney, term expired.

Francisco Delgado, of Santa Fe, N. Mex., to be register of the land office at Santa Fe, vice Manuel R. Otero, resigned.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Luke Voorhees, of Cheyenne, Wyo., to be receiver of public moneys at Cheyenne, vice William C. Deming, resigned.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR.

Henry S. Breckenridge, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary of War, vice Robert Shaw Oliver, resigned.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Samuel Houston Thompson, jr., of Colorado, to be Assistant Attorney General, vice John Q. Thompson, deceased.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

Second Lieut. Henry H. Arnold, Twenty-ninth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from April 10, 1913, vice First Lieut. Leighton Powell, Thirteenth Infantry, retired from active service April 9, 1913.

MEDICAL CORPS.

Lieut. Col. Charles M. Gandy, Medical Corps, to be colonel from April 16, 1913, vice Col. Louis A. LaGarde, retired from active service April 15, 1913.

Maj. Frederick P. Reynolds, Medical Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from April 16, 1913, vice Lieut. Col. Charles M. Gandy, promoted.

Capt. James M. Phalen, Medical Corps, to be major from April 16, 1913, vice Maj. Frederick P. Reynolds, promoted.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Probational Second Lieut. Wistar Morris Chubb, Corps of Engineers, to be second lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers with rank from April 23, 1912, the date of his original appointment. (The incumbent's probational appointment will expire with April 22, 1913.)

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 17, 1913.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICER.

Col. Hugh L. Scott to be brigadier general.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS.

Cavalry Arm.

Harold Melville Clark.
Clarence Ferdinand Ellefson.
Harold Thompson.
Richard Bronaugh Barnitz.
Raymond Morris.

Field Artillery Arm.

Howard Eager.

Infantry Arm.

John Charles Palmer Bartholf.
James Perry Cole.
Robert Harwood Barrett.
Ernest Joseph Carr.
Patrick James Hurley.
Colin Kingsley Lee.
Donald Robert McMillen.
Hugh Broadus Keen.
Ora Mathias Baldinger.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

SIGNAL CORPS.

Maj. George O. Squier to be lieutenant colonel.
Capt. Walter L. Clarke to be major.

CAVALRY ARM.

Capt. Lawrence J. Fleming to be major.
First Lieut. William E. W. McKinlay to be captain.
First Lieut. Gordon Johnston to be captain.
Second Lieut. Verne R. Bell to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Henry W. Baird to be first lieutenant.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Lucien G. Berry to be colonel.
Maj. William Lassiter to be lieutenant colonel.
Capt. Manus McCloskey to be major.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Capt. Albert G. Jenkins to be major.

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. John S. Parke to be colonel.
Capt. Lewis S. Sorley to be major.
Capt. William M. Morrow to be major.
First Lieut. Ward Dabney to be captain.
First Lieut. Paul M. Goodrich to be captain.
First Lieut. Frank H. Kalde to be captain.
First Lieut. William W. Taylor, jr., to be captain.
Second Lieut. Charles L. Wyman to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Edward H. Teall to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. John W. Lang to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. George T. Everett to be first lieutenant.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *April 17, 1913.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Throw Thy loving arms, O God our Father, round about us, that we may be strong and pure, noble and brave, that the things which make for the universal and eternal values of life, fatherhood, brotherhood, may weave themselves into the tissues of the soul so that when the storms of adversity beat upon us, disappointments come thick and fast, sorrows encompass like clouds, and grief pours itself out like rain upon our face, we may be strong in Thee after the similitude of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 14, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER. There are certain Members present who desire to be sworn in. They will present themselves, and the oath of office will be administered to them.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia, Mr. GUERNSEY, Mr. HAUGEN, and Mr. BARNHART appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Mr. Burleson to the Cabinet created a vacancy in the tenth district of Texas, which has just been filled by the election of J. P. BUCHANAN. His certificate of election has not yet arrived, but there is no contest, and I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to take the oath of office.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, my recollection is that under the law of Texas there has to be 30 or 40 days after the election before the result is canvassed; but in this case there is no question, there having been only one candidate.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. There were two candidates, but there is no question about the election, as Mr. BUCHANAN had a majority of over 3,000. He has a letter from his opposing candidate making no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Member will be sworn in.

Mr. BUCHANAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States, was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

THE SPEAKER'S LOBBY.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement to the House which he has been requested to make. Members now have no desks, and once in a while they want to write a letter. The Doorkeeper has provided tables in the Speaker's lobby, with pens, paper, ink, and so forth, and he requests that Members deposit their hats and coats in the cloakroom instead of in the lobby, so that Members can there avail themselves of the facilities for writing letters.

THE COMMITTEE ON RULES.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is it a privileged resolution?

Mr. HENRY. It is not.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 48.

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. STEDMAN, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for 10 days, on account of illness in his family.

THE WATERS OF THE NIAGARA RIVER.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 2498 was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The bill was drawn for the purpose of carrying out the law contemplated in the treaty between Canada and the United States for the fixing of the international boundary line. Several bills have been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I think this ought to be so referred.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ADAMSON and Mr. MANN reserved the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2498) for the control and regulation of the waters of the Niagara River above the Falls of Niagara, and for other purposes.

Mr. ADAMSON. What is the request?

The SPEAKER. To change the reference to the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the gentleman's committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the gentleman was chairman, and of which, I presume, he will again be the chairman. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana if this is substantially the same bill that was reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the last House?

Mr. CLINE. It is the same bill, and I reintroduced it. It was perfected after a year's hearing in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ADAMSON. As it appears that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been dealing with these bills heretofore, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. That is the committee to which it ought to go. There are some bills which may be referred to two or three committees; but inasmuch as the clerks had 3,000 bills to refer in one night, it is not strange that they may have got two or three erroneously referred. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

There was no objection.

MILEAGE OF MEMBERS, ETC.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would inquire of the gentleman if this bill has yet been introduced?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman mean through the basket?

Mr. MANN. I mean prior to to-day?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; it has not.

The SPEAKER. This bill carries a mileage of the Members. If any gentleman desires the rule enforced, the Chair is ready to enforce it now.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, while I recognize the situation, that the Committee on Appropriations has not yet been appointed and can not report a bill of this sort as a privileged matter, it does not seem to me that the House ought to commence passing appropriation bills, covering six pages, containing a good many items, until the bills have been printed, at least, so that Members may have an opportunity to see them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the bill is in print. It is available, and it is very simple. If read by the gentleman, he would understand it thoroughly. There is nothing new or startling in it.

Mr. MANN. About 20 minutes ago I obtained a copy of the bill through the courtesy of a member of the former Committee on Appropriations. I have not yet had an opportunity to scan it very carefully. There are several items in it that I think we ought to have an opportunity to see; and while I appreciate the desire of some gentlemen in reference to a particular item in the bill, yet I do not think it ought to come up in this way.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have less interest in it than any other Member in the House. I am simply endeavoring to accommodate the public business.

Mr. MANN. I understand very well that the gentleman from New York is not acting selfishly at all, but I think the bill would better be introduced, so that Members may have an opportunity to see and read it. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I will give notice at this time that I shall ask recognition on Monday next to pass the bill under suspension of the rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that he has in his possession—but has mislaid it momentarily—a letter from the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KINDEL], resigning from the Committee on Accounts. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted, and the Chair asks unanimous consent to place the letter in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The following is the communication referred to:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1913.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CLARK: I hereby present you my resignation as a member of the Committee on Accounts to which the Committee on Ways and Means has appointed me. I have notified Mr. UNDERWOOD, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and Mr. LLOYD, chairman of the Committee on Accounts, of my desire to be relieved from this duty. My reason for asking to be relieved is that I have been indorsed by the Members of the Colorado delegation for membership on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Very truly, yours, GEO. J. KINDEL.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House for the purpose of printing, not reading, the reports of the various officers of the House.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, are the documents to which the Speaker refers reports of the various officers of the House?

The SPEAKER. They are.

Mr. MURDOCK. I will ask the Speaker if he knows whether there are included in these documents the contribution and expenditure statements of the various candidates which are on file with the Clerk of the House? I refer to the election expense accounts.

The SPEAKER. They are not.

Mr. MURDOCK. Are they not a part of the records of the Clerk, and ought they not to be printed as a part of his report?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know. The truth about it is that neither the Clerk nor anyone else knows exactly what to do with these statements except to file them, under the law.

Mr. MURDOCK. I submit this to the Speaker, that inasmuch as the object of the law was publicity, would it not be a good plan for the Speaker to instruct the Clerk to publish those expense accounts as a part of his report?

The SPEAKER. The Speaker would have instructed the Clerk so to do if the Speaker thought he had any authority in the premises. The Clerk came to the Speaker last summer, when Members first began turning in these statements, and he wanted to know what to do with them. The Speaker told him, after reading the law, that he did not know what to do with them except to file them in the Clerk's office. If any gentleman desires them included in these reports or in the reports of the Clerk, he can make a motion and the Chair will entertain the motion.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then I move that the Clerk of the House be instructed to include in his printed report the statements relating to contributions and expenditures in campaigns by Members of Congress and national political committees on file in his office.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I raise the question of order on the gentleman's motion. It is not in order under the law nor under the rules of the House.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Speaker just invited me to make the motion.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am raising the point of order under the rules of the House. The gentleman would have to introduce a resolution and let it go to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have already introduced a resolution, and it has gone to the Committee on Accounts, and the Committee on Accounts has not reported. If I can get at it more rapidly in this way, I am very glad to do it. Does not the gentleman think they ought to be printed?

Mr. HARDWICK. If the gentleman would submit a request for unanimous consent, I would not object to it.

Mr. MURDOCK. But I made the motion.

Mr. HARDWICK. And I make the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from Kansas that he change his motion.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I suggest that we ought not in this way to determine a law that has been passed by Congress. There are certain duties laid upon the Clerk. If one of his duties is to give publicity in a certain form, he should comply with the law; and, if not, the remedy ought to be to change the law.

The SPEAKER. The law does not say a word about publishing these reports.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to say to the gentleman that the Clerk is an officer of the House, and the House has complete power over the Clerk and can order him to print these reports.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; but printing is only done in a certain way.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman confuses the position of the Clerk as an officer of the House, where it is proper to command him, and his position as a custodian under the law of certain documents. I have no objection to the end sought, but, unlike the gentleman from Kansas, I believe in doing things in order; and it does not occur to me that this is the way to reach that end.

Mr. MURDOCK. I made the motion at the Speaker's invitation, and the point of order has been made against the motion.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] rise?

Mr. LLOYD. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] has offered a resolution, which has been referred to the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. About what?

Mr. LLOYD. About this particular thing which he is discussing now, and his resolution is to provide that these accounts shall be published, or that a statement of them shall be published, as a public document. Now, we have given notice to him that he can appear before that committee and make a statement of the situation. The truth is that these statements are all filed. There is no man on the floor but that can go to the Clerk's office and get a statement of anything he wants to know.

Mr. MURDOCK. But, as the gentleman from Missouri knows, they are not public. Why not let the public get at the figures?

Mr. LLOYD. I beg the gentleman's pardon. So far as the office is concerned, they are published. Now, what he desires to do is to make it a public document. If he does so, it will make a voluminous publication, which will cost several thousand dollars to publish, and it ought not to be passed on now without consideration.

The reports of the treasurers of the several national committees are voluminous; the report of the Democratic treasurer will make a book of two or three hundred pages, the report of the Republican treasurer will make one pretty nearly as large, and the report of the Progressive treasurer will make one as large. The Chief Clerk says if it was required that all the reports be published it would make some 12 or 15 large volumes. Now, I think this matter ought to be investigated. We ought to know something about its expense, and we ought to know something about the necessity for it, without rushing into the consideration of this resolution.

Mr. MURDOCK. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are probably on file with the Clerk some 5,000 statements; some of them are quite lengthy and some of them but a single line or two. I deny that publication will take any such number of volumes as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] indicates. And I want to say this to the gentleman from Missouri: We passed, in recent Congresses, measures dealing with the publicity of campaign accounts. It was not intended merely that those campaign statements should be on file with the Clerk. It was intended that the public should see them.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, have they not seen them?

Mr. MURDOCK. If the gentleman will permit me to continue my remarks, one of the laws we passed provided that these documents should be destroyed after being held a certain time by the Clerk.

The thing we want to do is to get these statements published before they are destroyed. It is apparent from what the gentleman from Missouri says here this morning that it is impossible to get unanimous consent on this proposition. It is in the jurisdiction of the House to act on the matter now, and I am going to insist on the motion which the Speaker invited me to make.

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan rose.

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield first to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman made the statement that the expenses were intended for publication. As a matter of fact, has not every newspaper in the United States published them?

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly not. They published some of them piecemeal and in fragments, and not in their entirety. Let us see what the Congressmen and the candidates for President and their committees expended in the first national campaign where the law compelled them to make public statements.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield to me?

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON].

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I wanted to ask the gentleman if he has any information as to how many Members of the House have failed to file these statements as required by law?

Mr. MURDOCK. I have not. I do not think that is material to this proposition at all. I think the public is entitled to know who did not file and who did file, and the expenditures of the men who did file.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I am in favor of the publication. I am with the gentleman on that.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then I hope the gentleman will vote for my motion.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I thought the gentleman from Kansas might know.

Mr. BARNHART rose.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

Mr. BARNHART. Does the motion of the gentleman from Kansas merely contemplate the publication of those reports in the RECORD or in book form, to be distributed as a public document?

Mr. MURDOCK. I wanted it included in this report by the Clerk of the House.

The SPEAKER. The resolution of the gentleman from Kansas is one that has been referred to the Committee on Accounts, looking to the publication of these papers, or whatever it is—perhaps a memorandum—as a public document.

Mr. MURDOCK. My motion, however, Mr. Speaker, does not involve——

Mr. BARNHART. Just a minute. Then the resolution would properly come before the Committee on Printing and not before the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. It is difficult to tell where it would go.

Mr. MANN. The Committee on Printing has not yet been appointed, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the point of order pending, it seems to me clearly that the point of order is well taken. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] has introduced a resolution. It has been referred to the appropriate committee, and it is subject to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. While the Chair invited the gentleman from Kansas to make the motion——

Mr. FITZGERALD. That makes no difference, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows that. While the Chair says he invited the gentleman to make the motion, and is therefore really responsible for it, the Chair did not suppose anybody on earth would object to it—the Chair not being a mind reader. [Laughter.] The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, before the Chair decides the point of order I desire to be heard.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, has the Chair ruled me out of order after having invited me to make a motion?

The SPEAKER. Not yet. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Before the Speaker rules upon the point of order a gentleman on the floor makes a motion.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Has the Speaker ruled upon the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Speaker has not ruled.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman on the floor makes a motion, after having recognition from the Chair for that purpose. Now, motions are made in order of precedence. A gentleman on the floor secures recognition and offers a motion, which is not a motion of priority, and one can demand the regular order upon him and cut him out, because the regular order will bring before the House something which takes precedence over it. But what would a demand for the regular order bring before the House now? Nothing. There is nothing in order before the House, except a motion to adjourn.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; but the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MANN. That is always in order, notwithstanding a motion may be pending. Now, there is nothing on the calendar, and the Speaker having stated that it was a work of supererogation to call the calendar when nothing is pending thereon, the next thing in order is unfinished business. There is no unfinished business, and the next order of business is to resolve the House into Committee of the Whole House; but there is nothing to resolve upon in the Committee of the Whole House. There is nothing before the House which takes precedence of a motion made from the floor when recognition is given for that purpose.

Of course the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] can mend the matter, if he has the votes, by moving to adjourn, but I contend that, without the motion to adjourn, any motion offered on the floor to-day, with the House in the situation it is in, is in order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is mistaken in the proposition that was made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]. He did not demand the regular order. He made a point of order that the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] was not in order because it should be referred to the appropriate committee of the House. It was referred to the appropriate committee of the House, and whether there is actually an appropriate committee existing or not to consider the matter does not affect the case; and a resolution of this kind is clearly not in order to come up until it has been referred to the appropriate committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield to me first?

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman from Alabama yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] misunderstands my motion and confuses it with my resolution. My motion was that the Clerk of the House be instructed to include in his report, which is submitted to the House for printing, the statements on file in regard to campaign expenditures. My resolution looks to the publication of this statement in a public document. My motion is clearly different from my resolution. The gentleman is talking about my resolution, not about my motion.

Mr. MANN. If I understand the object of the gentleman from Kansas, it is to move now to insert in the report of the Clerk a statement of these expenditures.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is my motion.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Kansas know that the report that the Clerk is now making is for the fiscal year ending last year?

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, yes; and I will also say to the gentleman from Illinois that, as he knows, the report of the Clerk, which is to be filed and printed, also includes certain expenditures on the part of Members of Congress in detail.

Mr. MANN. What is it that makes the gentleman from Kansas think the Clerk makes a report now? The Clerk makes annual reports, but those reports are not made at this session of Congress, toward the close of the fiscal year, but at the regular session of Congress, at the end of the fiscal year. I do not think we want to wait until next December to obtain this routine information. As I understand, various gentlemen who are on the floor, or who are seeking by contests to obtain the floor, have not made reports as required by acts of Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is always seeking for a technicality.

Mr. MANN. For instance, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. McDonald, who is seeking a seat here, has not made such a report. I want to find out whether the law has been complied with now, and not in December.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then, why does not the gentleman from Illinois want publicity?

Mr. MANN. I always do.

Mr. MURDOCK. Why does he always come out, on a measure of this kind, and put in a technicality to defeat the purpose? Why does he not stand for publicity? What objection is there to the Clerk of the House publishing this statement?

Mr. MANN. On the other hand, I was endeavoring to put in a technicality to sustain the gentleman's motion, which he did not know enough about the rules to make.

Mr. MURDOCK. "The gentleman from Kansas" does not ask the help of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has the floor on the point of order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, so far as securing publicity in this manner is concerned, there is absolutely nothing in it. These reports are on file in the Clerk's office. They have been on file for months. There is not a local newspaper in the United States that has not investigated them and published them already. I have no objection to their republication if it can be done in an orderly way and at a reasonable cost, but I think it is improper for the gentleman to inject a motion here that may cost thousands of dollars, without the consideration of a committee. The gentleman himself has recognized that it should be considered in an orderly way by a committee, and has introduced a resolution and had it referred to the committee. I think he ought to pursue his proposition in the way in which he started to pursue it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. MURDOCK. In justice to me.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. On the first day of this session I attempted to get unanimous consent to have these statements published, and I was beaten by a motion to adjourn, being taken off my feet in that way, and the unanimous consent was refused. Then I took the regular course of introducing the resolution. Now, this morning the opportunity offers itself to get these statements published. I do not think the gentleman was quite within the facts when he said that these statements had been generally published. They have not been generally published. I have a statement in there—quite a long one—and I want to say to the gentleman that I do not think there is a soul on earth who has ever seen that statement since it was filed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Nobody was interested in it.

Mr. FOSTER. Why did not the gentleman publish it in his own paper?

Mr. MURDOCK. There was no particular demand that it be published at that time, but I will be glad to publish it. I am anxious to have all statements published. I do not believe in keeping these things back, and I do not think the gentleman from Alabama ought to interpose an objection at this point. These statements will be published eventually. Why not publish them now?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Kansas to the fact that I have been reliably informed by an officer of the House that if these statements are published in a book of the form of Webster's Unabridged Dictionary they will fill four volumes of that size.

Mr. MURDOCK. And they will not be bigger than——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman permit me to do my own talking?

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly I will, although the gentleman interrupts when I speak.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Or if they are printed in the form of an ordinary House document they will fill 30 volumes. Because no newspaper in this country thought it was of sufficient news value to publish the gentleman's statement as to his election expenses—and even his own newspaper did not think it was of sufficient importance to waste valuable space in publishing it—is no reason why this House, without any investigation or a report from a committee, should gratify the gentleman's desire to publish these statements. My statements were published in most of the metropolitan papers in New York and Boston, and in many magazines, showing that there was much keener interest in the manner in which my money was expended than the public had in the manner in which the gentleman from Kansas expended his.

Mr. MURDOCK. Upon which the gentleman congratulates me, of course.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And the gentleman from Kansas realizes as an experienced newspaper man that the press publishes those things in which it believes the public is most keenly interested. I do not know whether the gentleman is to be congratulated.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thought the gentleman wished to congratulate me.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My statement showed accurately the contributions that helped me in my campaign and the expenditures that were made.

Mr. MURDOCK. Did the gentleman have contributions?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did.

Mr. MURDOCK. I did not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And they were so modest, both in the amounts received and the amounts expended, that they attracted universal attention. Perhaps as much can not be said in behalf of the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MURDOCK. I will say to the gentleman that I had no contributions.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There were some people who, at least, thought my public services were of such value that they were willing to help me to be returned, even if nobody thought that of the gentleman from Kansas. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a ruling of the Chair on the point of order, so that the House may proceed.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Those of us who are not privileged to enter the Democratic caucus which is considering the tariff bill would like to know when the gentleman intends to report the tariff bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that we will report it at as early a date after the Democratic caucus has concluded its consideration of the bill as it is practicable to do so. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. And further, the deponent sayeth not.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to ask the gentleman seriously, What part of the Democratic caucus is secret? The claim has been made to me that there is a part of the Democratic caucus that is not secret. Can any Member of this House attend the Democratic caucus?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the gentleman from Kansas that so far as my observation goes and as far as the newspapers are concerned there has been no part of the Democratic caucus that has been secret up to this time. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to ask the gentleman if there is a roll call in the Democratic caucus?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to say to the gentleman from Kansas that I am proud of the Democratic rules so far as proposing an open caucus is concerned, because the Democratic caucus blazed the way to give publicity to caucus action. It is the only legislative body that I know of in the United States that did blaze the way, when my friend from Kansas was located in a secret caucus where nothing could come out, where not even a blast of dynamite could blow it out.

The Democratic Party established the rule in its caucus that every resolution should be entered in the journal and the journal should be kept open not only to members of the caucus but to the press and everybody else interested, so that they can inspect it and see what has been done. That journal is kept like the Journal of the House, on the same principle, with all matters of legislation embraced in it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will it be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No. If the gentleman will allow me——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, is this debate being carried on on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama, that when the House adjourns it adjourn to meet at a future day?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is being carried on by unanimous consent.

Mr. MANN. I did not know how long the unanimous consent might last.

Mr. MURDOCK. We are getting information, and therefore the gentleman from Illinois might object.

Mr. MANN. We can not on this side hear what the two gentlemen of the Democratic Party on the opposite side of the House are saying. The gentleman from Kansas is where he belongs, on the Democratic side of the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. With the leave of the gentleman from Illinois, does the gentleman from Kansas desire me to answer his question?

Mr. MURDOCK. I do.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If I may have order, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, every resolution which is offered in the Democratic caucus is entered in the journal, is open to inspection, and given to the newspapers if they desire to print it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. With the permission of the gentleman from Alabama I will say, as secretary of the Democratic caucus, that the minutes are examined almost every day by Members of the House and by newspaper reporters and others who desire to examine them. They are open to the public.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman put those in the RECORD, so that we may all see them?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will if I am authorized to do so.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas that our journal is open to him as well as his newspaper, and if he is interested in the matter we would be glad to see that he has an opportunity to scan the journal, but there is no use in taking up space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to print them for those who are not interested. If the gentleman is interested in

it he can do like other newspaper men do, inspect it, and then if he wants to print it in his home paper he has full opportunity to do so.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman from Alabama for his explanation, and think it has been quite full. The Democratic caucus does not admit reporters nor the public to the conferences, and therefore the journal is prepared in secret caucus and given only to inquirers.

Mr. FOSTER and Mr. SISSON called for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded, and the regular order is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is to vote on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman yielded for a question.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman can not yield for a question when the regular order is demanded.

Mr. MOORE. I merely wanted to know if the Republican——

[Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. It does not make any difference what the gentleman wants to know. The regular order is demanded, and the question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD (at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the order heretofore made, the House adjourned until Monday, April 21, 1913, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, asking authority to pay the rental for a refrigerator plant in one of the buildings of the Department of Commerce out of the appropriation for the contingent expenses of that department (H. Doc. No. 32), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. NEELEY: A bill (H. R. 2865) to amend section 2 of an act approved April 19, 1908, entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, and the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 2866) to provide for the condemnation, acquisition, and construction by the United States of America of telegraph lines, properties, and holdings in the several States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia and to provide for the operation of said telegraph lines and properties by the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2867) to provide for the condemnation, acquisition, and construction by the United States of America of telephone lines, properties, and holdings in the several States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia and to provide for the operation of said telephone lines and properties by the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 2868) providing for the retirement of petty officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy or Marine Corps and for the efficiency of the enlisted personnel; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 2869) relating to the naturalization of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2870) to regulate the coming into and the residence within the United States of Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Tartars, Malays, Afghans, East Indians, Lascars, Hindoos, and other persons of the Mongolian or Asiatic race, and persons of Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Tartar, Malayan, Afghan, East Indian, Hindoo, or other Mongolian extraction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 2871) to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by requiring the use of the block system by common carriers engaged in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 2872) to pension widow and minor children of any officer or enlisted man who served in the War with Spain or Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 2873) to prohibit interference with commerce among the States and Territories and with foreign nations and to remove obstruction thereto and to prohibit the transmission of certain messages by telegraph, telephone, cable, or other means of communication between the States and Territories and foreign nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2874) to cooperate with the States in encouraging instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries and home economics in secondary schools; in maintaining instruction in these vocational subjects in State normal schools; in maintaining extension departments in State colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2875) concerning the issuance of permits or special tax stamps for the sale of intoxicating liquors in communities where State or local laws forbid the sale thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 2876) to authorize the purchase or acquisition of an aviation field at Augusta, Ga., for aviation and other military purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2877) to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act to amend an act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission," approved June 29, 1906; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2878) providing for the erection of monuments over the graves of Maj. Gen. Elijah Clark and Col. John Dooly, in Lincoln County, Ga.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2879) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2880) to provide for the use of the block system for all trains engaged in interstate commerce, to provide for the examination and license of all telegraph operators engaged in handling block signals and telegraphic orders affecting the movement of trains on such railroads, and to provide for the hours of labor to be required of such telegraph operators and their compensation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2881) to limit the powers of certain courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2882) to prohibit any person from taking, receiving, or agreeing to receive, directly or indirectly giving or agreeing to give to any person any money or other valuable consideration directly or indirectly to procure aid in procuring or attempting to procure appointment to Federal office, and to provide a punishment therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 2883) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States"; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2884) increasing the cost of erecting a public building at Santa Barbara, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2885) to place certain ex-acting assistant surgeons of the United States Army on the retired list of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2886) to further regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2887) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved February 6, 1907; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2888) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States"; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2889) extending the limits of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2890) to amend the act to regulate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2891) to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station at Half Moon Bay, south of Point Montara and near Montara Reef, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2892) to provide for the erection of a lighthouse on Pilar Point at the entrance to Half Moon Bay, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 2893) to provide for the erection of a public building at Williamsburg, in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2894) to provide for the erection of a public building at Barbourville, in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2895) to regulate the hours of labor in continuous working plants of the United States; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 2896) to prevent ships in combines and conferences from passing through the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GORMAN: A bill (H. R. 2897) to erect a public building at Blue Island, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 2898) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish two condemned cannon to Wilson Colwell Post, No. 38, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Wisconsin, at La Crosse, Wis.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 2899) providing for the preservation of the old fort at Matanzas Inlet, Fla., and making appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2900) granting pensions to the soldiers of the different Seminole Indian wars and their widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2901) to remove criminal insane from the Government Hospital for the Insane in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2902) providing for the repair and preservation of the sea wall at St. Augustine, Fla., and making appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 2903) to further regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 2904) to provide for a public building at New Decatur, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 2905) to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station at West End, Lake Ponchartrain, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 2906) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend sections 2291 and 2297 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to homesteads"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2907) to define and punish lobbying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2908) to establish a primary election for the nomination by political parties of candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, to provide for primary and final election publicity pamphlets to be mailed to each registered voter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 2909) to extend the privileges of the seventh section of immediate-transportation act to Bay City, Mich.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 2910) establishing in the District of Columbia a neurological hospital for the care and treatment of the indigent insane of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 2911) to create a Territory of the District of Columbia by the name of the Territory of Columbia and to grant Territorial government of the same; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 2912) for the retirement of employees of the Government who served in the War with Mexico or the Civil War; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2913) for the erection of a statue in memory of the heroes of the *Titanic;* to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2914) permitting persons whose employment or business necessitates their absence from their respective States at presidential elections to vote for presidential electors in such other State as they may be on election day; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2915) for the creation of the firemen's relief and retirement fund, to provide for the relief and retirement of members of the fire department, to establish a method of procedure for such relief and retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2916) to license chauffeurs, conductors, and motormen in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2917) to prevent the use of mails for certain purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2918) to amend H. R. 1339, Sixty-second Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2919) for the establishment of a uniform system of weights and measures in the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2920) to promote the production of domestic industrial alcohol, increase the productive value of the land, and maintain its fertile qualities through the establishment of small and scattered distilleries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2921) to pension widow and minor children of any officer or enlisted man who served in the War with Spain or Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2922) to provide for the retirement of employees in the civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 2923) to amend section 2169 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2924) for the enlargement of the Federal building at San Jose, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 2925) reserving from the public lands in Idaho as a public park for the benefit of the people of the United States, and for the protection and preservation of the game, fish, timber, and all other natural objects therein, a tract of land herein described; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 2926) to provide for the payment of drainage assessments on Indian lands in Wagoner County, Okla.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2927) granting to all Indians or tribes the right to sue in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2928) to establish public highways or roads along all section lines in the Seneca, Wyandotte, Ottawa, Eastern Shawnee, Peoria, West Miami, and Quapaw Tribes of Indians in the Quapaw Agency, in eastern Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2929) providing for the removal of restrictions from certain lands in the Cherokee Nation, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2930) directing the Secretary of the Interior to deliver patents to Seminole allottees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2931) to provide for the expenditure of a portion of the reclamation fund in the States in which such fund originates; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2932) to authorize diverting and use of the waters of the Arkansas River, in the State of Oklahoma, and the construction, maintenance, and operation of machinery, works, appliances, and structures in connection therewith for the purpose of creating and developing water power; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 2933) to provide for a public building at Tuscumbia, in the county of Colbert and State of Alabama; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 2934) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 2935) to restrict the franking privilege; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 2936) to amend sections 2304 and 2305 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2937) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station within the second congressional district, State

of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2938) allowing a second homestead entry in certain cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2939) authorizing two persons to unite in making homestead entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2940) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Alva, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2941) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Anadarko, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 2942) authorizing 15 days' leave of absence with pay to per diem employees of the Lighthouse Service of the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 2943) to increase the limit of cost for the new public building site for the West Side, Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 2944) to provide a system of compensation for injuries resulting in disability or death to employees of common carriers subject to the regulative power of Congress, to civil employees of the United States Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 2945) granting a pension to widows of deceased soldiers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 2946) to pay rural mail carriers the sum of 10 cents per mile per day for each mile and fraction of a mile on routes of over 24 miles; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2947) to amend section 13 of the naturalization law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2948) providing that the United States shall in certain cases make compensation for the use of highways for carrying free rural-delivery mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2949) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Oak Bowery, Ala.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 2950) making an appropriation to reimburse the Cherokee and Creek Indians in Oklahoma, formerly Indian Territory, for money deducted from the royalties from leased lands of the Cherokees and Creeks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2951) to reimburse certain Eastern Cherokees who removed themselves to the Cherokee Nation under the terms of the eighth article of the treaty of December 29, 1835; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 2952) to grant additional grade to officers and veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 2953) to promote the safety of employees upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip all locomotives regularly engaged in switching service with footboards and headlights; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2954) to regulate the transportation of habit-forming drugs in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 2955) to provide a site and erect a public building at Chehalis, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2956) to provide a site and erect a public building at Hoquiam, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2957) to provide a site and erect a public building thereon at Centralia, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HENRY: A bill (H. R. 2958) to amend the antitrust laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 2959) fixing the price for use of telephones at private residences within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRYAN: A bill (H. R. 2960) to allow Saturday afternoon for rest to all Government employees; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 2961) to provide for the terms and places of holding district court of the United States in the eastern district of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 2962) to remedy in the line of the Army the inequalities in rank due to the past system of regimental promotion; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 2963) to relinquish, release, and quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to certain lands in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WHITACRE: A bill (H. R. 2964) to provide for the establishment of a tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 2965) to authorize James D. Markham and Chauncey A. Kelsey and others to construct a dam across the St. Croix River, between Minnesota and Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2966) to authorize the Secretary of War to make an agreement with the Municipal Electric Co., a corporation, for the disposal of the hydroelectric power developed by the dam between St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 2967) to provide for the disbursement of pension money of inmates of the Government Hospital for the Insane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 2968) to prohibit in the District of Columbia the intermarriage of whites with Ethiopians, Malays, or Mongolians; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BAKER: A bill (H. R. 2969) providing for an increase of salary of the United States attorney for the district of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 2970) prohibiting fraud upon the public by requiring manufacturers to certify to the materials of which a manufactured product is composed, and to place their name upon manufactured articles or containers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEELEY: A bill (H. R. 2971) to prevent the use of the mails and of the telegraph and telephone in furtherance of fraudulent and harmful transactions on stock exchanges; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 2972) forbidding the importation, exportation, or the carriage in interstate commerce of watchcases made, in whole or in part, of an inferior metal, having deposited or plated thereon, or brazed or otherwise affixed thereto platings, coverings, or sheets composed of gold or of an alloy thereof, bearing words or marks importing a guaranty of wear for a specified time, and of watchcases of less than 9 karat bearing the word "Gold," and of watch movements not properly marked in respect to the number of their jewels and their adjustment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 2973) making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TOWNER: Resolution (H. Res. 49) authorizing the Clerk of the House to pay to Henry N. Lewis, nephew and sole heir of Elijah Lewis, six months' salary and funeral expenses of said Elijah Lewis, late an employee of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MOON: Resolution (H. Res. 50) authorizing the appointment by the Speaker of an additional clerk; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HAYES: Resolution (H. Res. 51) to amend paragraph 4 of Rule XXVI; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Resolution (H. Res. 52) providing for the appointment of a commission of five qualified citizens to inaugurate improvements in the methods of transacting public business in the departments of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Resolution (H. Res. 53) directing the Clerk of the House to prepare and have published as a public document an alphabetical list of the expenses of all candidates for Congress in the congressional election of 1912; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HOLLAND: Resolution (H. Res. 54) authorizing the Doorkeeper of the House to appoint an attendant for the ladies' reception room; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CARTER: Resolution (H. Res. 55) authorizing appointment of janitors to committees; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CANTRILL: Resolution (H. Res. 56) authorizing the Clerk to appoint three laborers, three janitors, and a stenographer to the Journal Clerk; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. POU: Resolution (H. Res. 57) authorizing and empowering the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service to make certain investigations; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. NEELEY: Resolution (H. Res. 58) to print report of the Money Trust investigation; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 4) providing for the printing of 500,000 additional copies of Farmers' Bulletin No. 513; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HAYES: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 56) to provide for the transportation by sea of men, material, stores, and equipment for account of the United States, and of material, stores, and equipment for use in the construction or maintenance of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 57) proposing an amendment to the Constitution by providing that all of section 2 of the fourteenth amendment except its first sentence shall be repealed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 58) proposing to amend the Constitution by repealing the fifteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in lieu of paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, Article II, providing for presidential primaries in the several States on the same day and for more direct presidential elections; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 60) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in lieu of Article V thereof, providing for an easier method of amending the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 61) to direct and empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to revoke licenses under certain conditions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of Arizona, urging Congress to enact such legislation as may be necessary to vest in the United States the title and possession to the home and grave of Thomas Jefferson; to the Committee on the Library.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Hawaii, against the reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Utah, urging the establishment of a national university and a national department of education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: Memorial of the Legislature of Wisconsin, urging the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORDNEY: Memorial of the Legislature of Michigan, opposing the reduction of the tariff on sugar or wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: Memorial of Legislative Assembly of Utah, relative to aid from the Government of the United States for industrial education and the inauguration and establishment of a national university and department of education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of the Legislative Assembly of Utah, memorializing the Members of Congress to enact into law the pending Crago pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Utah, asking an appropriation of 1,000,000 acres of arid lands for the benefit of veterans who performed services in the Indian wars of the Territory of Utah and the widows of such veterans and for the improvement of the public roads of the State of Utah; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Utah: Memorial of the Legislature of Utah, favoring the establishment of a national university and department of education at Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Memorial of the Legislature of Washington, relating to the construction of State roads through national forest reserves at the expense of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KAHN: Memorial of the Legislature of California, requesting the United States Congress to authorize and direct the postal savings system to loan its funds to school districts; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Washington, favoring an intracoastal canal connecting the Straits of Juan de Fuca with Willapa Bay and the Columbia River; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Utah, asking that 1,000,000 acres of arid land be given to the veterans of the Indian wars of the Territory of Utah and to the improvement of the public roads of the State; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEVY: Memorial of the Legislature of New Mexico, urging the prohibition of further withdrawal of the lands of New Mexico for any purpose whatever, and requesting the restoration of all lands in the forest reservations of New Mexico that do not contain merchantable timber; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 2974) granting an increase of pension to David Neveau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2975) granting an increase of pension to James R. Oldfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2976) granting an increase of pension to William A. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2977) granting an increase of pension to Frank Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 2978) for the relief of the estate of Thomas F. Swafford, deceased, late of the State of Louisiana, for carrying United States mail on route No. 8263, in the State of Louisiana, during the period from January 1, 1861, to May 31, 1861; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARTON: A bill (H. R. 2979) granting a pension to Ada Hess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 2980) for the relief of the estate of James E. Morgan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2981) for the relief of the estate of William J. Sailing, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 2982) granting an increase of pension to Charles Sells; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2983) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 2984) granting a pension to Hans Hanson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2985) for the relief of Axel Jacobson; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 2986) granting a pension to James M. Ledbetter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2987) granting a pension to Mary Walls; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2988) granting a pension to D. A. Hollind; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2989) granting a pension to Lee Frazier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2990) granting a pension to Mary Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2991) granting a pension to Nancy L. Kirby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2992) granting a pension to Andrew J. Hullett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2993) granting a pension to P. J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2994) granting a pension to W. K. Simpson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2995) granting a pension to Daniel T. Youngblood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2996) granting a pension to Seborn Fassett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2997) granting a pension to Daniel B. Norwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2998) granting a pension to Lawson L. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2999) granting a pension to Posey Dobbs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3000) granting a pension to Robert A. Burns; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3001) granting a pension to John H. Pepper; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3002) granting a pension to Samuel D. Minor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3003) granting a pension to William F. Hass; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3004) granting a pension to Alexander Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3005) granting a pension to Henry C. Betz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3006) granting a pension to Jacob L. Kennamer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3007) granting an increase of pension to John M. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3008) granting an increase of pension to William Wells; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3009) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Reid; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3010) granting an increase of pension to Emma H. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3011) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Russell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3012) for the relief of Jesse J. Kennedy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3013) for the relief of Nathan Whitaker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3014) for the relief of the heirs of A. M. Harton; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 3015) for the relief of registers and receivers of the United States land offices of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 3016) for the relief of Morris S. Greenbaum and the firm of S. J. Greenbaum; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3017) for the relief of the estate of James Sayre, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3018) for the relief of the fiscal court of Bourbon County, Ky.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3019) for the relief of Lexington Lodge, No. 1, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Lexington, Ky., and the Grand Lodge Ancient Free and Accepted Masons of the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3020) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of George E. Johnson, administrator of the estate of Leo L. Johnson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 3021) for the relief of the Milwaukee Structural Steel Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 3022) for the relief of William Mickler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3023) for the relief of J. R. Sandlin; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3024) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James E. Dickerson and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 3025) granting a pension to George W. Sanders; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3026) granting a pension to George F. Sibert; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 3027) granting a pension to James A. Coyne; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 3028) granting a pension to John T. Rossee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 3029) granting a pension to Susan Querry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3030) granting a pension to Mary E. Barber; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3031) granting a pension to William Warner, alias Samuel Mee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3032) granting a pension to John W. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3033) granting an increase of pension to John F. Wortman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3034) granting an increase of pension to William R. Hendricks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3035) granting an increase of pension to Martin Stephens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3036) granting an increase of pension to Edward S. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3037) granting an increase of pension to Daniel C. Baswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3038) to correct the military record of Platoff P. Bush; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3039) to correct the military record of Jesse J. Clemmons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3040) for the removal of restrictions from all the lands of Sarah Hair; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3041) to carry into effect findings of the Court of Claims in the cases of Charles A. Davidson and Charles M. Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3042) for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under joint resolution of July 14, 1870, authorizing the Postmaster General to continue in use in the postal service Marcus P. Norton's combined postmarking and stamp-canceling hand-stamp patents or otherwise; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 3043) granting a pension to William W. Hartigan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3044) granting a pension to Luke Condron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GERRY: A bill (H. R. 3045) granting an increase of pension to James L. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3046) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Cutler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3047) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3048) granting an increase of pension to Hannah E. Crowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 3049) for the relief of the heirs of Sarah Winter; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3050) for the relief of the heirs of Peter Pope, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3051) for the relief of Joe Brown; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3052) for the relief of Rebecca Walthall, widow, and the heirs of John Walthall, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3053) for the relief of heirs of Nathaniel S. Word; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3054) to correct the military record of Jesse L. Meeks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3055) to correct the military record of Erastus Coyle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3056) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Joseph H. Bean, administrator of the estate of Joseph Bean, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 3057) granting an increase of pension to John W. Rudy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 3058) granting a pension to Robert L. Hester; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3059) granting a pension to J. L. Bailey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3060) granting a pension to William J. Whitfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3061) granting a pension to Milo Le Seur; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3062) granting an increase of pension to William Wells; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3063) granting an increase of pension to Charlie L. Pennington; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3064) for the relief of Eugene J. O'Connor and J. B. Schweers; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3065) for the relief of the heirs of John Larr, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3066) for the relief of heirs of Eli Frasuer; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3067) for the relief of the heirs of Larkin Nash, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3068) for the relief of the heirs of Russell W. Johnson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3069) for the relief of the estate of Willis Ramsey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3070) for the relief of estate of William Brantley Ryle, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3071) for the relief of Mrs. Mary W. Bailey, W. A. Jordan, Mrs. M. E. Turlington, and Ephram J. Jordan, heirs of Ephram J. Jordan, sr., deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 3072) for the relief of the claimants to the Coppinger grant, in the county of San Mateo, State of California, and all other persons claiming title to portions of said grant by mesne conveyances from Juan Coppinger; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 3073) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Winn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 3074) granting a pension to Michael Boyhan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 3075) granting an increase of pension to George Werley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3076) granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3077) granting an increase of pension to William M. Hickman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3078) granting an increase of pension to Simon E. Foust; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3079) granting an increase of pension to Robert McGhee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3080) for the relief of William S. Rote; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 3081) granting a pension to Herman Grasse; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3082) granting a pension to James H. Kampo; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3083) granting a pension to Adam Reuland; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3084) granting a pension to Carlota Huckins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3085) granting a pension to Virginia M. Gaspard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3086) granting a pension to Caroline Langenkamp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3087) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Mullins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3088) for the relief of Nels A. Nelson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3089) for the relief of John Dombroski; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3090) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Conrad Stark; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3091) to remove the charge of desertion standing against John G. Day; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 3092) granting a pension to James H. George; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3093) granting a pension to John Brecker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3094) granting a pension to Thomas F. Bomboy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3095) granting a pension claim to Robert M. McCormick; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3096) granting a pension to William H. Klinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3097) granting an increase of pension to Elias Fenstermaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3098) granting an increase of pension to George Showers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3099) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Zimmerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3100) granting a pension to Daniel S. Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 3101) granting a pension to Neda S. Thornton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3102) granting a pension to Patrick A. Galvin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3103) granting a pension to Cornelius Conly, alias Cornelius Conley or Cornelius Connelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 3104) granting an increase of pension to Henry Haddock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 3105) granting a pension to James H. German; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3106) granting a pension to Nathan W. Willcox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3107) granting a pension to Jefferson Pennington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3108) granting a pension to Marilla A. Castle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3109) granting a pension to Hester A. Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3110) granting a pension to James M. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3111) granting a pension to Frances C. Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3112) granting a pension to Angeline G. Kee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3113) granting a pension to Louis Seeberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3114) granting a pension to Thomas Corey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3115) granting a pension to Clementina Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3116) granting a pension to Francis M. Perfect; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3117) granting a pension to Andrew J. Legg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3118) granting a pension to Augusta Friedlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3119) granting a pension to Henry Lawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3120) granting a pension to Margaret D. Brewer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3121) granting a pension to John F. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3122) granting a pension to Bennett S. Musser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3123) granting a pension to William Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3124) granting a pension to Andrew Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3125) granting a pension to Ann Bontrayer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3126) granting a pension to Mary E. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3127) granting a pension to Maggie E. Middlecoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3128) granting a pension to Eliza Jane Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3129) granting a pension to Eden N. Dailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3130) granting a pension to Myrtle Webster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3131) granting a pension to Robert Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3132) granting a pension to Edward A. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3133) granting a pension to Louisa M. Fee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3134) granting a pension to Priscilla McCarty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3135) granting a pension to Mary D. Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3136) granting a pension to Maggie A. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3137) granting a pension to Peter F. Weasel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3138) granting a pension to Jesse D. McGee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3139) granting a pension to Addie McGinnis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3140) granting a pension to John Schneider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3141) granting a pension to Charles Glyckherr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3142) granting a pension to Martin L. Van Buren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 3143) granting an increase of pension to Jane K. Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 3144) granting an increase of pension to William Hix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3145) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3146) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Rader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3147) granting an increase of pension to James Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3148) granting an increase of pension to Pleasant H. Ripley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3149) granting an increase of pension to Preston Woodmansee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3150) granting an increase of pension to James A. McCann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3151) granting an increase of pension to Herman E. Hadley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3152) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Smyers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3153) granting an increase of pension to John Swem; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3154) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah R. Thornton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3155) granting an increase of pension to Buell G. Alford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3156) granting an increase of pension to James R. Hooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3157) granting an increase of pension to Joel Cokely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3158) granting an increase of pension to Pethra C. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3159) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Dugal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3160) granting an increase of pension to James K. P. Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3161) granting an increase of pension to William D. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3162) granting an increase of pension to Herman H. Bockhorst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3163) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Baysinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3164) granting an increase of pension to John P. McClarey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3165) granting an increase of pension to Elias E. Barker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3166) granting an increase of pension to Thurzy A. Leeds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3167) granting an increase of pension to Columbus H. Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3168) granting an increase of pension to Columbus W. Donnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3169) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3170) granting an increase of pension to Rufus Buxton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3171) granting an increase of pension to Willshier S. Hawley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3172) granting an increase of pension to James M. Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3173) granting an increase of pension to Noah Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3174) granting an increase of pension to Henry Cable; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3175) granting an increase of pension to Albert G. Romine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3176) granting an increase of pension to James M. Blakeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3177) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Mecham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3178) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Sherer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3179) granting an increase of pension to Charles Devance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3180) granting an increase of pension to Wyatt Botts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3181) granting an increase of pension to William H. Castleberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3182) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus P. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3183) granting an increase of pension to William A. Crum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3184) granting an increase of pension to James Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3185) granting an increase of pension to James Richey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3186) granting an increase of pension to James W. Lucas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3187) granting an increase of pension to John Fulgrout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3188) granting an increase of pension to James M. Odell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3189) granting an increase of pension to John W. Ragsdale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3190) granting an increase of pension to William Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3191) granting an increase of pension to Catherine F. Edsall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3192) granting an increase of pension to Elbert Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3193) granting an increase of pension to Louis Remiatte; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3194) granting an increase of pension to William Starry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3195) granting an increase of pension to George G. Fraim; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3196) granting an increase of pension to Mary D. Sheeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3197) granting an increase of pension to C. E. Kenney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3198) granting an increase of pension to William H. Terry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3199) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Van Wye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3200) granting an increase of pension to Sidney Shandy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3201) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Barker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3202) granting an increase of pension to Doctor C. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3203) granting an increase of pension to Hiram F. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3204) granting an increase of pension to John W. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3205) granting an increase of pension to William Waldo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3206) granting an increase of pension to John M. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3207) granting an increase of pension to Benet Messer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3208) granting an increase of pension to Richard Strother; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3209) granting an increase of pension to Orange Scott Cummins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3210) granting an increase of pension to James L. Saling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3211) for the relief of Howard V. Hinckley, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3212) for the relief of William Redder; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3213) to grant an honorable discharge to Richard Corner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3214) to remove the charge of desertion against Gilbert Acklen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3215) for the relief of Mrs. M. J. Shirley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3216) for the relief of Mary E. Phillips; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3217) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Munson, alias William Morgan, and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3218) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Asa Morgan, alias William H. Francis, and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3219) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles H. Mattoon, alias Charles H. Waters, and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3220) to remove the charge of desertion against William J. Morris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3221) to remove the charge of desertion against James M. Neal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3222) to remove the charge of desertion against Cyrus McCue; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3223) to remove the charge of desertion against Marion A. Salmons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3224) to remove the charge of desertion against Jacob Mull; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3225) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Richard Dove and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3226) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Alonzo Northrup and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3227) to remove the charge of desertion against Rowland H. Hilton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3228) for the relief of the widow and heirs of William K. Morrow, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3229) for the relief of William A. Lowe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3230) for the relief of Fanny Donnelly; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3231) for the relief of Benjamin F. Eads; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3232) for the relief of James A. Nickell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3233) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Ernst and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3234) to correct the military record of William H. McKown and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3235) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Staats; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3236) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3237) granting an increase of pension to Otillie Buzzard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 3238) granting a pension to Charles F. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3239) granting a pension to Lyman E. Tibbitts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3240) granting a pension to Elsie M. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3241) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Burson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3242) granting an increase of pension to Levi Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3243) granting an increase of pension to Henry Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3244) granting an increase of pension to Bailey Spivey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3245) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Botkin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3246) granting an increase of pension to Sue N. Inness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3247) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Barker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3248) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Marsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3249) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Reder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3250) granting an increase of pension to George O. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3251) granting an increase of pension to Robert Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3252) granting an increase of pension to Martin Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3253) granting an increase of pension to Jacob C. Rennaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3254) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Colyar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELEY: A bill (H. R. 3255) granting an increase of pension to B. F. Morland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3256) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Rankin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3257) granting a pension to Ella Betsey Perry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 3258) granting a pension to Charles A. Lyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3259) granting a pension to Robert F. Tietz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3260) granting an increase of pension to John McMahon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3261) for the relief of David Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3262) for the relief of the minor nephews of Owen F. Solomon, first lieutenant, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3263) for the relief of Jasper J. Henry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3264) for the relief of certain officers of the Second Regiment Louisiana Volunteer Cavalry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 3265) granting a pension to Catharine Slocum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 3266) for the relief of Maj. Horace P. Williams; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 3267) granting an increase of pension to David T. Manor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3268) authorizing the payment of a claim to Tolivar B. Clark; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3269) granting a pension to Charles M. Baughman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3270) for the relief of Oren H. Kunce; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 3271) granting a pension to Mary T. Parrish; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3272) granting a pension to J. L. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3273) granting a pension to Bettie Brock; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3274) granting a pension to Joseph Stewart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3275) granting a pension to Albert M. Geiger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3276) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Chick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3277) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Knott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 3278) for the relief of Thomas R. Mason; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3279) for the relief of the estate of George Patterson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 3280) granting an increase of pension to Christian C. Ellingson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3281) granting an increase of pension to James B. Whaley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3282) for the relief of A. R. Butler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 3283) granting an increase of pension to Kate Colver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 3284) granting a pension to August Jobst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3285) granting a pension to Marilla Lee Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3286) granting a pension to Mitilde K. Schiffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3287) granting a pension to Mary Dowling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3288) granting a pension to Regina Ebert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3289) granting a pension to Louis Rondeau; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3290) granting a pension to Walter H. Davies; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3291) granting a pension to Ole Hamrey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3292) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Hester; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3293) granting an increase of pension to James T. Moran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3294) for the relief of Lydia Mahoney; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3295) for the relief of John I. Conroy and others; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3296) for the relief of the McBride Electric Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3297) for the relief of William M. O'Keefe; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3298) for the relief of Herman W. Reichow; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3299) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Edwards Simonton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3300) for the relief of the Minnesota & Ontario Power Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3301) for the relief of R. B. Whitacre & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3302) for the relief of Lucius P. Ordway, trustee for the creditors of the Dwyer Plumbing & Heating Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3303) to correct the military record of Charles Kostohryz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3304) to correct the military record of Andrew J. Weidle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3305) directing the accounting officers of the Treasury to credit and settle an account of Maj. George H. Penrose; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 3306) granting an increase of pension to Charles Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 3307) granting a pension to Julia F. Roraback; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3308) granting a pension to Ralph E. Henderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 3309) for the relief of Ernest C. Stahl; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 3310) granting a pension to Minerva Ann Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3311) granting a pension to Martella M. George; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3312) granting a pension to Henry M. Forgay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3313) granting a pension to Eugene P. Twiford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3314) granting a pension to Aubrey P. Lawrence; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3315) granting a pension to James E. Hooks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3316) granting an increase of pension to Clyde C. Elkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3317) to correct the military record of James M. Wright; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WITHERSPOON: A bill (H. R. 3318) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Decatur, Miss.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3319) for the relief of the trustees of the Sageville Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Sageville, Lauderville County, Miss.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3320) for the relief of the trustees of Evergreen Lodge, No. 77, Free and Accepted Masons, of Decatur, Miss.; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL of California: Petition of E. E. Elliott and 938 other citizens of the following cities in the State of California: Anaheim, Alvarado, Artesia, Betteravia, Blanco, Buena Vista, Casmalia, Castroville, Chino, Compton, Concord, Garden Grove, Gilroy, Gonsales, Guadaloupe, Harris Station, Hollister, Hynes, Huntington Beach, King City, Salinas, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Santa Maria, San Juan, San Francisco, Sargent, Spreckels, Soledad, Lompoc, Los Angeles, Los Alamitos, Orley, Monterey, Meridian, Pasadena, Pleasanton, Puente, Moss Landing, Oxnard, Long Beach, Moss, Talbert, Watsonville, Whittier, and Spence, all protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BREMNER: Petition of the Forstmann & Huffmann Co., Passaic, N. J., protesting against placing raw wool on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of Rev. H. Ridgly Robinson, of Pitman, N. J., and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Glassboro, N. J., favoring the passage of legislation requiring the closing of the gates on Sundays during the entire Panama Exposition; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of sundry business men of Clear Lake, Bryant, Bushnell, Raymond, Elrod, Henry, Clarke, Doland, Hitchcock, Dempster, Huron, Arlington, Bancroft, White, Stockholm, Bonilla, Wolsey, Toronto, Tulare, Crandon, Frankfort, Redfield, Aurora, Volga, Bruce, Elkton, Estelline, Big Stone, Bookings, Ramona, Vienna, Hazel, Willow Lake, Castlewood, Brandt, Manchester, Oldham, Erwin, and Reville, favoring the passage of legislation compelling concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute their portion of the funds for the development of the local community, county, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURNETT: Petition of sundry business men of Cullman, Ala., favoring the passage of legislation to require concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute their portion of the funds in the development of the local community, county, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of the Nordbery Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; the Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, by D. W. Carmichael, chairman, and S. Glenn Andrus, secretary; the Sacramento Valley Development Association, by O. H. Miller, secretary; and of J. E. Ayer and 1,000 other citizens of the State of California, protesting against reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. T. Girmscheid, Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the elimination in the new tariff bill of the duty on importations of common clay pipes in cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Lancaster Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade, Lancaster, Pa., protesting against any change of the present tariff duty with reference to Philippine tobacco and cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Association of Woolen and Worsted Manufacturers, New York, N. Y., and the Carded Woolen Manufacturers' Association, protesting against the reduction of the tariff on wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Hanlon & Goodman Co., New York, N. Y., protesting against the reduction of tariff on brushes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Spice Trade Association, New York, N. Y., protesting against the placing of duty on whole spices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. H. Van Ingen & Co., New York, N. Y., relative to the framing of the administrative sections of the proposed new tariff law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Citrus Protective League of California, protesting against the placing of lemons on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pfister & Vogel Leather Co., Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the passage of legislation making a reduction of the duty on leather; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Washington Park Zoological Society, Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the passage of section 438 of the new tariff law, to prohibit the importation of feathers of wild birds for commercial use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Milwaukee Mirror and Art Glass Works, Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against any reduction in the present tariff on stained glass; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the E. C. Kropp Co., Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against any reduction of the tariff on view post cards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Prairie du Chien Woolen Mill Co., favoring the passage of a higher rate of duty than the proposed 30 to 35 per cent on manufactured woolens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York Life Insurance Co., New York, protesting against the passage of the income tax on life insurance policies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Atkin, Kroll & Co., protesting against the placing of a duty on vanilla beans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the Hanlon & Goodman Co., New York, protesting against the reduction of tariff on brushes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York Life Insurance Co., protesting against the enactment of the proposed income tax on life insurance policies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Eppinger & Russel Co. Creosoting Works, New York, protesting against the placing of a duty on creosote oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the C. H. Parsons Co., New York, protesting against the proposed tariff on burlap and jute bags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Wilson Bohannan (Inc.), New Orleans, La., protesting against any reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Carded Woolen Manufacturers' Association and the American Association of Woolen and Worsted Manufacturers, protesting against the placing of wool on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Federal Button Co., Newark, N. J., protesting against the proposed duty on vegetable ivory nuts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of sundry business men of Alpena, Letcher, Lane, Woonsocket, Wessington, Loomis, and Mitchell, all of South Dakota, favoring the passage of legislation compelling concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute their portion of a fund for the development of the local community, county, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of Charles S. Luce, favoring the passage of legislation providing for the retirement of old and infirm civil-service employees; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Hon. John F. Hurley and other citizens of Salem, Mass., favoring the passage of legislation to repeal the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from payment of tolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the New England Conference of Cigar Makers, protesting against any reduction of the duty on imported cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New England Conference of Cigar Makers, protesting against any increase of the internal-revenue tax on cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New England Conference of Cigar Makers, protesting against the passage of legislation levying a uniform duty of $1 a pound on all imported tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Jonathan Brown, jr., Salem, Mass., and Messrs. Hazen B. Goodrich & Co., Haverhill, Mass., protesting against the passage of any legislation making a reduction in the tariff on shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERRY: Petition of the Embreaso Club, Rush Light Club, Audubon Society of Rhode Island, Rhode Island Humane

Education Society, Rhode Island Field Naturalists' Club, Thimble Club, Bachelor Girls' Club, Mrs. E. D. F. T. Gladding, and Miss M. Elizabeth Baker, all of Providence, R. I., favoring the passage of legislation prohibiting the importation of wild-bird plumage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 3062) granting a pension to William Wells; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Petitions of F. J. McCoy and 48 other voters of Betteravia, D. A. Madeira and 104 other voters of Salinas, E. A. Richmond and 115 other voters of Alvarado, J. F. Conkey and 69 other voters of Santa Maria, P. E. Jack, jr., and 104 other voters of Spreckels, and A. X. Cox and 40 other voters of Watsonville, all in the State of California, protesting against the reduction in the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Fremont, Ohio, protesting against the passage of legislation for the reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of Potter County, Pa., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 237, to regulate the proper observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: Petition of the Commercial Club of Gering, Nebr., protesting against the passage of legislation reducing the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry residents of the towns of Ainsworth, Rushville, Valentine, Woodlake, Bassett, Long Pine, Chadron, Hay Springs, and Gordon, all in the sixth congressional district of Nebraska, favoring the passage of legislation compelling concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute their portion of the funds for the development of the local community, county, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Ministers' Association of Shenandoah, Pa., favoring the passage of legislation to regulate the hours of labor in continuous-working plants of the United States; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the change of tariff duty on boots and shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: Petition of 1,461 shoe workers and other citizens of Auburn, Me., protesting against the reduction of tariff on boots and shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of the Railway Business Association, favoring the passage of legislation for the adoption of a national budget as a means of regulating the expenditures and receipts of the National Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Lancaster Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade, Lancaster, Pa., protesting against the passage of legislation admitting Philippine tobacco free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, of Richmond, Va., favoring the passage of legislation making an immediate reform in the present banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the Hanlon & Goodman Co., New York, protesting against the reduction of the duty on brushes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Ogdensburg Business Men's Association, of Ogdensburg, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation making the duty on manufactured articles in proportion to that on raw material; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. C. Morse, of Cleveland, N. Y., protesting against the passage of legislation placing a tax on life insurance policies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Spice Trade Association, protesting against the passage of the proposed duties on spices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of the executive committee of the Massachusetts Woman's Christian Temperance Union, citizens of greater Boston and vicinity, and members of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls or the arbitration of the question at issue with the British Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POWERS (by request): Petition of certain citizens of Sanisville, Ky., favoring the passage of section 438 of the new tariff law, to prohibit the importation of feathers of wild birds for commercial use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of S. S. Scobey, Long Branch, N. J., favoring the passage of legislation to bring about a duty on palm-kernel oil and coconut oil wheresoever produced other than in the Philippine Islands, but allow all copra and palm-kernel nuts entry free; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Hallock-Denton Co., of Newark, N. J., protesting against the proposed 50 cents per pound duty on vanilla beans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey, protesting against the proposed 5 per cent duty on coal-tar creosote; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petition of 26 residents of Coldwater, Mich., protesting against the reduction of the tariff on shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of the Almes Harris Neville Co. and the W. A. Plummer Manufacturing Co., San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the passage of legislation placing the duty on jute bags and burlaps at 25 per cent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation freeing from tolls American ships engaged in the coastwise trade passing through the Panama Canal, and opposed to submitting the question to arbitration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the United Hatters of North America, Local No. 22, Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the passage of legislation reducing the tariff on hats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Robinson Hardware Co., Gilroy, Cal.; H. S. Manheim, Pope & Talbot, Carl Raiss & Co., F. S. Johnson Co., Langley & Michaels Co., Columbia Steel Co., all of San Francisco, Cal.; Akerman & Tuffley, North San Diego, Cal.; and H. Hackfelt & Co., Honolulu, Hawaii, protesting against the reduction of present tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Bemis Bros. Bag. Co., of San Francisco; Frank P. McFadden, of Blanco; Fred Koch and 10 other citizens of Artesia; William H. Sands, of Casmalia; John W. Colin, of Garden Grove; D. L. Allen and 1 other citizen of Los Angeles; M. D. Moore, of Buena Vista; Mrs. William J. Bradly and 7 other citizens of Betteravia; H. C. Lawrence, of Anaheim; J. G. Parsons, of Talbert; E. E. Norton and 3 other citizens of Long Beach; D. Burr, jr., and 2 other citizens of Sargent; E. V. Saunders & Sons, of Lompoc; Fred Reynolds and 15 other citizens of Spreckels; J. C. Talkenberg and 21 other citizens of King City; D. U. Copeland and 1 other citizen of Hynes; H. J. Sommer and 8 other citizens of Gonzales; Fred Johnson, of El Monte; H. H. Harris, jr., of Harris Station; T. S. Hawkins and 1 other citizen of Hollister; C. R. Graf and 1 other citizen of Puente; Dolores M. Allen and 5 other citizens of Monterey; John Scudder, jr., and 1 other citizen of Moss Landing; Con Donovan, of Nipomo; C. J. Hobson, of Orby; Felix Frizoyen and 7 other citizens of Spence; Charles K. Tuttle and 1 other citizen of Pacific Grove; D. J. Watson and 8 other citizens of Guadalupe; Frank Dowdy and 1 other citizen of San Juan; F. B. Travers and 1 other citizen of San Francisco; Sam T. Graham, of Pasadena; P. E. Vaughan, of Whittier; J. T. Stockton, of Santa Ana; Bernardo Viegas and 8 other citizens of Concord; John E. White and 16 other citizens of Gilroy; E. P. Albertson and 22 other citizens of Meridian; H. E. Pheysey and 74 other citizens of Chino; David Lewty and 55 other citizens of Santa Maria; Enos D. Prentice and 30 other citizens of Oxnard; H. B. Little and 20 other citizens of Huntington Beach; E. L. Benedict and 22 other citizens of Pleasanton; E. S. Harvey and 98 other citizens of Alvarado; J. C. Larson and 19 other citizens of Castroville; R. L. Angell and 39 other citizens of Compton; Neils E. Hansen and 64 other citizens of Salinas; W. J. McClary and 41 other citizens of Los Alamitos; W. L. Wiley and 39 other citizens of Soledad; and J. A. Norriss and 38 other citizens of Watsonville, all in the State of California, protesting against the proposed reduction of the present tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of the board of supervisors of the county of Fulton, N. Y., protesting against the passing of proposed legislation relative to the glove industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Paul Lennule, of Schenectady, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of the proposed income tax on life insurance policies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. B. Charles, of Amsterdam, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of the proposed income tax on insurance policies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *April 21, 1913.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

JOHN W. WEEKS, a Senator from the State of Massachusetts, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

CHEAT AND NEW RIVERS, VA. AND W. VA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 8th instant, photostat copies of all papers, correspondence, rulings, permits (without maps), etc., of the record in the War Department pertaining to the construction of dams or reservoirs by private parties in the Cheat and New Rivers, in Virginia and West Virginia, which, on motion of Mr. NELSON, was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PAGE. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of Vermont, favoring the so-called Francis amendment to section 4747 of the Revised Statutes relating to the attachment of pensions of United States soldiers and sailors under any legal or equitable process. I ask that the joint resolution be read and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Pensions, as follows:

Joint resolution relating to a request to the Vermont delegation in Congress.

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the Vermont delegation in Congress assembled be informed in the proper manner that it is the sense of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont that section 4747 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be amended as proposed by Representative FRANCIS, of Ohio.

FRANK E. HOWE,
President of the Senate.
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved February 13, 1913.

ALLEN M. FLETCHER, *Governor.*

STATE OF VERMONT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution relating to a request to the Vermont delegation in Congress," approved February 13, 1913, as appears by the files and records of this office.

Witness my signature and the seal of this office at Montpelier this 4th day of March, 1913.

[SEAL.]

GUY W. BAILEY,
Secretary of State.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Goffstown, N. H., and a petition of sundry citizens of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. PERKINS. I present a telegram, in the nature of a joint resolution, adopted by the Legislature of California, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CAL., *April 18, 1913.*

Hon. GEORGE C. PERKINS, *Washington, D. C.:*

Pursuant to the provisions of senate joint resolution No. 11, adopted by both houses of the California Legislature, I herewith transmit to you a copy thereof:

"Whereas a bill, House resolution No. 22871, known as the Lever bill, providing for farm demonstrator under the direction of the colleges of agriculture of the various States of the United States, has passed the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States and is now pending in the Senate: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the senate and assembly jointly*, That the legislature heartily approve all of the provisions in said bill and hereby respectfully requests our Senators in Congress to vote for and use every honorable means to secure the passage of said bill by the Senate of the United States as it passed the House of Representatives, without alternation or amendment as to benefits provided: Be it

"*Resolved further*, That copies of this resolution be sent by telegraph to each of the Senators from California in the Congress of the United States."

W. N. PARRIS,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. NELSON. I present a resolution of the Minnesota State Senate, relative to the duty on wheat and other farm products. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is reported in the public press that Congress proposes to enact certain tariff legislation by which the duty on wheat is to be reduced 10 cents per bushel and flour and other products of wheat are to be admitted free of duty, and that the duty on other farm products is to be materially reduced; and

Whereas the admission of flour and other products of wheat without any duty will, in effect, amount to removing the tariff on wheat, in so far as the price of wheat to the producer is concerned; and

Whereas it is not apparent that Congress contemplates any reduction in the tariff which will in any manner adequately compensate the farmers for the loss occasioned to them by reason of the admission of wheat and farm products with such materially reduced rates of duty: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota, That we hereby protest against any action of Congress reducing the tariff on wheat or other farm products.

STATE OF MINNESOTA, *Legislative Department, ss:*

I, George W. Peachey, secretary of the Senate of the State of Minnesota for the thirty-eighth session thereof, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the foregoing paper writing with the original resolution of the senate, introduced on the 8th day of April, 1913, by Senator George H. Sullivan, and that the same is a true and correct copy thereof.

GEO. W. PEACHEY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of the Joseph Ullmann Co., of New York, N. Y., remonstrating against placing a duty on raw furs, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WORKS presented a petition of members of the Homesteaders' Irrigation Co., of Rannells, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the conservation of the waters of the Colorado River, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GOFF presented a memorial of the National Window Glass Workers' Union of Salem, W. Va., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on window glass, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRONNA presented a resolution adopted by the Ministerial Association of Grand Forks, N. Dak., favoring the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the petition of John Orchard, of Dickinson, N. Dak., and a petition of the Grocery Co. of Minot, N. Dak., praying for a reduction of the duty on sugar, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of members of the Commercial Club of Minot, N. Dak., remonstrating against any reduction in the duty on wheat and barley, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STERLING. I present a letter signed by Charles A. Lum, secretary of the South Dakota Millers' Association, relative to the duty on wheat. I ask that the paper be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. D. & S. W. M. M. C.,
Aberdeen, S. Dak., April 14, 1913.

Hon. THOMAS STERLING,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The millers of South Dakota most respectfully and urgently call your attention to the new tariff law proposed to be enacted by the majority party in Congress as it will affect the milling industry of this State. As we understand the proposed bill, it provides for a tariff of 10 cents per bushel on wheat and 10 per cent ad valorem on flour coming from countries that tax American flour but free flour coming from countries that do not tax American flour. That means that England, which does not tax our flour, and Canada, which can easily remove its tax, the two greatest competitors in the manufacture of flour we have in the world, can import flour into this country free, while we have to pay 10 cents per bushel tariff on imported wheat.

We protest against this injustice most earnestly. It will practically result in driving the milling business out of the United States into Canada and England.

Note the effect of 10 cents per bushel tariff on wheat. At a dollar per bushel it means 10 per cent. But wheat is usually cheaper than $1, and on 90-cent wheat this would be a tax of 11.1 per cent, and on 80-cent wheat a tax of 12.5 per cent, and so on; the cheaper the wheat the heavier per cent of tax against it.

The ad valorem tariff of 10 per cent on flour acts in this same way. A specific tax of 50 cents per barrel on flour would be about the equivalent of 10 cents per bushel on wheat at a dollar a bushel.

On the other hand, the English mill, at present prices all around, can import wheat from Argentina, pay water transportation to Liverpool, grind it into flour, pay water transportation to New York, Boston, or any American seaport, and sell its flour in New York at $3.97½ per barrel, while it will cost the American mill to import wheat from Argentina, pay transportation and duty of 10 cents per bushel, $4.41 per barrel, the cost of the raw material in both instances.

The average profit of the American mill on flour is about 5 cents per barrel.

But this advantage to the Liverpool mill is 43½ cents per barrel. Many of our South Dakota mills ship flour to these eastern cities.

But the advantage to the Liverpool mill would be much greater than this because of the added profit to them of the by-products of flour in England. They get about $5 to $6 per ton more for their offal than the American mill gets at home. This reduces the cost of their flour 22½ cents to 28 cents per barrel.

Free Canadian flour and taxed Canadian wheat would operate the same way. The competition of these two countries would drive the milling business out of the United States entirely. Both in production of wheat and in milling capacity Canada is progressing by leaps and bounds. United States millers are already locating in Canada.

The millers of the United States want fair play. If wheat is to be taxed, its products and by-products should be taxed equally.

Therefore we ask for a duty of 10 cents per bushel on wheat and 10 per cent ad valorem on the products of wheat, to be made absolute, to apply on all importations.

We trust you will use your influence to secure justice to the milling industry of this country and of this State in the matter of this new tariff, as millions of dollars' worth of property, labor, and fertilizers are at stake in this matter.

Very respectfully, yours,

CHAS. A. LUM,
Secretary South Dakota Millers' Club.

Mr. JONES. I present a number of telegrams from labor organizations of my State relative to prompt action being taken looking to an investigation of working conditions in the coal mines in West Virginia. I move that the telegrams be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JONES presented a resolution adopted by the City Council of Spokane, Wash. favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the Government ownership of all telegraph and telephone lines, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a memorial of Local Union No. 33, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the free admission into the United States of cigars made in the Philippine Islands, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Prescott, Ariz., praying for a reduction of the annual assessment on mining claims, to be expended on the county roads leading to or through the mining districts in which the respective mining claims are located, which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. OLIVER. I present a memorial signed by over 200 employees of the Railway Steel Spring Co., of Latrobe, Pa., protesting against a reduction in the duty on wheels used for railway purposes and on railway tires. It is a very short memorial, and I ask that the memorial, but not the signatures, be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the request? That a memorial be printed in the RECORD?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request of the Senator from Pennsylvania is that the memorial be printed in the RECORD, without the names.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is there any special reason why it should be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. OLIVER. I think there is. It is a statement on the part of workingmen of the injury that will be done to them by the proposed reduction. If the Senator desires——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will not object.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, omitting the names, as follows:

LATROBE, PA., *April 18, 1913.*

Hon. GEORGE T. OLIVER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, residents of this State, hereby respectfully call your attention to the matter of the proposed reduction in the tariff on "Wheels for railway purposes and parts thereof, etc., and other railway tires or parts thereof, etc.," now pending before Congress.

The proposed reduction in the tariff on the above-mentioned products would seriously affect one of the most important industries as carried on by the Railway Steel Spring Co. in the town of Latrobe, and would positively result in the cessation of that company's activities at Latrobe. It is well known to you that the Railway Steel Spring Co. is one of the best wage-paying factories in Latrobe, and upon its operation a great many workmen and their families depend.

We therefore earnestly petition you to use all honorable means at your command to prevent the proposed reduction in the tariff on the above-mentioned products.

Mr. OLIVER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Beaver Falls, Pa., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on glass and glassware, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry business men of Pittsburgh, Pa., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on wheels for railway purposes, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of members of the Ministers' Association of Shenandoah, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the hours of labor in continuous working plants in the country, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. McLEAN presented a resolution adopted by the Board of Trade of Hartford, Conn., favoring the selection of that city as the headquarters for the customs district of Connecticut, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of William Hooper and 94 other citizens of Manchester; of Conover Fitch and 47 other citizens of Waltham; and of F. E. Lane and 147 other citizens of Milton, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the New England Hardware Dealers' Association, favoring the adoption of 1-cent postage on first-class mail matter, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Brule, Wis., praying for a reduction of the duty on sugar, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the closing of the gates of the Panama Exposition on Sundays, which were referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I present a certified copy of a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of South Dakota ratifying the proposed amendment to section 3, Article I, of the Constitution, relating to the manner of electing Senators of the United States. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of South Dakota, ss:*

I, Frank Glasner, secretary of state of the State of South Dakota, do hereby certify that the annexed bill, to wit, joint resolution No. 16, was duly passed by the 1913 session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota this 16th day of April, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

FRANK GLASNER,
Secretary of State,
By J. T. NELSON,
Assistant Secretary of State.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, ratifying and approving the proposed amendment to the first paragraph of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, and in lieu of so much of paragraph 2 of same section as relates to the filling of vacancies.

Whereas the Congress of the United States by a joint resolution, passed June 12, 1911, proposed as an amendment to the first paragraph of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, and in lieu of so much of paragraph 2 of same section as relates to the filling of vacancies, and submitted the same to the various States for ratification and approval, which said amendment is in words and figures as follows:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

"When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

"This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution:"

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring), That the foregoing joint resolution of the Congress of the United States, being the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, be, and the same is hereby, adopted, approved, and ratified by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, *Office of Secretary of State, ss:*

Filed February 27, 1913, at 10.10 o'clock a. m.

FRANK GLASNER,
Secretary of State,
By J. T. NELSON,
Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to state that the secretary of state of South Dakota sent a duplicate copy of the joint resolution to the Secretary of the Senate, which, I suspect, may have been intended for the Secretary of State. Out of an abundance of caution I ask for an order directing that the copy so received by him be forwarded to the Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SIZE AND COLOR OF CURRENCY.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that the reference of the bill (S. 1185) prohibiting changes in size and color of currency without the consent of Congress be changed from the Committee on Finance to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from Texas asks that the Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of the bill he has indicated and that the same be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the title of the bill be read.

Th VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 1185) prohibiting changes in size and color of currency without the consent of Congress.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Committee on Finance will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ESTATE OF WILLIAM E. PRESSEY.

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 56, submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of Maine on the 17th instant, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to the executor of the estate of William E. Pressey, late messenger at the card door of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back with an amendment in the nature of a substitute Senate resolution No. 40, submitted by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. JOHNSTON] on the 12th instant, and I submit a report (No. 10) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment was to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate, and that expenses contracted hereunder shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 54, submitted by the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] on the 17th instant, to report it favorably with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and I submit a report (No. 11) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment was to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on Territories, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized, during the Sixty-third Congress, to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back Senate resolution No. 47, submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] on the 15th instant, with an amendment striking out all after the resolving clause and inserting a substitute, and I submit a report (No. 9) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The Senate by unanimous consent proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment was to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on Public Lands, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized during the Sixty-third Congress to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a price not to exceed $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

WORK OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I had intended to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia whether it is the purpose to hold meetings of that committee at an early date, but I see that that Senator is not in his seat.

There have been hundreds of bills introduced in the present session that have been referred to committees. A number of those bills have gone to the Committee on the District of Columbia. The committees of the Senate were fully organized during the special session in March. I see no reason why these bills should not be taken up by the committees and acted upon. I have now some spare time that I would be glad to devote to the work of the committees of which I happen to be a member. Among other committees of which I am a member is the Committee on Public Lands. Numerous of these bills have been referred to that committee. Some of them came over from the last session of Congress, and they are important bills and should be acted upon.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that there is no reason why we should be wasting our time in adjournments for three days without any action on the part of the committees while we have the opportunity now to do work that we can not do at a later period in the session.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. WORKS. I yield.

Mr. BRISTOW. I have been impressed by the remark made by one or two other Senators that we are adjourning from day to day with nothing to do. I wish to suggest to the Senator from California that, so far as the senior Senator from Kansas is concerned, he never has been busier in his life. For one I have been trying to study the legislation which we have been called in special session to enact with a view of informing myself in detail to some extent upon that measure.

I wish to say if any Senator will investigate the tariff and the questions that are involved in it with a view of understanding the various features of the bill we are to consider he will find a great deal to do, without spending every day in committee on other bills.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I think I myself have not been idle in looking into the proposed tariff legislation. I know the disposition of the Senator from Kansas to spend practically all his time upon a bill of that kind. I have not quite that disposition. There is other legislation here that in my judgment is more important than the tariff, and there are a great many Senators who are not spending as much time upon the tariff bill as the Senator from Kansas who could be very well devoting their time to other legislation. I see no reason, notwithstanding what has been said by the Senator from Kansas, why the Senate should not be devoting some of its time to other measures.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will ask the Senator from California if he has indicated to the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia that he desired him to convene the committee to consider any of the bills to which he refers.

Mr. WORKS. I have not, Mr. President. The chairman of the committee, subject, I believe, to some modifications that have been made by the majority, has the right at all times to call the committee together. I believe at the present time the majority of the committee may take that course if they so desire. I call attention to the matter now not alone with respect to the Committee on the District of Columbia but other committees as well. I have referred to the Committee on Public Lands, which I think is equally important so far as the dispatch of business is concerned.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It has occurred to me, Mr. President, that if the Senator from California had indicated to the chairmen of those committees that he desired to have a meeting to consider any measure which he thought required consideration, he would have gotten a hearing very easily in that way.

Mr. WORKS. I have not had that experience, Mr. President. This is a matter of general importance, and not a mere question of the calling together of one committee.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, in order that the remarks of the Senator from California may not be misunderstood, I will say that I do not know how it is in reference to the particular committees which the Senator has named, but I know it to be a

fact that several committees, of which I have the honor to be a member, are not only having meetings, but that each of those committees have questions which have been submitted to subcommittees, and while general committees may not be in session continuously, I am sure there is not a day passes but some important matter is being considered by some of the subcommittees. I am on several of them myself, and I have just had occasion to complain to one of my colleagues here on the Judiciary Committee of having been put on a subcommittee that, by reason of my service on other subcommittees, I would not have time to give proper attention to; and I think that is true as to other committees.

The Senate is not idle by any means when not in session. Senators are very hard at work, and possibly doing very much more laborious and very much more valuable service than they do at any time when the Senate is actually in session.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I appreciate what is said by the Senator from Georgia with respect to the Judiciary Committee. I understand that that committee is holding its regular sessions, and I am very glad to hear it; but there are numerous other committees that are not holding sessions at all.

Mr. BACON. I happen to be on three important committees, and I can speak for all of them—the Committees on the Judiciary, Foreign Relations, and Rules. All of them have certainly been very active and very busy and laboriously engaged ever since the session began.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I came into the Chamber just as the Senator from California was beginning his statement. I understood him to intimate that the tariff hearings or the tariff consideration by the Finance Committee was interfering with other committee meetings. Am I correct in that?

Mr. WORKS. No; I made no such statement, Mr. President.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then I misunderstood the Senator.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 1267) to transfer Capt. Armistead Rust from the retired to the active list of the United States Navy; and

A bill (S. 1268) to appoint Jere Maupin a passed assistant paymaster on the retired list of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1269) for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under joint resolution of July 14, 1870, authorizing the Postmaster General to continue in use in the postal service Marcus P. Norton's combined postmarking and stamp-canceling hand stamp patents; or otherwise; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1270) for the relief of Edward William Bailey (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1271) for the relief of the trustees of the Zion Methodist Church of York County, Va.;

A bill (S. 1272) for the relief of R. S. Thornton;

A bill (S. 1273) for the relief of the trustees of the Zion Methodist Church of York County, Va.;

A bill (S. 1274) for the relief of the heirs of D. S. Cowles, deceased;

A bill (S. 1275) for the relief of the estate of Alfred H. Weaver, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1276) for the relief of David R. Mister; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1277) providing for the improvement of the roadway from the railroad depot at Fredericksburg, Va., to the national cemetery near Fredericksburg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1278) for the relief of the estate of Antonia Sousa, deceased; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

A bill (S. 1279) to authorize the Supreme Court to prescribe forms and rules and generally to regulate pleading, procedure, and practice on the common-law side of the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 1280) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prevent the exhibition of obscene, lewd, indecent, or vulgar pictures in places of amusement in the District of Columbia (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 1281) providing for the retirement of certain officers of the Philippine Scouts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1282) for the relief of Joshua F. Spurlin; and

A bill (S. 1283) for the relief of Leonidas Stout; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1284) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Shrode;

A bill (S. 1285) granting an increase of pension to Garret Patterson;

A bill (S. 1286) granting an increase of pension to Andrew F. O'Neill;

A bill (S. 1287) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Waggoner; and

A bill (S. 1288) granting an increase of pension to Henry Fairley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 1289) for the relief of Lemuel E. Cook (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 1290) granting a pension to Emma Conkright;

A bill (S. 1291) granting a pension to Ella Betsey Perry (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1292) granting an increase of pension to Holland Myers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 1293) to correct the military record of Harrison H. Hollowell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 1294) to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of female employees in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 1295) providing for the regulation, identification, and registration of all vehicles of the air, and the licensing of the operators thereof; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1296) for the relief of heirs of post-office clerks, city delivery carriers, and rural delivery carriers who die from injuries received while on duty; and

A bill (S. 1297) for reduction of postage on first-class mail matter; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1298) to purchase an oil painting entitled "The Death of Brevet Lieut. Col. Alonzo H. Cushing, at Gettysburg"; and

A bill (S. 1299) for the preparation of a plan and the erection of a foundation and pedestal on ground belonging to the United States Government, in the city of Washington, upon which to place a memorial or statue, to be furnished by the State of Pennsylvania, of Maj. Gen. George Gordon Meade; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 1300) for the relief of every officer or private soldier who was honorably discharged after 90 days' service in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the War of the Rebellion;

A bill (S. 1301) granting an annuity of $100 to officers and enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps who have been awarded medals of honor for gallantry in active and other soldierlike qualities under acts of Congress, and authorizing the President of the United States to make rules and regulations for carrying the act into effect;

A bill (S. 1302) providing for the retirement of noncommissioned officers, petty officers, and enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for the efficiency of the enlisted personnel; and

A bill (S. 1303) to consolidate the veterinary service, United States Army, and to increase its efficiency; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1304) authorizing the Department of State to deliver to Capt. P. H. Uberroth, United States Revenue-Cutter Service, and Gunner Carl Johannson, United States Revenue-Cutter Service, watches tendered to them by the Canadian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 1305) for the better payment of pensioners;

A bill (S. 1306) for the better payment of pensioners;

A bill (S. 1307) to amend the act of Congress approved February 6, 1907, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico";

A bill (S. 1308) providing pensions for commissioned officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Army who served on the western frontier during the Indian wars and campaigns from 1865 to 1890;

(By request.) A bill (S. 1309) to fix the rate of pension of sailors and soldiers in certain cases; and

A bill (S. 1310) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Means; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 1312) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert Barnett, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:
A bill (S. 1313) to place collectors of customs of the United States in the classified service; and
A bill (S. 1314) to place collectors of internal revenue of the United States in the classified service; to the Committee on Finance.
A bill (S. 1315) to place surveyors general of the United States in the classified service; and
A bill (S. 1316) to place registers and receivers of the General Land Office in the classified service; to the Committee on Public Lands.
A bill (S. 1317) to place United States district attorneys in the classified service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
A bill (S. 1318) granting an increase of pension to Jane Harrington; and
A bill (S. 1319) granting an increase of pension to Herman Sebert; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. JONES (for Mr. CLAPP):
A bill (S. 1320) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MYERS:
A bill (S. 1321) authorizing the Reclamation Service to execute certified copies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.
By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:
A bill (S. 1322) granting a pension to Mary M. Owens (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1323) construing the provisions of section 2 of the pension act of June 27, 1890; section 1 of the act of February 6, 1907; and section 1 of the act of May 11, 1912; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. GOFF:
A bill (S. 1324) to authorize Robert W. Buskirk, of Matewan, W. Va., to bridge the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at Matewan, Mingo County, W. Va., where the same forms the boundary line between the States of West Virginia and Kentucky (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.
By Mr. CRAWFORD:
A bill (S. 1325) to provide for the leasing of public lands containing coal; to the Committee on Public Lands.
By Mr. McLEAN:
A bill (S. 1326) granting an increase of pension to Marion C. Turrill (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
A bill (S. 1327) for the relief of the estate of Philip Halsey Remington; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. NORRIS:
A bill (S. 1328) to correct the military record of Jacob Lillian; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 1329) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Bachus;
A bill (S. 1330) granting an increase of pension to L. R. Young;
A bill (S. 1331) granting an increase of pension to Moses N. Jones;
A bill (S. 1332) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Litz;
A bill (S. 1333) granting a pension to Margaret J. Woodworth; and
A bill (S. 1334) granting a pension to Henry M. Swigart; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:
A bill (S. 1335) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. B. Andrews (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1336) granting an increase of pension to John W. Ferguson (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1337) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Dickey (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1338) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta B. B. Hayman (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1339) granting a pension to Henrietta S. Hodgdon (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1340) granting an increase of pension to Edgar S. McDonald (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1341) granting an increase of pension to Alice Quimby (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1342) granting a pension to Bridget Kelley (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1343) granting an increase of pension to Eunice B. Prescott (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1344) granting an increase of pension to Warren T. Noyes (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1345) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Pike (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
A bill (S. 1346) to authorize the Eastern Maine Railroad to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge without a draw across the Penobscot River between the cities of Bangor and Brewer, in the State of Maine; to the Committee on Commerce.
By Mr. STONE:
A bill (S. 1347) for the relief of the trustees of the Christian Church at Missouri City, Clay County, Mo.; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. SHIVELY:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 23) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to cause to be made examinations and surveys of the navigable rivers of Indiana and streams tributary thereto and report plans to prevent floods from and conserve and promote navigation on the same; to the Committee on Commerce.
By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:

"ART. XVIII. The Congress, whenever a majority of both Houses shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or on the application of the legislatures of 10 States, or on the application of 10 States through the vote of a majority of the electors of each, voting upon the question of such application, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, to be submitted for ratification in each of the several States to the electors qualified to vote for the election of Representatives. And the vote shall be taken at the next ensuing election of Representatives in such manner as the Congress may prescribe. And if in a majority of the States a majority of the electors voting thereon approve any proposed amendment, and if a majority of all the electors voting thereon also approve any proposed amendment, it shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution."

By Mr. STERLING:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 25) providing for the appointment of a national commission to make investigation and report as to the means and improvements practicable and necessary for the prevention of loss by the overflow of navigable inland waterways; to the Committee on Commerce.

STOCK GAMBLING.

Mr. ASHURST. I introduce a bill and ask that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.
The bill (S. 1311) for the regulation of the use of the mail by stock exchanges and their members, and to amend certain sections of the Criminal Code of the Compiled Statutes of the United States, relating to lotteries, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.
Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I desire to say in connection with the bill I have introduced providing for the regulation and use of the mails by stock exchanges and to amend certain sections of the criminal laws of the United States, that the enormous abuses growing out of stock gamblings have been apparent to us all for some time. I observe in the February, 1913, number of Everybody's Magazine an article upon that subject by a citizen of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to wit, Mr. Thomas W. Lawson, who caused to be prepared a bill prohibiting stock gambling. I am confident that there is merit in the bill. If enacted into law, should it produce only a small fraction of the beneficial results claimed by its proponents, it would take its place as salutary and wholesome legislation.
I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill which I introduced and the excerpt from the article in the February, 1913, issue of Everybody's Magazine be printed in the RECORD, and I herewith present the excerpt from the article.
The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? If not, the bill and the matter referred to will be printed in the RECORD.
Mr. BACON subsequently said: I wish to call attention to the fact that the request just made by the Senator from Arizona, which was acted upon, I think, without the Senate being in sufficient order to hear what it was, is in contravention to what has been recognized as the established practice of the Senate, and that is not to include in the RECORD the productions of people who are not Senators. It is not proper that the RECORD should be made the vehicle for carrying to the public the utterances of people who do not belong to this body. I trust the Senator from Arizona will not insist upon that request.
Mr. ASHURST. I ask that a page may return the paper to me, and I will repeat my request.
Mr. BACON. Probably I did not understand it correctly. As I understood the Senator, it was to include in the RECORD an

extract from an article which was written by Mr. Thomas W. Lawson. I have no objection to Mr. Thomas W. Lawson, but I object to anyone other than a Senator having the RECORD as a vehicle for communicating with the public.

Mr. ASHURST. I think the fault was mine, in that I did not speak loudly enough or pause sufficiently long to give Senators an opportunity to object.

I now ask unanimous consent that I may include in the RECORD the bill which I have just introduced, together with an excerpt from an article in Everybody's Magazine for February, 1913, in exposition and explanation of the bill.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I must object to the insertion in the RECORD of the article referred to.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I now give notice that immediately after the close of the morning business this morning I shall address myself to this bill, and I further state that I shall read such articles, papers, and proper arguments as I believe to be pertinent to the bill which I have just introduced.

ABROGATION OF TREATIES.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I desire to introduce a joint resolution and ask its reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations. In connection with it I desire to make a very brief statement, but not to make a speech.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon introduces a joint resolution, which will be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 22) declaring that the United States are of right freed and exonerated from each and all of the stipulations of the treaties concluded between the United States and Great Britain of dates of April 19, 1850, known as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and November 18, 1901, known as the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 22) declaring that the United States are of right freed and exonerated from each and all of the stipulations of the treaties concluded between the United States and Great Britain of dates of April 19, 1850, known as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and November 18, 1901, known as the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

Whereas for many years prior to the 19th day of April, 1850, the matter of constructing a canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by the Nicaragua route had been the subject of general discussion, and it was almost unanimously conceded that a canal by the way of the River San Juan de Nicaragua and either or both of the lakes of Nicaragua or Managua to any port or place on the Pacific Ocean was the most feasible under all the circumstances; and

Whereas most of the territory through which such canal would of necessity have to be constructed was under the jurisdiction of the Republic of Nicaragua while Great Britain was attempting to exercise jurisdiction over that part thereof known as the Mosquito Coast at the Atlantic entrance to said proposed canal, and whereas it was desired that there should be no question with reference to the protection of such canal when constructed along the proposed route, the United States and Great Britain, on the 19th day of April, 1850, entered into a treaty known as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, under and by the terms of which the signatory powers expressed a desire of consolidating the relations of amity which so happily existed between them "by setting forth and fixing in a convention their views and intentions with reference to any means of communication between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by the way of the River San Juan de Nicaragua and either or both of the lakes of Nicaragua or Managua to any port or place on the Pacific Ocean"; and

Whereas the particular object of said treaty was the construction and proper joint protection of a canal over the route indicated in the preamble thereof and no other, nor was any other at that time in the minds of the signatory powers, with the further purpose of establishing a general principle, of extending their protection by treaty stipulations to any other practicable communications, whether by canal or railway, across the isthmus which connects North and South America, and especially to the interoceanic communications should the same prove to be practicable, whether by canal or railway, which were then proposed to be established by the way of Tehuantepec or Panama; and

Whereas no canal was ever constructed across said Nicaragua route nor were the terms of said treaty nor any of them at any time observed or regarded by Great Britain in any respect or particular, and said treaty was practically abrogated and abandoned by the acts of Great Britain in failing and refusing at all times to observe the material stipulations thereof with reference to occupying, fortifying, colonizing, assuming, and exercising domain over a part of the route over which it was contemplated said canal should be constructed, all against the continued protest of the United States and her constituted authority; and

Whereas after said treaty had been practically and to all intents and purposes abandoned and abrogated, but nevertheless in order to remove any objection which might arise out of the convention of April 19, 1850, to the construction of a canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by whatever route might be considered expedient under the auspices of the Government of the United States alone without impairing the general principle of neutralization established in article 8 of said convention, the United States and Great Britain did on the 18th day of November, 1901, enter into another treaty known as the Hay-Pauncefote treaty; and

Whereas both the parties to said treaty had in mind only the construction of a canal through territory which was under the jurisdiction of a foreign power or powers, and did not have in mind at the time of the execution thereof the construction of a canal on territory entirely subject to the jurisdiction and control of the United States, and said treaty had not and could not have reference to a canal built within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, and with a full knowledge of the treaty then existing between the United States and New Granada, of date December 12, 1846; and

Whereas after the execution of said Hay-Pauncefote treaty and on the 18th of November 1903, the United States entered into a treaty with the Republic of Panama, under and by the terms of which the United States acquired, for the considerations therein expressed, a grant in perpetuity of the use, occupation, and control of a zone of land and land under water for the construction, maintenance, operation, and protection of a canal, of the width of 10 miles, extending to the distance of 5 miles on each side to the center line of the route of the canal to be constructed, beginning in the Caribbean Sea 3 marine miles from mean low-water mark and extending to and across the Isthmus of Panama into the Pacific Ocean to a distance of 3 marine miles from mean low-water mark; and

Whereas under and by virtue of the terms of said treaty certain rights were reserved to the Republic of Panama with reference to the passage of her ships through said canal, against which Great Britain has not at any time interposed any objection; and

Whereas the United States, at great expense and without any question as to her power, authority, or rights, has constructed a canal across the Isthmus of Panama on territory over which she has sole and exclusive jurisdiction and authority, and has enacted a law for the use of said canal by her own people as well as by other nations, in strict conformity with her duties and obligations to all the maritime powers of the earth, and after the enactment of said law, but before the President's proclamation fixing the canal tolls, Great Britain entered her formal protest against said act as violative of the treaty of November 18, 1901, and in particular to that portion of the act granting free tolls to American vessels engaged in coastwise shipping, which is purely a domestic concern; and

Whereas in said note of protest it is suggested that there are other provisions in said act to which Great Britain may later feel constrained to enter protest, claiming that they are violative of said treaty, particularly that part of said act which forbids the passage through said canal of railroad-owned ships, which provision is intended for the protection of the internal commerce of the United States:

Now, therefore, in order that the views of the Congress of the United States may be understood, and room for future protest and objection upon the part of Great Britain removed, be it

Resolved, That the United States are of right freed and exonerated from each and all of the stipulations of said treaty of April 19, 1850, commonly known as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and from each and all of the stipulations of said treaty of November 18, 1901, known as the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, heretofore concluded between the United States and Great Britain, and that the same shall not nor shall either of them nor any of the stipulations in either thereof contained henceforth be regarded as legally obligatory on the Government or citizens of the United States.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, in connection with and following in the RECORD the joint resolution which I have just introduced, and as a part of what I have to say, I desire to have printed the following: The Clayton-Bulwer treaty between Great Britain and the United States, dated April 19, 1850; the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, of November 18, 1901; then, as showing the relation between Great Britain, the United States, and the Central and South American Republics at the time these treaties were executed, I desire to have printed article 35 of the treaty between the United States and the Republic of New Granada, of December 12, 1846; also, as showing the views that the Congress of the United States has taken in reference to its power and authority, notwithstanding these treaties, with respect to the Panama Canal, I desire to have inserted a copy of the act of June 28, 1902, providing for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, Thirty-second Statutes at Large, page 481; also, as showing the rights acquired by the United States in reference to the treaty through which the canal has been constructed, a copy of the treaty with the Republic of Panama, of November 18, 1903; and, as showing the construction which Congress has placed upon the foregoing treaties, the act providing for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal, and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone, approved August 24, 1912, together with the proclamation of the President of the United States fixing the tolls to be charged for vessels passing through the canal pursuant to the provisions of the foregoing act; next in order, as showing the viewpoint of Great Britain, the protest of Mr. A. Mitchell Innes, of date of July 8, 1912, and the protest of Sir Edward Gray, handed to the Secretary of State of the United States by the British ambassador December 9, 1912, and bearing date November 14, 1912, and the reply of Mr. P. C. Knox, Secretary of State, dated January 17, 1913, to the note and protest of Great Britain; also, an article prepared by Mr. Feuille, law officer of the Isthmian Canal Commission, which was printed as a public document, showing from his viewpoint the power of the United States under the treaties with Great Britain; also an article by Judge Samuel Seabury, one of the justices of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, printed as a public document, on the same subject.

Mr. President, in asking that these documents be printed I do not expect to enlighten the American public or this Congress in regard to the relations of the two countries under these very important treaties, but there has been a great deal of discussion with reference to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and much of it, I am sure, has been had without the publication of any consecutive statement as to the

terms of the treaties or as to what has been done by this Government or by Great Britain in reference to any of them.

I have not undertaken to get together the correspondence on the part of this Government and the correspondence upon the part of Great Britain with reference to what has been done by the respective Governments under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. The protest of the United States has been repeatedly made in the past that Great Britain has repeatedly violated the terms of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, as the records will disclose. I have simply undertaken to get together consecutively a few of the things that have been done by these powers for the purpose of showing the attitude of the parties and that the United States had rights at the Isthmus of Panama that were exclusive before either the Clayton-Bulwer treaty or the Hay-Pauncefote treaty were executed, all of which must have been known to Great Britain. The Hay-Pauncefote treaty and the Clayton-Bulwer treaty were made with full knowledge that the United States had rights there that these treaties could not and were not intended to impair; and we are now asserting those rights when we ask that both of them be abrogated and annulled, when rights are asserted by Great Britain which were never contemplated at the time the treaties were executed, and particularly in view of the changed conditions in the relations of the parties to the subject of controversy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I want to suggest to the Senator from Oregon that the documents which he has asked to have placed in the RECORD might with great advantage be printed together as a Senate document.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Perhaps the Senator made that request.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection to that, but I did not make the request, though I am glad to consent thereto.

Mr. LODGE. I think it will be a great convenience to have them together. I offered, and had printed the other day, the correspondence of Sir Edward Grey and Mr. Knox, and I think it would be well to have those all united in this document, in one pamphlet.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I shall be very glad to have that done.

Mr. LODGE. If there is no objection, I make the request that they also be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, it was impossible, in the enumeration of these various acts, communications, and treaties, to judge whether or not there had been a careful enumeration of all of them. I do not know how exhaustively the Senator from Oregon has made his examination. It is very important, if these documents are thus printed, and especially if they are going to be printed as a document, that the document should be absolutely complete, and that everything which is pertinent to the question should be included in convenient form. If the Senator from Oregon will say that he has had an exhaustive examination made, of course I am willing to depend upon his judgment. If otherwise, if it is to take this permanent form, I would suggest to the Senator from Oregon that possibly it might be well to withhold his joint resolution until he can make a further examination and see whether or not he has included everything which should be included.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from Georgia will allow me, I will withdraw my request that these papers be printed as a Senate document. Of course it can do no harm to have them printed in the RECORD, as the Senator from Oregon requests. I would allow the matter of their being printed as a document to be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, who can put them in convenient form and have them printed.

Mr. BACON. I think that would be a very proper course to pursue. I will suggest further to the Senator from Oregon, with his permission, that he spoke of the Panama act in general terms, without giving the date, and as there have been numerous acts with reference to the subject, possibly it might be well for him to insert the date of the act to which he refers. He can do that at his leisure.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will see that the notes are corrected to carry out what I propose. I referred to the act providing for the government of the Panama Canal Zone.

Mr. President, in reference to the request of the Senator from Georgia, I desire to say that I have not gone into this matter critically at all; but I think I have got together all the treaties affecting the particular question that I wish to have the people understand. I want them together in the RECORD, so that there will be a consecutive statement of the relations between the two Governments with respect to these treaties. I do not ask that they be published as a public document; I do not ask that they be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee in order that they may report as to whether they shall be printed as a public document, because when that committee reports here on the subject as to what they think should be included in and printed as a public document, I may want to object. I have included all that I want to have from my viewpoint, and I think I have asked for the printing of all that anybody would want to have in order to arrive at a full understanding as to these treaties.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, as I understand, this is the submission of a request for unanimous consent. Unless the matter is referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, so that the record can be made complete not only from the Senator's viewpoint but from the viewpoint of other Senators, I shall feel compelled to object to the insertion in the RECORD

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I did not hear the statement of the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I withdraw my request for unanimous consent to print the matter referred to by the Senator from Oregon as a document, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations so that they may select those documents which are necessary to make the compilation complete.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am perfectly willing for that. What I said was that unless the Senator from Oregon would consent to do that I would feel compelled to object to the request to insert all these documents in the RECORD.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I did not make a request for unanimous consent. I simply said that I desired to make a statement. If the Senator objects to having the documents printed in the RECORD, I shall take the time now or later to read all of them into the RECORD. I hope the Senator will not object. I am simply making a request that is commonly made here. The courtesy is usually extended to Senators, and I do not see why a contrary rule should be invoked against me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon must see that, if he took the opportunity at a future time to read all these documents, in that time probably other Senators would have other documents which they would like to have printed, and they could all go into the RECORD at one and the same time. I think it would be better, if the Senator will consent, that this matter should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, so that they can make complete the list of documents. Then we can have all of the record at one time, and Senators can get it all in one place. I hope the Senator will modify his request to that extent and include the documents he has mentioned and such other documents as bear upon the question and let the matter go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, so that they may bring in a full list of them.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I think that is rather an unusual request for a Senator to make of one of his colleagues. I have stated very frankly that I have gotten together the documents that from my viewpoint affect the relations between the United States and Great Britain.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; but the Senator gave notice at the same time——

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator will pardon me until I finish. I do not pretend to say that I have gone into this matter critically and analyzed all the notes, all the correspondence, and all the treaties between the United States and Great Britain or any other of the powers, but I have taken pains to select those treaties that directly bear upon this subject—and I think I have them all. If there is anything else that should be printed, there is nothing to preclude any other Senator from making an addition to the RECORD; but I wanted the matter printed from my viewpoint, just as the Senator would want his speech to go into the RECORD from his viewpoint, without the interference of any committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is not a speech; this is a request for the insertion in the RECORD of certain printed public documents of the Government, which are now accessible to everybody, for that matter. But the Senator gave notice at the same time he made the request that he had not made any request to print the matter as a Senate document, and that he might, when such a request was made, object to it. So, if he is going to pursue that course, I think it would be very much better for the Senator to modify his request—he can withhold his remarks and they can all go in at once—send the matter to the Foreign Relations Committee, and let them bring in these documents and such other documents at the same time as they think bear upon this con-

troversy. Meanwhile, the Senator, as I have stated, can withhold his remarks subject to revision.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I am surprised that any Member of this body should deem it necessary to attach conditions to the exercise of the right of the Senator from Oregon to have inserted in the RECORD such papers as he asks to have printed. If any other Senator wishes to insert other papers, it is his privilege to do so. If a technical objection be made to the insertion of the papers in the manner requested by the Senator from Oregon, he can read them into the RECORD or he can ask the Secretary to read them into the RECORD and thus needlessly consume the time of the Senate. I respectfully insist that, whatever may be the purpose or the motive or the attitude of other Senators in attempting to engraft a condition upon which a Senator exercises his right with respect to the RECORD, it does not strike me, at least, favorably. I think the Senator from Oregon should be permitted to have his request granted unconditionally. He is not asking any favor of any Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from New York is peculiarly illogical. This is not a right of a Senator. If it were a right, unanimous consent would not be necessary. The very fact that unanimous consent must be had to do it proves that it is a right of the Senate, and not a right of a Senator.

I have no objection at all to the insertion of these documents in the RECORD, but I should like them to go side by side with any other documents that may have a direct bearing upon this question. There will be no harm done, because all that is necessary is that the Senator withhold his remarks from the RECORD until the Committee on Foreign Relations can meet and see if they want to add any other documents to these. I should be glad to have the Senator modify his request that far.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I want to be as reasonable in my demands as any Senator; but I think I am entitled to the rights that are accorded to Senators generally, and that have been more than once accorded to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. Why should a request of mine for the publication of papers which I have presented here, whether they be parts of a record or what not, be visèed by any committee of the Senate? If that is to be the rule——

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator must pardon me; I have not said anything about visèing them.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Pardon me, Mr. President. If that is going to be the rule I should like to know it, because I think I would have the same right hereafter, when the Senator from Mississippi or any other Senator introduces a paper, to appeal to the Senate to have it referred to a committee, and have it decide whether or not that is all of the given subject on either side.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. For the purpose of putting the question, the Chair will inquire as to whether he understood the Senator from Oregon correctly. His request was to print the documents in the RECORD and have the resolution referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That was the request, Mr. President. That was all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What was the request?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. My request was that the resolution should be referred to the committee in due course, and that I might have the consent of the Senate to have printed in the RECORD, along with it, not with the report of the committee, but with the resolution, the documents to which I have referred.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have the floor, I believe.

I hope the Senator from Oregon will not misunderstand me, and I do not see any necessity for any heat of any description about a matter of this sort. I am pursuing the rules of the Senate. When a request is made in the Senate to print matter in the RECORD, it is always made as a request for unanimous consent. The Senate keeps a string upon requests of that sort, for reasons which are perfectly palpable. A man might get up and request that there be inserted as a part of the RECORD the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence. He might make any request. So it is left to other Senators to judge as to whether a request, in the form in which it is presented, is a reasonable request.

Having expressed my opinion to that effect, and having seen that it has produced some little heat upon the part of my good friend from Oregon, I withdraw the objection, because I do not want him to misunderstand me.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I wanted to suggest that we have a necessity for a public document on this question. It seems to me the purposes of the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Oregon could be accomplished very easily by granting the request of the Senator from Oregon to insert this matter in the RECORD and then have a public document made of what the Senator from Oregon desires to have printed and such additional matter as the Committee on Foreign Relations wishes on this subject. It is a very important subject. It is one that is agitating the country. There are great demands for all of these treaties.

I would suggest that the request of the Senator from Oregon be granted, and that the Committee on Foreign Relations be permitted to have printed a public document including all these treaties and everything appertaining to this question. I should like to submit that request.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have no objection to printing in the RECORD the matter requested by the Senator from Oregon, but I should like to know definitely what he is printing in the RECORD.

The Senator referred to several treaties. I could not understand exactly whether or not he regarded all of them as treaties. For instance, he refers to one document of which he speaks as the treaty of 1849. I do not know whether that was simply an agreement that was entered into by some one who assumed to act as the agent of the Government or whether it was adopted as a treaty. I know we had agreements which were submitted to the Senate and which were not adopted as treaties.

I should like to know definitely, and the RECORD ought to show, whether or not everything that the Senator mentions as a treaty was actually a treaty and adopted by the Senate of the United States as such. We ought to have that, so that we may have an accurate statement of what is presented.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Does the Senator desire to have me state again the papers which I desire to have printed in the RECORD?

Mr. McCUMBER. I will ask the Senator this question: Whether or not the treaty of 1849, which he says we had with Colombia—which, I believe, was New Granada at that time—was a treaty adopted by the Senate of the United States?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There was a treaty adopted in 1846, not in 1849, between New Granada and the United States. The Senator will find it in the Treaties and Conventions between the United States and Other Powers.

Mr. McCUMBER. I refer to the one of 1849 which the Senator mentioned.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The one in 1849 was sought to be negotiated between the Republic of Nicaragua and the United States. It authorized the construction of a canal across Nicaragua, and Great Britain protested against it because she claimed jurisdiction over the Mosquito coast, through which the canal was to be constructed in part. It was because of that attempted agreement between the United States and Nicaragua that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was entered into.

Mr. McCUMBER. But the instrument of 1849, as I remember, was not adopted by the Senate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It was not consummated.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is what I wanted the RECORD to show.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. But the RECORD itself, if it is printed, will show whether it was a treaty or whether it was simply an unauthorized agreement.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not know whether the RECORD will show it as the Senator would have it printed.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I shall not undertake to have it printed as a treaty if it was not. The RECORD will show just what it was if it is printed at all.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being no objection, the documents will be printed in the RECORD, and the joint resolution, with the accompanying documents, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The documents referred to are as follows:

INTEROCEANIC CANAL.

CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY OF APRIL 19, 1850.

The United States of America and Her Britannic Majesty, being desirous of consolidating the relations of amity which so happily subsist between them, by setting forth and fixing in a convention their views and intentions with reference to any means of communication by ship canal which may be constructed between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by the way of the River San Juan de Nicaragua and either or both of the lakes of Nicaragua or Managua, to any port or place on the Pacific Ocean, the President of the United States has conferred full powers on John M. Clayton, Secretary of State of the United States, and Her Britannic Majesty on the Right Honorable Sir Henry Lytton Bulwer, a member of Her Majesty's most honorable privy council, knight commander of the most honorable Order of the Bath, and envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of Her Britannic

Majesty to the United States, for the aforesaid purpose; and the said plenipotentiaries having exchanged their full powers, which were found to be in proper form, have agreed to the following articles:

ARTICLE 1. The Governments of the United States and Great Britain hereby declare that neither the one nor the other will ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over the said ship canal; agreeing that neither will ever erect or maintain any fortifications commanding the same or in the vicinity thereof, or occupy, or fortify, or colonize, or assume, or exercise any domain over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, or any part of Central America; nor will either make use of any protection which either affords or may afford, or any alliance which either has or may have to or with any State or people, for the purpose of erecting or maintaining any such fortifications, or of occupying, fortifying, or colonizing Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, or any part of Central America, or of assuming or exercising dominion over the same; nor will the United States or Great Britain take advantage of any intimacy, or use any alliance, connection, or influence that either may possess with any State or Government through whose territory the said canal may pass, for the purpose of acquiring or holding, directly or indirectly, for the citizens or subjects of the one, any rights or advantages in regard to commerce or navigation through the said canal which shall not be offered on the same terms to the citizens or subjects of the other.

ART. 2. Vessels of the United States or Great Britain traversing the said canal shall, in case of war between the contracting parties, be exempted from blockade, detention, or capture by either of the belligerents; and this provision shall extend to such a distance from the two ends of the said canal as may hereafter be found expedient to establish.

ART. 3. In order to secure the construction of the said canal, the contracting parties engage that if any such canal shall be undertaken upon fair and equitable terms by any parties having the authority of the local Government or Governments through whose territory the same may pass, then the persons employed in making the said canal, and their property used, or to be used, for that object, shall be protected from the commencement of the said canal to its completion by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain from unjust detention, confiscation, seizure, or any violence whatsoever.

ART. 4. The contracting parties will use whatever influence they respectively exercise with any State, States, or Governments possessing or claiming to possess any jurisdiction or right over the territory which the said canal shall traverse or which shall be near the waters applicable thereto, in order to induce such States or Governments to facilitate the construction of the said canal by every means in their power. And, furthermore, the United States and Great Britain agree to use their good offices, wherever or however it may be most expedient, in order to procure the establishment of two free ports, one at each end of the said canal.

ART. 5. The contracting parties further engage, that when the said canal shall have been completed they will protect it from interruption, seizure, or unjust confiscation, and that they will guarantee the neutrality thereof, so that the said canal may forever be open and free, and the capital invested therein secure. Nevertheless, the Governments of the United States and Great Britain, in according their protection to the construction of the said canal, and guaranteeing its neutrality and security when completed, always understand that this protection and guaranty are granted conditionally, and may be withdrawn by both Governments, or either Government, if both Governments, or either Government, should deem that the persons or company undertaking or managing the same adopt or establish such regulations concerning the traffic thereupon as are contrary to the spirit and intention of this convention, either by making unfair discriminations in favor of the commerce of one of the contracting parties over the commerce of the other, or by imposing oppressive exactions or unreasonable tolls upon the passengers, vessels, goods, wares, merchandise, or other articles. Neither party, however, shall withdraw the aforesaid protection and guaranty without first giving six months' notice to the other.

ART. 6. The contracting parties in this convention engage to invite every State with which both or either have friendly intercourse to enter into stipulations with them similar to those which they have entered into with each other, to the end that all other States may share in the honor and advantage of having contributed to a work of such general interest and importance as the canal herein contemplated. And the contracting parties likewise agree that each shall enter into treaty stipulations with such of the Central American States as they may deem advisable, for the purpose of more effectually carrying out the great design of this convention, namely, that of constructing and maintaining the said canal as a ship communication between the two oceans for the benefit of mankind, on equal terms to all, and of protecting the same; and they also agree that the good offices of either shall be employed, when requested by the other, in aiding and assisting the negotiation of such treaty stipulations; and should any differences arise as to right or property over the territory through which the said canal shall pass between the States or Governments of Central America, and such differences should in any way impede or obstruct the execution of the said canal, the Governments of the United States and Great Britain will use their good offices to settle such differences in the manner best suited to promote the interests of the said canal, and to strengthen the bonds of friendship and alliance which exist between the contracting parties.

ART. 7. It being desirable that no time should be unnecessarily lost in commencing and constructing the said canal, the Governments of the United States and Great Britain determine to give their support and encouragement to such persons or company as may first offer to commence the same, with the necessary capital, the consent of the local authorities and on such principles as accord with the spirit and intention of this convention; and if any persons or company should already have, with any State through which the proposed ship canal may pass, a contract for the construction of such a canal as that specified in this convention, to the stipulations of which contract neither of the contracting parties in this convention have any just cause to object, and the said persons or company shall moreover have made preparations, and expended time, money, and trouble, on the faith of such contract, it is hereby agreed that such persons or company shall have a priority of claim over every other person, persons, or company to the protection of the Governments of the United States and Great Britain, and be allowed a year from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of this convention for concluding their arrangements, and presenting evidence of sufficient capital subscribed to accomplish the contemplated undertaking; it being understood that if, at the expiration of the aforesaid period, such persons or company be not able to commence and carry out the proposed enterprise, then the Governments of the United States and Great Britain shall be free to afford their protection to any other persons or company that shall be prepared to commence and proceed with the construction of the canal in question.

ART. 8. The Governments of the United States and Great Britain having not only desired, in entering into this convention, to accomplish a particular object, but also to establish a general principle, they hereby agree to extend their protection, by treaty stipulations, to any other practicable communications, whether by canal or railway, across the isthmus which connects North and South America, and especially to the interoceanic communications, should the same prove to be practicable, whether by canal or railway, which are now proposed to be established by the way of Tehuantepec or Panama. In granting, however, their joint protection to any such canals or railways as are by this article specified, it is always understood by the United States and Great Britain that the parties constructing or owning the same shall impose no other charges or conditions of traffic thereupon than the aforesaid Governments shall approve of as just and equitable; and that the same canals or railways, being open to the citizens and subjects of the United States and Great Britain on equal terms, shall also be open on like terms to the citizens and subjects of every other State which is willing to grant thereto such protection as the United States and Great Britain engage to afford.

ART. 9. The ratifications of this convention shall be exchanged at Washington within six months from this day, or sooner if possible.

In faith whereof we, the respective plenipotentiaries, have signed this convention and have hereunto affixed our seals.

Done at Washington the 19th day of April, A. D. 1850.

JOHN M. CLAYTON. [L. S.]
HENRY LYTTON BULWER. [L. S.]

HAY-PAUNCEFOTE TREATY.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, TRANSMITTING A CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN TO FACILITATE THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SHIP CANAL TO CONNECT THE ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC OCEANS, AND TO REMOVE ANY OBJECTION WHICH MIGHT ARISE OUT OF THE CONVENTION COMMONLY CALLED THE CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY.

To the Senate:

I transmit herewith, with a view to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, a convention this day signed by the respective plenipotentiaries of the United States and Great Britain to facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and to remove any objection which might arise out of the convention of April 19, 1850, commonly called the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, to the construction of such canal under the auspices of the Government of the United States.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1900.

[Amendments appear in italics.]

The United States of America and Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Empress of India, being desirous to facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and to that end to remove any objection which may arise out of the convention of April 19, 1850, commonly called the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, to the construction of such canal under the auspices of the Government of the United States, without impairing the "general principle" of neutralization established in article 8 of that convention have for that purpose appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States, John Hay, Secretary of State of the United States of America,

And Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, Empress of India, the Right Hon. Lord Pauncefote, G. C. B., G. C. M. G., Her Majesty's ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the United States;

Who, having communicated to each other their full powers, which were found to be in due and proper form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE 1. It is agreed that the canal may be constructed under the auspices of the Government of the United States, either directly at its own cost or by gift or loan of money to individuals or corporations or through subscription to or purchase of stock or shares, and that, subject to the provisions of the present convention, the said Government shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such construction, as well as the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal.

ART. 2. The high contracting parties, desiring to preserve and maintain the "general principle" of neutralization established in article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer convention, *which convention is hereby superseded,* adopt, as the basis of such neutralization, the following rules, substantially as embodied in the convention between Great Britain and certain other powers, signed at Constantinople October 29, 1888, for the free navigation of the Suez Maritime Canal; that is to say:

1. The canal shall be free and open, in time of war as in time of peace, to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any nation or its citizens or subjects in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise.

2. The canal shall never be blockaded, nor shall any right of war be exercised nor any act of hostility be committed within it.

3. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not revictual nor take any stores in the canal except so far as may be strictly necessary; and the transit of such vessels through the canal shall be effected with the least possible delay, in accordance with the regulations in force, and with only such intermission as may result from the necessities of the service.

Prizes shall be in all respects subject to the same rules as vessels of war of the belligerents.

4. No belligerent shall embark or disembark troops, munitions of war, or warlike materials in the canal except in case of accidental hindrance of the transit, and in such case the transit shall be resumed with all possible dispatch.

5. The provisions of this article shall apply to waters adjacent to the canal, within 3 marine miles of either end. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not remain in such waters longer than 24 hours at any one time, except in case of distress, and in such case shall depart as soon as possible; but a vessel of war of one belligerent shall not depart within 24 hours from the departure of a vessel of war of the other belligerent.

It is agreed, however, that none of the immediately foregoing conditions and stipulations in sections Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this article shall apply to measures which the United States may find it necessary to take for securing by its own forces the defense of the United States and the maintenance of public order.

6. The plant, establishments, buildings, and all works necessary to the construction, maintenance, and operation of the canal shall be deemed to be part thereof, for the purposes of this convention, and in time of war as in time of peace shall enjoy complete immunity from attack or injury by belligerents and from acts calculated to impair their usefulness as part of the canal.

7. No fortifications shall be erected commanding the canal or the waters adjacent. The United States, however, shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder.

ART. 3. (Art. 3 was stricken out by Senate.) [The high contracting parties will, immediately upon the exchange of the ratifications of this convention, bring it to the notice of the other powers and invite them to adhere to it.]

ART. 4. The present convention shall be ratified by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by Her Britannic Majesty; and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington or at London within six months from the date hereof, or earlier if possible.

In faith whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed this convention and thereunto affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate at Washington the 5th day of February, A. D. 1900.

JOHN HAY.
PAUNCEFOTE.

PROCEEDINGS ON THE HAY-PAUNCEFOTE TREATY OF FEBRUARY 5, 1900.

IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, *December 13, 1900.*

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the convention (Executive M, 56th Cong., 1st sess.) between the United States and Great Britain to facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

In pursuance of the order of December 7, 1900, the Senate proceeded to vote on the amendment to the convention reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations on March 9, 1900, which was as follows:

Insert, at the end of section 5 of article 2, the following:

"It is agreed, however, that none of the immediately foregoing conditions and stipulations in sections numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this article shall apply to measures which the United States may find it necessary to take for securing by its own forces the defense of the United States and the maintenance of public order."

On the question to agree to the amendment it was determined in the affirmative—yeas 65, nays 17.

On motion by Mr. LODGE, the yeas and nays being desired by one-fifth of the Senators present,

Those who voted in the affirmative are, Messrs. Aldrich, Allen, Allison, Bacon, Baker, Bate, Berry, Burrows, Butler, Carter, Chandler, Clark, Clay, Cockrell, Culberson, Cullom, Daniel, Deboe, Depew, Dillingham, Dolliver, Elkins, Fairbanks, Foraker, Foster, Hale, Hanna, Harris, Hawley, Heitfeld, Hoar, Jones of Arkansas, Kean, Kenney, Kyle, Lodge, McBride, McComas, McLaurin, McMillan, Mallory, Martin, Nelson, Penrose, Perkins, Pettigrew, Pettus, Platt of New York, Pritchard, Proctor, Quarles, Scott, Sewell, Shoup, Spooner, Sullivan, Taliaferro, Teller, Thurston, Towne, Turley, Turner, Vest, Warren, and Wetmore.

Those who voted in the negative are, Messrs. Bard, Beveridge, Frye, Gallinger, Hansbrough, Lindsay, McCumber, McEnery, Mason, Money, Morgan, Platt of Connecticut, Rawlins, Stewart, Tillman, Wellington, and Wolcott.

So the amendment was adopted.

The following amendments to the convention were proposed:

By Mr. ELKINS: Insert, at the end of section 5 of article 2, to follow the amendment proposed by the committee and adopted in Committee of the Whole, the following:

"But nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed to prevent the United States from acquiring at any time sufficient territory, and sovereignty over the same, upon which to build, manage, operate, defend, protect, and control said canal, or for any other purposes, as the United States may deem best in its own interests."

By Mr. TILLMAN: By striking out the amendment reported by the committee and adopted in Committee of the Whole and inserting at the end of article 2 the following:

"It is agreed, however, that none of the foregoing conditions and stipulations of this article shall apply to measures which the United States may find it necessary to take for securing by its own forces the defense of the United States and the maintenance of public order."

By Mr. ALLEN: To amend article 1 by striking out the word "under," in line 13, page 2, and inserting the word "by"; strike out the words "auspices of the," at the beginning of line 14, and the words "either directly," at the end of the same line; and by striking out the following, in lines 15, 16, and 17: "or by gift or loan of money to individuals or corporations, or through subscriptions to or purchase of stock or shares"; so that, when thus amended, the article will read as follows:

"ARTICLE 1. It is agreed that the canal may be constructed by the Government of the United States, at its own cost, and that, subject to the provisions of the present convention, the said Government shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such construction, as well as the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal."

By Mr. FORAKER: Amend article 2 by inserting after the word "convention," in line 24, page 2, the following: "which is hereby abrogated." Also, to amend by striking out article 3 of the proposed convention.

By Mr. BEVERIDGE: Amend by striking out article 3 of the proposed convention.

By Mr. PENROSE: Insert at the end of section 5 of article 2, to follow the amendment proposed by the committee and adopted in Committee of the Whole, the following:

"But nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed to prevent the United States from acquiring at any time sufficient territory, and sovereignty over the same, upon which to build, manage, operate, defend, fortify, protect, and control said canal, or for any other purposes, as the United States may deem best in its own interests."

By Mr. BUTLER: Amend by striking out section 7 of article 2 of the proposed convention.

DECEMBER 14, 1900.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported the following amendments to the said convention, which amendments were proposed by Mr. Foraker on the 13th instant:

Amend article 2 by inserting after the word "convention," in line 24, page 2, the following: "which is hereby superseded."

Also to amend by striking out article 3 of the proposed convention.

DECEMBER 15, 1900.

Mr. MASON offered the following amendment: Insert after section 7, article 2, the following:

"*Provided*, Nothing herein contained shall prevent the United States from protecting said canal in any way it may deem necessary if the said United States shall construct said canal at its own expense."

DECEMBER 17, 1900.

On motion by Mr. LODGE,

Ordered, That a vote be taken on the said convention and all of the pending amendments, and all amendments which may be offered, until the final vote is taken, on Thursday, December 20, 1900, at 3 o'clock p. m., without further debate after that hour.

DECEMBER 20, 1900.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an amendment to the first amendment proposed by Mr. Foraker, and reported from the committee the 14th instant, as follows: After the word "which" insert the word "convention."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to by unanimous consent.

After debate,

The hour of 3 o'clock p. m. having arrived, in pursuance of the order of the 17th instant, the Senate proceeded to vote on the amended amendment proposed by Mr. Foraker, and reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, to wit: In article 2, insert after the word "convention," in line 24, page 2 of the printed copy, the following: "which convention is hereby superseded."

On the question to agree thereto, it was determined in the affirmative.

On the question to agree to the further amendment proposed by Mr. Foraker, and reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, to wit: Strike out article 3, on page 3 of the printed copy, it was determined in the affirmative.

On the question to agree to the amendment proposed by Mr. Elkins, to wit: Insert at the end of section 5 of article 2, to follow the amendment proposed by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and adopted in Committee of the Whole, the following:

"But nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed to prevent the United States from acquiring at any time sufficient territory, and sovereignty over the same, upon which to build, manage, operate, defend, protect, and control said canal, or for any other purposes, as the United States may deem best in its own interests."

It was determined in the negative—yeas 25, nays 45.

On motion by Mr. Teller, the yeas and nays being desired by one-fifth of the Senators present.

Those who voted in the affirmative are, Messrs. Bacon, Bard, Bate, Berry, Beveridge, Butler, Clay, Cockrell, Culberson, Daniel, Elkins, Mallory, Martin, Mason, Money, Penrose, Pettigrew, Sullivan, Taliaferro, Teller, Tillman, Towne, Turley, Turner, and Vest.

Those who voted in the negative are, Messrs. Aldrich, Allison, Burrows, Carter, Chandler, Cullom, Deboe, Dillingham, Fairbanks, Foraker, Foster, Frye, Gallinger, Hale, Hanna, Hansbrough, Hawley, Hoar, Jones of Nevada, Kean, Lindsay, Lodge, McBride, McComas, McCumber, McEnery, McLaurin, McMillan, Morgan, Nelson, Perkins, Pettus, Platt of New York, Pritchard, Proctor, Quarles, Scott, Shoup, Spooner, Stewart, Thurston, Warren, Wellington, Wetmore, and Wolcott.

Pairs were announced as follows, the first named voting in the affirmative, the last named in the negative: Mr. Allen with Mr. Dolliver, Mr. Chilton with Mr. Simon, Mr. Kenney with Mr. Sewell, Mr. Harris with Mr. Clark, Mr. Jones of Arkansas with Mr. Platt of Connecticut, Mr. Heitfeld with Mr. Kyle, Mr. Mason with Mr. Baker.

On the question to agree to the amendment proposed by Mr. Allen, to wit: Amend article 1 by striking out the word "under," in line 13, page 2 (printed copy), and inserting the word "by"; strike out the words "auspices of the," at the beginning of line 14, and the words "either directly," at the end of the same line; and strike out the following in lines 15, 16, and 17, "or by gift or loan of money to individuals or corporations, or through subscriptions to or purchase of stock or shares"; so that, when thus amended, the article will read:

"ARTICLE 1. It is agreed that the canal may be constructed by the Government of the United States, at its own cost, and that, subject to the provisions of the present convention, the said Government shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such construction, as well as the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal."

It was determined in the negative.

The amendments proposed by Messrs. Beveridge and PENROSE were respectively withdrawn.

On the question to agree to the amendment proposed by Mr. Butler, to wit: Strike out section 7 of article 2.

It was determined in the negative—yeas 26, nays 44.

On motion by Mr. Butler, the yeas and nays being desired by one-fifth of the Senators present,

Those who voted in the affirmative are Messrs. Bacon, Bard, Bate, Berry, Beveridge, Butler, Clay, Cockrell, Culberson, Daniel, Elkins, Lindsay, Mallory, Martin, Mason, Money, Penrose, Pettigrew, Sullivan, Taliaferro, Teller, Tillman, Towne, Turley, Turner, and Vest.

Those who voted in the negative are Messrs. Aldrich, Allison, Burrows, Carter, Chandler, Cullom, Deboe, Dillingham, Fairbanks, Foraker, Foster, Frye, Gallinger, Hale, Hanna, Hansbrough, Hawley, Hoar, Jones of Nevada, Kean, Lodge, McBride, McComas, McCumber, McEnery, McLaurin, McMillan, Morgan, Nelson, Perkins, Pettus, Platt of New York, Pritchard, Proctor, Quarles, Scott, Shoup, Spooner, Stewart, Thurston, Warren, Wellington, Wetmore, and Wolcott.

Pairs were announced as follows: Mr. Allen with Mr. Dolliver, Mr. Chilton with Mr. Simon, Mr. Harris with Mr. Clark, Mr. Kenney with Mr. Sewell, Mr. Heitfeld with Mr. Kyle, Mr. Mason with Mr. Baker, Mr. Jones of Arkansas with Mr. Platt of Connecticut.

On the question to agree to the amendment proposed by Mr. Mason, to wit: In article 2, insert after section 7 the following:

"Provided nothing herein contained shall prevent the United States from protecting said canal in any way it may deem necessary if the said United States shall construct said canal at its own expense."

It was determined in the negative—yeas 25, nays 44.

On motion by Mr. Mason, the yeas and nays being desired by one-fifth of the Senators present,

Those who voted in the affirmative are Messrs. Bacon, Bate, Berry, Butler, Clay, Cockrell, Culberson, Daniel, Elkins, Lindsay, Mallory, Martin, Mason, Money, Penrose, Pettigrew, Scott, Sullivan, Taliaferro, Teller, Tillman, Towne, Turley, Turner, and Vest.

Those who voted in the negative are Messrs. Aldrich, Allison, Bard, Burrows, Carter, Chandler, Cullom, Deboe, Dillingham, Fairbanks, Foraker, Foster, Frye, Gallinger, Hale, Hanna, Hansbrough, Hawley, Hoar, Jones of Nevada, Kean, Lodge, McBride, McComas, McCumber, McEnery, McLaurin, McMillan, Morgan, Nelson, Perkins, Pettus, Platt of New York, Pritchard, Proctor, Quarles, Shoup, Spooner, Stewart, Thurston, Warren, Wellington, Wetmore, and Wolcott.

Pairs were announced as follows: Mr. Allen with Mr. Dolliver, Mr. Chilton with Mr. Simon, Mr. Harris with Mr. Clark, Mr. Jones of Arkansas with Mr. Platt of Connecticut, Mr. Kenney with Mr. Sewell, Mr. Heitfeld with Mr. Kyle, Mr. Mason with Mr. Baker.

On the question to agree to the amendment proposed by Mr. Bard, to wit: Strike out article 3 and substitute the following:

"ART. 3. The United States reserves the right in the regulation and management of the canal to discriminate in respect of the charges of traffic in favor of vessels of its own citizens engaged in the coastwise trade."

It was determined in the negative—yeas 27, nays 43.

On motion by Mr. Teller, the yeas and nays being desired by one-fifth of the Senators present,

Those who voted in the affirmative are, Messrs. Bacon, Bard, Bate, Berry, Beveridge, Butler, Clay, Cockrell, Culberson, Daniel, Elkins, Lindsay, Mallory, Martin, Mason, Money, Penrose, Perkins,, Pettigrew, Sullivan, Taliaferro, Teller, Tillman, Turley, Turner, Towne, and Vest.

Those who voted in the negative are, Messrs. Aldrich, Allison, Burrows, Carter, Chandler, Cullom, Deboe, Dillingham, Fairbanks, Foraker, Foster, Frye, Gallinger, Hale, Hanna, Hansbrough, Hawley, Hoar, Jones of Nevada, Kean, Lodge, McBride, McComas, McCumber, McEnery, McLaurin, McMillan, Morgan, Nelson, Pettus, Platt of New York, Pritchard, Proctor, Quarles, Scott, Shoup, Spooner, Stewart, Thurston, Warren, Wellington, Wetmore, and Wolcott.

Mr. Teller proposed the following amendments: In article 2, section 1, page 2, of printed copy, in lines 30 and 31, strike out the words "in time of war as in time of peace"; and in line 31 strike out the words "and of war."

On the question to agree to the proposed amendment, it was determined in the negative.

Mr. Teller also proposed the following amendments: Strike out the whole of sections 3 and 4 of article 2; in article 2, section 5, on page 3, of the printed copy, strike out, beginning with the word "vessels" in line 12, the remainder of the paragraph down to and including the word "belligerent" in line 17; in article 2, section 7, page 3, of the printed copy, strike out the first clause, beginning with the words "No fortifications" in line 30, down to and including the word "adjacent" in line 31, and in line 31 strike out the word "however."

On the question to agree severally to these amendments, it was determined in the negative.

No further amendment being proposed as in Committee of the Whole, the convention was reported to the Senate, and the amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole were concurred in.

The convention being in the Senate and open to amendment, Mr. TILLMAN proposed the following amendment: Strike out the amendment reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations and inserted at the end of section 5 of article 2, on page 3 of the printed copy, and adopted in Committee of the Whole, and insert at the end of article 2 the following: "It is agreed, however, that none of the foregoing conditions and stipulations of this article shall apply to measures which the United States may find it necessary to take for securing by its own forces the defense of the United States and the maintenance of order."

The question being to agree thereto, it was determined in the negative—yeas 27, nays 43.

On motion by Mr. TILLMAN, the yeas and nays being desired by one-fifth of the Senators present,

Those who voted in the affirmative are, Messrs. Bacon, Bard, Bate, Berry, Beveridge, Butler, Clay, Cockrell, Culberson, Daniel, Elkins, Kenney, Lindsay, Mallory, Martin, Mason, Money, Penrose, Pettigrew, Sullivan, Taliaferro, Teller, Tillman, Towne, Turley, Turner, and Vest.

Those who voted in the negative are, Messrs. Aldrich, Allison, Burrows, Carter, Chandler, Cullom, Deboe, Dillingham, Fairbanks, Foraker, Foster, Frye, Gallinger, Hale, Hanna, Hansbrough, Hawley, Hoar, Jones of Nevada, Kean, Lodge, McBride, McComas, McCumber, McLaurin, McMillan, Morgan, Nelson, Perkins, Pettus, Platt of New York, Millan, Morgan, Nelson, Perkins, Pettus, Pettus, Platt of New York, Pritchard, Proctor, Quarles, Shoup, Spooner, Stewart, Thurston, Warren, Wellington, Wetmore, and Wolcott.

Pairs were announced as follows: Mr. Allen with Mr. Dolliver, Mr. Chilton with Mr. Simon, Mr. Harris with Mr. Clark, Mr. Jones of Arkansas with Mr. Platt of Connecticut, Mr. Kenney with Mr. Sewell, Mr. Heitfeld with Mr. Kyle, Mr. Mason with Mr. Baker.

No further amendment being proposed, Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution for consideration:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the convention between the United States and Great Britain to facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and to remove any obstacle which might arise out of the convention commonly called the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, with the following amendments:

In article 2, insert after the word "convention," page 2, line 24, of the printed copy, the following: "which convention is hereby superseded."

In article 2, insert at the end of section 5, page 3, line 17, of the printed copy, the following:

"It is agreed, however, that none of the immediately foregoing conditions and stipulations in sections numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this article shall apply to measures which the United States may find necessary to take for securing by its own forces the defense of the United States and the maintenance of public order."

Strike out article 3 (page 3 of printed copy).

On motion by Mr. LODGE, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider the said resolution; and, on the question to agree thereto, it was determined in the affirmative, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

On motion by Mr LODGE, the yeas and nays being desired by one-fifth of the Senators present,

Those who voted in the affirmative are, Messrs. Aldrich, Allison, Bacon, Beveridge, Burrows, Carter, Chandler, Clay, Cullom, Deboe, Dillingham, Elkins, Fairbanks, Foraker, Foster, Frye, Gallinger, Hale, Hanna, Hansbrough, Harris, Hawley, Hoar, Jones of Nevada, Kean, Kenney, Lindsay, Lodge, McBride, McComas, McCumber, McEnery, McLaurin, McMillan, Mallory, Morgan, Nelson, Penrose, Perkins, Pettus, Platt of New York, Pritchard, Proctor, Quarles, Scott, Shoup, Spooner, Stewart, Sullivan, Taliaferro, Thurston, Turner, Warren, Wetmore, and Wolcott.

Those who voted in the negative are, Messrs. Allen, Bard, Bate, Berry, Butler, Cockrell, Culberson, Daniel, Heitfeld, Martin, Mason, Money, Pettigrew, Teller, Tillman, Turley, Vest, and Wellington.

Pairs were announced as follows: Messrs. Baker and Dolliver in the affirmative, with Mr. Towne in the negative; Messrs. Clark and Simon in the affirmative, with Mr. Chilton in the negative; Messrs. Depew and Sewell in the affirmative, with Mr. Rawlins in the negative; Messrs. Platt of Connecticut and Caffrey in the affirmative, with Mr. Jones of Arkansas in the negative.

Ordered, That the Secretary lay the said resolution before the President of the United States.

On motion by Mr LODGE,

Ordered, That the convention as amended and ratified be printed for the use of the Senate, and that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the convention and the proceedings thereon, and from the votes on all amendments and on the final ratification of the convention.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, TRANSMITTING A CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN TO FACILITATE THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SHIP CANAL TO CONNECT THE ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC OCEANS, SIGNED AT WASHINGTON NOVEMBER 18, 1901.

December 4, 1901. Read; treaty read the first time and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and, together with the message, ordered to be printed in confidence for the use of the Senate.
December 9, 1901 Reported without amendment.
December 10, 1901. Injunction of secrecy removed.
December 10, 1901. Ratified; injunction of secrecy removed from proposed amendments and votes thereon, and vote of ratification.

To the Senate:

I transmit, for the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, a convention signed November 18, 1901, by the respective plenipotentiaries of the United States and Great Britain to facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by whatever route may be considered expedient, and to that end to remove any objection which may arise out of the convention of April 19, 1850, commonly called the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, to the construction of such canal under the auspices of the Government of the United States, without impairing the "general principle" of neutralization established in article 8 of that convention.

I also inclose a report from the Secretary of State, submitting the convention for my consideration.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 4, 1901.

THE PRESIDENT:

I submit for your consideration and for transmission to the Senate, should you deem it proper to do so, with a view to obtaining the advice and consent of that body to its ratification, a convention signed November 18, 1901, by the respective plenipotentiaries of the United States and Great Britain to facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by whatever route may be considered expedient, and to that end to remove any objection which may arise out of the convention of April 19, 1850, commonly called the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, to the construction of such canal under the auspices of the Government of the United States, without impairing the "general principle" of neutralization established in article 8 of that convention.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN HAY.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 2, 1901.

The United States of America and His Majesty Edward the Seventh, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the British dominions beyond the seas, King, and Emperor of India, being desirous to facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, by whatever route may be considered expedient, and to that end to remove any objection which may arise out of the convention of the 19th April, 1850, commonly called the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, to the construction of such canal under the auspices of the Government of the United States, without impairing the "general principle" of neutralization established in article 8 of that convention, have for that purpose appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States, John Hay, Secretary of State of the United States of America;

And His Majesty Edward the Seventh, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the British dominions beyond the seas, King, and Emperor of India, the Right Hon. Lord Pauncefote, G. C. B., G. C. M. G., His Majesty's ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the United States;

Who, having communicated to each other their full powers, which were found to be in due and proper form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE 1. The high contracting parties agree that the present treaty shall supersede the aforementioned convention of the 19th April, 1850.

ART. 2. It is agreed that the canal may be constructed under the auspices of the Government of the United States either directly at its own cost, or by gift or loan of money to individuals or corporations, or through subscription to or purchase of stock or shares, and that, subject to the provisions of the present treaty, the said Government shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such construction, as well as the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal.

ART. 3. The United States adopts, as the basis of the neutralization of such ship canal, the following rules, substantially as embodied in the convention of Constantinople, signed the 28th October, 1888, for the free navigation of the Suez Canal; that is to say:

1. The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable.

2. The canal shall never be blockaded, nor shall any right of war be exercised nor any act of hostility be committed within it. The United States, however, shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder.

3. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not revictual nor take any stores in the canal except so far as may be strictly necessary; and the transit of such vessels through the canal shall be effected with the least possible delay in accordance with the regulations in force, and with only such intermission as may result from the necessities of the service.

Prizes shall be in all respects subject to the same rules as vessels of war of the belligerents.

4. No belligerent shall embark or disembark troops, munitions of war, or warlike materials in the canal, except in case of accidental hindrance of the transit, and in such case the transit shall be resumed with all possible dispatch.

5. The provisions of this article shall apply to waters adjacent to the canal within 3 marine miles of either end. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not remain in such waters longer than 24 hours at any one time, except in case of distress, and in such case shall depart as soon as possible; but a vessel of war of one belligerent shall not depart within 24 hours from the departure of a vessel of war of the other belligerent.

6. The plant, establishments, buildings, and all works necessary to the construction, maintenance, and operation of the canal shall be deemed to be part thereof for the purposes of this treaty, and in time of war, as in time of peace, shall enjoy complete immunity from attack or injury by belligerents and from acts calculated to impair their usefulness as a part of the canal.

ART. 4. It is agreed that no change of territorial sovereignty or of international relations of the country or countries traversed by the before-mentioned canal shall affect the general principle of neutralization or the obligation of the high contracting parties under the present treaty.

ART. 5. The present treaty shall be ratified by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by His Britannic Majesty; and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington or at London at the earliest possible time within six months from the date hereof.

In faith whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed this treaty and hereunto affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate at Washington the 18th day of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and one.

JOHN HAY. [SEAL.]
PAUNCEFOTE. [SEAL.]

RATIFICATION OF THE INTEROCEANIC CANAL TREATY.

IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, *December 16, 1901.*

The Senate having under consideration the convention between the United States and Great Britain to facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, signed November 18, 1901,

Mr. BACON proposed the following amendments:

In the preamble strike out all after the words "United States," in the tenth line, down to and including the word "convention," in line 11.

Strike out from article 2, in line 10, the following words: "Subject to the provisions of the present treaty."

Strike out all of articles 3 and 4.

Mr. CULBERSON proposed the following amendment:

Insert at the end of section 5, article 3, the following:

"It is agreed, however, that none of the immediately foregoing conditions and stipulations in sections Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this article shall apply to measures which the United States may find it necessary to take for securing by its own forces the defense of the United States and the maintenance of public order."

Mr. McLAURIN, of Mississippi, proposed the following amendment:

Strike out of article 3 the following:

"Substantially as embodied in the convention of Constantinople, signed the 28th October, 1888, for the free navigation of the Suez Canal,"

The question being on agreeing to the amendments proposed by Mr. BACON, it was determined in the negative—yeas 18, nays 60.

Those who voted in the affirmative are Messrs. Bacon, Bate, Berry, Blackburn, Carmack, Clark of Montana, Clay, Culberson, Dubois, Harris, Heitfeld, McLaurin of Mississippi, Mallory, Money, Simmons, Taliaferro, Teller, and Tillman.

Those who voted in the negative are Messrs. Aldrich, Allison, Bard, Beveridge, Burnham, Burrows, Burton, Clapp, Clark of Wyoming, Cockrell, Cullom, Deboe, Dietrich, Dillingham, Dolliver, Fairbanks, Foraker, Foster of Louisiana, Foster of Washington, Frye, Gallinger, Gamble, Gibson, Hale, Hansbrough, Hawley, Hoar, Jones of Arkansas, Kean, Kearns, Kittredge, Lodge, McComas, McCumber, McEnery, McLaurin of South Carolina, McMillan, Martin, Mason, Millard, Mitchell, Morgan, Nelson, Penrose, Perkins, Pettus, Platt of Connecticut, Platt of New York, Pritchard, Proctor, Quarles, Scott, Simon, Spooner, Stewart, Turner, Vest, Warren, Wellington, and Wetmore.

Pairs were announced as follows:

Mr. Bailey in the affirmative with Mr. Elkins in the negative.

Mr. Rawlins in the affirmative with Mr. Hanna in the negative.

The question being on agreeing to the amendment proposed by Mr. Culberson, it was determined the negative—15 yeas, 62 nays.

Those who voted in the affirmative are Messrs Bacon, Bate, Berry, Blackburn, Carmack, Culberson, Dubois, Heitfeld, McLaurin of Mississippi, Mallory, Money, Simmons, Taliaferro, Tillman, Vest.

Those who voted in the negative are Messrs. Aldrich, Allison, Bard, Beveridge, Burnham, Burrows, Burton, Clapp, Clark of Montana, Clark of Wyoming, Clay, Cockrell, Cullom, Deboe, Dietrich, Dillingham, Dolliver, Fairbanks, Foraker, Foster of Louisiana, Foster of Washington, Frye, Gallinger, Gamble, Gibson, Hale, Hansbrough, Harris, Hawley, Hoar, Jones of Arkansas, Kean, Kearns, Kittredge, Lodge, McComas, McCumber, McEnery, McLaurin of South Carolina, McMillan, Martin, Mason, Millard, Mitchell, Morgan, Nelson, Penrose, Perkins, Pettus, Platt of Connecticut, Platt of New York, Pritchard, Proctor, Quarles, Scott, Simon, Spooner, Stewart, Turner, Warren, Wellington, Wetmore.

Pairs were announced as follows:

Mr. Bailey in the affirmative with Mr. Elkins in the negative.

Mr. Rawlins in the affirmative with Mr. Hanna in the negative.

The question being on agreeing to the amendment proposed by Mr. McLaurin of Mississippi, it was determined in the negative.

The question being on agreeing to the final resolution of ratification, it was determined in the affirmative—72 yeas, 6 nays.

Those who voted in the affirmative are Messrs. Aldrich, Allison, Bard, Bate, Berry, Beveridge, Burnham, Burrows, Burton, Carmack, Clapp, Clark of Montana, Clark of Wyoming, Clay, Cockrell, Cullom, Deboe, Dietrich, Dillingham, Dolliver, Dubois, Fairbanks, Foraker, Foster of Louisiana, Foster of Washington, Frye, Gallinger, Gamble, Gibson, Hale, Hansbrough, Harris, Hawley, Heitfeld, Hoar, Jones of Arkansas, Kean, Kearns, Kittredge, Lodge, McComas, McCumber, McEnery, McLaurin of Mississippi, McLaurin of South Carolina, McMillan, Martin, Mason, Millard, Mitchell, Money, Morgan, Nelson, Penrose, Perkins, Pettus, Platt of Connecticut, Platt of New York, Pritchard, Proctor, Quarles, Scott, Simmons, Simon, Spooner, Stewart, Taliaferro, Turner, Vest, Warren, Wellington, Wetmore.

Those who voted in the negative are Messrs. Bacon, Blackburn, Culberson, Mallory, Teller, Tillman.

Pairs were announced as follows:

Mr. Bailey in the negative with Messrs. Depew and Elkins in the affirmative.

Mr. Rawlins in the negative with Messrs. Hanna and Sewell in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the injunction of secrecy be removed from the proposed amendments to the said convention, from the votes thereon, and from the final vote to ratify the convention.

ART. 35. The United States of America and the Republic of New Granada, desiring to make as durable as possible the relations which are to be established between the two parties by virtue of this treaty, have declared solemnly, and do agree to the following points:

First. For the better understanding of the preceding articles, it is and has been stipulated between the high contracting parties that the citizens, vessels, and merchandise of the United States shall enjoy in the ports of New Granada, including those of the part of the Granadian territory generally denominated Isthmus of Panama, from its southernmost extremity until the boundary of Costa Rica, all the exemptions, privileges, and immunities concerning commerce and navigation which are now or may hereafter be enjoyed by Granadian citizens, their vessels, and merchandise; and that this equality of favors shall be made to extend to the passengers, correspondence, and merchandise of the United States in their transit across the said territory from one sea to the other. The Government of New Granada guarantees to the Government of the United States that the right of way or transit across the Isthmus of Panama upon any modes of communication that now exist or that may be hereafter constructed shall be open and free to the Government and citizens of the United States and for the transportation of any articles of produce, manufactures, or merchandise of lawful commerce belonging to the citizens of the United States; that no other tolls or charges shall be levied or collected upon the citizens of the United States, or their said merchandise thus passing over any road or canal that may be made by the Government of New Granada, or by the authority of the same than is under like circumstances levied upon and collected from the Granadian citizens; that any lawful produce, manufactures, or merchandise belonging to citizens of the United States thus passing from one sea to the other in either direction for the purpose of exportation to any other foreign country shall not be liable to any import duties whatever; or, having paid such duties, they shall be entitled to drawback upon their exportation; nor shall the citizens of the United States be liable to any duties, tolls, or charges of any kind to which native citizens are not subjected for thus passing the said Isthmus. And, in order to secure to themselves the tranquil and constant enjoyment of these advantages, and as an especial compensation for the said advantages, and for the favors they have acquired by the fourth, fifth, and sixth articles of this treaty, the United States guarantee, positively and efficaciously, to New Granada, by the present stipulation, the perfect neutrality of the before-mentioned Isthmus, with the view that the free transit from the one to the other sea may not be interrupted or embarrassed in any future time while this treaty exists; and in consequence the United States also guarantee in the same manner the rights of sovereignty and property which New Granada has and possesses over said territory.

Second. The present treaty shall remain in full force and vigor for the term of 20 years from the day of the exchange of the ratification; and from the same day the treaty that was concluded between the United States and Colombia, on the 13th of October, 1824, shall cease to have effect, notwithstanding what was disposed in the first point of its thirty-first article.

Third. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if neither party notifies to the other its intention of reforming any of or all the articles of this treaty 12 months before the expiration of the 20 years stipulated above, the said treaty shall continue binding on both parties beyond the said 20 years until 12 months from the time that one of the parties notifies its intention of proceeding to a reform.

Fourth. If any one or more of the citizens of either party shall infringe any of the articles of this treaty, such citizens shall be held personally responsible for the same, and the harmony and good correspondence between the nations shall not be interrupted thereby, each party engaging in no way to protect the offender or sanction such violation.

Fifth. If unfortunately any of the articles contained in this treaty should be violated and infringed in any way whatever, it is expressly stipulated that neither of the two contracting parties shall ordain or authorize any acts of reprisal, nor shall declare war against the other on complaints of injuries or damages until the said party considering itself offended shall have laid before the other a statement of such injuries or damages, verified by competent proofs, demanding justice and satisfaction, and the same shall have been denied, in violation of the laws and of international right.

Sixth. Any special or remarkable advantage that one or the other power may enjoy from the foregoing stipulation are and ought to be always understood in virtue and as in compensation of the obligations they have just contracted and which have been specified in the first number of this article.

(Spooner Act.)

[Public—No. 183.]

An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to acquire, for and on behalf of the United States, at a cost not exceeding $40,000,000 the rights, privileges, franchises, concessions, grants of lands, right of way, unfinished work, plants, and other property, real, personal, and mixed, of every name and nature, owned by the New Panama Canal Co., of France, on the

Isthmus of Panama, and all its maps, plans, drawings, records on the Isthmus of Panama and in Paris, including all the capital stock, not less, however, than 68,863 shares of the Panama Railroad Co., owned by or held for the use of said canal company, provided a satisfactory title to all of said property can be obtained.

SEC. 2. That the President is hereby authorized to acquire from the Republic of Colombia, for and on behalf of the United States, upon such terms as he may deem reasonable, perpetual control of a strip of land, the territory of the Republic of Colombia, not less than 6 miles in width, extending from the Caribbean Sea to the Pacific Ocean, and the right to use and dispose of the waters thereon, and to excavate, construct, and to perpetually maintain, operate, and protect thereon a canal, of such depth and capacity as will afford convenient passage of ships of the greatest tonnage and draft now in use, from the Caribbean Sea to the Pacific Ocean, which control shall include the right to perpetually maintain and operate the Panama Railroad, if the ownership thereof, or a controlling interest therein, shall have been acquired by the United States, and also jurisdiction over said strip and the ports at the ends thereof to make such police and sanitary rules and regulations as shall be necessary to preserve order and preserve the public health thereon, and to establish such judicial tribunals as may be agreed upon thereon as may be necessary to enforce such rules and regulations.

The President may acquire such additional territory and rights from Colombia as in his judgment will facilitate the general purpose hereof.

SEC. 3. That when the President shall have arranged to secure a satisfactory title to the property of the New Panama Canal Co., as provided in section 1 hereof, and shall have obtained by treaty control of the necessary territory from the Republic of Colombia, as provided in section two hereof, he is authorized to pay for the property of the New Panama Canal Co. $40,000,000 and to the Republic of Colombia such sum as shall have been agreed upon, and a sum sufficient for both said purposes is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be paid on warrant or warrants drawn by the President.

The President shall then, through the Isthmian Canal Commission, hereinafter authorized, cause to be excavated, constructed, and completed, utilizing to that end as far as practicable the work heretofore done by the New Panama Canal Co., of France, and its predecessor company, a ship canal from the Caribbean Sea to the Pacific Ocean. Such canal shall be of sufficient capacity and depth as shall afford convenient passage for vessels of the largest tonnage and greatest draft now in use, and such as may be reasonably anticipated, and shall be supplied with all necessary locks and other appliances to meet the necessities of vessels passing through the same from ocean to ocean; and he shall also cause to be constructed such safe and commodious harbors at the termini of said canal, and make such provisions for defense as may be necessary for the safety and protection of said canal and harbors. That the President is authorized for the purposes aforesaid to employ such persons as he may deem necessary, and to fix their compensation.

SEC. 4. That should the President be unable to obtain for the United States a satisfactory title to the property of the New Panama Canal Co. and the control of the necessary territory of the Republic of Colombia and the rights mentioned in sections 1 and 2 of this act, within a reasonable time and upon reasonable terms, then the President, having first obtained for the United States perpetual control by treaty of the necessary territory from Costa Rica and Nicaragua, upon terms which he may consider reasonable, for the construction, perpetual maintenance, operation, and protection of a canal connecting the Caribbean Sea with the Pacific Ocean by what is commonly known as the Nicaragua route, shall through the said Isthmian Canal Commission cause to be excavated and constructed a ship canal and waterway from a point on the shore of the Caribbean Sea near Greytown, by way of Lake Nicaragua, to a point near Brito on the Pacific Ocean. Said canal shall be of sufficient capacity and depth to afford convenient passage for vessels of the largest tonnage and greatest draft now in use, and such as may be reasonably anticipated, and shall be supplied with all necessary locks and other appliances to meet the necessities of vessels passing through the same from ocean to ocean; and he shall also construct such safe and commodious harbors at the termini of said canal as shall be necessary for the safe and convenient use thereof, and shall make such provisions for defense as may be necessary for the safety and protection of said harbors and canal; and such sum or sums of money as may be agreed upon by such treaty as compensation to be paid to Nicaragua and Costa Rica for the concessions and rights hereunder provided to be acquired by the United States, are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be paid on warrant or warrants drawn by the President.

The President shall cause the said Isthmian Canal Commission to make such surveys as may be necessary for said canal and harbors to be made, and in making such surveys and in the construction of said canal may employ such persons as he may deem necessary, and may fix their compensation.

In the excavation and construction of said canal the San Juan River and Lake Nicaragua, or such parts of each as may be made available, shall be used.

SEC. 5. That the sum of $10,000,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, toward the project herein contemplated by either route so selected.

And the President is hereby authorized to cause to be entered into such contract or contracts as may be deemed necessary for the proper excavation, construction, completion, and defense of said canal, harbors, and defenses, by the route finally determined upon under the provisions of this act. Appropriations therefor shall from time to time be hereafter made, not to exceed in the aggregate the additional sum of $135,000,000 should the Panama route be adopted, or $180,000,000 should the Nicaragua route be adopted.

SEC. 6. That in any agreement with the Republic of Colombia, or with the States of Nicaragua and Costa Rica, the President is authorized to guarantee to said Republic or to said States the use of said canal and harbors, upon such terms as may be agreed upon, for all vessels owned by said States or by citizens thereof.

SEC. 7. That to enable the President to construct the canal and works appurtenant thereto as provided in this act, there is hereby created the Isthmian Canal Commission, the same to be composed of seven members, who shall be nominated and appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall serve until the completion of said canal unless sooner removed by the President, and one of whom shall be named as the chairman of said commission. Of the seven members of said commission at least four of them shall be persons learned and skilled in the science of engineering, and of the four at least one shall be an officer of the United States Army, and at least one other shall be an officer of the United States Navy, the said officers, respectively, being either upon the active or the retired list of the Army or of the Navy. Said commissioners shall each receive such compensation as the President shall prescribe until the same shall have been otherwise fixed by the Congress. In addition to the members of said Isthmian Canal Commission, the President is hereby authorized through said commission to employ in said service any of the engineers of the United States Army at his discretion, and likewise to employ any engineers in civil life, at his discretion, and any other persons necessary for the proper and expeditious prosecution of said work. The compensation of all such engineers and other persons employed under this act shall be fixed by said commission, subject to the approval of the President. The official salary of any officer appointed or employed under this act shall be deducted from the amount of salary or compensation provided by or which shall be fixed under the terms of this act. Said commission shall in all matters be subject to the direction and control of the President, and shall make to the President annually and at such other periods as may be required, either by law or by the order of the President, full and complete reports of all their actings and doings and of all moneys received and expended in the construction of said work and in the performance of their duties in connection therewith, which said reports shall be by the President transmitted to Congress. And the said commission shall furthermore give to Congress, or either House of Congress, such information as may at any time be required either by act of Congress or by the order of either House of Congress. The President shall cause to be provided and assigned for the use of the commission such offices as may, with the suitable equipment of the same, be necessary and proper, in his discretion, for the proper discharge of the duties thereof.

SEC. 8. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to borrow on the credit of the United States from time to time, as the proceeds may be required to defray expenditures authorized by this act (such proceeds when received to be used only for the purpose of meeting such expenditures), the sum of $130,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, and to prepare and issue therefor coupon or registered bonds of the United States in such form as he may prescribe, and in denominations of $20 or some multiple of that sum, redeemable in gold coin at the pleasure of the United States after 10 years from the date of their issue, and payable 30 years from such date, and bearing interest payable quarterly in gold coin at the rate of 2 per cent per annum; and the bonds herein authorized shall be exempt from all taxes or duties of the United States, as well as from taxation in any form by or under State, municipal, or local authority: *Provided*, That said bonds may be disposed of by the Secretary of the Treasury at not less than par, under such regulations as he may prescribe, giving to all citizens of the United States an equal opportunity to subscribe therefor, but no commissions shall be allowed or paid thereon; and a sum not exceeding one-tenth of 1 per cent of the amount of the bonds herein authorized is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay the expense of preparing, advertising, and issuing the same.

Approved, June 28, 1902.

PANAMA—SHIP CANAL.

Convention between the United States and the Republic of Panama for the construction of a ship canal to connect the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Signed at Washington, November 18, 1903.
Ratification advised by the Senate, February 23, 1904.
Ratified by the President, February 25, 1904.
Ratified by Panama, December 2, 1903.
Ratifications exchanged at Washington, February 26, 1904.
Proclaimed, February 26, 1904.

A proclamation by the President of the United States of America.

Whereas a convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama to insure the construction of a ship canal across the Isthmus of Panama to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans was concluded and signed by their respective plenipotentiaries at Washington, on the 18th day of November, 1903, the original of which convention, being in the English language, is word for word as follows:

ISTHMIAN CANAL CONVENTION.

The United States of America and the Republic of Panama being desirous to insure the construction of a ship canal across the Isthmus of Panama to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and the Congress of the United States of America having passed an act approved June 28, 1902, in furtherance of that object, by which the President of the United States is authorized to acquire within a reasonable time the control of the necessary territory of the Republic of Colombia, and the sovereignty of such territory being actually vested in the Republic of Panama, the high contracting parties have resolved for that purpose to conclude a convention and have accordingly appointed as their plenipotentiaries,

The President of the United States of America, John Hay, Secretary of State, and

The Government of the Republic of Panama, Philippe Bunau-Varilla, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the Republic of Panama, thereunto specially empowered by said Government, who after communicating with each other their respective full powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the concluded the following articles:

ARTICLE 1. The United States guarantees and will maintain the independence of the Republic of Panama.

ART. 2. The Republic of Panama grants to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation, and control of a zone of land and land under water for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of said canal of the width of 10 miles extending to the distance of 5 miles on each side of the center line of the route of the canal to be constructed; the said zone beginning in the Caribbean Sea 3 marine miles from mean low water mark and extending to and across the Isthmus of Panama into the Pacific Ocean to a distance of 3 marine miles from mean low water mark with the proviso that the cities of Panama and Colon and the harbors adjacent to said cities, which are included within the boundaries of the zone above described, shall not be included within this grant. The Republic of Panama further grants to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation, and control of any other lands and waters outside of the zone above described which may be necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the said canal or of any auxiliary canals or other works necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the said enterprise.

The Republic of Panama further grants in like manner to the United States in perpetuity all islands within the limits of the zone above described and in addition thereto the group of small islands in the Bay of Panama, named Perico, Naos, Culebra, and Flamenco.

ART. 3. The Republic of Panama grants to the United States all the rights, power, and authority within the zone mentioned and described in article 2 of this agreement and within the limits of all auxiliary lands and waters mentioned and described in said article 2 which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory within which said lands and waters are located to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority.

ART. 4. As rights subsidiary to the above grants the Republic of Panama grants in perpetuity to the United States the right to use the rivers, streams, lakes, and other bodies of water within its limits for navigation, the supply of water or water power or other purposes, so far as the use of said rivers, streams, lakes, and bodies of water and the waters thereof may be necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the said canal.

ART. 5. The Republic of Panama grants to the United States in perpetuity a monopoly for the construction, maintenance, and operation of any system of communication by means of canal or railroad across its territory between the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean.

ART. 6. The grants herein contained shall in no manner invalidate the titles or rights of private land holders or owners of private property in the said zone or in or to any of the lands or waters granted to the United States by the provisions of any article of this treaty, nor shall they interfere with the rights of way over the public roads passing through the said zone or over any of the said lands or waters unless said rights of way or private rights shall conflict with rights herein granted to the United States in which case the rights of the United States shall be superior. All damages caused to the owners of private lands or private property of any kind by reason of the grants contained in this treaty or by reason of the operations of the United States, its agents or employees, or by reason of the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the said canal or of the works of sanitation and protection herein provided for, shall be appraised and settled by a joint commission appointed by the Governments of the United States and the Republic of Panama, whose decisions as to such damages shall be final and whose awards as to such damages shall be paid solely by the United States. No part of the work on said canal or the Panama Railroad or on any auxiliary works relating thereto and authorized by the terms of this treaty shall be prevented, delayed, or impeded by or pending such proceedings to ascertain such damages. The appraisal of said private lands and private property and the assessment of damages to them shall be based upon their value before the date of this convention.

ART. 7. The Republic of Panama grants to the United States within the limits of the cities of Panama and Colon and their adjacent harbors and within the territory adjacent thereto the right to acquire by purchase or by the exercise of the right of eminent domain, any lands, buildings, water rights, or other properties necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, and protection of the canal and of any works of sanitation, such as the collection and disposition of sewage and the distribution of water in the said cities of Panama and Colon, which, in the discretion of the United States may be necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the said canal and railroad. All such works of sanitation, collection, and disposition of sewage and distribution of water in the cities of Panama and Colon shall be made at the expense of the United States, and the Government of the United States, its agents or nominees shall be authorized to impose and collect water rates and sewerage rates which shall be sufficient to provide for the payment of interest and the amortization of the principal of the cost of said works within a period of 50 years and upon the expiration of said term of 50 years the system of sewers and water works shall revert to and become the properties of the cities of Panama and Colon, respectively, and the use of the water shall be free to the inhabitants of Panama and Colon, except to the extent that water rates may be necessary for the operation and maintenance of said system of sewers and water.

The Republic of Panama agrees that the cities of Panama and Colon shall comply in perpetuity with the sanitary ordinances whether of a preventive or curative character prescribed by the United States and in case the Government of Panama is unable or fails in its duty to enforce this compliance by the cities of Panama and Colon with the sanitary ordinances of the United States the Republic of Panama grants to the United States the right and authority to enforce the same.

The same right and authority are granted to the United States for the maintenance of public order in the cities of Panama and Colon and the territories and harbors adjacent thereto in case the Republic of Panama should not be, in the judgment of the United States, able to maintain such order.

ART. 8. The Republic of Panama grants to the United States all rights which it now has or hereafter may acquire to the property of the New Panama Canal Co. and the Panama Railroad Co. as a result of the transfer of sovereignty from the Republic of Colombia to the Republic of Panama over the Isthmus of Panama and authorizes the New Panama Canal Co. to sell and transfer to the United States its rights, privileges, properties, and concessions as well as the Panama Railroad and all the shares or part of the shares of that company; but the public lands situated outside of the zone described in Article II of this treaty now included in the concessions to both said enterprises and not required in the construction or operation of the canal shall revert to the Republic of Panama except any property now owned by or in the possession of said companies within Panama or Colon or the ports or terminals thereof.

ART. 9. The United States agrees that the ports at either entrance of the canal and the waters thereof and the Republic of Panama agrees that the towns of Panama and Colon shall be free for all time, so that there shall not be imposed or collected customhouse tolls, tonnage, anchorage, lighthouse, wharf, pilot, or quarantine dues, or any other charges or taxes of any kind upon any vessel using or passing through the canal or belonging to or employed by the United States, directly or indirectly, in connection with the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the main canal or auxiliary works, or upon the cargo, officers, crew, or passengers of any such vessels, except such tolls and charges as may be imposed by the United States for the use of the canal and other works, and except tolls and charges imposed by the Republic of Panama upon merchandise destined to be introduced for the consumption of the rest of the Republic of Panama, and upon vessels touching at the ports of Colon and Panama and which do not cross the canal.

The Government of the Republic of Panama shall have the right to establish in such ports and in the towns of Panama and Colon such houses and guards as it may deem necessary to collect duties on importations destined to other portions of Panama and to prevent contraband trade. The United States shall have the right to make use of the towns and harbors of Panama and Colon as places of anchorage, and for making repairs, for loading, unloading, depositing, or transshipping cargoes either in transit or destined for the service of the canal and for other works pertaining to the canal.

ART. 10. The Republic of Panama agrees that there shall not be imposed any taxes, national, municipal, departmental, or of any other class, upon the canal, the railways and auxiliary works, tugs, and other vessels employed in the service of the canal, storehouses, workshops, offices, quarters for laborers, factories of all kinds, warehouses, wharves, machinery and other works, property, and effects appertaining to the canal or railroad and auxiliary works, or their officers or employees, situated within the cities of Panama and Colon, and that there shall not be imposed contributions or charges of a personal character of any kind upon officers, employees, laborers, and other individuals in the service of the canal and railroad and auxiliary works.

ART. 11. The United States agrees that the official dispatches of the Government of the Republic of Panama shall be transmitted over any telegraph and telephone lines established for canal purposes and used for public and private business at rates not higher than those required from officials in the service of the United States.

ART. 12. The Government of the Republic of Panama shall permit the immigration and free access to the lands and workshops of the canal and its auxiliary works of all employees and workmen of whatever nationality under contract to work upon or seeking employment upon or in anywise connected with the said canal and its auxiliary works, with their respective families, and all such persons shall be free and exempt from the military service of the Republic of Panama.

ART. 13. The United States may import at any time into the said zone and auxiliary lands, free of custom duties, imposts, taxes, or other charges, and without any restrictions, any and all vessels, dredges, engines, cars, machinery, tools, explosives, materials, supplies, and other articles necessary and convenient in the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the canal and auxiliary works, and all provisions, medicines, clothing, supplies, and other things necessary and convenient for the officers, employees, workmen, and laborers in the service and employ of the United States and for their families. If any such articles are disposed of for use outside of the zone and auxiliary lands granted to the United States and within the territory of the Republic, they shall be subject to the same import or other duties as like articles imported under the laws of the Republic of Panama.

ART. 14. As the price of compensation for the rights, powers, and privileges granted in this convention by the Republic of Panama to the United States, the Government of the United States agrees to pay to the Republic of Panama the sum of $10,000,000 in gold coin of the United States on the exchange of the ratification of this convention and also an annular payment during the life of this convention of $250,000 in like gold coin, beginning nine years after the date aforesaid.

The provisions of this article shall be in addition to all other benefits assured to the Republic of Panama under this convention.

But no delay or difference of opinion under this article or any other provisions of this treaty shall affect or interrupt the full operation and effect of this convention in all other respects.

ART. 15. The joint commission referred to in article 6 shall be established as follows:

The President of the United States shall nominate two persons and the President of the Republic of Panama shall nominate two persons and they shall proceed to a decision; but in case of disagreement of the commission (by reason of their being equally divided in conclusion) an umpire shall be appointed by the two Governments who shall render the decision. In the event of the death, absence, or incapacity of a commissioner or umpire, or of his omitting, declining, or ceasing to act, his place shall be filled by the appointment of another person in the manner above indicated. All decisions by a majority of the commission or by the umpire shall be final.

ART. 16. The two Governments shall make adequate provisions by future agreement for the pursuit, capture, imprisonment, detention, and delivery within said zone and auxiliary lands to the authorities of the Republic of Panama of persons charged with the commitment of crimes, felonies, or misdemeanors without said zone and for the pursuit, capture, imprisonment, detention, and delivery without said zone to the authorities of the United States of persons charged with the commitment of crimes, felonies, and misdemeanors within said zone and auxiliary lands.

ART. 17. The Republic of Panama grants to the United States the use of all the ports of the Republic open to commerce as places of refuge for any vessels employed in the canal enterprise, and for all vessels passing or bound to pass through the canal which may be in distress and be driven to seek refuge in said ports. Such vessels shall be exempt from anchorage and tonnage dues on the part of the Republic of Panama.

ART. 18. The canal, when constructed, and the entrances thereto shall be neutral in perpetuity, and shall be opened upon the terms provided for by section 1 of article 3 of, and in conformity with all the stipulations of, the treaty entered into by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain on November 18, 1901.

ART. 19. The Government of the Republic of Panama shall have the right to transport over the canal its vessels and its troops and munitions of war in such vessels at all times without paying charges of any kind. The exemption is to be extended to the auxiliary railway for the transportation of persons in the service of the Republic of Panama, or of the police force charged with the preservation of public order outside of said zone, as well as to their baggage, munitions of war, and supplies.

ART. 20. If by virtue of any existing treaty in relation to the territory of the Isthmus of Panama, whereof the obligations shall descend or be assumed by the Republic of Panama, there may be any privilege or concession in favor of the Government or the citizens and subjects of a third power relative to an interoceanic means of communication which in any of its terms may be incompatible with the terms of the present convention, the Republic of Panama agrees to cancel or modify such treaty in due form, for which purpose it shall give to the said third power the requisite notification within the term of four months from the date of the present convention, and in case the existing treaty contains no clause permitting its modifications or annulment, the Republic of Panama agrees to procure its modification or annulment in such form that there shall not exist any conflict with the stipulations of the present convention.

ART. 21. The rights and privileges granted by the Republic of Panama to the United States in the preceding articles are understood to be free of all anterior debts, liens, trusts, or liabilities, or concessions or

privileges to other Governments, corporations, syndicates, or individuals, and consequently if there should arise any claims on account of the present concessions and privileges or otherwise, the claimants shall resort to the Government of the Republic of Panama and not to the United States for any indemnity or compromise which may be required.

ART. 22. The Republic of Panama renounces and grants to the United States the participation to which it might be entitled in the future earnings of the canal under article 15 of the concessionary contract with Lucien N. B. Wyse now owned by the New Panama Canal Co., and any and all other rights or claims of a pecuniary nature arising under or relating to said concession, or arising under or relating to the concessions to the Panama Railroad Co. or any extension or modification thereof; and it likewise renounces, confirms, and grants to the United States, now and hereafter, all the rights and property reserved in the said concessions which otherwise would belong to Panama at or before the expiration of the terms of 99 years of the concessions granted to or held by the above-mentioned party and companies, and all right, title, and interest which it now has or may hereafter have in and to the lands, canal, works, property, and rights held by the said companies under said concessions or otherwise, and acquired or to be acquired by the United States from or through the New Panama Canal Co., including any property and rights which might or may in the future, either by lapse of time, forfeiture, or otherwise, revert to the Republic of Panama under any contracts or concessions with said Wyse, the Universal Panama Canal Co., the Panama Railroad Co., and the New Panama Canal Co.

The aforesaid rights and property shall be and are free and released from any present or reversionary interest in or claims of Panama and the title of the United States thereto upon consummation of the contemplated purchase by the United States from the New Panama Canal Co., shall be absolute, so far as concerns the Republic of Panama, excepting always the rights of the Republic specifically secured under this treaty.

ART. 23. If it should become necessary at any time to employ armed forces for the safety or protection of the canal, or of the ships that make use of the same, or the railways and auxiliary works, the United States shall have the right, at all times and in its discretion, to use its police and its land and naval forces or to establish fortifications for these purposes.

ART. 24. No change either in the Government or in the laws and treaties of the Republic of Panama shall, without the consent of the United States, affect any right of the United States under the present convention, or under any treaty stipulation between the two countries that now exists or may hereafter exist touching the subject matter of this convention.

If the Republic of Panama shall hereafter enter as a constituent into any other Government or into any union or confederation of states, so as to merge her sovereignty or independence in such Government, union, or confederation, the rights of the United States under this convention shall not be in any respect lessened or impaired.

ART. 25. For the better performance of the engagements of this convention and to the end of the efficient protection of the canal and the preservation of its neutrality, the Government of the Republic of Panama will sell or lease to the United States lands adequate and necessary for naval or coaling stations on the Pacific coast and on the western Caribbean coast of the Republic at certain points to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

ART. 26. This convention when signed by the plenipotentiaries of the contracting parties shall be ratified by the respective Governments and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington at the earliest date possible.

In faith whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the present convention in duplicate and have hereunto affixed their respective seals.

Done at the city of Washington the 18th day of November, A. D. 1903.

JOHN HAY. [SEAL.]
P. BUNAU VARILLA. [SEAL.]

And whereas the said convention has been duly ratified on both parts, and the ratification of the two Governments were exchanged in the city of Washington, on the 26th day of February, 1904;

Now, therefore, be it known that I, Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, have caused the said convention to be made public, to the end that the same and every article and clause thereof may be observed and fulfilled with good faith by the United States and the citizens thereof.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this 26th day of February, A. D. 1904, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and twenty-eighth.

[SEAL.] THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

By the President:
JOHN HAY, *Secretary of State.*

—

LEGACIÓN DE LA REPÚBLICA DE
PANAMÁ EN WASHINGTON,
Washington, D. C., February 18, 1904.

His Excellency JOHN HAY,
Secretary of State, etc., Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor of acknowledging the receipt of your communication, No. 23, of January 30, 1904, in which you express to me certain observations about the translation of the treaty of November 18, 1903, contained in the decree ratifying the treaty.

I accept in the name of the Government of the Republic what you propose in said letter, which reads as follows:

"SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 9th instant, transmitting a copy of the decree ratifying the treaty of November 18, 1903, and containing its text in the Spanish language.

"In reply to your request to be notified 'in case the translation is in every respect satisfactory,' I have the honor to invite your attention to a few omissions, as follows:

"1. In article 8, line 4, of page 6 of the translation, the words 'á la República de Panamá,' after 'traspaso de soberanía de la República de Colombia,' should be added.

"2. In the same article, last line of the article, the word 'ó' should be inserted between 'puertos' and 'terminales.'

"3. In article 9, last line but two in the second paragraph of the article, on page 7, the words 'cargar, descargar, almacenar y,' omitted from the English text, should come before the words 'trasbordar cargas.'

"4. In article 22, page 11, line 2 of the last paragraph, the words 'present or' in the English text have been omitted, and should be represented by the words 'ó actuales' placed in the Spanish text after the words 'derechos de reversión.'

"In regard to the exact equivalence of words in both languages, I have to indicate the following changes which appear to be necessary:

"1. In article 7, line 2 of page 5, the word 'puertos' should be used instead of 'bahías' for the English word 'harbors.'

"2. In article 9, line 4 of the article, page 6 of the copy submitted by you, the words 'customhouse tolls' have been rendered into 'derechos de aduana,' which are understood to mean duties collected on merchandise entered for actual consumption in the country. It is believed that the word 'peajes' would be preferable.

"3. In article 13, line 2 of page 8, the English word 'lands' has been translated 'obras,' for which 'terrenos' should obviously be substituted.

"There are a number of other words, the accurate meaning of which may give rise to a difference of interpretation, but inasmuch as there could be no other difficulty in connection with the said words, and in view of the fact that the Spanish text has already been formally approved by your Government, the necessity of making further changes therein will be obviated by your official statement that the English text shall prevail in case of such difference of interpretation.

"Accept, Mr. Minister, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

"FRANCIS B. LOOMIS,
"Acting Secretary."

I am, sir, with great respect, your very obedient servant,
P. BUNAU VARILLA.

—

DECRETO NÚMERO 24 DE 1903 (DE 2 DE DICIEMBRE), POR EL CUAL SE APRUEBA UN TRATADO CON LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS DE NORTE AMÉRICA.

La junta de gobierno provisional de la República de Panamá,

Por cuanto se ha celebrado entre el Enviado Extraordinario y Ministro Plenipotenciario de la República acreditado ante el Gobierno de los Estados Unidos de América, y el Señor Secretario de Estado de aquella Nación un tratado que copiado á la letra dice así:

CONVENCIÓN DE CANAL Á TRAVÉS DEL ISTMO.

Los Estados Unidos de América y la República de Panamá, deseosos de asegurar la construcción de un Canal para naves á través del Istmo de Panamá para comunicar los océanos Atlántico y Pacífico y habiendo expedido el Congreso de los Estados Unidos de América una ley aprobada el 28 de Junio de 1902 en prosecución de aquel objeto por la cual se autoriza al Presidente de los Estados Unidos para adquirir de la República de Colombia dentro de un plazo razonable el control del territorio necesario y perteneciendo actualmente la soberanía de ese territorio á la República de Panamá, las altas partes contratantes han resuelto con ese propósito concluir una convención y han designado de conformidad como sus Plenipotenciarios—

El Presidente de los Estados Unidos de América á John Hay, Secretario de Estado, y

El Gobierno de la República de Panamá á Philippe Bunau-Varilla, Enviado Extraordinario y Ministro Plenipotenciario de la República de Panamá, para ello especialmente facultado por dicho Gobierno, quienes después de haberse comunicado recíprocamente sus respectivos plenos poderes y de haberlos hayado en buena y debida forma, han convenido y concluído los siguientes artículos:

ARTÍCULO 1. Los Estados Unidos garantizan y mantendrán la Independencia de la República de Panamá.

ART. 2. La República de Panamá concede á perpetuidad á los Estados Unidos el uso, ocupación y control de una zona de tierra y de tierra cubierta por agua, para la construcción, conservación, servicio, sanidad y protección de dicho Canal, zona de una anchura de diez millas que se extenderá cinco millas á cada lado de la línea central del Canal que se va á construir, principiando dicha zona á tres millas de la línea media de la baja mar en el mar Caribe, extendiéndose á través del Istmo y terminando en el océano Pacífico á tres millas de distancia de la línea media de la baja mar, con la condición de que las ciudades de Panamá y Colón y los puertos adyacentes á dichas ciudades que están incluídos dentro de los límites de la zona descrita no quedarán comprendidos en esta concesión. La República de Panamá concede además á perpetuidad á los Estados Unidos el uso, ocupación y control de otras tierras y aguas fuera de la zona arriba descrita que puedan ser necesarias y convenientes para la construcción, conservación, servicio, sanidad y protección de dicha empresa.

La República de Panamá concede también del mismo modo y á perpetuidad á los Estados Unidos todas las islas que se encuentren dentro de los límites de la zona ya descrita y además el grupo de pequeñas islas situadas en la bahía de Panamá y conocidas con los nombres de Naos, Perico, Culebra y Flamenco.

ART. 3. La República de Panamá concede á los Estados Unidos todos los derechos, poder y autoridad en la zona mencionada y descrita en el Artículo II de este convenio y dentro de los límites de todas las tierras y aguas auxiliares mencionadas y descritas en dicho Artículo II las cuales poseerán y ejercitarán los Estados Unidos como si fuesen soberanos del territorio en que dichas tierras y aguas se encuentran situadas, con entera exclusión de la República de Panamá en el ejercicio de tales derechos soberanos, poder ó autoridad.

ART. 4. Como derechos subsidiarios de las concesiones que anteceden la República de Panamá concede á perpetuidad á los Estados Unidos el derecho de usar los ríos, riachuelos, lagos y otras aguas dentro de sus límites para la navegación, provisión de agua ó agua para fuerza motriz ú otros objetos, en cuanto el uso de tales ríos, riachuelos y aguas puedan ser necesarios y convenientes para la construcción, conservación, servicio, sanidad y protección del dicho canal.

ART. 5. La República de Panamá concede á los Estados Unidos á perpetuidad el monopolio para la construcción, conservación y servicio de cualquier sistema de comunicación por medio de canal ó ferrocarril á través de su territorio entre el mar Caribe y el océano Pacífico.

ART. 6. Las concesiones que aquí se expresan de ninguna manera invalidarán los títulos de derecho de los ocupantes de tierras ó dueños de propiedad particular en la referida zona, ó en cualquiera de las tierras ó aguas concedidas á los Estados Unidos según las provisiones de cualquier artículo de este tratado, ni tampoco se opondrán á los derechos de tránsito por las vías públicas que pasen á través de la referida zona ó por cualquiera de dichas tierras ó aguas á menos que esos derechos de tránsito ó derechos particulares se hallen en conflicto con los derechos que aquí se le conceden á los Estados Unidos, caso en el cual los derechos de los Estados Unidos serán de mayor valor. Todos los daños que se causen á los dueños de tierras ó de propiedades particulares de cualquiera clase que sean, á causa de las concesiones que contiene este tratado ó por causa de las obras que se efectúen por los Estados Unidos, por sus agentes ó sus empleados, ó debido á la construcción, conservación, servicio, sanidad y protección de dicho canal ó de las obras de saneamiento y protección de que aquí se hace mérito, serán valorados y arreglados por una comisión mixta que se nombrará por los Gobiernos de los Estados Unidos y de la República de Panamá, y

cuyas decisiones con respecto á daños serán finales, y cuyos avalúos serán cubiertos solamente por los Estados Unidos. Ninguna parte de los trabajos del Canal ó del Ferrocarril de Panamá, ni ninguna de las obras auxiliares que á éstos se refieran y autorizadas por los términos de este tratado, será impedida, demorada ni estorbada mientras estén pendientes los procedimientos para averiguar dichos daños. La apreciación de esas tierras ó propiedades particulares y el avalúo de los daños á ellas causados tendrán por base el valor que tenían ántes de celebrarse este tratado.

ART. 7. La República de Panamá concede á los Estados Unidos, dentro de los límites de las ciudades de Panamá y Colón y de sus bahías y territorios adyacentes, el derecho de adquirir por compra ó en ejercicio del derecho de dominio eminente, las tierras, edificios, derechos de aguas ú otras propiedades necesarias y convenientes para la construcción, conservación, servicio y protección del Canal ú otras obras de saneamiento tales como el recogimiento y disposición de desperdicios y la distribución de agua en las referidas ciudades de Panamá y Colón, y que á juicio de los Estados Unidos sean necesarios y convenientes para la construccion, conservación, servicio, saneamiento y protección de dicho Canal y del Ferrocarril. Todas las obras de sanidad, colección y distribución de desperdicios así como la distribución de aguas en las ciudades de Panamá y Colón se ejecutarán por los Estados Unidos y á su costa, y el Gobierno de los Estados Unidos, sus agentes y representantes tendrán autoridad para imponer y cobrar tarifas de agua y de alcantarillado que sean suficientes para proveer al pago de los intereses y á la amortización del capital del costo de esas obras dentro del término de cincuenta años; y al expirar esos cincuenta años el alcantarillado y el acueducto vendrán á ser propiedad de las ciudades de Panamá y Colón, respectivamente, y el uso del agua será libre para los habitantes de Panamá y Colón, excepto en cuanto la contribución de agua sea necesaria para el servicio y conservación de dicho sistema de albañales y acueducto.

La República de Panamá conviene en que las ciudades de Panamá y Colón cumplirán á perpetuidad las disposiciones sanitarias de carácter preventivo ó curativo dictadas por los Estados Unidos y si llega el caso de que el Gobierno de Panamá no pueda ó falte á su deber de hacer que se cumplan tales disposiciones en Panamá y Colón, la República de Panamá concede á los Estados Unidos el derecho y la autoridad de ponerlas en vigor. El mismo derecho y la misma autoridad se concede á los Estados Unidos para el mantenimiento del órden público en las ciudades de Panamá y Colón y sus territorios y bahías adyacentes en caso de que, á juicio de los Estados Unidos, la República de Panamá no pueda mantenerlo.

ART. 8. La República de Panamá concede á los Estados Unidos todos los derechos que hoy tiene y que más tarde pueda adquirir sobre las propiedades de la Compañía Nueva del Canal de Panamá y la Compañía del Ferrocarril, como resultado del traspaso de soberanía de la República de Colombia sobre el Istmo de Panamá y autoriza á la Compañía Nueva del Canal de Panamá para vender y traspasar á los Estados Unidos sus derechos, privilegios, propiedades y concesiones, como también el Ferrocarril de Panamá, y todas las acciones ó parte de las acciones de dicha Compañía, pero las tierras públicas situadas fuera de la zona descrita en el artículo II de este tratado, actualmente incluídas en las concesiones á ambas de las expresadas Compañías y que no sean necesarias para la construcción y servicio del Canal, volverán á poder de la República con excepción de aquellas propiedades que ahora pertenecen á ó están en posesión de dichas Compañías en Panamá ó Colón ó en los puertos terminales de éstas.

ART. 9. Los Estados Unidos convienen en que los puertos en ambas entradas del Canal y aguas de éstas, y la República de Panamá conviene en que las poblaciones de Panamá y Colón sean libres en todo tiempo de modo que en ellos no se impondrá ni cobrarán derechos de aduana, tonelaje, anclaje, faros, muelles, pilotaje ó cuarentena ni ninguna otra contribución ó derecho sobre las naves que usen ó que pasen por el Canal ó que pertenezcan á los Estados Unidos ó que sean empleados por ellos directa ó indirectamente en conexión con la construcción, mantenimiento, servicio, saneamiento y protección del Canal principal ú obras auxiliares ó sobre la carga, oficiales, tripulación ó pasajeros de ninguna de las dichas naves, excepto los derechos é impuestos que establezcan los Estados Unidos por el uso del Canal ú otras obras y excepto los derechos é impuestos que establezca la República de Panamá sobre las mercancías destinadas á ser introducidas para el consumo del resto de la República de Panamá y sobre los buques que toquen en los puertos de Panamá y Colón y que no crucen el Canal.

El Gobierno de la República de Panamá tendrá el derecho de establecer en dichos puertos y en las ciudades de Panamá y Colón los edificios y vigilancia que crea necesarios para el cobro de derechos sobre importaciones distinadas á otras partes de Panamá y para impedir los contrabandos. Los Estados Unidos tendrán el derecho de hacer uso de las poblaciones y puertos de Panamá y Colón como lugares de anclaje y para hacer reparaciones, trasbordar cargas ya sean de tránsito ó destinadas al servicio de Canal ó para otros trabajos que pertenezcan al Canal.

ART. 10. La República de Panamá se obliga á no imponer contribuciones de ninguna clase, ya sean nacionales, municipales ó departamentales sobre el Canal, los ferrocarriles y obras auxiliares, remolcadores, naves empleadas en el servicio de Canal, depósitos, talleres, oficinas, habitaciones para obreros, fábricas de todas clases, almacenes, muelles, maquinaria y demás obras, á sus oficiales ó empleados que se encuentren dentro de las ciudades de Panamá y Colón; y á no establecer contribuciones ó impuestos de carácter personal de ninguna clase que deban pagar los oficiales, empleados, obreros y demás individuos al servicio del Canal y ferrocarriles y obras auxiliares.

ART. 11. Los Estados Unidos se obligan á trasmitir los despachos oficiales del Gobierno de la República de Panamá por las líneas telegráficas y telefónicas establecidas para el Canal y usadas para negocios públicos y privados á precios no mayores que los exigidos de los empleados al servicio de los Estados Unidos.

ART. 12. El Gobierno de la República de Panamá permitirá la inmigración y libre acceso á las tierras y talleres del Canal y á sus obras auxiliares de todos los empleados y obreros de cualquiera nacionalidad bajo contrato de trabajar en el Canal ó que busquen empleo en él ó que estén relacionados con el dicho Canal y obras auxiliares, con sus respectivas familias y todas estas personas estarán libres del servicio militar de la República de Panamá.

ART. 13. Los Estados Unidos podrán importar en cualquier tiempo á dicha zona y obras auxiliares, libres de derechos de aduana, impuestos, contribuciones y gravámenes de otra clase y sin ninguna restricción, toda clase de naves, dragas, máquinas, carros, maquinarias, instrumentos, explosivos, materiales, abastos y otros artículos necesarios y convenientes para la construcción, conservación, servicio, sanidad y protección del Canal y de sus obras auxiliares, y todas las provisiones, medicinas, vestidos, abastos y otras cosas necesarias y convenientes para los oficiales, empleados, obreros y jornaleros al servicio y en el empleo de los Estados Unidos y para sus familias. Si de algunos de esos artículos se dispone y se hace uso fuera de la zona y de las tierras accesorias concedidas á los Estados Unidos y dentro del territorio de la República, quedarán sujetos á los mismos impuestos de importación ú otros derechos á que lo están iguales artículos importados bajo las leyes de la República de Panamá.

ART. 14. Como precio ó compensación por los derechos, poder y privilegios concedidos en esta convención por la República de Panamá á los Estados Unidos, el Gobierno de los Estados Unidos se obliga á pagar á la República de Panamá la suma de diez millones de dollars ($10,000,000) en oro amonedado de los Estados Unidos al efectuarse el canje de la ratificación de este convenio y también un pago anual de doscientos cincuenta mil dollars ($250,000) en la misma moneda de oro durante la vida de esta convención, principiando nueve años después de la fecha antes expresada.

Las provisiones de este artículo serán en adición á todos los demás beneficios asegurados á la República de Panamá en esta convención. Pero ninguna demora ó diferencia de opiniones repecto de este artículo ó de otras estipulaciones de este tratado afectará ó interrumpirá la completa ejecución y efectos de esta convención en todos los demás respectos.

ART. 15. La Comisión mixta á que se refiere el artículo 6 se establecerá como sigue:

El Presidente de los Estados Unidos nombrará dos personas y el Presidente de la República de Panamá nombrará dos personas y ellas procederán á dictar una decisión; pero en caso de desacuerdo de la Comisión (con motivo de estar igualmente divididas sus conclusiones) se nombrará por los dos Gobiernos un dirimente que dictará su decisión. En caso de muerte, ausencia ó incapacidad de un miembro de la comisión ó del dirimente, ó en caso de omisión, excusa ó cesación de actuar, su puesto será llenado por nombramiento de otra persona del modo antes indicado. Todas las decisiones dictadas por la mayoría de la Comisión ó por el dirimente serán finales.

ART. 16. Los dos Gobiernos proveerán de modo adecuado por un arreglo futuro á la persecución, captura, prisión, detención y entrega en dicha zona y tierras accesorias á las autoridades de la República de Panamá de las personas acusadas de la comisión de crímenes, delitos ó faltas fuera de dicha zona, y para la persecución, captura, prisión, detención y entrega fuera de dicha zona á las autoridades de los Estados Unidos de personas acusadas de la comisión de crímenes, delitos ó faltas en la zona mencionada y sus tierras accesorias.

ART. 17. La República de Panamá concede a los Estados Unidos el uso de todos los puertos de la República abiertos al comercio, como lugares de refugio para todas las naves empleadas en la empresa del Canal y para todas aquellas que hallándose en las mismas circunstancias de arribada forzosa vayan destinadas á atravesar el Canal y necesiten anclar en dichos puertos. Esas naves estarán exentas de derechos de anclaje y tonelaje por parte de la República de Panamá.

ART. 18. El Canal, una vez construído, y las entradas á él serán neutrales perpetuamente y estarán abiertas en los términos de la sección I del artículo tercero del tratado celebrado entre los Estados Unidos y la Gran Bretaña el 18 de Noviembre de 1901 y de conformidad con las estipulaciones de este tratado.

ART. 19. El Gobierno de la República de Panamá tendrá el derecho de transportar por el Canal sus naves, tropas y elementos de guerra en esas naves en todo tiempo sin pagar derechos de ninguna clase. Esta exención se extiende al Ferrocarril auxiliar para el trasporte de las personas el servicio de la República de Panamá y de la fuerza de policía encargada de guardar el orden público fuera de la dicha zona, así como para sus equipajes pertrechos y provisiones.

ART. 20. Si en virtud de algún tratado existente en relación con el territorio del Istmo de Panamá, cuyas obligaciones corresponden ó sean asumidas por la República de Panamá, existieren algunos privilegios ó concesiones en favor del Gobierno ó de los ciudadanos y súbditos de una tercera potencia, relativos á una vía de comunicación interocéánica, que en alguna de sus estipulaciones puedan ser incompatibles con los términos de la presente convención, la República de Panamá se obliga á cancelar ó modificar tal tratado en debida forma para lo cual le dará al dicho tercer poder la necesaria notificación dentro del término de cuatro meses desde la fecha de esta convención, y en caso de que el tratado existente no contenga cláusula que permita su modificación ó anulación, la República de Panamá se obliga á procurar su modificación ó anulación en tal forma que no exista conflicto con las estipulaciones de la presente convención.

ART. 21. Los derechos y privilegios concedidos por la República de Panamá á los Estados Unidos en los artículos precedentes se entiende que están libres de toda deuda, limitación, enfiteusis ó responsabilidad anterior, ó de concesiones ó privilegios á otros Gobiernos, corporaciones, sindicatos é individuos, y en consecuencia si surgieren algunos reclamos con motivo de las presentes concesiones y privilegios ó de otro modo los reclamantes se dirigirán contra la República de Panamá y no contra los Estados Unidas para obtener la indemnización ó el arreglo que pueda ser del caso.

ART. 22. La República de Panamá renuncia y concede á los Estados Unidos la participación á que puede tener derecho en los futuros productos del Canal fijada en el artículo 15 de Contrato de concesión celebrado con Lucien N. B. Wyse del cual hoy es dueño la Compañía Nueva del Canal de Panamá y á cualesquiera otros derechos ó reclamos de naturaleza pecuniaria que pudieran originarse de esa concesión ó relativos á ella ó que pudieran surgir de las concesiones á la Compañía del Ferrocarril de Panamá ó relativas á ellas, ó á algunas de sus modificaciones ó prorrogas; y del mismo modo renuncia, confirma y concede á los Estados Unidos desde ahora y para el futuro todos los derechos y propiedades reservadas en las mencionadas concesiones y que de otro modo habrían de corresponderle á Panamá antes ó á la expiración de los términos de noventa y nueve años de las concesiones otorgadas, al interesado y á las Compañías arriba mencionadas y todo derecho, título y participación que ahora tenga y que en lo futuro pueda corresponderle en las tierras en el Canal, en las obras propiedades y derechos pertenecientes á dichas compañías en virtud de las citadas concesiones ó de otra manera, y los que los Estados Unidos hayan adquirido ó adquieran de la Compañía Nueva del Canal de Panamá ó por su conducto incluyendo cualesquiera propiedades ó derechos que en lo futuro pudieren corresponderle á la República de Panamá en virtud del trascurso del tiempo de caducidad ó de otra manera, en virtud de reversión según los contratos ó concesiones con dicho Wyse, la Compañía Universal del Canal de Panamá, la Compañía del Ferrocarril de Panamá y la Compañía nueva del Canal de Panamá.

Los arriba mencionados derechos y propiedades quedarán libres de todos los derechos de reversión que pueda tener Panamá y el título de los Estados Unidos, cuando se efectúe la compra proyectada á la Compañía Nueva del Canal de Panamá, será absoluto en cuanto toca á la

República de Panamá, exceptuándose siempre los derechos de la República expresamente asegurados en este tratado.

ART. 23. Si en algún tiempo fuere necesario el empleo de fuerzas armadas para la seguridad y protección del Canal ó de las naves que lo usen, ó de los ferrocarriles y obras auxiliares, los Estados Unidos tendrán el derecho en todo tiempo y á su juico para usar su fuerza de policía y sus fuerzas terrestres y navales ó para establecer fortificaciones con ese objeto.

ART. 24. Ningún cambio en el Gobierno ó en las leyes y tratados de la República de Panamá afectará, sin el consentimiento de los Estados Unidos, los derechos que correspondan á los Estados Unidos en virtud de esta convención ó en virtud de estipulaciones en tratados que existan entre los dos países ó que para lo futuro lleguen á existir en lo relativo al objeto de esta convención.

Si la República de Panamá llegare á ser más tarde parte constituyente de otro Gobierno ó forme unión ó confederación de Estados de tal modo que su soberanía ó independencia quede confundida con la de otro Gobierno, unión ó confederación, los derechos de los Estados Unidos según esta convención no serán de manera alguna minorados ó restringidos.

ART. 25. Para el mejor cumplimiento de las obligaciones de esta convención y con el fin de dar protección eficaz al Canal y de preservar su neutralidad, el Gobierno de la República de Panamá venderá ó arrendará á los Estados Unidos las tierras adecuadas y necesarias para estaciones navales ó carboneras en la costa del Pacífico y en la parte occidental de la costa del mar Caribe de la República en ciertos puntos que serán convenidos con el Presidente de los Estados Unidos.

ART. 26. Esta Convención, dispués de firmada por los Plenipotenciarios de las partes contratantes, será ratificada por los respectivos Gobiernos y las ratificaciones canjeadas en Washington á la mayor brevedad posible.

En fé de lo cual los respectivos Plenipotenciarios firman la presente convención en duplicado y la sellan con sus respectivos sellos.

Hecha en la ciudad de Washington el 18 de Noviembre del año del Señor de mil novecientos tres.

(Fdo.) P. BUNAU-VARILLA. [HAY UN SELLO]
(Fdo.) JOHN HAY. [HAY UN SELLO]

y Considerando:

1º Que en ese tratado se ha obtenido para la República la garantía de su independencia;

2º Que por razones de seguridad exterior es indispensable proceder con la mayor celeridad á la consideración del tratado, á efecto de que esa obligación principal por parte de los Estados Unidos de América, principie á ser cumplida con eficacia;

3º Que con el tratado se realiza la aspiración de los pueblos del Istmo cual es la apertura del canal y su servicio en favor del comercio de todas las naciones; y

4º Que la Junta de Gobierno Provisional formada por voluntad unánime de los pueblos de la República, posee todos los poderes del soberano del territorio,

DECRETA:

Artículo único. Apruébese el tratado celebrado en Washington, Distrito Capital de la República de los Estados Unidos de América, el día 18 de Noviembre del presente año, entre su Excelencia Philippe Bunau-Varilla, Enviado Extraordinario y Ministro Plenipotenciario de esta República y Su Excelencia John Hay, Secretario de Estado de la República de los Estados Unidos de América.

Publíquese.

Dado en Panamá, á 2 de Diciembre de 1903.

(sgd.) J. A. ARANGO. (sgd.) TOMAS ARIAS.
(sgd.) MANUEL ESPINOZA B.
El Ministro de Gobierno
(sgd.) EUSEBIO A. MORALES
El Ministro de Relaciones Exteriores
(sgd.) F. V. DE LA ESPRIELLA
El Ministro de Justicia
(sgd.) CARLOS A. MENDOZA
El Ministro de Hacienda
(sgd.) MANUEL E. AMADOR
El Ministro de Guerra y Marina
(sgd.) NICANOR A. DE OBARRIO
Por el Ministro de Instrucción Pública,
El Subsecretario. (sgd.) FRANCISCO A. FACIO

[HAY UN SELLO DE LA REPÚBLICA DE PANAMÁ]

[Public—No. 337.]

[H. R. 21969.]

An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal, and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone.

Be it enacted, etc., That the zone of land and land under water of the width of 10 miles extending to the distance of 5 miles on each side of the center line of the route of the canal now being constructed thereon, which zone begins in the Caribbean Sea 3 marine miles from mean low-water mark and extends to and across the Isthmus of Panama into the Pacific Ocean to the distance of 3 marine miles from mean low-water mark, excluding therefrom the cities of Panama and Colon and their adjacent harbors located within said zone, as excepted in the treaty with the Republic of Panama dated November 18, 1903, but including all islands within said described zone, and in addition thereto the group of islands in the Bay of Panama named Perico, Naos, Culebra, and Flamenco, and any lands and waters outside of said limits above described which are necessary or convenient or from time to time may become necessary or convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, or protection of the said canal or of any auxiliary canals, lakes, or other works necessary or convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, or protection of said canal, the use, occupancy, or control whereof were granted to the United States by the treaty between the United States and the Republic of Panama, the ratifications of which were exchanged on the 26th day of February, 1904, shall be known and designated as the Canal Zone, and the canal now being constructed thereon shall hereafter be known and designated as the Panama Canal. The President is authorized, by treaty with the Republic of Panama, to acquire any additional land or land under water not already granted, or which was excepted from the grant, that he may deem necessary for the operation, maintenance, sanitation, or protection of the Panama Canal, and to exchange any land or land under water not deemed necessary for such purposes for other land or land under water which may be deemed necessary for such purposes, which additional land or land under water so acquired shall become part of the Canal Zone.

SEC. 2. That all laws, orders, regulations, and ordinances adopted and promulgated in the Canal Zone by order of the President for the government and sanitation of the Canal Zone and the construction of the Panama Canal are hereby ratified and confirmed as valid and binding until Congress shall otherwise provide. The existing courts established in the Canal Zone by Executive order are recognized and confirmed to continue in operation until the courts provided for in this act shall be established.

SEC. 3. That the President is authorized to declare by Executive order that all land and land under water within the limits of the Canal Zone is necessary for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, or protection of the Panama Canal, and to extinguish, by agreement when advisable, all claims and titles of adverse claimants and occupants. Upon failure to secure by agreement title to any such parcel of land or land under water the adverse claim or occupancy shall be disposed of and title thereto secured in the United States and compensation therefor fixed and paid in the manner provided in the aforesaid treaty with the Republic of Panama, or such modification of such treaty as may hereafter be made.

SEC. 4. That when in the judgment of the President the construction of the Panama Canal shall be sufficiently advanced toward completion to render the further services of the Isthmian Canal Commission unnecessary the President is authorized by Executive order to discontinue the Isthmian Canal Commission, which, together with the present organization, shall then cease to exist; and the President is authorized thereafter to complete, govern, and operate the Panama Canal and govern the Canal Zone, or cause them to be completed, governed, and operated, through a governor of the Panama Canal and such other persons as he may deem competent to discharge the various duties connected with the completion, care, maintenance, sanitation, operation, government, and protection of the canal and Canal Zone. If any of the persons appointed or employed as aforesaid shall be persons in the military or naval service of the United States, the amount of the official salary paid to any such person shall be deducted from the amount of salary or compensation provided by or which shall be fixed under the terms of this act. The governor of the Panama Canal shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, commissioned for a term of four years, and until his successor shall be appointed and qualified. He shall receive a salary of $10,000 a year. All other persons necessary for the completion, care, management, maintenance, sanitation, government, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone shall be appointed by the President, or by his authority, removable at his pleasure, and the compensation of such persons shall be fixed by the President, or by his authority, until such time as Congress may by law regulate the same, but salaries or compensation fixed hereunder by the President shall in no instance exceed by more than 25 per cent the salary or compensation paid for the same or similar services to persons employed by the Government in continental United States. That upon the completion of the Panama Canal the President shall cause the same to be officially and formally opened for use and operation.

Before the completion of the canal, the Commission of Arts may make report to the President of their recommendation regarding the artistic character of the structures of the canal, such report to be transmitted to Congress.

SEC. 5. That the President is hereby authorized to prescribe and from time to time change the tolls that shall be levied by the Government of the United States for the use of the Panama Canal: *Provided*, That no tolls, when prescribed as above, shall be changed, unless six months' notice thereof shall have been given by the President by proclamation. No tolls shall be levied upon vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States. That section 4132 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4132. Vessels built within the United States and belonging wholly to citizens thereof; and vessels which may be captured in war by citizens of the United States and lawfully condemned as prize, or which may be adjudged to be forfeited for a breach of the laws of the United States; and seagoing vessels, whether steam or sail, which have been certified by the Steamboat-Inspection Service as safe to carry dry and perishable cargo, not more than 5 years old at the time they apply for registry, wherever built, which are to engage only in trade with foreign countries or with the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila, being wholly owned by citizens of the United States or corporations organized and chartered under the laws of the United States or of any State thereof, the president and managing directors of which shall be citizens of the United States or corporations organized and chartered under the laws of the United States or of any State thereof, the president and managing directors of which shall be citizens of the United States, and no others, may be registered as directed in this title. Foreign-built vessels registered pursuant to this act shall not engage in the coastwise trade: *Provided*, That a foreign-built yacht, pleasure boat, or vessel not used or intended to be used for trade admitted to American registry pursuant to this section shall not be exempt from the collection of ad valorem duty provided in section 37 of the act approved August 5, 1909, entitled 'An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.' That all materials of foreign production which may be necessary for the construction or repair of vessels built in the United States and all such materials necessary for the building or repair of their machinery, and all articles necessary for their outfit and equipment may be imported into the United States free of duty under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe: *Provided further*, That such vessels so admitted under the provisions of this section may contract with the Postmaster General under the act of March 3, 1891, entitled 'An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and to promote commerce,' so long as such vessels shall in all respects comply with the provisions and requirements of said act."

Tolls may be based upon gross or net registered tonnage, displacement tonnage, or otherwise, and may be based on one form of tonnage for warships and another for ships of commerce. The rate of tolls may be lower upon vessels in ballast than upon vessels carrying passengers or cargo. When based upon net registered tonnage for ships of commerce the tolls shall not exceed $1.25 per net registered ton nor be less, other than for vessels of the United States and its citizens, than the estimated proportionate cost of the actual maintenance and operation of the canal, subject, however, to the provisions of article 19 of the convention between the United States and the Republic of Panama, entered into November 18, 1903. If the tolls shall not be based upon net registered tonnage, they shall not exceed the equivalent of $1.25 per net registered ton as nearly as the same may be determined, nor be less than the equivalent of 75 cents per net registered ton. The toll for each passenger shall not be more than $1.50. The

President is authorized to make and from time to time amend regulations governing the operation of the Panama Canal and the passage and control of vessels through the same or any part thereof, including the locks and approaches thereto, and all rules and regulations affecting pilots and pilotage in the canal or the approaches thereto through the adjacent waters.

Such regulations shall provide for prompt adjustment by agreement and immediate payment of claims for damages which may arise from injury to vessels, cargo, or passengers from the passing of vessels through the locks under the control of those operating them under such rules and regulations. In case of disagreement suit may be brought in the district court of the Canal Zone against the governor of the Panama Canal. The hearing and disposition of such cases shall be expedited and the judgment shall be immediately paid out of any moneys appropriated or allotted for canal operation.

The President shall provide a method for the determination and adjustment of all claims arising out of personal injuries to employees thereafter occurring while directly engaged in actual work in connection with the construction, maintenance, operation, or sanitation of the canal or of the Panama Railroad, or of any auxiliary canals, locks, or other works necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, or sanitation of the canal, whether such injuries result in death or not, and prescribe a schedule of compensation therefor, and may revise and modify such method and schedule at any time; and such claims, to the extent they shall be allowed on such adjustment, if allowed at all, shall be paid out of the moneys hereafter appropriated for that purpose or out of the funds of the Panama Railroad Company, if said company was responsible for said injury, as the case may require. And after such method and schedule shall be provided by the President, the provisions of the act entitled "An act granting to certain employees of the United States the right to receive from it compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment," approved May 30, 1908, and of the act entitled "An act relating to injured employees on the Isthmian Canal," approved February 24, 1909, shall not apply to personal injuries thereafter received and claims for which are subject to determination and adjustment as provided in this section.

SEC. 6. That the President is authorized to cause to be erected, maintained, and operated, subject to the international convention and the act of Congress to regulate radio-communication, at suitable places along the Panama Canal and the coast adjacent to its two terminals, in connection with the operation of said canal, such wireless telegraphic installations as he may deem necessary for the operation, maintenance, sanitation, and protection of said canal, and for other purposes. If it is found necessary to locate such installations upon territory of the Republic of Panama, the President is authorized to make such agreement with said Government as may be necessary, and also to provide for the acceptance and transmission, by said system, of all private and commercial messages, and those of the Government of Panama, on such terms and for such tolls as the President may prescribe: *Provided*, That the messages of the Government of the United States and the departments thereof, and the management of the Panama Canal, shall always be given precedence over all other messages. The President is also authorized, in his discretion, to enter into such operating agreements or leases with any private wireless company or companies as may best insure freedom from interference with the wireless telegraphic installations established by the United States. The President is also authorized to establish, maintain, and operate, through the Panama Railroad Company or otherwise, dry docks, repair shops, yards, docks, wharves, warehouses, storehouses, and other necessary facilities and appurtenances for the purpose of providing coal and other materials, labor, repairs, and supplies for vessels of the Government of the United States and, incidentally, for supplying such at reasonable prices to passing vessels, in accordance with appropriations hereby authorized to be made from time to time by Congress as a part of the maintenance and operation of the said canal. Moneys received from the conduct of said business may be expended and reinvested for such purposes without being covered into the Treasury of the United States; and such moneys are hereby appropriated for such purposes, but all deposits of such funds shall be subject to the provisions of existing law relating to the deposit of other public funds of the United States, and any net profits accruing from such business shall annually be covered into the Treasury of the United States. Monthly reports of such receipts and expenditures shall be made to the President by the persons in charge, and annual reports shall be made to the Congress.

SEC. 7. That the governor of the Panama Canal shall, in connection with the operation of such canal, have official control and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and shall perform all duties in connection with the civil government of the Canal Zone, which is to be held, treated, and governed as an adjunct of such Panama Canal. Unless in this act otherwise provided, all existing laws of the Canal Zone referring to the civil governor or the civil administration of the Canal Zone shall be applicable to the governor of the Panama Canal, who shall perform all such executive and administrative duties required by existing law. The President is authorized to determine or cause to be determined what towns shall exist in the Canal Zone and subdivide, and from time to time resubdivide, said Canal Zone into subdivisions, to be designated by name or number, so that there shall be situated one town in each subdivision, and the boundaries of each subdivision shall be clearly defined. In each town there shall be a magistrate's court with exclusive original jurisdiction coextensive with the subdivision in which it is situated of all civil cases in which the principal sum claimed does not exceed $300 and all criminal cases wherein the punishment that may be imposed shall not exceed a fine of $100 or imprisonment not exceeding 30 days, or both, and all violations of police regulations and ordinances and all actions involving possession or title to personal property or the forcible entry and detainer of real estate. Such magistrates shall also hold preliminary investigations in charges of felony and offenses under section 10 of this act and commit or bail in bailable cases to the district court. A sufficient number of magistrates and constables, who must be citizens of the United States, to conduct the business of such courts shall be appointed by the governor of the Panama Canal for terms of four years and until their successors are appointed and qualified, and the compensation of such persons shall be fixed by the President, or by his authority, until such time as Congress may by law regulate the same. The rules governing said courts and prescribing the duties of said magistrates and constables, oaths and bonds, the times and places of holding such courts, the disposition of fines, costs, forfeitures, enforcements of judgments, providing for appeals therefrom to the district court, and the disposition, treatment, and pardon of convicts shall be established by order of the President. The governor of the Panama Canal shall appoint all notaries public, prescribe their powers and duties, their official seal, and the fees to be charged and collected by them.

SEC. 8. That there shall be in the Canal Zone one district court with two divisions, one including Balboa, and the other including Cristobal; and one district judge of the said district, who shall hold his court in both divisions at such times, as he may designate by order, at least once a month in each division. The rules of practice in such district court shall be prescribed or amended by order of the President. The said district court shall have original jurisdiction of all felony cases, of offenses arising under section 10 of this act, all causes in equity, admiralty, and all cases at law involving principal sums exceeding $300, and all appeals from judgments rendered in magistrates' courts. The jurisdiction in admiralty herein conferred upon the district judge and the district court shall be the same that is exercised by the United States district judges and the United States district courts, and the procedure and practice shall also be the same. The district court or the judge thereof shall also have jurisdiction of all other matters and proceedings not herein provided for which are now within the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the Canal Zone, of the Circuit Court of the Canal Zone, the District Court of the Canal Zone, or the judges thereof. Said judge shall provide for the selection, summoning, serving, and compensation of jurors from among the citizens of the United States, to be subject to jury duty in either division of such district, and a jury shall be had in any criminal case or civil case at law originating in said court on the demand of either party. There shall be a district attorney and a marshal for said district. It shall be the duty of the district attorney to conduct all business, civil and criminal, for the Government, and to advise the governor of the Panama Canal on all legal questions touching the operation of the canal and the administration of civil affairs. It shall be the duty of the marshal to execute all process of the court, preserve order therein, and do all things incident to the office of marshal. The district judge, the district attorney, and the marshal shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for terms of four years each, and until their successors are appointed and qualified, and during their terms of office shall reside within the Canal Zone, and shall hold no other office nor serve on any official board or commission nor receive any emoluments except their salaries. The district judge shall receive the same salary paid the district judges of the United States, and shall appoint the clerk of said court, and may appoint one assistant when necessary, who shall receive salaries to be fixed by the President. The district judge shall be entitled to six weeks' leave of absence each year with pay. During his absence or during any period of disability or disqualification, from sickness or otherwise, to discharge his duties the same shall be temporarily performed by any circuit or district judge of the United States who may be designated by the President, and who, during such service, shall receive the additional mileage and per diem allowed by law to district judges of the United States when holding court away from their homes. The district attorney and the marshal shall be paid each a salary of $5,000 per annum.

SEC. 9. That the records of the existing courts, and all causes, proceedings, and criminal prosecutions pending therein, as shown by the dockets thereof, except as herein otherwise provided, shall immediately upon the organization of the courts created by this act be transferred to such new courts having jurisdiction of like cases, be entered upon the dockets thereof, and proceed as if they had originally been brought therein; whereupon all the existing courts, except the Supreme Court of the Canal Zone, shall cease to exist. The President may continue the Supreme Court of the Canal Zone and retain the judges thereof in office for such time as to him may seem necessary to determine finally any causes and proceedings which may be pending therein. All laws of the Canal Zone imposing duties upon the clerks or ministerial officers of existing courts shall apply and impose such duties upon the clerks and ministerial officers of the new courts created by this act having jurisdiction of like cases, matters, and duties.

All existing laws in the Canal Zone governing practice and procedure in existing courts shall be applicable and adapted to the practice and procedure in the new courts.

The circuit court of appeals of the fifth circuit of the United States shall have jurisdiction to review, revise, modify, reverse, or affirm the final judgments and decrees of the district court of the Canal Zone and to render such judgments as in the opinion of the said appellate court should have been rendered by the trial court in all actions and proceedings in which the Constitution or any statute, treaty, title, right, or privilege of the United States is involved and a right thereunder denied, and in cases in which the value in controversy exceeds $1,000, to be ascertained by the oath of either party, or by other competent evidence, and also in criminal causes wherein the offense charged is punishable as a felony. And such appellate jurisdiction, subject to the right of review by or appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States as in other cases authorized by law, may be exercised by said circuit court of appeals in the same manner, under the same regulations, and by the same procedure as nearly as practicable as is done in reviewing the final judgments and decrees of the district courts of the United States.

SEC. 10. That after the Panama Canal shall have been completed and opened for operation the governor of the Panama Canal shall have the right to make such rules and regulations, subject to the approval of the President, touching the right of any person to remain upon or pass over any part of the Canal Zone as may be necessary. Any person violating any of such rules or regulations shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction in the district court of the Canal Zone shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $500 or by imprisonment not exceeding a year, or both, in the discretion of the court. It shall be unlawful for any person, by any means or in any way, to injure or obstruct, or attempt to injure or obstruct, any part of the Panama Canal or the locks thereof or the approaches thereto. Any person violating this provision shall be guilty of a felony, and on conviction in the district court of the Canal Zone shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $10,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 20 years, or both, in the discretion of the court. If the act shall cause the death of any person within a year and a day thereafter, the person so convicted shall be guilty of murder and shall be punished accordingly.

SEC. 11. That section 5 of the act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, as heretofore amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto a new paragraph at the end thereof, as follows:

"From and after the 1st day of July, 1914, it shall be unlawful for any railroad company or other common carrier subject to the act to regulate commerce to own, lease, operate, control, or have any interest whatsoever (by stock ownership or otherwise, either directly, indirectly, through any holding company, or by stockholders or directors in common, or in any other manner) in any common carrier by water operated through the Panama Canal or elsewhere with which said rail-

road or other carrier aforesaid does or may compete for traffic or any vessel carrying freight or passengers upon said water route or elsewhere with which said railroad or other carrier aforesaid does or may compete for traffic; and in case of the violation of this provision each day in which such violation continues shall be deemed a separate offense."

Jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the Interstate Commerce Commission to determine questions of fact as to the competition or possibility of competition, after full hearing, on the application of any railroad company or other carrier. Such application may be filed for the purpose of determining whether any existing service is in violation of this section and pray for an order permitting the continuance of any vessel or vessels already in operation, or for the purpose of asking an order to install new service not in conflict with the provisions of this paragraph. The commission may on its own motion or the application of any shipper institute proceedings to inquire into the operation of any vessel in use by any railroad or other carrier which has not applied to the commission and had the question of competition or the possibility of competition determined as herein provided. In all such cases the order of said commission shall be final.

If the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be of the opinion that any such existing specified service by water other than through the Panama Canal is being operated in the interest of the public and is of advantage to the convenience and commerce of the people, and that such extension will neither exclude, prevent, nor reduce competition on the route by water under consideration, the Interstate Commerce Commission may, by order, extend the time during which such service by water may continue to be operated beyond July 1, 1914. In every case of such extension the rates, schedules, and practices, of such water carrier shall be filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission and shall be subject to the act to regulate commerce and all amendments thereto in the same manner and to the same extent as is the railroad or other common carrier controlling such water carrier or interested in any manner in its operation: *Provided*, Any application for extension under the terms of this provision filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission prior to July 1, 1914, but for any reason not heard and disposed of before said date, may be considered and granted thereafter.

No vessel permitted to engage in the coastwise or foreign trade of the United States shall be permitted to enter or pass through said canal if such ship is owned, chartered, operated, or controlled by any person or company which is doing business in violation of the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 2, 1890, entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," or the provisions of sections 73 to 77, both inclusive, of an act approved August 27, 1894, entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," or the provisions of any other act of Congress amending or supplementing the said act of July 2, 1890, commonly known as the Sherman Antitrust Act, and amendments thereto, or said sections of the act of August 27, 1894. The question of fact may be determined by the judgment of any court of the United States of competent jurisdiction in any cause pending before it to which the owners or operators of such ship are parties. Suit may be brought by any shipper or by the Attorney General of the United States.

That section 6 of said act to regulate commerce, as heretofore amended, is hereby amended by adding a new paragraph at the end thereof, as follows:

"When property may be or is transported from point to point in the United States by rail and water through the Panama Canal or otherwise, the transportation being by a common carrier or carriers, and not entirely within the limits of a single State, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall have jurisdiction of such transportation and of the carriers, both by rail and by water, which may or do engage in the same, in the following particulars, in addition to the jurisdiction given by the act to regulate commerce, as amended June 18, 1910:

"(a) To establish physical connection between the lines of the rail carrier and the dock of the water carrier by directing the rail carrier to make suitable connection between its line and a track or tracks which have been constructed from the dock to the limits of its right of way, or by directing either or both the rail and water carrier, individually or in connection with one another, to construct and connect with the lines of the rail carrier a spur track or tracks to the dock. This provision shall only apply where such connection is reasonably practicable, can be made with safety to the public, and where the amount of business to be handled is sufficient to justify the outlay.

"The commission shall have full authority to determine the terms and conditions upon which these connecting tracks, when constructed, shall be operated, and it may, either in the construction or the operation of such tracks, determine what sum shall be paid to or by either carrier. The provisions of this paragraph shall extend to cases where the dock is owned by other parties than the carrier involved.

"(b) To establish through routes and maximum joint rates between and over such rail and water lines, and to determine all the terms and conditions under which such lines shall be operated in the handling of the traffic embraced.

"(c) To establish maximum proportional rates by rail to and from the ports to which the traffic is brought, or from which it is taken by the water carrier, and to determine to what traffic and in connection with what vessels and upon what terms and conditions such rates shall apply. By proportional rates are meant those which differ from the corresponding local rates to and from the port and which apply only to traffic which has been brought to the port or is carried from the port by a common carrier by water.

"(d) If any rail carrier subject to the act to regulate commerce enters into arrangements with any water carrier operating from a port in the United States to a foreign country, through the Panama Canal or otherwise, for the handling of through business between interior points of the United States and such foreign country, the Interstate Commerce Commission may require such railway to enter into similar arrangements with any or all other lines of steamships operating from said port to the same foreign country."

The orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission relating to this section shall only be made upon formal complaint or in proceedings instituted by the commission of its own motion and after full hearing. The orders provided for in the two amendments to the act to regulate commerce enacted in this section shall be served in the same manner and enforced by the same penalties and proceedings as are the orders of the commission made under the provisions of section 15 of the act to regulate commerce, as amended June 18, 1910, and they may be conditioned for the payment of any sum or the giving of security for the payment of any sum or the discharge of any obligation which may be required by the terms of said order.

SEC. 12. That all laws and treaties relating to the extradition of persons accused of crime in force in the United States, to the extent that they may not be in conflict with or superseded by any special treaty entered into between the United States and the Republic of Panama with respect to the Canal Zone, and all laws relating to the rendition of fugitives from justice as between the several States and Territories of the United States, shall extend to and be considered in force in the Canal Zone, and for such purposes and such purposes only the Canal Zone shall be considered and treated as an organized Territory of the United States.

SEC. 13. That in time of war in which the United States shall be engaged, or when, in the opinion of the President, war is imminent, such officer of the Army as the President may designate shall, upon the order of the President, assume and have exclusive authority and jurisdiction over the operation of the Panama Canal and all of its adjuncts, appendants, and appurtenances, including the entire control and government of the Canal Zone, and during a continuance of such condition the governor of the Panama Canal shall, in all respects and particulars as to the operation of such Panama Canal, and all duties, matters, and transactions affecting the Canal Zone, be subject to the order and direction of such officer of the Army.

SEC. 14. That this act shall be known as, and referred to as, the Panama Canal act, and the right to alter, amend, or repeal any or all of its provisions or to extend, modify, or annul any rule or regulation made under its authority is expressly reserved.

Approved, August 24, 1912.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

INSTRUCTION OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF JANUARY 17, 1913, TO THE AMERICAN CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES AT LONDON, AND THE BRITISH NOTES OF JULY 8, 1912, AND NOVEMBER 14, 1912, TO WHICH IT REPLIES.

The Secretary of State to Chargé d'Affaires Laughlin.

No. 1833.] DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 17, 1913.

IRWIN B. LAUGHLIN, Esq.,
American Chargé d'Affaires, London, England.

SIR: I inclose a copy of an instruction from Sir Edward Grey to His Britannic Majesty's ambassador at Washington, dated November 14, 1912, a copy of which was handed to me by the ambassador on the 9th ultimo, in which certain provisions in the Panama Canal act of August 24 last are discussed in their relation to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty of November 18, 1901; and I also inclose a copy of the note addressed to me on July 8, 1912, by Mr. A. Mitchell Innes, His Britannic Majesty's chargé d'affaires, stating the objections which his Government entertained to the legislation relating to the Panama Canal, which was then under discussion in Congress. A copy of the President's proclamation of November 13, 1912, fixing the canal tolls, is also inclosed.

Sir Edward Grey's communication, after setting forth the several grounds upon which the British Government believe the provisions of the act are inconsistent with the stipulations of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, states the readiness of his Government "to submit the question to arbitration if the Government of the United States would prefer to take this course" rather than "to take such steps as would remove the objections to the act which His Majesty's Government have stated." It therefore becomes necessary for this Government to examine these objections in order to ascertain exactly in what respects this act is regarded by the British Government as inconsistent with the provisions of that treaty, and also to explain the views of this Government upon the questions thus presented, and to consider the advisability at this time of submitting any of these questions to arbitration.

It may be stated at the outset that this Government does not agree with the interpretation placed by Sir Edward Grey upon the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, or upon the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, but for reasons which will appear hereinbelow it is not deemed necessary at present to amplify or reiterate the views of this Government upon the meaning of those treaties.

In Sir Edward Grey's communication, after explaining in detail the views taken by his Government as to the proper interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, "so as to indicate the limitations which" His Majesty's Government "consider it imposes upon the freedom of action of the United States," he proceeds to indicate the points in which the canal act infringes what he holds to be Great Britain's treaty rights.

It is obvious from the whole tenor of Sir Edward Grey's communication that in writing it he could not have taken cognizance of the President's proclamation fixing the canal tolls. Indeed, a comparison of the dates of the proclamation and the note, which are dated respectively, November 13 and November 14 last, shows that the proclamation could hardly have been received in London in time for consideration in the note. Throughout his discussion of the subject Sir Edward Grey deals chiefly with the possibilities of what the President might do under the act, which in itself does not prescribe the tolls, but merely authorizes the President to do so; and nowhere does the note indicate that Sir Edward Grey was aware of what the President actually had done in issuing this proclamation. The proclamation, therefore, has entirely changed the situation which is discussed by Sir Edward Grey, and the diplomatic discussion, which his note now makes inevitable, must rest upon the bases as they exist at present and not upon the hypothesis formed by the British Government at the time this note was written.

Sir Edward Grey presents the question of conflict between the act and the treaty in the following language:

"It remains to consider whether the Panama Canal Act in its present form conflicts with the treaty rights to which His Majesty's Government maintain they are entitled.

"Under section 5 of the act the President is given, within certain defined limits, the right to fix the tolls, but no tolls are to be levied upon ships engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States, and the tolls, when based upon net registered tonnage for ships of commerce, are not to exceed $1.25 per net registered ton, nor be less, *other than for vessels of the United States and its citizens*, than the estimated proportionate cost of the actual maintenance and operation of the canal. There is also an exception for the exemptions granted by article 19 of the convention with Panama of 1903.

"The effect of these provisions is that vessels engaged in the coastwise trade will contribute nothing to the upkeep of the canal. Similarly vessels belonging to the Government of the Republic of Panama will, in pursuance of the treaty of 1903, contribute nothing to the upkeep of the canal. Again, in the cases where tolls are levied, the tolls in the case of ships belonging to the United States and its citizens may be fixed at a lower rate than in the case of foreign ships and may be less than the estimated proportionate cost of the actual maintenance and operation of the canal.

"These provisions (1) clearly conflict with the rule embodied in the principle established in article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of equal treatment for British and United States ships, and (2) would enable tolls to be fixed which would not be just and equitable, and would therefore not comply with rule 1 of article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty."

From this it appears that three objections are made to the provisions of the act; first, that no tolls are to be levied upon ships engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States; second, that a discretion appears to be given to the President to discriminate in fixing tolls in favor of ships belonging to the United States and its citizens as against foreign ships; and third, that an exemption has been given to the vessels of the Republic of Panama under article 19 of the convention with Panama of 1903.

Considered in the reverse order of their statement, the third objection, coming at this time, is a great and complete surprise to this Government. The exemption under that article applies only to the Government vessels of Panama, and was part of the agreement with Panama under which the canal was built. The convention containing the exemption was ratified in 1904, and since then to the present time no claim has been made by Great Britain that it conflicted with British rights. The United States has always asserted the principle that the status of the countries immediately concerned by reason of their political relation to the territory in which the canal was to be constructed was different from that of all other countries. The Hay-Herran treaty with Colombia of 1903 also provided that the war vessels of that country were to be given free passage. It has always been supposed by this Government that Great Britain recognized the propriety of the exemptions made in both of those treaties. It is not believed, therefore, that the British Government intend to be understood as proposing arbitration upon the question of whether or not this provision of the act, which in accordance with our treaty with Panama exempts from tolls the Government vessels of Panama, is in conflict with the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

Considering the second objection based upon the discretion thought to be conferred upon the President to discriminate in favor of ships belonging to the United States and its citizens, it is sufficient, in view of the fact that the President's proclamation fixing the tolls was silent on the subject, to quote the language used by the President in the memorandum attached to the act at the time of signature, in which he says:

"It is not therefore necessary to discuss the policy of such discrimination until the question may arise in the exercise of the President's discretion."

On this point no question has as yet arisen which, in the words of the existing arbitration treaty between the United States and Great Britain, "it may not have been possible to settle by diplomacy," and until then any suggestion of arbitration may well be regarded as premature.

It is not believed, however, that in the objection now under consideration Great Britain intends to question the right of the United States to exempt from the payment of tolls its vessels of war and other vessels engaged in the service of this Government. Great Britain does not challenge the right of the United States to protect the canal. United States vessels of war and those employed in Government service are a part of our protective system. By the Hay-Pauncefote treaty we assume the sole responsibility for its neutralization. It is inconceivable that this Government should be required to pay canal tolls for the vessels used for protecting the canal, which we alone must protect. The movement of United States vessels in executing governmental policies of protection are not susceptible of explanation or differentiation. The United States could not be called upon to explain what relation the movement of a particular vessel through the canal has to its protection. The British objection, therefore, is understood as having no relation to the use of the canal by vessels in the service of the United States Government.

Regarding the first objection, the question presented by Sir Edward Grey arises solely upon the exemption in the canal act of vessels engaged in our coastwise trade.

On this point Sir Edward Grey says that "His Majesty's Government do not question the right of the United States to grant subsidies to United States shipping generally, or to any particular branches of that shipping," and it is admitted in his note that the exemption of certain classes of ships would be "a form of subsidy" to those vessels; but it appears from the note that His Majesty's Government would regard that form of subsidy as objectionable under the treaty if the effect of such subsidy would be "to impose upon British or other foreign shipping an unfair share of the burden of the upkeep of the canal, or to create a discrimination in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise to prejudice rights secured to British shipping by this treaty."

It is not contended by Great Britain that equality of treatment has any reference to British participation in the coastwise trade of the United States, which, in accordance with general usage, is reserved to American ships. The objection is only to such exemption of that trade from toll payments as may adversely affect British rights to equal treatment in the payment of tolls or to just and equitable tolls. It will be helpful here to recall that we are now only engaged in considering (quoting from Sir Edward Grey's note) "whether the Panama Canal act in its present form conflicts with the treaty rights to which His Majesty's Government maintain they are entitled," concerning which he concludes:

"*These provisions* (1) clearly conflict with the rule embodied in the principle established in article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of equal treatment for British and United States ships, and (2) *would enable* tolls to be fixed which would not be just and equitable, and would therefore not comply with rule 1 of article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty."

On the first of these points the objection of the British Government to the exemption of vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States is stated as follows:

* * * "The exemption will, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, be a violation of the equal treatment secured by the treaty, as it will put the 'coastwise trade' in a preferential position as regards other shipping. Coastwise trade can not be circumscribed so completely that benefits conferred upon it will not affect vessels engaged in the foreign trade. To take an example, if cargo intended for a United States port beyond the canal, either from east or west, and shipped on board a foreign ship could be sent to its destination more cheaply, through the operation of proposed exemption, by being landed at a United States port before reaching the canal, and then sent on as coastwise trade, shippers would benefit by adopting this course in preference to sending the goods direct to their destination through the canal on board the foreign ship."

This objection must be read in connection with the views expressed by the British Government while this act was pending in Congress, which were stated in the note of July 8, 1912, on the subject from Mr. Innes, as follows:

"As to the proposal that exemption shall be given to vessels engaged in the coastwise trade, a more difficult question arises. If the trade should be so regulated as to make it certain that only bona fide coastwise traffic, which is reserved for United States vessels, would be benefited by this exemption, it may be that no objection could be taken."

This statement may fairly be taken as an admission that this Government may exempt its vessels engaged in the coastwise trade from the payment of tolls, provided such exemption be restricted to bona fide coastwise traffic. As to this it is sufficient to say that obviously the United States is not to be denied the power to remit tolls to its own coastwise trade because of a suspicion or possibility that the regulations yet to be framed may not restrict this exemption to bona fide coastwise traffic.

The answer to this objection, therefore, apart from any question of treaty interpretation, is that it rests on conjecture as to what may happen rather than upon proved facts, and does not present a question requiring submission to arbitration, as it has not as yet passed beyond the stage where it can be profitably dealt with by diplomatic discussion. It will be remembered that only questions which it may not be possible to settle by diplomacy are required by our arbitration treaty to be referred to arbitration.

On this same point Sir Edward Grey urges another objection to the exemption of coastwise vessels as follows:

"Again, although certain privileges are granted to vessels engaged in an exclusively coastwise trade, His Majesty's Government are given to understand that there is nothing in the laws of the United States which prevents any United States ship from combining foreign commerce with coastwise trade, and consequently from entering into direct competition with foreign vessels while remaining 'prima facie' entitled to the privilege of free passage through the canal. Moreover, any restriction which may be deemed to be now applicable might at any time be removed by legislation or even perhaps by mere changes in the regulations."

This objection also raises a question which, apart from treaty interpretation, depends upon future conditions and facts not yet ascertained, and for the same reasons as are above stated its submission to arbitration at this time would be premature.

The second point of Sir Edward Grey's objection to the exemption of vessels engaged in coastwise trade remains to be considered. On this point he says that the provisions of the act "would enable tolls to be fixed which would not be just and equitable, and would therefore not comply with rule 1 of article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty."

It will be observed that this statement evidently was framed without knowledge of the fact that the President's proclamation fixing the tolls had issued. It is not claimed in the note that the tolls actually fixed are not "just and equitable" or even that all vessels passing through the canal were not taken into account in fixing the amount of the tolls, but only that either or both contingencies are possible.

If the British contention is correct that the true construction of the treaty requires all traffic to be reckoned in fixing just and equitable tolls, it requires at least an allegation that the tolls as fixed are not just and equitable and that all traffic has not been reckoned in fixing them before the United States can be called upon to prove that this course was not followed, even assuming that the burden of proof would rest with the United States in any event, which is open to question. This Government welcomes the opportunity, however, of informing the British Government that the tolls fixed in the President's proclamation are based upon the computations set forth in the report of Prof. Emory R. Johnson, a copy of which is forwarded herewith for delivery to Sir Edward Grey, and that the tolls which would be paid by American coastwise vessels, but for the exemption contained in the act, were computed in determining the rate fixed by the President.

By reference to page 208 of Prof. Johnson's report, it will be seen that the estimated net tonnage of shipping using the canal in 1915 is as follows:

	Tons.
Coast to coast American shipping	1,000,000
American shipping carrying foreign commerce of the United States	720,000
Foreign shipping carrying commerce of the United States and foreign countries	8,780,000

It was on this estimate that tolls fixed in the President's proclamation were based.

Sir Edward Grey says, "This rule (1 of article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty) also provides that the tolls should be 'just and equitable.'" The purpose of these words, he adds, "was to limit the tolls to the amount representing the fair value of the services rendered, i. e., to the interest on the capital expended and the cost of the operation and maintenance of the canal." If, as a matter of fact, the tolls now fixed (of which he seems unaware) do not exceed this requirement, and as heretofore pointed out there is no claim that they do, it is not apparent under Sir Edward Grey's contention how Great Britain could be receiving unjust and inequitable treatment if the United States favors its coastwise vessels by not collecting their share of the tolls necessary to meet the requirement. There is a very clear distinction between an omission to "take into account" the coastwise tolls in order to determine a just and equitable rate, which is as far as this objection goes, and the remission of such tolls, or their collection coupled with their repayment in the form of a subsidy.

The exemption of the coastwise trade from tolls, or the refunding of tolls collected from the coastwise trade, is merely a subsidy granted by the United States to that trade, and the loss resulting from not collecting, or from refunding those tolls, will fall solely upon the United States. In the same way the loss will fall on the United States if the tolls fixed by the President's proclamation on all vessels represent less than the fair value of the service rendered, which must necessarily be the case for many years; and the United States will, therefore, be in the position of subsidizing or siding not merely its own coastwise vessels, but foreign vessels as well.

Apart from the particular objections above considered, it is not understood that Sir Edward Grey questions the right of the United States to subsidize either its coastwise or its foreign shipping, inasmuch as he says that His Majesty's Government do not find "either in the letter or in the spirit of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty any surrender by either of the contracting powers of the right to encourage its shipping or its commerce by such subsidies as it may deem expedient."

To summarize the whole matter: The British objections are, in the first place, about the canal act only; but the canal act does not fix the

tolls. They ignore the President's proclamation fixing the tolls, which puts at rest practically all of the suppositious injustice and inequality which Sir Edward Grey thinks might follow the administration of the act, and concerning which he expresses so many and grave fears. Moreover, the gravamen of the complaint is not that the canal act will actually injure in its operation British shipping or destroy rights claimed for such shipping under the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, but that such injury or destruction may possibly be the effect thereof; and further, and more particularly, Sir Edward Grey complains that the action of Congress in enacting the legislation under discussion foreshadows that Congress or the President may hereafter take some action which might be injurious to British shipping and destructive of its rights under the treaty. Concerning this possible future injury, it is only necessary to say that in the absence of an allegation of actual or certainly impending injury, there appears nothing upon which to base a sound complaint. Concerning the infringement of rights claimed by Great Britain, it may be remarked that it would, of course, be idle to contend that Congress has not the power, or that the President properly authorized by Congress may not have the power to violate the terms of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty in its aspect as a rule of municipal law. Obviously, however, the fact that Congress has the power to do something contrary to the welfare of British shipping or that Congress has put or may put into the hands of the President the power to do something which may be contrary to the interests possessed by British shipping affords no just ground for complaint. It is the improper exercise of a power and not its possession which alone can give rise to an international cause of action; or to put it in terms of municipal law, it is not the possession of the power to trespass upon another's property which gives a right of action in trespass, but only the actual exercise of that power in committing the act of trespass itself.

When, and if, complaint is made by Great Britain that the effect of the act and the proclamation together will be to subject British vessels as a matter of fact to inequality of treatment, or to unjust and inequitable tolls in conflict with the terms of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, the question will then be raised as to whether the United States is bound by that treaty both to take into account and to collect tolls from American vessels, and also whether under the obligations of that treaty British vessels are entitled to equality of treatment in all respects with the vessels of the United States. Until these objections rest upon something more substantial than mere possibility, it is not believed that they should be submitted to arbitration. The existence of an arbitration treaty does not create a right of action; it merely provides a means of settlement to be resorted to only when other resources of diplomacy have failed. It is not now deemed necessary, therefore, to enter upon a discussion of the views entertained by Congress and by the President as to the meaning of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty in relation to questions of fact which have not yet arisen, but may possibly arise in the future in connection with the administration of the act under consideration.

It is recognized by this Government that the situation developed by the present discussion may require an examination by Great Britain into the facts above set forth as to the basis upon which the tolls fixed by the President's proclamation have been computed, and also into the regulations and restrictions circumscribing the coastwise trade of the United States, as well as into other facts bearing upon the situation, with the view of determining whether or not, as a matter of fact, under present conditions there is any ground for claiming that the act and proclamation actually subject British vessels to inequality of treatment, or to unjust and inequitable tolls.

If it should be found as a result of such an examination on the part of Great Britain that a difference of opinion exists between the two Governments on any of the important questions of fact involved in this discussion, then a situation will have arisen, which, in the opinion of this Government, could with advantage be dealt with by referring the controversy to a commission of inquiry for examination and report, in the manner provided for in the unratified arbitration treaty of August 3, 1911, between the United States and Great Britain.

The necessity for inquiring into questions of fact in their relation to controversies under diplomatic discussion was contemplated by both parties in negotiating that treaty, which provides for the institution, as occasion arises, of a joint high commission of inquiry, to which, upon the request of either party, might be referred for impartial and conscientious investigation any controversy between them, the commission being authorized upon such reference "to examine into and report upon the particular questions or matters referred to it, for the purpose of facilitating the solution of disputes by elucidating the facts, and to define the issues presented by such questions, and also to include in its report such recommendations and conclusions as may be appropriate."

This proposal might be carried out, should occasion arise for adopting it, either under a special agreement, or under the unratified arbitration treaty above mentioned, if Great Britain is prepared to join in ratifying that treaty, which the United States is prepared to do.

You will take an early opportunity to read this dispatch to Sir Edward Grey; and if he should so desire, you will leave a copy of it with him.

I am, sir, your obedient servant, P. C. KNOX.

[Inclosure 1.]

Chargé d'Affaires Innes to the Secretary of State.

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Kineo, Me., July 8, 1912.

SIR: The attention of His Majesty's Government has been called to the various proposals that have from time to time been made for the purpose of relieving American shipping from the burden of the tolls to be levied on vessels passing through the Panama Canal, and these proposals, together with the arguments that have been used to support them, have been carefully considered with a view to the bearing on them of the provisions of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain of November 18, 1901.

The proposals may be summed up as follows:

(1) To exempt all American shipping from the tolls;
(2) To refund to all American ships the tolls which they may have paid;
(3) To exempt American ships engaged in the coastwise trade; and
(4) To repay the tolls to American ships engaged in the coastwise trade.

The proposal to exempt all American shipping from the payment of the tolls would, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, involve an infraction of the treaty, nor is there, in their opinion, any difference in principle between charging tolls only to refund them and remitting tolls altogether. The result is the same in either case, and the adoption of the alternative method of refunding the tolls in preference to that of remitting them, while perhaps complying with the letter of the treaty, would still contravene its spirit.

It has been argued that a refund of the tolls would merely be equivalent to a subsidy and that there is nothing in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty which limits the right of the United States to subsidize its shipping. It is true that there is nothing in that treaty to prevent the United States from subsidizing its shipping and if it granted a subsidy His Majesty's Government could not be in a position to complain. But there is a great distinction between a general subsidy, either to shipping at large or to shipping engaged in any given trade, and a subsidy calculated particularly with reference to the amount of user of the canal by the subsidized lines or vessels. If such a subsidy were granted, it would not, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, be in accordance with the obligations of the treaty.

As to the proposal that exemption shall be given to vessels engaged in the coastwise trade, a more difficult question arises. If the trade should be so regulated as to make it certain that only bona-fide coastwise traffic which is reserved for United States vessels would be benefited by this exemption it may be that no objection could be taken. But it appears to my government that it would be impossible to frame regulations which would prevent the exemption from resulting, in fact, in a preference to United States shipping and consequently in an infraction of the treaty.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir,
Your most obedient, humble servant,

A. MITCHELL INNES.

[Inclosure 2.]

The secretary of state for foreign affairs of Great Britain to Ambassador Bryce.

[Handed to the Secretary of State by the British Ambassador Dec. 9, 1912.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *November 14, 1912.*

SIR: Your excellency will remember that on the 8th July, 1912, Mr. Mitchell Innes communicated to the Secretary of State the objections which His Majesty's Government entertained to the legislation relating to the Panama Canal, which was then under discussion in Congress, and that on the 27th August, after the passing of the Panama Canal Act and the issue of the President's memorandum on signing it, he informed Mr. Knox that when His Majesty's Government had had time to consider fully the act and the memorandum a further communication would be made to him.

Since that date the text of the act and the memorandum of the President have received attentive consideration at the hands of His Majesty's Government. A careful study of the President's memorandum has convinced me that he has not fully appreciated the British point of view and has misunderstood Mr. Mitchell Innes's note of the 8th July. The President argues upon the assumption that it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to place upon the Hay-Pauncefote treaty an interpretation which would prevent the United States from granting subsidies to their own shipping passing through the canal, and which would place them at a disadvantage as compared with other nations. This is not the case. His Majesty's Government regard equality of all nations as the fundamental principle underlying the treaty of 1901 in the same way that it was the basis of the Suez Canal convention of 1888, and they do not seek to deprive the United States of any liberty which is open either to themselves or to any other nation; nor do they find either in the letter or in the spirit of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty any surrender by either of the contracting powers of the right to encourage its shipping or its commerce by such subsidies as it may deem expedient.

The terms of the President's memorandum render it essential that I should explain in some detail the view which His Majesty's Government take as to what is the proper interpretation of the treaty, so as to indicate the limitations which they consider it imposes upon the freedom of action of the United States, and the points in which the Panama Canal Act as enacted infringes what His Majesty's Government hold to be their treaty rights.

The Hay-Pauncefote treaty does not stand alone; it was the corollary of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of 1850. The earlier treaty was, no doubt, superseded by it, but its general principle, as embodied in article 8, was not to be impaired. The object of the later treaty is clearly shown by its preamble. It was "to facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by whatever route may be deemed expedient, and to that end to remove any obstruction which may arise out of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty to the construction of such canal under the auspices of the Government of the United States, without impairing the general principle of neutralization established in article 8 of that convention." It was upon that footing, and upon that footing alone, that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was superseded.

Under that treaty both parties had agreed not to obtain any exclusive control over the contemplated ship canal, but the importance of the great project was fully recognized, and therefore the construction of the canal by others was to be encouraged, and the canal when completed was to enjoy a special measure of protection on the part of both the contracting parties.

Under article 8 the two powers declared their desire in entering into the convention not only to accomplish a particular object but also to establish a general principle, and therefore agreed to extend their protection to any practicable transisthmian communication, either by canal or railway, and either at Tehuantepec or Panama, provided that those who constructed it should impose no other charges or conditions of traffic than the two Governments should consider just and equitable, and that the canal or railway, "being open to the subjects and citizens of Great Britain and the United States on equal terms, should also be open to the subjects of any other State which was willing to join in the guaranty of joint protection."

So long as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was in force, therefore, the position was that both parties to it had given up their power of independent action, because neither was at liberty itself to construct the canal, and thereby obtain the exclusive control which such construction would confer. It is also clear that if the canal had been constructed while the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was in force it would have been open, in accordance with article 8, to British and United States ships on equal terms, and equally clear, therefore, that the tolls leviable on such ships would have been identical.

The purpose of the United States in negotiating the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was to recover their freedom of action and obtain the right, which they had surrendered, to construct the canal themselves. This is expressed in the preamble to the treaty, but the complete liberty of action consequential upon such construction was to be limited by the

maintenance of the general principle embodied in article 8 of the earlier treaty. That principle, as shown above, was one of equal treatment for both British and United States ships, and a study of the language of article 8 shows that the word "neutralization," in the preamble of the later treaty, is not there confined to belligerent operations but refers to the system of equal rights for which article 8 provides.

If the wording of the article is examined, it will be seen that there is no mention of belligerent action in it at all. Joint protection and equal treatment are the only matters alluded to, and it is to one or both of these that neutralization must refer. Such joint protection has always been understood by His Majesty's Government to be one of the results of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of which the United States was most anxious to get rid, and they can scarcely, therefore, believe that it was such joint protection that the United States were willing to keep alive and to which they referred in the preamble of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. It certainly was not the intention of His Majesty's Government that any responsibility for the protection of the canal should attach to them in the future. Neutralization must therefore refer to the system of equal rights.

It thus appears from the preamble that the intention of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was that the United States was to recover the right to construct the transisthmian canal upon the terms that when constructed the canal was to be open to British and United States ships on equal terms.

The situation created was in fact identical with that resulting from the boundary-waters treaty of 1909 between Great Britain and the United States, which provided as follows:

"The high contracting parties agree that the navigation of all navigable boundary waters shall forever continue free and open for the purposes of commerce to the inhabitants and to the ships, vessels, and boats of both countries equally, subject, however, to any laws and regulations of either country, within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation, and applying equally and without discrimination to the inhabitants, ships, vessels, and boats of both countries.

"It is further agreed that so long as this treaty shall remain in force this same right of navigation shall extend to the waters of Lake Michigan and to all canals connecting boundary waters and now existing or which may hereafter be constructed on either side of the line. Either of the high contracting parties may adopt rules and regulations governing the use of such canals within its own territory and may charge tolls for the use thereof; but all such rules and regulations and all tolls charged shall apply alike to the subjects or citizens of the high contracting parties, and they * * * shall be placed on terms of equality in the use thereof."

A similar provision, though more restricted in its scope, appears in article 27 of the treaty of Washington, 1871, and Your Excellency will no doubt remember how strenuously the United States protested, as a violation of equal rights, against a system which Canada had introduced of a rebate of a large portion of the tolls on certain freight on the Welland Canal, provided that such freight was taken as far as Montreal, and how in the face of that protest the system was abandoned.

The principle of equality is repeated in article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, which provides that the United States adopts, as the basis of the neutralization of the canal, certain rules, substantially as embodied in the Suez Canal convention. The first of these rules is that the canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and war of all nations observing the rules on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation.

The word "neutralization" is no doubt used in article 3 in the same sense as in the preamble, and implies subjection to the system of equal rights. The effect of the first rule is therefore to establish the provision, foreshadowed by the preamble and consequent on the maintenance of the principle of article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, that the canal is to be open to British and United States vessels on terms of entire equality. It also embodies a promise on the part of the United States that the ships of all nations which observe the rules will be admitted to similar privileges.

The President in his memorandum treats the words "all nations" as excluding the United States. He argues that, as the United States is constructing the canal at its own cost on territory ceded to it, it has, unless it has restricted itself, an absolute right of ownership and control, including the right to allow its own commerce the use of the canal upon such terms as it sees fit, and that the only question is whether it has by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty deprived itself of the exercise of the right to pass its own commerce free or remit tolls collected for the use of the canal. He argues that article 3 of the treaty is nothing more than a declaration of policy by the United States that the canal shall be neutral and all nations treated alike and no discrimination made against any one of them observing the rules adopted by the United States. "In other words, it was a conditional favored-nation treatment, the measure of which, in the absence of express stipulations to that effect, is not what the country gives to its own nationals, but the treatment it extends to other nations."

For the reasons they have given above His Majesty's Government believe this statement of the case to be wholly at variance with the real position. They consider that by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty the United States had surrendered the right to construct the canal, and that by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty they recovered that right upon the footing that the canal should be open to British and United States vessels upon terms of equal treatment.

The case can not be put more clearly than it was put by Mr. Hay himself, who, as Secretary of State, negotiated the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, in the full account of the negotiations which he sent to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations (see S. Doc. 746, 61st Cong., 3d sess.):

"These rules are adopted in the treaty with Great Britain as a consideration for getting rid of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty."

If the rules set out in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty secure to Great Britain no more than most-favored-nation treatment, the value of the consideration given for superseding the Clayton-Bulwer treaty is not apparent to His Majesty's Government. Nor is it easy to see in what way the principle of article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which provides for equal treatment of British and United States ships, has been maintained.

I notice that in the course of the debate in the Senate on the Panama Canal bill the argument was used by one of the speakers that the third, fourth, and fifth rules embodied in article 3 of the treaty show that the words "all nations" can not include the United States, because if the United States were at war it is impossible to believe that it could be intended to be debarred by the treaty from using its own territory for revictualling its warships or landing troops.

The same point may strike others who read nothing but the text of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty itself, and I think it is therefore worth while that I should briefly show that this argument is not well founded.

The Hay-Pauncefote treaty of 1901 aimed at carrying out the principle of the neutralization of the Panama Canal by subjecting it to the same régime as the Suez Canal. Rules 3, 4, and 5 of article 3 of the treaty are taken almost textually from articles 4, 5, and 6 of the Suez Canal convention of 1888. At the date of the signature of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty the territory on which the Isthmian Canal was to be constructed did not belong to the United States, consequently there was no need to insert in the draft treaty provisions corresponding to those in articles 10 and 13 of the Suez Canal convention, which preserve the sovereign rights of Turkey and of Egypt, and stipulate that articles 4 and 5 shall not affect the right of Turkey, as the local sovereign, and of Egypt, within the measure of her automony, to take such measures as may be necessary for securing the defense of Egypt and the maintenance of public order, and, in the case of Turkey, the defense of her possessions on the Red Sea.

Now that the United States has become the practical sovereign of the canal, His Majesty's Government do not question its title to exercise belligerent rights for its protection.

For these reasons His Majesty's Government maintain that the words "all nations" in rule 1 of article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty include the United States, and that in consequence British vessels using the canal are entitled to equal treatment with those of the United States, and that the same tolls are chargeable on each.

This rule also provides that the tolls should be "just and equitable." The purpose of these words was to limit the tolls to the amount representing the fair value of the services rendered, i. e., to the interest on the capital expended and the cost of the operation and maintenance of the canal. Unless the whole volume of shipping which passes through the canal, and which all benefits equally by its services, is taken into account, there are no means of determining whether the tolls chargeable upon a vessel represent that vessel's fair proportion of the current expenditure properly chargeable against the canal—that is to say, interest on the capital expended in construction and the cost of operation and maintenance. If any classes of vessels are exempted from tolls in such a way that no receipts from such ships are taken into account in the income of the canal, there is no guaranty that the vessels upon which tolls are being levied are not being made to bear more than their fair share of the upkeep. Apart altogether, therefore, from the provision in rule 1 about equality of treatment for all nations, the stipulation that the tolls shall be just and equitable, when rightly understood, entitles His Majesty's Government to demand, on behalf of British shipping, that all vessels passing through the canal, whatever their flag or their character, shall be taken into account in fixing the amount of the tolls.

The result is that any system by which particular vessels or classes of vessels were exempted from the payment of tolls would not comply with the stipulations of the treaty that the canal should be open on terms of entire equality and that the charges should be just and equitable.

The President, in his memorandum, argues that if there is no difference, as stated in Mr. Mitchell Innes's note of the 8th July, between charging tolls only to refund them and remitting tolls altogether, the effect is to prevent the United States from aiding its own commerce in the way that all other nations may freely do. This is not so. His Majesty's Government have no desire to place upon the Hay-Pauncefote treaty an interpretation which would impose upon the United States any restriction from which other nations are free, or reserve to such other nation any privilege which is denied to the United States. Equal treatment, as specified in the treaty, is all they claim.

His Majesty's Government do not question the right of the United States to grant subsidies to United States shipping generally, or to any particular branches of that shipping; but it does not follow, therefore, that the United States may not be debarred by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty from granting a subsidy to certain shipping in a particular way, if the effect of the method chosen for granting such subsidy would be to impose upon British or other foreign shipping an unfair share of the burden of the upkeep of the canal or to create a discrimination in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise to prejudice rights secured to British shipping by this treaty.

If the United States exempt certain classes of ships from the payment of tolls, the result would be a form of subsidy to those vessels which His Majesty's Government consider the United States are debarred by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty from making.

It remains to consider whether the Panama Canal act, in its present form, conflicts with the treaty rights to which His Majesty's Government maintain they are entitled.

Under section 5 of the act the President is given, within certain defined limits, the right to fix the tolls, but no tolls are to be levied upon ships engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States, and the tolls, when based upon net registered tonnage for ships of commerce, are not to exceed $1.25 per net registered ton, nor be less, *other than for vessels of the United States and its citizens*, than the estimated proportionate cost of the actual maintenance and operation of the canal. There is also an exception for the exemptions granted by article 19 of the convention with Panama of 1903.

The effect of these provisions is that vessels engaged in the coastwise trade will contribute nothing to the upkeep of the canal. Similarly vessels belonging to the Government of the Republic of Panama will, in pursuance of the treaty of 1903, contribute nothing to the upkeep of the canal. Again, in the cases where tolls are levied, the tolls in the case of ships belonging to the United States and its citizens may be fixed at a lower rate than in the case of foreign ships, and may be less than the estimated proportionate cost of the actual maintenance and operation of the canal.

These provisions (1) clearly conflict with the rule embodied in the principle established in article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of equal treatment for British and United States ships, and (2) would enable tolls to be fixed which would not be just and equitable, and would therefore not comply with rule 1 of article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

It has been argued that as the coastwse trade of the United States is confined by law to United States vessels, the exemption of vessels engaged in it from the payment of tolls can not injure the interests of foreign nations. It is clear, however, that the interests of foreign nations will be seriously injured in two material respects.

In the first place, the exemption will result in the cost of the working of the canal being borne wholly by foreign-going vessels, and on such vessels, therefore, will fall the whole burden of raising the revenue necessary to cover the cost of working and maintaining the canal. The possibility, therefore, of fixing the toll on such vessels at a lower figure

than $1.25 per ton, or of reducing the rate below that figure at some future time, will be considerably lessened by the exemption.

In the second place, the exemption will, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, be a violation of the equal treatment secured by the treaty, as it will put the "coastwise trade" in a preferential position as regards other shipping. Coastwise trade can not be circumscribed so completely that benefits conferred upon it will not affect vessels engaged in the foreign trade. To take an example, if cargo intended for an United States port beyond the canal, either from east or west, and shipped on board a foreign ship could be sent to its destination more cheaply, through the operation of the proposed exemption, by being landed at an United States port before reaching the canal, and then sent on as coastwise trade, shippers would benefit by adopting this course in preference to sending the goods direct to their destination through the canal on board the foreign ship.

Again, although certain privileges are granted to vessels engaged in an exclusively coastwise trade, His Majesty's Government are given to understand that there is nothing in the laws of the United States which prevents any United States ship from combining foreign commerce with coastwise trade, and consequently from entering into direct competition with foreign vessels while remaining "prima facie" entitled to the privilege of free passage through the canal. Moreover any restriction which may be deemed to be now applicable might at any time be removed by legislation or even perhaps by mere changes in the regulations.

In these and in other ways foreign shipping would be seriously handicapped, and any adverse result would fall more severely on British shipping than on that of any other nationality.

The volume of British shipping which will use the canal will in all probability be very large. Its opening will shorten by many thousands of miles the waterways between England and other portions of the British Empire, and if on the one hand it is important to the United States to encourage its mercantile marine and establish competition between coastwise traffic and transcontinental railways, it is equally important to Great Britain to secure to its shipping that just and impartial treatment to which it is entitled by treaty, and in return for a promise of which it surrendered the rights which it held under the earlier convention.

There are other provisions of the Panama Canal act to which the attention of His Majesty's Government has been directed. These are contained in section 11, part of which enacts that a railway company, subject to the interstate commerce act 1887, is prohibited from having any interest in vessels operated through the canal with which such railways may compete, and another part provides that a vessel permitted to engage in the coastwise or foreign trade of the United States is not allowed to use the canal if its owner is guilty of violating the Sherman Antitrust Act.

His Majesty's Government do not read this section of the act as applying to, or affecting, British ships, and they therefore do not feel justified in making any observations upon it. They assume that it applies only to vessels flying the flag of the United States, and that it is aimed at practices which concern only the internal trade of the United States. If this view is mistaken and the provisions are intended to apply under any circumstances to British ships, they must reserve their right to examine the matter further and to raise such contentions as may seem justified.

His Majesty's Government feel no doubt as to the correctness of their interpretation of the treaties of 1850 and 1901 and as to the validity of the rights they claim under them for British shipping; nor does there seem to them to be any room for doubt that the provisions of the Panama Canal act as to tolls conflict with the rights secured to their shipping by the treaty. But they recognize that many persons of note in the United States, whose opinions are entitled to great weight, hold that the provisions of the act do not infringe the conventional obligations by which the United States is bound, and under these circumstances they desire to state their perfect readiness to submit the question to arbitration if the Government of the United States would prefer to take this course. A reference to arbitration would be rendered unnecessary if the Government of the United States should be prepared to take such steps as would remove the objections to the act which His Majesty's Government have stated.

Knowing as I do full well the interest which this great undertaking has aroused in the New World and the emotion with which its opening is looked forward to by United States citizens, I wish to add before closing this dispatch that it is only with great reluctance that His Majesty's Government have felt bound to raise objection on the ground of treaty rights to the provisions of the act. Animated by an earnest desire to avoid points which might in any way prove embarrassing to the United States, His Majesty's Government have confined their objections within the narrowest possible limits, and have recognized in the fullest manner the right of the United States to control the canal. They feel convinced that they may look with confidence to the Government of the United States to insure that in promoting the interests of United States shipping nothing will be done to impair the safeguards guaranteed to British shipping by treaty.

Your excellency will read this dispatch to the Secretary of State and will leave with him a copy.

I am, etc.,

E. GREY.

[Inclosure 3.]

[Panama Canal toll rates.]

A proclamation by the President of the United States of America.

I, William Howard Taft, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the power and authority vested in me by the act of Congress approved August 24, 1912, to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone, do hereby prescribe and proclaim the following rates of toll to be paid by vessels using the Panama Canal:

"1. On merchant vessels carrying passengers or cargo, $1.20 per net vessel ton—each 100 cubic feet—of actual earning capacity.

"2. On vessels in ballast without passengers or cargo, 40 per cent less than the rate of tolls for vessels with passengers or cargo.

"3. Upon naval vessels other than transports, colliers, hospital ships, and supply ships, 50 cents per displacement ton.

"4. Upon army and navy transports, colliers, hospital ships, and supply ships, $1.20 per net ton, the vessels to be measured by the same rules as are employed in determining the net tonnage of merchant vessels."

The Secretary of War will prepare and prescribe such rules for the measurement of vessels and such regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry this proclamation into full force and effect.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 13th day of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twelve and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and thirty-seventh.

[SEAL.] WM. H. TAFT.

By the President:

P. C. KNOX, *Secretary of State.*

[House Document No. 1313, Sixty-second Congress, third session.]

ARTICLE PREPARED BY THE LAW OFFICER OF THE ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION, MR. FEUILLE, REGARDING TOLLS ON THE PANAMA CANAL.

The provision of the Panama Canal act, recently enacted by Congress, which discriminates in favor of American coastwise shipping and the vessels of the Republic of Panama, has brought forth a protest from the British Government and unfavorable comment from the press at home and abroad.

It is claimed that the United States have violated treaty obligations in exempting American ships from toll charges at the canal; that, in consenting to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, Great Britain surrendered valuable rights held by her under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty; that without the Hay-Pauncefote treaty the United States could not build and maintain the canal alone, and that the surrender of her rights under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty constituted a valid consideration entitling Great Britain to equal treatment for her ships with those of the United States at the canal. The question is an historical one to some extent. It might be well to refer briefly to the history of the subject.

In 1850 the United States and Great Britain entered into an agreement, commonly known as the Clayton-Bulwer convention, to promote the building of a canal by the Nicaraguan route, and, when constructed, to jointly protect it against unjust detention, confiscation, seizure, or any violation whatsoever. The contracting parties also agreed that neither would erect fortifications at the canal or its vicinity, and that neither would directly or indirectly obtain the exclusive benefit of the canal or assume or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America. The Mosquito coast, over which Great Britain was then attempting to exercise jurisdiction, is situated in the vicinity of the Atlantic entrance of the proposed Nicaraguan canal.

The United States had two purposes in view in making the convention—to stop Great Britain's encroachment upon Central American territory and to remove the obstruction at the Atlantic entrance of the canal resulting from the English assumption of jurisdiction over the Mosquito coast.

One of the important provisions of the treaty was that prohibiting any discrimination in the use of the canal in favor of either of the contracting parties as against the other. The point is covered in the following explicit language:

"The Governments of the United States and Great Britain hereby declare that neither the one nor the other will ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over the ship canal. * * * nor will the United States or Great Britain take advantage of any intimacy, or use any alliance, connection, or influence that either may possess with any State or Government through whose territory the said canal may pass for the purpose of acquiring or holding, directly or indirectly, for the citizens or subjects of the one any rights or advantages in regard to commerce or navigation through the said canal which shall not be offered on the same terms to the citizens or subjects of the other."

There are other provisions to the same effect in the treaty. It is significant that the explicit language of the Clayton-Bulwer convention in respect to equality of treatment of the contracting parties was not employed in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. This will be discussed later on in this paper.

The convention applied to the Nicaraguan route and to Central America and not to the Panama route or South America, of which the Isthmus of Panama forms a part.

It is true that article 8 of the treaty did obligate the parties to extend their protection by treaty stipulations to the Panama route or the Tehuantepec route, but no such treaty stipulations were ever effected.

Inasmuch as article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer convention is referred to in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, it might be well to quote it here at length:

"ART. 8. The Governments of the United States and Great Britain having not only desired, in entering into this convention, to accomplish a particular object, but also to establish a general principle, they hereby agree to extend their protection, by treaty stipulations, to any other practicable communications, whether by canal or railway, across the Isthmus which connects North and South America, and especially to the interoceanic communications, should the same prove to be practicable, whether by canal or railway, which are now proposed to be established by the way of Tehuantepec or Panama. In granting, however, their joint protection to any such canals or railways as are by this article specified, it is always understood by the United States and Great Britain that the parties constructing or owning the same shall impose no other charges or conditions of traffic thereupon than the aforesaid Governments shall approve of as just and equitable; and that the same canals or railways, being open to the citizens and subjects of the United States and Great Britain on equal terms, shall also be open on like terms to the citizens and subjects of every other State which is willing to grant thereto such protection as the United States and Great Britain engage to afford."

When the Clayton-Bulwer convention was made the United States was under treaty obligations with New Granada, now Colombia, to guarantee positively and efficaciously to that Government the perfect neutrality of the Isthmus of Panama, with the view that the free transit from one to the other sea might not be interrupted or embarrassed while the treaty existed, and in consequence the United States also guaranteed in the same manner the rights of sovereignty and property which New Granada possessed over said territory. In other words, the United States was exercising a protectorate over the Isthmus of Panama in 1850, when the Clayton-Bulwer convention was made. In return for the protection afforded the Government of New Granada, the United States were to enjoy all the exemptions, privileges, and immunities concerning commerce and navigation which then or thereafter might be enjoyed by Granadian citizens, their vessels, and merchandise; and this equality of favors was to extend to the passengers, correspondence, and merchandise of the United States in their transit across the said territory from one sea to the other upon any means of communication established or to be established.

The Clayton-Bulwer convention did not impair the treaty between the United States and New Granada. Doubtless the existence of the latter

treaty caused article 8 to be inserted in the Clayton-Bulwer convention, so that by further treaty stipulations that convention could be made extensive to Panama with the consent of New Granada. Without a material modification of the treaty with the latter country, the Clayton-Bulwer convention could not have been applied to Panama.

However, no treaty stipulations for the extension of the Clayton-Bulwer convention to the Panama Canal were ever effected, and therefore that convention only applied to the Nicaraguan route and Central America.

The Clayton-Bulwer convention remained in existence for 51 years, that is to say, from 1850 to 1901, when it was superseded by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and in all that time nothing of consequence was done by Great Britain to promote the construction of the canal. Hence, the claim that the Clayton-Bulwer convention had become obsolete has some merit.

No one familiar with the trend of public opinion in the United States but knows that the American people had concluded to build the canal independently of any other nation when the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was made, and had not that treaty been entered into there is no doubt that the moribund convention of 1850 would have been abrogated by our Government in response to popular demand.

The Hay-Pauncefote treaty, made in 1901, did not affect the treaty made between the United States and New Granada, or Colombia, as it is now called, respecting the Isthmus of Panama. Hence, the United States, without interruption, has been under treaty obligations since 1846 to protect the Panama route and to maintain the neutrality of transit over the Isthmus. Neither the Clayton-Bulwer convention nor the Hay-Pauncefote treaty relieved the United States of the burden; and the preferential treatment accorded to the commerce of the United States across the Isthmus of Panama, in compensation for that burden, was not diminished or impaired by either of the conventions between England and the United States above mentioned. The right held by the United States under the Colombian treaty was equivalent to an easement over the Isthmus of Panama, and this easement ripened into a fee simple title when the treaty with Panama was made in 1903. Whence comes England's right to claim equal treatment with the United States at the Isthmus? She did not get it under the Clayton-Bulwer convention, nor by virtue of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. The treaty between the United States and Panama added nothing to England's rights under the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. The Clayton-Bulwer convention and the Hay-Pauncefote treaty left the status at the Isthmus unchanged under which the United States held special commercial privileges over that territory. That the United States are now the owners of the territory, instead of being the holders of an easement, can not change the status. Hence the United States now have rights, commercial and otherwise, at the Isthmus superior to those of England, as they have had since 1846.

It is claimed by Great Britain that the consideration for superseding the Clayton-Bulwer convention was to secure equality of treatment for her ships with those of the United States at the canal. There is no such consideration expressed in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty nor in the correspondence between the two Governments leading to the making of that treaty; nor does such a consideration arise by implication from a correct reading of the instrument. But a fair construction of it would permit of the suggestion that England's prime motive was to obtain the use of a shorter route to the Pacific through a canal built without cost to her and the neutrality of which was to be maintained by the United States singly and alone. If Great Britain's contentions were correct, the benefit to the United States from the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer convention would not be apparent. The English contention means that the United States renounced all benefits under the Clayton-Bulwer convention and yet retained the burdens and obligations of that instrument, not only in respect to England, but the other nations of the world as well, although they were not parties to the convention; and these burdens must be assumed in regard to a canal over which the Clayton-Bulwer convention could not have been extended without further treaty stipulations with New Granada as a party. Surely the burden is upon the party asserting such a claim to establish it by satisfactory evidence beyond doubt.

If the claim of Great Britain is conceded, that she surrendered certain rights in respect to the Nicaraguan Canal when she consented to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer convention, she in turn was relieved of the joint obligation to promote the building of the canal and to protect it and maintain its neutrality when built. It is fair to assume that the latter compensated for the former. Be that as it may, Great Britain agreed to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and that treaty superseded the Clayton-Bulwer convention.

But Great Britain will receive other considerations of incalculable value to her for agreeing to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer convention. Her tonnage in steam and sailing vessels is greater than that of the other maritime nations combined. It is not unfair to Great Britain to say that the relative advantage to come to her from the opening of the canal will be in like proportion; and her great superiority over the other nations in tonnage will give here a most favored position in the trade with the west coast of this hemisphere.

She has great possessions in Asia and Australia and other parts of Oceania; the Panama Canal will give her another highway to reach them.

The benefits to come to her from the canal will not stop here. We know that British America is larger than the United States, excluding Alaska, and British Columbia in the western part of Canada contains vast lumber regions and immense wheat fields which are just beginning to be developed. The opening of the canal will turn immigration toward the Canadian Pacific, and the future should bring a flourishing trade between that region and Great Britain in the exchange of manufactures for Canadian wheat and lumber.

But these are not all the advantages which England will obtain from the canal. Canada has hundreds of miles of coast on the Atlantic and three or four hundred miles of coast on the Pacific, and is traversed by transcontinental railroads. These conditions will make British America a most valuable base for the operations of the English Navy in both oceans when the canal is built, and thus the efficiency of England's Navy will be increased almost equally with our own.

These are some of the benefits that England is to receive from the canal. It is fair to assume that she considered them sufficient to compensate her for agreeing to the abrogation of the almost-forgotten Clayton-Bulwer convention, so that there might be no obstacle to the building of the canal by the United States. Were the Panama Canal project abandoned at this time England would probably be injured by the abandonment as much as the United States; and yet the burden of building the canal and of maintaining its neutrality thereafter is entirely on the United States. England has no obligations in that respect.

However, if we are under treaty obligations to treat England's ships on an equality with our own at the canal, it is our duty to respect them. But have we assumed such obligations? An answer to the question depends on the meaning of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. The treaty was made in Washington on the 19th day of November, 1901. Its purpose, as declared in the preamble, was to remove any objection which might arise out of the convention of April 19, 1850, known as the Clayton-Bulwer convention, to the construction of the canal under the auspices of the United States, without impairing the "general principle" of neutralization established under article 8 of that convention. The articles of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty are so interdependent that it is necessary to construe them together in order to get at the true meaning of the instrument, and for that purpose they are here set out in full:

"ARTICLE 1. The high contracting parties agree that the present treaty shall supersede the aforementioned convention of the 19th of April, 1850.

"ART. 2. It is agreed that the canal may be constructed under the auspices of the Government of the United States, either directly at its own cost, or by gift or loan of money to individuals or corporations, or through subscription or purchase of stock or shares, and that, subject to the provisions of the present treaty, the said Government shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such construction, as well as the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal.

"ART. 3. The United States adopts, as the basis of neutralization of such ship canal, the following rules, substantially as embodied in the convention of Constantinople, signed the 28th day of October, 1888, for the free navigation of the Suez Canal, that is to say:

"1. The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation or its citizens or subjects in respect to the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable.

"2. The canal shall never be blockaded, nor shall any right of war be exercised nor any act of hostility be committed within it. The United States, however, shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder.

"3. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not take any stores in the canal except so far as may be strictly necessary; and the transit of such vessels through the canal shall be effected with the least possible delay in accordance with the regulations in force, and with only such intermission as may result from the necessities of the service. Prizes shall be in all respects subject to the same rules as vessels of war of belligerents.

"4. No belligerent shall embark or disembark troops, munitions of war, or warlike materials in the canal, except in case of accidental hindrance of the transit, and in such case the transit shall be resumed with all possible dispatch.

"5. The provisions of this article shall apply to waters adjacent to the canal, within 3 marine miles of either end. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not remain in such waters longer than 24 hours at any one time, except in case of distress, and in such case shall depart as soon as possible; but a vessel of war of one belligerent shall not depart within 24 hours from the departure of a vessel of war of the other belligerent.

"6. The plant, establishment, buildings, and all works necessary to the construction, maintenance, and operation of the canal shall be deemed to be a part thereof, for the purposes of this treaty, and in time of war as in time of peace shall enjoy complete immunity from attack or injury by belligerents and from acts calculated to impair their usefulness as part of the canal.

"ART. 4. It is agreed that no change of territorial sovereignty or of the international relations of the country or countries traversed by the aforementioned canal shall affect the general principles of neutralization or the obligation of the high contracting parties under the present treaty."

Those articles contain all the material provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

The declaration in the preamble of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty that it is not intended to impair the general principle of neutralization established by article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer convention has been urged against any proposition to favor American ships at the canal.

The argument is based on the assumption that the terms "general principle of neutralization" used in the preamble include traffic conditions within their scope and meaning. But the assumption is not justified. They mean immunity from attack and nothing else. It is true the article in question does provide that the canal shall be open to the citizens and subjects of the United States and Great Britain on equal terms, but that was simply a statement of the consideration to each of the two contracting parties for the protection they were to extend to the canal. There are two separate elements expressed in the article—one, the protection of the canal, and the other the equality of treatment of the contracting parties in return for that protection.

The general principle which the parties desired to extend to the Panama route was one of protection; that is to say, neutralization. That proposition is expressed in the first sentence of the article. The equality of treatment of the contracting parties is another thought expressing the consideration in return for the protection of the canal, and is found in the second sentence of the same article. The term "neutralization" is not employed by international law writers to mean equality of treatment in respect to traffic conditions. The evident purpose of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was to secure immunity from attack for the canal. No other meaning can be given to the word "neutralization."

The language of article 2 of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is quite clear, and unless its terms are modified by some subsequent provisions of that treaty, it concedes to the United States the enjoyment of all of the rights incident to the construction of the canal, as well as the exclusive right for the regulation and management of the same. Is there any provision in the treaty which modifies article 2? It will be noted that the provisions relating to neutrality provided for in the Clayton-Bulwer convention are announced therein by the United States and Great Britain jointly, while in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty the United States alone establishes the rules. The partnership arrangement existing between the two countries under the Clayton-Bulwer convention has terminated, and the rules for the neutralization of the canal under the later treaty were enacted by the United States and must be maintained by that Government alone. Those rules are to be observed by other nations, and not by the United States. If this statement is true, then the rule of equality does not apply to the United States.

Great Britain's contention is that rule 1 does apply to the United States, and that, in effect, would be reading into the rule the words

"with the vessels of the United States," so that the language of the rule then would be as follows:

"The canal shall be free and open to vessels of commerce and war of all nations observing these rules on terms of entire equality with the vessels of the United States."

We do not believe that any such construction can be given to rule 1 if read in the light of the other provisions of the treaty.

The language of article 2 is very clear and affirmative:

"The United States shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to the construction of the canal, as well as the exclusive right of providing for its regulation and management."

These words can not be limited or impaired by implication. It requires an express provision in the treaty to minimize their effect, and none such can be found therein.

The claim now advanced by Great Britain is confined to the subject of canal tolls, but with equal propriety it might include all benefits given to American vessels of war or commerce at the canal. The rule of equality is not limited to canal tolls, but relates to any discrimination in respect to the charges or conditions of traffic or otherwise, and includes vessels of war and vessels of commerce. Consequently, no favors could be shown to our warships in the use of dry docks, anchorage basins, pilotage, coaling privileges, commissaries, and other conveniences at the canal without extending like privileges to foreign war vessels.

Those who denied our right to fortify the canal relied on the broad language of the rule to sustain their contention, and if England's claim in respect to tolls is correct it would seem that the objection made to our fortifying the canal would be equally well taken. If the rule of equality places American ships on the same basis with foreign ships, then our belligerent vessels will not be authorized to revictual or taken any stores in the canal except when strictly necessary, and all the other rules restricting the use of the canal by belligerents will apply to us. However, that doctrine has not been admitted by the people of the United States, and, for that matter, England has recognized our right to fortify the canal and to do anything necessary to protect it, and that carries with it an admission of a superior right in our warships to the use of the canal.

The British protest assumes that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty did not admit of the United States protecting the territory on which the canal was to be built because the United States was not then the owner of it. The protest overlooks the important fact that at that very time the United States was under treaty obligation with Colombia to maintain the neutrality of the Isthmus and to guarantee the sovereignty right of that country therein, and that treaty obligation was not diminished in any respect by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. Again, when the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was first submitted to the Senate it contained a provision to prohibit the United States from fortifying the canal. The Senate rejected the provision, and England accepted the treaty with the provision eliminated. In discussing the elimination of that provision, Lord Lansdowne, in a memorandum dated August 3, 1901, used this language:

"In my dispatch I pointed out the dangers of a construction in which one clause permitted the adoption of defensive measures while another prohibited the erection of fortifications. It is most important that no doubt should exist as to the intention of the contracting parties. As to this, I understand that by the omission of all reference to the matter of defense the United States desires to reserve the power to protect the canal at any time, when the United States may be at war, from destruction or damage at the hands of an enemy or enemies. On the other hand, I conclude that, with the above exception, there is no intention to derogate from the principles of neutrality laid down by the rules. As to the first of these propositions, I am not prepared to deny that contingencies may arise, when, not only from a national point of view, but in behalf of the commercial interests of the whole world, it might be of supreme importance to the United States that they should be free to adopt measures for the defense of the canal at a moment when they were themselves engaged in hostilities.

"It is also to be borne in mind that owing to the omission of the words under which this country became jointly bound to defend the neutrality of the canal, and the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, the obligations of Great Britain will be materially diminished."

Thus we see that the attempt to make the rules of neutrality applicable to the United States was without success. So that our right to fortify the canal may be said to be well established, and the right to fortify carries with it the further right to use the canal with our belligerent ships when necessary to prevent hostile fleets or armies from entering the canal. If ships of war and of commerce of other nations have an equal right with those of the United States in the matter of tolls it would be difficult for our Government to maintain that our belligerent ships have more rights in the canal than those of any other belligerent. Inasmuch as the burden of maintaining the neutrality of the canal is upon the United States alone it follows that our warships are not within the rule of equality laid down in rule 1, and that being so, it would be playing fast and loose with the rule to include our commercial vessels within its provisions and not do likewise with our vessels of war.

In discussing the belligerent rights of the United States at the canal, the British note of protest of November 14, 1912, says:

"Now that the United States has become the practical sovereign of the canal, His Majesty's Government do not question its title to exercise belligerent rights for its protection."

The writer of the protest does not seem to have had in mind the fact that the United States has been under treaty obligations since 1846 to protect the Isthmus and to maintain the neutrality of the transit across it, and that Lord Lansdowne, during the negotiations for the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, recognized, not only our right, but that it was our duty, to protect the canal. Were we so inclined, we might rest our case on the admission contained in the protest; that the acquisition by the United States of the territory over which the canal is being constructed was sufficient of itself to modify the treaty so as to afford belligerent rights to our warships. If the acquisition of the territory will thus benefit our war vessels, it is hard to conceive how equal favors to our vessels of commerce are to be withheld under such circumstances. At least one distinguished American diplomat has maintained that the acquisition by the United States of the canal strip did change the treaty status so as to authorize the exemption of American merchant ships from the payment of tolls. No doubt he will be pleased at discovering that Great Britain, in her protest, lends comfort to his views.

Viewed in the light of the circumstances and conditions attending the execution of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and construing rule 1 in connection with the other terms of the instrument, that rule simply amounts to what is known in treaties as "the most-favored-nation clause." In other words, the rule means that the nations observing the rules of neutralization laid down in the treaty by the United States shall be preferred in the use of the canal without discrimination in favor of one of such nations as against the other.

It has been said that language substantially the same as that of rule 1 of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is employed in the treaty of Washington between the United States and Great Britain relating to the Canadian and American canals and the use of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River, and that discrimination in favor of the ships of either of the contracting parties is not allowed under the latter treaty. It is true that entire equality is observed in the treatment of vessels of the parties to the Washington treaty, but it is so because the treaty itself clearly and affirmatively prohibits a discrimination in favor of one of the parties as against the other. The statement that the language of the Washington treaty is substantially that of the Hay Pauncefote treaty is incorrect. Article 27 of the Washington treaty leaves nothing to inference, but expressly says that Great Britain will engage to urge upon the Canadian Government to secure to the citizens of the United States the use of the Welland, St. Lawrence, and other canals in the Dominion on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the Dominion; and the United States engages that the subjects of Great Britain shall enjoy the use of the St. Clair Flats Canal on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States, and engages to urge upon the State governments to secure to the subjects of Great Britain the use of the several State canals connected with the navigation of the lakes or rivers traversed by or contiguous to the boundary line between the possessions of the high contracting parties, on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States.

Here we have unequivocal declarations that there shall be equality of treatment between the contracting parties. There is no such declaration in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

It has also been said that the rule of equality as expressed in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is the same as that laid down in the Suez Canal convention. But again we say that the statement is not correct. Article I of the Suez convention reads as follows:

"The Suez Maritime Canal shall always be free and open, in time of war as in time of peace, to every vessel of commerce or of war without distinction of flag."

The words "without distinction of flag," which I have underscored, make the meaning quite clear that all nations shall stand upon an equal footing. There is no such language in rule 1 of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

The correspondence between the United States and Great Britain leading up to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty throws much light on the subject. Rule 1 received the most serious consideration in the diplomatic negotiations preceding the adoption of the treaty, and that England's great solicitude was to secure for herself equal treatment with other nations appears from Lord Lansdowne's communication to Lord Pauncefote on October 23, 1901, on this subject, in which he said in part:

"I informed the United States chargé d'affaires to-day that His Majesty's Government had given their careful attention to the various amendments which have been suggested in the draft of the interoceanic canal treaty, communicated by Mr. Hay to your Lordship on the 25th of April last, and that I was now in a position to inform him officially of our views.

"Mr. Hay suggested that in article 3, rule 1, we should substitute for the words 'the canal shall be free and open to vessels of commerce and of war of all nations which shall agree to observe these rules, etc.' the words 'the canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules,' and in the same clause, as a consequence of the amendment, substitute for the words 'any nation so agreeing' the words 'any such nation.' His Majesty's Government were prepared to accept this amendment, which seemed to us equally efficacious for the purpose which we had in view, namely, that of *insuring that Great Britain should not be placed in a less advantageous position than any other power, while they stopped short of conferring upon other nations a contractual right to the use of the canal.*" (The italics are mine.)

The reasonable inference to be drawn from the language of the English negotiator is that he was seeking to obtain the most favored nation clause for Great Britain and nothing more. We must bear in mind that the Clayton-Bulwer convention contained provisions prohibiting the contracting parties from—

"Acquiring or holding, directly or indirectly, for the citizens or subjects of the one any rights or advantages in regard to commerce or navigation through the said canal which shall not be offered on the same terms to the subjects of the other."

The fact that no such language was employed or sought to be employed by Great Britain in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is significant, and would seem to support the conclusion that she only desired equal treatment with other nations, especially as she had assumed no obligation in respect to the canal that would not be expected of the other nations using it, that is to say, that none of them would do any act in the canal unfriendly to the United States. That obligation rests upon all civilized nations at peace with us without the necessity of a treaty.

But we need not leave our case here. It became necessary for the United States to enter into a treaty with the Republic of Panama to obtain the right of way across the Isthmus of Panama for the construction of the canal and political jurisdiction over the Canal Zone. In part consideration for the cession of the canal strip by the Republic of Panama, the United States agreed that the vessels of the Panaman Government should have free transportation over the canal at all times. This is a discrimination in favor of the vessels of Panama, inasmuch as no other nation has that privilege, but it is quite consistent with the most favored-nation clause.

The concession to the vessels of Panama, it is said, was necessary in order to acquire a right of way over which to build the canal and, in consequence, the privilege granted to Panama was proper and did not militate against the proposition that the United States must treat the vessels of all nations on terms of entire equality with their own vessels. The argument would create the anomalous situation in which Panama occupied a position superior to all nations, including the United States. In addition, the argument begs the question entirely. If Great Britain's claim is correct, the United States could not have made any such concession to Panaman vessels without violating the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and in order to keep within that treaty some other consideration would have had to be given to Panama in lieu of the exemption accorded to her ships.

But the concession to Panama is quite consistent with the most-favored-nation clause. That clause does not prevent the granting of a special privilege to another nation, provided a special consideration is given in return for the privilege. The most-favored-nation clause can not be understood to mean that a country should enjoy as a free gift that which is accorded to other nations for a full equivalent; that is to say, Great Britain, if she observes the rules of neutrality laid

down in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, shall enjoy the canal on an equal footing with all other nations observing those rules, but the rule would be unequal as to Panama if she were required to surrender the Canal Zone to the United States besides having to observe the rules of neutrality. Hence, Panama is entitled to a free canal for her vessels, because she has given a special consideration for the privilege which the other nations have not. This doctrine has been generally recognized, and especially by Great Britain.

The United States entered into a commercial treaty with the Hawaiian Islands in 1876, by the terms of which mutual trade concessions were made by the two Governments. At that time Great Britain and Hawaii had a treaty containing the most-favored-nation clause. The British Government admitted that—

"as the advantages conceded to the United States by the Sandwich Islands are expressly stated to be given in consideration of and as an equivalent for certain reciprocal concessions on the part of the United States, Great Britain can not, as a matter of right, claim the same advantages for her trade under the strict letter of the treaty of 1851."

We do not find that Great Britain's consent was asked by the United States before the concession was made to Panaman vessels, nor does it appear that Great Britain made any protest. It is fair to assume that she recognized the right of the United States to extend the privilege of a free canal to Panamian vessels in return for the cession of the Canal Zone and jurisdiction over it to our Government. It would seem that England could not very well admit a right to the United States in this and yet contend for her present construction of rule 1—that English ships and those of other nations observing the rules are entitled to use the canal on terms of entire equality with those of the United States.

It is true that Great Britain now protests against the exemption of Panaman vessels, but this objection, coming as it does nine years after the making of the treaty, when the canal is almost completed, does not deserve serious consideration. The only purpose it can serve is that of demonstrating that England now recognizes that she can not concede our right to exempt Panaman vessels without surrendering her case.

We might pursue the most-favored-nation theory further. On January 9, 1900, the United States, Colombia, and Panama negotiated what was known as the tripartite agreement, by which the United States granted to Colombia the right to convey through the canal her troops, materials of war, and ships of war without paying any duty to the United States. The agreement was negotiated by our State Department with the executive departments of Colombia and Panama and was ratified by our Senate and the Assembly of Panama, but was rejected by the Congress of Colombia, and hence did not become effective. The exemption from the payment of duties at the canal in favor of Colombian vessels could have been made only upon the theory that rule 1 accords to England nothing more than most-favored-nation treatment. Although Great Britain protested against the exemption of Colombian ships, the protest does not seem to have been as insistent as the one she now presents. Notwithstanding the English protest made at the time, our State Department carried forward the agreement, our Senate ratified it, and it failed only because the Colombian Congress rejected it.

The issue now pending with England has had full consideration by the United States Government. Our State Department, in making the canal treaty with Panama and the tripartite agreement with Colombia and Panama, and the Senate in ratifying this convention, have demonstrated that the treaty-making power of the United States has not been in accord with the English view of the subject. And now the Congress of the United States has spoken out against Great Britain's claim and has enacted the Panama Canal act, by which American shipping and the vessels of the Government of Panama are favored at the canal.

We might still pursue the doctrine a little further—that the most-favored-nation clause does not preclude a Government from granting special concessions to other nations in return for special favors. Suppose the United States, with some other maritime power as an ally, were to engage in a war, would it be correct to say that we could not admit the belligerent ships of our ally into the canal on an equal footing with our vessels? The American people would hardly concede that, and it may well be doubted that Great Britain would admit it were she the ally.

The issue has been discussed in this paper as though the burden were upon the United States in the argument. As a matter of fact, the onus is on Great Britain to establish her contention. Great Britain, in effect, is claiming a servitude upon our property—the canal—and a limitation on our sovereignty. Her claim, if valid, means that we must tax our imports and exports and our coastwise trade passing through the canal equally with the trade of other countries using that waterway. That means a serious restriction upon the sovereign right of the United States to regulate their fiscal and economic policies as they may deem best. The restriction would amount to a limitation of our sovereignty, as well as a servitude imposed upon our territory.

It is a well-established rule of international law that one sovereign can not claim a servitude on the territory of another except by compact, and "if a dispute occurs between a territorial sovereign and a foreign power as to the extent or nature of rights enjoyed by the latter within the territory of the former, the presumption is against the foreign State, and upon it the burden lies of proving its claim beyond doubt or question."

In summing up the objections to the British claim we might say that the commercial advantages which the United States has at the Isthmus came from the treaty with Colombia of 1846, and not from the Clayton-Bulwer convention or the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and neither of these affected the rights so held by us; that the terms of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, when properly construed, do not sustain it; that in abandoning the explicit language of the Clayton-Bulwer convention, which clearly prohibited a discrimination in favor of the United States, England lost her right to claim at this time equality with the United States in the use of the canal for her vessels; that Lord Lansdowne's communication of October 23, 1901, to Lord Pauncefote, already mentioned, tends to prove that England's only desire was to obtain equality of treatment with other powers for her vessels at the canal and nothing more; that the canal treaty with the Republic of Panama by which the vessels of the Republic are entitled to the free use of the canal, made without protest from Great Britain, is a strong circumstance in support of the proposition that rule 1 is nothing more than the most-favored-nation clause expressed in another form; and, lastly, Great Britain has not produced any sufficient proof to overcome the presumption arising against her from the circumstances just related; much less has she adduced any proof or argument to establish her claim beyond doubt or question.

Many of our citizens believe that the issue between Great Britain and the United States on the subject of canal tolls should be submitted to The Hague tribunal for determination under the provisions of the arbitration treaty between the two countries. This assumes that the question is a justiciable one. The treaty does not require all questions that may arise between the two countries to be submitted to The Hague. It does say that "differences which may arise of a legal nature or relating to the interpretation of treaties existing between the two contracting parties, and which it may not have been possible to settle by diplomacy, shall be referred to the permanent court of arbitration," etc. But the same clause of the treaty contains a proviso modifying the rule so laid down to the effect that neither of the parties is bound to submit questions affecting its vital interests, its independence, its honor, or the interests of third parties.

We have seen that the issue does affect the vital interests as well as the independence of the United States, inasmuch as the English claim imposes a limitation upon our sovereignty and a servitude on our territory, so as to materially impair our right to freely adopt such economic and fiscal policies as we may deem best, and we are not at liberty to use our own with freedom. The question is a vital one and of the most serious importance to the people of the United States, because all of the maritime powers of the world are equally interested with England in obtaining a decision adverse to the United States. And yet we are expected to submit the issue to a tribunal that is controlled by these same maritime powers.

It has been said that if the United States refused to submit the question to The Hague, the arbitration treaty may as well be destroyed. The answer to that is: If the question does, in fact, affect our vital interests or our independence, then there is no authority for its submission to that tribunal. The proviso which excludes such questions from the jurisdiction of The Hague is just as binding on the parties as any other part of the treaty, and the necessity for its observance is accentuated when the question is one in which the powers controlling the court are vitally interested. I do not intend to reflect on The Hague tribunal, but am simply stating the facts. In this instance the judges would also be parties at interest.

FRANK FEUILLE.

—

[From the Outlook of Mar. 8, 1913.]

THE PANAMA CANAL—SHALL IT BE AMERICAN OR ANGLO-AMERICAN?

(Article by Samuel Seabury, justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York.)

I commend an American canal, on American soil, to the American people. (Gen. Grant.)

The policy of this country is a canal under American control. The United States can not consent to surrender this control to any European power. (President Hayes.)

INTRODUCTION.

As early as 1550 the idea of a canal which should unite the waters of the Atlantic and of the Pacific was publicly discussed. From that time until the present idealists have dreamed and statesmen have struggled to bring about its realization. Difficulties—physical, financial, and political—have barred the pathway which led to achievement. The treaty which the United States made with the Republic of Panama removed the legal and political obstacles in the way of commencing the task which had been so long in contemplation. Since that time the United States has acted with characteristic energy. One of the greatest engineering achievements of mankind is being carried to a successful conclusion. The cost of the canal to the Government of the United States will exceed $400,000,000. In the near future vessels of commerce will pass through the canal from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It is estimated that within a year from the time it is opened a net tonnage of over 10,000,000 tons will use the canal. Of this tonnage, not quite one-quarter will be engaged in American coastwise trade. The Panama route will have a monopoly of the traffic of Hawaii and of the west coast of North and South America, with the exception of a small part of the trade of southern Chile, although it must compete with other routes for the large and valuable commerce of Pacific Asia and of Australia. The canal will decrease the distance from New York to San Francisco about 8,500 miles, and from New York to Australia about 4,000 miles. The saving in time for a vessel of 9 knots speed from New York to Iquique, Chile, one of the ports from which the heavy nitrate shipments are made, will be over 23 days. The trip from Liverpool to Iquique will be decreased nearly 3,000 miles. The saving of time and money which will result to those engaged in the world's commerce by the use of the Panama Canal can not be calculated.

The Panama Canal is the achievement of the United States alone. No other nation has aided in its creation. In August, 1912, the act of Congress making provision for the permanent government of the Canal Zone became a law. The law exempts coastwise trade from tolls. This comparatively unimportant provision and the provisions of the law which deny the right to use the canal to vessels owned by railway companies and those violating the provisions of the Sherman antitrust law have been made the basis of a formal protest by Great Britain on the ground that they are in conflict with the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. That protest raises questions of the utmost importance. The manner in which those questions shall be determined will profoundly affect the commercial development and national integrity of the United States.

THE HISTORY OF THE CANAL.

A brief history of the Panama Canal is essential to an understanding of the present controversy. In 1846 a treaty was entered into between the United States and Colombia, then called New Granada. The treaty gave to the United States a right of transit over the Isthmus of Panama "from the one to the other sea." The Panama Railroad, which was completed in 1855, was a result of this treaty. In 1849 the United States entered into a treaty with Nicaragua which provided for the construction of a ship canal from Greytown (San Juan) on the Atlantic coast to the Pacific coast by way of the Lake of Nicaragua. Great Britain, claiming a protectorate over the Mosquito Indians, in whose territory the Atlantic end would be placed, insisted that it alone should dictate the terms upon which the Nicaragua route should be opened. The British claim was in defiance of the Monroe doctrine and without moral or legal basis.

Mr. Lawrence, United States minister at London, presented the protest of his Government. It was ignored. Sir Henry Bulwer, the British minister at Washington, realizing that Mr. Clayton, the Secretary of State in President Zachary Taylor's Cabinet, had been alarmed by other acts of British aggression involving the seizure of Tigre Island, ignored Mr. Lawrence, and concluded the Clayton-Bulwer treaty directly with Mr. Clayton. This treaty was ratified July 5, 1850. The treaty provided that neither Great Britain nor the United States should ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over the canal or erect fortifications upon it, nor occupy or exercise

any dominion over any part of Central America; and that in the event of war the vessels of Great Britain or the United States must be permitted to pass unmolested, and that both parties should guard the safety and preserve the neutrality of the canal. The treaty also provided that the parties to it had been actuated, not only by the desire to accomplish a particular object, "but also to establish a general principle," and that "they hereby agree to extend their protection, by treaty stipulation, to any other practicable communication, whether by canal or railway, across the Isthmus * * * and especially to interoceanic communications * * * which are now proposed to be established by way of Tehuantepec or Panama."

By this treaty Great Britain tied the hands of the United States and reserved to herself the absolute power of obstruction. It is unnecessary to comment upon the opposition which the American people manifested to this treaty, or to trace the many diplomatic controversies which arose in regard to it, or to note the forcible objections which Seward, Evarts, and Blaine felt compelled to make to it. The significant fact to be here noted is that, until the treaty was superseded in 1901, it presented a complete bar to the efforts of the United States to secure the building of the canal.

In 1878 the Wyse concession was made by Colombia, and subsequently a French construction company was organized under the presidency of Ferdinand de Lesseps to build the Panama Canal. The prospect of the canal under French control was cause for alarm in the United States. In a special message to Congress March 8, 1880, President Hayes asserted that the policy of the United States required a canal under American control. Mr. Blaine, in language so forcible as not to permit of misunderstanding, pointed out that the passage of the armed vessels of a hostile nation through the Panama Canal would be no more admissible than the passage of armed forces of a hostile nation over the railway lines joining the Atlantic and the Pacific shores of the United States. The French Government gave the United States its assurance that it did not aim at political control, and expressed "its firm purpose to allow the character of the enterprise inaugurated by M. de Lesseps to remain an essentially private one." (See the Treaty regulations of the United States and Colombia, by John H. Latané, Ph. D., Annals of the American Academy of Political Science, 1903.) The failure of the French company in 1888 permanently defeated the efforts of M. de Lesseps, and the hope that the canal would be built was again deferred.

On November 18, 1901, the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was concluded. It recites the desire of the United States and Great Britain to facilitate the construction of a ship canal "by whatever route may be considered expedient," and to remove the objections arising from the Clayton-Bulwer treaty without impairing the "general principle of neutralization established in article 8 of that convention."

The first article of the treaty provided that it should supersede the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. The second article provides "that the canal may be constructed under the auspices of the Government of the United States," either at its own cost or by gift or loan of money to individuals or corporations or through subscription to or to purchase of stock and shares. This article also provides that the United States "shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such construction, as well as the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal."

The third article of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty deals with the neutralization of the canal, and in its first subdivision provides that "the canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise. Such conditions and charges shall be just and equitable."

Article 4 of the treaty provides "that no change of territorial sovereignty or of the international relations of the country or countries traversed by the before-mentioned canal shall affect the general principle of neutralization or the obligation of the high contracting parties to the present treaty." This clause was evidently inserted to guard against the treaty being impaired by changes in the South American Republics, but it did not contemplate the possibility of the United States acquiring the territory through which the canal is to be pierced. A study of the treaty in connection with the convention of Constantinople and with a full understanding of the circumstances under which the treaty was made shows clearly that the acquisition of the canal territory by the United States was not foreseen by either of the contracting parties. It should be noted that nothing contained in the treaty imposes any prohibition upon either of the contracting parties from purchasing territory to be traversed by the proposed canal.

On January 20, 1902, President Roosevelt sent to Congress a message recommending the construction of the canal at Panama. His message proposed the purchase of the French rights for $40,000,000. Congress acted upon this suggestion and appropriated $170,000,000, and directed the President, if the consent of Colombia could not be obtained, to have the canal constructed by the Nicaragua route at a cost not to exceed $180,000,000. The Hay-Herran treaty between the United States and Colombia was then negotiated, by which Colombia was to grant the desired privilege in return for $10,000,000 and an annual rental of $250,000. The terms of this proposed treaty had been agreed upon between the accredited representatives of the United States and Colombia, and the Senate of the United States on March 17, 1903, ratified the proposed treaty. The Colombian Government, however, sought to repudiate the promise of its representative, and indicated that it would ratify the treaty if it was paid $25,000,000. When the United States refused to yield to this demand Colombia concluded that it could not "constitutionally" comply with its promise to ratify the treaty. That the alleged constitutional objection was a mere pretense is evident from the fact that it could have been overcome by a payment of $15,000,000 more than the United States had agreed to pay and Colombia to accept. The action of Colombia in causing the proposed treaty to fail of ratification incensed and embittered the people of the State of Panama, whose interests would have been greatly promoted by the construction of the canal. The attitude of Colombia served to intensify the spirit of revolt among the people of Panama, who for many years had been treated unjustly by the Colombian Government. This last act of Colombia showed such a total disregard of the interests of the people of Panama and was instigated by motives so sordid and odious that the State of Panama seceded from Colombia and established a provisional government. Within a short time the United States, Great Britain, and France recognized the independence of the new Republic of Panama.

On November 18, 1903, M. Bunau Varilla, the accredited representative of Panama, and Secretary Hay signed the treaty of Panama, which was duly ratified. This treaty grants the United States in perpetuity a zone of land and land under water for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the canal of the width of 10 miles, beginning in the Caribbean Sea and extending to and across the Isthmus of Panama into the Pacific Ocean, with the exception of the cities of Panama and Colon. Certain other incidental territory and islands are also granted. The treaty grants the United States "all the rights, power, and authority" within the zone mentioned "which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory within which the said lands and waters are located, to the entire exclusion of the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, and authority." Article 5 of this treaty grants to the United States in perpetuity a monopoly for the construction, maintenance, and operation of any system of communication, by means of canal or railway, across its territory between the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean. In return for this grant the United States guarantees to maintain the independence of the Republic of Panama and to pay Panama $10,000,000, and from nine years after the date of the treaty to make an annual payment of $250,000 during the life of the treaty. The eighteenth article of this treaty provides that "the canal, when constructed, and the entrances thereto, shall be neutral in perpetuity, and shall be opened upon the terms provided for by section 1 of article 3 of and in conformity with all the stipulations of the treaty entered into by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain on November 18, 1901." In considering this provision of the Panama treaty, it is to be borne in mind that it is binding only upon the parties to it. That treaty prescribes and defines the correlative rights and duties of the United States and of the Republic of Panama. It does not enlarge the rights of Great Britain in reference to the canal. Great Britain was not a party to the Hay-Varilla treaty, and any obligation that was imposed upon the United States under it is due solely to the Republic of Panama, and is subject to any change that may be effected by mutual consent of the contracting parties.

This historical outline makes clear the steps which the United States has taken and the difficulties which it has finally overcome. The territory through which the canal is being constructed is subject solely to the sovereignty of the United States. Now that the United States has done everything requisite and necessary to make the canal available for use and has pledged itself to preserve to the commerce of the world the right to use it upon fair and reasonable terms, Great Britain comes forward to enter its protest against the exemption of American coastwise trade, with which, under existing laws, foreign nations can not compete.

THE BRITISH PROTEST.

The Panama Canal act, providing for the government of the Canal Zone and exempting coastwise trade from tolls, was enacted after a careful and scientific inquiry by Congress into the conditions affecting the Panama Canal. On December 9, 1912, Ambassador Bryce filed with the Secretary of State of the United States a protest against certain provisions of the Panama Canal act. The protest was signed for the British Government by Sir Edward Grey. The protest is based on the contention that the provisions of the Panama Canal act contravene the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. The particulars in which this act is claimed to be in conflict with the treaty are: (1) The provisions of section 5 of the act, which confer upon the President, within certain defined limits, the right to fix the tolls, but provide that no tolls are to be levied upon ships engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States. There is also an exemption made pursuant to article 19 of the Panama treaty, according to which the Republic of Panama has the right to transport over the canal its vessels and its troops and munitions of war without paying charges of any kind. If the United States should yield to this part of the British protest it would be necessary for it to act in violation of its treaty with the Republic of Panama. It is claimed that these provisions, first, are in conflict with the rule established in article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of equal treatment for British and United States ships; and, second, would enable tolls to be fixed which would not be just and equitable and would therefore not comply with rule 1 of article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. (2) The provisions of section 11 of the act, which prohibit a railway company subject to the interstate-commerce act of 1887 from having any interest in vessels which operate through the canal, and that part of the same section which provides that a vessel permitted to engage in constwise or foreign trade of the United States shall not be permitted to use the canal if its owner is guilty of violating the Sherman Antitrust Act.

Both of these claims rest upon the assumption that the events which have occurred since the ratification of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty can have no effect upon the validity of that treaty. In reference to the claim based on section 11 of the act, the protest makes no argument, but calls attention to the fact that if the provisions of that section are to be deemed applicable to British ships, the British Government reserves the right to amplify its protest after further study of the question involved. The reasons which impelled Congress to enact section 1 of the act are obvious. By these provisions it was sought to prevent monopoly of transportation in the canal and thus to keep the canal open to the free competition of the commerce of the world. Experience has taught the lesson that when the same company controls the means of transportation by land and sea competition is rendered impossible.

President Taft, in an effort to place upon the Hay-Pauncefote treaty a construction which would make it adaptable to the changed conditions which have resulted since the acquisition of the Canal Zone by the United States, treated the words "all nations," used in subdivision 1 of article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, as excluding the United States. The British protest refuses to accept this construction, and, referring to the argument of President Taft, announces plainly that "His Majesty's Government believe this statement of the case to be wholly at variance with the real question. They consider that by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty the United States has surrendered the right to construct the canal, and that by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty it recovered that right, upon the footing that the canal should be open to British and United States vessels upon equal terms." Great Britain, therefore, having explicitly refused to be bound by any construction of the treaty which recognizes and makes allowance for the changed conditions which have resulted since the adoption of the treaty, squarely presents to the United States the alternative of adopting an American canal policy or an Anglo-American canal policy. Under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty Great Britain claimed to be a partner in the canal enterprise with the United States. Under the British protest, transmitted by Sir Edward Grey, Great Britain still claims all the benefits of a partnership, although all the burdens of the enterprise are, under the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, to be borne solely by the United States. The importance of the protest consists, not in the fact that it relates to tolls, but in the fact that it carries with it the assertion that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty exists with the same force and effect to-day that it possessed before the United States became the sovereign over the territory through which the canal is being constructed. If this claim be admitted and the words "all nations," as used in subdivision 1 of article 3 of the Hay-

Pauncefote treaty, are to be regarded as including the United States, then the following consequences result:

The United States must impose the same rate of tolls upon its merchant ships, war ships, or Government vessels that it does upon those of foreign nations; it can never blockade the canal or exercise any right of war in it, even if it is itself a belligerent, and the representatives of the United States at Panama must open the locks and escort a hostile fleet through the canal; if the United States becomes a belligerent it shall not revictual or take stores in the canal, except when strictly necessary; it shall not embark or disembark troops or munitions of war in the canal territory, and its own war vessels shall not remain in the waters adjacent to the canal within the 3-mile limit for longer than 24 hours at any one time; and it can not use the plant and surroundings of the canal for any hostile purpose.

In short, if the United States should become a belligerent it could not use its own canal for naval and military purposes, and the canal would be of no more strategic value to it than it would be to its enemy. (Judge Seabury is, of course, stating these conclusions as a reductio ad absurdum. The reply to this argument, made by those who advocate the maintenance of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, is that in time of war all treaties will be abrogated, but the whole trend of Judge Seabury's argument is that the treaty was abrogated when the United States acquired the canal territory.—The Editors.)

Indeed, in time of war, if the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty are to govern, our seacoast would be more liable to attack than it was before the canal was built. Before the canal was built the isolation of our seaboard furnished comparative protection from foreign attack. The existence of the canal will make our coast thousands of miles nearer to the shores of a foreign enemy. If the canal shall be available to us for naval and military purposes, this danger will be obviated. If it is not to be available for these purposes, then we have increased the danger of our position rather than increased our safety. One has only to read the provisions of the six subdivisions of article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty to see at a glance that if one of these subdivisions is binding upon us all are binding. The same obligation which would require us to levy equal tolls, as provided by subdivision 1, would compel us to refrain from blockading the canal or from utilizing the canal for any military or naval purpose in the manner prohibited by the other subdivisions of article 3. The British protest does not specifically claim that all of these provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty are applicable at present, but it attacks a comparatively unimportant regulation of Congress upon a ground which asserts the binding effect of that treaty. The British protest makes no renunciation of rights under the treaty. It does, however, recognize that, as a result of events subsequent to the treaty, the United States has "become the practical sovereign of the canal," and that all the provisions of the treaty are not to be deemed of the same force that they possessed when the treaty was concluded. The significance of this remarkable part of the British protest will be commented upon below. For the present it is necessary only to note that even the British Government recognizes that a change in the status existing at the time the treaty was made has taken place, and that it is impossible to claim that the legal effect of the treaty has not been changed.

THE STATE OF THINGS WHICH WAS THE BASIS OF THE HAY-PAUNCEFOTE TREATY HAS CHANGED, AND THAT TREATY IS NOW VOIDABLE AT THE OPTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

It is a rule of international law, recognized among nations and publicists, that all treaties are concluded upon the tacit condition rebus sic stantibus. If vital changes affecting the subject matter of a treaty take place, so that it can not fairly be said that the parties contracted in reference to the changed conditions, the treaty is by implication abrogated. In other words, if the parties to a treaty contract on the basis that a certain condition or fact exists, and subsequently the condition or fact in reference to which the treaty is made is changed, the treaty is extinguished, and one of the parties to it can not in good faith hold the other bound to perform all or any of its terms. The fundamental fact in reference to which the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was made was that the canal was to be constructed in territory alien to the United States. The Hay-Pauncefote treaty did not even definitely decide upon the Panama route, but provided for the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans "by whatever route may be considered expedient."

The treaty contemplated merely that the canal should be constructed "under the auspices" of the United States, not in the territory of the United States. That the United States did not contemplate the actual acquisition of the territory in which the canal was to be constructed is conclusively evidenced by the fact that the Senate ratified the treaty with Colombia, which merely provided for constructing the canal "under the auspices" of the United States, and did not contemplate the cession of territory to the United States. The failure of Colombia to fulfill the promise of its accredited representative, the bitterness and spirit of revolt which that refusal engendered among the people of the State of Panama, led to the revolution which resulted in the secession of Panama from Colombia. The United States having been betrayed by Colombia, President Roosevelt, with characteristic genius, took the action which resulted in the United States securing the grant from Panama. Under that grant the Canal Zone became part of the territory of the United States and subject to its sovereignty, and the United States from that time on possessed the same exclusive rights over it that it possessed in reference to any other territory which it acquired by cession or conquest.

The Hay-Pauncefote treaty was made on the understanding that the canal was to be constructed upon alien territory. For this reason the position of the United States relative to the canal was regarded as analogous to the position of Great Britain toward the Suez Canal. Assuming that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty provides for equal rights in the canal to Great Britain and the United States, although all the burdens of building and caring for it and policing it were to devolve upon the United States, the situation becomes radically different after the territory becomes subject to the sovereignty of the United States. Suppose, merely for the sake of argument, instead of acquiring the Canal Zone in Panama, the United States abandoned that project and constructed the canal from New Orleans to San Francisco, would it be contended that the canal was subject to the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty? In legal effect and in principle the supposed case and the real case are identical. The treaty was made on the assumption that the canal was to be built in alien territory. The condition in reference to which the treaty was made never arose; and instead of the canal's being built in alien territory, it was built in territory of the United States.

The juridical status of the Panama Canal is that of an artificially constructed waterway, constructed wholly by the United States for commercial and strategic purposes, entirely through territory of the United States, the exclusive right of control over which is vested in the United States. The legal position of the United States and Great Britain in reference to the canal stands, when the case is reduced to its simplest terms, thus: A and B contract that A shall endeavor to obtain an easement over the land of C, and if A succeeds, the easement shall be used equally by A and B, but without any prohibition in the contract against either A or B acquiring the fee to C's land. Subsequently C grants in fee the property to A and his heirs. The judgment of the private law of civilized states in such a case holds that the contract between A and B is no longer of any legal force or effect.

The principle asserted above—that all treaties are concluded upon the tacit condition rebus sic statibus, and that, where the state of things which was the basis of the treaty and one of its tacit conditions no longer exists, the treaty becomes voidable, and either party may notify the other that it regards the treaty as abrogated—is sustained by authority. The principle was clearly recognized by Vattel (Law of Nations, book 2, ch. 13, sec. 200) and by Grotius (The Rights of War and Peace, ch. 16, sec. 25, et seq.) and, so far as I have been able to discover, is denied by none. Mr. Hall, in his work on international law, points out that neither party to an international compact "can make its binding effect dependent at his will upon conditions other than those contemplated at the moment when the contract was entered into, and, on the other hand, a contract ceases to be binding so soon as anything which formed an implied condition of its obligatory force at the time of its conclusion is essentially altered." (Sec. 116.) Mr. Hannis Taylor says:

"So unstable are the conditions of international existence, and so difficult is it to enforce a contract between States after the state of facts upon which it was founded has substantially changed, that all such agreements are necessarily made subject to the general understanding that they shall cease to be obligatory so soon as the conditions upon which they were executed are essentially altered." (Treaties on International Public Law, sec. 394.)

Writing upon the same object, Mr. Oppenheim says:

"It is an almost universally recognized fact that vital changes of circumstances may be of such a kind as to justify a party in notifying an unnotifiable treaty. The vast majority of publicists, as well as all the Governments of the members of the family of nations, agree that all treaties are concluded under the tacit condition rebus sic stantibus." (Vol. 1, p. 550, sec. 539.)

That the circumstances have changed to such an extent that some of the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty are extinguished is impliedly conceded by Sir Edward Grey in the British protest. He says:

"Now that the United States has become the practical sovereign of the canal His Majesty's Government do not question its title to exercise belligerent rights for its protection."

His statement suggests that if it had been contemplated that the United States was to acquire the territory through which the canal should be constructed clauses would have been inserted in the treaty which would have established the status of the United States as similar to that accorded Turkey and Egypt in reference to the Suez Canal. It is, of course, not improbable, if the possibility of the acquisition by the United States had been foreseen, that Great Britain would have made even this suggestion; but it ought not to be assumed that the United States would have consented to occupy toward its own canal an attitude similar to that which European powers, under the direction of Great Britain, have accorded Turkey and Egypt toward the Suez Canal.

The statement made in the British protest indicates that the next contention of Great Britain will be that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty has been constructively modified so as to make articles 10 and 13 of the Suez Canal convention applicable to the United States. However this may be, it is needless to speculate. The important circumstance now to be noted is that although Great Britain does not ask for a formal modification of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, nor renounce any legal rights she may have under the treaty, the concession is distinctly made that the changed conditions have modified some of the provisions of the treaty. Although this concession does not define which of the stipulations of the treaty the British Government considers to have been extinguished, it apparently concedes certain belligerent rights to the United States which, if the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty were in force, the United States would not possess. There is no justification for the claim that the abrogation of the provisions of the treaty has been pro tanto. If the state of things which was the vital condition of the treaty no longer exists, the whole treaty justly may be abrogated. One thing is plain as to the legal effect of the treaty: Either all of its stipulations are binding upon the United States or none of them are binding. From a juridical standpoint the change which has taken place is the most fundamental that could occur. The very subject matter of the treaty, which the treaty contemplated should continue to be territory alien to the United States, has become absolutely subject to the sovereignty of the United States. To hold, under these circumstances, that all the terms of the treaty are binding upon the United States would be preposterous and does not seem to be claimed in the British protest. The same circumstances which relieve the United States of some of the terms of the treaty relieve it of all of them. It can hardly be asserted, if changes so vital occur that some of the terms of a treaty are extinguished, one of the parties to the treaty can determine which of the other provisions of the treaty shall continue to be binding upon the other party to the compact. As some of the terms of this treaty are concededly no longer binding, none of them is binding if the United States shall so elect. The Hay-Pauncefote treaty has now become voidable, and the United States is entirely justified under accepted principles of international law in notifying Great Britain that it no longer considers that treaty to be in force. If the United States is to adopt an American canal policy, this it must do. If it does not do this, it must admit the claim of Great Britain to be an equal partner with the United States in the canal enterprise. The latter course involves the establishment of an Anglo-American canal policy in direct defiance of the Monroe doctrine, and it will create an entangling alliance which in the future must inevitably be the source of dissension and strife.

CONCLUSION.

The question has arisen whether the controversy as to the Panama Canal should be submitted to the Tribunal of The Hague for arbitration. Sir Edward Grey, in the British protest, suggests that if the provisions of the Panama Canal act, to which objection is made, are not repealed the question at issue should be submitted to arbitration. This suggestion involves the consideration of two questions:

First, does the arbitration treaty require the submission of the question at issue to arbitration? And, second, if it does not so require, should the United States consent to the submission of this question to arbitration?

If existing treaties require the submission of the question to arbitration, the matter is settled, and nothing remains to the United States but to adopt this course. The convention of 1899 for the arbitration of international disputes was signed by the representatives of the United States subject to a reservation which is set forth at length after their signatures. That reservation is as follows:

"Nothing contained in this convention shall be so construed as to require the United States of America to depart from its traditional policy of not entering upon, interfering with, or entangling itself in the political questions of policy or internal administration of any foreign State; nor shall anything contained in the said convention be construed to imply a relinquishment by the United States of America of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions."

Inasmuch as the Panama Canal is constructed in territory exclusively subject to the sovereignty of the United States, any question as to its control is a purely American question, as to which the United States, in signing the treaty referred to, refused to relinquish its traditional attitude. The traditional attitude of the United States is inconsistent with the submission to arbitration of any question as to a part of the territory over which its exclusive sovereignty extends. That the Monroe doctrine represents the traditional attitude of the United States will not be questioned, nor will it be seriously urged that the United States should submit to arbitration the question as to whether it should adhere to or renounce the Monroe doctrine as a part of its national policy. That doctrine involves one of the very questions which the representatives of the United States reserved the right to withhold from arbitration. It has never been a doctrine which commended itself to European statesmen, but it defines a policy essential to the development and national existence of the United States. The controversy as to the control of the Panama Canal is of precisely the same character, and the reservation made by the representatives of the United States in signing the arbitration treaty relieves the United States from submitting this question to arbitration. As to whether it would be good policy to submit this particular question to arbitration may be safely left to the good judgment of the American Congress. Congress, realizing the unfortunate experiences which the United States has had in dealing with the Panama Canal, may well hesitate to jeopardize the present position which the United States has attained by submitting so purely an American question to the arbitrament of a foreign tribunal.

The treaty of April 4, 1908, between the United States and Great Britain provides that "differences which may arise of a legal nature or relating to the interpretation of treaties existing between the two contracting parties, and which it may not have been possible to settle by diplomacy, shall be referred to the permanent court of arbitration established at The Hague by the convention of the 29th of July, 1899, provided, nevertheless, that they do not affect the vital interests, the independence, or the honor of the two contracting States, and do not concern the interests of third parties."

This treaty imposes upon the United States no obligation to arbitrate the present controversy, because that controversy does not relate "to the interpretation of treaties existing between the two contracting parties."

It has already been pointed out that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is now voidable and may be rendered void by the United States giving notice to Great Britain of the election so to declare the treaty. Moreover, it is plain that the present controversy falls squarely within the exception contained in the clause of the treaty quoted above. The question at issue does affect the vital interests, the independence, and the honor of the United States. It is a question which does concern the Republic of Panama, and therefore is not referable as a matter of right under this treaty. The exemption of vessels of the Republic of Panama from tolls under the provisions of the Panama Canal act was provided for in compliance with article 19 of the Panama treaty. The British protest is against this provision of the act. If this question is submitted to arbitration and should be determined adversely to us, the United States would be obliged either to comply with the award of the arbitration tribunal and violate its treaty with Panama or to violate the arbitration award and comply with its treaty with Panama. The question at issue does, therefore, "concern the interests of third parties," and is one in reference to which the treaty provides that it need not be submitted to arbitration.

The adoption of an American canal policy is in accord with the best traditions of the United States. It is the only policy which can be pursued consistent with the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine. The utterances of American statesmen which are sometimes quoted as favoring a contrary policy were utterances made on the assumption that the canal was to be built on territory alien to the United States. The position assumed by President Cleveland was based on the desire to avoid "entangling alliances" with the country through which it was supposed the canal would be constructed. The traditional attitude of the American people in reference to the canal was expressed by Gen. Grant when he said, "I commend an American canal, on American soil, to the American people." After a century crowded with difficulties and vicissitudes the Panama Canal, as the result of American genius, is about to be opened to the world. It is constructed wholly on territory subject to the sovereignty of the United States, and that country is shortly to determine whether it will pursue in regard to it an American policy or whether, disregarding the lessons of experience and in violation of American traditions, it will admit Great Britain as an equal partner in the enterprise. If an Anglo-American policy is desired, the United States will comply with the demands contained in the British protest. If an American canal policy is to be adopted, the Government at Washington will deal in no uncertain way with the British protest. The present is no time for vacillation or hesitancy. The requirements of the situation demand that the Government at Washington shall plainly inform the British Government that the conditions under which the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was concluded have vitally changed, and that that treaty is now, under the principles of international law, voidable, and give notice that the United States regards it as without force or effect.

Such action is required by every consideration of justice, and should be taken without equivocation. Any other course will involve gross injustice to the United States and will serve only to postpone the time when the United States, in self-defense, will be compelled to take the position suggested. As the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is now voidable rather than void, the Government of the United States should see to it that no action or failure to act on its part shall be construed into a renunciation of the rights which at present, under well-settled principles, it possesses.

Just and courageous action on the part of the United States will remove all difficulties which are presented by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty and leave the pathway free for the adoption of an American canal policy. An American canal, constructed by American enterprise on American soil, subject to the absolute and exclusive control of the United States, will prove a safeguard in times of war, and in times of peace will confer the greatest benefits not only upon the United States but upon all mankind.

THE CONSERVATION OF WATER POWERS (S. DOC. NO. 14).

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask to have printed as a public document a paper which I hold in my hand, the title of which is "The conservation of water powers." It is a very interesting and instructive paper.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama requests that the paper which he presents be printed as a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me ask the Senator from Alabama by whom the article is written.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is written by Rome G. Brown, of Minneapolis, Minn., and taken from the Harvard Law Review. It is entitled "The conservation of water powers," a question that is being discussed all over the country. It is a legal discussion of the matter, and I hope there will be no objection to my request.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama a question. I understand the paper is a brief by Mr. R. G. Brown on the subject of water power. Has not this already been printed as a public document?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Oh, no. This article has just appeared in the current number of the Harvard Law Review.

Mr. BURTON. The original brief has been published, then.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This is an entirely different matter. It is just published.

Mr. BURTON. How long is it?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is not long; only a few pages. It will make a short document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, it will be so ordered.

AMENDMENTS TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted an amendment proposing to pay the balance due the depositors in the Freedman's Savings & Trust Co., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BRISTOW submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $800 for the construction of a bridge across Chilocco Creek where it intercepts the State line of Kansas and the Chilocco School Reservation in Oklahoma, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for administration and improvement of the Glacier National Park, Mont., from $100,000 to $188,000, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. JONES (for Mr. CLAPP) submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 10) to reduce tariff duties, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

VALORIZATION OF COFFEE, ETC.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I submit the following Senate resolution, which I ask may be read, and then I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 58), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate the following information:

1. Copies of any and all requests asking for the dismissal of the case of the United States of America, petitioner, v. Herman Sielcken et al., defendants, heretofore pending in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

2. Copies of any and all agreements that were made by the parties to said action during its pendency providing for its discontinuance or its dismissal.

3. Copies of any and all correspondence regarding the maintenance or dismissal of said action.

4. Copies of any and all reports that were made by any agent or special attorney of the Government investigating the existence of any trust or combination in coffee or any scheme or plan for the valorization of coffee.

5. The name and address of the parties purchasing the coffee involved in said suit, together with the price and the amount purchased by each.

6. Copies of any memoranda, correspondence, letters, or documents on file in the Department of Justice pertaining to or connected with the settlement and dismissal of said action.

7. Any additional statement that he may desire to make touching any of the above matters.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have another resolution on the same subject which ought to be considered, perhaps, in connection with this one. I ask that the resolution may be read and that unanimous consent may be given for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 59), as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate the following information:

1. Copies of all letters and communications from the ambassadors, representatives, or agents of any foreign Government requesting the dismissal of the case of the United States of America, petitioner, *v.* Herman Sielcken et al., defendants, heretofore pending in the district Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

2. A statement of the reasons given for the dismissal of said case by any such ambassadors, representatives, or agents not made in writing.

3. Copies of any and all communications made by such ambassadors, agents, or representatives relating to or connected with the sale of the coffee involved in said case.

4. Copies of all evidence submitted to the Department of State tending to show or offered for the purpose of showing that the sale of said coffee was bona fide.

5. The names of said purchasers, the date of the making of the various sales, and the amount of coffee involved in each sale.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask if that resolution is addressed to the Secretary of State?

Mr. NORRIS. It is, Mr. President.

Mr. LODGE. Inquiries relating to our foreign relations are always, I think I may say, addressed to the President of the United States, and accompanied with words requesting him to transmit the papers, if not incompatible with the public interests. I think it is wiser, in a matter relating to foreign relations, that that form be followed.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I understand the rule as to putting into a request the words "if not incompatible with the public interest"; it applies only to resolutions asking for information from the President.

Mr. LODGE. I have never known the Secretary of State to be asked for any information about our foreign relations. Such requests are always addressed to the President of the United States.

Mr. NORRIS. I would have no objection, even though it be directed to the Secretary of State, to inserting the words "if not incompatible with the public interest." Of course I would not want by this resolution to do anything that is contrary to the practice and precedents of the past in calling upon the Department of State.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection in the world to the resolution. The result will be the same in either case. The President of course has it wholly in his power to send any such documents as he sees fit, but it is the customary form in asking for papers relating to foreign relations to address the President and never the Secretary of State, because the President of course is charged by the Constitution with the conduct of our relations with foreign Governments. I merely suggested the usual form. I do not think the Secretary of State is ever asked for documents of that kind.

Mr. NORRIS. I am perfectly willing that the resolution shall be modified by addressing it to the President and inserting the words suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. CULBERSON. Let the resolution be read as modified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution as modified.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest——

Mr. CULBERSON. That is sufficient.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. CULBERSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 60), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized, during the Sixty-third Congress, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject that may be pending before said committee, and to have such hearings printed for the use of the committee; that the expenses of such hearings be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the said committee and all subcommittees thereof may sit during the sessions of the Senate.

ELLEN D. GIVENS.

Mr. ROBINSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 61), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to Ellen D. Givens, widow of Edgar L. Givens, late a clerk in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, a sum equal to 12 months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

CLAIMS AGAINST MEXICO.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 62), which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the President is respectfully requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to cause to be transmitted to the Senate—

First. A full list of the names of claimants, if any, and the nature and amount of the claims for damages to person or property made by citizens of the United States of America against the Republic of Mexico and filed or deposited with the Department of State at Washington, D. C., since the beginning of the Madero revolution in Mexico to the present time, together with the statement of fact on which said claims are based.

Second. A full list of the names of all citizens of these United States, if any, who while leading lawful and peaceful lives in Mexico have been killed or wounded in Mexico or driven out of Mexico by Mexican soldiers or other armed bands on Mexican soil, together with the facts and circumstances attending such killing, wounding, or forceful deportation.

Third. A full list, if any, of such peaceful citizens of the United States of America as have been forcibly seized and held prisoners for ransom in the Republic of Mexico during the time first mentioned, and what sums of money, if any, have been paid by any person or persons to secure the release of anyone so imprisoned or held.

Fourth. What redress, if any, has been offered by Mexico in the premises, or demanded by the United States of America, and the result of such offer or demand, and what assurance of protection to the lives and property of our peaceful, law-abiding citizens in Mexico does that Republic offer.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. ASHURST. I submit a notice respecting the amendment of the rules of the body. I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona gives notice of an amendment of the rules, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

In accordance with Rule XL, I hereby give notice that at an early date, to wit, at the next meeting of the Senate, I shall offer a resolution proposing an amendment of the rules of the Senate, by adding the following, to be known as Rule —:

"*Resolved*, That no committee of the Senate shall sit behind closed doors: *Provided, however*, That this rule shall not apply to any committee considering treaties, executive business, or matters affecting foreign relations."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The notice will lie over.

COTTON-GOODS INDUSTRY (S. DOC. NO. 13).

Mr. SMOOT. I ask to have printed as a Senate document an article taken from the New York Commercial of Thursday, April 10, 1913, relative to the cotton-goods industry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. NEWLANDS subsequently said: Numerous suggestions have been made to me that we should meet next Thursday at 2 o'clock instead of 12. I therefore ask unanimous consent to amend the motion just adopted so that the Senate shall meet at 2 o'clock on Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? If there is no objection, the amendment moved by the Senator from Nevada that the Senate shall meet at 2 o'clock on Thursday next will be agreed to. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF ANTITRUST ACT.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, at the last session of the Senate I gave notice that to-day, after the close of the morning business, I would address the Senate upon the bill (S. 112) to restore section 1 of the act of Congress of July 2, 1890, chapter 647, Twenty-sixth Statutes at Large, to its original form as enacted, by striking out the words "unreasonable or undue," inserted therein by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. I desire to give notice now that I shall address the Senate on that bill at the close of the morning business at its session next Thursday.

SUPPRESSION OF OPIUM TRAFFIC (H. DOC. NO 33).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In transmitting the accompanying report from the Secretary of State, I most strongly urge not only the immediate appropriation of the sum of $20,000 which is asked, the absolute necessity for which is so apparent, but also the enactment of the requisite antidrug legislation to which this Government is pledged internationally.

It is a source of gratification to me personally, and it will always be, I am confident, a subject of gratification to the Nation, that this Government, realizing the extent of the opium and allied evils, should have initiated the world-wide movement toward their abolition. At this vital period of the movement to fail to take the few final steps necessary definitively and successfully to conclude the work would be unthinkable, and I therefore trust that there may be no delay in the enactment of the desired legislation and the consequent mitigation, if not suppression, of the vice which has caused such world-wide misery and degradation.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 21, 1913.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message and accompanying paper will be printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. STONE. Referred to the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. BACON. It should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I should say, Mr. President. Ought it not to be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It may go there if the Senator so desires, but it asks for an appropriation of $20,000.

Mr. BACON. I withdraw the suggestion, Mr. President. I did not hear the reading of the message distinctly.

Mr. BACON subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to say, in regard to the message from the President which was recently read and referred, that upon examination I find it contains two recommendations: One is for an appropriation, which properly goes to the Appropriations Committee, and the other is for legislation which would fall within the province of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I therefore ask that the order of reference be modified to the extent that so much of the message as relates to legislation be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask to take from the calendar Senate resolution No. 4, reported by the Committee on Rules with a report asking that the subject be referred to certain committees, and I ask that the report be adopted. I think the report of the Committee on Rules had better be read. It shows exactly what is proposed to be done with the resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. That is a report which went to the calendar under Rule VIII.

Mr. OVERMAN. The resolution went to the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on Rules submitted a report asking that the subject be referred to different committees.

Mr. GALLINGER. The report is now on the calendar.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is now on the calendar.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator asks unanimous consent to take up the report.

Mr. OVERMAN. I call up the report.

Mr. SMOOT. It can be called up by unanimous consent. I do not object.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the report is perfectly satisfactory to the Senator from Nevada. The resolution is upon the calendar, and notice has been given that speeches are to be made upon it. I ask unanimous consent that the report be now taken up and that the various sections referred to be referred to the respective committees as reported by the Committee on Rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator means to refer the subjects to the various committees?

Mr. OVERMAN. To refer the subjects to the committee as reported in the resolution from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator would want to pass the resolution now on the calendar. There ought to be action on the resolution by the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. The action desired is to refer the various sections of the resolution as reported by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GALLINGER. Precisely; but the Senate ought to so order by vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary proceeded to read the resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. I did not ask for the reading of the resolution. The resolution is not now before the Senate. I asked for the reading of the report of the committee and for the adoption of the report of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the report of the committee.

The Secretary read the report (No. 5), as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred Senate resolution 4, having considered the same, report the resolution back to the Senate with the recommendation that each subhead contained therein be referred for consideration to the proper committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter, to wit:

That section 2, relating to tariff and taxation, be referred to the Committee on Finance.

That section 3, relating to interstate-commerce matters, be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

That section 4, relating to interstate exchange, be referred for consideration to the newly created Committee on Banking and Currency.

That section 5, relating to public lands and natural resources, be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

That section 6, relating to military expense and auxiliary Navy, be referred for consideration to the Committees on Military and Naval Affairs, respectively.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, there ought to be an amendment to that report. There is one part of the second heading of the resolution that ought not to go to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. It is a matter that pertains to the business of the Committee on Commerce and relates to the improvement of our navigable streams. I wish the Secretary would be kind enough to read that part of it which is on page 5 of the resolution. I have not a copy of it. That part of the resolution ought to go to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

(d) Whether it is advisable to provide for the creation of a board of river regulation which shall bring into cooperation the departments and services of the National Government whose duties in any way relate to waterways in devising and carrying out comprehensive plans for the promotion of interstate commerce by the regulation of river flow, the mitigation of destructive floods, by the promotion of storage above and of bank and levee protection below, the establishment of terminal and transfer facilities, the coordination of rail and water carriers, and the cooperation of the Nation with the States, each within its jurisdiction, in plans and works for the full and, so far as practicable, compensatory development of the rivers for every useful purpose, and the establishment of an ample fund for continuous work during a period of 10 years.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, if the chairman of the Committee on Rules has no objection, I shall move to amend the report so as to provide that the paragraph just read be referred to the Committee on Commerce instead of to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. OVERMAN. So far as I am concerned, I will accept the amendment. I think that was the intention of the Committee on Rules, though no action was taken upon the Senator's suggestion by the committee. Therefore I left it as the committee directed, but I think it is proper that that part of the resolution should go to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, before the Senate comes to any conclusion regarding that question I should like to be heard.

Regarding the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], that subdivision (d) of resolution 3 be referred to the Committee on Commerce, instead of, as the resolution provides, to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, I have to say that it is true that in the past legislation relating to rivers and harbors has been referred to the Committee on Commerce, but I believe that the Committee on Interstate Commerce is the committee which should have jurisdiction relating to our rivers. I do not know whether the point has ever been made, but if it has not been made, it seems to me that this is a good time to make it.

The Committee on Interstate Commerce is of recent origin as compared with the Committee on Commerce. The Committee on Commerce at one time had jurisdiction of all the subjects now covered by the jurisdiction of both committees, but the Senate, in its wisdom, saw fit to divide the matters under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce into two branches and to organize a Committee on Interstate Commerce for the express purpose of taking up all questions relating to interstate commerce.

Mr. President, the whole power of the National Government relating to rivers rests upon the power of the Nation regarding

the regulation of interstate commerce. So far as the harbors are concerned, they belong to foreign commerce; but so far as the rivers are concerned, they are part of our interstate-commerce system. Our power to regulate and control them rests, not upon any special grant with reference to rivers, but upon a grant of power to the National Government to regulate commerce between the States; and it is the sole power under which the National Government can claim to exercise any jurisdiction over rivers, except such power as it has by reason of its ownership of the public domain regarding rivers within the borders of that domain; and there its powers are as proprietor of the land, and not as sovereign.

It seems to me that this is the right time to determine this question as to what committee has jurisdiction over this subject. Let me say in support of my view that this resolution not only covers the declaration of a policy regarding the rivers themselves, but it also declares for a policy for the establishment of terminal and transfer facilities on the rivers and the coordination of rail and water carriers.

So far as these subjects are concerned, they are now within the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Committee, and have always been considered so. The question of terminals and transfer facilities is a question that relates to the efficient exercise of power over interstate commerce, and the power to require coordination between the rail carriers and the water carriers is also a power which clearly belongs to the Interstate Commerce Committee.

The utmost that can be said is that this particular resolution involves a question that includes the jurisdiction of both committees. If that should be the sentiment of the Senate, the wise thing then would be to refer this particular section to both committees for their views and their reports, for, assuming that the Commerce Committee has thus far rightfully exercised the power actually to improve the rivers, certainly the Interstate Commerce Committee possesses the power to see to it that terminal facilities and transfer facilities are established, because they relate to interstate transportation; and they have the power to see to it that rail and water carriers coordinate so that public servants will, through a system of cooperation, effectually serve the public. My contention, therefore, is——

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to make a suggestion with regard to the question now before the Senate, which is rather an important one. The conflict between the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate Commerce and the Committee on Commerce ought not to be settled at this time; it ought not to be settled until the Committee on Rules has considered it. I suggest, therefore, to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] whether it would not be well to recommit the resolution to the Committee on Rules in order that the committee might consider the propriety of referring a part of it to the Committee on Commerce as well as a part to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. We will not be able to settle satisfactorily this morning the conflict of jurisdiction. There will be a number of Senators, I fancy, who will want to be heard upon that proposition.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Then, let me make an additional suggestion to the Senator, and that is, that the action advised by the committee be taken with reference to all other subjects than the one covered by subdivision (d) of section 3, and that that be recommitted to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. CUMMINS. I make this suggestion because the Committee on Rules did not have under consideration the particular matter that has been presented by the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota; it was not called to our attention; and it seems to me that we ought to have an opportunity to look it over in the committee before it is made the subject of extended debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. NEWLANDS. But will not the Senator yield to my suggestion that that provision alone be recommitted to the Committee on Rules?

Mr. CUMMINS. I mean that; that is the only matter in dispute.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will bear with me, there is another matter to which I wish to call attention that I think also should be recommitted, and that is subdivision (b) of section 5 of the resolution. I do this with some hesitation, because the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands is not present in the Hall and the chairman of the Committee on Conservation of National Resources is not present. It refers to recommendations regarding the protection of our natural resources in timber, coal, iron, and oil against monopolistic control.

It seems to me that if the Committee on Conservation of National Resources, which was formed but three or four years ago, has any jurisdiction whatever, it would be upon the very matter contained in this subdivision. Therefore I should like the Committee on Rules, before making their final report, if they are to recast their report, to take into consideration that suggestion.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I may say that I have no objection at all to the reference of that subdivision also to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Very well.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, would not subdivision (c) be included in the same head as subdivision (b) of that section—the applicability of the land laws of Canada, and so forth?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I would not be so sure of that, because that subdivision refers entirely to obtaining title to the land.

Mr. BURTON. I read from subdivision (c):

> And particularly those provisions regarding the grant of the surface to settlers, excluding from the operation of the grant timber, coal, iron, oil, and water-power sites.

Would not that be part of the proposed program of conservation?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. If the query is asked of me as to the legislative proposition, I should say that that should more properly go to the Committee on Public Lands, because it refers to the surface and the conditions under which the surface shall be granted. However, I think it perhaps ought all to go there.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that that subject matter has been before the Public Lands Committee for a number of years. I think subdivision (c) certainly ought to be referred to the Public Lands Committee:

> The applicability of the land laws of Canada to the conditions of our public domain, and particularly those provisions regarding the grant of the surface to settlers, excluding from the operation of the grant timber, coal, iron, oil, and water-power sites.

The Senator was a member of the Public Lands Committee, and he knows that that subject has been before it for years. I think rightfully it should be referred to that committee.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I think so, too, and my remarks applied only to subdivision (b). The Senator from Wyoming, as I understand, suggested that that subdivision be referred back to the Committee on Rules to determine whether it should go to the Committee on Public Lands or the Committee on Conservation of Natural Resources.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That was the suggestion.

Mr. NEWLANDS. And I assented to that.

Mr. SMOOT. And the Senator from Ohio suggested that subdivision (c) should also go to that committee. But I take it for granted that after further consideration, not only by the Senator from Ohio but by the Senator from Nevada, they will agree that subdivision (c) should go to the Public Lands Committee.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I think the Senator from Ohio will assent to that view.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I have no personal opinion on the subject. I notice that the Committee on Conservation of National Resources does not seem to be represented here. My suggestion was made only with the thought that there was enough of a question relating to subdivision (c) to justify referring back that paragraph or subdivision to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. NEWLANDS. If the Senator insists upon that, of course I shall have no objection.

Mr. BURTON. I think it ought to go back to the committee.

Mr. NEWLANDS. But it seems to me that is a subject over which the Public Lands Committee has exercised jurisdiction for so long a period that there can be no question about it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, let both subjects go back to the committee.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I hope the whole report will be recommitted. I think we can reframe the report according to the ideas suggested here.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I think it necessary only as to the three subdivisions of the bill that have been referred to.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to suggest to the Senator, though, that the report would be much more complete for future reference if but one report were made. I believe, myself, as the Senator from North Carolina says, that it would be very much better to have the whole of the report go back and have a complete report than to have it made in two parts.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Of course I will yield to the view of the chairman of the committee, who wishes the entire report to go back.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think that is better, because it will be more complete, as the Senator from Utah suggests, if we make the report in accordance with the ideas suggested on the floor as to the different subjects. The committee took it up and reported back on each subject as it appeared in the resolution; but it seems that under each subject in the resolution there were subheads involving matters which ought to go to other committees.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Let me state that there are only three subheads that are now matters of contention. Why not except them and let the rest of the report be adopted?

Mr. OVERMAN. I think it would be better to let it go back and have a full report as to the whole matter.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, if no one else wishes to do it, I move that the whole resolution be recommitted to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will confine that action simply to the three subdivisions. It is important that these matters shall be considered by the various committees at as early a date as possible, and there is no contention about most of them.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have assumed, Mr. President, that no time would be lost by doing it. The Senator from Nevada knows that with his main purpose I am perfectly in sympathy; but we are in a tangle here now, and we shall never get anywhere unless we disentangle it.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. CUMMINS. I move that the resolution be recommitted to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I want to say that there is nothing else to do. There is no such thing as amending a committee report by action on the floor. The committee report is an entirety. It must be dealt with by the Senate as an entirety. If defects are discovered in it, the report should be rejected, and it is a matter to be resubmitted to the committee. There has been an obvious defect discovered in this one, if indeed another term should not be applied to it. I am satisfied that it is not the report of the committee. I am satisfied that the committee would have made no such report if it had known what it was doing about this topic.

I make the point of order that there is nothing else to do with the report but either to adopt it, or to recommit it to the committee, or to reject it, and I suggest that the question is upon the motion offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, one of the leading members of the committee was upon the Committee on Rules, and the report is exactly in the terms of the motion made by a Senator who is a member of the Committee on Rules. I think it ought to go back, however.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order made by the Senator from Arkansas is sustained.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I have no objection to its going back to the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] that the resolution be recommitted to the Committee on Rules.

The motion was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERKS OR MESSENGERS TO SENATORS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I call up for consideration Senate resolution 15, being Order of Business No. 4, under Rule VIII.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi asks unanimous consent for the consideration of a resolution, the title of which will be stated by the Secretary.

Mr. SMOOT. Do I understand that the Senator has asked unanimous consent?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have a right to move it, if necessary. I ask unanimous consent for the present. If I do not get it, I will move it.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution 15: A resolution to authorize the employment of an assistant clerk to certain committees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I am not going to object to the consideration of this resolution, because I think it ought to pass; but I stated the other day that I should like to offer an amendment. I will say that if the chairman of the committee will give me assurance, not as to the character of action the committee is likely to take, but that in the near future the committee will act upon the matter that I submitted and bring it before the Senate, so that we will have an opportunity to act on it, I will not delay this resolution at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there was a resolution introduced, to which the Senator from Washington is referring, which provides that every Member of the Senate shall be permitted to have three employees. That matter was brought to the attention of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. Several Senators were heard upon it. The committee has the matter under consideration, but passed a resolution to postpone it until the next meeting, and to take it up then for definite action. The next meeting will be held on Saturday. The committee will act upon it, one way or the other, at that time.

Mr. JONES. And bring it before the Senate? Very well; then I will not interpose any objection to this resolution, because it ought to pass.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The committee will act upon it, one way or the other, at that time; but it may, of course, in its judgment, adopt it or report it adversely or indefinitely postpone it. I do not know what the committee will do, but it will act upon the resolution at that time.

Mr. JONES. What I want to get at is whether the committee will bring its report before the Senate, so that the Senate will have an opportunity to pass upon it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course I do not know about that, but I suppose it will either act adversely or act favorably, and in either event the matter will be brought to the Senate; or the committee may indefinitely postpone it. I think not, however.

Mr. JONES. Of course I do not think the committee should indefinitely postpone it. I think the committee ought to act one way or the other. I do not ask the Senator to assure me as to what action it will take. All I wish is to have the committee bring in its report, whether adverse or favorable.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course I can not give an assurance beforehand as to what the committee will do. I can only give the Senator my judgment. I think it will report it favorably or adversely, one or the other. That is my opinion.

Mr. JONES. Then I shall not object to the present consideration of this resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is before the Senate.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 15) to authorize the employment of an assistant clerk to certain committees.

The resolution had been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, with an amendment, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert a substitute, so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committees on Coast and Insular Survey, on Enrolled Bills, on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, on Expenditures in the Departments of Commerce and Labor, on Standards, Weights, and Measures, on Expenditures in the Department of State, on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game, on National Banks, on Public Health and National Quarantine, on Geological Survey, to Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands, on the Mississippi River and its Tributaries, on Pacific Railroads, on Railroads, on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard, on the University of the United States, on Woman Suffrage, to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service, on Indian Depredations, on Transportation and Sale of Meat Products, on Engrossed Bills, on the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress, on Private Land Claims, on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, on Revolutionary Claims, on Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia, on conference of the minority of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to employ one assistant clerk each, at $1,200 per annum, to be paid from "Miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law: *Provided*, That if any of the committees recited above already have three employees the resolution shall not apply to them, except that this proviso shall not apply to the conference of the minority of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon the amendment offered by the committee.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Let the resolution be read.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say, in explanation of it, that it takes in all of the committees of the Senate, the majority and minority, which have not already three employees, giving to each one of them that now has only two an additional man at $1,200 per annum.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, let me ask the chairman of the committee why it was deemed necessary to propose such a resolution at this time?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the first place, I do not know whether I am speaking out of order or not, but the Democratic caucus instructed me to make that request.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Democratic caucus instructed the Senator to make the request? That is pretty good authority, to be sure; but my understanding of the organization of the Senate is this:

There are 11 so-called minority committees which have three clerks. Probably not all of them are designated as clerks, but they have three clerks. There were 10 committees assigned

to the Democratic minority two years ago that were limited to two clerks by the agreement under which the committees were assigned to this side of the Chamber.

The only distinction in regard to the privileges accorded to the chairman of such a committee is that his clerk has a salary of probably $400 more, and his stenographer probably $200 or $240 more, than the employees of the individual Senator who is not chairman of a committee.

The Democrats who held those chairmanships were quite anxious to have the third clerk added; whether from necessity, or whether for the sake of uniformity, I do not at this time recall. I served upon the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is now chairman, and we considered the matter, and felt bound to observe the terms of the agreement. Besides that, we were unable to find that there was any reason for giving to those nominal committees an additional clerkship that did not also include every other Senator upon this floor. Those committees had no real existence. They had no work to do. It was merely an indirect means by which the plan was adopted of concealing the fact that those particular Senators had privileges that other Senators did not enjoy.

We felt, first, that under the agreement we were precluded from making a demand for the third clerk for these 10 committees; next, that the public service did not require the increased number of clerks; and we steadily and resolutely refused to permit our associates on this side of the Chamber to enjoy the privilege of having a third clerk for those particular 10 committees.

Now, it is proposed to extend the number of useless clerkships in the Senate so as to embrace those additional 10. If that is to be done, I think the Senator from Mississippi should also apply to the Democratic caucus for a bill for the relief of the particular 10 Democrats who were entitled to the privileges that are now extended to the brethren on the other side of the Chamber and that were withheld by their party associates here. I do not see any reason why the Democratic Party, when it came into control of the Senate, should expend more money in conducting its operations than was deemed necessary by our Republican brethren when they had charge.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh! I thought the Senator from Arkansas was through.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I am sure the Senator did. I was not interesting him, and it was very natural for him to suppose that I was through, or ought to have been through.

I simply wanted to bring out the fact that there has been a gross discrimination practiced against 10 Democratic Senators by the proposition that is now made; and to be entirely consistent about it you ought to extend an additional clerkship to every Senator on that side of the Chamber who is not the chairman of a committee—about 25 of them.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator from Utah for the present. I shall be glad to hear what the Senator from Mississippi has to say a little later.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken when he says that there are 10 Senators of the minority that were not taken care of before the Democratic Party came into power. I call his attention to the fact that there were 21 committees——

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Eleven of them were the old well-known minority committees.

Mr. SMOOT. Eleven of them were well-known minority committees. Then there were given to the majority three other committees formerly called minority committees, and I will call attention to which committees they were. They were the Committee on Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia, the Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in Executive Departments, and the Committee on Revolutionary Claims.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No, sir; those belonged to the 11 original minority committees. They have been Democratic minority committees during the long period that we were in the minority.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, they were not the 10 committees that the Senator speaks of.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator is drawing some distinctions that I do not recognize. I know there were 11 committees under the old régime.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to call attention to the fact that the law provides a messenger at $1,200 for the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, and also one at $1,440 for the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice. So that all that is involved in this whole question now, so far as the Republican side of this Chamber is concerned, is about five additional clerks. On the other side, there are changes that were made by the Democratic caucus, taking the Committees on Woman Suffrage and Public Health and National Quarantine from the minority committees and making them majority committees, which of course requires that this resolution shall pass in order that they——

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Of course the observations I submitted applied to general matters. These are mere matters of detail that do not affect the general result. There are 21 minority committees—possibly 24. It may be that three were subsequently added. Let us say there are 24 committees, then, that are under the control of the minority. Eleven of them are entitled to three clerks, and 10 of them are entitled to two.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, all that the Republican Party has here is the chairmanship of 20 committees. It is true that the Democratic Party gave the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] a chairmanship, and that was not charged, as I understand, to the Republican Party. That made the 21.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I am not going to quarrel with the Senator in his recital of details, because he is noted for his accuracy in respect to matters of that kind. I only dealt with the general outlines of the question. There are 21 or 24 committees that belong to the minority. Eleven of them are entitled to three clerks, and the rest are entitled to two clerks. The proposition now, as I understand, is to give each of the 10 committees an additional clerk, so as to make the whole 24 carry three clerks each.

Mr. SMOOT. All I wanted to say to the Senator was that, as far as the Republican side of the Chamber is concerned, this only involves about five additional clerks, and there are the 10 details.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. If we are going to give them five, why should we not give one to every Senator on the other side?

Mr. SMOOT. I will vote with the Senator from Arkansas to do that.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That is not the proposition, however.

Mr. SMOOT. I know it is not, and therefore we are not discussing it at this particular time. But I wanted to say that that is all that is involved, because the law itself specifically provides that the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department shall have three clerks, and the law specifically provides that the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice shall have three.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I go back again to the proposition that I am not discussing details; I am discussing the outlines of the proposition that there are 24 committees to which Senators of the minority are entitled. Eleven of them carry three clerks each and the rest carry two. The proposition is to give an additional clerk to each of those 13 committees.

I say the Democratic Party has no more reason for increasing the expense of conducting the Senate than it has for increasing that of any other department of the Government. If there are reasons for it, they ought to be made known; and it ought to be shown why the increases stop at these paper committees and do not extend to the individual Senators.

I am making a plea for the justice of the proposition as it was applied to our Democratic brethren over here during the years that they enjoyed these nominal chairmanships. If there are reasons for it, they ought to be made known; and we will respond according to the justice of the disclosures as they are presented to us.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the facts of the matter are these: There are 10 details that have always been allowed the minority outside of the 1 detail that went to the conference committee, which, of course, is provided for by law. There are also 5 others, making 15 committees that are already provided for. We are given 20 minority committees, not counting the one of the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER]. Therefore, Mr. President, as I said before, it will only involve an additional expenditure to take care of 5 assistant clerks if this resolution should pass, as far as the Republican side of the Chamber is concerned.

Mr. WORKS. There is no reason for allowing the chairmen of these nominal committees an extra clerk that does not apply with equal force to every Member of this body. I speak from experience. I was chairman of one of the nominal committees that had no work to do, and as a result of it I was allowed three employees in my office, and I needed them all badly. In the transmission of power to the other side of the Chamber I have lost one of those clerks. I need that help just as much now as I did when I was chairman of the committee. Serving on

other important committees necessarily makes additional work for me, and depriving me of that committee, as has been done, has crippled the work in my office.

Now, that ought not to be the case with respect to any Senator. He certainly should have enough help to do his work properly in his office. This matter of allowing clerks to the chairmen of nominal committees has no reason whatever to support it unless the Senator who is chairman needs that help for other purposes. If that be so, we might just as well do the right and square thing, and allow this help to all Senators. I am sure if other Senators are situated as I am they need this additional help, and they should have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What the Senator from California has just said may or may not be a position correctly taken, but it is a position which the Republican majority did not take toward the Democratic minority. It is a position which gentlemen upon the other side have arrived at rather late in the proceeding. I went through the last Congress with but two employees. I managed to get through. I expect I have as large a correspondence as any Senator on this floor, and my office does as much work as any others except those of a few chairmen of large committees.

This is not as large an increase as appears on the face of it. There have been hitherto 10 messengers who have been detailed as committee messengers and who have acted as clerks. They have really been put upon the roll by the Senators who called for them as detailed employees. I expect that without exception these 10 men will take these places, and therefore this special-messenger list ceases to exist. These 10, of course, will be paid now under this resolution.

In reply to my friend the Senator from Arkansas, I will say that I was upon the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with him and I opposed with him the resolution, which was just like this one. I opposed it upon the ground he has just stated, upon the general principle that a mere nominal committee should not call for assistant help for the chairman. But the Democratic caucus instructed that we should give to each committee three employees. It is true that we acted in doing that in a much more generous way toward the Republican minority than the Republican majority acted toward the Democratic minority. But it is not the fault of the committee if that be true. If it be a fault, it is the fault of the party of which the Senator from Arkansas and I are members and of the caucus which we both attended.

When you are discussing the question further, I want to say that the whole superstructure of the English-speaking race, or a great deal of it, is built upon what are called fictions of the law. It seems that wherever the English-speaking race go they begin to originate fictions of some sort in order to subserve practical purposes in a manner which will satisfy somebody demanding a theory for it. In some way in the Senate there grew up the habit of having a lot of nominal committees with nothing to do. Some of them were majority committees and some of them minority committees, and they were created with the view of giving the Senators at the head of those committees additional clerical help. I say with that view, because some of the committees are so ridiculously inoperative that nobody would give any other reason for their existence. But there was an underlying reason for it. As a rule, when a Senator comes here in his first Congress he has, compared with those who have been here longer, less work to do than they have. As he remains here his work accumulates. So the habit grew up of giving to Members in proportion to their seniority these nominal committees.

It was a rough-and-ready way of accommodating clerical assistance for the need of Senators, the supposition underlying it being that in proportion to the length of a Senator's service he needed clerical help. That is not always true. Like all fictions of the law, it is a rough-and-ready process rather than a mathematically accurate one. At any rate, that was the reason underlying it.

Now, we have all gone just this far and no further at this time. Whether we should go further or not I do not know. I do not know what the committee is going to do further, but I hope this resolution will be adopted. For the most part, it will give to those Senators who actually need help the help that they need. I do not say that that will be done in every case. I know several cases where it will not. It will not be the case with men who, owing to their identification with certain propaganda of legislation, need help. Then, I know of other cases——

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In one moment. I know of other cases where Senators make work for themselves. They go out on a crusade and imagine that they need help to carry on the crusade. But there are cases where the man's actual work of a legislative character would demand three employees where he has only two, and they are not provided for here.

Now, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. I wanted to ask the Senator from Mississippi if it is not true that this additional clerk applies not only to minority committees, but in some instances to majority committees?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] stated that. The division was five and five. My recollection is that it is a mistake that there are seven new clerks for the minority and three for the majority, but about that I do not pretend to be accurate. It is just an impression that I have.

Mr. FALL. I have in mind one instance. At the last session of Congress I happened to be chairman of a small committee, one of these nominal committees. It was surely a nominal committee; the committee never had a meeting and I doubt whether the committee will ever have a meeting. That committee had a clerk and a stenographer at the last session. Under this resolution that committee, which is now a majority committee, as it was at that time, will have three. The committee does not need three. The chairman of the committee, in my judgment, should have the three. Doubtless he will need them. The same is true with regard to other Senators. So, far from this being a discrimination, or as the Senator from Arkansas seemed to suggest, something that is being extended to Republicans that was not extended to the Democrats by the Republicans, I simply wanted to call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to this one committee that I speak of. It was a majority committee at the last session, with only two employees, and it is a majority committee at this session, with only two, and it will have three under this resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As will every other committee.

Mr. FALL. As will every other committee, I understand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. These positions are not really given to the committees for committee work; that is self-evident. They are given to them for the reason that senior Senators are supposed to have more work to do, and they claim that they are entitled to these chairmanships by seniority. That is the real logic underlying this fiction.

I hope, Mr. President, that the resolution will be passed.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator from Georgia wish to ask me a question?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; I thought the Senator was through. When the Senator from Mississippi is through I wish to make a few remarks.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I wish to ask the Senator from Mississippi a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will not yield the floor completely. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I wish to ask the Senator from Mississippi a question, if the Senator will allow me. I am hardly clear as to the purpose of the resolution. I have been away from the Chamber while the Senator has been speaking and perhaps he made it clear in my absence. I understand there are certain committees of the minority that have extended to them by detail one messenger.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And there are others that have only two employees without a detail.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I understand. It is not so stated in the resolution, but the purpose is to cut off the detailed messengers——

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was the purpose.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. And allow an assistant clerk at $1,200 per annum. Yet there is nothing in the resolution to take those messengers as details from the roll of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They are already taken from the roll of the Senate and are now in the service of the several chairmen of committees, and we presume they will be reappointed.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That is true; but they will not be reappointed as messengers. The roll of the Senate contains so many messengers—40, we will say. Ten of those messengers are detailed, we will say, to 10 minority committees. Those particular 10 are replaced by assistant clerks, leaving just 40 places upon the Senate roll, but only 30 of those places filled.

There is nothing in the resolution to cut off those 10 additional places and make the saving which the Senator is aiming at. Ought there not to be something in it to state the fact affirmatively that when those messengers cease service with these committees the place itself shall cease upon the roll of the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is an amendment which is proposed to be offered by the Senator from Utah which will take care of that by striking out the language "assisant clerk" and substituting the word "messenger."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I am not sure that that will do it, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that will take care of it, because the Sergeant at Arms will not appoint any more messengers to take the place of these.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I do not know whether he will or not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know he will not.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. He will have the place that can be filled. What I am objecting to right now is the possible generosity which may result in taking away $1,400 places from 10 committees and giving them $1,200 places and then taking the $1,400 places and filling them up by the appointment of whoever the Sergeant at Arms may see fit to designate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I assume the Sergeant at Arms will not appoint anybody to fill the places of these vacant messengerships.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. But would it not be well to make that perfectly plain?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will offer an amendment to make it plainer, I shall not object to it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I am not drawing amendments for the Senator, but I want to call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to a further fact. It seems to me the resolution is not perfectly plain in its statement that the messengers are to be dropped.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am perfectly certain that the Sergeant at Arms will do just what we want done, and there will be no difficulty about it. The trouble about what the Senator would want is this: All these messengers were carried upon an appropriation bill, and a Senate resolution can not abolish the position. If you were to put that in this resolution, you could not abolish the position as far as they are concerned. They are provided for. All we do is to let them be provided for upon the committee, and the Sergeant at Arms will not appoint anybody to fill their places. They are already detailed, and they are serving on the committees; and without an exception I suppose the men who are now serving will be reappointed, because when a Senator wanted a messenger detailed to him he named the man who was to be detailed to him. So practically it will work out just as we expect it to work. We could not by a mere resolution repeal a law.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Then the legislative situation would be that we have a law providing that certain men shall be paid at the rate of $1,440 per annum, and the Senate thinks that is an extravagance, and proposes to pay them out of its own contingent fund at $1,200 per annum until the end of the present fiscal year?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; until the end of the fiscal year. That is the substance of it. Now I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire, Mr. President, to enter a very brief criticism upon the plan of payment of many of the clerks of these various committees. For myself I am in favor of abolishing the committees that amount to nothing and giving a Senator the clerical aid that he needs. During the last session of Congress I was obliged to have three clerks. I had two, having no committee, and employed another, and paid the clerk myself. I do not think a Senator ought to be put in such a position. I think if a Senator, whether he is in the minority or not, needs three clerks he ought to have them, and I do not believe in using a nominal committee that is not a committee as a basis for giving them to him. I do not know that we can change it right now. It is an old custom that I speak of, but I hope we will get away from it the first time when it is possible to do so.

As illustrations, I wish to call attention to two or three gross inequalities in clerical hire furnished to Senators and furnished to committees, for which I do not believe there is a particle of excuse. I think the whole committee service and the clerical service upon committees ought to be revised and put on a rational basis. Take the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs. They stand upon the same basis and have practically about the same work. I find that the Committee on Military Affairs is given a chief clerk at $2,500, an assistant at $2,220, another assistant at $1,440, and a messenger at $1,200. I find that the Committee on Naval Affairs has a clerk at $2,500, an assistant at $1,440, and a messenger at $1,440.

Mr. SMOOT. I suppose the Senator knows there is a great deal more work in the Committee on Military Affairs than in the Committee on Naval Affairs. There are hundreds of bills referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and there are very few meetings of the Committee on Naval Affairs, with the exception of the time when the naval appropriation bill is under consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will turn to another, then. Take the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department and the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice. I find in one instance a messenger is paid $1,440 and in the other a messenger is paid $1,200. They are not messengers; they are stenographers. They ought to be given the name of the position they fill, and they ought to be paid fairly. I find one assistant clerk at $1,800——

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon me, that is just one of the ills we are seeking to correct now. We make the pay of the messenger of all these subordinate committees $1,200, instead of leaving some at $1,440 and some at $1,200. This resolution covers that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. You change them all to $1,200?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We change them all to $1,200.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I find in some of the other committees the assistant clerk is paid $1,800 and in another committee he is paid $1,440. Take the Judiciary Committee. I find a clerk at $2,500, one at $2,220, one at $1,800, one at $1,800, and a messenger at $1,440. I do not believe that there is such a difference between the work of the Judiciary Committee and these other committees. It seems to me that the fair and proper rule to adopt——

Mr. BACON. I hope my colleague will read in this connection the clerical force of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was noticing that just a moment ago. I will stop to read that and compare the two. In the Committee on Foreign Relations there are a clerk at $2,500, an assistant at $2,220, and one at $1,440, while the Judiciary Committee has two more clerks at $1,800.

Mr. President and Senators, I think that the proper and fair thing, as soon as we have an opportunity, is to take these committees and treat them fairly and squarely, abolish those which amount to nothing and retain those which are really important, and furnish clerical hire according to the service required. I hope we will in the near future come to the further proposition of giving Senators who have not committees the clerks they need.

Mr. STONE. Will the Senator from Georgia yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. What I am about to say will call for a response from the colleague of the junior Senator. The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I assume there are a good many more bills referred to the Committee on the Judiciary than to the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I should like to ask the opinion of the senior Senator from Georgia, who has had large experience on both committees, whether there is such a difference in the burden of work imposed on these two great committees as would require numerically nearly twice the clerical force and fully twice the cost of the clerical force as between those two committees.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Missouri I would state that there is no doubt about the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary has a great deal more detailed work than the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I do not think that the Committee on the Judiciary has any large amount of work which requires greater clerical assistance than the work of the Committee on Foreign Relations requires. The Committee on the Judiciary has a great deal of work through subcommittees; I presume more so than any other committee; certainly more than any other one committee that I have had occasion to give very close observation to.

The Committee on the Judiciary has a great many judicial questions submitted to its determination which require work by subcommittees. It has a great many nominations to consider, which require work by subcommittees, and very extended hearings by subcommittees; but they do not call for clerical labor except in the way of stenographers to take down the testimony taken before those subcommittees.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. They are outside.

Mr. BACON. I was about to state that in that case there is always brought in an expert stenographer for the purpose of taking down testimony. The ordinary stenographer of a committee is not competent to take down testimony given in an examination. It requires an expert stenographer, and they are always called in and paid extra.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If he is competent he has the committee's regular work to attend to, and another expert stenographer is always called in, anyhow.

Mr. BACON. Whether that is a reason or not, the other is a sufficient reason. I suppose there are a few committee stenographers who are capable of taking down testimony in the same way that our stenographers here take down the debates. There is nothing more difficult for a stenographer than the taking down of testimony where witnesses are being examined, subject to interruptions and cross-examination and conflicting questions and all that. It necessitates the utmost expertness on the part of the stenographer who takes it down. As a rule, I think, the former chairman of the committee, who sits before me, the present chairman not being now in his seat, will bear me out in the statement that in all the extended hearings, some of them lasting through months, an outside stenographer is brought in. I was on one subcommittee, I recall, that lasted a good many months; a vast volume of testimony was taken in that case; and, as in almost every other case, there was an outside stenographer called in who was an expert for that business.

So I return to the statement that while the detail work of the Judiciary Committee is very much greater than the detail work of the Foreign Relations Committee, I do not think the clerical labor required in the Judiciary Committee is materially greater, if at all greater, than the clerical work required in the Foreign Relations Committee.

I will state in this connection something that I think possibly may have to be brought to the attention of the Senate hereafter. The Foreign Relations Committee peculiarly requires a class of clerical assistance which, possibly, no other committee requires, because of the peculiar character of the questions with which it has to deal, international questions requiring sometimes very extended examinations, requiring familiarity with international law, requiring familiarity with treaties and methods of making treaties, and things of that kind. This, it seems to me, would require that the Committee on Foreign Relations should have an officer different from any which it is now authorized to employ, one possessing a higher degree of knowledge of these higher branches than is generally to be found in the case of the clerkship of a committee.

I have never moved in that regard because of the indisposition which has been manifested in what has been said by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] to call for more, now that the Democrats are in power, than was enjoyed by the Republicans when they were in power.

But I will say this: I have been for a long time—for some 10 years or more, possibly—chairman of one of these nominal committees. It is true I have been chairman, as it so happened, of committees which did have something to do, but very little compared to the more important committees. But the Foreign Relations Committee now has exactly the same force and only the force that the nominal committee had of which I have heretofore been the chairman. All that force is required for my personal work, and it is just simply that much additional work put upon them when the work of the committee is imposed upon those three employees or clerks which was formerly imposed upon them as the force of this nominal committee.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I wish to say, respecting the Judiciary Committee——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Just one word more, and then I will be through, if the Senator will yield.

I have said practically all I wish to say. Looking at the list of committees and the pay received by the different clerks of committees, it seemed to me perfectly evident that there was, at least in some instances, no regard for the services rendered in the differences of the pay. I wanted to call attention to it, and to express the hope that whenever we fix pay in the future regard shall be had to equality of service and equality of pay.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, lest it should be taken that the statement had been suggested that some of the committees had been in past Congresses having an excessive amount of help I wish to say in regard to the Judiciary Committee, having been chairman of that committee, that it is quite possible that that chairmanship having been changed and under better management less help will be required. I hope that is true. I never have compared the assistance which one committee has with another, but as long as the chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee was held by myself I have endeavored to secure for the services of that committee all the help that I thought was necessary for the proper performance of the duties of the committee, and no more. I will say now that I do not think that committee has ever had help that it did not require.

So far as comparing it with other committees is concerned I have no disposition to do that, and I have no knowledge upon which to make any comparison. I believe that every active committee of the Senate should have the help which it reasonably requires to perform its work, that it should have sufficient help and competent help.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not misunderstand me. I did not mean by anything I said to indicate that the Committee on the Judiciary had more help than it required; I did mean to indicate that the Foreign Relations Committee, which has not so much help, has not as much as it ought to have.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I was not referring to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. Now, Mr. President, if I may be pardoned——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am through.

Mr. BACON. While I am on my feet, Mr. President, I want to say that I think there is very great lack of appreciation on the part of the public, and possibly of some Senators who have not yet bent their backs to the full burden that they will have to bear, of the amount of labor that has to be done by a Senator who represents a whole State. The tendency has grown, and is continuing to increase, to devolve upon a Senator everything that is also devolved upon a Representative; in other words, a man at home is not content to get the assistance of his Representative, but the same assistance which he appeals to his Representative to give to him, he appeals to his Senator to give to him. In my State, for instance, with 12 Representatives, I have practically, sharing with my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Georgia], 12 districts, instead of 1, and the amount of labor which is imposed and the amount of clerical work which is required are immense.

Not only so, Mr. President, but the functions of the Federal Government have been so enlarged that I think it is not unreasonable or extravagant to say that a Senator has from two to three times as much work to do as a Senator had when I first became a Member of this body. I did not so fully realize that until some time ago in hearing a remark made by a Senator who served during the early part of my service here, who went out of the Senate, and came back. The work has grown gradually upon those who have remained here all of this time, and we hardly appreciate what the increase has been; but a Senator who went out and who was gone from the Chamber for six or eight years and came back, said to me when he came back that there was twice as much for him to do as there was in his former service.

The rolls of the Senate may appear to be large, but when it is considered what immense constituencies we represent, what immense interests we are called upon to deal with, what varied and almost innumerable functions of the Government we have to be constantly in the consideration of and in the dealing with, it is not to be wondered at that a very much larger force is required than was heretofore required and a much larger force than those who are not familiar with all these conditions may think to be necessary.

I do not know of any committee that has more assistance than it needs. When a Senator has an important committee and attends to the work of that committee, which is very great, and when he has, in addition to that, his own work to attend to, the clerical force required for him in order to properly attend to his committee work and to his personal work must necessarily be very large.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to say that it was not my purpose to criticize the number of clerical aids given to the Judiciary Committee. I was simply calling attention to the fact that there was an inequality in the distribution of the help to committees. I also wish to express the opinion that we ought to be willing to give every Senator, whether he has a committee or not, and although he is in the minority, the clerical help that he requires. He uses it to serve his people at home; he uses it in response to demands made upon him from home by his people. Without regard to the length of service of Senators, I think they each need more than two employees.

I found three could scarcely keep up with the demands from my home during the first two years of my service, and three now do not keep up with it, without any committee work at all to do. Having three and having a chairmanship, yet with no calls from the committee for service by my force, three do not attend to the demands from my home, from the people, to answer their letters and to look after matters in the departments about which they write to me; and their letters, I think, are entitled to a response, and to attention in the departments. I think it is poor economy to object to furnishing the force in a Senator's office necessary to look after the business of his constituents at home which they place upon their Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that, if his experience is the same as mine, he must receive hundreds and thousands of letters from people outside of his

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is an amendment which is proposed to be offered by the Senator from Utah which will take care of that by striking out the language "assisant clerk" and substituting the word "messenger."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I am not sure that that will do it, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that will take care of it, because the Sergeant at Arms will not appoint any more messengers to take the place of these.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I do not know whether he will or not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know he will not.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. He will have the place that can be filled. What I am objecting to right now is the possible generosity which may result in taking away $1,400 places from 10 committees and giving them $1,200 places and then taking the $1,400 places and filling them up by the appointment of whoever the Sergeant at Arms may see fit to designate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I assume the Sergeant at Arms will not appoint anybody to fill the places of these vacant messengerships.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. But would it not be well to make that perfectly plain?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will offer an amendment to make it plainer, I shall not object to it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I am not drawing amendments for the Senator, but I want to call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to a further fact. It seems to me the resolution is not perfectly plain in its statement that the messengers are to be dropped.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am perfectly certain that the Sergeant at Arms will do just what we want done, and there will be no difficulty about it. The trouble about what the Senator would want is this: All these messengers were carried upon an appropriation bill, and a Senate resolution can not abolish the position. If you were to put that in this resolution, you could not abolish the position as far as they are concerned. They are provided for. All we do is to let them be provided for upon the committee, and the Sergeant at Arms will not appoint anybody to fill their places. They are already detailed, and they are serving on the committees; and without an exception I suppose the men who are now serving will be reappointed, because when a Senator wanted a messenger detailed to him he named the man who was to be detailed to him. So practically it will work out just as we expect it to work. We could not by a mere resolution repeal a law.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Then the legislative situation would be that we have a law providing that certain men shall be paid at the rate of $1,440 per annum, and the Senate thinks that is an extravagance, and proposes to pay them out of its own contingent fund at $1,200 per annum until the end of the present fiscal year?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; until the end of the fiscal year. That is the substance of it. Now I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire, Mr. President, to enter a very brief criticism upon the plan of payment of many of the clerks of these various committees. For myself I am in favor of abolishing the committees that amount to nothing and giving a Senator the clerical aid that he needs. During the last session of Congress I was obliged to have three clerks. I had two, having no committee, and employed another, and paid the clerk myself. I do not think a Senator ought to be put in such a position. I think if a Senator, whether he is in the minority or not, needs three clerks he ought to have them, and I do not believe in using a nominal committee that is not a committee as a basis for giving them to him. I do not know that we can change it right now. It is an old custom that I speak of, but I hope we will get away from it the first time when it is possible to do so.

As illustrations, I wish to call attention to two or three gross inequalities in clerical hire furnished to Senators and furnished to committees, for which I do not believe there is a particle of excuse. I think the whole committee service and the clerical service upon committees ought to be revised and put on a rational basis. Take the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs. They stand upon the same basis and have practically about the same work. I find that the Committee on Military Affairs is given a chief clerk at $2,500, an assistant at $2,220, another assistant at $1,440, and a messenger at $1,200. I find that the Committee on Naval Affairs has a clerk at $2,500, an assistant at $1,440, and a messenger at $1,440.

Mr. SMOOT. I suppose the Senator knows there is a great deal more work in the Committee on Military Affairs than in the Committee on Naval Affairs. There are hundreds of bills referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and there are very few meetings of the Committee on Naval Affairs, with the exception of the time when the naval appropriation bill is under consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will turn to another, then. Take the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department and the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice. I find in one instance a messenger is paid $1,440 and in the other a messenger is paid $1,200. They are not messengers; they are stenographers. They ought to be given the name of the position they fill, and they ought to be paid fairly. I find one assistant clerk at $1,800——

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon me, that is just one of the ills we are seeking to correct now. We make the pay of the messenger of all these subordinate committees $1,200, instead of leaving some at $1,440 and some at $1,200. This resolution covers that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. You change them all to $1,200?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We change them all to $1,200.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I find in some of the other committees the assistant clerk is paid $1,800 and in another committee he is paid $1,440. Take the Judiciary Committee. I find a clerk at $2,500, one at $2,220, one at $1,800, one at $1,800, and a messenger at $1,440. I do not believe that there is such a difference between the work of the Judiciary Committee and these other committees. It seems to me that the fair and proper rule to adopt——

Mr. BACON. I hope my colleague will read in this connection the clerical force of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was noticing that just a moment ago. I will stop to read that and compare the two. In the Committee on Foreign Relations there are a clerk at $2,500, an assistant at $2,220, and one at $1,440, while the Judiciary Committee has two more clerks at $1,800.

Mr. President and Senators, I think that the proper and fair thing, as soon as we have an opportunity, is to take these committees and treat them fairly and squarely, abolish those which amount to nothing and retain those which are really important, and furnish clerical hire according to the service required. I hope we will in the near future come to the further proposition of giving Senators who have not committees the clerks they need.

Mr. STONE. Will the Senator from Georgia yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. What I am about to say will call for a response from the colleague of the junior Senator. The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I assume there are a good many more bills referred to the Committee on the Judiciary than to the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I should like to ask the opinion of the senior Senator from Georgia, who has had large experience on both committees, whether there is such a difference in the burden of work imposed on these two great committees as would require numerically nearly twice the clerical force and fully twice the cost of the clerical force as between those two committees.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Missouri I would state that there is no doubt about the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary has a great deal more detailed work than the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I do not think that the Committee on the Judiciary has any large amount of work which requires greater clerical assistance than the work of the Committee on Foreign Relations requires. The Committee on the Judiciary has a great deal of work through subcommittees; I presume more so than any other committee; certainly more than any other one committee that I have had occasion to give very close observation to.

The Committee on the Judiciary has a great many judicial questions submitted to its determination which require work by subcommittees. It has a great many nominations to consider, which require work by subcommittees, and very extended hearings by subcommittees; but they do not call for clerical labor except in the way of stenographers to take down the testimony taken before those subcommittees.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. They are outside.

Mr. BACON. I was about to state that in that case there is always brought in an expert stenographer for the purpose of taking down testimony. The ordinary stenographer of a committee is not competent to take down testimony given in an examination. It requires an expert stenographer, and they are always called in and paid extra.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If he is competent he has the committee's regular work to attend to, and another expert stenographer is always called in, anyhow.

Mr. BACON. Whether that is a reason or not, the other is a sufficient reason. I suppose there are a few committee stenographers who are capable of taking down testimony in the same way that our stenographers here take down the debates. There is nothing more difficult for a stenographer than the taking down of testimony where witnesses are being examined, subject to interruptions and cross-examination and conflicting questions and all that. It necessitates the utmost expertness on the part of the stenographer who takes it down. As a rule, I think, the former chairman of the committee, who sits before me, the present chairman not being now in his seat, will bear me out in the statement that in all the extended hearings, some of them lasting through months, an outside stenographer is brought in. I was on one subcommittee, I recall, that lasted a good many months; a vast volume of testimony was taken in that case; and, as in almost every other case, there was an outside stenographer called in who was an expert for that business.

So I return to the statement that while the detail work of the Judiciary Committee is very much greater than the detail work of the Foreign Relations Committee, I do not think the clerical labor required in the Judiciary Committee is materially greater, if at all greater, than the clerical work required in the Foreign Relations Committee.

I will state in this connection something that I think possibly may have to be brought to the attention of the Senate hereafter. The Foreign Relations Committee peculiarly requires a class of clerical assistance which, possibly, no other committee requires, because of the peculiar character of the questions with which it has to deal, international questions requiring sometimes very extended examinations, requiring familiarity with international law, requiring familiarity with treaties and methods of making treaties, and things of that kind. This, it seems to me, would require that the Committee on Foreign Relations should have an officer different from any which it is now authorized to employ, one possessing a higher degree of knowledge of these higher branches than is generally to be found in the case of the clerkship of a committee.

I have never moved in that regard because of the indisposition which has been manifested in what has been said by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] to call for more, now that the Democrats are in power, than was enjoyed by the Republicans when they were in power.

But I will say this: I have been for a long time—for some 10 years or more, possibly—chairman of one of these nominal committees. It is true I have been chairman, as it so happened, of committees which did have something to do, but very little compared to the more important committees. But the Foreign Relations Committee now has exactly the same force and only the force that the nominal committee had of which I have heretofore been the chairman. All that force is required for my personal work, and it is just simply that much additional work put upon them when the work of the committee is imposed upon those three employees or clerks which was formerly imposed upon them as the force of this nominal committee.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I wish to say, respecting the Judiciary Committee——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Just one word more, and then I will be through, if the Senator will yield.

I have said practically all I wish to say. Looking at the list of committees and the pay received by the different clerks of committees, it seemed to me perfectly evident that there was, at least in some instances, no regard for the services rendered in the differences of the pay. I wanted to call attention to it, and to express the hope that whenever we fix pay in the future regard shall be had to equality of service and equality of pay.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, lest it should be taken that the statement had been suggested that some of the committees had been in past Congresses having an excessive amount of help I wish to say in regard to the Judiciary Committee, having been chairman of that committee, that it is quite possible that that chairmanship having been changed and under better management less help will be required. I hope that is true. I never have compared the assistance which one committee has with another, but as long as the chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee was held by myself I have endeavored to secure for the services of that committee all the help that I thought was necessary for the proper performance of the duties of the committee, and no more. I will say now that I do not think that committee has ever had help that it did not require.

So far as comparing it with other committees is concerned I have no disposition to do that, and I have no knowledge upon which to make any comparison. I believe that every active committee of the Senate should have the help which it reasonably requires to perform its work, that it should have sufficient help and competent help.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not misunderstand me. I did not mean by anything I said to indicate that the Committee on the Judiciary had more help than it required; I did mean to indicate that the Foreign Relations Committee, which has not so much help, has not as much as it ought to have.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I was not referring to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. Now, Mr. President, if I may be pardoned——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am through.

Mr. BACON. While I am on my feet, Mr. President, I want to say that I think there is very great lack of appreciation on the part of the public, and possibly of some Senators who have not yet bent their backs to the full burden that they will have to bear, of the amount of labor that has to be done by a Senator who represents a whole State. The tendency has grown, and is continuing to increase, to devolve upon a Senator everything that is also devolved upon a Representative; in other words, a man at home is not content to get the assistance of his Representative, but the same assistance which he appeals to his Representative to give to him, he appeals to his Senator to give to him. In my State, for instance, with 12 Representatives, I have practically, sharing with my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Georgia], 12 districts, instead of 1, and the amount of labor which is imposed and the amount of clerical work which is required are immense.

Not only so, Mr. President, but the functions of the Federal Government have been so enlarged that I think it is not unreasonable or extravagant to say that a Senator has from two to three times as much work to do as a Senator had when I first became a Member of this body. I did not so fully realize that until some time ago in hearing a remark made by a Senator who served during the early part of my service here, who went out of the Senate, and came back. The work has grown gradually upon those who have remained here all of this time, and we hardly appreciate what the increase has been; but a Senator who went out and who was gone from the Chamber for six or eight years and came back, said to me when he came back that there was twice as much for him to do as there was in his former service.

The rolls of the Senate may appear to be large, but when it is considered what immense constituencies we represent, what immense interests we are called upon to deal with, what varied and almost innumerable functions of the Government we have to be constantly in the consideration of and in the dealing with, it is not to be wondered at that a very much larger force is required than was heretofore required and a much larger force than those who are not familiar with all these conditions may think to be necessary.

I do not know of any committee that has more assistance than it needs. When a Senator has an important committee and attends to the work of that committee, which is very great, and when he has, in addition to that, his own work to attend to, the clerical force required for him in order to properly attend to his committee work and to his personal work must necessarily be very large.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to say that it was not my purpose to criticize the number of clerical aids given to the Judiciary Committee. I was simply calling attention to the fact that there was an inequality in the distribution of the help to committees. I also wish to express the opinion that we ought to be willing to give every Senator, whether he has a committee or not, and although he is in the minority, the clerical help that he requires. He uses it to serve his people at home; he uses it in response to demands made upon him from home by his people. Without regard to the length of service of Senators, I think they each need more than two employees.

I found three could scarcely keep up with the demands from my home during the first two years of my service, and three now do not keep up with it, without any committee work at all to do. Having three and having a chairmanship, yet with no calls from the committee for service by my force, three do not attend to the demands from my home, from the people, to answer their letters and to look after matters in the departments about which they write to me; and their letters, I think, are entitled to a response, and to attention in the departments. I think it is poor economy to object to furnishing the force in a Senator's office necessary to look after the business of his constituents at home which they place upon their Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that, if his experience is the same as mine, he must receive hundreds and thousands of letters from people outside of his

home State. In fact, my mail to-day has at least as many letters from other States of the Union as it does from the State of Utah. I have always tried to attend to those just the same as I do those from my own home State, and I suppose that is the case with almost every other Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have not had the experience of being called upon to look after matters in the departments from other States, but I have had many inquiries about pending legislation and matters connected with legislation, information wished, all of which I endeavor to answer. I have never had less than one additional clerk in my office employed and paid by myself.

Mr. MCCUMBER. Mr. President, I think some of the Senators, at least, who are now chairmen of minority committees and who have had assigned to them from the Senate a messenger at $1,440 will be surprised to learn in this innocent resolution, which, upon its face, gave them one more clerk at $1,200, is really intended to cut down the messenger they now have to $1,200. That is the purpose as indicated by the chairman of the committee presenting the resolution.

Mr. President, I think what has already been stated by the two Senators from Georgia has indicated pretty clearly to the minds of most Senators that those who are engaged to do the work of the constituents of a Senator's own State are more than mere messengers. In my own office I know either they have got to brief cases or I have got to brief them for a great many people who are asking me for information and for opinions upon laws and upon cases which they present, where the decisions are against them in some land case or something of that character, so that I can present the cases to the Secretary of the Interior or to some other Secretary. So the class of clerks that we use, messengers included, are a class that must be capable once in a while of going to the departments and attending to cases for a Senator where the Senator can not possibly leave the Senate Chamber or leave the business connected with it.

Mr. President, the messengers that are employed to hand in cards for some one who wants to call a Senator out are receiving $1,440, but under this resolution the clerk whom you are to use in your committee and who is supposed to be competent to do the kind of work that will be required of him is to receive but $1,200.

I think every Senator who has clerks credited to him will agree with me that he needs certainly as intelligent men in his committee as are needed to hand cards into the Senate Chamber. I do not believe that we ought to cut any of them down to a meager $1,200 salary, and I am going to move to amend the resolution offered by the Senator by striking out the $1,200 item and inserting in lieu thereof $1,440. I offer that as an amendment.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, as I understand, the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate is going to hold further meetings in reference to the question of granting an additional clerk to all of the Senators. Am I correct about that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the Senator's inquiry?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Do I understand the chairman of the committee to say that he is going to hold further meetings or hold a further meeting in reference to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I distinctly stated, in answer to a question by the Senator from Washington—perhaps the Senator from Michigan was not then in his seat—that at the last meeting of the committee a resolution was passed that that particular resolution be taken up at the next meeting, which will be on Saturday next. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate has a regular meeting every Saturday.

In that connection, by the way, I want to say that some complaint has been made about these men receiving $1,200 a year. That committee has a great deal of work to do, and it ought to have if it is properly attended to. They were in session last Saturday about five hours, and the clerk of that committee receives, or its messenger who does stenographic work corresponding to the position named in this resolution receives, only $1,200.

Going back to the question asked by the Senator, I can only repeat what I said to the Senator from Washington, that on Saturday next this resolution comes up for consideration again, and I think the whole committee will at that meeting dispose of it one way or another. It may not get through discussing it and may carry it over to another meeting, but I think they will dispose of it one way or another. That is my opinion.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will allow me, I wish to ask the Senator from Mississippi a question. Does he not believe that the messenger he speaks of, who is a stenographer, should receive $1,440?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I do not. I can get him for $1,200, and he is a remarkably good stenographer. He does his work splendidly.

In connection with what the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] has said about somebody here at $1,440 a year handing in a card and somebody being a stenographer at $1,200, that may be a very good argument on either one of the two sides. It might be an argument to raise the salary of one; it might be an argument to reduce the salary of the other. Those incongruities have nothing to do with this proposition. I could get up and spend a week talking about incongruities of payment not only in the service of the Senate but all over the world. A good tailor receives more money sometimes than does a good lawyer.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator, I presume, admits that the cost of living has advanced in the last few years to some extent?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. Does it look quite compatible with that idea that the compensation of help should be reduced in price by $240 a year?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, there were two reasons for that. We are reducing some of them, and some of them are remaining where they were. The position with this committee, for example, has been $1,200 all the time. Such positions with a great many of these nominal committees have paid $1,200 a year all the time. Some of them were $1,440. We thought we ought to make them all $1,440 or else make all of them $1,200, and we decided to make all of them $1,200.

Mr. WARREN. May I offer one explanation there? The matter of $1,200 salary was introduced really not over two years ago, when an additional clerk or messenger was allowed because of the growing business, I assume, at that time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator is mistaken. I have been on the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate only two years, because I have been a Member of the Senate only that long, but I understand that this one employee has always been paid $1,200 and that committee has always had a third man.

Mr. WARREN. I am not prepared to say as to that now, but I think the Senator is mistaken certainly as to the general line of clerks. We have very few employees at $1,200 and they were authorized quite recently. For instance, I recall that all the clerks of this grade were receiving $1,440 when two committees asked that one clerk should be raised at the expense of the other because the messenger would simply act perhaps as a laborer or perform no clerical work, his duties being rather to wait on the committee. In those cases—I refer to the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Claims—because of the circumstances it was thought that the second clerk should have more than the third clerk, but otherwise they have all received $1,440. As I have said, something like two years ago there were some additions made at $1,200.

Of course, personally, I propose to be satisfied with whatever may be permitted me. The fact that I have been cut to half the usual number of clerks and have to pay some of them myself is the fortune or misfortune of political warfare, the result of the changes of politics, and I do not propose to make any complaint; but it is a bit ungracious, after the minority committees for more than 20 years have had messengers detailed from the roll of the Sergeant at Arms at $1,440—it has been the same whether the majority was Democratic or Republican—that immediately after this change, just at this time, and especially in view of the admitted fact, if you please, that the cost of living has advanced in the last 20 years, and, as stated by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], the work of Senators has increased very greatly—it does seem, I repeat, a little ungracious to reduce the rate of compensation of clerks allotted to the senior minority Members of the Senate who are, of course, occupying places on important committees that require a great deal of work.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am satisfied that when the Senator from Wyoming comes to think more about it he will conclude that he had no right to say that the present majority has been acting "ungraciously" to the minority.

Mr. WARREN. I did not say that anyone had acted ungraciously, but I said it seemed rather ungracious to insist now upon the change. I leave it with the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, the Senator will regret that he said "it seemed ungracious"——

Mr. WARREN. If it annoys the Senator I will withdraw it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Because it ought to seem very gracious to him for us to give a third man on some six or seven committees more than the minority on this side ever had, and it was done by a resolution of the Democratic caucus, showing that it was party action. So much for that.

Mr. WARREN. May I say to the Senator right there that he is not only adding a third man to a small number of minority committees but he is adding a third man to several committees of the majority——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that.

Mr. WARREN. That this side of the Senate did not formerly allow.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We are adding a third man to about seven minority committees and to about three majority committees. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has it five and five; but I think, when he looks over it, he will find that he is in error.

Now, I want to say this: Of course I sympathize with you gentlemen over there. You have been in the majority, and while you were in the majority every one of you had three employees. You are not in the habit of being in the minority.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Senator is mistaken about our having three employees.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; the Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought you all had three employees. I thought every one of you was chairman of some committee.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I did not have three clerks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very few of you, then, did not.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be correct, I want to say that there are nine committees of the majority—the Committee on Coast and Insular Survey, the Committee on Enrolled Bills, the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, the Committee on Expenditures in the Departments of Commerce and Labor, the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of State, the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game, the Committee on National Banks, the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, and the Committee on Woman Suffrage—nine committees of the majority and five of the minority.

Mr. STONE. What about them?

Mr. SMOOT. That are increased from two to three clerks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well; perhaps I am mistaken about that; but, at any rate, whatever it gives you, it gives you more than you ever gave us. It does not make much difference how much more, but it does give you more.

I was about to say that I feel sorry for you in a certain sense. You can not reverse a great national engine without disturbing the comfort of some of the passengers upon the train, especially if they are passengers in a Pullman car, who have been in the habit of enjoying the utmost luxuries of every description. It is more unpleasant to them than it is to the fellow in the ordinary local coach, where the smoking is done at the end of the train. You get in the habit of having this assistance and it is very hard for you to leave it off, whereas this side was educated in the business of helping itself to the utmost extent possible.

I have just passed through two years with two men, one of them, by the way, receiving $1,200 a year—not even $1,440—and the other man, I think, receiving $1,800; but whatever it was, we managed to get along. It is true there were three of us—those two and I; we made the three, and I did a good deal of the work. It is not intended that Senators should do no work of a clerical character at all. They get help, they get aid and assistance, but not substitutes. I especially feel sorry for Senators who were chairmen of important committees and had four and sometimes five assistants, who have come down now to three and, in some cases, to two. My heart goes out to you; but the Democratic Party has gallivanted around the country through its stump speakers and has announced that it proposes to economize in governmental expenditures. The expenses of the Senate of the United States are per annum ten times those of the House of Lords; and the minute we have a change in the administration you begin to crowd us to increase the expenditures, instead of cutting them off.

Now, we have a double duty to perform, and one of the duties conflicts with our affections. We have a duty to you, and we have a duty to the country, and our duty to the country may now and then conflict with our affection for you. We will try to bring the two as near as we can in unity and do the best we can for you, but just at this time this seems to me a pretty good thing for us to do. There are Senators like the Senator from Michigan——

Mr. OLIVER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think I have the floor, Mr. President, and I have not yielded.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not know the Senator had the floor.

Mr. OLIVER. I was about to ask who had the floor, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not know the Senator from Michigan had the floor or I would not have made so long an interruption. I thought I myself had the floor. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I asked the chairman of the committee whether or not he had had all the hearings that he required on this particular subject. I think he undoubtedly has. I think he knows to-day how he feels on granting an additional clerk to every Senator who does not have a chairmanship, either nominal or otherwise. I think there can be no argument advanced against granting every Senator, whether he has a committee chairmanship or not, such help as he actually needs in doing the work of a Senator. I think the Senator himself can recall a number of Senators, perhaps a great many Senators, on this side of the Chamber who are now without committee chairmanships, who have quite as much work to do as the Senators who hold chairmanships of nominal committees. So, it seems to me that these two things should go together.

I am not finding any fault with the granting of additional committee employees to Senators who have minority committees. I think they are entitled to them. I want them to have them. If we could not get the two, and my proposition to amend the resolution would defeat that, I should not offer it, because I trust that I am not so selfish that I would say, because I could not have just what I wanted, that some other Senator could not have what he can get and what he needs. But the two Senators from Georgia, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], and other Senators have expressed the true situation, namely, that the Senator who has the work to do should not be denied a clerk because he does not happen to be fortunate enough to have the chairmanship of a committee which has nothing to do.

So it seems to me, Mr. President, that what we ought to do at this time is to amend this resolution so as to incorporate in it the proposition to grant each Senator an additional clerk. I know that I need such help; I know that other Senators here situated as I am need it, and that their work can not be completely performed or as near completely performed without the extra help as it can be with it. So if I thought that we would have an adverse report next Saturday, as it seems to me the Senator from Mississippi clearly intimates we will have, and possibly that the resolution may be indefinitely postponed, I would make the motion now to amend the resolution, and I think I will do so. I move to amend the resolution——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state there is now pending an amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Then I will withhold my amendment until the other amendment is disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota to the amendment proposed by the committee. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 19, it is proposed to amend the committee amendment by striking out "$1,200" and in lieu inserting "$1,440."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I want to say merely that I hope that amendment will be defeated. The committee considered that question very carefully and arrived at the conclusion stated in the resolution for reasons that seemed abundantly satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment to the amendment. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. KENYON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, as I understand, this amendment is to provide 2 clerks at $1,440. It is increasing the amount of compensation from $1,200 to $1,440.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to say that committees that have had 3 employees heretofore have had a clerk at $2,220, a messenger at $1,440, and a stenographer at $1,200.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Oh, no.

Mr. MCCUMBER. At $1,440.

Mr. BRISTOW. No; that is a mistake. I am thoroughly familiar with it. It has been $1,200. There have not been—unless there are exceptions—two $1,440 clerks given to nominal

committees. When the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate during the last two years has allowed a third employee, it has always been at $1,200 a year.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that this change will apply to the 10 detailed employees who have always been paid at the rate of $1,440 per year. What the Senator says in relation to the others is correct, with perhaps one single exception that I now recall, and that is the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, which has two employees at $1,440. What he says in relation to the others—as to their salary being $1,200—is true, but the 10 detailed men have received $1,440 a year, and the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice had 2 employees at $1,440. These 11 committees are included in this resolution.

Mr. BRISTOW. Well, why should the details be any different now from what they were heretofore? This resolution is not intended to apply to any committees that have already three employees; it is intended to apply to those that have only two.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator is wrong. If he will read the resolution he will find that it does apply to those committees. It specifically names the committees, and says that there shall be an assistant clerk at $1,200 for those particular committees. If the Senate will vote for the pending amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER], then it will not change the salary paid to the men detailed to those different committees. If it is reduced to $1,200, then, of course——

Mr. BRISTOW. Why should the third clerk of one nominal committee get more than the third clerk of another?

Mr. SMOOT. If the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota is adopted, then they will all receive $1,440.

Mr. BRISTOW. Then, why should we increase the salaries of these stenographers when there has been no demand for it in the past?

Mr. SMOOT. There are a few increases from $1,200 to $1,440, but the majority of these are no increases whatsoever.

Mr. BRISTOW. Why should we pass this resolution, protecting these details, when every clerk of a minority Senator who has had a committee heretofore has been reduced from $2,220 to $2,000, and his stenographer has been reduced from $1,440 to $1,200? Why should we have some special legislation to protect simply the details, when the others are not protected? If you are going to raise the salary of everybody whose salary has been reduced by virtue of the change in the organization of the Senate, let us treat them all alike and make all of these clerkships of all of the Senators $2,220.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will permit me, I think he misunderstands what the Senator has said. Heretofore—it has gone back as far as I remember, twenty-odd years—there have been certain minority Senators, usually the senior members of the minority, that have had a third man—a messenger—detailed at $1,440. In the detail by the Sergeant at Arms there were 10 additional messengers put on that list, or Sergeant at Arms' roll, that were kept there because of this detail. So that now the 10 senior members of the minority side have the detail of those messengers exactly as both parties have heretofore done for twenty-odd years or more.

If this resolution should be construed exactly as it reads in the last sentence, and it is understood that those who have but three clerks now should not be disturbed, it would be according to the Senator's plan. But if we are to have withdrawn these messengers, and in their places put the $1,200 messengers, of course it makes $240 less for each of nine places.

While I am on my feet, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to say that I think it would be a great deal better for our manner of appropriation, and better for the good feeling and understanding between House and Senate, if these salaries were allowed to run on, to the end of the appropriations already made at least, even if they are to be reduced after that, as to those nine men.

The appropriations have carried for the balance of this year and all of next year, between 14 and 15 months, for the 9 messengers that are on the rolls at $1,440, and are detailed to these 9 Senators. To take those off and put on 9 men at $1,200 puts a drain on our Senate contingent fund of just that amount of money, and leaves the Sergeant at Arms free, if he chooses, to fill those $1,440 messenger places and use them.

Mr. BRISTOW. But there would not be any substance in it when we are saving $240 a year on each clerk. But this proposition is not a fair one, and I want to call the attention of Senators to it.

There are 23 minority Senators here whose clerks heretofore have been receiving $2,220 and whose messengers received $1,440. In consequence of the change in the majority of the Senate the salaries of the clerks to the 23 Senators who do not have chairmanships have been reduced to $2,000. Their messengers have been reduced from $1,440 to $1,200. If this resolution passes as reported by the committee, the same thing would happen to the 9 or 10 details. Why should not the details be treated in the same way and the same rule be applied to them that is applied to all these other employees?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, for the simple reason that they never have been treated that way for the last 20 years. These detailed messengers to Senators in the minority have always received $1,440 each.

Mr. BRISTOW. Will the Senator from Utah tell me why a nominal committee that is presided over by a minority chairman should have two clerks at $1,440, while a nominal committee presided over by a majority chairman should have one clerk at $1,440 and a clerk at $1,200? I do not care if it has been done for 20 years. How can you justify it?

Mr. SMOOT. The theory has always been, not only upon the Democratic side but upon the Republican side as well, that the senior Members of this body are on the more important committees and therefore require some additional help. It has been upon that theory, and that only, that this extra clerk has been detailed to them, and they have always been at $1,440.

Mr. BRISTOW. And 20 of the senior members on the minority side, because of that seniority, are given chairmanships, with a clerk at $1,440 and a clerk at $2,220.

Mr. WARREN. No; a clerk at $2,220 and a messenger.

Mr. BRISTOW. Well, a messenger; but the messenger is really a clerk. That is a misnomer. I do not know why he is called a messenger. He is not a messenger. He is simply an assistant to the clerk of the committee. Then they have a clerk or stenographer at $1,200.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not the case now, Mr. President. It will be the case if this resolution passes. But until the resolution passes the only committees that would have the 3 are the detailed 10 and whatever the law provides. I think there are about 3 other committees that the law provides shall have 3 clerks, and that is all that would have them.

Mr. BRISTOW. This resolution simply puts every minority committee upon exactly the same footing.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. WARREN. All but two of them.

Mr. BRISTOW. Well, all but two; that is true. I will say that the conference of the minority is on a different basis, but this is a fight to protect nine details from the operation of the change of administration of the Senate, and for nothing else, excepting them and maintaining them in the $1,440 positions which they had heretofore, while every other minority clerk suffers the reduction which comes from a change in the party management of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; the Senator is wrong. If the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] is adopted, they will all receive $1,440. There will not be any discrimination at all. But if the resolution passes as reported from the committee, then instead of all of them having $1,440, as would be the case if we adopt the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, they would all be cut to $1,200.

Mr. BRISTOW. And then, of course, there are majority committees that have three clerks.

Mr. SMOOT. This applies to all the committees.

Mr. BRISTOW. So that the proposition is to increase the salary of the third employee of every committee that has three clerks.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. BRISTOW. And leave 23 minority Senators, many of whom are just as busy as those who have committees, with one clerk at $2,000, and an assistant clerk at $1,200. There is not anything fair about it.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator of course understands that that question is to be decided by the Senate. The chairman of the committee has already said that it would be considered by the committee, and no doubt, in his opinion, it would be reported to the Senate, either adversely or favorably, as the case may be.

Mr. MCCUMBER. Mr. President, stating my own position, I believe we should have no clerk at less than $1,440. You may call these clerks messengers if you see fit. As a matter of fact, they are clerks, and they are doing clerical duty. We have been assigned clerks at $1,440. We have appointed those clerks at $1,440. The effect of this resolution is to cut them down to $1,200, or a loss of $20 a month, or $240 a year. That is the effect of it.

I know the clerk that I am using, the one that I have selected now to hold this position, as indicated by the Senator in charge

of the resolution, would undoubtedly be reappointed under the new resolution, but he would be reappointed with a salary less than he supposed he was getting when he was appointed, and to which I think he is entitled.

I have selected men who can do work for me, and who are of some assistance, who are worth their $1,440, and doubly so when we know that at least once a year they have got to travel a distance of 3,000 miles and pay their expenses there and back.

I will vote with the Senator to put every one of these clerical places upon a basis of $1,440 where the duties are anything other than that of mere messenger. I am certain that there is not a Senator here who has an employee who does not ask that employee to do clerical work that requires judgment and discretion and intelligence and a proper method of handling business. This being the case, I do not believe the majority are justified in cutting down these places to $1,200, when during all of the previous 20 years the same places have been at $1,440. But independently of that, the nature of the work is such as to justify the appointment of clerks who are capable of earning that much.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, in order that the full Senate may be present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum being suggested by the Senator from Mississippi, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.
Bacon	Fall	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Fletcher	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Gallinger	Newlands	Smoot
Bradley	Goff	Norris	Sterling
Brady	Gore	O'Gorman	Stone
Brandegee	Hollis	Oliver	Sutherland
Bristow	Hughes	Overman	Swanson
Bryan	Johnston, Ala.	Page	Thompson
Burton	Jones	Penrose	Thornton
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Perkins	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Pomerene	Walsh
Clarke, Ark.	Lodge	Ransdell	Warren
Colt	McCumber	Saulsbury	Williams
Crawford	McLean	Sheppard	
Cummins	Martin, Va.	Shively	

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I desire to state that my colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], is necessarily absent from the Senate on important business.

Mr. SHIVELY. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. KERN] is detained from the Senate on important business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present. The Secretary will call the roll on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I ask that the amendment may be reported to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 19, it is proposed to strike out "$1,200" and in lieu thereof to insert "$1,440."

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I desire to inquire what was the language of the resolution before it was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. Was there any change made in the resolution by the committee?

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee struck out the entire resolution and offered a substitute.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I should like to have read that part of the resolution in which the amendment comes, so that we will understand the full meaning of it.

The SECRETARY. After the naming of certain committees insert the words:

> Are hereby authorized to employ one assistant clerk each, at $1,200 per annum.

It is now proposed to strike out "$1,200" and in lieu thereof to insert "$1,440."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that is the amount of the original resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRADLEY (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN]. I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the affirmative). I observe that the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] has not voted. I therefore withdraw my vote, having a general pair with him.

Mr. CLAPP. Owing to the absence of my general pair, I decline to vote on this question.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to announce the following pairs:

Mr. BURLEIGH with Mr. OWEN.
Mr. CATRON with Mr. SHAFROTH.
Mr. ROOT with Mr. THOMAS.
Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. SMITH of Maryland.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan with Mr. REED.
Mr. STEPHENSON with Mr. LEA.
Mr. DU PONT with Mr. CULBERSON.
Mr. JACKSON with Mr. CHILTON.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bankhead	Goff	Martine, N. J.	Sterling
Borah	Gronna	Nelson	Sutherland
Brady	Hollis	Oliver	Thornton
Brandegee	James	Page	Townsend
Chamberlain	Lippitt	Penrose	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Perkins	Weeks
Colt	McCumber	Saulsbury	
Gallinger	McLean	Smoot	

NAYS—32.

Ashurst	Gore	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Bacon	Hitchcock	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Bristow	Hughes	Overman	Stone
Burton	Johnston, Ala.	Pomerene	Thompson
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Ransdell	Vardaman
Cummins	Kenyon	Sheppard	Walsh
Fall	Lane	Shively	Williams
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	Works

NOT VOTING—34.

Bradley	du Pont	Owen	Simmons
Bryan	Jackson	Pittman	Smith, Md.
Burleigh	Johnson, Me.	Poindexter	Smith, Mich.
Catron	Kern	Reed	Stephenson
Chilton	La Follette	Robinson	Swanson
Clapp	Lea	Root	Thomas
Crawford	Lewis	Shafroth	Tillman
Culberson	Newlands	Sherman	
Dillingham	O'Gorman	Shields	

So Mr. MCCUMBER's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. MCCUMBER. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment:

In line 19, on page 2, strike out "$1,200" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,440"; and in connection with the same amendment, at the end thereof, add the following:

Provided, That all clerks or messengers of the several committees of the Senate who are receiving a salary of less than $1,400 shall be paid a salary of $1,440 per annum.

This amendment will place all clerks and messengers—those of the majority and those of the minority—on exactly the same basis, at the rate of $1,440 per annum.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, as I understand, the resolution offered by the Senator from North Dakota is subject to a point of order. Substantially the same resolution was just before the Senate and was voted down. The Senator can not bring up the same matter in different parts of the resolution whenever he gets ready.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I think the Senator could not have distinctly heard the amendment. The previous amendment that I proposed was to the effect that the nine committees mentioned in the resolution should have clerks whose salaries should be $1,440 instead of $1,200.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But there are more than nine committees mentioned in the resolution.

Mr. MCCUMBER. Well, whatever number there are.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator did not name the committees in his amendment.

Mr. MCCUMBER. Yes; but the committees are named there. The present amendment provides that all shall be paid at the rate of $1,440 per annum, and I intend to have it cover the clerks and messengers of all Senators, whether they have committees or not. The previous amendment related to only a certain number. This amendment relates to all of them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And the previous amendment related to all the committees mentioned in this amendment, did it not?

Mr. MCCUMBER. Yes; and this amendment relates to all the committees of the Senate and to the clerks and messengers of Senators.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If that be the case, of course it is a different proposition.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I desire to supplement the point of order raised by the Senator from Mississippi by saying that the latter part of the amendment now offered by the Senator from North Dakota is not in order for another reason. It is the statutory law that no such amendment shall be passed on by the Senate until it has been referred to the Committee to Audit

and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I will read the section of the Revised Statutes which covers that proposition:

Hereafter no payment shall be made from the contingent fund of the Senate unless sanctioned by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, or from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives unless sanctioned by the Committee on Accounts of the House of Representatives.

That is a self-imposed limitation on the power of each House of Congress, and very wisely imposed, for the purpose of preventing these appeals that are based on personal considerations and committing the Senate to a bad precedent. It is conclusive, then, of the proposition.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not think the Senator will really insist upon that point of order. If that were true, we could make no amendments to the original resolution.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. We can not make any amendment that provides for the appropriation of money from the contingent fund of the Senate, as the statute limits the authority of the Senate in that respect.

Mr. McCUMBER. This resolution was referred to the committee, and the Senator will hardly claim that when the committee has reported it back every amendment must go back to the committee to be acted on.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. If it proposes a payment out of the contingent fund, the law sustains the contention that it does.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator would ask for a very strange rule that would come up to bother him exceedingly in the future.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. It has already come up in the Democratic caucus. The amendment now proposed was before the Senators on this side of the Chamber. An effort in this direction was made by the former Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Paynter. On a point of order being raised that the scope of the resolution could not be widened so as to include items not considered by the committee, the Vice President then presiding, Mr. Sherman, sustained the point of order.

Mr. McCUMBER. That was an original resolution.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. You are proposing to amend it by including new items of appropriation, introducing a new limitation, when the statute provides that no payments shall be made from the contingent fund without a report from the committee.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am proposing to amend the resolution which has been referred to the committee and reported back to the Senate.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. There is no reference in the statute to its being referred, but to payment. Let me read it again.

Mr. LODGE. Before the Senator does that, may I ask him a question?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I will be glad to answer.

Mr. LODGE. Do I understand the Senator to take the ground that a report of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate is not amendable?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. It is amendable with reference to matters submitted to the committee, but it is not by adding independent items, because that would make it a violation of the specific terms of the statute of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. This is a proposition to add a new item.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. To increase the expenditure from the contingent fund by a new item.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. We passed upon that. I do not make a point of order against that; but there is another point against it. We voted down the same proposition. So the whole amendment is subject to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I offer the following amendment——

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the original resolution which went to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses certain committees were named. They were certain of these nominal committees, and the Committee to Audit and Control, having jurisdiction over the matter, put upon the resolution the other nominal committees. Now, the Committee to Audit and Control never had under consideration any other committees except those named in the original resolution, and those named in the amendment to the resolution by the committee. The Senator offers to bring in a separate and independent item including all the committees of the Senate, the matters never having been under consideration by the Committee to Audit and Control.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It has been ruled out of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg pardon.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I move to add at the end of the last line the following words:

That each minority Senator not the chairman of a committee be, and he is hereby, authorized to employ one assistant clerk at $1,200 per annum, to be paid from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I raise the same point of order on that. The matter has not been considered by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If the Chair will withhold for a moment, does the chairman of the committee say that this matter has not been before his committee and has not been considered by it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It has not been reported by the committee.

Mr. TOWNSEND. But it has been before the committee and considered by the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It has not been acted upon by the committee either way, and of course the law requires that it shall be sent there for action.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It was sent there for action.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. It was not sanctioned by the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It has to be sanctioned by the committee.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Do I understand the Senator to contend that if a resolution is sent to the committee and the committee refuses to act upon it——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; you can move to discharge the committee and take up the matter, I suppose; but I do not think you can offer it as an amendment upon this resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, it seems to me it is only fair that both this question and the one which is so closely allied to it should be considered together and should be reported by that committee and acted upon at the same time. I move that the resolution be recommitted to the Committee on Contingent Expenses with instructions that the resolution proposing to give each Senator an additional clerk at $1,200 a year be reported in connection with it. I am not saying how it shall be reported, but that it shall be reported at the same time, in connection with it, so that both propositions may be considered.

I will say that should be done as a matter of simple justice, Mr. President. There is no need of going into details here, but it is known in the Senate that a number of the committees to which it is now proposed to assign an additional clerk are not working committees. They are committees which from the first day of the session to the last, and session after session, hold no meetings whatever. It is an indirect way of giving the chairmen of those committees additional help, which I admit they need, but it is equally true that Senators who do not happen to be at the head of one of these nominal committees that never meet are in exactly the same position with reference to needing additional help that the Senators are who happen to be at the head of one of these committees with no duties to perform. To give the committees that are mere names additional clerks when the real purpose is to give the chairmen of the committees additional help, and leave Senators who need this additional help out of consideration entirely, on its face lacks an element of equity and fairness all around.

I think that we ought to dispose of this subject at one time, and the situation is one in which it will be manifestly unfair to deal with one part of it only and leave the other in the air. The resolution that is before the Committee on Contingent Expenses but not yet reported, I think, ought to be here when we act upon this resolution. That is why I move to recommit the present resolution and that the committee be directed to report the other resolution one way or the other, so that we may consider them together.

Mr. JONES. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I trust the Senator from South Dakota will not insist upon that motion. While I think the two propositions ought to be acted upon together, I do not think we ought to delay action upon this resolution which gives help to Senators who do need the help. We have the assurance of the Senator from Mississippi that in his judgment the committee will act on this other proposition next Saturday.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I had not heard that.

Mr. JONES. He assured us that in his judgment the committee would act.

Mr. TOWNSEND. He has not given the assurance.

Mr. JONES. He said that in his judgment the committee would act. He did not assure us positively that it would act—I do not want to misrepresent him—but he did say that he

thought it would act, and I know the Senator from Mississippi well enough to believe that his committee will act next Saturday one way or the other.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Very well, Mr. President.

Mr. JONES. At any rate, I do not think we ought to hold up this proposition. Senators need this help, and I do not think we ought to hold it up. I believe the committee will act one way or the other next Saturday on this proposition.

Mr. CRAWFORD. With the assurance that it will receive consideration——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am not to be intimidated into anything. I have given such a statement as I thought was correct to at least two Senators upon the floor. If the Senator wants to recommit the resolution and has the votes to do it, let it be done. He might have some difficulty in getting it out again if he chooses to do that.

I rather wonder why the Senator did not make this argument during the last Congress. As far as giving any renewed assurance is concerned, I think I have given about as near an assurance as I propose to give. I could only give my opinion as to what the course of the committee would be, and I do not propose to give any assurance of any sort.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not desire to have any discussion over that matter and wander from the real merit of the claim for this additional help. I do not understand that there was any proposition before the last Congress to give these nominal committees additional help.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is here now, and this other question is connected with it. I simply wish to call attention to the situation. After the statements that have been made here about the need of having this additional help now, I would not delay it from those that have this opportunity to get it. Disclaiming any intention whatever at any time to coerce the Senator from Mississippi, for I would not make so grave a mistake as that, I will withdraw my motion to recommit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to say this, Mr. President: It is true that there was no proposition before the Senate at the last session. The reason why that is true was because the majority caucus at that time did not instruct that such a proposition should be brought before the Senate, and passed no resolution to do for the minority what the majority caucus of this session has passed for the minority of this session.

Mr. LODGE. Before the Senator takes his seat I should like to ask him a question, if I may. The last proviso recites "that if any of the committees recited above already have three employees, the resolution shall not apply to them." That means that those committees of the minority which now have three employees, including a messenger at $1,440, are not to be disturbed?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is right, and I will state the reason. I procured the assistance of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], who, as we all know, is great at details in matters of this sort; I procured the assistance of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], the assistance of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], and the assistance of the Secretary of the Senate, and the Secretary's office to get a full list of such of the committees as had only two employees. But I was afraid that even with all that there might be some error. I am just informed by the Senator from Massachusetts that in the case of his committee there is an error. It is so difficult to get these things right that I put in the resolution this proviso:

Provided, That if any of the committees recited above already have three employees, the resolution shall not apply to them.

So this resolution does not touch them in any way; it leaves them in statu quo.

Mr. LODGE. That means three employees whether by law or by detail.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; not detail, if they have one by detail, and most of these committees have. Over half these committees have messengers by detail.

Mr. LODGE. Only seven have messengers by detail, I think.

Mr. OVERMAN. Ten.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ten.

Mr. LODGE. Those 10 are all to be reduced to $1,200?

Mr. WILLIAMS. To $1,200.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I did not hear all of the colloquy between the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Massachusetts; but to give a concrete case, I have two clerks and also a messenger, who is delegated by the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This resolution applies to you, then. It applies to every case where the messenger is detailed.

Mr. McCUMBER. It would apply practically, then, to all the cases, because all of them are detailed clerks. I now move to amend by striking out "$1,200" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,400," and I ask for a roll call on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. I did not hear the Senator's motion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hope that the amendment will be voted down and that the action of the committee will be sustained.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas (to Mr. WILLIAMS). Move to lay it on the table.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will move, I believe, to lay the amendment to the amendment on the table.

Mr. McCUMBER. On that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand that as to the 10 committees on this side of the Chamber that have details the salaries are cut down to $1,200 under the resolution as reported by the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. All of them from $1,440, whether majority or minority committees. They are placed on an equal footing at $1,200.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand, then, there are 10 committees on this side of the Chamber that have detailed messengers at $1,440 and 3 on the other side. There may be more than that number. There are also messengers detailed by the Sergeant at Arms at $1,440. This resolution cuts all down, I understand, to $1,200.

Mr. WILLIAMS. To $1,200, making no distinction.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No; the Senator is entirely mistaken about that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There are 21 names in the resolution.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I understand that there are about 60 committees of the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. That being so, I move to reconsider the vote——

Mr. LODGE. A motion has been made to lay the amendment to the amendment on the table, and I make the point of order that it is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not debatable. The Senator from North Dakota calls for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll on the motion of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the amendment of the committee.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRADLEY (when his name was called). On account of my pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], I refrain from voting.

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. In his absence, I withhold my vote. I desire this statement to stand in the absence of that Senator.

Mr. JACKSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON]. I inquire whether he has voted or not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. JACKSON. As he has not voted, I will withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. THOMAS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—34.

Borah	Hitchcock	Nelson	Stone
Bristow	Hollis	Norris	Thompson
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	Pittman	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Johnston, Ala.	Pomerene	Vardaman
Crawford	Jones	Robinson	Walsh
Cummins	Kenyon	Saulsbury	Williams
Fall	Lane	Sheppard	Works
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	
Gore	Myers	Smith, Ga.	

NAYS—35.

Ashurst	Gallinger	McLean	Smoot
Bacon	Goff	Martine, N. J.	Sterling
Brady	Gronna	Oliver	Sutherland
Brandegee	Hughes	Overman	Thomas
Burton	James	Page	Thornton
Chamberlain	La Follette	Penrose	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Perkins	Warren
Colt	Lodge	Ransdell	Weeks
Dillingham	McCumber	Smith, S. C.	

NOT VOTING—27.

Bankhead	du Pont	Owen	Shively
Bradley	Jackson	Poindexter	Simmons
Burleigh	Kern	Reed	Smith, Md.
Catron	Lea	Root	Smith, Mich.
Chilton	Lewis	Shafroth	Stephenson
Clapp	Newlands	Sherman	Swanson
Culberson	O'Gorman	Shields	

So the Senate refused to lay Mr. McCUMBER's amendment to the amendment on the table.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

STOCK GAMBLING.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, during the morning hour I gave notice that after the morning business I would address the Senate on the subject of the bill I introduced. I trust the Senator from Arkansas will withhold the motion.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I withdraw the motion for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER].

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I only withdraw the motion for the purpose of giving the Senator from Arizona an opportunity to submit his remarks. He may present his remarks now just as well as at any other time. It is not necessary to have the bill before the Senate. Unless he is prepared to go on at this time, I shall renew the motion.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I introduced a bill this morning relating to a subject that has long impressed me——

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota will state his point of order.

Mr. McCUMBER. The point of order is that an amendment was offered and the yeas and nays were asked for upon it, and during the time when the yeas and nays were requested the Senator from Mississippi moved to lay the amendment upon the table. The yeas and nays were called upon that motion, and it was lost. It seems to me that now the amendment is still before the Senate undisposed of, with a demand for the yeas and nays on the amendment pending.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That does not interfere with debate, unless there has been some change in the rule with which I am not familiar. Does the Senator make the point of order that I can not move to go into executive session at this stage of the consideration of the pending resolution? I should like to know what we are to have in response to that.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; if the Senator from Arizona is speaking upon this question——

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. He is not required to say what he is speaking on.

Mr. McCUMBER. I can not object to his right to speak on this proposition.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator can not object to his right to speak on any proposition.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from Arizona indicated that he desired to address the Senate upon an entirely different subject; this is the subject before the Senate now, and it has not been removed from the consideration of the Senate; and until it is laid aside in some way no other question can be interjected. If the Senator from Arizona is to speak on this question in any way, then, of course, my point of order is not well taken,

Mr. ASHURST. I do not intend, directly or indirectly, to speak upon the subject of the report of the committee submitted by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], but I purpose speaking upon the bill which I introduced this morning. I will state very frankly that I do not fully understand the precise effect and purport of the committee report submitted by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and of course I do not care to speak upon a subject which I do not fully understand. I therefore will speak upon a subject which I do understand; that is to say, the bill which I introduced. It is my view of the rules, however, that having given the notice which I did this morning that I would address the Senate on the subject of the bill which I introduced, it is now in order for me to proceed. If not in order at this time, I shall cheerfully withhold my remarks until a later hour in the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The ruling of the Chair is that the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota is before the Senate, and that the Senator from Arizona can talk on any subject he pleases unless he has announced that he does not propose to speak to the pending question, in which event——

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I wish to suggest that the ruling of the Chair is entirely correct except the limitation. The Senator from Arizona is not required to notify anybody and is not responsible to anybody for what he chooses to talk about. He has a right to debate this question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas will understand that the reason for the statement by the Chair was the distinct disavowal on the part of the Senator from Arizona that he would speak to the question before the Senate.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That distinct disavowal is a part of his right. No one has a right to censor his remarks or confine him to any particular text. This is the only tribunal on earth where there is unlimited debate, and there is no question of relevancy here except what is designated in the rules, and this is not one of them. I think he is entitled to proceed to address the Senate and to choose his own words in which to address the Senate. He probably will be able to say something that will have some relevancy, although he is not even required to do that. This is a more important question than the trifling matter about these salaries. If there is any power that can put a limitation upon the right of a Senator to debate questions according to his own judgment, then we are for the first time entering upon a cloture rule that had better be considered in its entirety before it becomes one of the rules of the Senate.

I think the Senator from Arizona is entitled to proceed according to his own judgment. That is in accordance with the precedents of the Senate and not in violation of any rule of the Senate that anyone can direct our attention to. If he can, I pause to afford him an opportunity to do so.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] is correct in saying that, under the customs of this body, a Senator can talk on any subject at any time, provided he has the strength to do so; but I rise more particularly to correct the statement made by the Senator from Arkansas, who is usually very accurate and who evidently is paying a good deal of attention to the study of the rules of the Senate, when he says this is the only body on the face of the earth that has unlimited debate. As I understand the matter, the House of Lords has unlimited debate, the Parliament of Canada has unlimited debate, the State Senate of New Hampshire has unlimited debate, and I can imagine there are other legislative bodies similarly situated. So that I correct the Senator for the purpose of showing that we do not stand alone in that respect, whether it is for good or for bad.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I shall not controvert what the Senator says at this time, because it is not material and I do not care to waste the time on it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish to say one word with respect to the ruling which I understood the Chair to make. I think that ruling can be sustained upon reason and in accordance with the precedents of the Senate. No Senator has ever yet declared during the 15 years I have been here that he proposed to take up and discuss a subject other than the one pending and that he would not discuss the pending subject. If that can be done, then any Senator, at any time, of his own volition, can bring up a bill and proceed to discuss it at length, even though another motion is pending.

I admit, Mr. President, that neither the Chair nor the Senate can call to order a Senator because his remarks are not directed toward the subject that is before the Senate; but I do not think our rules have ever been construed to mean that when a Senator disclaims any intention of discussing the subject before the Senate, but, on the contrary, proceeds to state "I shall call up another proposition that I referred to this morning and discuss that," that he is within the rules of the Senate, he himself admitting that he is not within the rules and does not intend to be within the rule that requires a subject to be disposed of either by vote or a motion to lay it aside, or by a motion to go into executive session or to adjourn, which takes precedence. So I think the Chair was eminently correct in his ruling.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] are all right, but his deductions are not justified by the actual case with which we are dealing. He says it is not within the competency of a Senator to call up for consideration an entirely distinct question and to proceed to discuss it. I do not understand it is the purpose of the Senator from Arizona to call up anything. There is quite a distinction between displacing a proposition pending before the Senate and submitting remarks that are not relevant. If that rule were applied, it would depopulate the Senate and absolutely doom some of us to eternal silence, if we had to talk sense and talk directly to the questions that are pending. We have not progressed to that point yet. I maintain that the Senator from Arizona is entitled to proceed, if he sees proper to do so; and if he does not see proper to do so, then I propose to make a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I have not the slightest desire to proceed unless I am strictly in order. If I be out of order I will wait until just before the moment of adjournment, and then deliver the brief remarks I desire to make.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator is in order if he wishes to proceed.

Mr. ASHURST. If I be in order, I want to say this——

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator, with his permission, if he intends to address himself to the subject under consideration before the Senate?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, my remarks will be as far removed from the subject under consideration as were some of the speeches respecting it this afternoon. I do not intend or expect to touch in the remotest way the subject that was under consideration when I obtained the floor. So far as that subject is concerned, my remarks will go out upon an unreturning parabola.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then, Mr. President, I insist that the Senator can not call up another resolution and speak to it while another motion is pending.

Mr. ASHURST. I will say, most respectfully, that I did not call up a resolution. I gave notice this morning that I would make some remarks, and they will be very brief.

Mr. President, proceeding, as I assume, in order, I desire to state that this morning I introduced a bill which I asked to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. To that request, I understand, objection was made. I have given the subject of that bill much consideration, because we all must be aware of the fact that the reprehensible and scandalous gambling transactions in some of the great cities of our Nation have had a tendency to increase the high cost of living to an enormous degree——

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I ask for order.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senate is not in order.

Mr. ASHURST. I will say that I do not care whether any Senator listens or not. I am talking to the people, and before I shall have said my last word on this bill millions of people will be interested in the matter.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ASHURST. I cheerfully yield to the Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. I simply want to say that there are some of us, at least there is one on this side, who wishes to hear the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. I know that. I thank the Senator. In the course of my investigations regarding reprehensible transactions upon the stock market, I had occasion to read a magazine published, I believe, in New York City, to wit, Everybody's Magazine, which contained a rough draft of a bill prepared, as I understood, by a citizen of Massachusetts, to wit, Mr. Thomas W. Lawson, a gentleman whom I do not know and from whom I have never received a letter or any other communication. In support of the draft of his bill prohibiting gambling was a short argument. I asked this morning to be permitted to include my bill and that short and temperate statement in the RECORD. Objection was made by a Senator whom I regard as one of my dear friends, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON]. I should at this time state that no Senator here has a higher appreciation of that great Senator than have I. He has for over 18 years been an honored and distinguished Member of this body and an eminent leader in the great Democratic Party, to which I have the honor to belong; and it is with much reluctance that I differ from him, and with some diffidence that I seek to incorporate into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the matter to which that Senator has objected.

Moreover, certain Senators here appear to harbor an impression that I do not have a punctilious regard for the rules of the Senate. Senators, that is a mistaken impression. It is true that, like most other Senators, when I first came here I doubted the advisability of many of the rules; but I am now prepared to say that I believe the rules of this body, taken as a whole and excluding some obvious inconsistencies in them, are a wise and efficacious collection of rules for the government of any parliamentary body of this character, and there is no Senator more desirous of observing the rules of the Senate and courtesies of life than am I, for when you break down one rule—one barrier—another will be broken down and then another. Try as we may, Mr. President, we can not escape these courtesies, these little amenities, which add beauty, zest, and grace to life, and when we violate and break down one rule, soon we will break down another. That is the reason I am so anxious to proceed only in order.

Senators have suggested that I should not attempt to make these remarks this afternoon. Cicero, in one of his epistles, said:

> Nobody can give you wiser advice than yourself; you will never err if you listen to your own suggestions.

While I welcome advice from all sources, I have found that I make few errors when I follow my own suggestions. Therefore I now ask unanimous consent that the bill introduced by me this morning be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request that the bill be printed in the RECORD? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1311) for the regulation of the use of the mail by stock exchanges and their members, and to amend certain sections of the Criminal Code of the Compiled Statutes of the United States, relating to lotteries, and for other purposes, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

> A bill for the regulation of the use of the mail by stock exchanges and their members, and to amend certain sections of the Criminal Code of the Compiled Statutes of the United States, relating to lotteries, and for other purposes.
>
> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That Title LXIX a, chapter 8, section 213, of the Criminal Code of the Compiled Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:
>
> "SEC. 213. No letter, package, postal card, or circular concerning any lottery, gift enterprise, or similar scheme offering prizes dependent in whole or in part upon lot or chance, or concerning any stock exchange where securities or stocks, bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness, or evidence of part or proportionate ownership of property, are dealt in on a margin or on credit; and no lottery ticket or part thereof, or paper, certificate, or instrument purporting to be or to represent a ticket, chance, share, or interest in or dependent upon the event of a lottery, gift enterprise, or similar scheme offering prizes dependent in whole or in part upon lot or chance, and no letter, statement, account, bill of particular, or other information regarding any purchase or sale upon or in any stock exchange of any securities, stock, bond, or other evidence of indebtedness, or of part or proportionate ownership of property on a margin or on credit; and no check, draft, bill, money, postal note, or money order, for the purchase of any ticket or part thereof, or of any share or chance in any such lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme, or for or on account of any purchase or sale upon or in any stock exchange, on a margin or on credit, of securities, stock, bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness, or evidence of part or proportionate ownership of property; and no newspaper, circular, pamphlet, or publication of any kind containing any advertisement of any lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme of any kind offering prizes dependent in whole or in part upon lot or chance, or containing any list of the prizes drawn or awarded by means of any such lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme, whether said list contains any part or all of such prizes, or containing any prices at which any stocks, bonds, notes, or other securities, or other evidences of indebtedness or evidence of part or proportionate ownership of property, shall have been brought or sold upon or in any stock exchange on a margin or on credit, shall be deposited in or carried by the mails of the United States or be delivered by any postmaster or letter carrier. Whoever shall knowingly deposit or cause to be deposited, or shall knowingly send or cause to be sent, anything to be conveyed or delivered by mail in violation of the provisions of this section, or shall knowingly deliver or cause to be delivered by mail anything herein forbidden to be carried by mail, shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than two years, or both; and for any subsequent offense shall be imprisoned not more than five years. Any person violating any provision of this section may be tried and punished either in the district in which the unlawful matter or publication was mailed or to which it was carried by mail for delivery according to the direction thereon, or in which it was caused to be delivered by mail to the person to whom it was addressed."
>
> SEC. 2. The foregoing section, in so far as it expressly relates to stock exchanges and the business there carried on, shall not apply to any stock exchange which is organized under the laws of the State where its principal place of business is located: *Provided*, That such stock exchange is organized with a charter and by-laws which comply with all of the provisions of this act: *And provided*, That such stock exchange and its members comply with all of the provisions of this act and further comply with the provisions of the charter and by-laws required by this act.
>
> SEC. 3. The charter or the by-laws of such stock exchange shall provide that the members thereof and all persons doing any business upon the exchange, or the officers of such stock exchange, or both, shall keep a full, accurate, and complete record of all business done upon the exchange; that the same shall be kept in proper books of account; that the Postmaster General of the United States shall have authority and power to direct the manner in which such books, records, and accounts shall be kept; and that all the books, records, and accounts of such exchange and of every member thereof, and of every person who does any business upon the exchange, shall be at all times open to the inspection of the Postmaster General and any and every post-office inspector specially designated for the purpose by the Postmaster General, not, however, exceeding at any one time three in number in any one city or town. Said charter or by-laws shall further provide that any member or other person doing business upon the exchange who shall refuse or neglect to comply with the foregoing requirements, or who shall willfully destroy any such records or any paper demanded by the Postmaster General, or by such inspector specially designated as aforesaid, shall be expelled from the exchange.
>
> SEC. 4. The by-laws of such exchange shall further provide—
>
> (a) That no one excepting a member, or, as the by-laws may provide, a designated agent or designated employee of a member, shall be allowed to do or conduct any business upon the exchange.
>
> (b) That no member or other person upon the exchange shall directly or indirectly sell or offer for sale or pretend to sell any property or security and at the same time either directly or indirectly purchase or pretend to purchase the same property or security at the same price.
>
> (c) That no member or other person doing business upon the exchange shall accept or execute or attempt to execute an order from any

customer or other person for the purchase or sale of any security, knowing or having reason to believe that he or any other member or person authorized to do business on the exchange has, either directly or indirectly, from the same customer, an order to purchase the security which he is ordered to sell, or to sell the security which he is ordered to purchase.

(d) That no member or other person authorized to do business upon the exchange shall sell, or attempt to sell, or pretend to sell, or pretend that he has sold any security, nor buy, or attempt to buy, or pretend to buy, or pretend that he has bought any security, with the purpose or intent of recording a quotation or price.

(e) That the word "security" as used herein shall include shares in any corporation, joint-stock company, or association, bonds, coupons, script, rights, choses in action, and any and all other evidences of debt or property and options for the purchase or sale thereof.

(f) That the following transactions upon the exchange or between members of the exchange are prohibited, viz:

1. Washed or fictitious sales.

2. Margin sales where there is no intent actually to purchase or deliver the securities. If settlements are made without the completion of the purchase or sale of the securities and the actual delivery thereof, this shall be prima facie evidence that this clause has been violated.

3. The taking or carrying of a speculative account, even though the securities are actually delivered, if the customer is an employee of a bank, trust company, or insurance company, unless such bank, trust company, or insurance company consents in writing to the transaction.

SEC. 5. No member of such exchange shall be by such exchange or its officers hindered or prevented from trading freely in or on any other exchange which has been organized and is conducted in accordance with this act, and which has the right to use the mails hereunder, nor shall any such exchange forbid any member from executing orders because such orders are received from a member of any other such exchange.

SEC. 6. No such exchange shall require that any certificates of stock, bonds, evidence of property, or other security dealt in on such exchange shall be printed, lithographed, or engraved, by or at the place of business of any designated firm, person, or corporation; but such exchange may require that all such certificates of stock, bonds, or evidence of property or other security shall be printed or lithographed or engraved, according to any designated standard of workmanship, quality, or excellence.

SEC. 7. The charter or the by-laws of such exchange shall further provide that any member or person authorized to do business upon the exchange who shall violate any of the provisions of the by-laws required by this act, or any of the provisions of this act, shall be expelled from the exchange. The by-laws of such exchange may provide for a method of hearing and determining whether such member or person authorized to do business upon such exchange has violated any section or clause of this act or of the charter or by-laws of the exchange, and shall further provide that a member expelled for such cause can not be reinstated for at least five years from the date of such expulsion.

SEC. 8. Whenever it shall appear to the Postmaster General, or any inspector designated by the Postmaster General, that any section or clause of this act or of the charter or by-laws provided for in this act has been violated, he or some agent or employee of the Post Office Department shall in writing call the same to the attention of some officer of the exchange wherein such alleged violation occurred. Thereupon, unless it appears to the satisfaction of the Postmaster General, or such agent as he may designate, that the said exchange has promptly and properly heard and determined the said alleged violation and has expelled the person who has so violated this act or the charter or by-laws of said exchange, then the Postmaster General shall in writing notify said exchange that at the expiration of 10 days from the receipt of such notice such exchange and its members shall cease to have the privilege of using the mails.

SEC. 9. The Postmaster General of the United States shall have authority and power to direct the manner in which the books, records, and accounts of stock exchanges and of the members thereof using the mails shall be kept; and he and such post-office inspectors as he may specially designate for such purpose, not exceeding three at any one time, shall have authority and power to inspect and make copies of the books, records, and accounts, or any part thereof, of any such exchange and of any member thereof.

SEC. 10. A copy of such book, record, or account, or any part thereof, made pursuant to section 9 hereof shall constitute competent evidence of the contents of any such book, record, or account, or part thereof, in any proceeding instituted by or before the Postmaster General; and in any proceeding, civil or criminal, under this act, when such stock exchange or member thereof fails to produce said books, records, or accounts upon due notice, or where said books, records, or accounts have been lost or destroyed.

SEC. 11. The completion of a purchase or sale of any security or pretended purchase or sale of any security, when said purchase or pretended purchase or said sale or pretended sale is not accompanied by an actual delivery of the said security shall constitute prima facie evidence that there was no actual intent to deliver the said security, and that the purchase or sale was fictitious.

SEC. 12. No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or producing any books, papers, or other documents before the Postmaster General or any post-office inspector or before any court, magistrate, or grand jury upon any investigation, proceeding, or trial for a violation of any of the provisions of this act upon the ground or for the reason that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to convict him of a crime or to subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter or thing concerning which he may so testify or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, and no testimony so given or produced shall be received against him upon any criminal investigation or proceeding.

SEC. 13. Any such exchange or officer or member thereof shall have the right by bill of equity filed in the United States district court in the district in which such exchange is located to apply for an injunction to enjoin the Postmaster General and any and every postmaster and agent and employee of the Post Office Department from interfering with the use of the mail by such stock exchange and its members. Said court is hereby given authority and power to issue a restraining order or injunction, as it may deem just, if it shall appear to the court that this act has not been violated and that the charter and by-laws of said exchange provided for in this act have not been violated. Unless such injunction or restraining order shall have been issued such exchange and all members thereof who have not resigned and withdrawn therefrom shall, at the expiration of said 10 days, cease to have the privilege of using the mails.

SEC. 14. This act shall take effect at the expiration of six months from the date of its passage.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I shall now read the following:

THE STOCK-GAMBLING KILLER.

If this law be put upon the statute books by the incoming Congress and President Wilson in 1913, this is what it will do by 1914:

Absolutely destroy stock gambling.

Start the drop in the annual interest return to invested capital.

Start the drop in the high cost of the American people's living without a corresponding drop in the wage of the American people.

Start an increase in the price of every honest, good American security.

Start a drop in the price of every dishonest, bad, American security.

Pull the teeth, cut the claws, and wither the fangs of the Money Trust.

Start the stock exchange toward the high position it should occupy in the Nation's business structure.

A study of this law will clearly show that no honest business can be injured by its enactment.

In its drafting I have had the best legal talent in the land. Its authors have bedrock plumbed their knowledge and their experience to fulfill my order, which was "to spare no time, money, or effort in the creation of a law to which no honest man or woman could object."

My instructions were:

Sacrifice nothing to the radical or the sensational, nothing to the interest of any individual or class. Confine its prohibitions to those evils which are not only recognized by all, but which the stock exchange itself emphatically prohibits but never prevents. Above all, make it so simple that all can understand.

This law fills the bill plus, and once on the statute books it will prove the system's gallows. It is the only way in which these present evils can be constitutionally destroyed.

Boiled down, this law means:

That no stock exchange can exist without the use of the mails.

That no stock exchange will be allowed to use the mails unless it organizes and does business under the charter and by-laws set forth in this law.

That the constitution and by-laws set forth in this law are such that if the stock exchange and its members live up to them many of the present evils which have brought high-cost living will become impossible.

That if they are not lived up to, the Postmaster General will give notice that the exchange in 10 days will be put out of business—barred from the mails—and that every member of the exchange who in the meantime does not resign and cease doing business on the exchange will be barred from the mails.

As the Post Office works to-day, the Postmaster General's power is absolute; there is no appeal from it to the courts or to any one or thing; but only because Congress under its authority conferred by the Constitution has not provided any. In this law Congress provides for an appeal to the court.

Therefore the exchange and its members are not subject to the will of the Postmaster General or to any other official of the Post Office Department. If, when they receive the Postmaster General's notice barring them from the mails, they feel that they have not infringed, they will have the right to ask the United States court of the district to enjoin the Postmaster General, whereupon the facts of the infringement of the law will be tried in open court.

To those who raise the question of constitutionality, I say:

The Constitution gives Congress absolute right to bar anyone from the use of the mails on the ground of public policy.

All the courts have said that Congress, not the courts, has the say so as to what is against public policy, and that once Congress has decided what is against public policy no court or other power can interfere.

All the courts have decreed that the use of the mails is the right of no citizen, that it is merely the privilege of any citizen, and that no citizen whose use of the mails Congress has decided is against public policy will be allowed to exercise this privilege.

When Congress passes this law it will have said in effect that it is against public policy for the stock exchange to do business as the stock exchange has been doing it.

And Congress protects the stock exchange and all its members by saying: "If you are unjustly accused of breaking your pledge not to cheat, you have but to go to the nearest court and get redress."

The final boiling down of this law is: That once this law is on the statute books, no member of the big exchanges will take any chance of losing his business and incurring the disgrace of being pounced upon by the Post Office Department, and consequently stock gambling will be killed.

This law, once it is on the statute books, will be the last word on stock gambling, just as the Louisiana lottery law was the last word on lotteries, for it will read:

Congress has decided that it is against public policy for any stock exchange to cheat. Therefore, bar every cheating stock exchange and its members from the mails.

Mr. President, what I have just read I have not written or prepared. It is simply the clipping and excerpt which I tried to get into the RECORD this morning. Every word of what I have read was written by Mr. Lawson. Therefore, having accomplished my purpose and having included into the RECORD that excerpt which I attempted this morning to put into the RECORD, I have done what seems to me to be my duty.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 36 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, April 24, 1913, at 2 o'clock p. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 21, 1913.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

William C. Logan, of Oregon, to be collector of customs for the district of Astoria, in the State of Oregon, in place of William F. McGregor, whose term of office expired by limitation June 15, 1912.

Thomas C. Burke, of Oregon, to be collector of customs for the district of Portland, in the State of Oregon, in place of Philip S. Malcolm, whose term of office expired by limitation January 9, 1911.

AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

James L. Baity, of Missouri, to be Auditor for the War Department in place of Elton A. Gongwer, resigned.

GOVERNOR OF ALASKA.

J. F. A. Strong, of Juneau, Alaska, to be governor of Alaska, vice Walter E. Clark, resigned.

SURVEYOR GENERAL OF ALASKA.

Charles E. Davidson, of Fairbanks, Alaska, to be surveyor general of Alaska, vice William L. Distin, term expired.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. George S. Willits, an additional number in grade, to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 26th day of March, 1913.

Capt. Walter F. Worthington, an additional number in grade, to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 26th day of March, 1913.

Capt. William N. Little, an additional number in grade, to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 26th day of March, 1913.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 21, 1913.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE.

John E. Osborne to be Assistant Secretary of State.

THIRD ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE.

Dudley Field Malone to be Third Assistant Secretary of State.

COUNSELOR FOR THE STATE DEPARTMENT.

John Bassett Moore to be counselor for the Department of State.

AMBASSADOR.

Walter Hines Page to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Great Britain.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Wistar Morris Chubb to be second lieutenant.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

Richard Grady to be a dental surgeon in the Navy.

POSTMASTERS.

OHIO.

John C. Gorman, Ironton.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William C. Kreider, Mauch Chunk.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *April 21, 1913.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou great Father-soul, above all, through all, in us all, we bless Thee for all the disclosures Thou hast made of Thyself in the works of Thy hands which environ us—the stars which shine by night, the sun which fills the earth with glory day by day, the change of seasons, the wonderful adaptation of means to ends everywhere apparent. But above all do we thank Thee for that strange, mysterious something which we call conscience—the still, small voice speaking through the soul words of encouragement when we are in harmony with the laws which Thou hast ordained, chiding us when we strike a discordant note. Make more sensitive our spiritual ears, that we may hear more clearly Thy voice, and give us the courage to obey. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 17, 1913, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa and Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas appeared before the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER. Last Thursday the President sent a message in, and after the message came in certain gentlemen got into a prolonged parliamentary wrangle, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] moved to adjourn, and the Chair forgot all about the message and now presents it to the House. Luckily there is nothing in it that demands immediate action.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

On August 21, 1912, and October 19, 1912, there were appointed by the President, in accordance with the authority granted to him to reorganize the customs service, Winfield T. Denison, Esq., an Assistant Attorney General; William Loeb, jr., Esq., collector of customs at New York; and Felix Frankfurter, Esq., law officer of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, as a committee to inquire into the procedure, practice, and administrative methods of the Board of United States General Appraisers.

I transmit herewith the report of this committee on these subjects.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 15, 1913.*

The SPEAKER. The message and accompanying document are ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent Mr. HENRY was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of James Tandy, first session, Fifty-ninth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ASSAULT ON REPRESENTATIVE SIMS.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 59.

Whereas it has been published in various newspapers circulating in the city of Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, and otherwise currently reported, that on Friday, April 18, 1913, THETUS W. SIMS, a Representative in Congress from the State of Tennessee, was, in a public park in said city, while on his way from his place of residence to a department of the Government for the purpose of transacting official business, and while in attendance upon the Congress as such Representative, set upon and physically assaulted by one C. C. Glover, a citizen of the District of Columbia; and

Whereas said assault is alleged to have been made because of words spoken by said Representative on the floor of the House while it was in regular session; and

Whereas said assault, if made, constitutes a breach of the privileges of the House and of its Members and demands immediate action on the part of the House for the protection of its rights and the rights of its Members in the performance of official duties: Therefore be it

Resolved, That a select committee of five members be appointed forthwith by the Speaker of the House to investigate and report:

First, whether such assault was made by said C. C. Glover upon the said Representative, THETUS W. SIMS; and if so, then,

Second, a course of procedure to be followed in dealing with the said C. C. Glover, to the end that the rights and the privileges of the House of Representatives and its Members shall be maintained and protected.

For the purpose of ascertaining the fact herein required to be reported upon, the said committee shall have power to send for persons and papers, and to examine witnesses upon oath administered by the chairman or any member thereof.

Said committee shall report not later than Saturday, April 26, 1913.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I take it that every Member of this body is familiar in a general way with the episode which occurred on Friday last between a Member of this body and a citizen of the District of Columbia, it having been widely published in the local papers and in all papers, substantially, throughout the country. It therefore does not seem necessary for me to enter now into any review of that episode, and it seems to me that all the facts that are essential to action upon the part of this House are contained in the resolution as it has been offered and read from the desk. That it presents a question of highest privilege, I take it, is a matter which can scarcely be gainsaid. I think I should say this: That this matter is not presented at the request of the Member who is alleged to have been assailed, nor is it presented by me simply because of the fact that I happen to be from the same State as the Member who is alleged to have been assailed, but it is presented as a matter of House privilege, in the belief that this House owes it to itself to protect its own rights and

the rights of its Members in the performance of their official duty.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am in entire sympathy with the purpose of the gentleman. I know the services of Mr. SIMS. He has been one of the men here who has been fearless in handling local affairs, and when I read the episode it was my hope that when his friends moved in this House they would follow the precedent and have immediate action upon the proposition; that is, that they would follow the old precedent where the offender was brought before the bar of the House and reprimanded by the Speaker.

Now, I would like to ask the gentleman why he brings in a proposition for a committee to investigate? Why is it not better in a case of this kind, where the dignity of the House has been affronted, for the House to act with dispatch?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the cases to which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] refers—I take it he refers to the case of Samuel Houston and to the Wood case, in 1870, and there are some other cases in which the House has taken cognizance of physical assaults upon its Members—in those cases the Member who was assaulted himself brought the question to the attention of the House in a letter addressed to the Speaker, and upon that letter as a basis the House proceeded to take summary action.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] has not brought the matter to the attention of the House by a letter to the Speaker or otherwise, and there are those of us who feel that he ought not to be asked, or that it ought not to be suggested, that he bring it to the attention of the House; and, consequently, after a conference among some of those interested in this proposition, it was determined that this was the most dignified method of procedure. The committee which is provided for is simply to first find a fact, and, if it finds that fact, to report a method of procedure.

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, my point was this: There is no dispute between the two gentlemen as to the episode. It occurred. Now, what is the purpose of the appointment of the committee? What will the committee find out other than the things we already know.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The matter has not been brought to the official attention of the House by any statement other than such as is contained in this resolution, embodying a mere allegation. It is my opinion, as a legal proposition, that if it had been brought to the attention of the House in the manner and form that the other cases to which the gentleman has referred were brought to the attention of the House, the House could have taken action; but not being brought in that way, it seems to me, as a legal proposition, that it is necessary that there be some official determination of the fact that the assault did occur.

Mr. POU and Mr. COOPER rose.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield first to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. POU. The gentleman has just stated what I was going to suggest—that up to this time the House officially knows nothing.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I understand it to be admitted that there is no reason why, because of the physical condition of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], alleged to have been assailed, he himself could not have brought this to the attention of the House. He has been, and is, physically able to bring it to the attention of the House. Is that true?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Why, of course, that is true.

Mr. COOPER. Does the gentleman know of any case where the House of Representatives heretofore has ever seen fit to order an investigation of this kind upon mere newspaper report, when in the same newspapers the Member of the House alleged to have been assaulted is reported as saying that he does not wish to do anything further about the matter? There is nothing before the House of an official character. There is nothing—no complaint—to show here that an assault was committed. It is putting the House of Representatives, is it not, in the attitude of proceeding upon mere newspaper report?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which I am presenting is based upon newspaper report and current rumor otherwise circulating.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. One moment. But upon my responsibility as a Member, and believing it to be a question far beyond any personal feeling that might be entertained by my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], being a matter that touches the privileges of the House and all its Members, I have assumed the responsibility of bringing it before the House.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. The resolution is not related to the responsibility of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] himself at all?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Except in so far as I offer it.

Mr. COOPER. It is based entirely upon what the gentleman admitted a moment ago, namely, mere newspaper report and public rumor; but the public rumor is based upon the newspaper report.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. COOPER. Now, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me an interruption further? Does not the gentleman know that sometimes mere newspaper rumors are wholly unreliable; that they have been contradicted repeatedly as absolute misstatements upon this floor? Ought we to proceed at this time solely upon newspaper rumor when the gentleman who is alleged to have been assaulted is able, physically, to bring the matter to the attention of the House?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the House, when it comes to final action upon this proposition, will not be proceeding upon mere newspaper reports. It will be proceeding upon a solemn report made by a committee appointed under the terms of this resolution, if it shall pass; and so far as the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin is concerned, that it ought not to be brought to the attention of the House by any Member of the House unless it be the Member who was himself assaulted, I submit that that is overlooking the rights of all the other Members of the House, and is making what it is not desired to make this case—a personal matter with the Member assailed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will yield for a question.

Mr. COOPER. I did not wish to be put in the position into which the gentleman now seeks to put me. I asked if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] were physically able to make this complaint. If it were true that he had been assaulted so severely that he could not write a letter or otherwise make complaint and bring the matter to the attention of the House, then some other person could properly do so either by direct statement or upon information and belief. There is no reason whatever why the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] can not make complaint. But in the same newspaper report upon which the gentleman [Mr. GARRETT] relies it is related that his colleague [Mr. SIMS] said that he did not wish to proceed with the matter. Therefore why should the House, on mere newspaper report, go into a proceeding of this kind?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin seems to be making up his mind on the strength of a newspaper report that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] said he did not wish to proceed in the matter.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there can be no question, I think, so far as the fact is concerned, that the statement made by the resolution as to an assault upon a Member of the House is entitled to an investigation. The resolution which has been presented was submitted to me, along with other Members of the House, before it was presented. I stated to the gentleman in charge of the matter that I could see no objection to the passage of the resolution.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit one interruption?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that since the resolution was submitted to him there have been added in the first paragraph, after the words "transacting official business," as the gentleman will see down there, the words "and while in attendance upon the Congress as such Representative" I did not have an opportunity to submit that to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman was under no obligation to me, of course, in the matter.

There is one matter in the resolution, however, which, upon further examination, I desire to call to the attention of the

House. The resolution recites that Mr. SIMS was assaulted by Mr. Glover; that the assault is alleged to have been made because of words spoken in the House in debate; and then it recites that—

Whereas said assault, if made, constitutes a breach of the privileges of the House and of its Members,

Then the resolution provides for the appointment of a committee to ascertain the facts and, if the facts are as alleged, to report a course of procedure.

I am quite in accord with the resolution, with the understanding, however, that I am not prepared at this time to express a definite opinion as to whether an assault upon a Member of the House outside of the House constitutes a breach of the privileges of the House. That may be a question which ought to be examined into by the committee when appointed, and I think will be examined into by the committee when appointed; and I think that the committee when appointed will not assume that the resolution adopted by the House carries with it a determination by the House that the House sustains this "whereas" without further examination into the precedents and into the constitutional privileges of the House.

My present feeling is that I would like to see it clearly established that an assault upon a Member of the House for his official work constitutes a breach of the privileges of the House. But I am not prepared yet to say whether under the precedents, the law, and the Constitution that be the case. I hope that the committee, if appointed, will make examination into the question as to whether an assault upon a Member of the House outside of the House, either for words spoken in this Congress or a prior Congress, or for other official business, constitutes an assault upon the privileges of the House and its Members, and that it will make a report upon which the House can act intelligently.

I do not believe this is a matter that is personal with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS]. If the privileges of the House have been invaded, it is the duty of the House to protect itself and its Members if it has the constitutional right to do so. If under the law the privileges of the House have not been invaded, there is nothing more that we can do except so to determine.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am in entire accord with what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has just said, and I should not speak at all but for the fact that I desire to add just one suggestion.

If this resolution shall carry, I hope that the committee to be appointed will consider not simply the question whether the power of the House goes to the extent of authorizing action on and punishment for an assault upon a Member for words spoken in the House or for actions as a Member, but whether it may not also be very much wider than that, and rest upon the right of the House to protect itself and its membership by punishing an assault without regard to whether the assault be related to any official act of a Member or words spoken by him in his official capacity, and I join with the gentleman from Illinois in the hope that the committee may make such a report as will give to the House a clear view of its powers in matters of this kind, that it may know and the public may know the responsibilities that rest upon us and upon the public touching membership in the National House of Representatives.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield two or three minutes to me?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of the very gravest importance, not only to the House of Representatives but to the citizens of the country. The assumption of the authority on the part of the House to punish a citizen for an assault on a Member out of the presence of the House is an assumption of doubtful authority.

Since the publication of the matters referred to in this resolution, I have taken occasion to go through the precedents and decisions. No doubt the committee appointed will go into the question of the authority of the House to punish, as for a contempt of the whole House, an assault upon one of its Members outside of the presence of the House.

The resolution takes the most dignified form that the House could possibly take at this time in connection with the matter in question.

Under the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Kilbourn *v.* Thompson (103 U. S., 168) the House has no authority to punish a citizen for the assault alleged to have been committed in this case.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do.

Mr. HARDWICK. In the case to which you refer the power of the House was denied solely because the House was seeking to prosecute an inquiry that the court held was entirely beyond its jurisdiction, was it not?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think the gentleman will find that was the case.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The whole question of the right of the House to punish for contempt was gone into by Mr. Justice Miller in that case. The report in Hinds' Precedents is a synopsis and not the full report of the case.

Mr. HARDWICK. But the decision rested on just what I have stated, did it not?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No; and the court went into the question of the right of Congress to punish for contempt and decided that it has no such right, and the court also went so far in the Kilbourn case as to review and disagree with and reverse the rule in the case of Anderson against Dunn, in which the right was sustained. I hope there will be a full discussion of this question when the proposed committee reports.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have myself some very well-defined ideas about the legal powers of the House in matters of this kind, but I do not care to express them now. In fact, it has seemed to me that in view of the form in which the resolution is drawn it is not proper to express those ideas at this particular time. The question of power will arise in due time. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed the following committee: Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia, Mr. RUCKER, Mr. CRISP, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. NELSON.

The SPEAKER, being informed that Mr. RUCKER was out of the city and would not return for a week, substituted the name of Mr. COVINGTON for that of Mr. RUCKER.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States, was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

THE OPIUM EVIL (H. DOC. NO. 33).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, ordered printed, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In transmitting the accompanying report from the Secretary of State I most strongly urge not only the immediate appropriation of the sum of $20,000 which is asked, the absolute necessity for which is so apparent, but also the enactment of the requisite antidrug legislation to which this Government is pledged internationally.

It is a source of gratification to me personally, and it will always be, I am confident, a subject of gratification to the Nation, that this Government, realizing the extent of the opium and allied evils, should have initiated the world-wide movement toward their abolition. At this vital period of the movement to fail to take the few final steps necessary definitively and successfully to conclude the work would be unthinkable, and I therefore trust that there may be no delay in the enactment of the desired legislation, and the consequent mitigation if not suppression of the vice which has caused such world-wide misery and degradation.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 21, 1913.*

The PRESIDENT:

Since the early days of our relations with China and other oriental countries it has been a constant policy of this Government to aid such countries in their efforts to prevent the development of an opium evil within their borders, or to assist them toward the eradication of such an evil where it already existed. In conformity with this established policy, and as early as 1833, in the various treaties negotiated with China, Japan, and Siam, American citizens were absolutely forbidden either directly or indirectly to engage in the opium trade, or

were permitted to engage in that trade only in conformity with the laws of those countries.

In the autumn of 1906, when this Government learned that China had set on foot earnest efforts to crush out the opium evil within her boundaries, it initiated an international movement which aimed to secure on behalf of the Chinese effort the cooperation of those western powers having territorial possessions in the Far East and who were concerned therefore in the economic, diplomatic, and other controversies arising from the Far Eastern opium traffic. The international movement inaugurated by this Government was not only fully justified by the fact that it had since its earliest contact with the Orient forbidden American citizens to engage in the opium trade, but because it was found necessary to protect the population of the Philippine Islands against the effects of that traffic. In furtherance of its purpose this Government in September, 1906, entered upon a correspondence with the Governments of Great Britain, France, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, and China to ascertain if the time had not arrived for the interested Governments to determine if the entire Far Eastern opium traffic could not be brought to an end. The above-mentioned Governments willingly offered to cooperate with the United States, and agreed to a joint investigation of the question. Thereupon six other nations, namely, Russia, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Portugal, Persia, and Siam, particularly interested in the Orient, were also invited to join in the investigation, and in February, 1909, there met at Shanghai, China, the International Opium Commission. That commission thoroughly examined the opium question in all its bearings, and arrived at nine unanimous conclusions which, in substance, condemned the evils associated with the production and use of opium and morphine, and contained recommendations as to the measures to be taken to bring such abuses to an end.

But the International Opium Commission was not empowered to negotiate a convention binding the participating powers. It was a commission for the purpose of study, consideration, and recommendation. To obtain a more positive result, a further step was necessary—an international convention to be agreed upon in conference by delegates of the interested Governments, such a convention to provide not only international rules under which opium should be produced and the traffic therein conducted, but also the general rules by which opium should be confined to strictly medicinal purposes in the territories of the different countries. Accordingly, in the autumn of 1909, this Government issued a proposal to those Governments which had been represented in the international commission that there should be a conference composed of delegates with full powers to meet at The Hague or elsewhere to conventionalize the conclusions arrived at by the International Opium Commission and the essential corollaries derived therefrom. The proposal contained a tentative program which proved to be generally acceptable.

The Netherlands Government very promptly and courteously requested that the conference meet at The Hague, and on December 1, 1911, on invitation of the Queen of the Netherlands, a conference of the powers represented in the Shanghai commission assembled there, and the delegates thereto were authorized by their Governments to formulate and sign an international convention. In the correspondence between the United States and the several Governments which led to the assembling of the conference the necessity for the consideration not only of the opium evil, but also of the morphine, cocaine, and Indian hemp drug evil was developed, and it was agreed by the interested Governments that those questions were to be included in the program of work, and by convention were to be placed under the same limitations as opium.

On the 23d of January, 1912, the delegates to The Hague conference signed a convention composed of strict stipulations as to the production and the international and national traffic in opium, morphine, and cocaine, and—an important point—it confirmed to China all that had been agreed upon between that country and Great Britain by virtue of their agreement of May 8, 1911. (See S. Doc. No. 733, 62d Cong., 2d sess.)

That the questions dealt with by the Shanghai commission were not only humanitarian and moral, but also questions of great economic importance, had been partly realized and was steadily developed during the sittings of The Hague conference. Since it was found that they affected not only the revenue and economic interests of the 12 powers with oriental relations whose representatives had assembled at The Hague, but also the major part of the other nations of the world, the conference came to the conclusion that to make its convention effective it was necessary to secure adherence thereto by the other nations of the world. Therefore the convention was so drafted that it was not to become effective until 34 other nations named in article 22 of the convention should add their signatures to the instrument by means of a protocol of supplementary signatures to be opened at The Hague.

The necessary supplementary signatures to the convention were to be secured by December 31, last, the Netherlands Government and the United States cooperating to that end. In the event of failure to secure all 34 signatures the Netherlands Government engaged immediately to call a final conference of all signatory powers, that conference to determine upon the deposit of ratifications of the convention. Up to the 31st of last December, the two Governments had secured the signatures, or been assured of the signatures, of all of the Latin-American States except one; while but three of the European States had declined to sign. Since a few of the necessary 34 signatures have not been subscribed to the convention, a second and final conference has now become necessary, and the Queen of the Netherlands has therefore invited all the signatory Governments to send delegates with full powers to The Hague in June next to agree upon the deposit of ratifications of the convention which it is to be hoped will definitively bring to an end the deplorable and ruinous abuses connected with the production and traffic in opium, morphine, and cocaine.

This, Mr. President, is a movement which I have closely followed for the past six years. I have examined all the essential facts and documents relating thereto, and have been gratified to review the growth of this humanitarian, moral, and economic movement from a consultation between this Government and five or six of the great powers of the world to one which now embraces the cooperation and has the sanction of almost the entire group of civilized States, and this in spite of the fact that it means past and future financial losses to the powers concerned of over $50,000,000 aggregate annual revenue. The entire movement illustrates a principle abroad in and stamped with the approval of the world to-day, namely, that the peoples are now agreed that an evil such as the opium evil is never wholly national in its incidence, can never be suppressed by two nations alone, as was supposed to be the case with the Far Eastern opium traffic, but that such an evil as it appears in one State is a concomitant or reflex of a similar evil in other States, and therefore is international in its moral, humanitarian, economic, and diplomatic effect; further that few evils can be eradicated by national action alone, and therefore that there must be cooperation of all the States directly or indirectly interested before such an evil is mitigated or suppressed. This movement, in which the United States has taken so large a part, was thought at first to concern only those countries of the Far East or those western nations having territorial possessions in the Far East—five or six in number. But it has proceeded by way of a sober international commission of inquiry composed of commissioners representing 13 nations, and by a conference composed of delegates with full powers representing 12 of these nations. Those delegates having formulated and signed on behalf of their Governments a convention containing strict pledges for national legislation and international cooperation, it was presented to the remaining States of Europe and America—34 in number—for their signature, and so far only 3 of the 34 have hesitated.

I have seen in the Orient and elsewhere the havoc wrought by the abuse of opium, and I feel a pride that our Government has been in the forefront of a progressive movement which by the cooperation of the other nations of the world has been carried to the point where but a final step is necessary effectually to put an end to the misuse of drugs which while of inestimable benefit to humanity when properly used are such a curse when abused.

That this international movement for the suppression of the opium traffic has been of incalculable benefit to China and has been one of the chief factors in her modern rehabilitation can not be denied, and there can be no doubt that the civilized world has rallied to the support of that country in her opium crusade, because of the fact that that crusade is not spasmodic and a matter of authority, but genuine, and of and by the will of the Chinese people.

The economic burden imposed upon China by the abuse of opium was well-nigh unbearable. It has been stated on the highest authority that up to the time the opium reform movement began the Chinese people expended over $150,000,000 a year on the consumption of foreign and native opium; that the value of the land given over to the production of native opium, were it planted with wheat or other more useful crops, would yield to the Chinese people an annual return in the neighborhood of $100,000,000; that the average earning capacity of the millions who were addicted to the habit of opium smoking was reduced one quarter, resulting in an annual loss in productive

power of nearly $300,000,000, or a total annual loss to China of about $550,000,000. In this calculation no account is taken of the capital loss involved.

It would be easy for me to point out that the release of China from her opium evil will redound to the credit of all nations concerned and leave a vast number of her people free to spend their energies in the development of internal and foreign commerce to an extent that our commercial bodies have long realized, to the material benefit of China and of those nations who have so loyally assisted her in her great internal movement for reform, and should soon enable the Chinese people to stand as economically free as any other people in the world.

I regret, however, that there is one feature of the international and national effort for the suppression of the opium evil that should be disquieting to the Government and people of the United States. It has been stated that a reflex effect of the initiation by the United States of the international movement for the abatement of the opium evil took the form of improved domestic legislation in nearly all countries concerned, and of very drastic legislation in some. Yet, despite this, this Government since February, 1909—the time of the passage of the Federal opium exclusion act—has taken no further definitive action for Federal control of the opium and allied traffics in the United States. The passage of the opium exclusion act was the first step which the Congress took to put our own house in order. There were three bills introduced in the last Congress which aim to supplement and perfect that act. I understand they are to be introduced in the early days of the present session, and will be pressed to enactment, thus placing this Government in a rightful position before the world; this is greatly to be desired.

The necessity for our representation at the forthcoming conference at The Hague is so apparent that I need not enlarge upon it, and I therefore have the honor to recommend that the Congress be asked immediately to appropriate the sum of $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to enable this Government to meet expenses incidental to and in continuity of its efforts to stamp out the opium evil through the forthcoming final conference at The Hague, and otherwise to make effective the results heretofore accomplished; this sum to be expended at the discretion of the Secretary of State and to continue available until the object appropriated for is accomplished.

Since the forthcoming conference will meet in the coming June, and the necessary and extensive preparations must be made for it by this Government, it is very important that the appropriation be made immediately available.

Respectfully submitted.

W. J. BRYAN.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN EXPENSES OF FIRST SESSION OF SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 2973.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 2973. Making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, namely:

UNDER LEGISLATIVE.

The appropriations for mileage of Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from the Territories, and expenses of Resident Commissioners, made in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1914, approved March 4, 1913, be, and the same are hereby, made immediately available and authorized to be paid to Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates from the Territories, and Resident Commissioners, for attendance on the first session of the Sixty-third Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

For stationery for Members and Delegates and Resident Commissioners, at $125 each, for the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, $55,000.

For the following employees during the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, but not longer than until and including June 30, 1913, namely:

For 46 pages, including 2 riding pages, 4 telephone pages, 1 press gallery page, and 10 pages for duty at the entrances to the Hall of the House, at $2.50 per day each; 3 telephone operators, at the rate of $75 per month each; in all, $10,535, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

For the following in the Department of Labor, pursuant to the act of March 4, 1913, creating a Department of Labor, from March 4, 1913, or from the date of their appointment and qualification, respectively, until the end of the fiscal year 1914, namely:

The Secretary of Labor, at the rate of $12,000 per annum; Assistant Secretary of Labor, at the rate of $5,000 per annum; Solicitor of the Department of Justice for the Department of Labor, at the rate of $5,000 per annum; chief clerk, at the rate of $3,000 per annum; disbursing clerk, at the rate of $3,000 per annum; private secretary to the Secretary, at the rate of $2,500 per annum; confidential clerk to the Secretary, at the rate of $1,800 per annum; and private secretary to the Assistant Secretary, at the rate of $2,100 per annum; in all, $42,300, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

All appropriations made for the fiscal year 1914 and balances, after March 4, 1913, of appropriations made for the fiscal year 1913, together with all appropriations made or to be made in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1914, for the bureaus, offices, or other divisions of whatever designation or character, transferred from the Department of Commerce and Labor to the Department of Labor under the act approved March 4, 1913, shall be available for expenditure in and by the Department of Labor, and shall be treated the same as though said branches of the public service had been directly named in the laws making said appropriations as parts of the Department of Labor, under the direction of the Secretary of the department: *Provided*, That as to all general appropriations for printing and binding, and contingent or miscellaneous expenses, the amounts that shall be transferred hereunder, except where the same are specifically fixed by law, shall in the case of each bureau, office, or other division be not less than the average amount expended on account of or allotted for expenditure to each of the same during the fiscal years 1912 and 1913.

The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed, as soon as may be practicable, to transfer to the Department of Labor all chiefs of division, assistant chiefs of division, clerks, messengers, assistant messengers, watchmen, charwomen, laborers, or others now employed in the divisions of his office who were, up to March 4, 1913, wholly engaged upon the work relating to the business of the bureaus and offices of the Department of Commerce and Labor transferred to the Department of Labor under the act of March 4, 1913; and in proportion to the number of persons in the divisions of his office whose time and labor were partially devoted to the work of said bureaus and offices he shall transfer approximately an equivalent number of clerks and other employees to said Department of Labor, and the appropriations made for the compensation of all persons transferred hereunder shall be credited to and disbursed by the Department of Labor.

The Secretary of Labor shall submit to Congress, for the fiscal year 1915, and annually thereafter, estimates in detail for all personal services and for all general and miscellaneous expenses for the Department of Labor.

THE PANAMA CANAL.

SEC. 2. That during the fiscal year 1914 all moneys received by the Isthmian Canal Commission or the governor of the Panama Canal from any services rendered or materials and supplies furnished employees, the Panama Railroad Co., the Canal Zone government, the Panama Government, and other departments of the United States Government, from hotel and hospital supplies and services; from rentals, wharfage, etc.; from labor, materials, and supplies and other services furnished vessels and to those unable to obtain similar labor, materials, supplies, and services elsewhere, shall be credited to the appropriation from which payments for the materials, supplies, labor, or other services were originally made; except that moneys received from the sale of material and equipment purchased and used for construction purposes, and as a reimbursement for the expenditures incurred in constructing waterworks, sewers, and pavements in the cities of Panama and Colon, including interest on such expenditures, excluding payments on account of the expenses for maintenance of such waterworks, sewers, and pavements incurred under agreement with the Panama Government, and otherwise herein disposed of, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; and except that after the canal is opened for use and operation the net profits accruing from the operations herein authorized shall annually be covered into the Treasury of the United States, as provided for the profits accruing from the business authorized in section six of the Panama Canal act.

That until the close of the fiscal year 1914, when any material, supplies, and equipment heretofore or hereafter purchased or acquired for the construction of the Panama Canal is no longer needed, or is no longer serviceable, it may be sold in such manner as the President may direct, and without advertising in such classes of cases as may be authorized by him.

RENTAL OF BUILDINGS.

SEC. 3. Hereafter the statement of buildings rented within the District of Columbia for use of the Government, required by the act of July 16, 1892 (27 Stat. L., 199), shall indicate as to each building rented the area thereof in square feet of available floor space for Government uses, the rate paid per square foot for such floor space, the assessed valuation of each building, and what proportion, if any, of the rental paid includes heat, light, elevator, or other service.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Illinois are each entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, this bill makes the appropriation for mileage for the regular session of the Sixty-third Congress available for this session. It provides the money necessary to supply Members with stationery, in accordance with law; it provides for certain session employees in the nature of pages for the House. It also provides for the situation arising from the creation of a Department of Labor in the closing days of the last Congress. In the closing hours of the last Congress a bill was passed creating the Department of Labor. To that department were transferred from the Department of Commerce and Labor certain bureaus, but no provision was made for the compensation of the new Secretary and his Assistant and of certain other employees, nor was there time to make arrangements for the transfer of the appropriations made for the Department of Commerce and Labor to the new Department of Labor. A provision in this bill provides for compensation for certain places created in the act, and imposes upon the Secretary of Commerce the duty of transferring employees to the Depart-

ment of Labor who properly should be there, and provides for the transfer of appropriations in order that the appropriations may be expended by the new department.

The bill also contains a provision relative to the Panama Canal. The paragraph was contained in the sundry civil bill as it was prepared by the Committee on Appropriations at the last session of Congress. It was known as section 3, but due to some misunderstanding arising in the closing hours of the session the provision was stricken from the bill on a point of order. Unless the provision makes available certain receipts in accordance with what has been done in the past, it will require appropriations aggregating $1,000,000 in addition to those heretofore made.

There is one other provision, which is of an administrative character, which requires that in the statement of the buildings rented in the District of Columbia for the use of the Government to be made each year there shall be inserted information which will indicate the area of the rented space, the price per square foot of floor space paid for the rented property, and the assessed value of the property. It is believed that this information, with the other information now required by the statute, will be of great value to Congress.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the gentleman from New York, in reference to section 2 of the bill, whether he knows how much money is now held by the Panama Railroad Co. which it is proposed to turn into the Treasury?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is none held; but under the law at present certain receipts are utilized in the construction of the canal. Under the Panama Canal act, as soon as the commission is abolished and a permanent organization effected, these receipts will no longer be available toward the construction, but certain receipts are utilized and the net profits turned in as miscellaneous receipts. The purpose of this provision is to continue available the same funds toward construction after the Panama Canal act is put into effect until the construction work is completed.

Mr. FOSTER. So that there is no money held now by the Panama Railroad Commission which has not been turned into the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. FITZGERALD. This does not affect the Panama Railroad money at all.

Mr. COVINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield for a moment?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. COVINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] that this provision simply carries into immediate effect the scheme of legislation that was devised for the control of those same funds in the permanent government of the zone. In the last sundry civil appropriation bill it went out on a point of order, and after careful examination and an understanding of its temporary character the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce became convinced that the Appropriations Committee was dealing properly and wisely with the temporary situation.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that all the receipts from the commissary department and from the railroad company are now going into the construction fund of the Panama Canal. Is that right?

Mr. COVINGTON. Oh, no.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There are certain supplies furnished by the commission, and the proceeds of the sale of certain materials are credited to the construction fund. The funds of the Panama Railroad Co. are separate and distinct, and are held separate and distinct.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what I wanted to know. What becomes of this fund now held under this provision of the bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. Which fund?

Mr. FOSTER. The funds of the Panama Railroad Co. and of the commissary department of the railroad company.

Mr. SHERLEY. The Panama Railroad Co. funds are not affected by this provision at all. All this provision contemplates is that the moneys that are received by the canal commission for services performed, whether for the railroad company or otherwise, instead of being covered into the Treasury may be used as a part of the construction fund to continue the work.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the railroad company now any fund on hand?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, yes; the railroad company has a great many funds.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Nearly $2,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is it proposed to do with that fund?

Mr. SHERLEY. This does not affect that at all.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not affect it in any way?

Mr. SHERLEY. No.

Mr. COVINGTON. The net result would be it would have to be reappropriated, and it would show, as a matter of fact, that the same fund has been appropriated.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield first to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], who desires to ask a question.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to clear up in my own mind a doubt about the accounting system of the House itself. We appropriate money for mileage and stationery in this bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not for mileage. We make available for this session of Congress the appropriation already made.

Mr. MURDOCK. The larger proportion of the committees of the House are not yet appointed, but each committee, as a matter of fact, is working to some extent and has a clerk. When do we make the appropriation in the beginning of the Congress for the pay of the clerks of the committees?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is carried in the legislative bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. When is that available?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The legislative bill for the fiscal year 1913 carries the appropriation out of which they are being paid at the present time, and the legislative bill for the fiscal year 1914, passed at the last session, continues their payment from the 1st of July next, the beginning of the fiscal year.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then, as the system operates, really before a committee is appointed there is a clerk to that committee.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certain clerks are on the annual roll and they are paid regardless of whether the committee be announced. They attend to bills and different matters that come into the committee. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Ten minutes.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I see in this bill that the private secretary to the Secretary of Labor receives a salary of $2,500. I would like to inquire if this is the same salary received by other private secretaries to members of the Cabinet?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is the same compensation as is paid to private secretaries of all members of the Cabinet. I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York reserves the rest of his time.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do.

Mr. MONDELL. I notice on page 5, lines 10 and 11, section 2, the words "and other departments of the United States Government" are used. I assume this section is intended to refer exclusively to the canal and the Canal Zone. Was that the intention?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is the intention; yes.

Mr. MONDELL. It seems to me those words without any qualification might be held to apply to sums received for those purposes through other departments of the Government.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is true. For example, if a naval vessel went to the Isthmus and the Panama Canal Commission rendered some services and paid for them out of the appropriations made for the Canal Zone, it wishes the money given to it as a reimbursement to be available for the purpose of work on the Canal Zone. The same conditions should exist if the services were rendered to any other department.

Mr. MONDELL. But only on the Canal Zone.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes; on the zone. It is really a bookkeeping matter. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to publish in the RECORD the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Kilbourn against Thompson, touching the question of the power of the House to punish for contempt.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Supreme Court decision in the case of Kilbourn against Thompson.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that is a very long case, and in my opinion the House should not print this case in the RECORD for the gentleman from Kansas, who has already expressed an opinion upon the questions involved in anticipation of the report of the committee which has been appointed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I shall object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have no objection to printing it as a document, so it may be available for Members.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think it important that Members of the House should read this case.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest to the gentleman that he print a reference to the case in his speech if he wants to, and everybody knows how to find a decision of the Supreme Court and how to read a law report.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; but it is a little difficult to find a sufficient number of the report.

The SPEAKER. It is objected to, and that is the end of it.

Mr. MANN. I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

The SPEAKER. How much time?

Mr. MANN. As long as he desires.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to have printed as a document an article printed in the American Economic Review of last March, entitled "The Tariff Board and wool legislation," by William S. Culberson, who was connected with the Tariff Board. I will say this article makes an analysis in a nonpartisan way of all the various tariffs relating to the wool schedule that were introduced in the last Congress, and I am sure it will prove very valuable to every Member upon both sides of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to print as a document an article on the subject of wool by W. S. Culberson.

Mr. SHERLEY. Would the gentleman object to having printed as a part of the document an article by Mr. Page, formerly a member of the Tariff Board, on the woolen schedule, to be found in the North American Review for the current month?

Mr. LENROOT. Not at all.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] amends the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] by asking that a certain article written by a Mr. Page, and printed in the current number of the North American Review, on the same subject, also be printed as a public document. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand they are to be printed together in the same document?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; as a document.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let the light go with the darkness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know the extent of these publications. About how many pages are there?

Mr. SHERLEY. This particular one is about 10 or 15 pages in the North American Review, I think.

Mr. FINLEY. Now, as to the other——

Mr. LENROOT. About 20 pages of it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman who made the request a question. I have read one of the articles and appreciate its value; and I wanted to ask the gentleman that if unanimous consent is granted and this is printed as a document, how the Members receive it—through the folding room or document room?

Mr. LENROOT. Through the document room, as the request stands.

Mr. MURDOCK. How many are they entitled to as Members?

Mr. LENROOT. I think it is 2,500.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They remain to the credit of the Members in the document room.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] how many are printed?

Mr. FINLEY I think in the neighborhood of 1,500 or 2,000, or something like that. I do not know the exact number.

Mr. MANN. The usual number is 1,540, of which the House receives a little over 400 copies.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is it not true that there can be a reprint if that number is not sufficient?

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield any further.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would like to ask——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] objects.

Mr. MANN. I do not object to the request for printing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. EDWARDS. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] how these documents are to be distributed?

Mr. LENROOT. The application will be by the Members to the document room, and they will receive them.

Mr. EDWARDS. They are not to be distributed through the folding room?

Mr. FINLEY. No.

Mr. COOPER. Did I understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to say that the House, under the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], will have only 400 copies?

Mr. MANN. I think a little less than that.

Mr. COOPER. That is not one apiece.

Mr. MANN. The House has it in its power to fix the number desired. The usual number is limited.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield this time one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD certain letters from two distinguished Democrats—first, letters from Thomas Jefferson——

Mr. FITZGERALD. I object to printing in the RECORD anything until we get rid of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] objects.

Mr. WILLIS. He objects to the printing of the letters of Thomas Jefferson?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman from Ohio has time in which to state what he wanted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] objects. It does not make any difference what his reason is.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat remarkable that the gentleman on the other side of the aisle who will be chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, one of the greatest committees in existence in any legislative body on earth, a leading Democrat, should at the beginning of a Democratic administration object to printing in the RECORD a letter written by Thomas Jefferson, the father putative of Democracy. [Applause on the Republican side.] But we have drifted so far away from any of the doctrines of the early fathers that now the gentlemen are afraid to have printed for the generation of to-day letters written by Thomas Jefferson then and letters written by William R. Hearst now. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT]?

Mr. MANN. For a question?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; but does not the gentleman think that it is Democratic sacrilege to associate Thomas Jefferson with William R. Hearst? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I notice that there is some applause on the Democratic side on that. But there are mighty few Members on that side of the aisle who are willing to be known and have their names published as applauding. [Applause on the Republican side.] You gentlemen over there are not afraid now of Thomas Jefferson, because he is dead. [Laughter on the Republican side.] But you are afraid of William R. Hearst, because he is alive. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

No doubt, some day, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], who objected the other day and to-day to the request to print Mr. Hearst's letter, will obtain a reconciliation with Mr. Hearst. But it will not be a real reconciliation; it will be a Clark-Bryan reconciliation. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

And, Mr. Speaker, I may say that this side of the House, and I believe the other side of the House, not only sympathize with the Speaker in the contest that has been going on, but he, the Speaker, has our profound respect [applause on the Republican side], and we are not afraid to say so, because we are not seeking to influence the Secretary of State in the selection of men to fill jobs. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Is it because the gentleman thinks it is a hopeless job? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. No; it is not because we think it is a hopeless job. We think we are not deserving. You think it is not a hopeless job, but it is, just the same, with you. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to the gentleman that it is not hopeless.

Mr. MANN. When the distinguished gentleman has been here a little longer he will have learned how hopeless it is. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MANN. I do.

Mr. HARDY. Why does not the gentleman devote his attention to harmonizing the Bull Moosers with his party instead of harping about Bryan?

Mr. LAFFERTY. That is what the gentleman is doing.

Mr. MANN. It would be useless to waste an answer upon the gentleman from Texas. He could not appreciate what has been said. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman will permit just one suggestion, I object to that last part, because it puts me in the same class with the gentleman himself, who could not appreciate my question. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Then I object also, because I object to being put in the same class with the gentleman. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, what is the proposition before the House? To suspend the rules and pass an appropriation bill. Why suspend the rules? The other day the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], before the bill was introduced, asked to have it immediately considered, when no Member of the House had an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman himself said he had read it.

Mr. MANN. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I did not say I had read it. I said I had received a copy of it ten or fifteen minutes before, but I did not have time to read it. The gentleman from New York may have read it before he introduced it [laughter on the Republican side], but he asked to have it passed without consideration, and now he asks to have it passed under suspension of the rules, where there can be no amendment offered to it. Why? In a few moments the House will have brought before it a rule for the consideration of two different appropriation bills, each of which will permit a motion to recommit, so that at least some questions can then be brought before the House.

What is there in this bill which the gentleman is afraid to have brought to the attention of the House? Is it the Panama Canal proposition? Is it the proposition to permit the President to sell, without advertising, the equipment on the Canal Zone? Or is it that proposition so dear to the hearts of many here—the subject of mileage? [Laughter.] For some years the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] has been seeking an opportunity to bring before this House a square vote on the subject of mileage.

Gentlemen on that side of the aisle have prevented that being done every time the question has been up in the last two years. Now the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] again finds himself in the situation where he must either vote against an appropriation for the maintenance of the Department of Labor or vote for a proposition for mileage which he considers unfair and unjust, with no opportunity to move to recommit the bill with instructions as to mileage. That is a very smooth thing. I admire the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] because he is a fine legislator and one of the smoothest articles that ever graced the floor of the House of Representatives. [Applause and laughter.] The gentleman from New York presents the proposition in such a way that he forecloses the right to amend, to recommit, to do anything with it except to vote for everything in the bill or vote against a proper appropriation for the maintenance of the Department of Labor.

The new Members on the Democratic side will find themselves being led by a rope in their noses, compelled to walk forward, compelled to do what they are told, with no opportunity to amend. You can not amend the tariff bill, you can not amend the sundry civil appropriation bill, you can not amend the Indian appropriation bill, you can not amend this little bill now before us. All you can do is to do what you are told by your bosses on that side of the House. On the stump you have been eloquent in declaiming against bossism and against Cannonism, but when you come here you lie down and let them walk over you, and you do exactly as they motion their fingers to you. [Laughter.]

How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has four minutes remaining.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I feel very grateful to my friend on the other side of the aisle [Mr. MANN] for the few things he has said about me.

I have tried in my way to get some amendment before the House on the mileage proposition. In doing that I suppose I have in a measure brought down upon my shoulders a storm of indignation. I imagine that time and again I have been accused privately, if not publicly, of insincerity on this proposition.

Mr. BARTLETT. Did the gentleman ever have the assistance of the gentleman from Illinois in that effort?

Mr. COX. I never did. But I want to assure the Members of this House, if they need any assurance from me, that I have been sincere in this proposition. I am not quarreling at all about the manner in which the bills have come before the House heretofore, against which I have desired to offer my amendment. I would like very much at some time to get a square vote on this proposition.

Mr. MURDOCK. A record vote.

Mr. COX. A record vote, as suggested by the gentleman from Kansas. If ever we get a direct record vote on this proposition, I can not believe the membership of this House will refuse to reduce the mileage now paid to Members.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I can not yield. If the gentleman will give me more time, I will yield.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield the gentleman one minute, if he will allow me to make the statement that there was a record vote on this matter in the last Congress.

Mr. COX. I was not here at that time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman was absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. COX. That is true.

Mr. FITZGERALD. At that time there was a very strenuous controversy and a record vote on it.

Mr. BARTLETT. I know there was a record vote in the last Congress, and I know on several occasions I have voted with the gentleman from Indiana to reduce this mileage.

Mr. COX. I am glad to hear the gentleman make that announcement.

The Democratic Party—and I claim to be a member of it—have assailed the Republican Party on every stump, on every occasion when the opportunity presented itself to us, and we have condemned you Republicans for extravagance. The press of the country have condemned you. The first session that we were in control here it can truthfully be said to our credit that we made a record for economy. In the last session we can not boast of our record for economy. But I do not believe any Congress can make an efficient record for economy unless it is perfectly willing to begin at home. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman from New York yield to me two minutes?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will give the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. COX. It is of no use to talk to me of discussing with the people from whom you hold your commissions that it is necessary to have 20 cents a mile to carry us from our homes to the Capital and return again, because the people know that it is not true. We pay our ambassadors only 5 cents a mile. Why should we appropriate to ourselves 20 cents a mile and deny it to our ambassadors?

A MEMBER. Perhaps we have 5-cent ambassadors.

Mr. COX. It is suggested that we have 5-cent ambassadors. I doubt that very much, because I believe that we have been ably represented at foreign courts.

Now, I want to address myself particularly to the young Members of this House in this Congress, you who are fresh from the people. I saw you come into our caucus held last March, and I saw you drive a coach and four through some of the old rules that have been in vogue for 100 years, and I rejoiced to see you do it. I remember that when I came here I was told to go way back and sit down, as far as committee assignments were concerned. I saw you come here and violate and break those rules. I appeal to you, if the question ever comes where we can get a square vote on this question, when you are fresh from the people, that you stand for economy and that you will vote to repeal this law, or, if not to repeal it, at least to reduce it to 5 cents a mile. [Applause.]

I am not a crank on this question, but I am fighting to get this mileage reduced as it ought to be reduced.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I repeat at this time what I have said on many occasions, that I am as little interested in

the mileage as any Member of the House. My mileage amounts to $92. This matter has been vigorously debated at times to my knowledge for 14 years, and every time the House has decided not to change the mileage. Under the law Members are entitled to mileage which is now fixed. This bill provides for that mileage. It was appropriated for the next session of Congress. This bill provides that the money heretofore appropriated shall be made available at this time.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is not complaining about this bill or of the manner in which it is brought before the House. He was on the other side in the mileage question from the gentleman from Indiana when the fight was made, and he gave as a reason for believing in the mileage as now fixed, an opinion which was widely published throughout the country, that we ought to appropriate sufficient mileage to enable the Members to bring their wives to Washington, because when their wives are here Members render more effective service. [Laughter.]

The truth of the matter is, the gentleman from Illinois believes that every item in this bill should be adopted; he has not suggested a single change that he would make in the bill if he was given an opportunity to offer an amendment. As a matter of fact he alone is responsible for the House considering the bill under conditions that do not admit of amendment. Last Thursday this bill was presented, and I asked unanimous consent to have it considered. Had consent been granted, every Member would have had an opportunity to offer amendments. But the gentleman from Illinois, fearing, perhaps, that somebody might attempt to interfere with and change this perfect measure, objected to that procedure and compelled me to move to suspend the rules, as that is the only way at present in which the House can get the bill before it.

The object of the gentleman from Illinois in his remarks this morning was not to antagonize the bill; it was an attempt, if possible, to cover up the widespread dissensions and divisions in his own party. [Laughter.] I objected to the publication of two letters in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker. For the first time in 14 years' service in this House I found some disposition on the part of my political opponents to read the writings of distinguished Democrats. I have ascertained that whenever permission is refused to embalm a publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a curiosity is created in men to find out what is in the papers presented for publication. Like all human beings, they are curious as to anything to which objection is made for publication, and the two letters are now likely to be read by every Republican.

I know, from my knowledge of Republican Members in this House, that it will benefit them all greatly to read both of the letters.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] speaks of reconciliations. For the first time since the Populistic Party went out of power during my service here we have three so-called parties and several independent movements in this House.

Mr. HARDWICK. Personally conducted.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] heads the Democratic Party. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] hopes he is at the head of the Republican Party, though from what I have been reading about the dissensions in their caucus there may be some doubt about it. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], somewhat of a Republican, although advertised as a Progressive, has another organization of his own, and then some Members on that side of the House, unable to come in under any of these organizations, are acting as independent guerrillas in the House. [Laughter.] Why not try and reconcile Members on that side? Within a few days I have read a statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] recently assigned by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to the Committee on Ways and Means, in which he most vehemently denounces the proposed indorsement by the Republican caucus of a moribund tariff bill prepared by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]. Reconciliations are in order over there, and how gratifying it would be to the gentleman from Illinois, and to everyone else who is opposing the organized Democracy, triumphant in this country, if there could be one great reconciliation. If the late President of the United States and his recent bosom friend who immediately preceded him in the White House could only be induced by some magic touch to come together and bury their personal differences in the interest of the G. O. P., how happy the gentleman from Illinois would be. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. And how unhappy the gentleman from New York would be. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. No, Mr. Speaker; for while that reconciliation is a futile hope, and while I should much prefer that my party should have the opportunity of beating them both together, since they will not give us that opportunity we will be content to beat them one at a time, all in the interest and for the welfare of the entire country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

MEMORIAL TO THOMAS JEFFERSON AT ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House joint resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 62.

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sum:

For defraying the expenses of the members of the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, authorized to attend and represent the Senate and House at the unveiling and dedication of the memorial to Thomas Jefferson at St. Louis, Mo., on April 30, 1913, $7,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of which sum $3,000 shall be accredited to the Senate, to be expended under the direction and by the order of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and $4,000 accredited to the account of and expended under the direction and by the order of the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and by the Committee on Accounts of the House, respectively.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

Mr. FOSTER. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects; and the Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] to act as tellers.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 141, noes 53.

So a second was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois to 20 minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered by the Members who served in the Sixty-second Congress that a delegation to attend the unveiling and dedication of this monument to Thomas Jefferson was appointed by the Speaker of that Congress. The people of the States of the Louisiana purchase have donated some $450,000 for the purpose of erecting a monument to Thomas Jefferson.

That monument will be unveiled on the 30th day of April at St. Louis. The Senate very properly accepted the invitation to send a delegation representing the Senate on this important occasion, and named gentlemen to represent that body. The House accepted the same invitation, and the Speaker, in response to the authorization passed by this House, has named 12 gentlemen to represent the House on that occasion.

Mr. SMALL. How many Members compose the delegation of the Senate?

Mr. HEFLIN. Eight in the Senate, I believe. I regret, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, to find anybody opposing this resolution. I think it is the measliest economy that I have ever seen practiced by anybody. The idea of any Democrat in this House opposing a measure of this kind to have this House duly represented at that important occasion in honor of a man who formerly served in Congress, who was afterwards President of the United States, author of the Statutes of Religious Liberty in Virginia, the founder of the university, the author of the Declaration of Independence, and the founder of the great Democratic Party! It surprises me to hear these gentlemen opposing a measure of this kind. Now, these Members who have been appointed on this committee are not rich men; they are going to represent the dignity of this House on that occasion. It is an important occasion. No more important lesson can be taught to the youth of this country than to call to their attention what Thomas Jefferson stood for in the civic affairs of his land, and I am surprised to see gentlemen offering opposition at all to this measure. Now, gentlemen will note that the resolution says $7,000, so much to be used by the Senate, so much by the House, and so much of that fund, $7,000, as may be necessary to pay the expenses of these gentlemen, and I want to say that that is the only expense that will be paid—railroad fare, hotel fare. That is all. Do you not believe, gentlemen, that this House ought to defray those expenses? I think that the House ought to do that.

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. HEFLIN. I will.

Mr. SMALL. If there are 20 on the committees of the two Houses, the sum of $7,000 will amount to $350 each. Does the gentleman think that is an excessive amount?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not think it will take anything like that amount. I did not prepare the resolution. The amount named is too much.

Mr. SMALL. Why does the gentleman seek to appropriate an amount more than necessary for the purpose?

Mr. HEFLIN. The gentleman will note that the resolution says:

Or so much thereof as is necessary to defray the legitimate expenses of this committee.

Mr. SMALL. Did gentlemen of the committee investigate as to the amount which would be necessary for the expenses of this trip?

Mr. HEFLIN. I have not, but some gentlemen have; but I will say frankly——

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. HEFLIN. Just briefly.

Mr. COX. How many Members of the House are on this committee?

Mr. HEFLIN. Twelve.

Mr. COX. And how many of the Senate?

Mr. HEFLIN. Eight.

Mr. COX. Twenty in all?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for a moment? I want to say that 2 members of that committee are not now Members of this Congress and are now home, 1 in St. Louis and 1 in East St. Louis, so there will be only 10 members of the committee.

Mr. HEFLIN. So there will be practically no expense for those two gentlemen; but, gentlemen, let me suggest to you—and I want those of you who oppose the resolution to reply to this—you have heard tell of straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, think of the remarkable economy some of you have practiced in this House. You vote for some big appropriation without murmuring, and on a matter like this, where it is a very small appropriation, gentlemen almost have fits when it is suggested. [Laughter and applause.] These delegations will have to account for their expenses. I am chairman of the committee appointed to go upon this trip. I shall account for every cent that I expend on that trip, and nothing but my legitimate expenses and of other gentleman of that committee will I ask at the hands of this House. As chairman of that delegation I will account to this House. I will see to that myself.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLAYTON). Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Briefly.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the gentleman from Alabama believe that Thomas Jefferson needs any monument erected by human hands to perpetuate his memory?

Mr. HEFLIN. Now, Mr. Speaker, in reply to that, I think Thomas Jefferson lives in the hearts of the people of the country. But from time immemorial it has been the custom of all civilized countries to erect monuments to perpetuate the memory of their distinguished dead. This country owes it to Thomas Jefferson to build a great monument to him, and the patriotic people of that section of the United States have done so. They will unveil it on the 30th day of April, and the only contribution that the Government of the United States will make toward that monument will be to bear the expenses of a delegation from the House and a delegation from the Senate. [Applause.]

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER].

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not permit the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] to exceed me in admiration for Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, and the man who did so much for the liberties of the people of this country and of the world. But I do suggest that when it comes to the appropriation of money for junketing trips I am opposed to it, as Thomas Jefferson, I believe, would be were he alive to-day. In the last Congress there was a resolution passed to provide for a committee to go to St. Louis to attend the unveiling of a statue of Thomas Jefferson. Upon that committee were appointed 12 Members of the House at that time. Two of those gentlemen have since ceased to be Members, and are private citizens. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Alabama should go to St. Louis, that with all his eloquence he would be able to describe something of the wonderful tribute to this great man. But I submit that after it is all through and he comes back to Washington to assume his duties in this House, which he performs in a most distinguished manner, that he will not have added one iota to the greatness of Thomas Jefferson. And yet, according to his resolution, there is an authorization of $7,000 of the people's money to be spent upon this trip.

I submit to you, my friends, who have been upon trips at the expense of the Government, that you know what they are. It is useless for me to depict to you to-day any of those trips and how the money is usually spent. I do not believe, after we have spent $5,250,000 for the celebration of the great event with which Thomas Jefferson had something to do, that it is necessary now that we should spend $7,000 for the unveiling of this statue to that great man.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman recalls that the resolution appointing this committee was a simple House resolution, not even a concurrent resolution, and appointing the House committee, and did not that resolution and the committee appointed under it die with the Sixty-second Congress?

Mr. FOSTER. I think, Mr. Speaker, there is no question as to the fact stated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. And now we are to appropriate money for the expenses of a committee that died with the Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. FOSTER. That resolution which passed in the last Congress provided no appropriation. And I stated upon the floor at that time that they would probably be back here at the next Congress asking that an appropriation be made to defray the expenses of these gentlemen who are expected to attend this ceremony. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that if the last Congress had intended that these expenses should be paid they should have provided an appropriation for that purpose, and not have waited until that resolution had died with that Congress, and then come back at this time and ask an appropriation of $7,000.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. I will.

Mr. HARDY. If the legitimate expenses of this committee only are to be paid, is it not difficult to figure out how each one could spend for car fare and sleeper and eating more than $100 apiece on that trip?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I would think that probably true if the man was spending the money out of his own pocket, but when it comes to spending the money out of the Government's pocket there may be some difference.

Mr. HARDY. If each one spent $100, that would be $1,200. What is the necessity of making it $7,000?

Mr. FOSTER. This makes the amount about $330 each for this trip.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. Is it not provided in the resolution that these bills should be audited by the proper committees?

Mr. FOSTER. It provides that they shall be audited. But let me say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN] that they have a limit of $3,000, and did the gentleman ever know——

Mr. GOULDEN. Our Committee on Accounts, on which I served for six years, carefully audited all expenditures of this character, as was their duty.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no complaint to make of the Committee on Accounts or its chairman, but I suggest to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN] when they present their bill within the limit of $3,000 the Committee on Accounts will allow it.

Mr. GOULDEN. I do not think they should. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois. I think the appropriation should have accompanied the resolution authorizing the appointment of a committee. I think it is wrong at this time to bring in a resolution of this kind, and especially for so large a sum.

Mr. FOSTER. I will say to the gentleman that if the appropriation had been presented with the resolution at the time it would probably not have passed, but I do not know. They come back now to a new House and ask you, because a former Congress had authorized this committee, to supply the money to pay the expenses of these gentlemen to attend the unveiling of the monument at St. Louis.

Mr. GOULDEN. I will say to the gentleman that I am duly thankful that I was not a Member of the last House, and that therefore I have nothing to answer for.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, no man in this House more highly respects and few men in the United States hold in greater reverence the name of Thomas Jefferson than I do. No man in this House has a greater respect for my friend from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] than I have. But I do not believe that it becomes him or any other Member of this House to undertake to forestall any man who might oppose this resolution by characterizing his action as being the meanest piece of parsimony that a man was ever guilty of if he should raise a protest against it.

I have voted for appropriations time and time again, but those were, in my judgment, necessary appropriations. I do not believe it can be shown by any Member of this House during my six years' experience on this floor that I have ever opposed an honest, meritorious appropriation which was needed to run the operations of this Government. But I oppose, and shall continue to oppose, even at the risk of being called parsimonious, the appropriation of public money to give a few men of this House and at the other end of the Capitol nothing in God Almighty's world but a junketing trip at public expense.

Why ask for $7,000 in this case? The average expense, or the legitimate expense incurred by one in traveling from here to St. Louis and return can, in my judgment, be paid with the small sum of $60.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. That will cover his train fare and his Pullman fare, and will cover his meals upon the train. Why ask $7,000? Four thousand dollars of it, I believe, is to go to the House, and $3,000 of it is to go to the Members of the Senate. The $4,000 is to be divided among 12 Members of the House. Why do that when $60 apiece will pay all the legitimate expenses between here and St. Louis plus what little expense may be required while in the city of St. Louis?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman not know that——

Mr. COX. Let me tell the gentleman and others that there are other men and other people who should be consulted concerning this and other appropriations. They are the men and women back home who must by means of every drop of sweat that trickles down their brows pay these expenses. Will this proposed trip add one iota to the greatness of Thomas Jefferson? Echo answers back "No!" Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, Abraham Lincoln, and other great men and patriots who have lived and died in this country have not yet reached the zenith of their fame or eminence in public estimation, and as long as civilization dwells on the face of the earth you can erect monuments in every city of the Union to commemorate the birth of Thomas Jefferson and other great men, yet it will not add one iota to his greatness. He will continue to grow in the opinion of patriotic Americans.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield to his colleague?

Mr. COX. For a question.

Mr. CLINE. If $60 is to be the amount of the legitimate expense of a man going and coming between Washington and St. Louis, including all the expenses incident to the trip, what is the balance to be used for?

Mr. COX. I do not know what the balance could be used for.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman must know that champagne is expensive. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. I do not know anything about that, because I do not use champagne, although I may be no better on that account.

But I do sincerely appeal to the gentlemen on this side of the House to vote against this resolution when the vote is taken. We warned you in the last session, on the Monday night before the House adjourned, when we undertook to get from the gentleman in charge of the proposition a statement as to where the money was finally coming from. We put the question squarely up to him then, "Will you not be back here asking Congress to make an appropriation to pay these expenses?" At that time we were denounced as being penny-wise. I know there are men on this floor who do not look at these things very seriously. I know that in the district from which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] hails they probably do not take very kindly to the arguments now made by myself and by my friend from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER]; but let me say to him and to those who sympathize with the arguments he makes that if he had to make a race for Congress in the North, as we do, where we have a Republican opponent facing us at every turn in the road and calling on us to account for these things, he would never denounce a Member on the floor of this House for being penny-wise in opposing these appropriations.

Gentlemen, we are starting in early. Let us see if we can not make a record for economy, especially in view of the fact that the President of the United States recently announced through the press of the country that economy would be one of the slogans of his administration. When men come to this House and ask for an appropriation of $7,000, and when every man who is able to figure the rudiments of arithmetic knows that $7,000 is not needed for this purpose, and it is confessedly unnecessary, let us vote against it.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Would the gentleman object to paying these members their actual expenses?

Mr. COX. I would most emphatically object to it.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. The gentleman would object to paying their actual expenses?

Mr. COX. I would object to paying their actual expenses. If any Member desires to get leave of this House to go out and attend the unveiling of this statue, I have no objection in the world, provided he wants to pay his own expenses; but I am unalterably opposed to this Congress appropriating one dollar or one penny for the expenses of anyone to go out there and attend that dedication. What good will it do? How does it propose to bring happiness or prosperity to the home of a single person in this land? The gentleman says it is a matter of great national importance that will call the attention of the youth of the country to the greatness of Thomas Jefferson. I deny it. There is no necessity to call their attention to the greatness of Thomas Jefferson, because his greatness stands and will continue to stand forever in the minds of the school children of this country, and not only of this country but of the world in general.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a word more to summarize this matter. Seven thousand dollars is the appropriation asked for here. What for? How is it going to be expended? I hope two-thirds will not vote to suspend the rules, and that the motion will be defeated.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, there may be some question as to whether it is desirable to have the Congress appropriate money to pay the expenses of a junketing trip. Personally, I do not think it is desirable or wise. Gentlemen on that side of the House appear to be divided in their councils upon that question, but I assume that there is no question as to the desirability and wisdom of erecting in the great city of St. Louis a monument to the memory of Thomas Jefferson. We upon this side honor the patriotic memory of Thomas Jefferson and we maintain the integrity of many of his teachings.

A few minutes ago I sought recognition for the purpose of placing in the RECORD some of the things that this great patriotic American said upon the questions now pending before the public, and of immense present interest. I had never supposed that we would live to see the day when gentlemen upon the Democratic side of the House were so ashamed of the policies they maintain that they would object to a publication of the letters of Thomas Jefferson relative to those subjects.

I say there is no doubt that it is desirable and wise and patriotic to erect a monument at St. Louis to the memory of this great American. But if there were any doubt about it, the fact that in substantially all of his public utterances he maintained and defended the doctrine of protection to American industries that fact alone would be sufficient to entitle him to high place. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, since objection was made to the printing of the sayings of this patriot and sage, I now propose to read some of them for the edification of Members on that side who are unfamiliar with the writing and policies of Thomas Jefferson touching the tariff question. [Applause on the Republican side.]

These are some of the things that Thomas Jefferson said at various times concerning a protective tariff:

"It is true we must expect some inconvenience in practice from the establishment of discriminating duties. But in this, as in so many other cases, we are left to choose between two evils. These inconveniences are nothing when weighed against the loss of wealth and loss of force which will follow our perseverance in the plan of indiscrimination. When once it shall be perceived that we are either in the system or in the habit of giving equal advantages to those who extinguish our commerce and navigation by duties and prohibitions as to those who treat both with liberality and justice, liberality and justice will be converted by all into duties and prohibitions. It is not to the moderation and justice of others we are to trust for fair and equal access to market with our productions or for our due share in the transportation of them, but to our means of independence and the firm will to use them. Nor do the inconveniences of discrimination merit consideration. * * * Perhaps not a commercial nation on earth is without them." (Foreign Commerce Report, vii, 650. Ford ed., vi, 483. Dec., 1793.)

"Should any nation, contrary to our wishes, suppose it may better find its advantage by continuing its system of prohibitions, duties, and regulations it behooves us to protect our citizens, their commerce and navigation by counter prohibitions, duties, and regulations also. Free commerce and navigation are not to be given in exchange for restrictions and vexations; nor are they likely to produce a relaxation of them." (Foreign Commerce Report, vii, 647. Ford ed., vi, 480. Dec., 1793.)

"The revenue on the consumption of foreign articles is paid cheerfully by those who can afford to add foreign luxuries to domestic comforts. Being collected on our seaboards and frontiers only and incorporated with the transactions of our mercantile citizens, it may be the pleasure and pride of an American to ask, What farmer, what mechanic, what laborer, ever sees a taxgatherer of the United States?" (Second inaugural address, viii, 41; Ford ed., viii, 343. 1805.)

"Between nations who favor our productions and navigation and those who do not favor them one distinction alone will suffice; one set of moderate duties for the first and a fixed advance on these as to some articles and prohibitions as to others for the last." (Foreign Commerce Report, vii, 650; Ford ed., vi, 482. Dec., 1793.)

"Where a nation imposes high duties on our productions or prohibits them altegether, it may be proper for us to do the same by theirs, first burdening or excluding those productions which they bring here in competition of our own of the same kind, selecting next such manufactures as we take from them in greatest quantity and which at the same time we could the soonest furnish to ourselves or obtain from other countries, imposing on them duties lighter at first, but heavier and heavier afterwards, as other channels of supply open. Such duties, having the effect of indirect encouragement to domestic manufactures of the same kind, may induce the manufacturer to come himself into these States, where cheaper subsistence, equal laws, and a vent of his wares, free of duty, may insure him the highest profits from his skill and industry." (Foreign Commerce Report, vii, 648; Ford ed., vi, 481. Dec., 1793.)

And so, Mr. Speaker, contrary to the present doctrine of the Democratic Party, it is clear that the patriot and sage who founded the party was in favor of a system of discriminative duties and was in favor of a protective tariff.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. Very briefly.

Mr. HARDY. Does not the gentleman know that Jefferson expressly said he preferred free seas, but was in favor of discriminating duties only with other nations who discriminated against us?

Mr. WILLIS. I am quite familiar with what Jefferson said.

Mr. HARDY. Is not that what he said?

Mr. WILLIS. As far as that is concerned, Mr. Speaker, the interruption of the gentleman is not apropos, because there is not a civilized nation on earth that does not discriminate against our products through tariffs, and that is exactly the situation that Jefferson was talking about.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further just now, for I have not the time. I want to talk about Jefferson, and the doctrines of Jefferson are so far removed from present Democratic doctrines and practices that I hate to undertake to mix them in the same sentence. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that since our friends on the other side appear to be embarrassed, appear to be eager to object to the placing in the RECORD of any statements from this sage and philosopher, Thomas Jefferson, then, from time to time, some of us on this side of the aisle will undertake to elucidate matters and instruct those on the other side of the aisle as to what the real principles of Jeffersonian Democracy are. Only just the other day a very distinguished Democrat, known all over the country, said some very interesting things upon this subject. I read from a statement of Mr. William Randolph Hearst. In that statement he said:

"Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, recognized the principle of protection and advocated discriminating duties in favor of American shipping and reciprocity treaties in favor of American trade."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that at the present stage in this session of Congress we should bring the tariff into a discussion of this resolution. This is a very simple proposition and one which every gentleman recognizes and knows is necessary. The Louisiana purchase was perhaps the most important event connected with the administration of Thomas Jefferson, and I dare say no more important event has ever happened in the affairs of our Nation than the purchase of that great territory. In the city of St. Louis we have erected this memorial at a cost of almost half a million dollars in memory of Thomas Jefferson, but in connection only with the Louisiana purchase, in order that we may forever keep fresh in the minds of the people of that great territory this great act of his. There is no one who does not appreciate that great purchase and no one who does not realize what was accomplished by it. The city of St. Louis is the center practically of this great territory that was acquired by Jefferson at that time, and we had there some years ago, as all know, one of the greatest expositions that the country has ever seen, in which we celebrated that event. Now, as we are closing up the affairs of that exposition we think it most fitting and proper that we should expend the amount of money that we have expended in the erection of this memorial to Jefferson and to the Louisiana purchase. That memorial will contain the records and the archives of the Louisiana purchase in connection with this exposition. It will be a great historical thing for the people in the years that are to come, and they will view it and learn of the great event that was accomplished in the administration of the great Jefferson.

We of the committee appointed to go to St. Louis understood and understand now that no money that is appropriated here will be expended for any junketing expedition. This is a most serious and important matter, and there is no Member appointed by the Congress of the United States who would go there and perform this serious and solemn duty who would in any way class his going with a junketing expedition.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. How does the gentleman account for the fact that it takes three hundred and thirty-odd dollars for each individual to go to St. Louis, stay one day, and return?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I had nothing to do with preparing the resolution providing for the amount; but the resolution does provide that whatever of this amount is needed and necessary for paying the proper and legitimate expenses shall be expended, and I know that I for one would not see a dollar of this expended in connection with my going that is not expended for what is a necessary and a legitimate purpose. This money will be in the hands and under the supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, who is responsible to this House.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman please state to the House what he regards as the legitimate expense of the trip, so that we will have some idea of what may be expended?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I will say to my colleague from Missouri, and I do not speak for the other members of the committee, that going and coming from my home in the city of St. Louis to Washington I expend usually about $75 for the round trip.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT].

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, as I understand this resolution it means simply to carry out an order of this House. During the closing days of the last session a resolution relating to the appointment of a committee was discussed for a considerable length of time. Two economists of the House, my friend from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox], made exactly the same speeches on that occasion, and the result was, after the House had listened to the pros and cons of this question, a vote of 220 in favor and about 26 against the appointment of the committee.

Mr. SISSON. But if the gentleman will permit, there was no appropriation carried in that bill, however. That resolution, too, is dead now, is it not?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. No; it is not. Allow me, I have only two minutes. The House made an order at that time to instruct a committee of this House to go to St. Louis. Now, after that order has been made I hope the House will carry it out and keep its faith——

Mr. SISSON. If the gentleman will permit, $52 is the railroad fare and the sleeping-car fare accommodations to St. Louis and return, is it not?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. This is the concern of the financial officers of the House and Senate, not mine. And in further answer I will say that I have full confidence in the Sergeant at Arms of this House, although he does belong to another party.

Mr. SISSON. Does not the gentleman believe $2,000 would be ample?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Perhaps it would; but the committee did not make the calculation; it was made by the officers of the House and they calculated that the limit of cost should be fixed as specified in the resolution.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Briefly.

Mr. GARNER. I have not sufficient confidence in anyone who made a calculation where it cost $350 for a man to go to St. Louis and return and to stay one day. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, the fact that $7,000 will constitute the total fund does not mean that that $7,000 must be expended.

Mr. GARNER. But the gentleman said the officers had made the calculation and they were responsible for this $7,000.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. As far as I am concerned you might cut that amount in two.

Mr. GARNER. Is it not a fact when we passed this resolution at the last session of Congress it was then stated it would not exceed $2,500?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I have no recollection of that statement.

Mr. GARNER. Now, why do you make it $7,000?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I do feel, permit me to say in conclusion, that the House ought to send a delegation clothed with the dignity of the American Congress and worthy of the great object for which this delegation was appointed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I had the pleasure of speaking in this House for an appropriation of money to build a monument to Abraham Lincoln in the city of Washington. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] voted for that bill appropriating two or three million dollars. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] voted for that bill, and I would like to ask the gentleman how he can excuse himself before a Democratic constituency at home when he votes to erect a monument to a Republican President and declines to pay the expenses of a delegation to witness the unveiling of a monument to a Democratic President? [Applause.]

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman permit me to answer?

Mr. HEFLIN. I have not the time.

Mr. FOSTER. But the gentleman wants to state the facts.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield briefly for one second to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. COX. The difference is this, when I voted to erect a monument to Abe Lincoln there was no appropriation for a junketing trip for Members of the House and Senate of the United States.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana——

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Just briefly; I have but little time.

Mr. FOSTER. The matter that I voted on last session was for a location, not an appropriation.

Mr. HEFLIN. I can not permit any more interruptions. I am reminded of a statement made in this House by the Senator from Kentucky, OLLIE JAMES, when he called these two gentlemen the twin brothers of 1-cent economy in the House, these two gentlemen who are voting for millions of dollars to erect a monument in one instance, but would decline to expend a few hundred dollars to enable a committee of this House to properly witness the unveiling of a monument to the greatest Democrat and patriot that ever lived. [Applause.]

Two Republicans from Missouri have advocated the passage of this resolution, and two Democrats only on this side have opposed the passage of it. Gentlemen say that it is a junketing trip. Is it a junketing trip for a delegation to represent the dignity of this great Congress at the unveiling of this monument to this great man, costing less than $3,000, probably? I did not prepare the resolution. It was handed to me this morning after I reached the House. I was reminded that this was the last day we could pass a resolution of this kind; and I now wish to say, although the resolution says "$7,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary," I will amend it, if gentlemen will permit me, and make it $2,500 [applause], and pass it through this House. I hope gentlemen, if they are sincere in not expending money uselessly, will grant me unanimous consent to amend this resolution for that purpose.

Gentlemen, this is a great occasion, and the Members are not able to pay their own expenses to St. Louis. The committee has already been appointed. The House has gone on record by a vote of about 200 to 20. This resolution was passed through the Sixty-second Congress; and I stated to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] that I thought Congress ought to pay the expenses of the delegation. I wanted to say to Members, as a member of the committee, that I will return in writing an account of every cent I expend, and I will request it of other gentlemen; and I state to the House now that a bill of particulars in the way of expenses will be given to this House when the committee returns. Gentlemen of the House, do not go on record as opposing the sending of this committee to the unveiling of a monument to Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. GUDGER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have not the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] declines to yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. Some gentlemen seem to think it would be popular at home to say that they declined to send delegates on a junketing trip. Gentlemen, if some good Democrat, who knows how to put you to the issue before your constituents, will tell them that you stood in the way of expending $3,000 to send Representatives from Congress to the unveiling of a monument to Thomas Jefferson it will hurt you worse than you imagine.

Mr. COX. I will make it the issue any time that you want it.

Mr. HEFLIN. I will state to the gentlemen that the resolution was prepared by some one else and handed to me a little while ago, and I introduced it. It has a saving clause, although it says $7,000. It says, "or so much thereof as may be necessary." But, Mr. Speaker, I always see these stud bugs of economy rise in the House when a proposition like this comes up, and it reminds me of what the governor of Louisiana said about a Florida cracker. Some one asked, "What is a Florida cracker? Describe one to me." He said, "When you are riding through the country on the train look out of the window. If you see a brown object in the woods, it is either a cracker or a stump. If it moves, it is a stump." [Laughter and applause.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to gentlemen to support this resolution. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the resolution and insert "$2,500" where "$7,000" occurs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] asks unanimous consent to modify his resolution by substituting "$2,500" for "$7,000."

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have the resolution reported as it would read if so amended.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution, without objection.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For defraying the expenses of the members of the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives authorized to attend and represent the Senate and House at the unveiling and dedication of the memorial to Thomas Jefferson at St. Louis, Mo., on April 30, 1913, $2,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of which sum $3,000——

Mr. HEFLIN. Now, Mr. Speaker, just there. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for calling my attention to that. I think there ought to be inserted "$1,000" for the Senate and "$1,500" for the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution accordingly.

The Clerk read as follows:

Of which sum $1,000 shall be accredited to the Senate, to be expended under the direction and by the order of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and $1,500 accredited to the account of and expended under the direction and by the order of the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and by the Committee on Accounts of the House, respectively.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the modification of this resolution in the respects read by the Clerk?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the amended resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Cox) there were—ayes 140, noes 57.

Mr. COX. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-seven gentlemen are present—a quorum. Two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rules are suspended and the resolution as modified is agreed to.

CONSIDERATION OF SUNDRY CIVIL AND INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 41 (H. Rept. 4).

Resolved, That immediately after the adoption of this rule the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H. R. 2441)

making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes; that said bill shall be considered under the rules governing general debate during the said day for not exceeding 40 minutes; that at the conclusion of such general debate the bill shall be read in extenso; that the previous question shall then be considered as ordered on the bill to its final passage; that after the final vote thereon the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H. R. 1917) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes; that said bill shall be considered under the rules governing general debate during the said day for not exceeding 40 minutes; that at the conclusion of such general debate the bill shall be read in extenso; that the previous question shall then be considered as ordered on the bill to its final passage; and that this order shall continue from day to day until both of the bills herein mentioned are disposed of.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this resolution be limited to 40 minutes, 20 minutes of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], and 20 minutes by myself, and that at the expiration of the 40 minutes the previous question shall be considered as ordered.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I find difficulty in getting time on the other side to oppose the proposition. Has the gentleman any time on his side that he can give me?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] is interrogating the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. CAMPBELL rose.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of the right to object.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I was not going to make any objection. I was going to make an explanation, that I had yielded already five minutes of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. MURDOCK. And the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] says he will give me an additional two minutes.

Mr. MANN. I think, Mr. Speaker, we are entitled to a reasonable allotment of time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] wants some time. That would leave no time for me.

Mr. POU. If the proposition is not satisfactory to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], I would be glad to have him make a suggestion.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Say 30 minutes on a side.

Mr. POU. Make it 25 minutes on a side. I suggest to the gentleman from Kansas 25 minutes to a side.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Very well; 25 minutes to a side.

Mr. POU. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that debate be limited to 50 minutes, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] asks unanimous consent that the debate on this resolution shall not exceed 50 minutes, one-half of the time to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], and that at the end of the 50 minutes the previous question shall be considered as ordered under the rule. Is there objection?

Mr. RODDENBERY. May I ask the gentleman from North Carolina what are the provisions of the rule? I was not in the Chamber at the time it was read.

Mr. POU. The rule provides that two appropriation bills, one the sundry civil and the other the Indian appropriation bill, shall each have 40 minutes' debate, and that at the end of the 40 minutes we shall proceed to vote upon the bills.

Mr. BARTLETT. The bill would have to be read, of course.

Mr. RODDENBERY. I have reference particularly to the sundry civil bill. The rule provides for the consideration of the sundry civil bill just as introduced in the House?

Mr. POU. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, this resolution reported by the Committee on Rules provides for immediate consideration of two appropriation bills which failed of passage during the last Congress. One of these, as has been said, is the sundry civil bill, and the other is the Indian appropriation bill.

The fact that these two bills were passed by the last Congress is, in the opinion of the Committee on Rules, a sufficient justification for the reporting of this rule.

Both of these bills passed both Houses in the last Congress. One of them was vetoed by the President. The other was passed by the House and by the Senate and went to the conferees, who failed to agree. These two bills as introduced, as I understand it, are in almost the exact form of the two bills which failed in the last Congress. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reserves the remainder of his time. He used two minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman from North Carolina use a little more of his time?

Mr. POU. There is no gentleman on this side who cares to be heard at this time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I only desire sufficient time to submit to the House that the argument made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] is hardly sufficient to carry conviction on a measure of this kind. My protest is based on two distinct propositions. One is that this is a special rule brought out from the Rules Committee to take care of a bill of vital importance, with only 40 minutes' debate allowed; and from the vantage point of that Rules Committee I feel convinced that such an order in this individual case is unjustifiable. I am convinced also that it is unjustifiable as a general policy.

I submit to the House that a bill of this importance, covering 200 pages as it does, with over 150 separate and distinct headings, and with a myriad of subjects included, is of such a nature that it can not be properly considered in 40 minutes. The fact that it has been considered by a previous House, that it has been passed by Congress and vetoed by the President, is but another argument in favor of the proposition that it demands further consideration before passage. For this reason I am opposed to its consideration under this special rule.

Besides that, I believe there is another feature which is more important, and that is the fact that it is the beginning of a policy of introducing from the Rules Committee special rules to advance certain legislation and to retard other legislation.

This is the first time in this session when such a step has been taken, and it is the beginning of a policy.

We have heard so much here this morning about that sage of Monticello, Thomas Jefferson, that I would like to read from his manual a line or two on this very point of these special rules being brought in to overthrow various regular rules. After quoting the famous maxim which is found at the very beginning of his manual, he goes on to say:

> So far the maxim is certainly true, and is founded in good sense, that as it is always in the power of the majority, by their numbers, to stop any improper measures proposed on the part of their opponents, the only weapons by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceeding which have been adopted as they were found necessary, from time to time, and are become the law of the House, by a strict adherence to which the weaker party can only be protected from those irregularities and abuses which these forms were intended to check, and which the wantonness of power is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities.
>
> And whether these forms be in all cases the most rational or not is really not of so great importance. It is much more material that there should be a rule to go by than what that rule is—that there may be a uniformity of proceeding in business not subject to the caprice of the Speaker or captiousness of the Members. It is very material that order, decency, and regularity be preserved in a dignified public body.

Now, I submit that the systematic practice of bringing in special rules tends to take away all vestige of representation from the minority. I believe that as a just proposition this bill itself should be considered carefully and well. It has not had committee consideration; it can not have had committee consideration. It is reported here without full investigation, or any investigation, and it is proposed to pass it in 40 minutes. Some of us are fresh from the people, as was remarked here this morning, and we are here bearing a commission to see that public business shall be transacted in the open—that the sunlight shall be let in on some business that has hitherto been transacted in star-chamber sessions. That is one feature of this matter. I believe that the Democratic Party is not wholly responsible for these special rules. I believe that the opposition party which was in the majority some time ago, but now is in the minority, had the same rule, word for word, as is now brought in by the Democratic majority, and so it comes with ill grace from that party to say anything against it. But there is an organization on the floor of this House which can come with clean hands to this proposition and can say that we want public business transacted out in the open. Scientists have said that tuberculosis germs can be cured by sunlight, and so we say that the germs of political jugglery can be cured by the sunlight of publicity. [Applause.]

For that reason we stand for the policy which declares that the House is greater than any of its committees, greater than any creature that it has created, and that here is the place to thrash out the public business in the open and decide fairly

and squarely as to the merits of individual measures, with full and fair consideration of matters touching the conduct of public business. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does the gentleman from North Carolina expect to use any more of his time?

Mr. POU. Yes. I will yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the consideration of two appropriation bills that failed in the last Congress. One is the sundry civil appropriation bill, carrying $116,795,327.01. It was vetoed by the President of the United States because of two limitations on the appropriations contained in the bill. A reading of the President's veto will show that he had never examined the two provisions carefully or he would not have made the comprehensive statement regarding their effect which he inserted in the message.

The House passed the bill over the President's veto by a vote of nearly 6 to 1—257 to 48—so that the overwhelming sentiment of the House was in favor of the bill as agreed upon in conference. It was not acted upon in the Senate because the bill reached the Senate within 10 minutes of the time fixed for adjournment, and no opportunity was had to have a vote on it. The bill as agreed upon in conference was $3,512,106 more than it was when it passed the House. In other words, the Senate, a coordinate branch of the legislative body, did not increase the bill, carrying $113,000,000, by more than $3,000,000.

As it passed the Senate it carried $119,643,000, or $6,359,000 in excess of the bill as it passed the House.

So that in the adjustment of the differences about one-half of the $6,000,000 that had been added by the Senate was stricken out of the bill. This bill is less, as finally agreed upon, by $1,331,655 than the sundry civil bill for the current fiscal year, although the bill now before the House contains items aggregating $6,087,798 which were transferred from the permanent and other appropriations into the sundry civil bill. If these transfers had not been made, this bill would have been $7,500,000 less that the bill for the current year. The bill for the current year was $2,511,061 less than the sundry civil bill for 1912.

That was the last year for which a Republican Congress appropriated. The first session in which the Democrats were called upon to appropriate in a sundry civil appropriation bill they reduced the bill by $24,511,000 under the amount carried by the one prepared by Republicans, and for the current year practically $7,000,000 additional; so that this bill is, in effect, $31,000,000 less than the last bill handled by the Republican Congress.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman what is the total of this bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. One hundred and sixteen million seven hundred and ninety-five thousand three hundred and twenty-seven dollars.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Will there be any opportunity at all under this rule to offer amendments to the bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, under this rule, because of the incorporation in the present rules of the House of the so-called Fitzgerald amendments, there will be an opportunity to do at this time what could not have been done 20 years ago, when a similar procedure was followed. That is, the minority, or the opposition to this bill, will be able to move to recommit with instructions, in which instructions it will be possible for them to set out the particular changes they believe should be made in the bill, and obtain the opinion of the House by a record vote.

Mr. MOORE. But there will be no opportunity to offer amendments as the bill is read. The bill has to be read under the rule, and there will be no opportunity under that rule to offer amendments.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand that there will not be, and in view of the fact that the House by a vote of more than 5 to 1, including, if I be not mistaken, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, voted for this bill, I do not believe there should be any particular anxiety on his part to offer any amendment to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, in the Fifty-fourth Congress four appropriation bills failed, and at the beginning of the Fifty-fifth Congress a rule was introduced for their consideration, iden ical with the rule now under consideration. It was the opinion that as this bill represented practically completed legislation, as months had been spent in its preparation, as the House and Senate had had full opportunity to consider and did consider each item in the bill when it was before the House and the Senate, there was not the same necessity for that consideration at this time. In the Fifty-fifth Congress the Republicans asserted that the imperative necessity speedily to take up tariff legislation compelled the prompt consideration of the bills then undisposed of. The same reason exists now. If gentlemen condemn this rule, let me suggest to them that as it provides for the consideration of only two appropriation bills, instead of four, comparing it with the rule of the Fifty-fifth Congress, depending upon the standpoint from which it is viewed, it is either only half as bad or twice as good as the rule adopted in the Republican Congress. There is at this time an advantage, to which I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] will give some attention when he speaks, as I see he has the debate in the Fifty-fifth Congress on his knee, that under the rule adopted at that time there was no opportunity on the part of the minority—that is, no opportunity secured by the rules of the House—to obtain recognition to move to recommit any one of the four bills considered at that time and to have a vote upon any matter of importance that might be desired by the minority.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman quite sure about that statement?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Quite sure. I said there was no opportunity secured by the rules of the House by which the minority could obtain recognition to move to recommit.

Mr. MANN. But the rules did secure to the minority at that time the right to move to recommit.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is mistaken. It had long been the practice in this House, established by repeated rulings, that the gentleman in charge of the bill was entitled to preference in recognition on a motion to recommit.

Mr. MANN. But he made no such motion, and so the minority had the right to make the motion.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The minority might have had the right, but under the practice in the House the gentleman from Illinois in charge of bills, when he had a more powerful and more numerous and better disciplined following, until the adoption of the rule to which I have referred, known as one of the Fitzgerald amendments, never gave the minority the opportunity to make such motions, because the gentleman from Illinois himself was an expert in the art, as the Member in charge of a bill, of making the motion to recommit, moving the previous question, and depriving the minority of any opportunity ever to have its views as desired to be written into legislation voted upon by the House. Now, however, as a result of the amendment to the rules, prepared by myself, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], or whoever cooperating with him so desires, will have an opportunity to make the motion to recommit, and the minority can not be deprived of that right under the rules.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, at each succeeding session of Congress since the Democrats have been in power I have been able to say that rules coming from the Committee on Rules have been more drastic than any that have preceded, and I am able to say that of this rule—for there is no man who was a Member of the last Congress but will admit that this rule is more drastic than any which was ever presented during that Congress—it shuts off all power of amendment, it shuts off all debate, practically, upon a great bill—196 pages of it—and their excuse is that in the Fifty-fifth Congress, when four appropriation bills had failed during the session preceding, the Republicans offered a similar rule. As the gentleman from New York has said, this rule was word for word similar to that rule offered by the Republicans. They not only admit it, Mr. Speaker, but they boast of it, and I want to call the attention of the Democratic side to the RECORD, which shows that then, upon this same rule, word for word, instead of supporting it, every Member on the Democratic side in that Congress voted against that rule. I want to call attention, Mr. Speaker, to some of the distinguished men who are Members of this House who then voted against that rule which they now propose to support. Among them was Mr. ADAMSON, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The next I find is Mr. CLARK of Missouri, the distinguished Speaker of this House, who then voted against this rule, which presumably he is now for.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. For a moment.

Mr. HARDWICK. Can the gentleman find the names of any Republicans over there who are still here who voted for it?

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, yes; I can. Mr. CLAYTON, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, voted against it. Also Mr. HENRY, the chairman of the Rules Committee. My friend Mr. KITCHIN, Mr. MOON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SIMS, Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland, and last, but not least, Mr. UNDERWOOD, the present leader of the majority upon that side, voted against this rule upon a similar bill which you now propose to vote for. Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of that old, old saying that "When the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be, but when the devil was well the devil a monk was he." But, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; I will yield for a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is not the gentleman aware that one bill, the sundry civil, carried by that rule had not been passed by the Fifty-fourth Congress in the ordinary way of proceeding under the rules, but had been passed, under suspension of the rules, in the closing hours of the session, and the complaint of the Democrats was that no opportunity had ever been given to the House to consider it under the rules of the House?

Mr. LENROOT. I will call the gentleman's attention now to what the complaint was, and I want to read from the debate for a moment. The then leader of the Democratic minority was Mr. McMillin, and in opening the debate he said——

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; the gentleman is mistaken——

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Reed was Speaker—

Mr. Speaker, you, if I may speak personally, changed the rules of this House for the purpose, as was claimed, of enabling the House "to do business." Now it is proposed by this special rule to set aside all the rules of the House in order to have the House "do business." It is unfortunate if, after so long and fierce a controversy, your contention has wholly failed of its purpose. What is the proposition here? A new Congress has met—

That is true now.

Four important appropriation bills failed in the last Congress—

In this case there are two.

They involve an expenditure of $72,000,000—

Here nearly $150,000,000.

There are 148 Members of Congress in this body who were not in the last Congress—

In this House there are 154 new Members who were not Members of the last Congress—

and who had nothing to do with the consideration of those bills in that Congress. It is now proposed that those 148 Members tie themselves, shut their eyes, and, like young birds, take whatever is administered to them, whether it be good or not.

That was the main objection then. He proceeds:

Under the general rules of debate these bills are to be considered. And what are the general rules of debate? One is that the first man who gets the floor can occupy it for an hour. Therefore, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Cannon, rising to one bill or to all four bills—

In this case the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]—

will have it in his power to occupy the whole time in debate, never yielding the floor to anyone else; and whether he yields it or not, the House will have already cut off from itself the right to deliberately consider the measures.

That was good logic then. If I had been a Member of the House then, I would have agreed with it. And it is good logic now. He concludes his remarks with this paragraph:

Is it possible you are afraid of the House, afraid of yourselves, afraid to trust the representatives of the people? Let us not abandon the prerogatives and customs of the House.

It ought to appeal to you now. This man was then a leader of that Congress.

The next man who participated in that debate was the late Mr. De Armond, not only one of the ablest Democrats who ever sat in this House, but one of the ablest and most patriotic men who ever sat upon either side of the aisle. [Applause.] He said, with reference to this rule:

I venture to say that legislative history will not produce a parallel to the outrage of this legislation.

And this is exactly the same rule.

Here is the greatest appropriation bill of all the appropriation bills.

That was the sundry civil bill and this is the sundry civil bill—

And the greatest of its class ever submitted to this House or to any other representative body of free people. This bill is to be twice passed. Once when the session was well-nigh run, once when the session was just begun.

Just exactly as is the case to-day.

Twice it is to be put through the House, without any opportunity for amendment, without opportunity for criticism. Under what plea? There is not even time given to state that.

And a little later another distinguished Democrat participated in that debate, and I want to quote from him, namely, Mr. Handy. He said:

Far be it from me, Mr. Speaker, to seek to cripple the public service by inadequate appropriations, but am I not entitled, is not every new Member of this House fairly entitled, to an opportunity to examine the provisions of these bills? I appeal to the older Members of this House, to the gentlemen who framed these bills, and to those who became familiar with them in the last House, to give us new Members some chance for discussion, some privilege of amendment, some opportunity for investigation, before they force us to vote "yes" or "no" on bills that carry $72,000,000 in bulk.

Only half as much as these bills carry.

Why, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether any legislative body in the history of the world ever voted such a sum of money on such brief and inadequate discussion and consideration.

Do you suppose, Mr. Speaker, that at that time you thought, or that any of those men who were Members of the House thought, that the time would ever come when the Democrats then opposing a rule like this would themselves offer one identical in terms, sentence for sentence and word for word? He goes on to say:

These bills have never been considered by a committee of this House. We have as yet no Appropriation Committee to consider them. Seventy-two millions of dollars with 160 minutes of discussion! Nearly $500,000 a minute! The sundry civil bill alone carries $53,000,000.

This one to-day carries $116,000,000.

And it is proposed to pass it after 40 minutes of discussion! Here we are to make the unparalleled record in appropriation of a million of minute.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has expired.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has just spoken, with that ability that always characterizes him, read part of the speech of the gentleman from Missouri, the late Mr. De Armond. He did not read that part of the speech which called the attention of the House to the fact that the great sundry civil bill that the Republicans were at that time undertaking to put through under special rule had never been considered in any Congress with the right to offer amendment or to consider individual items. The previous year that sundry civil bill had been passed under suspension of the rules, without the right to amend, and one of the items carried in it, and one of the items that caused the most adverse comment, was a provision establishing the Danville Soldiers' Home, that could not have been passed if it had ever been brought out on the floor for a fair debate, with the right of amendment.

The proposition which confronts this House now is entirely distinct from that which confronted that House at that time. At that time there was a bill which, I repeat, had never been considered by the House except as a whole. It had never been considered item by item. Here is a bill that the gentleman himself knows was considered carefully item by item, with full opportunity for debate and with full opportunity for amendment. It represented no partisan view of any man on this side of the Chamber. It was simply one of the great supply bills, properly considered and properly passed.

It went to the President of the United States, and he, on account of a specific item, vetoed the bill, and it came back to the membership of the last House; and its Members were so satisfied with the bill that by a vote of 5 to 1 they passed it over his veto. And yet the gentleman would try to give to the country the impression that we are undertaking to stifle debate; that we are undertaking to pass over a great supply bill that represents simply the wisdom or the judgment of one gentleman, the gentleman who introduced it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the gentleman think that 154 new Members of the House are not entitled to an opportunity?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think the reasoning on which the question is predicated would require the opening up of every supply bill that has been passed where the money carried by it has not been expended. There is no reason in logic why these one hundred and odd new Members could not just as well say, "Here is the provision made for the Navy in the coming year, after July 1. The money has not been expended. We are fresh from the people. We should have the right to open it up and reconsider the matter." The gentleman knows that the logic is specious; that it does not really state the case.

If there had been an attempt to prevent consideration by the Congress; if the previous House had not considered it on its merits, as was the case that the gentleman cites, back in the Fifty-fourth Congress, then there would be some reason for the gentleman's position. But now it is simply the captious criticism of a man that desires to show that because complaint was made of a rule under certain circumstances, we should not now present a rule under entirely different circumstances.

Here is a bill that is in amount less than the bills that have preceded it; a bill that has brought economy. That bill that the gentleman refers to was a bill so extravagant that the Republicans did not dare on either occasion to leave it open for amendment or consideration by the membership of the House.

Now, I have not believed in unduly tying the membership. Neither have I been one of those men who have thought that there was a viciousness in the fact that a rule was a special rule. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] read, and properly read, from Jefferson that the rules were intended for the protection of the minority, and therefore there should be no special rules. It is true that they are intended for the protection of the minority, and under ordinary circumstances fairness requires the ordinary rules to be in effect. But it was never suspected by anybody who recognized the necessity of doing practical things in a practical way that there should not be from time to time special rules in order that business might be expedited.

What is the condition that confronts the country that the gentleman's plan would altogether upset? There are certain moneys carried in this bill that are made immediately available. There is certain work—certain work on the Panama Canal and certain other work of the highest importance—that is being held back because of the lack of supplies. But the gentleman, because of the belief that the new Members should have an opportunity, would hold up all of these public matters in order that this bill might be reopened and rediscussed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. He talks of the new Members coming fresh from the country. We all come fresh from the country every two years, and we believe that there has been a proper consideration of this bill and that there is no need of a second consideration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] use the remainder of his time? We have only one more speech on this side.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to my colleague from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is not at all remarkable that this gag rule should have been brought in, but it is remarkable that it should be brought in so early in the new Congress.

Now, the fact of the business is that the Democratic leadership in this body, with a majority of 147 behind them, has become overbold. If the Democratic leadership of this body were not overbold, it would not launch out in the beginning of a session with an outrageous gag rule of this kind. The thing that is unbelievable is that most of the 154 new Members of Congress will permit without protest the passage without consideration of a bill carrying $116,000,000, of which they know absolutely nothing. There are two methods of debate in considering a bill in this House. One is known as "general debate," a provision for a period of time during which Members have the right to debate diversely if they desire, not to the point and not pertinently to the measure under consideration. The Democratic leadership of this House have given you 40 minutes of that sort of consideration for this sundry civil bill, which is one of the great bills of the Congress.

There is another method for the consideration of bills in this House, which is known as consideration under the "five-minute rule." It is our most workmanlike method of consideration, a method under which the individual here has maintained his rights. The bill is read by paragraphs, and at the end of a paragraph any Member is entitled to the right to debate that paragraph pertinently, and to offer amendments to it. I want to point out to the new Members of this House on both the Democratic and the Republican sides that they are surrendering the right to that five-minute rule when they adopt this special rule brought in by the Committee on Rules. I assert also that this rule would not be brought in if the Democratic majority were five or ten or fifteen Members. No leader would dare bring in such a gag rule if the majority were so small as that, but it is because the leaders feel sure, with a majority of 147, that they attempt this sort of thing. It is in line with the practice of deferring committee appointments with regard to the tariff bill. There is no reason at all why the Democratic Members of this House should not have their committee appointments now. Why do you not get them now? Because the Democratic leaders of this House are applying the whip and lash to your backs and holding off the committee appointments in order that they may drive you into a favorable vote upon a secretly prepared tariff measure.

It is unbelievable, I say, that any fortunate enough citizen to be a Member of the American Congress would swallow a gag like this and submit to a leadership which is imposing this rule upon him on the theory that he has not the spirit to protest.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly, I will yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not yield, because he has no time remaining.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will give the gentleman one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia yields one minute.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to inquire whether the gentleman objects to the cutting off of debate or to the cutting off of the opportunity of amendment?

Mr. MURDOCK. Now, the gentleman proposes, I suppose, to say that under some halfway measure he fathered several years ago it is in order to move to recommit this bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I do not. I am asking the gentleman whether he objects to the cutting off of the opportunity for debate.

Mr. MURDOCK. I object to the gag rule which cuts off every Member of this House from the right to have this bill considered under the five-minute rule, a paragraph at a time, with full opportunity to debate and amend.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will permit me, I was anxious to know whether he objected to the cutting off of the opportunity of Members to speak or the opportunity of Members to offer amendments.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman permit me——

Mr. FITZGERALD. One moment.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman knows that there is often too much general debate and not enough five-minute debate.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman has not pointed out any respect in which he desired the bill to be amended, but the gentleman must remember that on the openin; day of the House he did not desire to permit Members to discuss a motion which he then made, because he moved the previous question for the purpose of cutting off debate.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; and the House voted down the previous question and then adopted a substitute proposition after the gentleman's debate had preceded the motion for the previous question, which shut off the debate we desired, which it had a perfect right to do.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, the House can vote down this rule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] yield me more time?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Eight minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, my skirts are clear in the main at least. I did not move the previous question on the opening day on a resolution which I offered in regard to the swearing in of a Member.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But the gentleman voted for this rule in the Fifty-fifth Congress.

Mr. MANN. Nor do I propose to move the previous question to prevent debate or amendments to the sundry civil bill. In the Fifty-fourth Congress Mr. Cleveland was the President. The House was Republican. The bill failed, and a Republican President came in with the Fifty-fifth Congress and a Republican House. It is true that the same procedure was then adopted as is proposed to be adopted now.

A few moments ago I stepped out into the lobby back of the Speaker's chair and looked at the marble face of the statue of Uncle Joe Cannon, and I found it in a broad grin. [Laughter.]

It was Uncle Joe who drew the resolution 16 years ago for the passage of the sundry civil bill without amendment and without debate. It was your side which for 16 years has been reviling Cannon and Cannonism, and now the only defense you can make for what you are doing is that you are doing what Uncle Joe did 16 years ago. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] state that they have no such precedent. That is true; they have never made a precedent in the past, and I think they will never have an oppor-

tunity to make one in the future. [Laughter.] Having done nothing, having no responsibility, nobody can charge anything up to them. [Laughter.] It is true that the Republicans when they had the responsibility passed the bill. It is true that when the Democrats have the responsibility they propose to supply the necessary funds to carry on the Government. It is true that the minority, following the precedents of all ages, insist upon the right to talk and propose amendments. It is true that when we were in the majority we did not give you a chance, and you told the country how we inflicted this punishment upon you and perpetrated this outrage on a free Government. It is true that you are proposing to do the same old thing, in the same old way, with the same old excuse. You secured your power by playing a confidence game on the American people, and they are finding it out, and shortly we will be having the power to do the thing that you are now doing, and I do not know but that we will have the same old excuse. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that many of the 154 Members who are serving their first term here are wondering why it is that we are proceeding in the manner in which we are now proceeding. It is a simple matter. The tariff bill has not yet passed; it is not absolutely certain how you are going to vote on some items in that bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes, it is.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is not absolutely certain how you will vote on the bill when it is finally passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman is not posted. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. These uncertainties have made it unwise on the part of the leadership to appoint the committees. You have not had the committee assignments you figured on immediately after the election. You have also been wondering why you have not been getting some of those post offices that the folks back home are hammering you about from every town and village in your district. Why, the tariff bill is not passed. How can you expect the goods to be delivered until you have delivered the goods? [Laughter.]

That is the reason that you are called upon to-day to pass a bill appropriating over $100,000,000 for the civil service of the Government and to pass the Indian appropriation bill, which is not only bad for what it contains but is worse for what it does not contain.

You are asked to pass these bills without an opportunity of offering a single amendment, without the opportunity of improving them in any manner whatever, and in fact without an opportunity of knowing very much of what is in either of them. You have come here believing that you were all of some importance. Why, you have not been of sufficient importance yet to find out just what committee you are going to get; where you are going to be assigned. One or two men have been telling you exactly what to do and how to do it, and if you are wise you will do just what they tell you to do. [Laughter.]

That is to say, if you are to get the committee assignments that you want, and if you are to get the fellows appointed for postmasters back home that you want, you must act well your part. Very much depends, therefore, on how you act in the near future on the tariff bill that foreign manufacturers are so anxious for. It is two weeks since this Congress convened. Only 4 committees out of something like 40 have been appointed. It is yet several weeks until the 1st day of July. These appropriation bills that you are proposing to put through this House after 40 minutes of general debate are for the fiscal year beginning on the 1st day of July next. There is plenty of time to pass them in the orderly way. But the committees will not be appointed until you vote on the tariff bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Nine minutes.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I have been a little amused to-day at some of these Republican experiences that we have been hearing.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if he does not think this report ought to be voted down on account of the Platt National Park being left out?

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I say that I have been somewhat amused at some of the Republican experiences and confidences that we have been given to-day. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], who is high in the favor of that party, intimates that four years ago, when they were passing that monstrosity known as the Payne-Aldrich bill, they held up their committees for just that reason, because that was exactly what was done; and when the Dingley bill was passed you held up your committees, except the Ways and Means and the Committe on Rules, and I suppose your President and bosses were hitting you over the heads then, and you had to do it all under the one-man system, and that man had to see that you delivered the goods, and he did see to it.

On our side what has happened is simply this: The committee charged with the duty of appointing committees can not lay down the tariff bill and name these committees at this time. They have assured this side of the House, and they have made the statement public, that just as soon as the tariff can be passed and they can have the time to do the actual labor involved the committees will be announced. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Of course they will.

Mr. HARDWICK. There is no trouble about that, and you gentlemen did not do that while you were running under your one-man system. There is another thing that really amuses me——

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. There does not seem to be any dispute in the gentleman's mind about the one-man system on both sides.

Mr. HARDWICK. No; I have no trouble about that. [Laughter.] We have on this side a committee that acts as a committee on committees, but they are not in any sense the bosses of the House. There are 14 members on that committee, and that is 14 times as good as your system, and that is about as big as the whole party of my friend from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK.] [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, it agonizes my soul to hear my good friend from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] talk about gag rules. That has been the principal part of his stock in trade, and I think he has a little overdone it. The trouble we found with the "gag" rule that you proposed in the Fifty-fifth Congress and which your party, many of whom sit on this floor now, voted for, and if you other gentlemen had been there I suppose you would have voted for it, too, in those good old days of Republicanism; the trouble about it was that you had a sundry civil bill that never had been considered under the five-minute rule, where there had never been opportunity for real debate or substantial amendment, and you proposed to pass it the second time without consideration. On the other hand, what do we do? We take up this sundry civil bill after it has been considered with great care as to every paragraph and every item under the five-minute rule, after full debate, and with unlimited opportunity for amendment. Not only that, but it has been passed by the Senate, considered by that body, has been through conference, and after it has met a veto from the President of the United States it has been passed in this House, which had then a Democratic majority of only 64, by a vote of 5 to 1, almost every Republican, as well as every Democrat, certifying to the country that the bill was right and ought to become a law.

Mr. LENROOT. What about the other three bills that had been passed?

Mr. HARDWICK. My understanding is that the deficiency bill in the Fifty-fourth Congress was passed under about the same circumstances as the sundry civil bill. However, the principal bill involved then, as now, was the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The bill had never been agreed to in conference.

Mr. HARDWICK. No. The conferees had never agreed on it, as I recall it.

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. CANTRILL. I would like to remind my colleague while he is on the floor to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Democratic leader submitted the question to the Democratic caucus as to whether or not they should proceed with the tariff bill or proceed to name the committees, and the rank and file—the Democratic Party in Democratic caucus—instructed our leader to proceed with the tariff bill and then name the committees.

Mr. HARDWICK. Undoubtedly.

Mr. CANTRILL. And the Ways and Means Committee did not undertake to boss that caucus, but the caucus bossed the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HARDWICK. Undoubtedly; and I want to tell my friends on the other side of the Chamber that if we had had little enough sense to unduly protract the period of this tariff revision and unduly prolong the uncertainty with which business regards any sort of a tariff change, whether up or down while scrambling over committee pie, our party would be ridiculous in the eyes of the American people. Now, another thing I want to say to my good friend from the State of Illi-

nois, the able and astute Republican leader on the other side: He said when he went out here he imagined he could see the marble statue of Uncle Joe smile on account of this rule. If he could have seen Uncle Joe when the original bill passed in the Fifty-fifth Congress he would no doubt have seen him smile a great deal more than in imagination he can see the statue smile to-day; because in that bill, that was never considered under the five-minute rule, there was an item for a soldiers' home, at a cost of $150,000, provided for at Danville, Ill.; but I am glad that when the Democratic Party brings in a bill of this kind no such charge can be laid at the door of its chairman.

Mr. BARTLETT. And for a soldier's home in his own home town.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; in Danville, Ill. Then another thing was involved in this rule. Why did we present this rule? We say this bill has been considered thoroughly, paragraph by paragraph and item by item, and that the light of day had been turned on the bill in both Chambers of this Congress. We say more—that this House by a five-sixths vote passed it just as we offer it to you, over the veto of the President of the United States. We say more. This bill—and the Indian appropriation bill in the same way to a smaller degree—contains about $28,000,000 of actual necessary appropriations for public works that are halted unless we pass these bills in the immediate future. It contains $12,000,000 or $14,000,000 for public works that under the statutes are available continuously, regardless of the date fixed by the bill. Not only that, but it contains about $8,000,000 or $10,000,000, I am informed, of river and harbor works, besides the Panama Canal provisions. We say that the country does not wish the tariff bill to be halted while we carry this bill through a weary process of two or three weeks of debate and delay on the floor of this House, and therefore we offer this bill that has been thoroughly considered—every line, every item, every paragraph—and we ask you to pass it now before we go into the tariff discussion, before we come to the consideration of the tariff bill, because if we do not pass it until that time we can not pass it at a time when the public works of the country will not suffer because of the delay.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman referred to the vote on the veto message of the President——

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think it would be quite fair to say that that vote was had during the last three hours of the expiration of the term of Congress, when it was a question of taking that bill or nothing; that that does not necessarily indicate how the gentlemen would vote——

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not think it indicates, however, that Members of this House, knowing this extra session was about to be convened, would have their judgment coerced to vote wrongfully to pass a bill over the President's veto unless they thought the bill was right; and I want to say to the gentleman I would not support the bill if as a whole I had not thought it ought to pass, the President's veto to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does not the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] think that the gentleman from Illinois should have remembered that the sundry civil bill was brought in during the last three hours of the session in the Fifty-fourth Congress when he was criticizing Democrats for bringing in the bills in the manner in which they were brought in in the last Congress?

Mr. MANN. It was not brought in during the last three hours of the session of the Fifty-fourth Congress.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] said that in the bill in the Fifty-fourth Congress there was appropriated $125,000 for a soldiers' home——

Mr. HARDWICK. I said "$150,000."

Mr. CAMPBELL. And then went on to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of this Congress that his town got nothing out of it. I will call his attention to the fact that he got $500,000 for his home town in this bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. The city of New York is about the same size as Danville, Ill., I take it, and the items in question are of equal public importance?

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is his home town.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was an appropriation for existing work now under way, and authorized by a Republican administration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] has expired. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 126, noes 94.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 221, nays 110, answered "present" 4, not voting 97, as follows:

YEAS—221.

Adamson	Dent	Jones	Reed
Aiken	Dickinson	Keating	Reilly, Conn.
Abercrombie	Dies	Kennedy, Conn.	Reilly, Wis.
Alexander	Dixon	Kettner	Richardson
Allen	Donovan	Key, Ohio	Roddenbery
Ashbrook	Doolittle	Kindel	Rothermel
Aswell	Doughton	Kinkead, N. J.	Rouse
Bailey	Driscoll	Kirkpatrick	Ruley
Baker	Dupré	Kitchin	Russell
Barkley	Edwards	Konig	Sabath
Bartlett	Evans	Konop	Seldomridge
Beakes	Faison	Korbly	Sharp
Beall, Tex.	Fergusson	Lazaro	Sherley
Bell, Ga.	Ferris	Lee, Ga.	Sherwood
Blackmon	Finley	Lee, Pa.	Sims
Booher	Fitzgerald	L'Engle	Sisson
Borchers	Flood, Va.	Lever	Slayden
Borland	Floyd, Ark.	Levy	Small
Bremner	Foster	Lieb	Smith, Md.
Brockson	Fowler	Lobeck	Smith, Tex.
Brodbeck	Francis	Logue	Sparkman
Brown, N. Y.	Gallagher	Lonergan	Stephens, Miss.
Brown, W. Va.	Garner	McAndrews	Stephens, Nebr.
Brumbaugh	Garrett, Tenn.	McClellan	Stephens, Tex.
Buchanan, Ill.	Garrett, Tex.	McCoy	Stone
Buchanan, Tex.	Gerry	McDermott	Stout
Bulkley	Gilmore	McGillicuddy	Stringer
Burgess	Gordon	McKellar	Sumners
Burke, Wis.	Gorman	Maguire, Nebr.	Taggart
Burnett	Goulden	Martin, N. J.	Talcott, N. Y.
Byrnes, S. C.	Gray	Martin, S. Dak.	Tavenner
Byrns, Tenn.	Gregg	Moon	Taylor, Ala.
Callaway	Gudger	Morgan, La.	Taylor, Ark.
Candler, Miss.	Hamill	Morrison	Ten Eyck
Cantrill	Hammond	Murray, Mass.	Thacher
Caraway	Hardwick	Murray, Okla.	Thomas
Carr	Hardy	Neeley	Thompson, Okla.
Carter	Harrison, Miss.	Nolan, J. I.	Townsend
Casey	Harrison, N. Y.	O'Brien	Tribble
Church	Hay	Ogiesby	Tuttle
Clancy	Hayden	O'Hair	Underwood
Clark, Fla.	Heflin	Oldfield	Vaughan
Claypool	Helm	Padgett	Walker
Clayton	Helvering	Page	Walsh
Cline	Hensley	Palmer	Watson
Collier	Hill	Pepper	Weaver
Connelly, Kans.	Holland	Peters	Webb
Connolly, Iowa	Howard	Peterson	Whitacre
Conry	Hoxworth	Phelan	Williams
Covington	Hughes, Ga.	Post	Wilson, Fla.
Cox	Hull	Pou	Wingo
Crisp	Humphreys, Miss.	Quin	Witherspoon
Cullop	Igoe	Ragsdale	Young, Tex.
Davenport	Jacoway	Rainey	
Decker	Johnson, Ky.	Raker	
Deitrick	Johnson, S. C.	Rayburn	

NAYS—110.

Anderson	Gardner,	La Follette	Rupley
Austin	Gillett	Langham	Scott
Bartholdt	Good	Langley	Shreve
Barton	Goodwin, Me.	Lenroot	Sinnott
Bell, Cal.	Graham, Pa.	Lindquist	Sloan
Britten	Green, Iowa	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Idaho
Browne, Wis.	Greene, Mass.	McKenzie	Smith, J. M. C.
Bryan	Greene, Vt.	McLaughlin	Smith, Minn.
Burke, S. Dak.	Guernsey	Manahan	Smith, Saml. W.
Campbell	Hamilton, Mich.	Mann	Stafford
Cary	Haugen	Mapes	Stephens, Cal.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hawley	Merritt	Stevens, Minn.
Cooper	Hayes	Miller	Sutherland
Cramton	Helgesen	Mondell	Temple
Crosser	Hinds	Moore	Thomson, Ill.
Curry	Hinebaugh	Morgan, Okla.	Towner
Davis, Minn.	Hulings	Morin	Treadway
Dillon	Humphrey, Wash.	Moss, W. Va.	Volstead
Dunn	Johnson, Utah	Mott	Wallin
Dyer	Johnson, Wash.	Murdock	Walters
Esch	Kahn	Norton	Wilder
Fairchild	Keister	Parker	Willis
Falconer	Kelley, Mich.	Patton, Pa.	Woodruff
Fess	Kelly, Pa.	Platt	Woods
FitzHenry	Kennedy, Iowa	Plumley	Young, Mich.
Fordney	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Powers	Young, N. Dak.
Frear	Kreider	Roberts, Mass.	
French	Lafferty	Rogers	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Browning	Carlin	Eagan	Steenerson

NOT VOTING—97.

Adair	Barchfeld	Burke, Pa.	Dale
Ainey	Barnhart	Butler	Danforth
Ansberry	Bathrick	Calder	Davis, W. Va.
Anthony	Bowdle	Carew	Dershem
Avis	Broussard	Copley	Difenderfer
Baltz	Bruckner	Curley	Donohoe

Dooling	Hamilton, N. Y.	Maher	Slemp
Doremus	Hamlin	Metz	Smith, N. Y.
Eagle	Henry	Montague	Stanley
Edmonds	Hobson	Moss, Ind.	Stedman
Elder	Houston	Nelson	Stevens, N. H.
Estopinal	Howell	O'Leary	Sullivan
Farr	Hughes, W. Va.	O'Shaunessy	Switzer
Fields	Kennedy, R. I.	Patten, N. Y.	Talbott, Md.
Gard	Kent	Payne	Taylor, Colo.
George	Kiess, Pa.	Porter	Taylor, N. Y.
Gittins	Knowland, J. R.	Prouty	Underhill
Glass	Lesher	Rauch	Vare
Godwin, N. C.	Lewis, Md.	Riordan	Watkins
Goeke	Lewis, Pa.	Roberts, Nev.	White
Goldfogle	Lindbergh	Rucker	Wilson, N. Y.
Goodwin, Ark.	Linthicum	Saunders	Winslow
Graham, Ill.	Lloyd	Scully	
Griest	Madden	Sells	
Griffin	Mahan	Shackleford	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.

For the vote:

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. STEENERSON.

Until further notice:

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAUNDERS with Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND.

Mr. WHITE with Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. WATKINS with Mr. NELSON.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. PAYNE.

Mr. STEDMAN with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. RUCKER with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. SWITZER.

Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. VARE.

Mr. LLOYD with Mr. WINSLOW.

Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. HOWELL.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. GOEKE with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. FARR.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. DONOHOE with Mr. DANFORTH.

Mr. DIFENDERFER with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia with Mr. PROUTY.

Mr. DALE with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CURLEY with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. GITTINS with Mr. AVIS.

Mr. BATHRICK with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. ADAIR with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. BUTLER.

Mr. HAMLIN with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no"; but I am paired with my colleague, Mr. SCULLY, and I desire to withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. BROWNING, and he answered "Present."

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall, listening?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think the usual question ought to be asked these gentlemen.

The SPEAKER. That is what I asked the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MANN. The Speaker asked part of it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair asked the gentleman if he was in the Hall, listening.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but I think that the new Members ought to know what the requirements are.

The SPEAKER. Of course. The real question is, "Were you in the Hall, listening, when your name was called, or ought to be called?"

Mr. BARNHART. I was not listening, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. SCULLY, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for five days, on account of illness.

THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution that passed the House a little while ago, in regard to the unveiling of the Jefferson Monument, was amended, but it is necessary also to amend the title. I ask that the title be amended.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] asks unanimous consent to amend the title to that Jefferson resolution.

Mr. MANN. Did it have a title before?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. HEFLIN. It is desired to give it a title.

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is to give it a title, unless somebody objects. The Clerk will report the title that is proposed to be prefixed to the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution making an appropriation for defraying the expenses of the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives authorized to attend and represent the Senate and House at the unveiling and dedication of the memorial to Thomas Jefferson, at St. Louis, Mo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I reintroduced the tariff bill this morning, with certain amendments. Under its new number it is numbered 3321. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed 10,000 copies of the bill, of which 2,000 shall be for the use of the committee. We have that many requests for it, or requests approximating that many. Two thousand are to be allotted to the document room, and the balance are to be distributed to Members in the folding room.

The Clerk read the following resolution:

House resolution 69.

Resolved, That 10,000 copies H. R. 3321 be printed, 2,000 for Ways and Means Committee, 2,000 for document room, and 6,000 to folding room.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The bill is introduced to-day with the changes made by the Democratic caucus, I assume?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. It is reintroduced as an original bill, is it not? It does not show the amendments?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is introduced as an original bill.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman expect the Ways and Means Committee to act upon it to-morrow?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. MANN. It will probably be acted upon without change?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman prefer to have 10,000 copies of it printed now instead of waiting until it is reported back?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do; for two reasons. One reason is that it is more convenient to the Printing Office, and the other is that there is a demand for copies of the bill immediately, and we will have them here to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. I do not know that the gentleman from Alabama can give us assurances, and yet if the country can be thoroughly well assured that there will be no change made in the Committee on Ways and Means, so that the bill as introduced would be in fact the bill as reported, then we shall know what to expect.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that there are 14 Members out of the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means who are committed to the bill as introduced, and I expect to get 14 votes in committee in the morning to report it back to the House.

Mr. MANN. What is the gentleman's program about taking up the bill? Does he propose to take it up on Wednesday?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My desire is to report it to the House to-morrow and take it up on Wednesday.

Mr. MANN. It will not be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; not to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that 10,000 copies of the bill that he introduced to-day on the tariff be printed, 2,000 copies for the use of the committee, 2,000 to go to the document room, and the remainder to go to the folding room.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. How about printing the handbook containing the tariff data?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I intend, when I file the report, to make the handbook an appendix to the report, and I will ask unanimous consent at that time for printing the number of copies that the House desires.

Mr. DYER. Reserving the right to object, are there any of the handbooks that have been printed now available?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think they are practically all exhausted; they had to be changed to meet some of the amendments.

Mr. DYER. I could not get a single copy.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There was only a limited number printed because it was expected that there might be changes, and the handbook had to be changed to correspond with the changes in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is recognized.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MANN. I will ask the gentleman from New York if we can have some arrangement for a division of time?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand that under the rule I am recognized for the 40 minutes. I am willing to yield one-half of that time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT], who was the senior member of the Committee on Appropriations on that side in the last Congress. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts 20 minutes.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill, like the rule under which it is considered, is an exemplification of Democratic insincerity. For 20 years this House has rung with denunciation of Czar Reed and Czar Cannon, and professions that just as soon as the Democratic Party had control this tyranny would be done away with. Now, at the very beginning of their control, we see them select as their model for a rule the most drastic rule that the combined invention of these two czars was ever able to contrive. [Laughter.]

So for 20 years while the Democratic Party was out they have been professing that they were the champions of economy. They have been denouncing Republican extravagance, and have been telling us that just as soon as they came into power they would illustrate to us Democratic simplicity and economy. When they came into power in this House two years ago, they did begin to show some evidences of a desire for economy. The bills which the Appropriations Committee brought in in the first session did prune down appropriation bills. The Democratic platform of last year demanded the abolition of useless offices, denounced Republican extravagance, and promised fundamental changes and economy.

But what did they do after election? What did they do in the second session of that Congress? Just as soon as the election had passed by, just as soon as they had sailed into power on their professions of opposition to tyranny and extravagance here, then we see the real Democratic purpose disclosing itself, and that Congress passed bigger appropriation bills than had ever been passed in a time of peace. This bill is the largest sundry civil appropriation bill, omitting the appropriations for the Panama Canal, except one, that has ever been passed, and it is larger than that one if you omit also the appropriations for the rivers and harbors. So I say that this whole performance to-day is an exemplification of Democratic insincerity and an illustration of noble promises before election and base performance after election. Still I am inclined to think that after all it is wise for them to introduce it in this way.

I desire that they shall be economical. I believe that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee desires it, and I presume it is wise that they should bring it in under a rule not to allow their own party to get their hands on it. [Laughter.] If the Democratic majority of 64 in the last Congress passed a sundry civil bill of one hundred and sixteen millions, Heaven knows how big a bill a Democratic majority of 145 would pass. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

And so I am inclined to think that it is wise that the bill should come in in this way, that the new Members should not be allowed to put their finger in the pork barrel; that the committee places should be kept dangling before their eyes; and that they should be made to follow their leaders.

What will happen to it when it gets to the Democratic Senate where they probably will not have any such rule makes us tremble. So I should be content with this bill, believing that it is a better bill than this Democratic Congress would be apt to pass, if it was not for one clause in it. That is the clause upon which the President at the last session based his veto. That is the clause that provides that the appropriation for prosecutions under the Sherman law shall not be expended in suits brought against wage earners and farmers.

President Taft in his message disclosed the fundamental vice of such a provision. It is class legislation of the rankest and most vicious kind. It says that a penal statute, universal in its terms, shall not be enforced against certain classes in the community; and as if to make it worse, the classes which a body of officeholders elected by the suffrages of the people have selected to exempt from the operation of the statute are the two largest voting classes in the country. That shows the motive, the cowardice, the purpose of the provision. It shows that it is pandering to selfish prejudices, that it is a desire to cajole those two great classes and to advertise themselves as their especial friends.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that such legislation is vicious in itself; but when the classes exempted are those two most powerful classes, it shows a weak, base yielding to popular prejudice, a seeking for popular votes, which condemns the measure as much as the principle itself.

Of course, I understand that some excuse themselves by saying that, after all, there are other funds in the hands of the Attorney General which he can use, and that this does not absolutely prevent the enforcement of that statute. If that is so—and I suspect it is—it is no excuse for voting for this provision. It shows that it is hypocritical as well as vicious. It shows that it is a desire to humbug them as well as flatter them, and I do not believe that the intelligent, upright, thoughtful members of either of those two classes will be flattered and cajoled by any such transparent subserviency as that. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am against that clause, and I can not help hoping that the present Executive will also be opposed to it.

It was reported early in this session that this appropriation bill was to be introduced without that clause in deference to the wishes of the President, but it has not been omitted. I know nothing except newspaper reports, but the newspapers indicate that the President was very reticent upon that subject, and that he thought he had troubles enough of his own without taking up opposition to the House on that ground. I can not but believe that he sympathizes with his predecessor, President Taft, whether he has the same courage of his convictions or not. I believe President Wilson is a statesman of great intelligence and of high purpose, and that he can not approve a provision of such rank class legislation as this.

And, moreover, Mr. Speaker, there are some words of his which indicate his position. Let me read one sentence:

> We speak too exclusively of the capitalistic class. There is another as formidable an enemy to equality and freedom of opportunity as it, and that is the class formed by the labor organizations and leaders of the country—a class representing only a small minority of the laboring men of the country, quite as monopolistic in spirit as the capitalists and quite as apt to corrupt and ruin industries by their monopoly.

That is the language of Woodrow Wilson at the South Carolina dinner in New York in April, 1907. I have no reason to think he repudiates those opinions to-day. When the Republican administration was in power, when there was a Republican Attorney General, the Democratic Party did not think it necessary to pass such a limitation as this. They left Mr. Taft's and Mr. Wickersham's administration free. They did not tie their hands. But just as soon as they get an administration of their own, just as soon as they get a Democratic Attorney General, they limit his activities and they say his powers shall be limited by this qualification. I do not think the Democratic Attorney General deserves such treatment. A Republican administration was broad-minded enough to take him into their service years ago, and he proved by his efficiency then that he is worthy to be Attorney General and that he does not deserve this insult. I believe this Democratic administration, both because they do not wish this slur cast upon them and from the mere fundamental, unselfish, broad-minded reason that they recognize it as vicious legislation, must be opposed to it, and I trust that the same courage that President Taft exhibited will be shown by the present Executive. Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, I shall move to recommit the bill, striking out this provision. [Applause on the Republican side.]

How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Ten minutes.

Mr. GILLETT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is recognized for five minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the rule for the consideration of this bill and the Indian appropriation bill because I believe the rule vicious, and I voted against it because in my opinion these bills, had they been considered under the ordinary rules of the House, would have been very considerably amended. I desire to call the attention of the new Members of the House to some items contained on pages 186, 187, 188, and 189 of the bill. On those pages we propose to appropriate approximately $5,000,000 for the fortification of the Panama Canal. This is the second considerable appropriation

for that purpose, the former appropriations being, however, considerably less. This is the beginning of an expenditure which, at the very lowest estimate, will not be less than $50,000,000, and may reach $100,000,000. Col. Goethals has said that if we fortify the canal as these items suggest it will cost us $25,000,000 a year to support the troops that will be necessary to hold the canal, and he himself does not promise us that with this great outlay we could hold the canal any longer than for a short time against an expeditionary force sent by any great power against the canal. One hundred and fifty-four Members of this House I imagine have never read those items; at least they have never had the opportunity to pass upon them. When the bill was under consideration in the former Congress I attempted to move to recommit with instructions to strike out these items. Under the ruling of the Chair, because I was not opposed to the bill in toto, I was not allowed to make that motion. So I assume I shall not be allowed to make that motion to-day. Therefore, having tied our hands, having by rule provided that no amendment can be offered to the bill, and it being impossible to offer a motion to recommit unless the Member offering it states that he is opposed to the bill in toto, no amendment of the sort I have suggested or any amendment to any one item of the bill can be offered, either under the five-minute rule in the ordinary way, or on a motion to recommit. So gentlemen on the other side, large numbers of them, who have never read this bill, who at least have never had an opportunity to consider it, have by their action to-day so provided that it will be impossible for them to vote against this or any other of a considerable number of items in the bill that should be stricken out.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] voted to pass this bill over the President's veto, and I assume that while there might be some items in the bill with which he is not in accord, yet he favors the bill as a whole. It would be of little value to offer him opportunity to amend this bill in the House. He offered a great number of amendments to the bill in the last House, and none of them appealed to a majority of the Members present. As there was a Democratic majority of only 64 in the last House and there is a Democratic majority of 147 in this House, I can not understand how the gentleman could expect to be any more successful under these circumstances than he was when the majority was less.

Mr. MONDELL. Do I understand the gentleman to hold that the error increases with the increase of the Democratic majority?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; but when the gentleman was not even able to convince a number of his own party of the propriety or merit of his propositions, it is absolutely futile to attempt to convince a House with a majority of 147 Democrats against him.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the error could not have been very serious in the mind of the gentleman from Wyoming, else he would not have voted to pass the bill over the veto of the Republican President.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is quite apparent the gentleman could easily have recorded his opposition to the bill if there was some fundamental objection by refusing to vote to pass it over the President's veto.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand the gentleman takes the position that a Member can not vote for an appropriation bill because he is opposed to some items in it or because he desires to insert some other items?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. That seemed to be the position of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], acquiesced in by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; but so long as his attempt to amend the bill was futile in the last House we all understand it would be a waste of time to repeat the performance now.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman assume that the new Members on that side are as blind as the old Members were?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, it was an unfortunate thing that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] could not have been present during the dying hours of the last Congress to have recorded himself against the passing of the bill over the President's veto, but I understand he was so overcome with grief at the passing out of power of the party to which he has been attached for so many years and under whose flag he has served in this House that he could not arrange to be here during the last half hour of the session and so was deprived of the opportunity of voting to sustain the veto of the President of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

But the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] labors under the same misapprehension as President Taft when he vetoed the bill. Nobody was surprised at President Taft demonstrating that he did not understand or know just what the provisions in the bill accomplished, although I must express great astonishment that so skilled and so careful and so shrewd a legislator as the gentleman from Massachusetts should fall into the same error as President Taft. President Taft in his message in veto makes this statement:

> At a time when there is widespread complaint of the high cost of living it certainly would be anomalous to put on the statute books of the United States an act in effect preventing the prosecution of combinations of producers of farm products for the purpose of artificially controlling prices; and the evil is not removed, although it may be masked, by referring to the purpose of the organization as "to obtain and maintain a fair and reasonable price for their products."

The most kindly characterization of the act of the President in sending such a statement as that to Congress is that he never read the provision which he criticized, but took some one's opinion as to just what it was, as he had done in connection with the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill when he said it was the best tariff bill ever enacted. The sundry civil bill and the legislative appropriation bill for the next fiscal year carry over $10,000,000 to defray expenses of court officers, officials, employees, and for expenses necessary in the prosecution of the legal business of the country. Six hundred thousand dollars is appropriated for the salaries of the United States district attorneys, $325,000 for the payment of regular assistants to United States district attorneys, $553,630 in the legislative bill for the force of the Attorney General in the Department of Justice, over $1,000,000 for witness fees, and a number of other items, all of which aggregate over $10,000,000, and all of this money is available for the purpose of prosecuting offenders against the Sherman antitrust law regardless of the class or category to which they apply with the exception of one single item of $300,000.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. GILLETT. If this clause did not prevent the Attorney General from such prosecution, may I ask what the purpose of this clause was?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am about to explain. I thought perhaps the gentleman from Massachusetts understood what had been done, although I am not surprised that the recent occupant of the White House did not understand or know what was going on in Congress. Some years ago there was a controversy in the House precipitated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT]. He pointed out that a Republican administration, despite many protestations, was not doing anything to suppress the criminal combinations of capital which were oppressing the people in every direction, and he offered an amendment to the sundry civil appropriation bill appropriating $250,000 to relieve the administration of the excuse that it was hampered by a lack of funds for the prosecution of offenders against the Sherman antitrust law.

The spark that was struck by the gentleman from Georgia created such a conflagration that before the House finished, upon the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. LACEY, the appropriation was made $500,000. During the first two or three years following practically none of that money was expended by the administration, but later it commenced to employ distinguished lawyers and undertook the prosecution of certain litigation against certain industrial combinations that had been oppressing the people. Three or four years ago considerable agitation arose as a result of the so-called Danbury Hat case. Anyone who will examine the records of the Senate during the discussion of the Sherman antitrust law is aware of the fact that such men as Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts; Senator George, of Mississippi; and other distinguished lawyers expressed the opinion that the United States Supreme Court would never dream of construing the Sherman antitrust law as affecting either labor organizations or farmers' organizations. In the Danbury Hat case, as I recall, the Supreme Court referred to the records of Congress, and said that there was nothing to indicate that there was any intention ever to exclude organizations of either class, so that in the Sixty-first Congress—I am not sure whether it was three or four years ago—so that there might be no misunderstanding as to the specific purposes for which this particular fund had been made available, the so-called Hughes amendment, which many gentlemen who previously served in this House on that side have reason to recall with regret, was proposed in order to confine the employment out of this particular fund of attorneys to be employed in cases against industrial combinations. To the astonishment of everyone the administration itself took a very active part in attempting to defeat the amendment.

It passed the House and was stricken out in the Senate, and near the end of the session the House by a very close vote concurred in the Senate amendment. My recollection is that the vote showed a difference of about 10, which eliminated the

amendment from the bill. I do not know whether the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] overlooked that fact when he stated that the Congress had never put any such restriction upon a Republican Attorney General. It was not because the attempt had not been made. And more than that, an attempt had been made at that time, because the attitude of the last Republican administration was such that there was grave reason to believe that it would have taken much more pleasure in prosecuting labor organizations and farmers' organizations than it would have taken in prosecuting the industrial combinations that had been so oppressive to the country.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not exactly understand the position of the gentleman from New York, and I would like to inquire whether he holds the antitrust law applies to the labor organizations in maintaining wages and strikes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think it does, now that the Supreme Court has so decided, but I think it was not so intended.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will say to the gentleman that the Supreme Court has not so decided.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In the Danbury Hat case—209 United States, I think it is—the Supreme Court has expressly held it and sustained the litigation brought under that act.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the gentleman will yield a little further, I will say that in my judgment the gentleman is entirely in error as to what the Supreme Court held in that case of which he is speaking. I have a copy of it right here, in which they say that the secondary boycott is illegal, whether conducted by a labor union or anyone else.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is what President Taft has insisted comes within the inhibition of the antitrust act, and in his message to Congress, sent here the last day of the last Congress, he says:

> An amendment almost in the language of this proviso, so far as it refers to organizations for the increasing of wages, etc., was introduced in the Sixty-first Congress, passed the House, was rejected in the Senate, and after a very full discussion in the House failed of enactment. Representative Madison, speaking in favor of the amendment which struck out the proviso, characterized it as an attempt "to write into the law, so far as this particular measure is concerned, a legalization of the secondary boycott." * * *

That is what the United States Supreme Court held in the Danbury Hat case, that because it was in effect a secondary boycott it came within the inhibition of the antitrust law. I do not think I misunderstand the effects of the decisions or the contentions of the gentlemen who have been objecting to this provision.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield a little further?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman either misunderstands me or intentionally perverts the language. There is a vast deal of difference in the secondary boycott and the other proposition.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The President contends that it authorized the secondary boycott, and that is the ground on which he vetoed the bill. There is no difference of opinion as to what his contention was as to the effect of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, there is ample power and there are ample funds appropriated in this bill to permit the prosecution of offenders against every law, regardless of whom the offenders may be. I have no doubt that everybody can rest confident of the fact that under this administration all offenders against any law, regardless of class or person, will be proceeded against with impartially, although I may add that as the result of the Democratic Party controlling this administration there is less likelihood that there will be so many persons who will put themselves in a position where it will be necessary to invoke the aid of the criminal law. It is known that the same practices will not be tolerated now as have been prevalent heretofore during the many years of Republican misrule in this country.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I used?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used 16 minutes and has 4 minutes left.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to say just one word more, and that is that the only mistake that was made in this rule was in giving so much time for the discussion of the bill, because nobody—except the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT], with respect to this particular provision—has pointed out a single change desired in the bill, and also excepting the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], who made fruitless attempts to strike out the Panama Canal appropriations on several prior occasions.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] reserves four minutes.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's last criticism is preposterous. To expect that anybody could in 20 minutes' time, or a portion of it, point out the defects and desired amendments in a bill containing hundreds and even thousands of items and appropriating $116,000,000 would be to expect the impossible. Of course, we can only have time to discuss one or two special points in the bill. And moreover, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman's supercilious air of superiority toward President Taft will not injure President Taft and will not help the gentleman's case.

The gentleman's explanation does not explain. So far as I can gather from it, what he means is that this appropriation is a humbug and a piece of hypocrisy, and will amount to nothing, because there is other money available that can be used for the same purpose.

Very possibly that is the argument that put it into the bill. The gentleman from New York, to his credit, opposed this item when it was offered on the floor of the House and was ultimately defeated, and now apparently he accepts it and swallows it with the best grace he can.

Mr. Speaker, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, when the sundry civil appropriation bill passed at the last session of the last Congress it carried an item of $500,000 for a Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition at San Francisco. The present bill carries a similar item.

Since that bill passed there has appeared an article in the newspapers throughout the country to the effect that the governor of California had objected to a State building on the ground that there was not enough money in the State treasury to warrant the appropriation for a State building. Since then I have received from the president of the exposition company a telegram asserting that the statement as published is entirely erroneous; that there will be a State building; and that the State of California will appropriate approximately $10,000,000 for the exposition, together with the $12,500,000 that the people of San Francisco have appropriated for that purpose, so that we shall have, approximately, from the people of California $22,500,000 for the exposition.

Nothing like that has ever been done before by any community or any State in furtherance of any exposition. I desire to read the telegram from the president of the exposition company. It is as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., *April 10, 1913.*

Hon. JULIUS KAHN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Report that California is not to have State building at Panama-Pacific Exposition is ridiculous. It arose from an editorial misconception of a published statement by Gov. Johnson. Circumstances were, the State has appropriated $5,000,000 for the exposition and also passed a bill permitting the various counties to levy a special tax for exposition purposes, which will amount to about $5,000,000, thus making contribution of the State between nine and ten million dollars, in addition to twelve and one-half million dollars from San Francisco. Representatives of some of the counties, acting independently of the exposition and without its active support, introduced a bill for further special appropriation from the State for California State building, in order to conserve the funds raised under their special tax. Gov. Johnson declined to indorse this proposition on the ground that the nine or ten million dollars from the State was sufficient. The statement referred solely to the proposed bill and was not intended to have any bearing whatever on the general question of a State building. He has issued a strong statement, which we are giving the press to-night, protesting against the distortion of his interview, in which he says:

"Reports that have been sent broadcast to the effect that the State has turned down the exposition or did not intend to exhibit are wholly without foundation. Our people, with a generosity unparalleled in history of expositions, have placed at the disposal of the Panama-Pacific Exposition $10,000,000, and in addition have empowered the counties to levy a tax of 6 cents on each hundred dollars of assessed valuation for exposition purposes. Of course out of these various sums an appropriate State building will be constructed."

Question was never as to whether a State building will be built, but only from what fund the money should be taken. There certainly will be a California building that will do credit to the State and to the Nation which she represents as hostess. The plans for this building have already been drawn.

CHARLES C. MOORE,
President Panama-Pacific International Exposition.

I make this statement to the House because quite a number of Members have spoken to me at various times since they saw the newspaper item to the effect that California would not have a State building, in order that their minds may be set at rest as to the attitude of California in the matter.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Certainly; I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I do not wish to detract from the force of the gentleman's statement, and wish to say that the public spirit displayed by the citizens of San Francisco and California with respect to this exposition is highly commendable, more so than the spirit recently displayed toward a friendly nation. But he says that in the matter of expenditures the example of San Francisco or California had never been excelled or even equaled. I wish to say that St. Louis alone raised $22,000,000 for its exposition.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERY] one minute.

Mr. RODDENBERY. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be harshly critical of our friends on the other side touching their opposition to the adoption of the rule which brings this measure to immediate passage. This identical bill was before the House in February, in the last session. Then, when a rule was proposed to limit general debate on it to one hour, I antagonized its adoption and, upon a division, ascertained that not a Member on the Republican side supported me in an effort to get debate and consideration then. After the bill was for three days discussed under the five-minute rule I moved to recommit it with instructions to reduce the amount $11,000,000, and gentlemen on the Republican side, upon a division, voted unanimously against that proposition. When the labor amendment was up, offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAMILL], and the farmers' amendment was up, offered by myself, gentlemen on that side had ample opportunity to support it or antagonize it if they desired. In addition to that, during the three days' consideration of the bill the House remained in session continuously from 10.30 o'clock in the morning until 11 o'clock at night. I opposed the procedure then and lost. Gentlemen who protest now stood mute then. At this time, seeking political gain and for political buncombe, statesmen on the Republican side seek to invoke Members on this side to antagonize a rule for the speedy passage of legislation that has had fairer consideration than the Republican régime was accustomed to give. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] now proposes by a motion to recommit to strike out the labor and farmer exemption provision vetoed by a Republican President, the most salutary piece of legislation in the bill, and which a Democratic President in a few days will have the pleasure of approving. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has three minutes remaining.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have differed with some of my colleagues in the past, and I differ with some of them now touching the desirability of certain legislation, but in that difference I have tried to keep a proper sense of proportion. In the closing hours of the last Congress I undertook to call attention to the fact that the President of the United States, if he vetoed the sundry civil bill, as the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Cannon, said he would, because of the limitations placed on the special antitrust fund, would have lost that sense of proportion.

So far as I know, I was the first man in the Congress of the United States who opposed an amendment that undertook to change the substantive law of the land by exempting labor unions from the operation of that law. In the consideration of the penal code, when the codification of section 5508 was up, a penal section that dealt with conspiracies against the laws of the country, an amendment exempting labor unions was offered which I opposed and which was then voted down. I should not now vote for a bill that carried with it a provision changing the substantive law of the land so as to exempt any class from what I consider to be a general penal statute. But there is a world-wide difference between that position and the one which is presented in this bill. Here is a provision which, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has well said, was first offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] to furnish the Department of Justice with additional funds in order that they might not have any excuse for a failure to proceed against the great organizations of capital that were oppressing the people. Aside from any other consideration, it is perfectly proper to see to it that a fund so created in the first instance for that purpose shall be kept for that purpose and that purpose alone.

Believing, therefore, that the provision now in this bill did not affect the substantive law, that it was a limitation upon a particular fund for a given year, I said in my speech of the last session that I should support the bill, and I expect on this occasion to vote for the bill and to help to make it a law.

There is another reason for my present support of this bill. I do not think this House can consistently open up this bill as to a particular matter without opening it up as to all other matters. My justification for the rule that was passed a few moments ago, my justification for my position now in voting for the bill, is that it has received the proper consideration of Congress, that it received a vote of five out of six men in the House of Representatives at the last session, and that, therefore, knowing the need of the Government to have immediately available funds carried in the bill, it should not be delayed by a reconsideration.

Another word and I am through. I do not entirely agree with what has been recited touching the legislative history of the Sherman antitrust law. I shall not now undertake to discuss what was said at the time of the enactment of the Sherman antitrust law, and particularly what was said by Senator Edmunds, who, more than any one man, was responsible for the exact language; but I feel that I should say that I believe the full scope of the law was appreciated by Congress when it was enacted, and that scope properly embraced all conspiracies in restraint of trade.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill at length.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 22, 1913, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, together with a memorandum relative to an authorization to enter into a lease for the rental of additional floor space for the Bureau of the Census and transfer of said bureau from its present quarters to the new building for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 34); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting schedule of useless executive documents (H. Doc. No. 35); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 3322) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Oelwein, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3323) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Osage, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 3324) to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DONOHOE: A bill (H. R. 3325) to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquor to minors within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 3326) to create a tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 3327) to expedite the sale of ceded Chippewa Indian lands in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 3328) to provide for the construction of four revenue cutters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 3329) to prevent cruelty to poultry while being transported from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia into or through another State or Territory or the District of Columbia by any railroad company, car company, company operating steam, sailing, or other vessels, or the masters or owners of same, or express companies, or any common carrier engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 3330) to increase the pension of certain pensioned soldiers and sailors who lost the sight of one eye or the sight of both eyes in the service of the United States, and to provide a rate of pension for those who have lost the sight of one eye and partial loss of sight of the other eye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 3331) for the relief of the Kentucky drafted men; to the Committee on War Claims.

Mr. Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 3332) to amend section 167 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3333) to establish a fish-cultural station in the western part of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3334) authorizing the quitclaiming of the interest of the United States in certain land situated in Hampden County, Mass.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3335) to amend an act entitled "An act granting to certain employees of the United States the right to receive from it compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment," approved May 30, 1908; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3336) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3337) to authorize the Connecticut River Co. to relocate and construct a dam across the Connecticut River above the village of Windsor Locks, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 3338) to prohibit interference with commerce among the States and Territories and with foreign nations, and to remove obstructions thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3339) to prohibit interference with commerce among the States and Territories and with foreign nations, and to remove obstructions thereto, and to prohibit the transmission of certain messages by telegraph, telephone, cable, or other means of communication between States and Territories and foreign nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3340) granting the public lands belonging to the United States and situated in the State of Arkansas to the State of Arkansas for the use and benefit of the common schools of that State; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3341) authorizing a resurvey of township 11 north, range 8 west of the fifth principal meridian, in Arkansas; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3342) to repeal section 1 of the act of March 3, 1875, entitled "An act granting to railroads the right of way through the public lands of the United States"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3343) to amend river and harbor act of March 3, 1899, making appropriations for improvement of upper White River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3344) to provide for the construction, maintenance, and improvement of post roads and rural delivery routes through the cooperation and joint action of the National Government and the several States in which such post roads or rural delivery routes may be established; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3345) to provide for the erection of a public building at Brinkley, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3346) to provide for the erection of a public building at Clarendon, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3347) to refund the cotton tax; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 3348) to remove the restrictions from certain allotted Indian lands in the Quapaw Agency, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3349) providing for ascertaining the competency of the Seneca Tribe and other tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, and for issuing patents to those found competent, and removing the restrictions on their lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3350) granting to all Indians or tribes the right to sue in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3351) to appropriate $500,000 to deepen the channel and remove the obstructions in the Arkansas River, in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3352) to provide for the construction of a military road at the United States cemetery at Fort Gibson, Okla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3353) to provide for the erection of a public building at Vinita, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3354) to provide for the erection of a public building at Wagoner, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3355) to provide for the erection of a public building at Bartlesville, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3356) to provide for the erection of a public building at Sapulpa, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3357) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station within Cherokee County, in the third congressional district, State of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3358) authorizing all tribes or bands of Indians of Oklahoma to submit claims to the Court of Claims which have not heretofore been determined by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3359) for the relief of the Miami Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3360) to compensate the Delaware Indians for services rendered by them to the United States in various wars; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 3361) granting pension to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 3362) granting to the Inter-City Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, the right to construct, acquire, maintain, and operate a railway bridge across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 3363) to fix the mileage of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress; to the Committee on Mileage.

By Mr. SHARP: A bill (H. R. 3364) to establish a school of aviation and meteorological research in the city of Lorain, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3365) to provide for the erection of a public building at Beckley, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3366) authorizing a survey of New River in Virginia and West Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3367) to provide for the erection of a public building at Logan, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3368) to regulate the collection of internal revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3369) to establish an agricultural experiment station in the fifth congressional district of West Virginia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3370) for the relief of the lock masters, lockmen, and other laborers and mechanics employed by the United States Government in the locks and dams of the Kanawha River, in West Virginia; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3371) to promote the safety of employees and passengers upon railroads engaged in interstate traffic; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3372) for the relief of West Virginia State troops; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 3373) to permit second homestead and desert-land entries in certain cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: A bill (H. R. 3374) to promote the safety of passengers and others upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to use cars constructed of steel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 3375) granting an increase of compensation to bookbinders, machinists, printers, and pressmen

in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3376) to prevent the sale or transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of articles of food held in cold storage for more than the time herein specified and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOORE: A bill (H. R. 3377) to repeal part of an act entitled "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3378) creating a Panama Canal trade commission and to enable the commercial, agricultural, and industrial interests of the United States to derive advantages from the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRYAN: A bill (H. R. 3379) to provide the method of electing United States Senators where no method is provided by State statute; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 3380) providing for the construction of a bridge across the Anacostia River in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 3381) to equalize the allowances of warrant officers with those of other officers in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3382) for the relief of certain retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3383) to establish a light and fog signal in New York Bay at the southwesterly end of Governors Island; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 3384) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to deliver to certain cities and towns condemned bronze or brass cannon, with their carriages and outfit of cannon balls, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3385) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to deliver to certain cities and towns condemned bronze or brass cannon, with their carriages and outfit of balls, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 3386) to establish a fish hatchery in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 3387) prohibiting the importation of foreign meats which have not been inspected and passed in conformity with the provisions of the meat-inspection acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHARP: A bill (H. R. 3388) authorizing one year's pay to widow or designated dependent relative upon the death of any Army aviator while on such duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 3389) to expedite the final settlement of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3390) to expedite the final settlement of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 3391) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 3392) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Portage, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHARP: A bill (H. R. 3393) to authorize the carrying of mail by aeroplane or by any other similar device; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 3394) to create a tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: A bill (H. R. 3395) to provide for a public building at Herkimer, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 3396) to establish a legislative reference bureau in the Library of Congress; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. NEELEY: A bill (H. R. 3397) to amend the national banking laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 3398) providing for the purchase and disposal of certain lands containing kaolin, kaolinite, fuller's earth, and other minerals within portions of Indian reservations heretofore opened to settlement and entry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 3399) to establish a hospital for the treatment of trachoma, tuberculosis, and other diseases of the Indian, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RUPLEY: A bill (H. R. 3400) to authorize the construction of a magazine and high-explosive shop to replace the inadequate, unsanitary, and unsafe buildings at the Frankford Arsenal at Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHARP: A bill (H. R. 3401) to establish an aeronautical commission to gather information as to the development of aviation in the United States and foreign countries, reporting the facts and making its recommendations to Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Utah: A bill (H. R. 3402) providing for the marking, tagging, or labeling certain fabrics and articles of clothing, also defining the misbranding thereof, and providing penalties for its violation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 3403) for the relief of tobacco growers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3404) to levy a tax upon the issuance of coupons, prize tickets, and other devices and on the redemption and payment, purchase, or exchange of coupons, prize tickets, tags, bands, or other devices, things, or parts of articles or things that shall have been attached to, packed in or with, or formed a part of, or encircling, or given with any manufactured tobacco, cigar or cigars, cigarette or cigarettes, or snuff, or any stamped package or receptacle thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 3405) to provide for the payment of assessments lawfully made by city or borough authorities upon property owned by the United States within said city or borough for the purpose of building sewers, sidewalks, curbs, and street pavements, etc.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DIES: A bill (H. R. 3406) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Sabine River at Orange, Tex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 3407) to provide payment for overtime to United States penitentiary guards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3408) providing for a military highway between Forts Leavenworth and Riley, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3409) to place the National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers under the administration of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3410) to extend the benefits of the act of June 27, 1890 (as amended by the act of May 9, 1900), granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who served in the military or naval forces of the United States, their widows, minor children, or dependent parents, and the act of February 6, 1907, granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3411) establishing the rank of officers of the United States Army on the relative list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3412) to provide Federal aid for the improvement of public highways in the United States traveled by rural free-delivery mail carriers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3413) to purchase the Kansas and Missouri bridge at Fort Leavenworth for military purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3414) to provide an eight-hour workday for United States penitentiary guards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 3415) granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1864 to 1898 and to their widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3416) for the erection of a public building at the city of Tucson, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3417) to establish a fish-culture station in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Resolution (H. Res. 60) to print 500 copies of a compilation of letters and statements and other authoritative information relating to the affairs of the Indian people, etc.; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: Resolution (H. Res. 61) to pay to Mary S. Mann, widow of Charles H. Mann, late superintendent of reporters' gallery, a certain sum of money; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution (H. Res. 62) to investigate the steamboat monopoly between the city of Washington and Mount Vernon; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Resolution (H. Res. 63) to provide for the printing and distribution of Washington's Farewell Address; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Resolution (H. Res. 65) authorizing the Doorkeeper of the House to appoint a messenger, who shall also be janitor for certain committee rooms; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MONDELL: Resolution (H. Res. 66) requesting the Secretary of the Interior to furnish the House with certain information; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Resolution (H. Res. 67) to amend Rule XI of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 68) to amend Rule XXIII of the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Resolution (H. Res. 70) creating a committee of the House of Representatives to be known as the committee on equal suffrage; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: Resolution (H. Con. Res. 5) providing for a referendum vote on the tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 63) to restore the status of the Fourth Regiment Arkansas Mounted Volunteer Infantry (State militia), which served the United States Government 10 months in the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 64) authorizing the Director of the Census to publish statistics of the domestic and foreign consumption of cotton, the surplus held by cotton manufacturers of the United States, and the number of bales exported; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. CARY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 65) providing for an increase of pay to the charwomen employed in the House Office Building; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 66) providing for an increase of pay to the custodian employees of the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 67) for the proposed purchase of the estate of Mount Vernon by the National Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOORE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 68) authorizing and directing the Secretary of State to confer with Great Britain and other nations with a view to their participation in the cost of construction and maintenance of the Panama Canal and the neutralization thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCOY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 69) providing for the appointment of a committee of four Members of Congress, two appointed by the President of the Senate and two by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the purpose of inquiring into 1-cent letter postage and other matters relative thereto; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 70) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, requesting the repeal of the license tax on railroads in Seward Peninsula until August 24, 1917; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Colorado, urging the establishment of Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Wisconsin, urging the creation of a board of river regulation and control of flood waters; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. THACHER: Memorial of the Legislature of Massachusetts, urging Congress to take such action regarding the shortage of coal as will prevent unreasonable advances in the prices thereof during the winter season; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Memorial of the Legislature of Wisconsin, asking for the submission of a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania, urging legislation to reimburse Elizabeth Glancy and Anna McCalgan for the loss sustained through death of their husbands while employed in a United States arsenal; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GARDNER: Memorial of the Legislature of Massachusetts, relative to the cost of coal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Massachusetts, relative to the sale by the United States Government of a certain tract of land in the city of Chelsea; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THACHER: Memorial of the Legislature of Massachusetts, relative to the sale by the United States of a certain tract of land for naval hospital site to the city of Chelsea; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, urging an appropriation for an additional building in the Frankford Arsenal, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HELGESEN: Memorial of the Legislature of North Dakota, urging Congress to enact a law prohibiting the use of parcel post for the mailing of cigarettes, snuff, etc., in States prohibiting the sale thereof; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KEATING: Memorial of the Legislature of Colorado, urging upon Congress the necessity of the early designation, construction, and maintenance of a system of national highways; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: Memorial of the Legislature of Hawaii, urging Congress not to lower the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 3418) granting a pension to Eliza M. Drummond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3419) granting a pension to Maggie Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3420) granting an increase of pension to Charles Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3421) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Hospes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 3422) granting a pension to Mary E. Cornish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3423) for the relief of George W. Bryant; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 3424) granting a pension to Harman F. Schultz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3425) granting an increase of pension to Loren G. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3426) granting an increase of pension to George Coffet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3427) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Boland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 3428) for the relief of James Stanton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3429) for the relief of James W. Morgan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3430) for the relief of Lottie Rapp; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3431) for the relief of Peter Carroll and others, lately laborers employed by the United States military authorities in and about Fort Leavenworth, Kans.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3432) to reinstate Frank Ellsworth McCorkle as a cadet at United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3433) for the relief of Christ Schrey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3434) for the relief of Hugh Cameron; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3435) for the relief of Mrs. Max S. Retter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3436) to place John Kiernan on the retired list of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL of California: A bill (H. R. 3437) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John D. Humphrey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 3438) granting a pension to Mary E. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3439) granting an increase of pension to Mary Koenen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3440) to remove the charge of desertion against Peter Gumm; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3441) to remove the charge of desertion against Samuel Schenck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 3442) granting an increase of pension to Michael McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3443) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Webber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3444) granting a pension to Mary MacArthur; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3445) for the relief of Randall G. Butler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3446) for the relief of Michael Philbin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3447) for the relief of Frederick Webber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3448) for the relief of John Murray; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 3449) granting a pension to William Altdorfer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 3450) granting an increase of pension to Marion McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3451) granting an increase of pension to Arthur B. Carr; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3452) for the relief of William Kinney, alias William Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3453) for the relief of S. Spencer Carr; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3454) for the relief of James U. Quinn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3455) for the relief of Rev. Oscar Samuel, alias August Meier; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3456) for the relief of S. O. Onsgard; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3457) for the relief of John H. Ethridge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 3458) granting a pension to John Salmon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3459) granting a pension to Lorena A. Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 3460) for the relief of John C. Farrell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3461) for the removal of restrictions from all of the lands of Fannie Winney Kariho; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3462) for the relief of Marion County, W. Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHOE: A bill (H. R. 3463) authorizing the appointment of Maj. John S. Bishop, United States Army, retired, on the retired list of the Army, with the rank of brigadier general; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3464) granting a pension to Caleb F. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 3465) for the relief of S. A. Way, trustee for the heirs of Samuel Way, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 3466) granting a pension to Eugene H. Chamberlain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 3467) granting an increase of pension to Garret H. Hessalink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 3468) for the relief of the heirs of the late Samuel H. Donaldson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 3469) granting a pension to Adeline E. Ferrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3470) granting a pension to Charlotte I. Arnold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3471) granting a pension to Emma A. Blodgett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3472) granting a pension to Sylvia L. Bartlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3473) granting a pension to Lilly B. Parkhurst; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3474) granting an increase of pension to Edward F. Seery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3475) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus B. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3476) granting an increase of pension to Austin H. Stockwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3477) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Clarke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3478) granting an increase of pension to Levi C. Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3479) granting an increase of pension to Simon B. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3480) for the relief of Frank H. Phipps; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3481) for the relief of Albert W. Phelps; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3482) for the relief of Francis M. Atherton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3483) for the relief of Wilson B. Strong; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 3484) granting a pension to Mary A. Albright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3485) granting a pension to Otis H. Shurtliff; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 3486) granting a pension to Charles H. Kelley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3487) granting an increase of pension to Michael Cassidy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3488) for the relief of Albert Greenlaw; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GORMAN: A bill (H. R. 3489) granting a pension to Ellen Killeen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 3490) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin S. Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRISON of New York: A bill (H. R. 3491) for the relief of Watson B. Dickerman, administrator of the estate of Charles Backman, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 3492) for the relief of Cornell Riveland; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3493) for the relief of Robert McFarland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3494) for the relief of James Curran; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3495) granting a pension to Hans Hanson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3496) granting a pension to Edward Hinman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3497) granting a pension to Lizzie Wilkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3498) granting a pension to Mary E. Burrell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3499) granting a pension to Harriet M. Townsend; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3500) granting a pension to Jane E. Myrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3501) granting a pension to Dora Evaline Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3502) granting a pension to Elizabeth Cumming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3503) granting a pension to Hattie E. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3504) granting a pension to George M. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3505) granting an increase of pension to John H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3506) granting an increase of pension to Alvin H. Hacam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3507) granting an increase of pension to Matt Farmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3508) granting an increase of pension to Alvin S. Dean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3509) granting an increase of pension to Cash Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3510) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael McWilliams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 3511) for the relief of G. O. Nolan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3512) granting a pension to Marie Elizabeth Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3513) granting a pension to Rebecca Horn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3514) granting a pension to John R. McMurray; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3515) granting a pension to Philip Raper; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3516) granting a pension to Thomas J. Riley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3517) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Heydenburg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3518) granting an increase of pension to Lillian M. Dayton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3519) granting an increase of pension to Ann Eliza Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3520) to correct the military record of Joinville Reif; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3521) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay Eli Sears $480 for property destroyed by the Pima Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3522) for the relief of the administrator and heirs of John G. Campbell, to permit the prosecution of an Indian depredation claim; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 3523) for the relief of J. T. Berry; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3524) for the relief of Spencer County; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 3525) granting an increase of pension to James A. Rives; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3526) for the relief of William Nevin; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3527) granting a pension to Absolem Maynard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3528) granting a pension to J. P. McClintock; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3529) granting a pension to John Galloway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3530) granting a pension to John Muck Maynard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3531) granting a pension to William J. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3532) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Mitchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3533) granting a pension to Emily Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3534) granting a pension to Electra Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3535) granting a pension to Henderson Branham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3536) granting an increase of pension to Maurice Hungerford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3537) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Flowers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3538) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Plybon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3539) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3540) granting an increase of pension to Sue E. Madden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3541) granting an increase of pension to Andy Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3542) granting an increase of pension to Zacariah Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3543) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3544) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. McGinety; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3545) granting an increase of pension to C. Milstead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3546) granting an increase of pension to Henry Stephenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3547) granting an increase of pension to Noah Sias; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3548) to remove the charge of desertion from the records of the War Department against James T. Billups; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3549) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John W. Shelton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3550) for the relief of the Hurricane Baptist Church, Hurricane, W. Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3551) for the relief of the heirs of Richard Parsons and Mildred Parsons; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3552) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Point Pleasant, W. Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3553) for the relief of the estate of Philip Null, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3554) for the relief of Charles Cook, administrator of the estate of John Cook, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3555) for the relief of the estate of Philip Null, deceased; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3556) for the relief of heirs of William Douthit; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3557) for the relief of the heirs of Charles Ruffner, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3558) for the relief of the heirs of Edward and William Holderby; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3559) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Barboursville, W. Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3560) for the relief of the heirs of John Morgan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3561) for the relief of Venila Browning (née Kinder); to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3562) for the relief of Leroy Douglass; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3563) for the relief of James Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3564) for the relief of Lida Jones and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3565) for the relief of Leroy Douglass; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3566) for the relief of Anna De Bord; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3567) for the relief of John H. Snyder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3568) for the relief of Mary A. Smith and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3569) for the relief of Thomas McCallister; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3570) for the relief of James M. Stephenson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3571) for the relief of Louis F. Brooks; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3572) for the relief of James M. Clouston; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3573) for the relief of F. F. Morris; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3574) for the relief of Jacob Harshbarger; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 3575) granting an increase of pension to Samuel R. Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 3576) for the relief of the heirs of Simeon P. Sandidge; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3577) for the relief of the trustees of Bloomfield Lodge, No. 57, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Bloomfield, Ky.; the trustees of the town of Bloomfield, Ky.; and the trustees of the Bloomfield graded common schools of Bloomfield, Ky.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 3578) granting a pension to Rebecca Getz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3579) to correct the military record of John Cole; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3580) to correct the military record of Allen C. Newland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3581) to correct the military record of Harvey Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3582) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to James Kane; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3583) granting a pension to George H. Poust; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3584) to correct the military record of Edward Hilsher, alias Edward Holmes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KREIDER: A bill (H. R. 3585) granting a pension to Sydney Kempton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3586) granting an honorable discharge to Francis Tomlinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3587) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John F. Kelly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3588) authorizing the Secretary of War to give to Charles Harris, private, United States Army, retired, the grade of sergeant as of the date of his retirement; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 3589) granting a pension to William John Rosenberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3590) granting an increase of pension to Amanda I. Allison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3591) granting an increase of pension to Permelia J. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 3592) for the relief of J. S. Wilson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3593) for the relief of Margaret Neace; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3594) for the relief of H. H. Combs; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3595) for the relief of Peter Cline; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3596) for the relief of the estate of David W. Allen; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3597) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Farmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3598) granting a pension to Ross D. Caudill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3599) granting a pension to Henry Fields; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3600) granting a pension to George R. Arrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3601) granting a pension to Blaine Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3602) granting a pension to Boaz Adkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3603) granting an increase of pension to Irvin Patrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3604) granting an increase of pension to Keenaz F. Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3605) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Frazure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3606) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah H. Combs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3607) granting an increase of pension to Milton H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3608) granting an increase of pension to Richard L. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3609) granting an increase of pension to Henry Horn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3610) granting an increase of pension to Serena Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3611) granting a pension to Kate R. Harner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3612) to correct the military record of John G. Lawler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEVY: A bill (H. R. 3613) to reimburse Le Grand C. Cramer for amount of damages to his motor launch *Winninish* by the U. S. launch *Guncdmertrix* at Morris Heights, N. Y., on March 31, 1911; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3614) for the relief of the survivors of the *General Slocum* disaster; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 3615) granting a pension to Almira D. Pettingill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3616) granting a pension to John Shirmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3617) granting a pension to Gustav Buelow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3618) granting a pension to Horace G. Butterfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3619) granting an increase of pension to Axel E. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3620) granting an increase of pension to Don F. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3621) granting an increase of pension to George W. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3622) granting an increase of pension to Giles A. Woolsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3623) granting an increase of pension to Elias S. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3624) granting an increase of pension to Owen Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3625) granting an increase of pension to Robert Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3626) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Summers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3627) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Delaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3628) granting an increase of pension to Lottie A. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3629) for the relief of Jacob Weyland; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3630) for the relief of Andrews & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3631) to correct the military record of John Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3632) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John W. Wünderlich and grant to him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 3633) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 3634) granting a pension to Henry Kline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3635) granting an increase of pension to George W. Grable; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3636) to correct the military record of Sylvester De Forest; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 3637) for the relief of Emma Lanchbury; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3638) providing for the issuance of patent to George W. Wolf; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MOORE: A bill (H. R. 3639) for the relief of Morris Busch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 3640) for the relief of William T. Riddle; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3641) granting a pension to Thomas Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3642) granting an increase of pension to Henry Suddoth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3643) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Hammack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3644) granting an increase of pension to J. D. Livingston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3645) granting a pension to Daniel O'Connell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEELEY: A bill (H. R. 3646) to pay an award in favor of the heirs of John W. West, deceased; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3647) to carry out the findings of the United States Court of Claims in the case of John A. McLaughlin, colonel Forty-seventh Indiana Volunteer Infantry; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 3648) granting a pension to the widow of Jacob Saxer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3649) granting a pension to the widow of Frederick Stolcolp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3650) granting a pension to the widow of John E. Bartlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3651) granting an increase of pension to Harlow J. Greenfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3652) granting an increase of pension to James B. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3653) for the relief of W. A. Devine; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3654) to reimburse William Kuelling, postmaster at Shullsburg, Lafayette County, Wis., for postal-savings stamps stolen; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 3655) granting a pension to Lowry Holman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3656) granting a pension to John A. Ditmore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3657) granting a pension to Harry A. Rhea; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3658) granting a pension to Bertha Oglesby; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3659) granting a pension to James W. Clarke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3660) granting a pension to William E. Watson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3661) granting a pension to Robert R. Gilmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3662) granting a pension to Nellie V. Cornelius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3663) granting a pension to Elizabeth Kirby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3664) granting pensions to Matilda K. Trett and Ira Ambrose Trett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3665) granting a pension to James W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3666) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Franklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3667) granting an increase of pension to Eli N. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3668) granting an increase of pension to John P. Goshen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3669) granting an increase of pension to James A. Adcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3670) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Robertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3671) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim Romine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3672) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Hutcheson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3673) for the relief of L. D. Bryant, jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3674) for the relief of J. W. Goodloe; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3675) for the relief of Esther Emmart; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3676) for the relief of Laura J. Dills; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3677) for the relief of the estate of John Richards, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3678) for the relief of the heirs of George Small; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3679) for the relief of the heirs of B. Y. Trotter; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3680) for the relief of the heirs of Manning Harris; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3681) for the relief of the heirs of James Kerr, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3682) for the relief of the heirs of Deaderick Pike, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3683) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel Corruthers, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3684) for the relief of the heirs of James H. Branch, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3685) for the relief of the heirs of David P. Coffey, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3686) to correct the military record of John N. Thompson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3687) to correct the military record of Joseph R. (Riley) McVey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3688) to correct the military record of John R. Chapman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3689) to correct the military record of C. W. Fowler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3690) to execute the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the estate of Laura J. Dills, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 3691) for the relief of William H. Gambrill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 3692) granting a pension to Elizabeth Loefstrom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3693) granting a pension to Henry Jordan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3694) granting an increase of pension to Susana Barclay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3695) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3696) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3697) granting an increase of pension to William Bright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 3698) for the relief of William M. Hilliard; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3699) for the relief of B. F. Hembree; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3700) for the relief of William Cunningham; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3701) for the relief of Griffin Callahan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3702) for the relief of Nancy Coffey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3703) for the relief of William C. Bragg; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3704) for the relief of Mary B. Dancy; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3705) for the relief of James T. Dowdy; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3706) for the relief of Stephen Fanning; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3707) for the relief of Xantippe Jackson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3708) for the relief of J. W. Johnson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3709) for the relief of Nancy M. Weaver; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3710) for the relief of William J. Wilcoxson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3711) for the relief of Alfred O. Williamson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3712) for the relief of Dr. Ira G. Wood; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3713) for the relief of James Williams; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3714) for the relief of Thomas W. White; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3715) for the relief of John T. Graves; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3716) for the relief of Bathsheba Gordon; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3717) for the relief of James G. Porter; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3718) for the relief of Martha J. Sibley; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3719) for the relief of Sallie C. Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3720) for the relief of W. C. Tipton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3721) for the relief of John C. Thomas; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3722) for the relief of Parks S. Townsend; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3723) for the relief of Dan Walden; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3724) for the relief of George M. Harraway; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3725) for the relief of John T. Lehman; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3726) for the relief of Mattie H. Ligon; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3727) for the relief of Mary J. Bailey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3728) for the relief of Houston L. Bell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3729) for the relief of the estate of Peter S. Baker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3730) for the relief of R. D. Crosthwaite, administrator; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3731) for the relief of heirs of Benjamin Lawler; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3732) for the relief of the heirs of Elizabeth Thompson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3733) for the relief of the heirs of Kennon H. Steger, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3734) for the relief of heirs of Preston Smith, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3735) for the relief of heirs of Andrew J. Peacock, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3736) for the relief of heirs of William Wann, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3737) for the relief of heirs of Josiah White, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3738) for the relief of the heirs of Jane McCartney; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3739) for the relief of heirs of J. P. McGaha, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3740) for the relief of the heirs of A. E. Mills, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3741) for the relief of the estate of A. L. Logan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3742) for the relief of the estate of Isaac Winston, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3743) for the relief of the estate of Jesse Vann, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3744) for the relief of the estate of William P. Tanner; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3745) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin Snodgrass; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3746) for the relief of the estate of John Sibley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3747) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Knight, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3748) for the relief of the estate of James H. Ware, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3749) for the relief of the estate of James Williams, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3750) for the relief of the estate of John Walston, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3751) for the relief of the estate of Henry Ingram, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3752) for the relief of the estate of W. W. McCrary; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3753) for the relief of the estate of Joseph A. Martin, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3754) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin B. Coffey, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3755) for the relief of the estate of Marius B. Cawthon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3756) for the relief of William Moseley, administrator; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3757) for the relief of Jonathan Morris, executor of Jonathan Morris, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3758) for the relief of Bettie Linder, administratrix of B. Franks, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3759) for the relief of the executor or administrator of the estate of C. C. Spiller, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3760) to refer the claim of Nancy Taylor against the United States to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3761) for the relief of Samuel W. Shackelford, trustee of Susan Shackelford; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3762) for the relief of Samuel H. Yarbrough and estate of John Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3763) for the relief of William W. Callahan, administrator of the estate of Thomas Gibbs; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3764) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Robert Herstein, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3765) for the relief of Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Pleasant Springs, Ala.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3766) for the relief of the trustees of the Chestnut Grove Church, in Morgan County, Ala.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3767) to provide for the payment of the claim of the Methodist Episcopal Church South at Trinity, in Morgan County, Ala., against the United States; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 3768) granting a pension to Herman E. Jansen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3769) granting a pension to Henrietta Sherman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3770) granting a pension to James Langton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3771) granting a pension to Joseph F. Flynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3772) granting a pension to Theresa Sheidmantel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3773) granting an increase of pension to Marzio Martini; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3774) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. H. V. Holdsworth; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3775) granting an increase of pension to James F. Conway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3776) granting an increase of pension to Michael Curtin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3777) for the relief of Capt. George Willson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3778) for the relief of Thomas Crowley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3779) for the relief of the American West Indies Trading Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3780) for the relief of former Paymaster's Clerk John A. Murphy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3781) to restore to the active list of the Marine Corps the name of Albert Hamilton; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3782) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Washington E. Hall, alias John Duffy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 3783) granting a pension to Alberta E. Fleming; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3784) granting a pension to Rivolcete Francis De Moisey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUPLEY: A bill (H. R. 3785) appropriating $25,000 each to Mrs. Anna McCalgan and Mrs. Elizabeth Glancy to reimburse them for the loss sustained through the death of their husbands while in the employ of the United States Government at Frankford Arsenal, at Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 3786) granting a pension to John Kinkade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 3787) granting an increase of pension to James Mohan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3788) granting an increase of pension to Olaf Volkerts; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHARP: A bill (H. R. 3789) granting a pension to Austin L. Straub; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3790) granting a pension to Elizabeth Neely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3791) granting a pension to Hannah M. Seeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3792) granting a pension to Fannie I. Burt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3793) granting a pension to Nettie B. Shores; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3794) granting a pension to Barbara Scisinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H R. 3795) granting a pension to Sarah A. Armentrout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3796) granting a pension to Anna R. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3797) granting a pension to Charles L. Pfahl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3798) granting a pension to James H. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3799) granting a pension to Oscar May; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3800) granting a pension to Susan E. Lime; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3801) granting a pension to Juliette Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3802) granting a pension to Frank Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3803) granting a pension to James Bellamy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3804) granting a pension to Lovina Bliss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3805) granting a pension to Mary Rischert; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3806) granting an increase of pension to Clark S. Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3807) granting an increase of pension to James T. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3808) granting an increase of pension to Frederick A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3809) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Lockhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3810) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Finley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3811) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3812) granting an increase of pension to Hiram A. Knapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3813) granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3814) granting an increase of pension to John Rexford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3815) granting an increase of pension to William Rech; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3816) granting an increase of pension to T. S. Dexter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3817) granting an increase of pension to Llewellyn W. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3818) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Stebbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3819) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Mahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3820) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Early; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3821) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3822) granting an increase of pension to Rowland J. Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3823) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Roscoe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3824) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Crane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3825) granting an increase of pension to Zenus Funk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3826) granting an increase of pension to George W. Cushman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3827) granting an increase of pension to James Fitch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3828) granting an increase of pension to Fidel Saile; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3829) granting an increase of pension to John Galloway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3830) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3831) for the relief of Marcus Billstine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3832) for the relief of Thomas E. Osborn; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3833) for the relief of Joseph Kahnheimer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3834) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Earl; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3835) to restore the name of John O. Wilkins, deceased, to the rolls of Company G, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3836) to place Johnathan J. McClarren on the retired list with the rank of captain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 3837) granting a pension to Sarah P. Tranmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3838) granting an increase of pension to Jerome B. Greenslate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 3839) for the relief of the estate of Leopold Harth, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3840) for the relief of the estate or heirs of Philip P. Phillips, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 3841) for the relief of the estate of William Joslin, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3842) for the relief of heirs of Thomas F. Clayton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3843) for the relief of the heirs of the late Peter Deel; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3844) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Kuykendall; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3845) for the relief of heirs or estate of Mrs. Eunice Hurdle, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3846) for the relief of heirs or estate of James Porter, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3847) for the relief of Mrs. M. B. Stephenson, daughter and sole heir of Thomas B. Coleman, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3848) for the relief of heirs or estate of John Mills, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3849) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of A. M. Rayburn, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3850) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Charles O. Spencer; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3851) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of G. D. Able, administrator of the estate of Catherine J. Rutherford, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3852) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Mrs. J. H. T. Jackson, administratrix of estate of Elizabeth Hull Welford, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3853) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Charles A. Doak and John R. Doak; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3854) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of J. D. Robinson, administrator of estate of Melchisedec Robinson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3855) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of J. A. Hill, administrator of estate of Benjamin Hawes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3856) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of California M. Hearn, in her own right, and as administratrix of estates of Susan L. Bailey and Julia B. Hancock, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3857) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of W. T. Smith, administrator of Maria A. Reinhardt, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3858) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Minor Saunders; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3859) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of the Presbyterian Church of Batesville, Panola County, Miss.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3860) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of John Fuller, administrator of J. B. Fuller, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3861) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Mrs. L. H. Rowland, administratrix of Willis J. Moran, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3862) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of John L. Woodson, administrator of Richard O. Woodson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3863) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Margaret Raiford Loftin, administratrix of Robert Raiford, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3864) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Hardinia P. Kelsey and Mildred E. Franklin, heirs of Hardin P. Franklin, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 3865) for the relief of Michael Flaherty, guardian of John Flaherty, claimant; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 3866) granting a pension to Edmund Ralph; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3867) granting a pension to Ethelinda Hixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3868) granting a pension to Mary A. Mann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3869) granting a pension to Bertha J. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3870) granting a pension to Rosa Baldwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3871) granting a pension to Moses Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3872) granting a pension to Gabriel H. Leighty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3873) granting a pension to Sampson Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3874) granting a pension to Maria Chavis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3875) granting a pension to Jessie Canterbury; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3876) granting a pension to Daniel B. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3877) granting a pension to David A. Poindexter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3878) granting an increase of pension to Alexander R. Cating; to the Committe on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3879) granting an increase of pension to Jesse A. Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3880) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wiggins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3881) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Holland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3882) granting an increase of pension to Edward L. Hudson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3883) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3884) to correct the military record of Allen Fenton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3885) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Peter Scott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3886) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas Jefferson McCollister; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3887) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William H. Harrison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3888) for the relief of the Kanawha & Ohio Transfer Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3889) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frederick Boeden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation for the Government to establish a

Federal telephone and telegraph system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petition of the National Drainage Congress, favoring the passage of legislation for the establishment of a department of public works to make provisions for the regulation and control of stream flow; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also (by request), petition of the Idaho Congress of Mothers and Parent Teachers' Association, Boise, Idaho, protesting against the passage of legislation giving the control and ownership of the national forests to the States wherein they lie; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), petition of Boiler Makers' Local Union No. 335, Grand Junction, Colo., favoring the passage of legislation requiring that the chief, assistant chief, and district Federal boiler inspectors shall be practical boiler makers of not less than eight years' experience, with the ability to pass the Federal civil-service examination; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petition of the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation making an appropriation for the construction of new buildings for the Golden Gate Life-Saving Station; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petition of the peace commission, Norfolk, Va., relative to universal peace and favoring the construction of a millenial dawn temple in California in 1915; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of the Buckeye Aluminum Co., of Wooster, Ohio, against a reduction in the duty on aluminum, ingot and sheet, and aluminum cooking utensils in tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Utica Glass Co., of Utica, Ohio, against the reduction of the duty on window glass; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Ohio State Life Insurance Co., the Midland Mutual Life Insurance Co., and Bruenger & Dunbar, of Ohio, against passage of the income-tax section of the tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Steubenville, Ohio, favoring passage of legislation for 1-cent postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Glass Blowers' Union of Newark and Utica, Ohio, against reduction of the duty on glass; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of sundry business men of Webster Groves and Florisant, Mo., favoring the passage of legislation compelling concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute their portion of the funds for the development of the community, county, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Unions Nos. 44 and 281, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the placing of Philippine tobacco and cigars on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the L. & A. Scheff Distilling Co., the Provident Chemical Works, and the Parker-Russel Mining & Manufacturing Co., of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways nad Means.

Also, petition of the Blanke-Baer Chemical Co., St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the placing of a duty on vanilla beans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Master Stone Masons' Association, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of legislation for a 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Bemis Bros. Bag Co., the H. & I. Chase Bag Co., and the Fulton Bag & Cotton Mills, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring legislation placing a differential duty on burlap cloth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. H. Herrick, of the Massachusetts Life Insurance Co., and of John Herring and others, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the proposed tax on life insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. F. Dickinson, manager of the Georgia plantation, of Mathews, La., protesting against the placing of sugar on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hanlon & Goodman Co., New York, N. Y., protesting against the reduction of tariff on brushes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Lancaster Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade, Lancaster, Pa., protesting against the placing of Philippine tobacco and cigars on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL of California: Petition of T. J. Fleming, Los Angles; the W. A. Plummer Manufacturing Co., San Francisco; and the Ames Harris Neville Co., San Francisco, all in the State of California, protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on jute burlap and jute bags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. E. Randell; the Behrendt-Levy Co., Los Angeles; the San Joaquin Light & Power Corporation, Los Angeles; the Doak Gas Engine Co., Oakland; the California Cotton Mills Co., Oakland; Kuliman, Salz & Co., Benicia; California Barrel Co., San Francisco; Levi Strauss & Co., San Francisco; the A. C. Rulofson Co., San Francisco; Golcher Bros., San Francisco; Scovel Iron Store Co., San Francisco; L. P. Degen Belting Co., San Francisco; the John Bollman Co., San Francisco; Coffin-Redington Co., San Francisco; Marshall-Newell Supply Co., San Francisco; Getz Bros. & Co., San Francisco; Scandinavian Belting Co., San Francisco; the A. Lietz Co., San Francisco; Pacific Rolling Mill Co., San Francisco; Henry R. Worthington, San Francisco; beet growers, farmers, and other citizens of the following towns: Artesia, Alvarado, Agenda, Benicia, Betteravia, Blanco, Casmalia, Clearwater, Chino, Castroville, Compton, Concord, Downey, El Monte, Gilroy, Gonzales, Guadaloupe, Huntington Beach, Hynes, Hueneme, King City, Longbeach, Lompoc, Los Alamitos, Los Alamos, Los Angeles, Meridian, Monterey, Norwalk, Orby, Oxnard, Pleasanton, Salinas, Santa Ana, San Juan, Santa Maria, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Sargent, San Juan Bautista, San Francisco, Spreckels, Watsonville, and Whittier, all in the State of California, protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Memorial of the Wisconsin Peace Society, against repeal of act exempting American coastwise shipping from payment of Panama Canal tolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the business committee of the La Pointe Band of Chippewa Indians, in the State of Wisconsin, against passage of legislation proposing to give to the Secretary of the Interior power to dispose of certain lands in said reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Pennsylvania Millers' State Association, Lancaster, Pa., favoring placing of tariff on products of grain equal to that placed on grain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Power & Mining Machinery Co., of Cudahy, Wis., against reduction of tariff on machinery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Associated Charities of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring clause prohibiting importation of aigrettes, etc., from wild birds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Fred M. Prescott Steam Pump Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., against reduction of duty on sugar and on machinery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a petition of C. J. Dexter, of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring prohibiting importation of feathers of wild birds for trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. H. Anger, of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring clause prohibiting importation of stuffed birds and aigrettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Ludlow Manufacturing Associates, of Boston, Mass., against reduction of duty on jute goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Kleckherfer Box Co., against inequality of tariff schedule on oats and rolled oats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the O. C. Hansen Manufacturing Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., against 20 per cent duty on imported hair on angora goatskins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Association of Window Glass Manufacturers, against reduction of duty on window glass; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Kleckherfer Box Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., against inequality of tariff on oats and manufactured products thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Milwaukee Lithographing Co., against taking off specific duty on lithographic productions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Otto L. Kuehn Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., against import duty on raw oats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Milwaukee Mirror and Art Glass Works against reduction of duty on stained and painted glass; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American manufacturers of steel shears and scissors against reduction of duty on steel shears and scissors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of Kullman, Salz & Co., of Benicia, Cal., by Ansley K. Salz, president and manager, and by 742 other citizens of the State of California, protesting against reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the Joseph Dixon Crucible Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., against removal of a specific duty of 45 cents per gross on lead pencils; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George A. Momson, of New York, N. Y., against taxing life insurance companies operating on the mutual plan a tax of 1 per cent of their net income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Spice Trade Association of New York, N. Y., against placing same duty upon ground spices as upon whole spices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. Mabel Clark, of New York, N. Y., favoring passage of the feather proviso, Schedule N of the tariff act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pennsylvania Millers' State Association, favoring placing of equal tariff on products of grain as that placed upon grain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Saratoga Victory Manufacturing Co., of Victory Mills, N. Y., against placing 12½ per cent duty on cotton cloths; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Ellison & Ellison, of New York, N. Y., against placing typewriters on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of New York, N. Y., against reduction of tariff on printing machinery, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Eastern Millinery Association, of New York, N. Y., against prohibiting importation of feathers, plumes, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the German Savings Bank, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against taxing income of mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of Major William McKinley Circle, No. 18, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Missouri, St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of bill for erection of national home in Washington, D. C., for the widows of the soldiers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the New York Mercantile Exchange, of New York City, favoring removing of tariff on butter, cheese, and eggs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William M. Webster, Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of legislation for a 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Luke Tiernan, St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of legislation providing for the labeling and tagging of all fabrics and articles of clothing intended for sale under interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of the New York Association of Biology Teachers, favoring prohibition of importation of aigrettes, egret plumes, etc., that are not for scientific or educational purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, of Richmond, Va., favoring passage of banking and currency reform laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FREAR: Petition of sundry citizens of Hudson, Wis., against the opening of the Panama-Pacific Exposition on Sundays; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Rev. De Witt S. Clark and members of the Tabernacle Church, Salem, Mass., and William Hooper and other citizens of Manchester, Mass., favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILLETT: Petition of Bishop Thomas F. Davies and other citizens of western Massachusetts, favoring the repeal of the free-tolls portion of the Panama Canal act or the arbitration of the question at issue with the British Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Maine: Petition of William A. T. Blagden, Frank Kimball, and 580 other citizens of Maine, favoring the retaining of the present duty on shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GORMAN: Petition of Pasquade Parducci and others, of Chicago, Ill., against lowering tariff on wheels for railway and other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of Miss M. A. Magovern, of New York City, favoring exemption of life insurance conducted on the mutual plan from the income-tax section of the tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Pennsylvania Millers' State Association, Lancaster, Pa., protesting against the placing of flour on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of the Lancaster (Pa.) Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade and the members of the Cigar Makers' Union, Lancaster, Pa., protesting against the reduction of the tariff rates on tobacco and cigars from the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Lancaster Township (Pa.) Farmers' Association, protesting against the placing of Philippine tobacco and cigars on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: Petition of Victor Hutsledpt and others of De Kalb, Ill., against the dissolution of the United States Steel Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 394, against allowing free trade with the Philippine Islands in cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of Salt Lake City, Utah, favoring the passage of legislation establishing a Federal telegraph and telephone system in connection with the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Mr. B. Schmitz and 634 other citizens of the following cities in the State of California: Alvarado, Artesia, Betteravia, Castroville, Chino, Compton, Concord, Gilroy, Gonzales, Guadaloupe, Hollister, Huntington Beach, King City, Salinas, Santa Maria, Spreckels, Soledad, Lompoc, Los Alamitos, Meridian, Pleasanton, Oxnard, Moss Landing, Watsonville, and Whittier, protesting against the proposed reduction in the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the estimate submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury for the expenses of collecting revenue for the district of Los Angeles for the year 1914; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation for the further regulation of the salmon fisheries of Alaska; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petition of the Pennsylvania Millers' State Association, of Lancaster, Pa., favoring equal placing of tariff on products of grain as on grain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Lancaster Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade, of Lancaster, Pa., against bringing into the United States free of duty any tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGLEY: Petition of sundry women of the State of Kentucky, favoring the passage of legislation to prevent the importation of plumes and feathers of wild birds for millinery use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVY: Petition of the Woman's Forum, New York City, favoring the passage of legislation for the adoption of the Star Spangled Banner as our national anthem; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of sundry citizens of Minnesota, favoring legislation to force concerns selling goods entirely by mail to contribute their share to the support of the communities in which they do business; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Memorial of 120 members of the New York Association of Biology Teachers, against importation of aigrettes, egret plumes, etc., either raw or manufactured, not for scientific or educational purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: Petition of the Shoe Workers of Auburn, Me., protesting against the reduction of the tariff on boots and shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: Memorial of the Ministers' Alliance of Parkersburg, W. Va., favoring law to prevent interstate transportation of opium and cocaine except for medicinal uses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOTT: Memorial of the East Buffalo Live Stock Association of East Buffalo, N. Y., against placing of meat on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of C. C. Dennis and other citizens of Oswego, N. Y., against reduction of duty on railroad wheels, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the American manufacturers of steel shears and scissors, against reduction of the duty on steel shears and scissors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the National Association of Window Glass Manufacturers against the reduction of duty on window glass; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 12, of Oneida, N. Y., against the free admission of cigars and tobacco from the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Pennsylvania Millers' State Association, against the duty on wheat, etc., and placing flour on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of sundry citizens of Covington, Ky., favoring an amendment to the Constitution enfranchising women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of the Lancaster Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade, Lancaster, Pa., protesting against the reduction of the tariff rates with the Philippine Islands on tobacco and cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Va., favoring the passage of legislation making an immediate reform in the present banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Berg & Co., Orange Valley, N. J., protesting against the reduction of tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Hanlon & Goodman Co., New York, N. Y., protesting against the reduction of the tariff on brushes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Federal Button Co., Newark, N. J., protesting against the removal of vegetable ivory nuts from the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Webb Wire Works, New Brunswick, N. J., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on music wire; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pennsylvania Millers' State Association, Lancaster, Pa., protesting against the placing of flour on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry residents of Caldwell, N. J., favoring the passage of the legislation placing such a tariff on feathers that it will prevent the importation of plumes and feathers of wild birds for millinery use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Spice Trade Association, New York, N. Y., protesting against the placing of the same duty on ground spices as whole spices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Victor Talking Machine Co., Camden, N. J., protesting against any reduction of the tariff on phonographs, gramophones, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Spratt's Patent (American Limited, manufacturers of dog cakes, etc.), Newark, N. J., protesting against the removal of the duty on dog biscuits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Jerome B. Greenslate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Sarah P. Tranmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Memorial of the National Society of Record Associations, of Lake Park, Minn., against the free entry of live stock and dressed meats under the new tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of August May and 101 other citizens of Alvarado; L. Zerkovich, of Agenda; Jay E. Randall and 23 other citizens of Artesia; E. I. Holmes, of Berkeley; B. G. Barca and 1 other citizen of Betteravia; D. W. Potter and 3 other citizens of Blanco; W. F. Johnston and 1 other citizen of Casmalia; Waldemar T. Brazil and 7 other citizens of Castroville; Ralph C. Homan and 50 other citizens of Chino; John B. Nichols and 27 other citizens of Compton; William D. Stephens and 6 other citizens of Concord; G. W. Squire and 3 other citizens of Downey; C. D. Warner and 5 other citizens of El Monte; J. A. Muscio, of Faxon; Theo. E. Weldon and 5 other citizens of Gilroy; G. E. Patton and 5 other citizens of Gonzales; W. C. Stokes and 23 other citizens of Guadaloupe; J. A. Cushman, of Hollister; Edwin H. Wood and 4 other citizens of Huenene; L. R. Convirs and 12 other citizens of Huntington Beach; James Stimpson and 8 other citizens of Hynes; Ben Wynn and 2 other citizens of King City; G. H. Sumner and 3 other citizens of Lompoc; A. W. Knox and 2 other citizens of Long Beach; Hooker & Gardner and 13 other citizens of Los Alamitos; C. H. Pearson and 13 other citizens of Los Alamos; J. F. Davis and 1 other citizen of Los Angeles; H. L. Thornbrough and 12 other citizens of Meridian; A. M. Osio and 4 other citizens of Monterey; I. N. Clanton and 7 other citizens of Norwalk; Frank Sognorelli and 3 other citizens of Orby; W. E. Schumacher and 5 other citizens of Orcutt; Douglas Bros. and 147 other citizens of Oxnard; H. S. Ball, of Pacific Grove; Herman G. Koller and 35 other citizens of Pleasanton; S. A. Katsma, of Puente; J. T. Lund and 34 other citizens of Salinas; K. Mertig and 2 other citizens of San Francisco; J. E. Sindel and 7 other citizens of San Juan; Joe Lopez, of San Luis Obispo; A. W. Walker and 16 other citizens of Santa Ana; D. T. Perkins, of Santa Barbara; A. W. Pioda, of Santa Cruz; Frank Milehans and 22 other citizens of Santa Maria; E. F. Brown and 3 other citizens of Sargent; J. F. Doyle and 23 other citizens of Soledad; A. Miles and 2 other citizens of Spreckels; T. E. Trafton and 3 other citizens of Watsonville; Henry Moore, of Whittier; John F. Watson, of Wilmington; the L. P. Degen Belting Co. and 18 other firms of San Francisco; Kullman, Salz & Co., Benicia; the Doak Gas Engine Co. and the California Cotton Mills Co., Oakland; the Pacific Manifolding Book Co., Emeryville; and the Behrandt-Levy Co. and 2 other firms of Los Angeles, all in the State of California, protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pacific Coast Tanners' Association, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the placing of raw materials entering into the manufacture of leather on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Purity Oats Co., Keokuk, Iowa, protesting against the placing of rolled oats, oatmeal, and oat hulls on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Western Hardwood Lumber Co., Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against any great reduction of the tariff on building lumber and cabinet woods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the W. A. Plummer Manufacturing Co. and the Ames Harris Neville Co., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on jute and jute bags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of sundry citizens of Gainesville, Tex., against the change or removing the Goddess of Liberty from our coins; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. THACHER: Petition of Mayor Charles S. Ashley and other citizens of New Bedford, Mass., favoring repeal of clause in Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from payment of tolls or the arbitration of the question at issue with the British Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Federation of Socialist Clubs of Bristol County, Mass., favoring investigation of prosecution against editor and staff of the Appeal to Reason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of the Amsterdam and Schenectady (N. Y.) Savings Bank, against taxing of such institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *April 22, 1913.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, our Father in heaven, for the spirit which came into the world nineteen hundred years ago, heralded by the angelic host, praising God and saying, "Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace, good will toward men;" that the chorus has been growing in volume and intensity down through the ages; that God lives and reigns in the hearts of men to-day with greater potency than ever before in the history of the world; that love is in the ascendancy and truth is marching on. Grant, O most merciful Father, that it may so continue until the Christ spirit shall possess all hearts; that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done in earth as it is done in heaven, to the glory and honor of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. ANSBERRY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

THE TARIFF.

By direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. UNDERWOOD reported back, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report (No. 5), referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present the views of the minority on that bill and ask that they be printed with the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] presents the views of the minority and asks unanimous consent that they be printed with the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file other minority views within four days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to file within four days other minority views. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there may be an additional number of the report on this bill printed to the cost of $500, which I believe is the limitation on the printing, and that 500 of the copies may go to the Committee on Ways and Means, the remainder to go to Members through the folding room.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama intend to embrace within that request the two minority views?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will ask if that request will include the printing of the views of the minority with the report?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It will, because the views of the minority as presented by the gentleman will go in as a part of the report.

Mr. LANGLEY. That will not include the minority views to be filed later by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK]?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; the gentleman from Kansas, when he presents his views, will have to make his own request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that a number of copies of the majority report, together with the minority views filed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], not to exceed $500 in cost, be printed.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Would it be practicable for us to include our minority views with the majority report and the other minority views?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think so, because the House expects to take up this bill to-morrow morning.

Mr. MURDOCK. And it is to be immediately printed?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We desire to have it printed at once.

Mr. MURDOCK. It will go to the printer to-day?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It will go to the printer now. In fact, the printer already has a copy.

The SPEAKER. Let the Chair understand the situation. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Kansas to give his attention. If the gentleman's views are filed in time to be printed with the report and views of the minority filed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], then they will be printed with the report. Is that the understanding?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, that is impossible. This will go to the printer within an hour and the gentleman desires four days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire now to submit another request for unanimous consent. On yesterday the House ordered printed 10,000 copies of the tariff bill. The printer has informed me that he was able to print only 5,400 of them under the limitation of cost prescribed in the law. In order that the House may have the full number that was ordered yesterday, I ask unanimous consent that there may be an additional 4,500 copies of the bill, H. R. 3321, printed, to be distributed as ordered yesterday.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to suggest to the gentleman may he not find he will have the same trouble about the report under the $500 limit to which he has just referred, that it will not give enough reports?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I will have to ask another order. I will either have to do that or get a concurrent resolution through the two Houses, and I thought this was the easiest way to accomplish it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Why does not the gentleman do that now?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not make two orders the same day.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. That is of the bill as reported now. Make it 5,000 copies of the bill as reported.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will amend it in that respect. I ask unanimous consent that the motion may be 5,000 copies of the bill as reported be now printed, to be distributed in accordance with the order made yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that 5,000 copies of the tariff bill be printed under the conditions made yesterday.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman will have to make conditions now, because there will be a new order against the printer. Does the gentleman desire now those 5,000 copies to go to the folding room?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I said in accordance with the order of yesterday, that 2,000 copies of the print go to the committee and 2,000 to the document room and the balance to the folding room.

Mr. MANN. That is just the point. There will be two different prints, slightly different, one of the bill as reported and one as introduced.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have arranged already with the Public Printer; he will print this as the reported bill on the order of yesterday. I thought there would be no objection.

Mr. HAMMOND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. HAMMOND. How many of these reports will go to the folding room?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They will all go to the folding room except 500 copies to the committee.

Mr. HAMMOND. And will be there apportioned among the Members?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. There ought to be some extra number go to the document room, because they are constantly having requests for them.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will modify my request, Mr. Speaker, that 500 copies of the report go to the committee, 500 to the document room, and the balance to the folding room, to be distributed to the Members.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that 5,000 copies of the bill be printed, that 500 copies go to the Committee on Ways and Means——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think that order has been agreed to. The request I make is in reference to the report and it is that it may be printed, and that $500 be the limit of cost and that 500 copies of the report may go to the committee.

Mr. MANN. The printing of the report was agreed to. The gentleman asked for 5,000 copies of the reported bill to be printed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thought that had been agreed to.

Mr. MANN. It has not.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not believe it was ever agreed to; but, if so, it will not hurt to agree to it again. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to print 5,000 copies of the tariff bill, 500 copies to go to the Committee on Ways and Means, 500 to the document room, and the rest to the folding room. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I believe the order in reference to the printing of the report has been already agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it has.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Alabama takes his seat I would like to ask a question. I understand he intends to call up this bill to-morrow. I will ask him if he has any suggestion to make now as to the length of general debate or order of it?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I would be glad if the gentleman has a suggestion to agree on the time of debate now if he wishes to do so.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I simply wanted to get at the mind of the gentleman from Alabama on the subject more than anything else.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the gentleman that I would like to start to-morrow morning with the consideration of the bill under general debate and let the debate run, say, five days, having night sessions, and at the end of that time to close general debate and take up the reading of the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Has the gentleman any suggestion to make as to the division of the time, whether it is to be controlled by members of the committee or whether it is to be controlled by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union? I have no special preference for either proposition.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would prefer that the Chairman would control the time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, my recollection of the practice is that before the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, unanimous consent is asked for an arrangement of time between the two opposing sides. That is the general practice, is it not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. If unanimous consent is refused, then when the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, it is within the province of the Chair to recognize anyone whom he pleases?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is.

Mr. MURDOCK. For an hour's time in each instance. Is that the case?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. With certain limitations.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman desires to do so, I will ask unanimous consent that debate on this bill shall be limited to five legislative days, commencing to-morrow.

Mr. MURDOCK. Now, Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know if I could make an arrangement with the majority leader and with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], of the minority, as to what time I am to have?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole controls the time. He will divide it as customary, and divide it between the two sides of the House. I have no doubt that he will recognize the gentleman from Kansas and his party for their fair share of the minority time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is about 5 per cent.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman will permit, in the division of that time it is about 1 to 7, and so the time allowed to the gentleman and his friends should not be more than that proportion.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that should be an inflexible rule.

Mr. LANGLEY. That is assuming they are of equal weight.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not think that should be the rule as to allotment of time for general debate in the House. There has been a lot of latitude based on the demand for time. It may be, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], we may not need all the time he allots to us, but I do not think it fair to put it on a mathematical basis.

Mr. FORDNEY. I think it would. There are about 140 Members on this side of the House——

Mr. PAYNE. I understand the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] proposes to leave the recognition entirely with the Chairman and not divide the time, so that I think this discussion is rather premature, and I do not see the object of limiting the debate just now.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no particular desire to limit the debate now, because I recognize the fact that when the bill has been considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, it is in the power of the House to close debate any time it desires to do so. I will say that my purpose is to let the debate run about five days.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. MANN. The Republican Members of the House desire to have a conference in the Hall of the House on Thursday evening, and in any arrangement that is made, by rule or otherwise, on the subject, I hope that will be taken into consideration.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that I am always glad to accommodate the minority in any way we can. As I wish to close this debate, and wish to have, generally, night sessions from now on until the close of the time, I hope the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will find it convenient to arrange a different time for that meeting.

Mr. MANN. There is no way of arranging for a different time for the meeting if the House is to be in session from 12 o'clock noon every day. We can not very well have a conference before 12 o'clock. We have not made any complaint about the delay in the consideration of this bill in the Democratic caucus, and I think the gentleman will desire, in fairness to the minority, to permit them to have the use of the Hall of the House on Thursday evening without subjecting them to be in attendance in the House that night. I would suggest to the gentleman to give a little longer time for debate, leaving out that night. I hope the gentleman will agree as to a division of time, and I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] ought to be able to agree between themselves as to the control of the time on the minority side.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that, of course, it is customary in the House to divide the time equally between the minority and the majority.

Mr. MANN. I understand that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And I am not complaining about that. Of course, the minority in this House has only one-third of the membership—that is, both minorities put together—and therefore two-thirds of the House will only have half of the time. Now, as to the division of the time that goes to the minority, which will probably be half of all the time, I think the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Kansas ought to work out their own division.

Mr. MANN. I think they ought to be able to agree.

Mr. MURDOCK. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] I will be glad to agree, for this reason: I think if you put this proposition in the hands of the presiding officer, that when he recognizes a man in the Committee of the Whole he will recognize him for an hour. That is liable to let a few men monopolize this debate, because the natural tendency of a man in making a tariff speech is to extend his remarks.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the gentleman that the Chair has always controlled the time in that respect in the past.

Mr. MURDOCK. Can he recognize a man for less than an hour?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think so.

Mr. MURDOCK. I will be glad to arrange with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] as to a division of time.

Mr. MANN. That can be arranged to-morrow morning.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then I suggest that the matter go over until to-morrow morning.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am perfectly willing that it should go over until to-morrow morning, but I would like to close the debate in five days, with night sessions. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], Would it be convenient for him to have his caucus on Wednesday, instead of Thursday, or does he desire to have it on Thursday?

Mr. MANN. I think it would not be convenient.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If it is desired, we can take a recess until half past 7 on that day. Now, Mr. Speaker, we can determine about the time to-morrow morning. I ask unanimous consent that the daily hour of meeting of the House shall be changed from 12 o'clock noon to 11 o'clock a. m. until otherwise ordered by the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the hour of meeting of the House be changed from 12 o'clock noon to 11 o'clock a. m. until otherwise ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is it the purpose of the gentleman, in holding night sessions, to hold them late, or not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not determine that until we get into it.

Mr. MURDOCK. That means, under the gentleman's request, that we shall meet at 11 o'clock and continue in session until 5 o'clock, and then begin a night session at 8 o'clock?

Mr. MANN. Let it run from 11 to 11. We have nothing else to do. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the country expects us to pass this bill as speedily as we can, in justice to the membership of this House. There are no other committees appointed, and no other work to do, and I see no reason why we should not start at 11 o'clock in the morning and run until a reasonable hour at night. The will of the House can determine that.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman modify that request and instead of commencing at 11 o'clock to-morrow make it begin on Thursday?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], I will ask unanimous consent that after to-morrow the daily hour of meeting shall be 11 o'clock a. m. instead of 12 o'clock noon until otherwise ordered by the House; that is, commencing Thursday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that after to-morrow the hour of meeting of the House be 11 o'clock a. m. instead of 12 o'clock m. until further ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has an official communication from the proper authorities of the State of South Dakota, announcing the ratification of the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution, with respect to the election of United States Senators by popular vote, and will place it among the archives of the House.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. When the House adjourned yesterday the previous question had been ordered upon the bill making appro-

priations for sundry civil expenses of the Government, of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2441) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill be recommitted, with instructions to report it back forthwith to the House, omitting the language on page 129 beginning with the word "Provided," on line 13, to the bottom of the page.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. GILLETT. I move to recommit, with instructions to the committee to report the bill back forthwith, amended by striking out all of page 129 after the figures "$300,000," constituting the proviso.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the matter that is proposed to be stricken out.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, however, That no part of this money shall be spent in the prosecution of any organization or individual for entering into any combination or agreement having in view the increasing of wages, shortening of hours or bettering the conditions of labor, or for any act done in furtherance thereof, not in itself unlawful: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the prosecution of producers of farm products and associations of farmers who cooperate and organize in an effort to and for the purpose to obtain and maintain a fair and reasonable price for their products.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the previous question.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] demands the previous question.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARTLETT. In case this motion should prevail and there were instructions to the Committee on Appropriations to report forthwith an amendment striking out this provision, how could that be accomplished when there is no Committee on Appropriations in existence?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] was to recommit this bill to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, which exists, with directions to that committee to report it back.

Mr. BARTLETT. But that was not his motion as I understood it.

Mr. MANN. He did not so state, but that is the only committee to which it could be referred.

Mr. BARTLETT. The parliamentary inquiry was made for the purpose of determining that, to know how we would be situated if this motion should prevail.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has relieved the Speaker of the duty of stating the case. Of course this came from the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No, Mr. Speaker, it did not.

The SPEAKER. Practically it did.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Practically not, because there was no Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to make the report of it.

The SPEAKER. This bill was considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, and if this motion should prevail, the Chair would make this report, because that is the only way out of it.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I purposely omitted mentioning any committee. I simply followed the exact language of the rule.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman did not mention the committee, the Chair will rule his motion out of order.

Mr. GILLETT. Then, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make another motion. I omitted it for that express purpose, so that if the point should be raised it might be decided. Now, if the Speaker rules my motion out of order I wish to make another motion.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not make any point of order. I made a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not going to rule on a point of order that is not made.

Mr. BARTLETT. All I wanted was information.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on this motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and pending the announcement of the result,

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. To request the yeas and nays on this motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] demands the yeas and nays. All those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Thirteen Members, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks for a division.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. On what motion?

The SPEAKER. On the motion to recommit.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 47, noes 198.

Accordingly the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question being taken, the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Indian appropriation bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 1917) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914.

The SPEAKER. On this bill there are 40 minutes' debate under the rule adopted yesterday, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman agreed upon a division of time?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. We have not. I suppose there will be 20 minutes on a side, under the rule.

Mr. MANN. Will not the gentleman from Texas yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE]?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Certainly; I will yield to him the control of the time on that side, and if the gentleman desires to make a statement first, I have no objection.

Mr. MANN. You yield him 20 minutes' time?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I yield him 20 minutes' time. I reserve my time. Does the gentleman from South Dakota desire to use a part of his time now? If not, I will make a general statement.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I would prefer that the gentleman from Texas make his statement now.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration is the annual Indian appropriation bill. It is for the purpose of paying the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with the various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914.

Last year we had extensive hearings before the Committee on Indian Affairs on the bill, and those hearings are in print and are in the room of the Committee on Indian Affairs of this House. When the bill passed the House it carried appropriations aggregating $8,262,000 in round numbers. The Senate, after consideration of the bill, added $5,488,594 to the House appropriations, making the bill as it passed the Senate total $13,750,594. That increase was covered by 131 Senate amendments. The conference committee of the two Houses on the bill reduced that amount by $3,672,317, leaving the bill so that it carried one million and a few hundred thousand dollars above the amount that the bill carried when it passed the House.

The bill agreed upon in conference and reported back to the two Houses amounted to $10,079,205. This is the exact amount carried in this bill.

The conference report, under the rules, should first have been approved by the Senate. The bill had passed the House, and every item in it had been well considered and was satisfactory to the House. The Senate added, as I have stated, over $5,000,000, and in conference we cut nearly four millions of that amount from the bill. The Senate refused to agree to the conference report of the two Houses on the bill. There was in the bill an appropriation of $100,000 for the purpose of removing from Oklahoma to New Mexico the Apache Band of Indians, known as the Geronimo Band, that went on the war-

path more than 25 years ago. These Indians were captured by the Army and held as prisoners at Fort Sill, Okla.

Two years ago Congress passed a bill providing that they should be released as prisoners of war and removed to the reservation from which they came in New Mexico, and Congress provided that if they should not desire to return to New Mexico that Congress should buy land for them in Oklahoma. This bill carried a provision for $100,000 for the purpose of purchasing this land in Oklahoma for those that remained in that State. One of the Senators from the State of New Mexico, taking advantage of the fact that there was no closure rule in that body, in the common parlance of the two Houses, talked our bill to death. It failed to pass for that alleged reason only.

This is the identical bill that I have presented here to-day, and it contains the same items and is based upon the mass of facts that we procured after extensive hearings, as I have already stated to the House.

The Committee on Rules has reported this bill to this House in the same terms and amounts that were agreed upon by the conference committee of the two Houses. The only objection urged to the bill in the Senate was the objection to the return of the Apache Indians to New Mexico. I understand that most of these Indians have been already transferred to New Mexico, and hence there is no reason for expending all of the $100,000 in Oklahoma, but the unexpended balance will be turned back into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will.

Mr. COOPER. Was not there a similar bill which contained a provision for the sale of the Hot Springs National Park in Oklahoma?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That item was eliminated and is not in this bill. It was in the sundry civil bill and not in this bill. I know it is not in this bill at the present time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, unless some gentleman desires to ask a question, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary to take up the time of the House in discussing this bill. As stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS], who was the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs when this bill was considered, the bill was carefully considered and prepared in the last session of the last Congress, passed the Senate, went to conference, and the conferees agreed upon the bill in the form in which it is now before the House; and while there may be some provisions in the bill that personally I would like to see changed, it was my opinion, under the circumstances, that it would be very much better for the bill to be introduced in the form in which it was agreed to in conference and passed, rather than to attempt any amendments. Therefore I hope the bill will pass.

I yield half a minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. I. NOLAN].

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD a copy of a resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of the city of San Francisco upon the subject of Government ownership of telegraph and telephone companies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution is as follows:

FEDERAL TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH SYSTEM.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, CLERK'S OFFICE,
April 15, 1913.

Hon. JOHN I. NOLAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your attention is respectfully called to the attached resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco.

Yours, very truly,

J. S. DUNNIGAN, *Clerk.*

Federal telephone and telegraph system. On motion of Supervisor Vogelsang: Resolution No. 10114 (new series), as follows:

Whereas the telegraph and telephone are daily becoming more necessary to the comfort and convenience of all the people; and

Whereas in its original grant of franchise to the Western Union Telegraph Co. the Government of the United States reserved the right to acquire the same; and

Whereas Government ownership and control of the means of transmission of electric messages and communications is as logical and necessary as its monopoly of transmission of written or printed matter: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, That in the judgment of this board the present is the time for the acquisition of these utilities by the Government of the United States and that the Congress be urged to take such steps as may be necessary for the acquisition and establishment of a Federal telegraph and telephone system, rendering a local intrastate and interstate postal service. Be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of this board transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from California.

Adopted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, April 14, 1913.

Ayes: Supervisors Bancroft, Caglieri, A. J. Gallagher, G. E. Gallagher, Giannini, Hayden, Hilmer, Hocks, Jennings, Koshland, Mauzy, McCarthy, McLeran, Murdock, Murphy, Nolan, Payot, Vogelsang.

Approved, San Francisco, April 15, 1913.

J. S. DUNNIGAN, *Clerk.*
JAMES ROLPH, Jr., *Mayor.*

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House was very carefully considered by the last Congress, and I think that in the main its provisions are wise and proper. I think it is unfortunate that the new Members of the House have not had an opportunity to examine the bill and to offer amendments to it; but inasmuch as that is not possible under the rule that has been adopted, I am glad to give my assurance—whatever weight that may have—that the bill did have careful consideration, was carefully drafted, and in the main it is a very satisfactory Indian bill.

I take advantage of the opportunity offered me, Mr. Speaker, to ask permission to insert in the RECORD two memorials adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, recently in session, addressed to Congress, one relating to the administration of the land laws generally and particularly to the activities of special agents, and another relating to the administration of the laws relative to the repayment of moneys paid on land proofs and entries. Following the first of those petitions, I desire to insert an editorial from the Washington Post under the caption "Wyoming's protest," and, following the second resolution, another editorial from the same paper under the title "Bureaucracy hard hit."

These resolutions of the Wyoming Legislature recite briefly some of the grievances of western communities relative to certain policies which have been pursued by the Interior Department in relation to the public lands. We out there are still of the opinion that the Interior Department ought to be bound by the law; that it ought to follow the law; that it is the duty of the administrative officers of that department to give to American citizens seeking locations on the public lands, seeking to use and acquire the public lands, the rights and privileges that Congress has in its wisdom granted them. We believe that in the past the administration of the land laws has not in all instances been in accordance with the letter or the spirit of the statutes. We believe men have been denied rights which the law gives them. We believe that there has been a policy prevalent in the department which has been held to be superior to the statutes. All we ask is that the Interior Department in administering the land laws shall administer them according to their spirit and intent, granting no more than the law contemplates, withholding nothing that the law grants.

This Democratic administration has a splendid opportunity through its Secretary of the Interior to increase the respect, or rather to win back the respect, of the western people for the administration of the law so far as it relates to public land.

Mr. Speaker, I for one will be entirely free and frank in giving the administration credit if it shall attempt to administer the laws according to their letter, spirit, and intent, rather than in accordance with a theory contrary thereto, and I shall be quite as free as I have been in the past to criticize if in the administration of the land laws those who are seeking homes on the public domain, those who are endeavoring to develop the resources of that western land, are discouraged, hampered, and thwarted in their efforts to exercise the rights and privileges which the laws grant.

The memorial of the Legislature of Wyoming, relative to the administration of the public-land laws, is as follows:

TWELFTH LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WYOMING.

Enrolled joint memorial 1, House of Representatives, State of Wyoming.

Memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States relative to the administration of the public land laws:

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows:

Whereas the State of Wyoming has been and is being discriminated against by the unjustifiable rulings of the Department of the Interior in the administration of the land laws; and

Whereas the Department of the Interior has particularly discriminated against this State in the rulings it has made concerning irrigation projects under the Carey Act, thereby retarding the development of the State; and

Whereas the major portion of the special agents of the department are men from the extreme East and not familiar with conditions in the West; and

Whereas these same special agents act more as persecutors of settlers than prosecutors of fraudulent entries; and

Whereas the rules and regulations laid down by the Forestry Department have become so burdensome and costly that it has and is forcing men and companies out of business and depriving many of our local men of employment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we protest against the administration of the land laws which prevents the irrigation, reclamation, and settlement of our public lands.

That we favor an enlarged and additional homestead law.

That, if we must have special agents, that they be western men, familiar with conditions.

That we demand that the regulations relative to the cutting of timber for local use be altered so that residents may secure timber and lumber at reasonable instead of prohibitive prices.

The editorial of the Washington Post to which I have referred is as follows:

WYOMING'S PROTEST.

The joint resolution from the Wyoming Legislature, demanding relief from arbitrary and unfair enforcement of the land laws by special agents of the Interior Department, and presented to the United States Senate, will appeal to the conservationists as an outcropping of an old heresy.

It is a curious thing about the so-called conservationists that violations of law mean little to them when done in the name of conservation.

There is only one way to enforce any law, and that is with equal justice to all. But this kind of justice, if extended to the citizens of Alaska, who are now paying $14 a ton for coal from Canada when they might be mining their own, or to the prospectors of the West, or the manufacturers of the South who want water power, would provoke from the conservationists an expression of deep resentment.

Yet, why should not the laws of the land be regarded by the conservationists as well as by other citizens? Why should capital be deprived of the right of investing in American enterprises in the South, in Wyoming, or in Alaska? Why should a fetich created by a few fanatics be permitted to halt the development of the United States?

The States have never deeded to the Federal Government their control of streams within their borders. The riparian owners have not deeded their rights to the Secretary of War. The Wyoming Legislature vigorously protests against the unjust enforcement of arbitrary rules of the Interior Department, and asks Congress to see to it that the servants of the public do not put themselves up as masters.

The law should be obeyed by all citizens, even including the officers of the United States Government. The natural resources of the country should be conserved, but so should the laws. President-elect Wilson will show his common sense if he insists on the enforcement of the conservation laws so that the interests of the people, rather than the conceit of a few censors, shall be conserved.

The other resolution to which I have referred is as follows:

TWELFTH LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WYOMING.

Enrolled joint resolution 3, House of Representatives, State of Wyoming.

A joint resolution relating to the refunding of certain moneys now lying in the Treasury of the United States, being paid therein by certain citizens of the United States in attempting to make final proofs on the public domain, and memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass such legislation as may be necessary for the refunding of these moneys to those who have so paid them into the Treasury of the United States and thereby relieving the distress caused to certain citizens of the United States by both denying patent on public lands for different causes and then retaining the money paid, as provided by law, preliminary to perfecting such proofs.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

Whereas certain citizens of the United States have filed on portions of the public domain, pursuant to the several acts of the Congress of the United States providing for the filing on and for the making of final proof and the securing of patent on the said public domain of the United States, so set apart for such purposes; and

Whereas these citizens, in attempting to make final proof, previous to perfecting patents on the public domain filed on under the several acts of Congress providing for the securing of patents on the public domain, to wit: Under the homestead act, the stone and timber act, the desert-land act and the coal-land act have been unsuccessful and for one cause or another have been denied patent; and

Whereas these citizens have paid different sums of money into the Treasury of the United States, previous to their attempts to make final proofs, as provided by the acts of the Congress of the United States, and which proofs were unsuccessful and patents were denied; and

Whereas these moneys have never been refunded to the citizens who have so paid them into the Treasury of the United States previous to their unsuccessful attempts to make final proofs; and

Whereas both the failure to secure title to the lands on which these attempts to make final proofs were made, and the loss of the moneys so paid into the Treasury of the United States have wrought untold hardship and loss to these citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, memorialized and requested to enact such legislation as may be necessary for the refunding of these moneys so paid into the Treasury of the United States to the citizens so paying them in and thus relieve the hardship and loss which the withholding of these moneys is causing these citizens; be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies of this memorial and request be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Secretary of the Interior, asking their aid in bringing the object of this memorial and request before Congress and in securing from same adequate legislation for the purpose herein set forth; and be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies of this memorial and request be sent to the Senators from Wyoming in the Congress of the United States, viz, Hon. CLARENCE D. CLARK and FRANCIS E. WARREN, and our Representative in said Congress, Hon. FRANK W. MONDELL, asking them to use their best efforts to secure a favorable action upon the request embodied herein.

Repeated protests that the present practice of the Interior Department in the matter of repayment having failed to secure favorable action on various applications for repayments, I recently introduced a resolution of inquiry relative to the present status of such applications, as follows:

Resolution.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby requested to furnish the House of Representatives a list of all applications for payment of money paid on public-land applications, selections, entries, and proofs which have been pending in the Interior Department over three months, with character of application, selection, entry, or proof, name of land district, of applicant, and amount involved.

The following editorial from the Washington Post of recent date, while it does not bear directly on the matters referred to, does point out the evils which lie at the bottom of most of the troubles which those who dare the hardships of the frontier to establish homes and develop resources encounter in their dealings with the Interior Department, to wit, the policy of following what the bureaus hold should be the law rather than the law itself. It may seem strange beyond belief to some people that under our form of government it is necessary to appeal to the bureaus whose duty it is to administer the laws to grant our citizens the rights and opportunities the law contemplates they shall have, yet such is the case. The Post editorial is as follows:

BUREAUCRACY HARD HIT.

The verdict of acquittal in the Alaska coal lands conspiracy case is not only "a most extraordinary victory for counsel for the defense," so characterized by Judge Kenesaw M. Landis from the bench, but it is a famous victory for popular rights and sound public policy over bureaucratic methods of government. The result of the trial breaks the grip of conservation run mad and comes at a most opportune time for the new administration, affording, as it does, a splendid opening for the party in power to show its hand in conformity with the plank in the Baltimore platform promising a return to a more rational and businesslike policy in exercising authority over the public domain. Here is a great chance for Democracy to demonstrate its readiness to employ the implements of construction as well as the pruning knife. The verdict nullifies the pretext for withdrawing the Alaskan coal fields from entry, but the formal order which closed the door of opportunity continues in force. And back of that formal order, which of itself offers no stumbling block to reform, are the intrenched forces of bureaucracy, occupying a vantage ground from which they have for years successfully operated—thwarting the efforts of Congress to liberalize the land laws on one side, and on the other exercising legislative, executive, and judicial powers of their own contriving, with the disguised but settled purpose to make the path of the homesteader and prospector too thorny to travel.

This monopoly of defiance and oppression in restraint of human rights and national development has been kept in office by pressure of misdirected public sentiment and executive tolerance. Thus fortified, these promoters of bureaucracy have made and unmade cabinets, written party platforms, packed juries, suborned witnesses, falsified the records—all in the name of conservation. To-day, however, the truth is known. The revelations of the past year have opened the eyes of the people, cost the clique the support of the press, and kicked some props from under their last stronghold. As a finishing blow to the sinister policy that has worked so evilly in Alaska and 10 Northwestern States, perhaps the course of action urged by the Portland Oregonian offers the best suggestion. "In order that justice be done," remarks the Oregonian, the service "should be overhauled, its entire practice revised, and the men who, through long habit are mentally incapable of dealing out justice should be displaced. We look to President Wilson and Secretary Lane to initiate these reforms and put an end to the arbitrary star-chamber methods which now prevail."

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to discuss this matter further, and unless there is some gentleman on this side who desires some time I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call for the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill.

During the reading of the bill,

The SPEAKER. At the bottom of page 39, in the last line, line 25, the word "who" ought to be "whose."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be changed accordingly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to change the word "who" to the word "whose" in line 25, page 39. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RODDENBERY, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. L'ENGLE, for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to ask unanimous consent to have a resolution which I introduced—resolution No. 40—changed from the Committee on Agriculture, there being no such committee, to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. What is the resolution about?

Mr. FOWLER. The resolution is only a resolution of inquiry.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the resolution?

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I will state to the gentleman if it is a resolution of inquiry he can call it up, notwithstanding the fact that there is no committee appointed.

Mr. FOWLER. The resolution requests the Secretary of Agriculture to give certain information relative to the Weather Bureau. It goes no further than to ask or request information.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Agriculture from the consideration of the resolution named and refer it to the Committee on Rules. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON TARIFF BILL.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the record does not show that the request I made this morning about the printing of the report on the tariff bill had been agreed to. I want to renew the request—that is, that there may be a number of copies of the report printed, up to the $500 limitation of law; that 500 copies of that report shall go to the Ways and Means Committee, 500 to the document room, and the balance to be distributed to Members through the folding room.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that there shall be printed a number of copies of the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, together with the report of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] setting forth the views of the minority, not to exceed the cost of $500; 500 copies to go to the Committee on Ways and Means, 500 to the document room, and the rest to the folding room.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the House how many copies can be printed for $500?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not, because I do not know. I do not think there will be as many as the House needs, and I will have to ask a little later on, perhaps to-morrow or the next day, for an additional number.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman thinks there will be a sufficient number for the Members to have at least one?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, yes.

Mr. MANN. This request is for a number in addition to the usual number?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HULINGS. I rise for the purpose of inquiring whether the motion of the gentleman from Alabama comprehends the printing of the minority report to be presented by the Progressive Party?

The SPEAKER. That can not be done to-morrow, because the report will not be ready to-morrow.

Mr. HULINGS. Well, when it is done.

The SPEAKER. There will be no trouble about that.

Mr. MANN. It will be printed as a matter of course when it is presented.

The SPEAKER. There will be no trouble about that. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that there shall be printed a number of copies of the report filed by himself for the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, together with the report filed by Mr. PAYNE, of New York, for a portion of the minority, not to exceed $500 in cost; 500 of those reports to go to the Committee on Ways and Means, 500 to the document room, and the rest to the folding room. Is there objection.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LAFFERTY. Reserving the right to object—to ask if the gentleman from Alabama will amend his request to include the report of Mr. MURDOCK if filed to-day?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request. I have made it plain to the membership of the House in answer to the question several times——

Mr. LAFFERTY. This report will probably be filed to-day, and if filed to-day, is there any objection to its being printed?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all.

Mr. MANN. If filed to-day, it will go, necessarily, with the report.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no possibility of its being filed to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LAFFERTY. I object.

The SPEAKER. The agreement is that it be filed to-day.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Very well; I do not object.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman just stated that he did.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 23, 1913, at 12 o'clock m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. UNDERWOOD, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 3890) to provide a site and erect a public building thereon at Clinton, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3891) to provide a site and erect a public building thereon at Lafollette, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3892) to provide a site and erect a public building thereon at Lenoir City, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3893) to provide a site and erect a public building thereon at Rockwood, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 3894) amending section 1 of the act of June 19, 1912, limiting the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 3895) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant two coal leases of 960 acres each on the unleased segregated mineral lands of the Choctaw Nation in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3896) providing for a reappraisement of the addition to the town site of Wilburton, Okla.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 3897) to amend the act of June 30, 1906, wherein $3,000,000 was permanently set aside yearly to defray the expenses of the Bureau of Animal Industry in the inspection of cattle, sheep, swine, and goats; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3898) to change the name of oleomargarine to margarin; to change the rate of tax on margarin; to protect the consumers, dealers, and manufacturers of margarin against fraud; and to afford the Bureau of Internal Revenue more efficient means for the detection of fraud and the collection of revenues; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3899) to amend the food and drugs act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3900) for the extension of H Street east of Fifteenth Street to Twentieth Street NE.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3901) for the extension of Maryland Avenue east of Fifteenth Street to M Street NE.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3902) to fix the requirements governing the receipt, transmission, delivery, and preservation of messages of interstate telegraph and telephone companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3903) to amend section 715 of the Revised Statutes as amended by act of Congress of March 3, 1905; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3904) amending section 1608 f of the act of Congress entitled "An act to amend chapter 55 of an act entitled 'An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia,'" approved February 23, 1905; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3905) appropriating $5,000 for the improvement of that portion of National Avenue, village of West Milwaukee, Milwaukee County, Wis., abutting the grounds of the Northwestern Branch National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3906) to amend the present method of collecting garbage, ashes, and other refuse in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3907) to fix the price of gas in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3908) to increase the pensions of the blind who served in the War with Mexico, the Civil War, and the War with Spain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVY: A bill (H. R. 3909) to provide for the investigation of combinations, monopolies, trusts, and mergers and to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 3910) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 3911) providing for the retirement of noncommissioned officers, petty officers, and enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps and for the efficiency of the enlisted personnel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALLIN: A bill (H. R. 3912) providing for interchangeable mileage books or tickets on all railroads within the provisions of the interstate-commerce act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHARP: A bill (H. R. 3913) to authorize a competitive test of aeroplanes of domestic manufacture and award prizes therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 3914) to provide a site and erect a public building thereon at Jefferson City, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3915) to further amend an act approved August 13, 1894, entitled "An act for the protection of persons furnishing materials and labor for the construction of public works," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 3916) providing for the regulation, identification, and registration of all vehicles of the air and the licensing of the operators thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 3917) regulating the compensation of stationary firemen employed in Federal Government buildings in the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings.

By Mr. MOORE: A bill (H. R. 3918) appropriating $30,000 for high-explosive shop for Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, and $11,350 for dredging Frankford Creek; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 3919) to reduce the mileage of Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from Territories, and Resident Commissioners; to the Committee on Mileage.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Resolution (H. Res. 64) directing the Speaker to appoint a special committee of seven members to inquire into and investigate the operations and practices of the Baseball Trust; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 71) proposing an amendment to the Constitution for the election of Representatives for a four-year instead of a two-year term; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. HAYES: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 6) prescribing a new form for the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS: Memorial of the Legislature of Massachusetts, relative to the sale by the United States of a certain tract of land in the city of Chelsea; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Massachusetts, relative to the cost of coal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KINDEL: Memorial of the Legislature of Colorado, urging the establishment of a Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GRIEST: Memorial of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania, requesting legislation to reimburse Mrs. Elizabeth Clancy and Mrs. Anna McCalgon for loss sustained through death of their husbands while in the employ of the United States Government; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, memorial of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania, urging the appropriation of funds for the construction of certain buildings in the Frankford Arsenal at Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 3920) for the relief of William E. Murray; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 3921) granting a pension to Mary Binder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3922) granting a pension to Mitchell Fritts; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3923) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Henshaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3924) granting an increase of pension to Jane Coleman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 3925) granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Click; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3926) granting a pension to Eldora G. Sangston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 3927) to correct the military record of Charles Mace; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 3928) for the relief of Edward S. Carr; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 3929) granting a pension to James Gleason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3930) to correct the military record of John Banks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 3931) to remove the charge of desertion standing against George W. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3932) to carry out the findings of the United States Court of Claims in case of William S. McGowen, formerly lieutenant, Twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 3933) granting a pension to Parnie H. Dean; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 3934) for the relief of Anton H. Burg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 3935) granting an increase of pension to George G. De Wolf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELGESEN: A bill (H. R. 3936) for the relief of Ethel M. Young; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 3937) for the relief of the administrator and heirs of Fritz Contzen, to permit the prosecution of an Indian depredation claim; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 3938) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Jacob Doxtater; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 3939) granting an increase of pension to Winfield S. Mattern; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 3940) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel B. Champlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3941) granting an increase of pension to George W. Shreckengaust; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3942) granting an increase of pension to Charles Harmon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3943) granting an increase of pension to John Cotner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3944) granting an increase of pension to William R. Heffelfinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 3945) granting an increase of pension to Jacob T. Crosby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 3946) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 3947) granting an increase of pension to Thomas N. Moody; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3948) granting an increase of pension to James R. Barrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3949) for the relief of Felix Morgan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3950) for the relief of Joseph P. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3951) to correct the military record of William M. Cheuvrout; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 3952) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Tunnison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3953) waiving the age limit for admission to the Pay Corps of the United States Navy in the case of Harry Lincoln Miller; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 3954) for the relief of William E. Horton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 3955) to correct the military record of Martin Fay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 3956) granting an increase of pension to Gertrude Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3957) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hollister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3958) for the relief of the survivors of McLean's Pennsylvania regiment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 3959) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 3960) to correct the lineal and relative rank of First Lieut. Thomas J. Leary, Medical Corps, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARTER: Petition of sundry citizens of Tishomingo, Okla., favoring a law to cause concerns selling goods direct to consumers by mail to contribute their portion of funds in the development of the local community; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Marietta Tweedy, Edith Gifford, Emilie L. Hansen, and E. W. Hoffmann, of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the clause in the tariff bill prohibiting the importation of plumages of wild birds for trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Board of Trade of New York, N. Y., against any increase in the value of articles purchased abroad that Americans may bring into the United States free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the F. Mayer Boot & Shoe Co., Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the reduction of the tariff on boots and shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Committee of Wholesale Grocers, New York, favoring the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Bemis Bros. Bag Co. and others, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of legislation placing a differential duty on burlap cloth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the board of managers, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, La Crosse, Wis., protesting against the passage of the proposed legislation to reduce the members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the customs guards at the port of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the proposed reduction of the salaries of the customs guards at the port of San Francisco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the reduction of the wages of the employees of the customs service as contemplated in the reorganization of the customs service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Fulton County Glove Workers' Union, Gloversville, N. Y., protesting against the reduction of the tariff on gloves; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., by D. W. Carmichael, chairman, and S. Glen Andrus, secretary; the Sacramento Valley Development Association, by O. H. Miller, secretary; and J. E. Ayer and 1,000 other citizens of California, protesting against the reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of Baer Bros., of New York City, against the reduction of the tariff on bronze powders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Benjamin P. Waldmay, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the reduction of the tariff on vegetable ivory buttons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of James W. Henderson, John B. Brady, Nathan Prensky, John B. Hahn, G. D. Wright, and John G. Kirchner, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring an amendment to the income-tax section of the tariff bill exempting life insurance companies conducted on the mutual plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. E. A. Gibbs, of New York City, favoring the clause in tariff act against importation of wild birds to be used in the millinery trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of sundry citizens of California, favoring an appropriation for the construction of a milennial dawn temple in California in 1915; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of sundry brush manufacturers of the United States, favoring an increase in the present tariff rate on brushes instead of the proposed reduction of the tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. F. Dickinson, of Matthews, La., against the reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of Dr. J. W. Thayer and 25 others, of Gilroy, Cal., against the reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. C. Falkenberg and 25 others, of King City; John Harper and 26 others, of Castroville; Antone Souza and 32 others, of Guadaloupe; James B. Campbell and 75 others, of Compton; Messrs. Hooker and Gardner, of Los Alamitos; H. L. Thornbrough and 51 others, of Meridian; George C. Miller and 14 others, of Gonzales; H. F. Sundberg and 36 others, of Huntington Beach; Charles A. Gale and 36 others, of Pleasanton; W. H. Connelly and 15 others, of Concord; E. P. Giacomazzi and 70 others, of Soledad; Fred Desmond and 41 others, of Artesia; and Charles C. Saunders and 145 others, of Chino, all in the State of California, against the reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the reduction of the wages of the employees of the customs service as contemplated in the reorganization of the customs service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of the Chestnut Hill Branch of the National Alliance of Unitarian and other Christian Women, favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls or the arbitration of the question at issue with the British Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring the passage of legislation to close the gates of the Panama Exposition on Sunday; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. SHERLEY: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 3954) for the relief of William E. Horton, major, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Prof. Daniel Freeman and others, favoring the portion of the tariff bill prohibiting the importation and sale of plumage in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *April 23, 1913.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. William Couden, of Norwalk, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, Almighty Father, for the rest of the night and the strength of the day. By such unfailing mercies do we know that we are dependent on Thee. Without Thee we can do nothing. Let us willingly put our moral and spiritual natures also in Thy care. Through our weaknesses and our aspirations, our ideals and our needs, keep us in close contact with Thee. Bless this assembly and all its Members. Endue these, Thy servants, with righteousness, that Thy people may be joyful. We ask it in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. EDWARDS, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. ASHBROOK, for one week, on account of death of brother.

SWEARING IN A MEMBER.

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

MAINTENANCE OF ORDER.

The SPEAKER. When the present occupant of the chair was sworn in at the beginning of this Congress he invited the aid and cooperation of all the Members in maintaining order, and while nobody is now doing anything out of order, yet the Chair wishes to make a suggestion or two, not a lecture.

It has been brought to the attention of the Chair by several Members that there has been an unconscious violation of the rules. The rule is that there shall be no smoking in this Chamber. So far as the Chair is aware, that rule has not been violated outright, but what a good many of the Members complain of is that gentlemen will rush in—10 or 15 or 20 of them—with cigars lighted and smoking, and it is offensive to the Members complaining. Two or three Members also have complained that occasionally some gentleman puts his feet upon the top of one of these benches, and they claim that is bad form. [Laughter.]

Now, the Chair hopes that all the Members will take to heart the request the Speaker made in the beginning, that they help him keep order in the House. The fact that the number of Members has been increased by 41 makes it harder than ever, a good deal harder, to maintain order.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD rose, amid applause.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes; and, pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all the Members of the House may have leave to print or extend their remarks in the RECORD until five days after the bill is disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Five legislative or five calendar days?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Five legislative days.

Mr. PAYNE. Five days, commencing with what time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I say, five days after the bill is disposed of.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Five days after it passes the House?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; after it passes the House.

Mr. LANGLEY rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LANGLEY. I rise to ask the gentleman from Alabama if that will be confined to the tariff bill—this extension of remarks?

The SPEAKER. Of course it will be confined to the tariff bill and will apply to nothing else.

Mr. LANGLEY. It ought to be so confined, but I did not so understand it, as it comes in under general debate, which is not limited to any particular subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the tariff bill; and, pending that, he asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen shall have leave to extend their remarks for five legislative days after the bill leaves the House——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And to print, if they do not speak.

The SPEAKER. And to print, of course.

Mr. BARTLETT rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Alabama if I can.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Under the rules, those who speak on a bill, not those who ask leave to print or are authorized to print, are not limited to five days at the present time. Is it the purpose of the gentleman to require gentlemen who address the House upon the bill to print their remarks within the five days?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I understand the rule, a Member has the right and the opportunity, until the RECORD is closed, to correct his speech at any time. But my request was to allow the Members who did not speak to print, and those who did speak to revise and extend their remarks, up to and including five days after the conclusion of the bill in the House.

Mr. BARTLETT. That changes the present rule, so far as those who speak are concerned.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If a gentleman only corrects his remarks and does not revise and extend them, it does not change the rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question is on resolving into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PAYNE. Can an arrangement be made as to a division of time?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, what about the matter of time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to close general debate on this bill on next Tuesday morning. If gentlemen have any suggestions to make, I shall be glad to hear them.

Mr. MURDOCK. This is the situation with the Progressives in the House: We have reduced our demands for time to a minimum of six hours. Naturally we realize that our time is much dependent upon the amount of general debate permitted by the majority. If you go into the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule next Tuesday, how many days or how many hours will that give us for general debate?

Mr. GARNER. Ten hours a day for 5 days would make 50 hours.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It will be in the neighborhood of 10 hours a day for 5 days, or 50 hours. I do not know whether it will run exactly that amount of time, because there may be times when some gentlemen may not be prepared to speak and the House will have to adjourn; but it gives an opportunity for 50 hours of general debate.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is what it would run—50 hours. The gentleman understands, of course, that in general debate there is always pressure for time at the end of the debate, and there is often great difficulty in getting gentlemen to speak at the beginning. Now, if an understanding is reached between the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and myself as to the proportion of time that we shall occupy, what arrangement can we have about using the time from day to day?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Why, it is customary in debate for one side to occupy an hour or two hours, and then for the other side to occupy an hour or two hours, and I think that is proper.

Mr. PAYNE. In other words, to equalize the time from day to day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. To equalize the time as you go along. If you are not prepared to equalize the time as you go along, you ought to lose it.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. What is the nature of the rule under which this bill is going to be passed?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is no rule adopted as yet, and I do not know that there will be any rule.

Mr. MURDOCK. Now, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK]?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. What division do you propose now to make as between the two minorities?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I prefer to go into Committee of the Whole and allow the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to regulate the time, because he can do it more conveniently than I can.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman will allow me right there, I have had some talk with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] this morning, and I told him I thought an equitable division of the time between the two parties in the minority would be one hour out of five for the Progressives; that is, out of every five hours allotted to the minority that the Progressives should have one hour and the Republicans four hours as we go along from day to day, and that the gentleman ought to use his proportion of the time from day to day.

Mr. MURDOCK. We are perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. FORDNEY. I have no doubt you are perfectly willing, because that gives you much more time than you are entitled to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Not at all.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; it does.

Mr. MURDOCK. Not at all.

Mr. FORDNEY. I object to any such inequitable rule. The Progressives are entitled to one hour out of seven and not any more, I will say to the gentleman from New York, in proportion to their representation, out of the time allotted to this side. Why should they have one hour out of five?

Mr. GARNER. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole might give them more than that.

Mr. FORDNEY. Let him do it, then.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask all gentlemen to refrain from conversation, and all except those who are engaged in this effort to arrive at an understanding to take their seats.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that these various gentlemen who lead different aggregations on that side of the aisle permit the request for the five days to be granted——

Mr. MANN. There has been no such request made. The gentleman, as usual, is behind the times.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Alabama made that request.

Mr. MANN. I beg the gentleman's pardon; he made no such request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama made an announcement, not a request, that he wanted to close this general debate next Tuesday morning.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no reason why the whole House should be detained while gentlemen on that side are trying to accommodate 5 per cent of the membership of the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Kansas that although there is two-thirds of the House on this side of the aisle and one-third on that side, there is no disposition on our part not to conform to the general rule to give one-half of the time to the minority, but the minority must arrange the division of their time between themselves. I think if the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from New York will reach an agreement, that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union will carry it out as far as the time is concerned.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, while he may recognize a gentleman for 10 or 20 minutes, can not take any gentleman off the floor if he is recognized in general debate short of one hour, if he wishes to maintain the floor. Hence it is desirable, so many gentlemen wishing to address the committee, to have a division of the time where a limited time can be granted. Now, if the gentleman from Alabama will permit, I will ask unanimous consent that the time of general debate be limited to matters relating to the bill, to be equally divided between the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], with the provision that the gentleman from Kansas be allowed six hours of the minority's time yielded to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the proposition of the gentleman from Illinois, but if that is agreed to I shall couple with it the other provision that general debate shall close on Monday.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman that I shall not object to that, except that my observation has been in the House that almost invariably upon these bills the gentleman himself and others on his side will desire an hour or two probably on Tuesday, by general agreement. I shall not object to the request to close debate, but the gentleman can move to close debate at any time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; and the House can change it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Just as soon as I have submitted this request. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this bill close when the House adjourns next Monday night, and that the time be equally divided between myself, as chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], with the understanding that the gentleman from New York will yield the portion of his time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] which has been agreed upon between them.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman can see that under that arrangement the control of the time passes from me into the hands of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; he yields to you.

Mr. MURDOCK. How does he yield to me? There is no provision in this request made by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PAYNE. If that agreement is made, I will yield to the gentleman from Kansas an hour each day, or such time as is equitable.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this tariff bill close when the House adjourns next Monday.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. MOORE. To ask the gentleman from Alabama a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH] asked if we were proceeding under any rule, and the gentleman from Alabama stated that there was no rule. There is a rumor, coming from the street as it were, that the bill would be read under a rule and that there would be a limitation upon the number of amendments that might be offered by the minority. Is any such proposition contemplated?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No such proposition has been agreed upon up to this time. I do not know that there will be. Of course we want reasonable latitude in the consideration of this bill and expect to grant it. If an exigency should arise, if it is necessary to adopt a rule to get the bill through the House it will be adopted.

Mr. MOORE. I have no desire to filibuster against the bill, nor would I; but there are many paragraphs to which amendments ought to be offered in justice to Members on this side of the House and concerning which there ought to be some discussion. If a limitation is put upon the ability of a member of the minority to offer amendments, of course that checks his efforts to properly represent the wishes of his constituents. I desire to know whether we are to proceed under any such limitation, it being reported there would be a rule of that kind.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is no rule agreed on. I do not know whether it will be necessary to adopt a rule. As far as I know at this time, the bill will be read under the five-minute rule, although that program may be changed; but I will say this to the gentleman, that if he desires to make an extended argument on this bill he should make it in general debate, because I intend, when we get into the Committee of the Whole, to enforce the five-minute rule.

Mr. MOORE. That is the very point. In general debate, of course, we would be limited to an hour, but when we come to read the bill, say, when the chemical schedule is read, and one paragraph is reached that may be of vital interest to constituents of any one of the Members, and an amendment is offered, will there be a restriction upon the number of amendments that may be offered by those who endeavor to defeat the paragraph?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We expect to take the bill up, as far as I know at the present time, under the rules of the House, and, as the gentleman knows, there is no limitation on amendments, under the rules of the House.

Mr. MOORE. If there is to be no limit upon the five-minute rule——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, I am not prepared to answer the gentleman's question now. I can only say to him that there has been no rule agreed upon. I do not know whether there will be.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman permit me to say this, that the district I represent, for instance, is largely a manufacturing district, and I presume there is scarcely a single paragraph in the bill that does not in some way or other affect those interests. It will be manifestly impossible to offer an amendment to every paragraph in accordance with the wishes of my constituents, but there ought at least to be some demonstration of their interests here, something ought to be done by their Representative to at least explain their wishes. If a Member under those circumstances should attempt to amend every paragraph according to the wishes of his constituents, it would be an interminable operation. I want to know whether the committee had thought of a rule or had intended, as rumor reports, to have a rule?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If gentlemen on that side desire to offer their amendments by sections, I am willing to agree to a proposition of that kind by unanimous consent.

Mr. MOORE. What does the gentleman mean by "sections"?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have already yielded to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I will yield to the gentleman from Kansas in a moment.

Mr. MOORE. I want to get a definition of the word "sections."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If gentlemen on that side prefer by unanimous consent to agree that this bill shall be taken up and considered by schedules, I think there would be no disposition on my part not to agree with them.

Mr. MOORE. I want to get the gentleman's meaning. He said there would be no objection to considering the bill by sections. How does he differentiate as between sections, paragraphs, and schedules? Ordinarily we consider a bill under the five-minute rule by paragraphs. Is "sections" a different proposition?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In the first section there are a number of schedules—14, I believe. The balance of the bill has 3 sections. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania has a proposition

to make asking unanimous consent to consider the bill along that line, I would be very glad to hear what it is.

Mr. MOORE. That is just the point. I hope the gentleman will bear with me for a moment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not attempt to amend the rules in regard to the five-minute debate at this time.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, if I understand right, this means that there will not be any opportunity to offer amendments until in some instances over 100 pages of the bill have been read.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no proposition. This proposition I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania was making.

Mr. MOORE. That is to say, no amendment until we have completed the reading of the entire tariff schedule, and then no amendment until we have finished the income-tax schedule, and then no amendment until we have finished the administrative section.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has erected a mark to shoot at, and is now shooting at his own mark. The suggestion did not come from me. It came from the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE. Then will the gentleman answer a specific question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know whether I will or not.

Mr. MOORE. It is provided in this bill that the duty upon wool shall be free. When we reach the wool paragraph will it be in order to offer to amend it so that there will be a duty say of 18 cents per pound upon wool?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We will determine that question when we reach it.

Mr. MOORE. Then we can not reach it until we finish the section. That is good-by to amendment.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania is in error. I discussed the matter at the time with the gentleman from Alabama. It was proposed, as I understand, by some gentlemen on the majority side to provide for eight hours of general debate and then amendment in a certain way. The gentleman from Alabama has now proposed five days of general debate. My understanding is that after the close of general debate it is the present intention of the gentleman from Alabama to allow liberal debate under the five-minute rule in this way. Of course it is quite patent that if on every paragraph in the bill amendments were offered, even one amendment or various amendments upon each paragraph and then considerable discussion, we would be here much longer than the gentleman from Alabama would consent or the majority would consent to, and I have no criticism of him for that; but within reasonable limitation, without any effort upon this side to filibuster, I think we can rely upon having a reasonable opportunity for debate with the knowledge that if it is protracted long under the five-minute rule the gentleman from Alabama I think would be justified from his point of view in stopping it by bringing in a rule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois it is not my purpose to unduly cut off reasonable debate, but I do intend to insist that the speeches shall be limited to five minutes each.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman from Alabama yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is not all this discussion proof of the fact that if the plans of the Progressive Party were carried out as regards the tariff [laughter], a revision of the tariff one schedule at a time at a session, then we should have a real discussion of the bill, with full right of amendment under the five-minute rule? Is not that the fact?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, the gentleman has that same right now, I am inclined to think.

Mr. MURDOCK. Not at all. If the gentleman from Alabama brings in an omnibus bill at one session of Congress and expects the consideration under the five-minute rule of such a bill in a very few days——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not in a few days. There is no distinction whatever between the consideration of this bill under the five-minute rule as a whole bill and considering 14 schedules under the five-minute rule as 14 schedules. There is no distinction whatever.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman will find in practice, as he knows, that there is a distinction.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know of any, and I think my friend from Kansas ought to take lessons on the rules if he finds where such a distinction lies.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the gentleman will remember former experiences, he will recall that toward the conclusion of the consideration of any tariff measure under the five-minute rule amendments offered under the five-minute rule are usually voted down with an uproar, a hurrah, and a rush, and there is no real consideration of them. That will be demonstrated in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does my friend from Kansas expect the Progressive Party to put any amendment offered on this bill, whether it was offered to sections or to the——

Mr. MURDOCK. The Progressive Party expects consideration by the entire body of any amendment they offer.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly; and they will have consideration.

Mr. MURDOCK. And it does not desire to be met by the cry which will be heard in a few days—the cry of "Vote, vote, vote!"—in a session according no consideration of amendments offered, with no attention by a House wearied with long discussion. Meritorious amendments are voted down without real consideration here, and the gentleman knows that is true in regard to every tariff bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] that my experience with this House has been this, that if a man offers a meritorious amendment and backs it up by reason this House always listens to it. And I think when my friend says he anticipates the amendments coming from his party are going to be hooted down, he reflects on the intelligence of his own party.

Mr. MURDOCK. Not at all. And I will say to the gentleman from Alabama that he knows it to be the experience in this House, in the consideration of a long measure, that the first amendments offered to the first paragraphs in the bill usually get very careful consideration and are given long debate, but at the close of consideration of a long bill such as this there is no real consideration given to the amendments.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not think the gentleman ought to take me off my feet.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. In two minutes I intend to demand the regular order.

Mr. MANN. I do not think the gentleman ought to interfere. This is not an appropriation bill.

Mr. MOORE. The first section of this bill contains 132 pages.

Mr PAYNE. The gentleman knows the rule is that a bill is considered by paragraphs.

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman from Alabama will permit me to ask, Is the gentleman from New York in favor of the passage of this bill as it is written or does he think it ought to be amended?

Mr. PAYNE. There is no occasion to ask any such question as that. I am in favor of getting this time for debate fixed first and have general debate on the bill.

Mr. MOORE. I want to ask a very simply question, which is whether or not we may have opportunity to offer an amendment to this bill under the five-minute rule before we have reached page 132?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will refer the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] to the rules of the House, which will give him full information and which say that when a bill is read under the five-minute rule he can offer an amendment to each paragraph as it is reached, which I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows.

Mr. MOORE. At the proper time, when we have reached the item of potatoes, may we have an opportunity to offer an amendment taking them from the free list?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not hear the gentleman.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MOORE. I want to know——

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded, and that is for the Chair to put this demand for unanimous consent. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent, pending the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, that general debate on this bill shall be closed with the adjournment of the House on next Monday; in the meantime that the time shall be divided equally between himself and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] agreeing to yield six hours to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], to be disposed of as the gentleman from Kansas chooses—in 1 speech or 15, or any other number. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on my motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the bill H. R. 3321.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3321, a bill to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to fix the time for debate on this bill, so that it may be definitely known by the Members, and, therefore, having discussed the bill to this extent, I intend to move for the committee to rise, and when we get back in the House I intend to move that general debate shall be closed on Monday next.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that general debate on the bill H. R. 3321 close when the House adjourns on Monday next. And I wish to state, Mr. Speaker, that I make this motion at this time so that the House may be given full opportunity of knowing as to when this debate shall close.

I shall now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] before moving the previous question, if he desires that I yield to him.

Mr. MANN. I suppose the motion is not in order until the House has again resolved itself into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will make that motion, Mr. Speaker, and, pending that motion, I will make the other motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes; and, pending that——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move that general debate on the bill H. R. 3321, the tariff bill, be closed when the House adjourns on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. And pending that, the gentleman from Alabama moves that general debate on the tariff bill close at the adjournment of the House next Monday.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I renew the unanimous-consent request made by the gentleman from Alabama a few moments ago.

The SPEAKER. And, pending both motions of the gentleman from Alabama, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the time be equally divided, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the other half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], with the further provision that the gentleman from New York yield six hours of his time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], to be disposed of as the latter gentleman chooses. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. That carries with it, I suppose, the proposition that the debate close on Monday?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That was the understanding. Was not that included?

Mr. MANN. That was a part of the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER. It also includes the proposition that the general debate on the tariff bill close when the House adjourns next Monday. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MONDELL. To reserve the right to object, in order to make a few observations.

The SPEAKER. It is too late to object to that.

Mr. MONDELL. I understood the Chair to ask if there was objection.

The SPEAKER. Did not the Chair also say he heard none? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. The Chair did at one time, but the Chair again asked if there was objection.

I have just a brief observation to make. I do not intend to object, but I want to call attention to the fact that the arrangement that is made is exceedingly liberal to the minority party, with emphasis on the "minority."

It is probably true that there will not be 50 hours of general debate.

The House will not continue in session 10 hours a day during this debate. If it does, it will establish a new record, and therefore the time of debate will not be 50 hours, but something less. But whether we are in session or in debate 50 hours or 40 hours or 30 hours the minority is to have 6 hours.

I do not object to it, but I simply want to call attention to the fact that it is an exceedingly liberal arrangement to the Progressives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The gentleman from Alabama withdraws his supplementary motion and moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321, of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the enactment of this bill into law will mark the beginning of a new era in the fiscal legislation of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

For many years before the Civil War this Government was administered under low-tariff conditions, beneficial to the citizenship of the country and not detrimental to the growth of the industries of the United States. The high taxes that we now pay at the customhouses were levied to meet the exigencies of a civil war and are the outgrowth of war conditions. After the war was over the necessity of retaining high-taxation measures on the statute books had passed, but interested parties who had been able to amass fortunes out of this indirect system of taxation have been able to control the Government, with but one brief period intervening, for the last 50 years and have maintained this unjust system of war taxation.

Four years ago this House faced the same situation it is facing to-day. The party then in power, the administration then controlling public affairs, had been elected to office on a distinct promise to the people to revise the customs taxes downward in the interest of the taxpayer.

It is unnecessary at this time to go into the details of how that party failed to keep its promise or of how and why it has been repudiated by the American people for that failure. It is sufficient to say that the Payne bill had hardly been enacted into law before its own advocates commenced apologizing for it and proposing tariff commissions or other methods of revising their own enactment, recognizing the fact themselves that the American people were not satisfied with the bill they had passed and that they must give some excuse for their failure to keep their pledged faith with the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The election of 1910 was a repudiation of the party that passed the law now on the statute books. A Democratic House was sent here to revise the tariff in the interest of the American people. They proposed a series of bills. Many were passed by a Republican Senate, and went to a Republican President, who vetoed them.

The House must bear in mind that we have been living under practically the same system of taxation since 1897, when the Dingley bill was enacted just prior to the Spanish War. Irrespective of theory, the condition of the country has entirely changed since that time, both from the standpoint of the consumer and of the manufacturer.

When the hearings were had on the Payne tariff bill I recall that the room was filled with American manufacturers, insisting

that radical changes should be made in the Dingley law, and that the system of taxation then in vogue was obsolete and out of touch with the industrial conditions of the country. Yet they woke up to find the law substantially reenacted, and the relief that even the industries of the country sought against these unjust burdens of taxation was not granted.

The real question that we have to consider is that of the rights and interests of the consuming masses of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The question of industry in this country is, and from our standpoint must always be, secondary to the rights and necessities of the great American consuming public. [Applause.]

So far as the people were concerned, the main reason why a revision of the customs laws was both demanded and expected was because of the increased cost of living since the enactment of the Dingley bill in 1897. During that period I find from statistics that the value of farm products have increased 93 per cent; food, 47 per cent; clothing, 36 per cent; metals and implements, 48 per cent; drugs and chemicals, 24 per cent; house-furnishing goods, 24 per cent; and all commodities covered by the present law have increased on an average 47 per cent.

I do not contend, nor would it be fair to say, that this increase in values is wholly due to the tariff. In some cases it is and in others it is not. But it is safe to say that a large portion of the increased cost of living to the American citizen has grown directly out of the system of taxation levied to protect the great manufacturing interests of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If that were not true, we would find the cost of living in countries like England, which has no such system of taxation, as high as ours. On the other hand, we know in many countries not maintaining a high protective tariff, although the cost of living has increased to some extent, the actual cost to each individual is far less and has increased proportionately less than it has to the people of the United States.

Although we have reduced the tariff in the interest of the consumer in this bill, it would be untrue to say that the effect of this reduction is going to be immediate. There are many reasons why we can not promise this to the people, but there is one which is quite sufficient. Under all the laws of trade supply and demand must regulate prices. The retail merchants of the country have fixed their prices to-day on goods now on their shelves, which were bought under conditions fixed by Republican legislation. They will not reduce their prices until they are compelled to do so, nor will they begin to reduce the price to the consumer until competition from fellow merchants forces them to do so. That competition will naturally not arise until the merchant has disposed of the goods on his shelves, which he has purchased under conditions of a high Republican tariff.

But I do fully believe that within a reasonable time, when present stocks of goods are sold out, the American people will receive a real reduction in the cost of living if this bill is enacted into law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Whenever it is proposed to reduce the taxes levied for privileged classes the cry is always raised that it will impair industry. The greatest moving cause for the impairment of industry in the United States in the last 50 years has been the shackles fastened by high protective legislation to the ships of industry, like the barnacles at sea that cling and drag downward. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is this high cost of living to employees that of necessity increases the cost of production. It is the high cost of supplies that industry must bear that increases its cost of production. It is this increased cost of production that has chained American industries to our shores and prevented them from going out among the nations of the earth to spread the goods and wares of American enterprise in foreign markets and to secure the fruits of American labor and American enterprise to the people of our great country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But it has done yet another thing. It has stifled enterprise, throttled energy, and placed a premium on incompetency.

Not as a result of our investigation, but from an investigation set on foot by gentlemen who sat on that side of the aisle, not through our agents, but through their agents, we find that a tariff board, appointed by them to inquire into the conditions of these great industries, reports that they find establishments maintained by this tariff system where the machinery operating is 60 years old; these establishments have taken their profits in the past to pay enormous dividends to stockholders, depleting their own enterprises for personal greed, and are maintaining a business to-day with worn-out, ancient, and ineffective machinery; yet they ask the American people through taxes to maintain the price they place on their product. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the condition that confronts these gentlemen, who prefer to maintain on the statute books a Dingley and a Payne law in the interest of decadent corporations rather than reduce the tariff by voting for a bill that will relieve the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The bills that we propose to the country are not new. We are not taking advantage of the American people in proposing them. A Democratic House was returned two years ago and wrote a series of bills revising this tariff, and we presented them to the country as our platform. They were indorsed by the national platform of the Democratic Party as a flag under which we would fight our battles. We went to the country, and the American people have returned to this House one of the greatest majorities any party has ever had in these Halls since the Civil War. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We do not speak for ourselves, but we speak through the authority of an edict from the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The great contending parties in this Nation hold two diverse theories when it comes to writing a tariff bill. The Republican Party stands for a protective tariff, which they have defined as a tariff that equals the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, with the addition of a reasonable profit to the home manufacturer. I have seen some Republicans who have attempted to abandon that platform, but, so far as I know, the great party leaders are standing to this position in defeat as they stood to it in the days of their power. Therefore I think I can fairly take that definition as representing the position of the political enemy confronting us. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House do not reach their conclusions from the same standpoint that our political adversaries would. Gentlemen on the other side of the aisle believe that we should adjust a tariff to meet the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit. That position of necessity must rest on the basis of the cost of production. The majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House not only do not agree with that theory but we have not attempted to write this bill upon that basis. As a matter of fact, I contend that the theory is not defensible, that it is impossible for anyone to reach a conclusion based upon the difference in the cost-of-production-theory. If the money cost of production is made a test in certain classes of goods, the prices are not fixed by the lowest cost of production, but by the highest. This is true of every commodity subject to the law of diminishing returns. When the price is fixed by the cost of producing it, that portion of the supply which is brought into existence under the least favorable conditions must fix the basis. I do not think that anybody will deny the economic proposition that if wheat is selling in the markets at 75 cents a bushel the price of wheat is fixed by the market price and not by the question of whether it costs a dollar a bushel to raise wheat or 25 cents a bushel to raise wheat. As a matter of fact, it is not always the best land that fixes the price. It is more often the poorest land that fixes the price of a commodity that is raised upon it, when there is not sufficient good land to drive the poor land out of business. It is not always the State that can produce a commodity at the lowest price that is the rival for the control of that market, because you may have State A, which can produce both corn and wheat more cheaply than State B, but it may be more productive and profitable for State A to raise corn than wheat, so the market for wheat may come from State B, which is the least advantageously situated to produce the supply.

If you are fixing the tax on the commodity, my friends upon that side of the House, how are you going to determine the cost of production? Are you going to measure it between the best mill in America and the best mill abroad, or are you going to measure it between the worst manufacturing enterprise in America and the best abroad? Where are you going to find your measure on which to fix this difference in the cost of production at home and abroad? More than that, if you stand by that difference-of-cost theory, with what country are you going to measure it? It is manifest that in a great many of the textile products there is great difference between the English, the German, and the Italian cost of production. Which of them are you going to measure your tariff against? Which are you going to say is the true measure of the difference in cost of production upon which to levy this tariff—the English mill, the German mill, or the Italian mill? You have to fix on one or the other; you can not use them all. Ah, but you may say that you will find an average, that you will take the average cost of production at home and the average cost of production abroad; but if you do, I say that averages necessarily protect no one. The average, if you use that basis, will drive out of existence the weaker mill. The average, if you are going to stand upon that basis, will give undue protection to the stronger mill. Therefore you can not find an intelligent basis on which to ascertain the difference in the so-called cost of production at home and abroad [applause on the Democratic side], nor can you write an intelligent tariff act upon that basis, and the proof of it is that you never have done so.

The Democratic Party stands for a tariff for revenue only, with the emphasis upon the word "only." [Applause on the Democratic side.] We do not propose to tax one man for the benefit of another, except for the necessary revenue that we must raise to administer this Government economically. Then how do we arrive at a basis in writing a revenue tariff bill? We adopt the competitive theory. We say that no revenue can be produced at the customhouse unless there is some competition between the products of foreign countries and domestic products; that if you put the wall so high that you close the door to importation no revenue can be raised, and that if you want to raise revenue at the customhouse you must admit some importations before the tax will fall upon them and revenue be derived.

Now, if you will follow the amount of imports into this country based on the Republican bills on the statute books for the last 50 years, you will find in every schedule, in nearly every paragraph, impassable walls and mountain peaks over which it is impossible for importations to come, and then you will find a low valley through which imports are allowed to flow to produce some revenue. You have for 50 years played favorites. You have given to your chosen minions the power to tax the American people by building prohibitive tariff walls, and you have opened the gates of those walls to revenue from those for whom you did not care. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In this bill we have not been able at one fell swoop to wipe out all the iniquities, the injustices, and favoritism that you have ingrafted on the body politic in five decades, but so far as this committee and our party is concerned we have played favorites with no man. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No favored manufacturer has sat behind the closed doors of the Ways and Means Committee to dictate the taxes that he should be allowed to levy on the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have given an honest, open, and fair hearing to every man who desired it, regardless of his politics or business. We have not been able to wipe out all the favoritism that you have ingrafted in these bills, because a great many of the industries in the United States have been built up on the rotten foundation that you placed under them. Too great harm would result to industries, to the thousands of workers and laborers employed therein, were we suddenly to destroy these foundations. So far as it was practicable to do so without working an absolute injustice to the American consumer, we have endeavored to lower the tariff wall with a jackscrew, since it was not our commission to lower it with an ax. Now, you say, how can we work out our theory of a competitive tariff? When we discard the theory of cost of production and admit that some competition should exist in every line of industry, then it is a simple proposition to compare the amount of imports coming into this country with the amount of goods consumed, and you can ascertain at the customhouse whether there is any competition, reasonable competition, or drastic competition. Unfortunately we have not had the data in all instances to determine this, but we have written a provision into the bill requiring the President of the United States to furnish the Congress annually with such information, and when exact knowledge of the amount of imports and the American consumption in any given article is secured you will be able to tell at a glance whether the rates you levy at the customhouse are reasonably competitive, drastic, or prohibitive, and this gives you the basis on which to adjust your rates.

Of course this is not true with every commodity. Some things are so essential to the life of the individual that they should be given him without taxation, regardless of whether or not they are competitive, but as a general rule in this bill we have sought to fix a reasonably competitive tariff at the customhouse, with this exception—well, I withdraw that expression; it is not an exception—with this qualification: That we levy high taxes on the luxuries of life and endeavor to place the taxes on the necessaries as low as possible consistent with raising a reasonable amount of revenue. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, before passing away from the cost-of-production theory and the competitive theory of levying a tariff tax, we always hear a cry from the great manufacturing interests of this country that you can not lower the tariff without affecting the price of labor. I heard that cry from one man who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in the last hearings, when subsequent testimony showed that he was working the poorest class of foreign labor in the sweatshops of New York. Yet he came before the Congress of the United States asking for a protective tariff to protect labor that was undergoing the grind of the garret sweatshops of his own city. Of course, we are proud of the fact that many American laborers obtain higher wages than they do abroad, but it is largely due to their own industrial organizations, since by reason of their labor unions they have enforced justice from those great manufacturing interests that would not have been accorded them otherwise. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And more than that, it is not the cost of labor that counts so much as it is the efficiency of labor, and in many of these great enterprises the testimony shows that by reason of the efficiency of labor the unit of cost of production in America is cheaper than abroad. But that is not the only question that we have to consider. You must not overlook the fact in trying to work out the theoretical difference in cost of production at home and abroad that the problem of transportation costs is one of the great vital questions involved. The question of carrying the raw material to the furnace or the factory is a greater item in the cost of production than even the labor cost.

The question of carrying the finished product from the factory to its ultimate market is one of the most important factors to be considered. And this fact is recognized. But how are you going to balance it? Are you going to balance it for the products of the United States Steel Corporation produced at Pittsburgh, at the Atlantic seaboard, or on the Pacific coast? Are you going to balance the cost of transportation for the citrus fruit industry of California, at the Mississippi River, or at the Atlantic Ocean? Why, I had before me a representative of the great iron industry of this country some time ago, and he stated, what is a fact, that the cost of transportation on iron piping from the Pittsburgh factories to San Francisco is $10.50 a ton freight rate, while that from the English mills to San Francisco is only $5 by water route. He insisted that we should determine the competitive point, or the point of difference in cost of production, at San Francisco, and that we should equalize the freight-rate difference between $5 a ton, the English rate, and $10.50 a ton, the Pittsburgh rate, for iron pipe at San Francisco. In other words, that we should levy on all the people of the United States a tariff tax in order that he might compete with a producer that had cheaper water transportation to San Francisco. That is the basis on which you have been building tariff rates, but it is not a basis that the American people will ever recognize as fair or just or right. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

My friends on that side of the House were guilty of exactly that proposition when they enacted the Payne tariff law. The lemon industry of California, under a tax of 1 cent a pound on lemons, was able to pay the freight rates eastward and practically control the American market up to the Allegheny Mountains. They saw that other people had prohibitive tariff rates, so they demanded of you, and you gave it to them, an increase of taxation on lemons from 1 cent a pound to 1½ cents a pound, in order to force the American people to buy their lemons from California and pay the inland freight rate so that they might drive out of the American market the lemons grown across the water in Sicily. You did that for them. That is the way you wrote this tariff and fixed the difference in cost at home and abroad. With what result? You raised the price of lemons in every hospital in the United States; you raised the price to the poor and to the dying in their beds to satisfy the greedy maw of the California fruit producers. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, in this speech I can not go into details concerning the changes in the bill. When the bill comes up under the five-minute rule it will give me pleasure to answer any question the gentlemen desire to ask in reference to it. But I desire to point out here the basis on which this bill has been constructed—by levying taxes on the luxuries of the rich and reducing them on the necessaries of the poor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In the Payne bill attar of roses was free. Under this bill we levy a tax on it of 20 per cent. In the Payne bill perfumery was taxed an equivalent ad valorem rate of 72 per cent. In this bill we tax perfumery at an equivalent ad valorem rate of 74 per cent. In the Payne bill highly scented toilet soap was taxed 50 per cent, and we tax it 40 per cent. In the Payne bill, automobiles were taxed 45 per cent; we maintain that tax. In the Payne bill, gold manufactures were taxed 45 per cent; we raise the tax to 50 per cent, and the same on silver manufactures. Highly finished pile fabrics in Schedule J, the luxuries of the rich, were taxed in the Payne bill 60 per cent, and we maintain a tax of 45 per cent. You taxed oriental carpets at an equivalent ad valorem rate of 58 per cent; we maintain a tax of 50 per cent on them. Articles of silk wearing apparel you taxed 60 per cent, and we maintain a tax of 50 per cent on them. On jewelry you had a tax amounting to about 76 per cent and we place a tax of 60 per cent. So, my friends, as I demonstrate to you, on the luxuries of the rich——

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. That lowers them?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We lowered them, and I will tell you why, my friends. I know it never would enter your mind that there could be any reason for lowering a tax on luxuries of this kind. The only reason we lowered them was because on some of them you had put the rate so unconscionably high that the articles could not come in, and we really wanted the Government to get from them a part of the revenue. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, I would like the gentlemen on that side of the House, who have maintained this indefensible system of taxing the poor for five decades, to listen to the other side of the story. On common soap you placed a tax of 20 per cent. We have lowered the tax to 5 per cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You taxed the furniture of the poor man's house 35 per cent. We have lowered it to 15 per cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You taxed bread and biscuits 20 per cent. We place them on the free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On cotton clothing you taxed the people of this country 50 per cent. We have reduced it to 30 per cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On the flannels that protect them against the cold winter storms you taxed the people of the United States over 93 per cent, and we have reduced the tax to 25 and 35 per cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The tax on women's and children's dress goods under your system of levying a tax for the benefit of the manufacturer was about 100 per cent, and we have lowered that to 35 per cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You taxed the shoes of the people of the United States, after giving the shoemaker free raw material and stating at the time you gave it that he did not need the protection; you gave him 10 per cent and we give free shoes to the people of America. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, it is impossible to go into the numerous details of this bill, but I desire to call your attention to the changes of taxes by schedules. I will print the entire table in my remarks, but at this time I shall refer only to the averages.

Comparative summary showing total revenue, by schedules, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and as estimated for the first 12-month period under H. R. 3321.

Schedule.	Item.	Imports. 1912	Imports. Estimate for a 12-month period under H.R. 3321.
A	Chemicals, oils, and paints:		
	Values, free	[1]	$3,131,000
	Values, dutiable	$47,235,641	[2]$62,969,000
	Duties	$12,239,742	$12,985,000
	Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	25.91	[2]19.64
B	Earths, earthenware, and glassware:		
	Values, free		$108,000
	Values, dutiable	$21,994,265	$28,469,000
	Duties	$11,156,221	$9,478,000
	Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	50.72	33.17
C	Metals, and manufactures of:		
	Values, free		$6,536,000
	Values, dutiable	$50,491,870	$70,030,000
	Duties	$17,340,221	$15,459,000
	Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	34.35	20.19
D	Wood, and manufactures of:		
	Values, free		$18,880,000
	Values, dutiable	$24,414,943	$6,110,000
	Duties	$3,042,834	$898,000
	Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	12.46	3.59
E	Sugar, molasses, and manufactures of:		
	Values	$105,744,519	$111,866,000
	Duties	$50,951,199	$40,196,000
	Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	48.18	35.93
F	Tobacco, and manufactures of:		
	Values	$31,116,052	$30,595,000
	Duties	$25,571,508	$26,002,000
	Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	82.18	84.99
G	Agricultural products and provisions:		
	Values, free	[3]	$19,259,000
	Values, dutiable	$117,711,156	$108,488,000
	Duties	$34,146,071	$21,567,000
	Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	29.01	16.87
H	Spirits, wines, and other beverages:		
	Values	$20,731,233	[4]$25,195,000
	Duties	$17,409,815	$20,987,000
	Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	83.98	83.30
I	Cotton manufactures:		
	Values	$24,358,360	$36,927,000
	Duties	$11,085,150	$11,257,000
	Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	45.51	30.48

[1] The value of the imports for 1912 of the act of 1909 transferred from the free list to this schedule by H. R. 3321 was $15,052,409.

[2] The decrease in the estimated value of imports and the increase in the equivalent ad valorem compared with the chemical bill vetoed by President Taft is caused by the transfer to the free list of tanning extracts, barks, and woods, oils used in soap making, varnish gums, and also the increased rates on various articles, such as coal-tar dyes and colors, licorice root, etc

[3] The value of the imports for 1912, transferred from the free list of the act of 1909 to this schedule by H. R. 3321, was $6,043,330.

[4] Though the rates are not increased, the estimated imports show an increase over 1912 because the latter was a year of abnormal importations, due to the termination of the reciprocity agreements with countries producing commodities dutiable under Schedule H. In anticipation of the higher rates of duty effective after the termination of these agreements, the importations were increased. Normal imports under existing rates of duty may now be expected since the overstock is practically consumed.

Comparative summary showing total revenue, by schedules, etc.—Contd.

Schedule.	Item.	Imports. 1912	Imports. Estimate for a 12-month period under H.R. 3321.
J	Flax, hemp, and jute, and manufactures of:		
	Values, free		$371,000
	Values, dutiable	$108,698,102	[1]$60,941,000
	Duties	$49,062,348	$15,977,000
	Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	45.14	26.06
K	Wool, and manufactures of:		
	Values, free		$33,309,000
	Values, dutiable	$48,361,374	$35,745,000
	Duties	$27,072,116	$12,774,000
	Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	55.98	18.50
L	Silks and silk goods:		
	Values	$26,571,510	$36,861,000
	Duties	$13,695,239	$16,212,000
	Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	51.54	43.98
M	Pulp, papers, and books:		
	Values, free		$11,427,000
	Values, dutiable	$22,828,121	$13,534,700
	Duties	$4,886,671	$2,957,130
	Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	21.41	11.85
N	Sundries:		
	Values, free	[2]	$9,382,000
	Values, dutiable	$108,952,769	[3]$170,866,000
	Duties	$26,931,900	$59,952,000
	Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	24.72	34.26
	Total dutiable:		
	Values, free		$102,403,000
	Values, dutiable	$759,209,915	$798,596,000
	Duties	$304,597,035	$266,701,000
	Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	40.12	29.60

[1] The estimated imports under Schedule J show a large decrease from the year 1912, because all laces and embroideries included in this schedule under the law of 1909 have been transferred to Schedule N in H. R. 3321.

[2] The value of the imports for 1912, transferred from the free list of the act of 1909 to this schedule by H. R. 3321, was $28,790,338.

[3] The estimated imports under Schedule N show a large increase caused by the transfer of articles to it from other schedules, chiefly laces and embroideries that were formerly included in Schedules J, K, and L.

On the entire chemical schedule the tax was 25.91 per cent. Our taxes levied on that schedule are 19.64 per cent, or a reduction in the chemical schedule of 24 per cent below the Payne law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On earths, earthenware, and glassware you levied a tax of about 51 per cent. We levy a tax of 33 per cent, a reduction below the Payne bill of 35 per cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On metals and manufactures of metals you levied a tax of 34 per cent. We levy a tax of 20 per cent, a reduction below the Payne bill of 41 per cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On wood and the manufactures of wood you levied a tax of 12 per cent, and we levy a tax of 3½ per cent, a reduction of 71 per cent. We place most of it on the free list, in order that the American workman may have free lumber with which to build his own home. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You have levied a tax on sugar of 48 per cent. We have reduced that tax to 35 per cent for the next three years, or a reduction of 25 per cent; and at the end of the three years we intend, if this bill becomes a law, to place it on the free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.] So that the one commodity above all others that most directly reflects the taxes levied at the customhouse no longer goes on the table of the consumer bearing the marks of 50 years of oppressive taxation that our friends on that side of the House have taught the American consuming public to recognize when they open their home door. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As to tobacco and the manufactures thereof, we considered them as luxuries or in the nature of luxuries and good revenue producers, so made no vital change in the schedule.

On agricultural products and provisions we have reduced the tax from 29 per cent to 17 per cent, or a reduction of 42 per cent.

On spirits, wines, and other beverages we have left the taxes as they are in the present law.

On cotton manufactures you taxed the public about 46 per cent. We reduced the average tax to 30 per cent, making a reduction of 33 per cent below the Payne bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On flax, hemp, and jute and their manufactures we have reduced the tax from 45 to 26 per cent, a reduction of 42 per cent below the Payne bill.

On wool and manufactures of wool you taxed the public nearly 56 per cent. We tax them 18½ per cent, a reduction in favor of the American people of 67 per cent below the Payne bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On silk goods the tax was about 52 per cent. We tax it 44 per cent, or a reduction of 15 per cent.

On paper and books you taxed them 21 per cent. We tax them 12 per cent, or a reduction of 45 per cent.

The sundries schedule is the only one in this bill raised by us. You taxed sundries about 25 per cent, and we tax them 33 per cent, or an increase of 35 per cent. And why? Because we have plucked out of other schedules all the laces and embroideries and put them in one paragraph in the sundry schedule at the high rate of 60 per cent, because they are luxuries and highly competitive. Then we have increased the tax on uncut diamonds and on finished diamonds. We have gathered together a number of other luxuries, such as furs, and put taxes on them in this schedule in order that the luxuries of the rich might be taxed and the necessaries of the poor untaxed. [Applause on the Democratic side.] For that reason the bill shows in the sundries schedule an increase over the Payne bill. But taking an average for the whole bill, your bill last year showed 40.12 per cent, and our bill, under the estimate, will average 29.60 per cent, or a reduction below the Payne bill taxes of last year of 26 per cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This reduction exists notwithstanding the fact that we have increased the taxes on a number of luxuries that you did not tax, which, of course, raised the average for the entire bill.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not attempt to discuss the customs tax features of the bill further at this time. I wish to say, however, that this bill is the beginning of a new theory of levying taxes by this Government, a theory with which our Republican friends have taken direct issue.

They say in their report—now mark the words—

> In presenting this bill the committee is met with a threatened deficit in revenue of about $100,000,000, which it is compelled to meet by extraordinary methods of taxation used heretofore only in time of war. As a revenue measure the committee at the very outset confess this bill to be a failure. It would seem as if a party pledged to a revenue tariff would strive to make the revenue feature conspicuous.

What does the Republican Party mean by that? They can mean but one thing, that they intend in the future to stand as they have stood in the past, to continue to tax consumption in this country and let the great wealth of the United States go untaxed. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You say, gentlemen of the Republican Party, that we levied this income tax because we could not raise the revenue at the customs. Ah, my friends, you are so blind that you can not see the trend of the times. You are so reactionary that you can not realize that this great country of ours is moving on, not only in industrial growth but in the ideas and the thoughts and the rights of men. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Wedded to your idols, you thought we levied this income tax because we had to. Why, Mr. Chairman, we could have found this $100,000,000 at the customs if we had so desired; but the time has come in this country when the great untaxed wealth of America must and shall bear its fair share of the burdens of running the Government of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We remove the taxes at the customhouse on necessaries purposely to levy a tax on wealth. I wish my friends on the other side to clearly understand this. [Applause on the Democratic side.] When you levy a tax on consumption the man of moderate means pays as much taxes on the clothes he wears and the food he consumes as the multimillionaire, and up to this time, except when the exigencies of war, as you say, required otherwise, you have exempted the great wealth of this country, notwithstanding the fact that we build a fleet and maintain an Army to protect that wealth against foreign foes or domestic troubles.

Yet a Republican committee, facing the hour of a change in the fiscal system of our country, still proclaim themselves on record as wedded to their idols and unwilling to tax the money of the rich. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am not going into a full discussion of the merits of the income tax at this time. My colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], is largely responsible for the work done on this section of the bill and is entitled to great credit for it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I will leave this portion of the bill for him to discuss when his time comes.

In regard to the revenues of the Government, we have printed in the report an estimate of revenues and expenditures under this bill. There are two portions of the income tax, one relating to the tax on corporations and the other relating to the tax on individuals. As we estimate it, the total income tax paid by individuals and corporations combined will amount to something more than $100,000,000. But we have included in our estimate, for the sake of convenience, $30,000,000 from the income tax with the internal-revenue tax, as it is so included in the estimate for last year's revenue. With the reductions in this bill, it will leave a deficit of about $69,000,000 from internal-revenue taxes, customs taxes, and other incidental sources, to be made up by the income tax. In that amount we have included the taxes that will be raised from corporations. We estimate that the amount of revenue that will be derived from personal income tax will be $70,000,000, leaving a surplus of revenue above expenditures of something over a million dollars.

Now, that looks like rather a close estimate, but it must be borne in mind that because of the contracts the last Congress had to assume from a previous Republican administration large increases in expenditures were necessitated for the Army and Navy. And then the last Congress increased the appropriations for the old soldiers, which expenditure also had to be met. These three items amount to $20,000,000 increase for the Army, $12,000,000 for the Navy, and $26,000,000 for pensions, making a total of $58,000,000.

Time of necessity will reduce the pension appropriation. The old soldiers of the country are all approaching 70 years of age. Unquestionably there will be a diminution in the amount of appropriations necessary to pay pensions within the next three years on account of the death of the present pensioners.

I believe, and feel that I can assert with confidence, that the increases made in the Army and the Navy appropriations in the past year by rigid and honest economy in the future will be reduced. So I am confident that under this bill, with the natural reductions coming from decreases in pensions and from economy in appropriations, we will not only have a million dollars of balance in our favor but we will have several millions. Indeed, I assuredly believe that the $40,000,000 which will be raised from sugar next year will be taken care of by these decreases when the three years have passed, and that it will not be necessary to increase taxes anywhere else to make up for the loss of revenue when all sugar goes to the free list.

There are a number of changes in the administrative features of this bill, but I prefer to discuss them under the five-minute rule and explain the details at that time. I have only a few words to say in conclusion. I believe that this bill is an honest revision of the tariff downward. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I believe that it is not so drastic as to jeopardize any legitimate industry; and by "legitimate industry" I do not mean those mills and factories that have gorged themselves on dividends in the past and left their floors and machinery to decay. There is no reason why they should be considered in this equation; but no legitimate industry is going to be injured by the enactment of this bill. I believe, on the other hand, that competition will bring industry to the firing line; competition will force it to its best endeavors; competition will develop it and strengthen it, so that it will no longer be a battle merely for the home market, but out of this competition will grow the strength that will carry our commerce beyond the seas. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, there is only a few words more. We are going to revise the tariff, and the Democratic Party is going to pass this bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have insisted on a reasonable limitation of general debate to-day. I shall insist on a reasonable consideration under the five-minute rule because the country is waiting to see the effect of this bill. It makes no difference whether they agree with you in theory or with us, they are as one voice and one man in demanding that this legislation should be speedily enacted and that they may have an early opportunity to adjust themselves to the new conditions. [Applause on the Democratic side.] As the party in power, I say it is our duty to the country to send this legislation through as speedily as we can, with due regard for the rights of the minority in this House, which this side of the House is always willing to accord, giving a fair consideration and a reasonable opportunity to be heard. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Gentlemen, I thank you for your attention. [Loud applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. MANN. Is it the intention of the gentleman now to yield to questions in reference to details concerning the bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would prefer to answer them when we take the bill up under the five-minute rule. As the gentleman understands, I have spoken for something over an hour and I am somewhat tired at this time.

Mr. MANN. I remember how vigorous the gentleman is, and that four years ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] spoke for nine hours explaining his bill—perhaps had need for

that length of time, but we obtained the information, and I do not think we have to-day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the Committee on Ways and Means has prepared and presented to the House a statistical handbook, which it has made a part of its report, giving the details in reference to all of these matters. I do not care to yield to any questions, but if the gentleman desired——

Mr. MANN. Oh, I was asking for the information of Members of the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman from Illinois desires to ask a question, I will endeavor to answer it.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. But the gentleman from Illinois does not ask all of the questions for this side of the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not care to yield generally for that purpose at this time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, before I begin I desire to ask a question of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] which it is understood between us that he shall answer. The minority report says that Schedule K, wool and woolens, was practically unchanged in the Payne law from what it was in the Dingley law. Is that true?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to confess that my friends have been guilty of such iniquity as reenacting the Dingley schedule into the Payne law practically without amendment I think there were three amendments.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that correct statement of the case.

WHAT AILED US?

Mr. Chairman, from the country's viewpoint there were two sound reasons for dismissing the Republican Party from power. In the first place, we stubbornly resisted reasonable reforms. Why we did so it is hard to say. Perhaps the truculent manner in which those reforms were advanced may have had much to do with our course. No man likes to be seized by the throat. No man who is a man will stand being threatened, especially by a reformer. Moreover, he who has been breathing it longest is the poorest judge of the atmosphere of a crowded room. Perhaps, in like manner, we Republicans were so long in power that we ceased to be conscious of the trend of the public thought which enveloped us.

The second reason for our dismissal was the fact that the country, I am sorry to say, desires a revision of the tariff much farther-reaching than the Payne law.

Supposing these reasons for our dismissal to have been ample, yet they were supplemented by mendacity of a peculiar virulence. It is not true that we were corrupt. It is not true that the Payne law was a violation of our promises, express or implied. It is true, however, that the country was ill content with some of the schedules of the Payne law. It can not be denied that subsequent reports of the Tariff Board have confirmed, in part at least, the country's judgment with respect to Schedule I and Schedule K, cotton goods and woolen goods.

Here let me pay my tribute to the veteran leader from the State of New York

Mr. PAYNE. Schedule I and Schedule K never met with your approval. Over your protest and against your will they were voted into the law which bears your name.

Yet through the four years which have passed you have uttered no word to defend yourself at the expense of your coworkers. You have had a weary burden of reproach to bear, and right generously have you borne it.

In the appendix to this address I shall include statements just received from the Treasury Department, together with an official table. These documents show that the Payne law has proved in practice to be a downward revision of the tariff.

THE DEMAND FOR A CHANGE.

We failed to move with the age. That was the head and front of our offending. The Republican chieftains could not adjust their views to modern schools of thought. They persisted in governing the country in their own way, not in the country's way, and so we all came to grief. The trust magnate in his director's chair damned Taft because he attacked the trusts. The orator on the hustings damned him because he did not attack the trusts. The western farmer swore vengeance on the Republican Party because, as he said, New England manufactures were overprotected. The New England operative swore vengeance on the Republican Party because, as he said, the duty on the food products of the farm was too high.

On one thing alone everyone was agreed—that the Republican Party must pay the penalty.

SPILLED MILK.

It makes very little difference now whether the Payne law was a fulfillment of my party's pledges, as I earnestly believe, or whether it was a double-dealing, interest-controlled, diabolical perversion of our promises, as the country believes or wishes to believe. The Nation does not want the Payne law, the Nation will not have the Payne law. If necessary, the Nation would rather elect a Congress of numbskulls and charlatans who will administer the elixir which it seeks rather than retain a Congress of Æsculapians who insist on compounding the old formulas, which the Nation refuses any longer to swallow. Perhaps the old political physician may in the end prove right. Perhaps the new political physician may turn out to be only another Dr. Cook.

THE HOUR FOR ACTION.

But the time for disputation has expired. The Nation's wish has been ascertained. The new doctor has been summoned. The hour for him to prescribe has arrived. It behooves us old doctors to refrain from captious interference. We must stand by to assist when necessary, and we must refrain from too fervid prayers that the new treatment may result in the patient's prostration.

MEN MUST KEEP FAITH.

Radical legislation of all kinds I expect very soon. I see no reason to believe that the Democratic membership in Congress is a gathering of rogues. Far from it. Yet rogues they surely will be accounted if they fail to carry out the program which they have promised. But I believe that they will enact the far-reaching legislation in which they have so often expressed their belief. I predict that this Congress and probably the next will place on the statute books some overdue reforms which will prove beneficial, but even more of those unwholesome innovations of whose success the cloistered smatterer is so certain. I believe that the day has gone by when legislators can safely neglect or even desire to neglect the issues upon which they have been elected. I am glad that it is so. I hope and believe that the next four years will prove to all men that it is so. In that way alone can the confidence of the people in their chosen representatives be restored. That this lack of confidence is unjust I deeply feel. That it is the product of malicious misrepresentation I am sure. Nevertheless, it exists, and to-day like a wraith it haunts representative government.

So by keeping their pledges in letter and in spirit shall the Democrats perform a service to the Nation.

THE PENALTY OF FAILURE.

Yet a strict adherence to their promises will not alone suffice to retain them in power. Democratic theories and Democratic beliefs when given the form of law must entail success and prosperity or once again the people will turn away. If the future shall show that the price of that which labor produces can be lowered without interference with the remuneration of that labor itself, then the Democratic tenure of power will be long in the land. But if the future shall show that Democratic policies entail nothing beyond a crop of disasters, the country will look elsewhere for leadership.

THE PROGRESSIVE'S CHANCE.

Men sometimes forget their promises. Suppose that the Democrats fail to carry out their radical program. Will the country return at once to our party? I doubt it. The people wish to try some of these new ideas and are willing to risk the consequences of their proving disastrous. The Republicans have not given them the legislation which, wisely or foolishly, they wish. If the Democrats follow our example, it need surprise no one should the people turn to the Progressive Party. In fact, this is the only direction in which I can foresee a future for that party. If the Democrats prove radical, intelligent radicals will not vote to turn them out of power. Surely only men who are more than ordinarily attached to the new party's name will risk a division of the radical vote by supporting the Progressive candidates.

SAFETY-VALVE DUTIES.

The Republican doctrine of a sound customs tariff requires that duties shall be fixed neither too high nor too low. They must be so high that foreign nations can neither flood our markets with goods nor dump their surplus upon us. On the other hand, they must be so low that any unwarranted rise in the price of American products shall at once invite importations from abroad.

The ideal of you Democrats is a tariff for revenue, but to such an extent only as may be consistent with your promise that no legitimate industry shall be harmed by the pending revision. Attractive as such a proposition may sound, its execution is seriously hampered by the actual conditions which confront us.

THE DILEMMA.

Clumsy as it is, misleading to the farmer as it is, inconsistent and unjust as are many of its provisions, this bill nevertheless is an attempt to carry out the promises which you Democrats made to the people. Therein lies the difficulty—your promises conflict with each other. You can not ride two horses traveling in opposite directions. You can not by one and the same tariff law keep up the price which the farmer receives and yet reduce the price which his customer pays. You can not fairly impose free trade on the fisherman and the shoemaker and the woolgrower while you force them to buy supplies protected by a duty. Yet you can not grant free trade in all the articles which the fisherman and the shoemaker and the woolgrower use without openly and obviously and beyond dispute violating your promise not to injure any legitimate industry.

THE WHOLE IS EQUAL TO THE SUM OF ALL THE PARTS.

The market basket must not be taxed, and yet the farmer must be protected. That is the perplexing paradox which must be elucidated. When cooks learn to make omelettes without breaking eggs, when one arm of a balance can rise without the other arm descending, when a magnet is invented with both poles positive, then it may be possible to provide for free foodstuffs and at the same time for protected farm products.

Look at the grotesque attempt in this bill to pursue that will-o'-the-wisp. You Democrats profess to protect the farmer's sheep. You try to soothe the simple herdsman with a 10 per cent protection for his flock. Do you think that he will fail to note that you are admitting free of duty each and every element of which his flock is composed? What purpose, other than political, does it serve if you protect the herdsman's sheep while you admit free of duty the fleece of those sheep, the skin of those sheep, and the flesh of those sheep? You might just as well compliment the garment maker with a 25 per cent duty on suits of clothes and then square yourselves with the consumer by admitting coats free and waistcoats free and pantaloons free.

In this bill the farmer is enticed with a mirage which appears to be a duty of 10 cents a bushel on oats, but on closer inspection the hallucination disappears. Oats themselves may be protected, but oatmeal made from those oats is not protected, nor are rolled oats protected. All the oats which men eat are free, and the only reason why the oats which horses eat are not free also is because farmers have votes and horses have none.

The countryman is said to have accepted many a gold brick in his time. The countryman is a plain dealer; but nothing except the countryman's sense of humor will keep him from exploding when he hears about that 10 per cent duty on cattle which you have so kindly given him. What is a cow made of? A cow has bones; a cow has a hide; a cow has flesh; a cow has hoofs; a cow has horns; a cow has blood; a cow has hair; and a cow gives milk. The cow may be dutiable at 10 per cent, but her bones are free, her hide is free, her flesh is free, her hoofs are free, her horns are free, her blood is free, her hair is free, and her milk is free. Inasmuch as the entire cubic content of the cow is free, while the cow herself is dutiable, I am forced to the conclusion that the Democratic majority estimates the bovine soul to be worthy of just 10 per cent protection.

Wheat must pay a duty of 10 cents a bushel, while bread and biscuits made from that wheat are free, and flour made from that wheat is free if it comes from certain nations.

THE UNDERWOOD CONTRIBUTION TO ECONOMIC THOUGHT.

What possible protection are all these duties to the farmer? All his foreign competitor needs to do in order to avoid payment of any duty whatever is to convert his sheep into mutton and wool, his cattle into hides and beef, his oats into oatmeal, and his wheat into bread, biscuits, or wafers. So good-bye to the farmers' protection. And good-bye to the jobs of many an American who to-day is manufacturing food.

Since my boyhood I have heard men expound the theory of free raw materials. I am prepared to admit that this doctrine has made some headway with New England manufacturers. Unquestionably it has an appreciable following among our leading economists. It is evident, however, that the doctrine is old fashioned and is to be replaced by the Underwood dogma of "free finished products and taxed raw materials." Mr. Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I congratulate you on having written a new page in the history of political economy. Doubtless this new page will commend itself to those modern philosophers whose enthusiasm for a doctrine is in exact proportion to its novelty.

BOOTS AND SHOES.

Now, a few observations on shoemaking, the principal industry of my district.

When under the Payne law the duty on shoes was cut in two, I confess that I expected a vast increase in importations. I may have been so incautious as to predict some such occurrence.

At any rate, I was wrong. The importations of shoes remain small, while the value of our exports amounted in the fiscal year of 1912 to $16,000,000, of which $10,000,000 was absorbed by the various countries of the American Continent. As the value of our annual product of boots and shoes now amounts to $500,000,000, it will be seen that our export trade represents a little over 3 per cent of the total.

Because of the amount of our shoe exports and because of the fact that our shoe imports are negligible, the Democratic Committee on Ways and Means has felt justified in subjecting us to the unlimited competition of free trade.

I shall not to-day present my grounds for believing that free boots and shoes are a serious menace to one of our great industries. On the contrary, I admit at once that from the Democratic point of view it was consistent to put boots and shoes on the free list, for you Democrats believe that only actual imports can justify a duty on any given article.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, from the majority's viewpoint free boots and shoes may be just; but even so, where is the justice of charging a duty on any of the supplies which are required for use in the shoe industry? Shoe leather, the principal item, has been put on the free list, to be sure, but I hold in my hand a list of 30 different dutiable articles, all of which enter into the process of shoemaking.

The Democratic Committee on Ways and Means probably meant to act fairly by the shoemakers when it put leather on the free list. Yet it was a case of robbing Peter to pay Paul, and it was a pretty slim settlement of Paul's account at best. If shoes ought to go on the free list because there are no shoe imports, then leather ought to stay on the dutiable list because there are annually $6,000,000 to $7,000,000 of leather imports.

As a matter of fact, an injustice is to be done to the leather industry greater even than that which is to be done to the shoe industry. Both industries must buy in a protected market and sell in an unprotected market. The difference is that leather men are to be subjected to a foreign competition which has already clearly manifested itself even under the present rates of import duty.

Upon my word, Mr. Speaker, such a course as this is not free trade. It amounts to subsidizing the foreigner to fight our own shoemakers and our own tanners. To our own citizens we say, "You shall pay a tax or duty on many of your raw materials." To the foreigner we say, "You shall escape scot-free of any tax whatever."

FISH.

In the name of the consumer fish is to be put on the free list. Poisonous as that cup may be for the fisherman, his draft has been embittered because his sense of injustice has been aroused.

My Democratic friends, why did not you in the name of the consumer put rice on the free list?

Is it because rice yields a revenue? Fish yields more revenue. Is it because rice is imported, notwithstanding the present duty? More fish than rice is imported, notwithstanding the present duty. Is it because the cultivators of rice are poor men? In all the history of Gloucester, never was anyone able to retire from business on profits made in the fisheries.

What is the explanation then? Why in the name of the consumer do you distinguish between one raw food product and another raw food product? Why do you make fish of fish while you make fowl of rice and of vegetables, early and late, and, for a while at least, of sugar? Some one must throw light upon this question. Else it should be no cause for astonishment should the censorious accuse you Democrats of sectional favoritism.

THE FREE MARKET BASKET.

The Democratic Party, correctly enough, I imagine, expects to reap a bountiful political harvest from its adoption of the free market basket as a policy aiming at the reduction of the high cost of living.

Perhaps the free market basket may not satisfy the tariff longings of the farming States; but does any representative of an industrial community doubt for a moment the popularity of the free market basket? Is any man from a manufacturing State unconscious of the widespread belief that the tariff is responsible for the high price of food products? We may argue till we are black in the face that a duty of 1½ cents a pound on beef can not possibly raise the price 10 cents a pound. We may expend our eloquence on the axiom that a duty of 4 cents a pound on bacon can not account for the fact that the people are paying more for that article than they paid when the duty was still higher. Try as we may to divest our audiences of

their error, we only succeed in divesting ourselves of our audiences.

Every Massachusetts Republican Congressman knows all that. Last autumn there was not one of us who was unaware of the temptation to insure his own election by declaring for free foodstuffs. Yet we knew in our hearts that duties on manufactures and duties on farm products must go hand in hand. How long did the protective system last in England after the repeal of the Corn Laws? Just about as long as it took the indignant British farmer to join with the free trader and wipe the whole slate clean.

THE PROPHETS ARE HIBERNATING.

So I admit that to-day the policy of the free market basket is at the height of its popularity. If the future shall show that the free market basket in actual operation is an empty market basket, the feeling in its favor will change. If time shall prove that the free market basket contains foodstuffs as high priced as ever, its popularity will wane.

Speaking of lower prices, as the day for the trial of the great experiment approaches I have detected a growing hesitancy on the part of my Democratic friends to specify just what foodstuffs will be cheaper. I commend their prudence.

By the same token I notice a tendency on my own side of the House to hedge a little on our forecasts of destruction.

The fact is that prophecy belongs in the category of lost gifts. We do not any of us know what is going to happen. We can not, for instance, foresee the future industrial policy of British trade-unions. We know that to-day the shoemakers of England restrict their output to a substantial degree. We know that the weavers of England object to the introduction of the automatic loom. We do not know how soon those unions may come to some arrangement with their employers. When that day arrives it is not unreasonable to expect that our shoe shops and our textile mills will speedily feel the results.

Exceptional crops may disguise the untoward effects, if any there be, of the pending bill, while diminished crops may intensify them. No matter what consequences may occur, men will always differ as to the extent with which the Underwood law of 1913 should be charged with the responsibility. Even at this late day men are still wrangling over the effects of the Wilson law of 1894.

FANTASTIC FORECASTS.

I am no herald of disaster, yet it is my belief that it is unjustifiable to assert that there is no ground for apprehension of industrial depression. Whether the business world is in the next few years to be subjected by the Government to the thumbscrew and the rack, as the alarmists tell us, or whether it is to be subjected to a surgical operation for its own good, as many persons contend—in either case it is not to be expected that the patient should display any noteworthy eagerness.

Yet, though there may well be a reasonable fear lest trade should slacken or even languish, and though the danger of prolonged unemployment is by no means lightly to be dismissed, it is fantastic to prate of total ruin when all around us we see vigor. The blind man may babble of our decadence, but the man of normal vision can see nothing but growth.

TO MY FELLOW CONVICTS.

A few words to my own side of the House. A decade ago the country believed that the Republican Party could do no wrong. For four years past the country has believed that the Republican Party can do no right. Unreason in praise, unreason in blame.

The Nation in its passion condemned us for a dishonesty of which we were not guilty. Having convicted and punished us, the Nation will now proceed to examine the evidence, and last of all perhaps the indictment may be reached. The indignation against us will grow fainter and fainter until at last men will ask each other whether after all it was justice which was meted out to us. When that day comes we shall be restored to power purged of the evils incident to every long tenure of office.

For the most part we Republicans are conservative; but we seek to conserve only that which is sound, and we seek to uproot and replace that which is outworn and detrimental. It is the ship of state which we wish to conserve, not the barnacles on her bottom nor the rats in her hold.

We are no boding tremblers who shrink from change.

Change may be violent and painful, yet its end is life. Decay may be calm and painless, yet its end is death.

It is decay, not change, which men ought to fear, and the Republican Party should give no heed to the timid mortal whose overwrought fancy can see only the ghastly specter of social upheaval lurking behind that which in reality is beneficent evolution.

OUR PARTY'S FUTURE.

If in the future we shall follow the wise policy of suppressing in season the abuses which human nature breeds, if in the future we shall refuse to tolerate unreasonable delay in the destruction of evils, then we may be certain that the Republican Party will be preserved as an heritage for generations yet to come.

Since the Republican Party was founded many a dynasty has fallen, many an ancient power has been overthrown from turret to foundation stone, many a scepter has been wrenched from many a majestic grasp.

My friends, we are now at the head of the column. We are the leaders who must choose the right road and reject the wrong road. The Republican book of fate is open and our names are on the front page. Falter, and we shall see our grand old party swept away into the awful past of things which once were great. Grasp the helm boldly and, by the grace of God, we shall bring our good dreadnought safe through the hurricane.

APPENDIX A.

Below are two recent letters from the Treasury Department which show that in practice the Payne law has proved to be a downward revision of from 4 to 6½ per cent. When it is remembered that the greater part of the increases of duty in the Payne law were confined to wines, spirits, silks, perfumery, and other luxuries it will be at once apparent that there was a substantial downward revision in that part of the tariff law in which the average man and woman is particularly interested:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 17, 1913.

Hon. A. P. GARDNER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th instant, requesting information as to certain computations made by the Treasury Department in 1910, showing a comparison of the duties collected under the tariff act of 1909 with those that would have been collected on the same importations under the tariff act of 1897.

You state that Ex-Congressman E. J. Hill, of Connecticut, made the assertion in a speech that the computation showed that the importations considered actually paid into the Treasury under the Payne law $11,178,162.02 less than they would have paid if no change of law had been made. You request to be informed as to the following points:

First. Is the above difference correctly stated?

Second. What were the months covered by the computation?

Third. What were the aggregate importations covered by the computation?

In reply I have to state that:

First. The figures given are correctly stated, as shown by the computations made, which are believed to be correct. The amount stated represents the net decrease.

Second. The months covered by the computations were the six months from October 1, 1909, to March 31, 1910.

Third. The aggregate importations covered by the computations had a total value of $804,878,645.46, and these importations consisted of all dutiable items, Philippine goods, and items in the free list for the period mentioned, with the exception of various items having a total value of $2,983,830.97, relative to which the data at hand were insufficient to form a satisfactory basis for the computation of the duties under the act of 1897.

Respectfully,

J. F. CURTIS,
Assistant Secretary.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 1, 1913.

Hon. A. P. GARDNER,
House of Representatives, United States.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th instant, further in the matter of computations made on importations received under the tariff act of 1909, showing a comparison of the duties collected and the duties computed on the same importations under the rates of the tariff of 1897.

You state that you have been informed that such computations have been made for the period from April 1, 1910, to October 1, 1910, and you request information as to the following points:

First. Whether or not a computation has been made by the Treasury Department for an entire year showing a comparison of the duties collected under the tariff act of 1909 as compared with the duties that would have been collected on the same importations had the tariff act of 1897 still been in force?

Second. Which 12 months were covered by these importations?

Third. What results appeared—

(a) As to percentage of increase or decrease under the Payne law?

(b) As to the increase or decrease in the total amount collected under the Payne law?

In reply I have to state that the department did not make computations for the six months mentioned by you, but did for the fiscal year 1911, relative to which, in response to your questions, you are advised as follows:

First. Yes; the computation as outlined was made.

Second. The 12 months covered were those from July 1, 1910, to June 30, 1911.

Third. (a) The computations showed a decrease under the Payne law of 4.05 per cent. (b) The decrease under the Payne law shown by the computations was found to be $13,036,875.84.

As in the previous computations, the above figures represent the net decrease on the items compared, consisting of the dutiable items, Philippine goods, and items in the free list according to the importations for the period under consideration, except various items relative to which the data at hand were insufficient to form a satisfactory basis for a computation of the duties under the tariff act of 1897. The percentage of decrease is based on the duties computed under the tariff act of 1897.

With respect to the last paragraph of your letter, requesting information as to whether there is any printed publication which covers the points mentioned, I have to state that the department knows of no printed publication covering the points in question, as the computations were prepared in the form of typewritten schedules only during the years 1910 and 1911 for the use of the President.

Respectfully,

J. F. CURTIS,
Assistant Secretary.

APPENDIX B.

[From page III, Department of Commerce and Labor report on imported merchandise entered for consumption in the United States in 1912.]

Average rate of duty collected on all importations, free and dutiable, during the following years:

	Per cent.
Wilson tariff.	
1895	20.44
1896	20.67
Part Wilson—Part Dingley.	
1897	21.89
Dingley tariff.	
1898	24.77
1899	29.48
1900	27.62
1901	28.91
1902	27.95
1903	27.85
1904	26.29
1905	23.77
1906	24.22
1907	23.28
1908	23.88
Part Dingley—Part Payne.	
1909	22.99
Payne tariff.	
1910	21.11
1911	20.29
1912	18.58

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, how much time has been consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has used 1 hour and 25 minutes, and the gentleman from New York has consumed 45 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that as one of the new Members here to-day I have listened with as much interest as anyone to these scholarly addresses by the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Massachusetts.

They have told us a great deal of the theory of tariff, have elaborated upon the theories of a tariff for revenue only and a high protective tariff. They seem to forget that the vast majority of American citizens care less than nothing for academic theories and war crys and slogans fashioned to deceive.

The plain people of this country demand that the tariff be constructed with an eye single to the common welfare by a method which shall assure justice to all.

We have had tariffs for special interests, for war charges, for infant industries, for the manufacture of millionaires and paupers. The time is assuredly here for a tariff for the people. If you must have a theory, suppose we put it on the theory that things which are crooked and those which are reared in darkness and secrecy can not grow high and strong, and that common sense is the best assurance of efficiency and justice in the tariff.

Mr. Chairman, I am here holding a commission from the people of one of the greatest industrial districts of this country and of the world. In view of that fact, I desire to make a statement of the wishes of the people of my district regarding this tariff legislation. I promise you it will not be a repetition of desires you have had dinned into your ears unceasingly in the past. I shall not attempt to speak for any other interest save that of the common people, by whose command I am here.

In my district are located some of the greatest industrial establishments of the world. They have given the district the name of "workshop of the world." But let me tell you that the greatest claim of the district to consideration at your hands is not in the workshops but in the workers, not the machines but the machinists, not the buildings but the builders, not the tools but the toilers. In those giant establishments armies of men and women toil, and they are producing daily wealth greater than was dreamed by fairy tale writers of old. Their brain and brawn unite to pour out with lavish hand the countless products that make for greater comfort and should make for a happier humanity. And over that army of workers, greater than any that ever went forth in the annals of war, there floats a nobler banner and on it the words are wrought "for service."

I am here to represent them, the real manufacturers, those who take the ragged, raw material out of the field and mine, and in the sweat of their brows transform it into products of usefulness. They are the miracle workers, who handle the ore through its processes and make the iron and steel to serve the purposes of mankind. Theirs is the real work of manufacturing, and only when their tasks are finished do we have the completed products which are so highly regarded in statistics and in laws.

I speak for them and they deserve representation far beyond my ability to give, for they and those whose interests are identical with theirs make up the bone and sinew of this Nation, the masses of the people, upon whom alone the hope for the future rests. But I am responsible for presenting their cause as best I may, and in doing that I tell you that the time has come to deal with facts, not political theories. The people I represent care less than nothing for party labels and war crys. They do care everything for securing equality of opportunity, equal rights to every man.

The people believe in protection, honest protection, but they believe in it as a principle, not as a privilege. They are through with meaningless partisan appeals, fashioned for deception. They have abandoned the false pretense that the process of making millionaires by legislation justifies suffering and misery on the part of the many. They have decided for themselves that prosperity does not consist in swollen fortunes for a few, while the many lack the comforts of life. They will not even be satisfied to see one section of this Nation prosper at the expense of all the rest of the people. They believe that under present conditions an excessive tariff which fosters monopoly and shuts out all competition is no more protection than free trade, since it lowers the standard of American wages by reducing their purchasing power.

The people want an equalization of the cost of labor here and abroad, but they will not tolerate a situation where, under cover of that principle, a tariff is levied many times higher than the entire labor cost entering into a product. I am here to tell you that the people will no longer stand for the betrayal of the principle of honest protection by those who claim to be its chiefest apostles. In proof of that I might point you to the fact so evident here to-day that the majority of those apostles, victors in a hundred fights, have made their last sad journey from Leipsic to Waterloo. And it will profit those who survive to remember that the dangers to honest protection do not come from those who desire to remedy existing evils, but from those who insist on injustice and disregard of the right, deception, and special privileges to the few at the expense of the many. [Applause.]

The people make but one request in this matter of tariff legislation. They ask justice, and they are determined to secure it. They demand that the tariff shall be so adjusted that its benefits will be equally bestowed upon all the people of this Nation and not upon a class. The first question that should be considered by those who are to make tariff laws is, "Can justice be secured through the old methods of tariff making, or does that aim demand the adoption of a new and better method?"

If the present system is satisfactory and has met the requirements of justice, then the demand for another method has no claim whatever to consideration. But if experience shows that the demands of justice have not been met in the past, then the claims of another method deserve full investigation.

The history of tariff legislation in this country shows that succeeding laws have been jumbles of absurdities based on guesswork and logrolling, and that they have utterly failed to satisfy the justice and humanity of the American people. Almost the first business of the First Congress, assembled under the Constitution, was the consideration of a tariff bill. It was presented by James Madison, who urged its passage solely on the ground of remedying the "notorious deficiency in our Treasury." No attention was paid to the future effects of the measure, and the fact that the very men who secured its passage later became bitter opponents of the protective principle shows that they regarded it simply as an emergency measure in which the exigency of the occasion excused many defects.

From that day until this, a period of 125 years, the tariff question had been the puzzling problem of the Nation. Two hundred and sixty-one separate tariff laws have been enacted, and if all the hearings, investigations, and testimonies were published and collected the volumes would fill an immense library.

Public men of great renown have shifted from one side to the other of the question. Webster and Calhoun, in notable speeches in the United States Senate, have at different times favored each side as they followed the demand of their Commonwealths. Nullification measures have been passed by sovereign States in their indignation against tariff measures. Compromises have been

necessary to avert civil strife; depressions and financial crises have followed both high tariff and low tariff acts based on limited information; administrations have been changed and parties cast from authority while the opposition party was elevated to power, and still in spite of all this the same system of tariff making has persisted to the dissatisfaction and anger of the people.

Every tariff revision in recent years has meant disaster for the party responsible. President Cleveland led the forces of Democracy to a revision, and the voters could scarcely wait until the election to show their fury. President Harrison revised the tariff, and the Republican Party was retired from power forthwith. President McKinley escaped the same fate only through a foreign war, and President Taft's unlucky revision is too fresh in our memories to need recalling, or, if it needs recalling, a glance at the White House and the membership of this body should be sufficient. It is to be remarked also that President Wilson will not profit by their example, but insists on following the same haphazard method so often rejected by the people, and there is little room to doubt but that history will repeat itself when the people give their decision.

The fact of the matter is, and only the veriest pauper of observation fails to see it, that acting through the old system of tariff making we are as far from a permanent and satisfactory solution of this perplexing issue as we were when Madison introduced the first tariff bill into Congress.

Under such circumstances it is assuredly the part of wisdom to determine why no solution has been reached, and the reason is not hard to find. Every tariff act passed thus far has been framed on limited information and through political and partisan compromise. The adjustment of the tariff schedules to the tariff policy of the Nation is a technical problem. It affects every man, woman, and child through commerce and industry, and demands a complete accurate and impartial knowledge of all the essential facts relating to the industries affected.

To secure that knowledge it is imperative that Congress have at its service a permanent body of trained and impartial experts to secure the vast amount of technical and statistical data needed for the legislation which is to vitally affect many and diverse interests. For that reason the Progressive plan for the creation of such a commission meets the urgent need, and the history of the past upholds the Progressive's contention that it is the only solution of a problem which has vexed the Nation from its foundation. It is the only solution which does away with the two factors which have prevented satisfactory and just tariff legislation in the past, insufficient information and legislative logrolling.

Judging from the past, it becomes evident that the impartial, nonpartisan tariff commission is not only necessary to produce symmetry and completeness, but it is absolutely imperative to end the haphazard, juggling methods of tariff making which have made the tariff a cause of disturbance in trade and production and a source of injury to the public welfare. [Applause.]

But while the historian looks only at yesterday the student of events looks at to-day. There is no real patriotism in public or in private life except that which exerts itself for all the people. There is no real statesmanship except that which stands ready to meet the conditions of the present and for sacrifice, if need be, in behalf of a just and righteous effort for the common good.

I am not here as a doctrinaire on either side of the tariff question. I consider that Congress should deal with things as they are to-day, that its measures should be adapted to the present situation, regardless of theories of the past. The tariff question is simply a question of meeting the needs of to-day justly and equitably and in a manner which will promote the common welfare. From that viewpoint the creation of a tariff commission is a necessity, for conditions are such that an adequate and just method of dealing with them is not only a wise measure but a patriotic duty.

I maintain that a fair and conscientious judgment of the result of the excessive protection of the present tariff law must convince one that some change is absolutely necessary. The people at large have made up their minds to that at least, but only because they have become convinced that the excessive rates imposed on many articles force the public to pay excessive prices for the wants and requirements of everyday life.

I said before that I come from the workshop of the world, and yet I am forced to say that in that workshop, with a production that staggers the imagination, the task of making a livelihood is an increasingly difficult one. Each year makes production cheaper and easier through new methods, but each year sees in the ranks of the army of producers more gaunt figures, hungry men and women, and children with the marks of premature age imprinted upon their countenances. Often the statistics of our great industries would seem to give the impression that the employees are simply so many producing machines, but they can not be so regarded. They are human beings with loved ones to protect, and they have hearts and minds as well as hands. They are awake to conditions and they must be taken into consideration by the lawmakers of this Nation. They have the same needs and hopes and fears as the captains of industry who sometimes seem to scarcely know of their existence.

These citizens of America are asking nothing but what is fair and just, and they will be satisfied with nothing less. They want no special privileges and undue advantages; all they ask is justice and the commonest kind of justice at that. They do not ask charity, they ask what is due them. They ask one hundred cents' value for every dollar expended—no more and no less.

What is their condition to-day? They go forth in the morning, taking the only thing they have to sell—their labor—and they sell it in the market for whatever the market will give. They are anxious to labor arduously if they may secure for themselves and their families the livelihood they deserve. They work long and skilfully and produce abundantly. But somehow, through processes they could not see, but whose mysteries they better understand to-day, they find their incomes insufficient to meet their absolutely necessary expenses. Instead of abundance, there is scarcity in their homes; instead of some leisure to develop a full, rounded life, they find themselves tied to a deadly routine of hopelessness, with its toll of blighting toil and fatigue. While selling their commodity in a market place for what it will bring, they pay an unseen tax collector a tribute on everything they buy.

Those are actual conditions, and I defy any man to successfully deny them. Pennsylvania and other industrial States have been held up as States which profit most from high protection; but let me say that in no other States in the Union has the policy of honest protection been more shamefully abused. In them we have seen competition excluded from abroad by a towering tariff wall, behind which home manufacturers combined into giant trusts and throttled domestic competition. I do not maintain that excessive tariff has been the only factor, but it has had a part in producing such a condition. Following that condition we have seen plants reduced in number and workmen thrown out of employment in order to curtail production and maintain high prices. We have seen small concerns crushed out of existence with ruthless power, and then that augmented force turned just as ruthlessly against all combinations of workmen who desired the right of collective bargaining. We have seen American labor getting decent wages and humane hours, not in the ultraprotected industries, but in the nonprotected industries which are not in any fashion subsidized in the name of labor. We have seen the necessaries of life soaring upward far beyond the power of wages to follow. We have seen men trying to work for ordinary wages when the prices of life's needs were extraordinarily high, and the result has been that life itself is almost a luxury.

We have seen business men, striving to serve the wants of a community in honest fashion, pilloried by a resistless power that crushed out their independence and dictated the terms on which they should do business. We have seen the foreign-labor competition, so greatly decried by ultraprotectionists, brought to our doors to supplant American labor at lower wage levels. We have seen the mills and mines manned with foreign workmen in increasing numbers until they form the large majority of the employees in many industries. We have seen, as the result of such a situation, the tramping of the sullen hordes of anarchy, with their strange banners and alien cries of hate and destruction, forming a distinct menace to free institutions.

The people have seen all this and more, and with the truth staring them in the face they have made up their minds that the day of excessively high tariffs for the products of great combinations is over. The American public will no longer bow to a big business which pays enormous dividends on watered stock and less than a living wage to those who turn out its products. They have decided once and for all that the tariff is not a matter of political expediency, not a commodity with which to bargain for political preferment, but a living, vital fact which concerns every individual and which must be dealt with in a spirit of justice and equality. The people believe also that juggling with the tariff will not serve as a club over manufacturers to keep them from dishonesty and greed and inhumanity. They believe in direct and fundamental remedies to prevent unscrupulous employers from grinding down the wages of labor and imposing upon the consuming public. Something more

than the sword of Damocles in the shape of a tariff revision is needed to protect wage earners and the public against the conscienceless cunning of strong-armed lust for gain. Those remedies must be adopted, for the evils of to-day will not be dealt with and met through a political-jobbery tariff, handled as a partisan question, with the barter and sale of the market place.

I am under no illusions as to the possibilities that lie within this Underwood tariff bill. I do not believe any finite mind can see into the future with a gaze sufficiently searching to know the results of its passage. It has been written in hasty manner, and every schedule contains mysteries which no one understands, not even the men who put them there. It has in reality been passed in a secret binding caucus, with all the evasions which such a method makes inevitable. It is a leap in the dark, but after all the consequences of that leap must be charged to the very interests who have in the past scorned the demands of the people and scoffed at their prayers for relief. Through a period of many years the great protected industries of this country have built up a system of haphazard, reckless tariff legislation, because through it they secured golden privileges. They profited through the betrayal of the promises of the Republican Party, which passed a tariff law of suicidal folly and brazen treachery. The great interests of the country, which might have stood for a fair and impartial tariff commission in the past, did not want justice and a square deal to all; they should not complain to-day if they suffer from the system they themselves created. They are simply reaping what they sowed and the harvest was as certain as the seed time.

I know well that I am speaking new and strange doctrine from my district, but I am voicing the desires of the common people of all parties and creeds, and to them alone I am responsible for my actions. I know the probable results of any action which opposes the powers that have profited by ultra-protection, and that when they could no longer trust to their special privileges being supported by the people, have deliberately organized a vast political machine to secure unjust advantages. I know the tactics used to discredit and disgrace, the degrees of baseness, the money poured out like water, the falsehoods circulated in controlled mediums.

I know all that and I accept it. I could not do otherwise and be true to those who have trusted me. I have learned, too, in my brief life that it is far better to accept the gall of defeat than to wear a crown of victory purchased at the price of treason to the people and their interests.

I believe that the tariff is fundamentally a moral question and that it will never be settled until it is settled right. The Underwood bill does not settle the question right, and I am firm in the belief that it will be as conclusive evidence as the other measures of the past—that only in a just, nonpartisan, impartial tariff commission can justice be secured. It will show that such a solution of this problem is imperative because of the eternal wrangle between the protected interests and the people which the present system makes inevitable. The creation of the tariff commission will be the enthronement of a principle of right and not a sordid issue between classes of citizens. It should be adopted because it is the requirement of an enlightened and progressive era in American development. It derives its strength not from the promises that it will give special privileges to a part, but that it is necessary for the good of all. It demands adoption as a matter of straightforward business policy, not only because it is right but because nothing else will meet the demands of common justice. It would not destroy the principle of protection but would let the light in on its character and on each of its countless ramifications. If the principle can not stand the light of truth, the sooner it is destroyed the better. If it is a policy that means advancement of the common welfare, the truth can not hinder, but will further its success and perpetuate its advantages.

For myself, I am willing to have my motives assailed and be execrated by every holder of special privilege, every preyer upon the poor, every drab of journalism, and every parasite of politics, if I may have the supreme pleasure of standing for the interests of those who earn an honest living in the sweat of their brows, and ask only a square deal and no favors. They make up this great Nation and give it riches and greatness. They deserve at the very least that they should eat their honestly earned daily bread with the bitterness of injustice taken from it. They deserve that and they will never rest until they have secured it. This vexing tariff question will be settled and it will be settled right. For, while the historian looks only at yesterday and the student of events only at to-day, the patriot, with faith in America, pays due regard to both and considers also to-morrow. Some one has said that "Justice is the end and aim of government. It always has been pursued and always will be pursued until it be attained or until liberty be lost in the pursuit." I would omit the last clause of that quotation, for I am firm in the faith that justice will be secured in this Nation of ours.

The new type of American citizenship is asking legislation for the common good and his fight is not to secure privileges for himself but to keep others from securing privileges which would injure the general welfare. He stands squarely against the standpatism of stagnation and also the radicalism of indiscriminating destruction. He wants progress along fair and just lines, and I believe that he will hold to that purpose through all changes of parties and political organizations with no abating of heart or hope until he has conquered all obstacles and secured the most priceless boon possible to mankind—justice and equal opportunity for every man, woman, and little child.

And that goal will be secured in the tariff, not through a juggling, logrolling system which produces a tariff for special interests, with too much or too little protection by chance, but through a better and more just method, which shall produce a tariff for all the people.

Gentlemen, I thank you for your courtesy. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, for the fifth time in a generation the prosperity of the Nation and the fate of political parties hang on the drafting and enactment of tariff legislation. In the light of the far-reaching effect, economic and industrial, sociological and political, of past revisions, the occasion is one of profound concern for all of the American people and of grave responsibility for those in position to write their views into law.

You of the Democratic household of faith have complete control under the great dome and at the White House; the responsibility is therefore wholly yours. We on this side may and will protest. It is our duty to criticize wherein we believe criticism is justified. We may even indulge in prophecy, but we do not cherish the hope or harbor the expectation that our protests, our criticisms, or our prophecies will avail in changing in the slightest degree the plan or scope of your determination. What is to be will be yours for better or for worse, so far as praise or blame shall attach and follow. Viewing your legislation as we do, our profound regret with regard to it arises from the fact that while you alone are responsible the evil effects we anticipate can not be confined to you, or those who agree with you, but will fall as a deadly blight upon the whole body of our people.

FAVORABLE CONDITIONS.

You have entered upon a revision of the tariff schedules under the most fortuitous circumstances and conditions that ever surrounded or accompanied a similar undertaking. You have the exceeding good fortune that your revision occurs at a time of unexampled prosperity. Whatever else may be said of Republican tariff legislation this no man can gainsay, that under it, whether by reason of it or in spite of it must remain a matter of opinion, the industries of the Nation have grown and prospered at a rate and to a degree unparalleled in the world's history. Under our legislation there has been a continuous and unchecked advance in the modes and standards of living, a steady shortening of the hours and increase in the rewards of labor, a marvelous prosperity widely diffused and very generally enjoyed. Upon the very crest of this ceaselessly advancing wave of human betterment with all of the advantages of its mighty momentum; with a Treasury, in spite of your enormous appropriations, well stocked; with the granaries of the Nation still laden with the fruits of an unprecedented harvest and every prospect for another fruitful year, you enter upon your work. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Furthermore you are fortunate beyond all past experience in the attitude of the people and of the press toward your enterprise. Notwithstanding the fears and the misgivings with which a large portion of our people view your determination to write upon the statute books your widely conflicting, but generally radical, declarations relative to the tariff there is a well-nigh universal determination, expressed and apparent on every hand, to await with philosophical resignation the outcome of your labors and the practical effects of your handiwork. No considerable number of men, no important influences, so far as I know, have attempted or contemplated any action that shall unfairly prejudice in advance the effect of your schedules.

No organized effort has been or is likely to be made, as has been so frequently our experience in the past, for purely selfish or partisan purposes to create an atmosphere of hostility and distrust. No one is disposed to arouse anger and resentment through misleading, untruthful, or purely captious and carping criticism of your schedules or their probable effect. In spite of unwarranted and ungracious assertions to the contrary by some

high in your councils, there is no evidence in any quarter of any concerted effort to create panic, but rather an abundance of proof of a determination on the part of powerful influences in the field of capital and labor to preserve normal and favorable conditions pending the enactment and trial of your legislation.

YOUR ADVANTAGES.

To fully realize the advantage which you enjoy under present conditions we have but to recall the wicked assaults upon the McKinley bill, during and subsequent to the period of its enactment, or the scurvy tricks and mendacious statements which characterized the campaign which immediately followed. We have only to compare present conditions with those which obtained when the Dingley bill became a law; the pressing demand for immediate revenue to replenish a treasury your legislation and administration had depleted; the imperative necessity for heroic remedies for the restoration of industries your policies had prostrated, and to bring back a prosperity you had driven from our own to foreign shores.

Coming down to later times within our immediate recollection, we vividly recall the unfortunate conditions which accompanied the enactment of the Payne bill; the atmosphere of suspicion and hypercriticism which surrounded it on all sides during the period of its gestation; the hostile attitude of a powerful press; the merciless assaults upon its faults and the conscienceless misrepresentation of the tenor and probable effect of many of its schedules. From these staggering handicaps which have burdened our past revisions, exaggerating their faults, minimizing their virtues, creating prejudices which abundance of revenue, favorable trade balances, or general prosperity could never wholly remove, you are fortunately free. Your success or failure therefore will depend wholly upon the character of your legislation and its effect upon the Nation and its people.

YOUR HANDICAPS.

On the other hand, you are embarrassed by what you did a year ago when, without responsibility and with the announced hope of "putting the President in a hole," you played partisan politics with the tariff and introduced and passed bills whose schedules, by a process of political somersaulting, you now largely repudiate. Wholly through your own fault, you are without accurate information on which to base schedules by reason of your refusal to retain the services or accept the findings of a capable and nonpartisan Tariff Board. The scandalously brief period given for the presentation of views before your committee, a few moments, in many cases, to industries of vast extent and great importance, the widespread opinion that no argument not in harmony with your declared purpose would have any weight or influence with you, had the effect of deterring those engaged in many important lines of endeavor from attempting to speak for their industries and enterprises. Finally you were and are handicapped by the utter lack of any clearly defined or definitely announced policy of tariff revision. The result of all this is that the product of your labors, compromises, and guesses is neither fiscal fish, flesh, nor fowl, neither free trade, tariff for revenue, nor for protection, but an undigested mess and mixture of them all, with free trade, present or prospective, predominating.

COMMITTEE NOT WHOLLY TO BLAME.

The Democratic members of the committee who framed this measure and rammed it down the throats of their protesting colleagues accomplished their purpose not by arguments addressed to your judgment but by artful appeals for support for that coordinate branch of the Government which controls the shaking of the plum tree. Whether it was loyalty to the titular head of the party or a lively sense of favors to come which most prevailed in persuading many of you, contrary to your judgment as to the best interests of your constituents, I shall leave it to them to decide, with the conviction that neither excuse will save you from the wrath to come. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But these gentlemen who framed the measure and compelled you to accept it are not wholly to blame because it is what it is, for with a platform declaration that protective tariffs are unconstitutional, with a presidential declaration that no legitimate industry should suffer, with the Underwood patented "competitive" tariff, and the ancient Democratic shiboleth of free trade, all to reconcile, the wonder is that the committee did not do worse, if, indeed, that were possible.

Had the free traders in your party been able to prevail in all things the result could not have been much, if any, more disastrous, for the need of revenue would have stayed their hand, and they would, at least, have been consistent enough not to place a duty on the raw material of an industry the finished product of which went to the free list, as you have done in numerous instances. Had the tariff for revenue idea prevailed the total destruction which now impends over the sheep-raising, the sugar-growing, and other industries of the country might have been in a measure averted. Had the Underwood idea of a "competitive" tariff been carried out in good faith and with full information many of our industries which now face ruin might have been partly saved, for while the author of that copyrighted form of tariff does not know it, a competitive tariff fairly interpreted is but another name for a tariff measuring the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. Had the assurance of President Wilson, given during the campaign, that no legitimate industry had anything to fear from Democratic tariff revision, been fulfilled great enterprises of the farm and ranch, the mill, mine, and factory would not now be under sentence of destruction through Democratic tariff legislation.

DEADLY AS A WHOLE, UNSOUND IN DETAIL.

The deadly character of this tariff mixture is the inevitable result of an uncanny combination of every evil form of Democratic heresy. As certain elements but mildly dangerous in themselves become, in combination, destructive and deadly to a superlative degree, so these various Democratic tariff heresies in evil combination become an agency of measureless potentiality for harm. Not only is the measure fundamentally wrong in principle or lack of principle, but it bears numberless evidences of unsound and ill-considered action in the casting and framing of schedules. The general substitution of ad valorem for specific duties is squarely in conflict with the lessons of our own experience and directly contrary to the present practice of those countries, like Germany, which have made the most thorough and scientific study of tariff questions. This is certain to aid and encourage fraud and lead to such serious and general undervaluation as to render rates, at best too low, still lower in their actual application. The placing of the same or a higher rate on the raw material of a process or industry than on the advanced or finished product has no counterpart in any tariff legislation with which I am familiar and will be disastrous to industries. In various schedules of the bill a great variety of articles widely differing in the percentage of labor cost are grouped under one head with the same rate. This is evidence either of profound ignorance of the elementary principles of tariff making or of utter indifference as to the effect of schedules on American labor and enterprise. Of necessity such rates are either too low to give the American producer any chance on any of the articles or else too high on some and too low on others.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I would be glad to do so, but I have only an hour and I desire to complete what I have in mind to say.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is just a question with reference to the statement the gentleman made—that no tariff bill but this ever permitted raw material to come here free and taxed the manufactured product.

Mr. MONDELL. That is not exactly what I said; but no tariff bill, I am sure, that was ever framed and introduced anywhere on the face of the earth ever did that to the extent that this bill does.

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh.

Mr. MONDELL. And I know of no former tariff legislation that ever did that, except possibly in a few very rare and unimportant instances. In this case it runs through your entire bill. If there is any principle at all to your bill—which I very much doubt after a careful consideration of it—that would seem to be it. You not only paralyze the industries of the country by your rates, but for fear you should have left some industry in position to keep its head above your engulfing tide of free trade you propose to handicap the American producer, the American manufacturer, over and above any possible handicap that lower wages paid on the other side might bring. [Applause on the Republican side.] For fear there should be some lingering hope that some industry somewhere might survive you have introduced this principle, this theory, whatever you may call it, this lack of principle which runs all through your bill, through which you place on the free list finished products the raw materials of which are taxed. That alone and without reference to any other proposition in the bill justifies any man who believes in intelligent tariff revision, high or low, in voting against the measure.

"NEAR" PROTECTION AND CONFISCATION.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has at intervals confessed himself a near protectionist by seeking to apply his so-called competitive-tariff theory in such manner as to give the American producer at least a fighting chance in his home market, and a few of the rates he fixed may possibly measurably cover the difference in cost of production here and abroad.

In so far as this has been done, we welcome such recognition of the virtues of the protective principle. How utterly inconsistent with this attitude is the ruthless slaughter of enterprises of present vast extent and great future promise, like the sugar and wool and woolen industries.

President Wilson is quoted in the papers as having stated to newspaper men that if any sugar factories closed by reason of free sugar it would only be for effect, and they would soon resume. I hope the President did not say that. It is bad enough to have the President and his party take the position that the interests of the majority demand the immolation on the altar of the public good of great and growing industries, but it is infinitely worse if, in sentencing great industries to extinction and fixing the date of execution, the claim is made by high official authority that when the mandate is carried out it will be a case of suicide.

Anyone who has given the subject any consideration knows that under free sugar practically no sugar cane or sugar beets for sugar-making purposes will be grown. A few, perhaps a half dozen at most, of over 75 beet-sugar factories, costing from a half to a million dollars each, might struggle along for a few years, trying to survive on a local market. It is certain no new factories would be built, and in a few years at the most the beet-sugar industry would be but a memory of the constructive character of Republican and the destructive character of Democratic policies. The effect on the cane-sugar industry would be equally destructive. If you Democrats, in your zeal to accomplish a possible saving on the national sugar bill of a few cents per person per annum, are willing to confiscate millions of property in mills and factories and millions more in the value of farms; if you are content to take from tens of thousands of farmers the market for their best and perhaps only profitable crop, you at least should have the grace to do it without adding insult to injury.

The factories manufacturing sugar from American beets and cane represent an investment of over $100,000,000. This will be an almost total loss, for the factories can not be used for any other purpose. The value of the million acres now planted to beets and cane will be reduced by many millions of dollars; a crop which now brings the farmer $50,000,000 annually will be lost to him—all this in the interest of the customs-defrauding Sugar Trust and the foreign combine, which two years ago, after the American sugar crop was sold, aided the Refiners' Trust to boost the price of sugar 2 cents.

FREE WOOL DESTRUCTIVE.

Free wool means loss and depression to our entire sheep and wool industry and complete destruction to the most important part of the industry, that of merino and mixed-blood sheep. No man who knows enough about the industry to speak intelligently about it will deny the truth of this general proposition.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] admitted that the 20 per cent duty proposed by his bill of last year would not save the sheep industry of the Ohio Valley. He and his party coolly suggest that if the industry don't pay under free trade it should be thrown into the scrap heap and something else substituted for it. In half a dozen intermountain States the sheep decreased over half in number in three years under the Wilson bill, and even more in value; and a few years more of free trade would have virtually wiped out the industry. During that same period the sheep of the country decreased 15,000,000 in number and the wool clip 90,000,000 pounds, a loss of at least $75,000,000 to the industry.

Not content with having brought great loss on the American woolgrowers by continual agitation of the tariff, the gentlemen on the other side now use present low wool prices, for which they are largely responsible, as an argument for making them still lower under free trade. The fact is, however, that while prices have been greatly depressed during this tariff agitation actual comparison of the London and Boston prices of identical wools, made within the past few months, show a difference in favor of the American grower by reason of the present tariff of from 5½ to 7½ cents a pound. Take that amount from the farmers' and flockmasters' price and one does not need to be a prophet to foresee what will happen.

We are informed that this bill is intended to reduce the cost of living. Have our Democratic friends forgotten that the cleanest, sweetest meat in the world lies under the wool of the American sheep, especially the mountain sheep? How do you propose to make up for this loss of meat supply? I note that you have separated the sheep from the goats, and, contrary to scriptural injunction, you abandon the sheep and protect the goats. Is it your idea to give the people goat meat instead of mutton on the theory that they will be lucky to get any meat at all under a Democratic administration? The meat of a billy goat will unquestionably give more aroma of a kind to Democratic free-trade soup kitchens than that of a merino lamb. If this is not the reason for the favor you extend the goat, is it because they raise goats in Texas and sheep in Ohio? You put a 10 per cent duty on the wheat of Minnesota, none on her flour, and 33⅓ per cent protection upon the rice of Louisiana and Texas. You do not believe in protection, you say, and you have left but tattered fragments of it in this bill except that you protect Texas on rice and the hair of the goat, and in New Jersey, which has furnished us with a President, on the silk industry; also a few favored localities where they manufacture automobiles.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield to just one question?

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will be brief.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does not the gentleman think it is as fair to the cotton raisers of the South to have their cotton bagging free and untaxed as that the great grain raisers of the West should have their binding twine free? Does not he think that is equally fair and just?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think the proposition of free bagging for one industry alone and confined to that industry is fair or equitable, whether it be the industry of the raising of cotton or anything else. If it be held to be proper to place all bagging for all purposes on the free list there may be at least an argument for it, but to place on the free list bagging which is used only for the one purpose, in one industry, is neither fair nor equitable. As to other bagging, the gentleman has so arranged it in the schedule that there is not a particle of protection for the American manufacturer of bagging against the miserable, underpaid Hindu labor that produces it in India.

Mr. BARTLETT. There ought to be——

Mr. MONDELL. Why, in the philosophy of the gentleman, no. He does not believe, apparently, that any American labor ought to be protected from the underfed and the underpaid and the miserably housed and the half-nourished coolie of the East.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is an article made in America by a trust, and that trust not long ago shut out its own labor by not paying them sufficient wages.

Mr. MONDELL. It is very easy for the gentleman to talk about trusts as an excuse for any Democratic iniquity.

Mr. BARTLETT. I can establish my statement by proof.

Mr. MONDELL. It is very easy to attempt to answer every question concerning the schedules of this bill by talking about trusts. It reminds me of an argument they used to make down in the gentleman's country, which I hope they do not use any longer. I asked a gentleman once how it was that a man advocating certain policies could come from a certain region if those policies were discussed there. He said, "Do not fool yourself. They do not discuss those policies. They shout 'Nigger domination'; that settles it."

Now, the gentleman, whenever a question is raised as to any of the schedules in this bill, will shout "Trust." [Laughter.] Aye, that has been a potent slogan in the past, and there has been some reason for it, but when, under Democratic legislation, the soup houses are filled with thousands of American citizens who can not secure employment, when mills and factories are closed, when the farmer is compelled to sell his product for less than it costs to produce it, the gentleman will not be able to fool the people by continually referring every proposition to the trusts. [Applause on the Republican side.] The gentleman is like the doctor who could not cure a particular ailment with which a patient was afflicted, but he was willing to throw him into fits, because he thought he could cure the fits.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman permit just one word?

Mr. MONDELL. I am sorry I have not the time, if I am to conclude in the time given me.

Mr. BARTLETT. Just a word.

I have not made the statement concerning the Bagging Trust without full information. It appears in the evidence before the Payne Ways and Means Committee, in 1909, that had hearings on the tariff bill of that year——

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman can make a speech as long as he pleases about that trust or any other trust. I am no more in favor of trusts than he is. This fact remains, that in India, which is the principal competitor of American bagging manufacturers, the average wage is less than one-tenth of what it is in the United States, and the gentleman can not answer that proposition by talking about trusts. I am as much against trusts and combinations in restraint of trade as he is, and that is why I do not propose to join in a proposition to paralyze the great American farm industry in sugar beets and sugar cane in order to help the law-breaking Sugar Trust to throttle the

American people by controlling the price of sugar. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I can not better express my views in regard to the attitude of the Democratic Party on the sheep and wool question than by quoting an extract from a speech I made in the House on June 12, 1911, as follows:

In peace the products of the flocks of our country add to our comfort and enjoyment and in war they furnish us with material for clothing and blankets for the soldiers in the field, without which we would be almost as helpless in the face of an enemy in a long and arduous campaign as we would be without ammunition for our guns. But for the sheep and wool industry we would in time of peace be shorn of many luxuries and comforts and in time of war we would be naked to our enemies. Yet this is the industry, ancient and honorable, useful and necessary, producing wealth from waste, employing hundreds of thousands of men, from the shepherds on the plains to the operatives in the mills, which the Democratic Party does not consider entitled to any consideration as to its present status or future prospects in the framing of a tariff bill.

WHO IS TO BE BENEFITED?

As I have conned the schedules of this bill my wonder has increased as to what occupations and industries its framers expected would remain open to American labor and industry after its schedules got into full swing. The rates are so low on manufactured products of many kinds and great volume as to threaten the employment of numberless mill and factory workers. That our people will not be able to overcome the handicap which the measure places on American enterprise in the assembling and fabrication of a vast variety of articles, without a reduction in wages, is patent to anyone having an elementary knowledge of conditions. It is true that a few favored lines of manufacture, like those of silks and automobiles, for instance, are left with adequate protection, but these are the rare exceptions.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Just a question.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does not the gentleman think that automobiles and silks above all things ought to be taxed?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, everything in this world is comparative. There are mighty few American working girls—God bless them, honest, virtuous, and courageous—there are mighty few of them who under a Republican administration can not afford a Sunday dress of silk, thank God. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Why, this bill reduces the tax on silks below what it is in the Payne bill.

Mr. MONDELL. It reduces the duty on silks mighty little, much less than it will reduce the wages and the opportunities for employment of the working girl. But I did not refer to these particular rates of duty with a view of contending that they were or were not reasonably protective. I called attention to them to illustrate the illogical, inequitable, lopsided, limping, hobble-skirted character of your legislation. You leave a 10 per cent duty on wheat, but flour, the product of wheat, you place on the free list. Cattle and sheep are dutiable; beef and mutton are on the free list. You claim the cotton planter is entitled to free bagging and free cotton ties because cotton is on the free list, but you place wool on the free list; and while you do not protect the American manufacturer of such bagging as the woolgrower uses, you do retain a 30 per cent duty on it, as you do on practically everything the woolgrower uses in his business. You deprive the woolgrower of all protection, but you place a duty on tops, the first finished product of the wool, so high as to give the larger woolen manufacturers, whom you have been berating for years, a virtual monopoly. You have been talking incessantly about making the poor man's clothing cheaper, and yet you have retained in your bill the most objectionable feature of present Schedule K by fixing a rate on cheap mixed goods of cotton and wool as though they were all wool. You have followed the good old Democratic doctrine of allowing our people to import rags and shoddy free; that is logical in a Democratic tariff bill, for rags will be all the style when your administration gets into full swing. I suppose you think it also logical to place a high rate, comparatively, on imported goods made largely of rags and shoddy. Taking into consideration the advantages which manufacturers secure in some instances under your bill through free raw material, the protective rates you have placed on some of their products are actually higher than under the Payne law. These are the details that condemn the bill; its utter lack of any foundation theory, its resultant iniquities, which would make it ridiculous if it were not tragic.

LOSS TO FARMERS AND STOCKMEN.

It can be said, without fear of successful contradiction, that no considerable portion of our people engaged in any form of agriculture or husbandry outside the cotton belt can escape serious loss and injury through the passage of this bill.

Free cotton ties, bagging, and press cloth may temporarily be of some slight value to the cotton planter, though that is doubtful, but certain it is that the sop of free agricultural machinery will not compensate the farmers, dairymen, flockmasters, and herdsmen of any part of the country for the cheapening of their products, which you hope to accomplish by allowing free or nearly free importations of like articles.

I presume that you gentlemen hope that the beet-sugar farmer, whose industry you propose to destroy, will be consoled by your assurance that if he had an opportunity to grow beets he might have the privilege of tending them with a German cultivator. No doubt you expect the Louisiana sugar planter to find compensation for the loss of his best crop in the promise that he may have the privilege of preparing his land for less profitable crops with a Belgian plow.

When our splendid merino and mixed-blood wool industry is destroyed you gentlemen, no doubt, hope to derive satisfaction from the fact that if we had sheep to shear we might buy Sheffield shears for that purpose free of duty. Should the lower prices for meats which you hope to secure by placing them on the free list be realized, no doubt you expect the farmer and stockman to be entirely satisfied with the assurance that you have attempted to give him cheaper hoes and prod poles.

In all human probability no American farmer will ever buy satisfactory farm machinery cheaper under your bill than he does now; therefore if the reduced prices of hay, grain, dairy products, fruits and vegetables, swine, sheep, and cattle which you have promised shall materialize, the loss will be wholly uncompensated by any corresponding gain. If, as a matter of fact, the placing of agricultural machinery on the free list were to reduce the price of such machinery by the small amount of the present low tariff, which, by the way, does not apply against England or any country which does not levy a tax against our farm machinery, the possible gain to the farmer would be but an infinitesimal fraction of his certain loss.

WHAT ARE LEGITIMATE INDUSTRIES?

Reading the schedules of your bill and recalling the assurance of President Wilson that no legitimate industry had anything to fear from Democratic tariff revision, one is challenged by the query, What is a legitimate industry?

Is that ancient agricultural and pastoral pursuit which first weaned men from savagery, the profession of the patriarchs of old, the occupation of those who as they watched their flocks by night received from the angel of the Lord the first tidings of the advent of the Savior of mankind, not a legitimate industry in the opinion of the Democratic President and Congress? And if so, why? Is the husbandry in the valley of the Ohio and the Rocky Mountain region of those gentle creatures, the scriptural type of innocence, which furnish the cheapest, the cleanest, and the juiciest of meats for the feeding of the people and the finest and strongest of golden fleece for the clothing of the Nation, not a legitimate enterprise? And if so, why?

Are the hundreds of millions of dollars invested in mills and factories for the production of cane and beet sugar not legitimate investments? Are the opportunities and employment offered to hundreds of thousands of American farmers and laborers in the growing of sugar cane and sugar beets not legitimate opportunities and employments? And if not, why? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. From South Dakota.

Mr. MONDELL. For just a moment.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Has the gentleman seen any discussion in part of the hearings had before the Committee on Ways and Means between the gentleman from New York and some of the witnesses in regard to what is a legitimate American industry? I refer to the gentleman from New York, Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. MONDELL. I have not had that pleasure.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I think the logical purport of that was that a legitimate American industry is an industry that can sustain itself in this country in the face of all opposition from abroad without any protection. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; in other words, an industry that can maintain itself under a Democratic administration; and the only industry that can do that is the soup-house industry. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Only for a question. I regret I have not more time at my disposal.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Since the gentleman from North Dakota has referred to me in this matter, I will say to him that I do consider that in trying to maintain by tariff rates a tropical crop in a temperate zone, as, for example, Louisiana cane sugar, an attempt is made to maintain an illegitimate industry.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, with all due apologies to North Dakota for the mistake of having been credited twice to that State, as I have read those hearings the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] was practically to the effect that I stated that a legitimate American industry is an industry that is not to be harmed by the proposed Democratic revision of the tariff—that is, an industry that can thrive in this country without protection.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; and the statement just made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] satisfies me that no industry that requires any protection whatever is, in the opinion of the gentleman from New York, a legitimate industry, whether it be agricultural or industrial. That is what his proposition leads to, and while he may have, his party has not the courage to write a bill boldly declaring that policy, though they came near writing such a bill. There are others on that side who, like the gentleman from New York, are full-fledged free traders. There are few who have the courage to declare it; most of them prefer to leave the impression at home that, as far as the home industry was concerned, it was to be made an exception. If that had not been done, there would be many seats now held on that side filled by Republicans.

INJURY TO WEST AND PACIFIC SLOPE.

It is true the great West and Northwest had little representation on the Democratic committee which framed this bill, but is it possible that the members of that committee do not know of or care for the people or the industries of that fair and fertile portion of our land, the source of the grain and meat supply of the Nation?

If the committee had no regard for the vast products in wool and mutton, beef and wheat, sugar, and dairy products of that region, what about those on the Democratic side who were sent here by the people of that region to look after their interests? There is not a product of the agricultural or pastoral midwest, northwest, mountain west, or Pacific slope which is not either doomed or seriously menaced by this bill. Where are those Democrats from that region whose duty it is to guard their people and their enterprises? What have they to say in this hour of their people's peril?

A SURRENDER TARIFF.

Hailing from the West, as I do, it is perhaps natural that my attention should be particularly challenged by the menace this bill presents to the people of that region, but perhaps the most amazing thing about the bill is the fact that no industry or enterprise seems to have been important enough to be spared and none so insignificant as to escape. Great textile and metal industries have their rates cut to the bone. Perhaps that was to be expected from your past declarations, but a multitude of smaller industries—in regard to which the committee had little if any information, if we are to judge from the hearings—are put on the ragged edge or thrown overboard. Up and down the schedules rode the committee, apparently for all the world like a gang of drunken cowboys shooting up the town or a band of Moro fanatics running amuck. This is no revision; it is a smashing of the tariff, a complete surrender of our markets to foreigners. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Scattered about throughout the country in almost every Northern State, no doubt in many Southern States, are small shops, foundries, mills, and factories engaged in the manufacture, in a limited way, of a vast variety of articles, including knit, felt, and woven goods, special clothing, gloves and mittens, machine tools, special machinery, wooden and iron ware, household utensils, harness and saddles, sundries—none have escaped. The slogan of the Donnybrook fair, "Wherever you see a head, smash it," has been the shibboleth. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

BENEFITS THE PHILIPPINES, INJURES HAWAII AND PORTO RICO.

Not content with smashing schedules so as to give all the world the privilege of our great market free, or measurably so, our Democratic friends prepare to give the people of the Philippines unqualifiedly the free run of our market, not only for their own goods and products but for the goods of all the world shipped to us by way of the Philippines, provided such goods are Philippine in half their value. This amazing proposition practically annuls whatever temporary benefit might be derived from the reduced duty retained on sugar for three years and is as indefensible as a policy as it is impossible of honest administration. We are gravely assured that this plan to allow all the world to ship its goods here free through the Philippines is proper, because the "War Department suggested it."

The Democratic Party proposes, I understand, a policy of scuttle toward the Philippines, that we sever all connection with and obligations toward them, and you inaugurate this policy of surrender by giving them tariff benefits accorded no one else, not even our own people. This extraordinary proposition is carried in the same bill which contemplates the termination of our reciprocal benefits and obligations under our treaty with Cuba—the same bill through which we are to inflict great and lasting injury on our own territory and people in Hawaii and Porto Rico.

LOSS OF MARKETS AND REVENUE.

This measure surrenders the best markets in the world to foreigners without attempt or pretense of securing any trade advantages thereby. It will cause the loss of many millions of revenue, the payment of which is in the main no appreciable burden, and proposes to fill the gap in revenue by an inquisitorial personal tax.

Whatever our opinion may be of the wisdom of adopting in time of peace the English system of a national income tax, thus depriving the States of that source of revenue, I doubt if such a tax on earned incomes as low as $4,000 will prove profitable or popular, and when the tax is so drawn as to amount to triple taxation in many instances it becomes indefensibly inequitable in such cases.

WHO BENEFITED AND HOW.

But we are told that all the sacrifices of opportunity and enterprise this measure proposes are in the interest of the people. Is it possible that our Democratic friends, when they speak of the people, have only in mind the cotton planters, a few favored manufacturers, and the dwellers on the east side of New York? Do the cotton kings, those who dwell in the shadow of Tammany Hall, and a few favored manufacturers constitute the people in the opinion of the Democratic Party? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] My friend from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] referred to it the other day as the policy of Dixie and Tammany against the balance of the country. I am glad to use his apt expression, giving him credit for it.

No doubt you have in mind also the so-called ultimate consumer, whose purchasing power does not depend in any wise upon the state of the industries of the country. There are a few such, no doubt, whose incomes being fixed beyond the power of trade or industrial conditions to disturb them, may be benefited by the conditions of low prices you hope to establish. Beyond these I can think of no one under the flag who can hope to benefit by your legislation.

On the other hand, the most optimistic among you can conjure up no legitimate industry, no opportunity of honest employment, which will be benefited or enlarged through your legislation. While many industries tremble in anticipation of the effect of your schedules, none anticipate more favorable conditions by reason of it. While labor in many lines is threatened with loss of employment or lowering of wages, no class of labor looks for better wages or more constant employment as a result of your action. The best that you can offer labor is that by reducing the rewards of the producers on the farms you may possibly temporarily better the conditions of the consumers of their product in the cities and towns.

THE BEST YOU CAN HOPE FOR.

This, then, is the best you can hope for, that by the destruction of certain industries, great and small, with great and permanent loss, the transfer of production from ours to foreign shores, and by the reduction of the rewards of the agricultural classes of our people you may bring some small benefit to a mythical class labeled the ultimate consumer.

Many men at one time and another in the world's history have followed as disappointing a phantom as you are now pursuing. Men have sought the alchemy that was to turn dross to gold; they have endeavored to secure perpetual motion; they have searched for a fountain of perpetual youth; they have looked for the pot of gold at the foot of the rainbow; and one and all their quests, their efforts, and their endeavors have been quite as sensible, reasonable, and logical as yours; they have all been bitterly disappointed, even as you will be. [Applause on the Republican side.]

DEMOCRATIC FAILURE.

Your failure will not be due to differences of individual opinion, marked as they are. It will not result from selfish efforts to secure local advantages and ignore the just claims of others, much as that will divide your councils. Neither will

it come from lack of loyalty to party leaders or of disposition to accept their advice, for of those qualities you have displayed more than is good for your constituents or well for your country. Your trouble lies deeper than all these; it is elementary and fundamental. It arises from your failure to recognize or follow the truth, to establish a principle of action and stick to it.

Certain great truths and principles lie at the foundation of any successful fiscal policy for a country like ours. We have established here a condition and a standard of living, of education, of opportunity, of ambition above that of any other people. Nothing would be easier, if our people would stand it, than to bring about a lowering of those standards; but if we are to maintain them, if we are to raise them higher, if we are to make them all-pervading among our people, we can not, we must not, place our people on a plane as to their employment, as to the rewards for their labor and endeavor, with those who are content or compelled to accept and live under standards, conditions, and opportunities less favorable than ours. These are the plain, simple truths which must be recognized as the basis of tariff legislation. You refuse as a party to accept them; therefore you have not written in 50 years, and you will not in 50 more, a tariff law satisfactory to the American people.

REPUBLICAN TARIFF POLICY.

We have made some mistakes, but our principles are sound. We have profited by our errors and we will write the next tariff law that the American people will accept, for they will not accept yours. We have always assumed as the proper basis of legislation a tariff rate at which the American could pay and receive a higher wage than his foreign competitor and meet him on even terms. At one time as to many industries it was not especially material if the rate was somewhat above this point, but with the growth of combination, and of opportunity for combination, some abuses came, and as the opportunity for further and greater abuses existed the demagogue came also. We were blamed not only for the abuses which did exist but more for the opportunities for abuse which, the people were led to believe, existed in some of our schedules.

TARIFF COMMISSION.

As the necessity became apparent for schedules, which while affording our own people an opportunity to do the Nation's work gave no hiding place for monopoly, we adopted the plan and policy of securing accurate and scientific information as to the cost of production at home and abroad. In an interval of virtue the Democratic leaders accepted and approved the plan, only to follow evil counsel later to defeat it.

The result is that although the Tariff Board we were able to secure and retain for a short time did make a report on certain schedules no attention was paid to it in framing this bill. I am not surprised at that; I am surprised that holding the views you do the committee went through the idle and empty form of holding hearings.

In your philosophy, or sophistry, nothing that an American artisan, producer, or manufacturer could say touching the need of tariff rates to protect his labor or production could or did have any effect on your action. A table of imports and of home production, a schedule of rates calculated to increase the former and decrease the latter, a few orders from the White House modifying your plans, a secret caucus binding the souls and consciences of Democratic Members, and the thing was done. And the Lord have mercy upon us and upon all our people.

Mr. HARDY. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. I want to ask the gentleman, if high protection has made such high wages in this country, why has it not produced high wages in Italy and Germany?

Mr. MONDELL. Protection has increased and maintained wages wherever as a policy it has been adopted. [Applause on the Republican side.] It has done that to a peculiar, unexampled, and extraordinary degree under the American flag. But I am thinking about these troubled gentlemen who, like my friend from Texas, want a duty on wool.

Mr. HARDY. Oh, the gentleman should not make that statement.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, the other gentleman from Texas, a number of gentlemen from Texas, who want a duty on wool. You can not have that, say your masters of the Ways and Means Committee, but they gave you a duty on rice, of which you grow some in Texas. It is hard to keep track of the various local protection fads of you gentlemen on the other side. Some of you want a duty on wool, some on sugar, while some of your real statesmen have been content with a duty on rice or peanuts. But you can not combine to secure what you ask for. Why? Because you have been teaching the doctrine that a man may stand for protection for his own district but he must be against the protection of industries in all other districts, and therefore they slaughter your industries in detail because you fight in detail.

Mr. HARDY. I would like to ask the gentleman if that is all the answer, all the reasons, he has to give why high protection has not increased wages in Italy?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Texas is going far afield. That is not strange when he becomes the champion of a bill that proposes to place the highly paid labor of America in unprotected competition with the pauper labor of Italy to which he refers. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman from Wyoming.

EASY TO MISLEAD.

Mr. MONDELL. It is true the Democratic way is the easy way to do it, and it is in harmony with the easy way in which you have led many people to agree to give you a chance at the tariff. It does not require courage or statesmanship to appeal to human selfishness, to bring some people to applaud a plan which proposes in the name of virtue to deprive the people of one section of opportunities because another section does not happen to have that particular form of opportunity. It is easy to bring some people to believe that the prosperity others enjoy is in some way at their expense. It is not difficult to win applause and support, of a certain kind, on the promise to bring blessings to those to whom the appeal is made by carrying misery to others.

It is not impossible to prove that the protective policy has not established perfectly ideal conditions everywhere and among all people, particularly if one denies or ignores the glorious fact that under it conditions among our people, and especially among those who toil, are more favorable than in any other land and have grown steadily better. You have endeavored, and with some success, to make men believe that the better wages and opportunities our people enjoy are not due to protection but largely to organization, ignoring the fact that as no one has ever been able to squeeze blood from a turnip or make bread from stones, so no amount of organization can wring a living or adequate wage from an employment that does not pay, an enterprise from which there is no return. [Applause on the Republican side.]

SELFISH APPEALS FAIL.

Your appeals have been to localism, to sectionalism, to class consciousness, to selfishness, to cupidity, and while they have been, owing to our dissensions, temporarily successful, they must, in the nature of things, fail in the day of test. They have already failed with you. In the secret caucus you have held, numbers of you from time to time, fighting for your own section or for local industries, have hurled your salvos against the patronage-buttressed position of your temporary masters, the Ways and Means Committee. Again and again devoted bands, fighting for what you consider the interests of your constituents, have dashed yourselves against the barriers of party discipline, and all in vain. And yet there has not been a moment, since the bill was first submitted to caucus, when if all of you who have been fighting for perfectly proper and needful changes in schedules had combined you could not have saved the industries and employments of your people doomed or menaced by this bill. But you could not combine, because you were each pledged to the selfish rule of attempting to preserve prosperity in your own sections or industries regardless of the interests of other sections or industries.

COMING REPUBLICAN TRIUMPH.

From these scenes of party strife, of personal anguish among your membership, from the painful contemplation of the evil days certain to befall as the result of your legislation, I look forward to that not distant day, when the destructive and paralyzing effect of your legislation being painfully patent to all, the people will demand that you provide a tariff commission, which shall ascertain and report the facts on which to base a tariff, measuring the difference of cost of production at home and abroad. But you will not write the bill based on such a report. Before it is made you will be hurled from the seats of power in this House, and Republicans, true to their party principles, chastened by defeat, tried and tempered by adversity, will again be called to control and responsibility. Then we will write upon the statute books a tariff bill, based on accurate information, whose schedules, while affording no harbor or opportunity for monopoly or oppression, shall protect American labor and industry against unfair and unequal competition from foreign shores. [Loud applause on Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose at this time to discuss the tariff question, but to avail myself of a privilege under the rule to pronounce a brief eulogy on the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Stephen A. Douglas, touching his life, his character, and his public services.

Mr. Chairman, Stephen A. Douglas was born 100 years ago to-day in the town of Brandon, in the State of Vermont. His father died when he was 2 months of age, leaving the family with limited means. He received an academic education at Brandon and at Canandaigua, N. Y. He was very studious and unusually bright and promising. At the age of 20, short of stature and slender of figure, he turned his face to the westward in search of fame and fortune. He reached Jacksonville, Ill., in the autumn of 1833, a stranger without money and without friends. He taught school, read law, and took an active interest in politics, and within 14 years after the date of his arrival he had been admitted to the bar, had been a member of the Illinois Legislature, prosecuting attorney, registrar of the land office, secretary of state, judge of the supreme court, and three times elected a Representative in Congress, and had been elected to and entered upon his first term in the United States Senate when not yet 34 years of age. His rise was phenomenal. The history of this country, with all its splendid opportunities and brilliant men, fails to record another instance of such rapid progress and achievement.

He was a born leader of men. His presence inspired confidence, and his marvelous intellect was of that magic power that men intuitively recognized his force of character, dominating influence, and supreme leadership. He was an orator of superb ability, perhaps the superior of any man among the great men then in public life.

Soon after he entered the Senate he became the most potent factor in that body, and thenceforth dominated its policies and shaped its legislation. Nor did his control and leadership confine itself to the upper branch of Congress. Although he died at the early age of 48, no man in this country has acquired a greater influence than that exercised by Douglas over the minds of the people. No man has had a greater personal following. For a decade the great majority of the people had absolute confidence in his political integrity and implicitly trusted and followed him and supported every measure of public importance advocated by him.

The last 10 years of his life were the most stormy years in the political history of the country, and Douglas was the one central figure. By far the most potent factor in politics, he occupied a middle ground between the contentions of the North and those of the South, and sought in every way within the province of man to effect a reconciliation and bring about a condition of affairs which would avoid a conflict of arms between the two sections of the country. But so intense and bitter had the conflict become that longer delay or further compromise was impossible, and Douglas went down to defeat between the extreme contentions—the upper and nether millstones—of the two opposing factions.

Although he had been defeated by Mr. Lincoln for the Presidency, when war came Douglas arose to sublime heights, and espoused the cause of the Union with a vigor and force unexcelled, and contributed by the might and power of his influence more to the support of the administration and the cause of the Union than any other individual or group of men throughout the entire North. So complete was his control over the members of his own party that when he spoke all political differences were forgotten, and his followers rallied to the support of Lincoln and to the cause of the Union as one man.

When the excitement and intensity which attended the outbreak of hostilities was at its height in the State of Illinois and the Middle West, Douglas addressed a joint session of the Illinois Legislature, upon the invitation of that body, and delivered his last and most famous speech in support of the Union. This speech was made on April 26, 1861. The effect was inspiring; it stilled every opposition, and lined up all factions in the North in support of the Constitution and the flag. If eloquence is measured by the immediate and momentous effect on the minds of men, then this speech deserves to rank among the great orations of the world, and is well worth reproduction here, and I ask the privilege of incorporating a portion of it in the RECORD as a part of these remarks. He was introduced by Hon. Shelby M. Cullom, then speaker of the Illinois House of Representatives, and said:

For the first time since the adoption of the Federal Constitution a widespread conspiracy exists to destroy the best Government the sun of heaven ever shed its rays upon. Hostile armies are now marching upon the Federal Capital with the view of planting a revolutionary flag upon its dome, seizing the national archives, and taking captive the President. A war of aggressive extermination is being waged against the Government established by our fathers.

Already the piratical flag has been unfurled against the commerce of the United States. Letters of marque have been issued appealing to the pirates of the world to assemble under that revolutionary flag and commit depredation upon the commerce carried on under the Stars and Stripes. The navigation of our great river into the Gulf of Mexico is obstructed. Customhouses have already been established and hostile batteries have been planted upon its banks.

The question is whether this war of aggression shall proceed and we remain with folded arms, or whether we shall meet the aggressors at the threshold and turn back the tide of revolution and usurpation.

So long as there was hope of a peaceful solution I prayed and implored for compromise. I can appeal to my countrymen with confidence that I have spared no effort, omitted no opportunity to secure a peaceful solution of all these troubles and restore peace, happiness, and fraternity to this country.

When all propositions of peace fail and a war of aggression is proclaimed there is but one course left for the patriot, and that is to rally under the flag which has waved over the Capital since the days of Washington and around the Government established by him and his compeers. The first duty of an American citizen, or of a citizen of any constitutional government, is obedience to the constitution and the laws of his country.

It is a crime against the inalienable and indefeasible right of every American citizen to attempt to destroy the Government under which we were born. It is a crime against constitutional freedom and the hopes of the friends of freedom throughout the wide world to attempt to blot out the United States from the map of Christendom.

Yet this attempt is now being made. The Government of our fathers is to be overthrown and destroyed. The Capital that bears the name of the Father of his Country is to be bombarded and leveled to the earth among the rubbish and the dust of things that are past. The records of your Government are to be scattered to the four winds of heaven. The constituted authorities placed there by the same high authority that placed Washington and Jefferson and Jackson in the chair are to be captured and spirited away, to become a byword and a scorn to the nations of the world.

Not only is our constitutional government to be stricken down, not only is our flag to be blotted out, but the very foundations of social order are to be undermined and destroyed. The demon of destruction is to be let loose over the face of the land; a reign of terror and mob law is to prevail in each section of the Union, and the man who dares to speak for the cause of justice and moderation in either section is to be marked down as a traitor.

I appeal to you, my countrymen, not to allow your passions to get the better of your judgment. Do not allow your vengeance on the authors of this great iniquity to lead you into rash and cruel and desperate acts upon loyal citizens who may differ with you in opinion. Let the spirit of moderation and justice prevail. You can not expect within so brief a period after an exciting political canvass that every man can rise to the high and patriotic level of forgetting his party prejudices and sacrifice everything upon the altar of his country, but allow me to say to you, you will not be true to your country if you ever attempt to manufacture partisan capital out of the misfortunes of your country. When calling upon Democrats to rally to the tented field, leaving wife, child, father, and mother behind them, to rush to the rescue of your Government, do not make war upon them and try to manufacture partisan capital at their expense out of the struggle in which they are engaged from the holiest and purest of motives. Then I appeal to you, my own Democratic friends—those men who have never failed to rally under the glorious banner of the country whenever an enemy, at home or abroad, has dared to assail it—to you with whom it has always been my pride to act—do not allow defeat in a partisan struggle and the elevation of an opposing party to power, do not let that convert you from patriots into traitors to your native land.

Whenever our Government is assailed, when hostile armies are marching under new and odious banners against the Government of our country, the shortest way to peace is the most stupendous preparation for war. Every friend of freedom, every champion and advocate of constitutional liberty, throughout the land must feel that this cause is his own.

What is the attempt now being made? Several States of the Union have chosen to declare that they will no longer obey the Constitution; that they will withdraw from the Government established by our fathers; that they will dissolve without our consent the bonds that have united us together. But not content with that, they proceed to invade and obstruct our dearest and most inalienable rights secured by the Constitution.

I have struggled, almost against hope, to avert the calamities of war and to effect a reunion and reconciliation with our brethren of the South. I yet hope it may be done, but I am not able to point out to you how it may be effected. Nothing short of Providence can reveal to us the issue of this great struggle. Bloody, calamitous, I fear it will be. Let us so conduct it, if a collision must come, that we may stand justified in the eyes of Him who knows our hearts and who will judge our every act. We must not yield to resentment nor to the spirit of vengeance, much less to the desire for conquest or ambition. I see no path of ambition open in a bloody struggle for triumph over my own countrymen. There is no path for ambition open in a divided country. Hence whatever we may do must be the result of conviction, of patriotic duty—the duty we owe to ourselves, to our posterity, and to the friends of constitutional liberty and self-government throughout the world.

My friends, I can say no more. To discuss these topics is the most painful duty of my life. It is with a sad heart, with a grief that I have never before experienced, that I have to contemplate this fearful struggle; but I believe in my conscience that it is a duty we owe ourselves, our children, and our God to protect this Government and the flag of our country.

His death, which followed soon after this speech was delivered, was a great loss to the country. The Nation could ill afford to spare a man of his great worth in the hour of its peril, but he had spoken, and the magic of his name and the power of his word were as potent in death as in life, and while the country lost the wisdom of his counsel, the influence of his last words became an invaluable asset to the administration and to the cause of the Union.

It is said of Douglas that he was ambitious, and that his whole life was lived with one object in view—to achieve the

Presidency. Inordinate ambition may be a crime, but the ambition of Douglas was laudable, and with all his craving for that high office, he was, above all, a patriot. Ambition may also be imputed to other great men who have aspired to the Presidency but failed of their goal. It is a notable fact that the great men of the country who have aspired to and sought the Presidency with a consuming desire and ambition, to the exclusion of all other aspirations, have failed to achieve the aim and object of their lives. The way to the Presidency is strewn with disappointed hopes and shattered ambitions. Good men and great have achieved the supreme and ultimate aim, but those who have sought it most, whose lives were spent seeking that exalted station, have signally failed. Notable among these are Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, Stephen A. Douglas, and James G. Blaine. Let us hope that the rule will not apply to men now in life, but that those who have lost a while, but are yet full of hope and prospects, may prove the exception and achieve the object of their most cherished ambition and that the millions who are to-day hoping and praying for their success may realize their fondest hopes.

The name of Douglas is inseparably linked with that of the immortal Lincoln. It is not my aim nor would it serve any good purpose here to analyze their characters and to compare or contrast these two great men. They were opposites in manner, in speech, and in form, but in the essentials that go to make great men there was no such dissimilarity as is generally supposed; both loved their fellow man, both were men of the highest type, the strictest integrity, the best motives, and the loftiest ideals; both were politicians after the school of their day and both were statesmen of highest rank; both were ambitious, both aspired to the highest station in life, and both attained greatness and distinction; both were patriots and both laid down their ambitions and gave up their lives upon the altar of their common country. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN].

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, when a great political party has been intrusted with power and has been given such an overwhelming majority as the Democratic Party now has in this House, and when that party has adopted the policy of legislating through the secret caucus, simply bringing the results of their caucus actions into the House for ratification, I presume it is a waste of time and energy for a Member on this side of the House to make any observations on the character of the contemplated legislation or to offer any argument against the wisdom of any of the provisions of the measures thus to be disposed of. But as I have never been able to agree with the numerous tariff policies advocated by the Democratic Party in the last 50 years, and as I have the honor of representing the greatest agricultural district in the United States, I can not sit quietly by and see the agricultural industry, the greatest and most important in this country, the industry upon which every other industry, and, in fact, the whole country, depends for its prosperity, ruthlessly discriminated against as it is in this bill without entering a vigorous protest.

So important is the agricultural industry that no nation has ever attained its greatest possible advance that has not carefully protected it, and no nation that has failed to jealously guard the interests of its farmers has long maintained its once proud position among the nations of the world. I know that free traders are want to point to England as an exception to this rule, but it is not so certain that England will long escape the fate of every other nation that has neglected the interests of agriculture, although, because of the very limited area of fertile land in the "Island Empire," she is less affected by the steady decline in her agriculture than would be any of the other great nations of the world, and but for this fact she could not have survived her present policy as long as she has. But this is a burning question in England to-day, and an Englishman, discussing the question of duties on agricultural products last March, said:

> What agricultural results have accrued under our present fiscal system? (1) We have enormously decreased the annual production of wealth from our fertile land; (2) cast away steady employment for more than a million men; (3) driven these to emigrate or migrate to our centers, already crowded, in search (and often in vain) of precarious casual employment at poor wages; (4) diminished by one-half our race of skilled food producers; (5) secured dearer, not cheaper, food; (6) made it so that there are few, if any, articles of food imported which we could not ourselves now profitably produce at the present prices or at lower. * * *
>
> Duties on manufactures will be all right for that limb of the body politic, but what about the other sick one—the important one of agriculture? What the State needs is a balanced production from land and workshop. The restoration of agriculture to its pristine prosperity, to its old position as an absorber of labor, is essential, and this can best be done by duties on imported farm products. * * *
>
> The main object of every real fiscal reform must be to increase home production, home employment, home wages.

Mr. Keir Hardie, the well-known English Socialist, a supporter in the British Parliament of the present "free-trade" ministry, writing in the Clarion of January 9, has this to say about the conditions observed in the United States under protection:

> Life out there, especially in the West, has more freedom than at home, and the very fact of wages being high leads to a greater self-respect and a higher all-around standard of living. Men walk with more independence in their gait than they do with us, and there are opportunities, generally speaking, for getting on there which do not exist here.

Under the exhaustive investigations of her tariff commission England herself is gradually awakening to the conditions that her neglected agriculture has brought upon her. The report of her tariff commission says that there is—

> a broad contrast between the policy adopted by foreign countries and that adopted by the United Kingdom. Generally speaking, all foreign and European countries accept as the basis of their economic policy the necessity for maintaining a flourishing agriculture. This is partly due to economic reasons, partly to considerations of national defense and security. The result, speaking generally, is that these countries, instead of pursuing an exclusively manufacturing or an exclusively agrarian policy, have endeavored to maintain a balance between agriculture and manufactures.

"A balance between agriculture and manufactures!" That is the key to prosperity and happiness in any country, and especially in this country, where we possess untold millions of acres of fertile land, coupled with a salubrious climate, that makes it possible to produce at home everything that our people need for food. But this key to the prosperity and happiness of our people has either escaped the notice of the Democratic Party or for selfish political reasons they have deliberately thrown it aside.

I again quote from the 1906 report of the English tariff commission, which says:

> The causes of the decline in agriculture are world-wide in their operation, affecting all importing countries. The striking feature in the case of the United Kingdom is that agriculture has been more depressed than in any other country, and more depressed than any other branch of economic activity. During the last 25 years the course of all agricultural prices has been the same downward direction, with the result that agriculture has been subject to a great combination of causes, all tending toward its depression.
>
> European countries generally have pursued a policy involving import duties on agricultural produce, whereas in the United Kingdom agriculturists have been subject to the unrestricted importation of foreign produce on terms not dissimilar in many cases from those experienced by manufacturers who complain of dumping.

"Dumping" is the marketing of the surplus products of an industry in a foreign country cheaper than it is sold in the country where it is produced, and any country that permits this kind of competition is not properly caring for its industries.

That legislation has a great deal to do with the success or failure of any industry is evidenced by the difference in the prosperity of the agricultural industries of England and those of Germany and France, where they have ample protection. James J. Hill, in his book, "Highways of Progress," says:

> How to meet German competition is to-day the study of every intelligent leader of industry and every cabinet on the Continent of Europe. It will be found that a large share of her world-wide success is due to symmetrical national development. Agricultural industry has not been slighted. Behold a contrast that throws light upon the idle host of England's unemployed marching despondently through streets whose shop windows are crowded with wares of German make. Between 1875 and 1900 in Great Britain 2,691,428 acres which were under cereals and 755,255 acres which were under green crops went out of cultivation. In Germany during the same period the cultivated area grew from 22,840,950 to 23,971,573 hectares, an increase of 5 per cent.

Is there any better illustration of the blighting influence of free trade in agricultural products than is furnished by this statement? England, so densely populated that if every acre were made to produce its utmost enough could not be produced to feed all the people, her farmers with the best market for food products in all Europe right at their doors and enjoying cheap farm labor, has under free trade been compelled to abandon millions of acres of fertile land, and is abandoning more every year, while in Germany, under protection, every acre of cultivated land has not only been retained, but every arable acre is being gradually redeemed to add to the cultivated area of the country. Count Bismarck, in the Reichstag in May, 1879, made the following statement:

> Is not the moment approaching when our agriculture will no longer be able to exist, because corn is pressed down to a price at which it can not be remuneratively produced in Germany, taxation, the cost of living, and the cost of land being as they are? When that moment comes, then not only agriculture, but the Prussian State and the German Empire will go to ruin as well.

And immediately thereafter he established a system of tariff duties on German agricultural products. To Bismarck, therefore, who in early life was a rank free trader, but who, unlike most free traders, permitted stubborn practical facts to convince him of his error, the German farmers owe the fact that they are among the most prosperous farmers in the world.

If there is any country in Europe where the farmers are more prosperous than in Germany, it is France. But the French

farmers met with the same trouble that is sure to overtake the farmers in every country sooner or later, and but for the wisdom of her statesmen they would be no better off to-day than the farmers in England. Mr. Merideth, an English authority, says:

The trouble in France, as elsewhere, centered in the persistent fall in the prices of agricultural produce, due in part to the general appreciation of gold, but due principally to the cheapening of transport and the appearance on the home market of transoceanic cereals and meat. The result was the increased protection of agricultural products in 1885 and 1887 and the tariff of 1892.

Having thus received ample protection they became, and I believe are still considered, the most prosperous farmers in Europe, if not in the world.

Again, quoting from Mr. Hill's Highways of Progress. He says:

Agriculture in England has suffered in the last 25 years by the opening of new land in America and the cheapening of the world's transportation—

and he should have added "and because the Government did not protect the farmers against those conditions."

We need not go to England to find an illustration of the effect that the opening of new land and the cheapening of transportation will have on agriculture where the farmers are not protected against those influences. We have but to go back in our own history some 40 to 50 years to the time when our great western empire, an empire of the richest agricultural lands in the world, began to be opened, just at a time when transportation was being revolutionized so as to almost annihilate distance and so cheapened that the products of the Far West could successfully be marketed in the older and more populous sections of the East. In those days New England farms were selling at from $100 to $200 per acre, but the opening of the great West with its cheap land and the wonderful yields of its rich virgin soil, coupled with cheap transportation, gradually reduced the value of New England farms until many of them were actually sold for less than the cost of the improvements. But because of the low price of farm products that often prevailed in the West, the farmers were unable to farm as scientifically as they should have done, and therefore tried to make up for unscientific methods by farming larger areas, which resulted in lower yields.

The result has been that with reduced yields and increased cost of land, labor, machinery, and everything the Western farmer has to buy he can no longer produce foodstuffs at as low cost as when his land was new and more productive. Because of this New England is again coming into her own, and her farms are gradually regaining much of their lost value. Farmers in New England or anywhere else can by patience, perseverance, industry, and intelligence overcome and outlive any natural handicap, but there is one menace that always threatens their industry, namely, the fallacious political doctrine that it is "immoral" and "unconstitutional" for a government to consider and care for the welfare of its own people and its own industries as against the rest of the world. We have tried to put this doctrine into practice time and time again, always with disastrous results, but it seems that each succeeding generation refuses to learn or benefit by the experience of those who have gone before, and so the Democratic Party, the exponent of this doctrine, is again in power. The Democratic Party, like the farmers who vote that ticket once in each generation, apparently refuses to learn or benefit by the experience of other nations, and therefore they propose in this tariff bill to put our farmers in direct competition with Canada, Argentine, and other new and rapidly developing sections of the world. Do not forget that when you force our farmers to compete with these countries they will have to compete, not only with their rich virgin soil and cheap railroad transportation, as did New England against our great West, but against the cheap South American labor and ocean freights, which when the Panama Canal is finished will be a greater handicap than most men now realize.

They tell us that it has become necessary to put food products on the free list because our farmers can no longer produce enough food to supply the needs of the American people and because the farmers are getting so much for their products that the people in the cities are justly complaining of the high cost of living. I make the assertion here and now, without fear of successful contradiction, that both of these statements are erroneous and without any foundation whatever. But let us examine them. Mr. James J. Hill has spent fortunes in agricultural experiments and has made a lifelong study of our agricultural conditions, and is therefore acknowledged to be the greatest authority we have on our agricultural possibilities.

In his book Highways of Progress he makes the following significant statement on this subject.

Only one-half the land in private ownership is now tilled. That tillage does not produce one-half what the land might be made to yield without losing an atom of its fertility.

In profit we are satisfied with a small yield at the expense of the most rapid soil deterioration. We are satisfied with a national annual average product of $11.38 per acre at the cost of a diminished annual return from the same fields when we might as well secure two or three times that sum.

An industrious, fairly intelligent, and exceedingly comfortable agricultural community can raise from the soil food enough for the needs of 490 persons to the square mile. Adopting that ratio, the 414,498,467 acres of improved farm lands in the United States on the date of the last official report—an area materially enlarged by the present time—would support in comfort 317,350,405 people, enabling them at the same time to raise considerable food for export and to engage in necessary manufacturing employments. Applying the same ratio to the entire acreage of farm lands within the United States, both improved and unimproved, which was at the same date 838,591,774, the population indicated as able to live with comfort and prosperity on the actually existing agricultural area of this country, under an intelligent system and a fairly competent but by no means highly scientific method of agriculture, rises to 642,046,823.

If this statement, that our farmers can and eventually will support a population of about 650,000,000 people, is correct—and no intelligent man who has given the subject careful and serious study will deny that it is at least approximately correct—and if it is, then the statement that our farmers can not now abundantly support our present population becomes so absurd that it would seem as if it could only be made by driveling idiots or by men who would rather venture a guess on any subject than to give it careful and serious study.

Next to Mr. Hill, our greatest expert on agricultural products and possibilities, is another big railroad man, Mr. B. F. Yoakum. In an address before the Farm Credits Conference in Chicago, on April 9, on "Relations of the Government, agriculture, and the railroads and their bearing on better marketing," he said:

Agriculture and transportation have laid the foundation which has made this the greatest and most powerful Nation of the world. They are the biggest factors in America's growth.

There are now not more than 1,000 miles of new railroad under construction. It would require the construction of 165,000 miles of additional railroad to furnish the same transportation facilities west of the Mississippi River that there are east of it, on the basis of area. That great area of rich country can not grow as it should on 1,000 miles per annum of newly built railroads.

Mr. Yoakum said that he believed in the readjustment of the tariff, but declared that if Congress should wipe out the entire tariff on every article that is brought into this country on last year's collections it would only amount to $326,000,000, while the waste which falls upon the farmers of the Nation means an annual loss of over five times the entire amount collected by our revenue collectors. In other words, the annual waste on our farms, caused by insufficient transportation facilities, excessive rates on cheap products and by our present absurd system of distribution, is greater than the amount paid by all our people yearly for potatoes, flour, boots and shoes, and woolen goods of all kinds. If the farmers and the consumers of their products could divide this loss between them, it would go a long way toward solving the high cost of living for both, but to make this possible would require the highest kind of statesmanship plus patient and persevering efforts, while to take the products of any great industry and thow them into the free list requires neither brains nor ability.

Now, let us examine the other contention, namely, that the farmer and the price he gets for his products is responsible for the "high cost of living." It matters little where we begin, so let us take potatoes first. You have put potatoes on the free list. Why? You say because the poor people have to pay from $1 to $1.50 per bushel for this necessity, and that is more than they can afford. I grant you that this is true, but do you know that there are enormous quantities of potatoes rotting in the fields almost every year because they are so cheap that they will not pay the cost of getting them to the consumer? Do you know that the farmers of North Dakota alone would be delighted to contract with the Government or any other responsible party to supply all the potatoes that can be consumed by the whole United States at 25 cents per bushel on the farm? And the finest potatoes in the world at that. Now, is not that cheap enough? I admit that the consumer has to pay from 400 to 600 per cent more for potatoes than the farmer gets for them, but why should you punish the farmer for that? He is not to blame. And if you are so ignorant that you can not determine the cause of the enormous and unjustifiable increase in the price of farm products between the farmer and the consumer, or if you are so incompetent that you can not remedy the wrong, you ought at least to have manhood and decency enough not to try, convict, and sentence our farmers without a hearing and without investigation just to furnish political capital for some of the Democratic statesmen who came from the cities and congested centers of our country and whose constituents, if this bill becomes a law, will soon become co-sufferers with the farmers.

I have just visited the markets of this city for the purpose of finding out what the consumer has to pay for farm products and how much prices are increased over what the farmers

receive. I will here insert a table in the RECORD giving the facts and figures in detail:

Table A.

Commodity.	Unit of sale to consumer.	Price the farmer receives.	Price the consumer pays.	Per cent of increase consumer pays over the farmer's price.	Per cent of purchase price chargeable to distribution.	Per cent of the purchase price received by the farmer.
Wheat flour	Barrel	$3.38	$8.00	140	57	43
Do	Bread, 325 loaves to the barrel.	3.38	16.25	380	79	21
Rye flour	Barrel	1.94	9.80	400	80	20
Corn meal	10-pound sack	.12½	.50	300	75	25
Corn flakes	1-pound package	.01¼	.15	1,100	91	9
Oatmeal	do	.01	.10	900	90	10
Potatoes	Bushel	.25	1.00	300	75	25
Onions	do	.50	2.00	300	75	25
Turnips	do	.25	1.60	540	84	16
Parsnips	do	.35	2.00	470	82	18

But as I go along I want to tell you what the per cent of increase in prices is: Onions 300 per cent, parsnips 470 per cent, rutabagas and turnips 540 per cent, milk and cream more than 50 per cent, butter from 25 to 40 per cent, eggs from 25 to 50 per cent, oatmeal 900 per cent, cornmeal 300 per cent, corn flakes 1,100 per cent, and all package breakfast foods about the same; all kinds of canned goods show an increase of several hundred per cent; rye flour 400 per cent, wheat flour 140 per cent, and bread 380 per cent. I asked the marketmen if these prices were unusual, and they said they were not. I asked what their retail prices were last year and the year before, and they said they were about the same. I then asked how they accounted for the fact that wheat, rye, and corn are from 30 per cent to 40 per cent cheaper this year than last, and yet the consumer has received no benefit from the decline. The reply was that while flour, cornmeal, and so forth, can be bought in carload lots somewhat cheaper than last year, the decline is not enough to permit any change in the selling price of the small packages in which it has to be delivered to the city trade; and as to package goods, nearly all of them were sold under a trade-mark and were put on the market at a uniform price, and the increase or the decrease in the price of the farm products out of which they are made simply resulted in an increase or decrease of the profits of the concern that puts them on the market.

As an illustration that the price the farmer is getting for his products is not responsible for the high cost of living, let me quote from a statement made to a reporter of the Chicago Tribune by Mr. J. R. Cahill, an investigator for the Board of Trade of England, while in this country for the purpose of investigating the price of food, and so forth. He said:

> I can not understand how we can buy bread in England for one-third the price you pay in Chicago when you send us our wheat. You pay 5 cents for 14 ounces of bread, while we get a loaf weighing 64 ounces for 10 cents, made out of your own wheat. Our 4-pound loaf never costs more than 12 cents, and usually only 10 cents.

While it needs no argument to prove that it is an injustice to make the American consumer pay more than twice as much for his bread as the English consumer pays, it is clear that the price which the farmer gets for his wheat has nothing to do with the price of bread, for in each case his wheat is sold for the same price.

The following table, compiled from the records of the Agriculture Department, shows that the price of farm products has declined the last year to such an extent as to seriously cripple the industry, and still that great decline has not been reflected in the slightest degree in the city retail "markets":

Table B.

Commodity.	Average price paid farmer, Apr. 1, 1912.	Average price paid farmer, Apr. 1, 1913.	Percentage of reduction in farm products.
Wheat (hard)	$0.92	$0.72	21
Corn	.71	.53	25
Barley	.92	.48	47
Oats	.52	.33	36
Flax	1.91	1.13	40
Potatoes	1.17	.50	57
Apples	1.04	.82	21
Beans	2.42	2.10	13
Onions	1.67	.77	54
Rye	.85	.62	27
Buckwheat	.77	.68	11

If a decline in prices, as great as this table shows, has not benefited the consumer in the slightest degree, what reason have you for thinking that forcing down the price of wheat and rye another 10 cents per bushel is going to benefit the consumer when a decline of more than twice that much has not reached him? Forcing down the price of wheat 10 cents per bushel, which would reduce the cost of a loaf of bread one-seventh of a cent, will not help the consumer, but may mark the difference between success and failure with the wheat raisers. Any intelligent and unprejudiced student can quickly convince himself that the farmer is not now getting more for his products than enough to pay for expenses, upkeep, and a comfortable living, and that if the price of his products could be reduced to the lowest point at which his industry could exist at all the reduction would be so small that it would not be passed on to the ultimate consumer. There is less added to the price of wheat between the producer and consumer than on most other products, and still a reduction of 10 cents per bushel on wheat would make possible a reduction of only one-seventh of a cent per loaf of bread, an amount so small that the baker would add it to his profit instead of reducing the price of the loaf. It would be just as sensible for the farmers to say that because their business is not now profitable the consumer should be made to pay more for farm products, even if the increase in price did not go to the farmer, as it is for the consumers to say that because they have to pay too much for farm products the farmer shall be compelled to reduce his price even if the reduction is not passed on to the consumer.

It is very evident therefore that by discriminating against the farmers who raise breadstuffs you are not even going to help the poor people of the cities to cheaper bread, and if you succeed in making the raising of foodstuffs less profitable than it is now you will bankrupt that industry, which means that no other industry can succeed that depends on the farmers for a market, and that includes practically all our industries.

Why have you treated barley and malt, the product of barley, different from wheat, rye, buckwheat, and so forth? Of course you are just as inconsistent in dealing with barley as with the other grains mentioned. Your excuse for putting all kinds of flour on the free list, and thereby robbing the farmer of the duty you put on his grain, is said to be that you thought that it might make cheaper bread for the poor. But in dealing with barley you forgot all about the poor, both the poor farmer and the poor beer drinker, for while you have reduced the duty on barley 50 per cent and the duty on malt about 45 per cent you have left the same high duty on beer, ale, stout, and porter contained in the Payne-Aldrich law, which can only be in the interests of the breweries and saloon keepers, for, of course, the ultimate consumer will pay just the same price as before.

The farmers in my State got about 90 cents per bushel for their 1911 barley crop, while they have sold their 1912 crop for about 35 cents a bushel, and still beer, ale, and so forth, by the glass, was the same price both years. Cutting the duty on barley in two will take that amount out of the pockets of the farmers, and no one will be benefited except the breweries and saloon keepers, who may be able to buy a little cheaper at wholesale. I can not understand why you should prefer to favor the breweries and saloon keepers rather than the farmers, unless you figure that you have received more support from them in the past than from the farmers, and that having discriminated against the farmers, as you have in this bill, you will be more dependent on the saloon element in the future than you have been in the past. I know you will say that you have not discriminated against the farmers, citing the fact that you have left a duty of 10 cents per bushel on wheat and oats and 15 cents per bushel on barley, and 10 per cent ad valorem on horses, cattle, sheep, and other farm animals, and that this is as large a duty proportionately as you have allowed on the products of our shops, mills, and factories. This proves one of three things: Either that you are absolutely dishonest in your dealings with the farmer or that you are so densely ignorant that you are unfit to legislate for this great Nation, or that you believe the farmers of this country are so ignorant that they will not recognize the act which has paralyzed their industry or that they will not understand who is responsible for their condition. I can speak for the intelligence of the farmers of the great wheat-growing region of this country, and I want to say to you that there is no more intelligent class of people anywhere in the world than they, but still they can be fooled once in a while. For example, last fall thousands of men in my State voted for a Democratic candidate for the Presidency for the first time in their lives, and they did this for two reasons—first, because they were dissatisfied with the Payne-Aldrich tariff law and the system of legislation under which it was enacted, which, by the way, you have continued; and, second, because the Democratic Party and its candidate for President, Mr. Wilson, had pledged themselves to so revise the tariff laws that no "legitimate industry" should be injured. Believing, as they had a right to believe, that in all

the world there is a no more "legitimate industry" than that of agriculture, and having still some faith in the honor of men, they took the Democratic Party and its candidate at their word. Intelligent as they are they could not believe it possible that a great political party could be so corrupt and so absolutely devoid of honor and principle that it would make promises for the sole purpose of getting votes and with no intention whatever of fulfilling them; and neither could they understand how a great political party, after all the experiences of the past, could still be so absolutely ignorant of the first principles of practical economic and industrial laws that it would blindly do the very opposite of what it had promised and honestly believe it was fulfilling its pledges.

Now, let me try to show you in as few words as possible what you are trying to do to the farmers of this country and how you are keeping your platform pledges and the personal pledges of the man who is now the President of the United States.

Let us first take wheat, on which you have left a duty of 10 cents per bushel, but the products of which you have practically put on the free list. What will be the result? It takes 4½ bushels of good wheat to make a barrel of flour. If the American farmer is going to get the benefit of the 10-cents-per-bushel tariff on wheat, a barrel of flour is going to cost the American miller 45 cents more than it costs the Canadian miller. That handicap, with flour on the free list, would put the American miller out of business. If he runs his mills he will have to buy his wheat as cheaply as his Canadian competitor. If this bill becomes law, he will either have to close his mills or force the price of American wheat down to the level of the Canadian market. Now, which of these courses do you think he will pursue? If you do not know, ask any 10-year-old schoolboy, and he will tell you that our millers will be compelled to put our wheat down to the level of the prices paid by their foreign competitors if he is going to continue in business, and therefore the 10-cent duty on wheat will do the farmer no good.

What is true of wheat is equally true of meats of all kinds and oats, to the extent that oats are used for food. It is a self-evident fact that the price of any so-called raw material produced in this country and consumed by our industries will never go higher than the same can be purchased for abroad plus transportation if the finished product is on the free list. Therefore when you put a duty on wheat, cattle, hogs, and sheep, and at the same time put flour, beef, pork, mutton, and wool on the free list, you are perpetrating what would be a huge joke if the consequences would not be so serious. Now, if you honestly believe that the farmer who gets about 20 per cent of the price paid by the consumer for the bread and other products made out of his wheat is the real cause of the high cost of these necessaries, why do not you have the courage of your convictions and put wheat and all other farm products on the free list? The result would be the same and you would not be breaking your solemn promise to the farmers any worse than you will if this bill becomes a law, and you would at least be playing the game open and above board and not trying to stack the cards like a dishonest and contemptible gambler. The farmers thoroughly understand what is about to happen to them, and you can rest assured that they will hold you responsible. But the trouble will be that it will be like going out in the morning and finding your chicken coop empty and then trying to hold an irresponsible thief accountable for the loss. You may be able to place him in the custody of the sheriff for a while, but that will not bring the chickens back, and he will be sure to repeat the operation if he ever gets the chance.

I was very much interested in some of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, and I will quote some of the things said there, because those of you who are not particularly interested in the agricultural schedule may not have read them.

Mr. S. H. Cowan, of Texas, representing the cattle interests of that State, was one of the ablest and most interesting witnesses, and a fair sample of all the Democrats who appeared before the committee. He started out by saying:

I am a Democrat, Mr. Chairman; I believe in a tariff for revenue.

Then, continuing, he said:

We are opposed to, and I come here for the purpose of opposing, the placing of cattle and meat products on the free list, and it is upon that subject that I wish to address the committee. * * * We are not advocating a protective tariff. * * * When we come to make laws—and of course we are all attempting here and there to work for the best interests as we see the situation, looking, of course, at the situation with respect to our own districts, trying to satisfy the people, trying to get the most votes for ourselves and our parties, yet when we come down to the business side of it that is the side that we come from here. The man who presents his case like the fish man did this morning, like the lemon man presents it, like the rice man will present it, and like the onion man will present it, and, of course, I might enumerate a thousand others, be he Democrat or Republican, that is the way he will look at the question when he is seeking to retain a tariff—from the standpoint of benefit to his business—and there is no use to deny that. When a Congressman comes to enact a law which will have the effect of benefiting or injuring a business he would be false to his duty if he did not consider the effect of what he does. So I think I state a mere matter of ordinary logic when I say that he does not consider the effect of a tariff system of laws—and I speak of a tariff system and not of a particular article—who does not consider the effect of the system he adopts and then go down from a system to individual items, fails to perform his duty as a Representative of the people and as a patriot of the country.

* * * * * * *

Mr. JAMES. Are the farmers of Texas in favor of untaxed farming implements?

Mr. COWAN. Undoubtedly; just as I am in favor of untaxed shoes and hats and coats and pocketknives and everything, if you come down to the individual disposition. * * * In political meetings, when we make speeches and talk about this great proposition of free trade, in order to save the people from the high cost of living, of course that is one thing; but when we come down to consider what is going to be the effect of a law on the statute books, it is another thing. * * *

Mr. JAMES. Do you think free meat would ruin the cattle industry?

Mr. COWAN. It would.

Mr. JAMES. Did not all the Members of Congress from Texas vote for free meat?

Mr. COWAN. I think they all did.

Mr. JAMES. And were they not elected overwhelmingly?

Mr. COWAN. They were; and we vote the Democratic ticket there in spite of politics, in spite of platforms, in spite of everything that is said in any platform. If the Democratic platform says prohibition, we vote for it; if it says "anti," we vote for it.

Mr. JAMES. I know that is true——

Mr. COWAN. You know that, Mr. JAMES, just like I do. * * *

Mr. FORDNEY. You voted in Texas the Democratic ticket and put in the House of Representatives a heavy Democratic delegation, and immediately after election packed your satchels, came up here, and prayed to them for God's sake not to do the very same things they agreed to do if you elected them. [Laughter.]

Mr. COWAN. There is no use to take time about this, because we both understand it perfectly well.

After this Mr. Cowan went on and made one of the ablest arguments for a protective tariff that has ever been made anywhere; but what I can not understand is how a man so able and intelligent as Mr. Cowan can have the audacity to ask for protection for his own industry and then demand free trade on "shoes and hats and coats and pocketknives and everything" else; but that seems to be the fundamental difference between a Republican and a Democrat. A Republican believes that he has no right to so legislate as to increase the profits of a few industries at the expense of all others. He understands that no tariff system will work out in practice that does not treat all industries alike. The farmer can not sell his products at a profitable price unless he is willing to pay a price for the products that he wants in exchange for his own that will permit of reasonable wages and profit in their making; and if this bill becomes a law our factories, shops, and mills will soon discover that they can not maintain a profitable business after the farmer, who is the biggest consumer of their products, has been robbed of his profits.

This is, nevertheless, in accordance with Democratic doctrine, for Democrats all seem obsessed with the idea that by some legislative legerdemain it can be made possible for everyone to sell their own labor and products at a high price and buy every other person's labor and products at a cheap price. This doctrine, like perpetual motion, has been declared possible as far back as we have any records, but neither has ever been put into successful operation, and it is safe to say never will.

But let us go back to Mr. Cowan's testimony and brief before the committee. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] accused Mr. Cowan of taking a narrow view of the subject, saying:

You are not considering the welfare of the people of the United States?

Mr. COWAN. If you will allow me to proceed, I will show you that I am.

Mr. HARRISON. I shall be very glad if you can do so.

Mr. COWAN. I am representing the best interests of the people of the United States. I undertake to say that when you discourage cattle raising in this country—mind you, Texas and the Mexican border and Montana and Idaho and Nebraska and Kansas are not the only cattle-growing countries; there are over a million head of cattle in the State of New York, cattle shipped from Texas, which are finished in New York and sold on the Buffalo market. Calves that are bought in Texas are fed on the farms of Indiana and Ohio. The interwoven fabric of farming, where you raise corn, grain of all sorts, and hay with the live stock in the cattle-producing business of this country, is such that you can not separate the two, that you can not continue the fertility of the soil of this country without the use of live stock. In the States of Kentucky and Tennessee—I having been born in Tennessee—I know that the red hills in Tennessee and large parts of Kentucky are rejuvenated because they sow it in clover and grass and graze cattle on it; and so they do in Virginia, and so they do in Pennsylvania and so they do all over the entire farming country.

Now, I say it is to the best interests of the country that it be self-supporting in the way of the productions of cattle. So that if you, just for the sake of patronizing some people, who say they want cheaper meats, shall open the doors of this country to the flood of meats that could come in here at the end—maybe not right now—from South America, just to the extent that that meat takes the place in New York, in Philadelphia, in Boston, in Baltimore of the cattle which we are shipping from the West out here, just to that extent we fail to get a market.

Who is going to ship it here? Have you ever thought of that? The man who can handle it. Why, I know Members of Congress, men running for office, making public speeches, who have asserted that the object they had in putting meats on the free list was in order to undertake to curb the Packers' Trust. That is a popular thing to do at a logrolling. It is popular to these people who do not know anything

about it, and yet the packers of the United States own a majority of the packing houses of Buenos Aires, and there is not a single packing house in Buenos Aires that undertakes to start out a shipload of beef to New York.

Now let me give you some statements made on this subject by Herbert W. Mumford, Chief of Animal Industry, last September, and we will be able to better understand the position the American farmer will be in if this bill becomes a law.

He says:

From the international standpoint the most important and recent development in the meat industry of the Argentine Republic is the entrance and growing ascendency of North American interests.

Chicago meat companies entered this field only seven years ago, but have already attained such a position that they are a decided, if not a dominating, influence in the progress of the trade and the control of prices. The extent of their interests is only partially known to the public, either of Argentina or the United States, but they admittedly hold two of the seven companies engaged in the production and export of cold-storage meat and are believed to have at least a working understanding with several of the others. They have also secured land for the purpose, it is believed, of establishing new plants.

The two avowedly North American enterprises are the La Plata Cold Storage Co. and the La Blanca Co. The former, since coming under its present control, has risen from a state of insignificance to that of the largest single producer in the Argentine field.

Taken together, the La Plata and the La Blanca companies last year produced a third of the Argentina's total output of cold-storage beef and almost as large a proportion of the mutton and lamb. Their rapid expansion is indicated by the fact that jointly they have chartered all the space in 19 new steamships ordered by the Nelson Line for the River Plata fresh-meat trade.

But most important of all, perhaps, as showing the influence of the American companies in the Argentine is the fact that they are generally credited with having stimulated the industry through the introduction of progressive methods, particularly in the development of chilled beef. Chilled beef—the kind to which United States consumers are accustomed and regarded as superior to frozen beef—has been brought into commercial importance within the last year or more by the North American companies, and seems destined to supersede in importance the frozen product. In 1909 the La Plata Cold Storage Co. produced more than twice as much chilled meat as any other company and, together with the La Blanca Co., marketed more than 50 per cent of the entire output of that article.

The importance of the position of the Chicago companies in the Argentine is that, apparently, it puts the meat industry of the two principal producing countries in the same hands. Argentina is the largest exporter of beef in the world and, next to New Zealand, the largest shipper of mutton. Argentina now occupies the place formerly held by the United States as a purveyor of beef to Europe, the increase in the home consumption having cut down our exports in a marked degree.

Shipments of beef from the River Plata to the United States may come shortly, but they will probably be directed by the same interests which supply the market here, not in opposition to them.

It is generally known that in our meat industry the so-called Beef Trust is in absolute control of the machinery of distribution, and that they can put the wholesale price of meats to any price they see fit; but it is not so generally known that our Beef Trust is in practical control of the system of distribution in South America, but when this is understood it is easy to understand what "free meats" will mean to the farmers of this country. Putting meats on the free list is putting a club in the hands of the Beef Trust that they can use against the farmers and ranchers of this country with tremendous effect. It can then say to our farmers, "If you do not want to sell at the price we offer, it is immaterial to us, for we can now get our supplies from the ends of the earth, and as we already have our packing houses, cold-storage plants, and refrigerator ships engaged in the South American trade, we will get our supplies from there for a while." Thus driven to the wall, our farmers will have to take what the Beef Trust is willing to give. If this would result in cheaper meats to the consumer, there would at least be some compensation, but anyone who knows anything about the Beef Trust and its methods knows that this would be highly improbable. In the past the Beef Trust has used to the fullest extent its power to hold the wholesale price of meats at the highest price that would not reduce consumption enough to injure its business, and it will no doubt continue the same policy in the future, and if they do, no benefits will accrue to the consumers through "free meats."

If you really wanted to benefit both the producer and consumer of meats you should have retained a duty on beef and fat cattle and admitted free stockers and feeders under 2 years old. This would have permitted our farmers to have imported hundreds of thousands of young stock to be finished on the grass and cheap feed that often goes to waste because they have nothing to feed it to. This would so help to increase our supply of beef that we would not have to go abroad for it. In my opinion, any man who votes for a law that tends to make our people dependent upon any foreign country for the food that we can produce ourselves in abundance is worse than a traitor. But you will ask, "What is the difference whether we go abroad for our beef or for stockers and feeders?" There is all the difference in the world, my friends. There is very little money for anyone in raising stockers and feeders, and if beef can be imported into this country free the young cattle will be finished in the country where they are raised and shipped to us as beef, while, if you put a duty on beef but let the young stock in free, that young stock will be shipped to this country and our farmers could buy them for a price they could afford to pay and in finishing them on the cheap feed that now is often wasted, they would not only greatly increase the quantity of beef but they would also produce a large quantity of the one thing most needed by our farmers to-day—a source of wealth lost sight of by most men dealing with this question—namely, barnyard manure. Unless we want our farm lands to go to rack and ruin we must stop the steady and constant depletion of soil fertility and return to the soil much of what has already been lost, and the application of barnyard manure is the readiest and most effective method of accomplishing this object, and to protect our soil we must foster and develop the live-stock industry among our farmers.

In a letter written on January 14, 1913, by Hon. J. A. Bonsteel, Government soil-survey scientist, he said:

Our farmers are now putting fertility back into the soil through stable and yard manure to an estimated value of $1,000,000,000 per year.

But still they are taking the fertility out of the soil much faster than they are putting it back, and if this continues we shall soon have destroyed the greatest source of wealth possessed by this or any other countr in the world.

Mr. Bonsteel, in the letter referred to, also said:

There are many communities in the older settled portions of the United States, which have been occupied for farming purposes for a period ranging from 100 to 150 years, where the crop yields at the present time equal or exceed the yields which have been secured at any previous period in the history of the community. In these localities a rational crop rotation has been supplemented by the feeding of live stock and the use of stable and yard manures.

This shows the possibility of maintaining the fertility of our soil and of supporting many times our present population under a correct and scientific system of farming. Unfortunately, however, this system has only been practiced in isolated sections of the country, as is witnessed by the fact that our average yield of grains per acre is gradually decreasing. Our western farmers in the past had a virgin soil to handle, and they seemed to think that its fertility was inexhaustible, and it is only of recent years that they have realized their mistake and have sought to correct their mistake by introducing a system of mixed farming and stock raising. In this proposed law you strike a vicious blow at the live-stock industry—the one industry that has in its keeping the welfare and success of our entire agricultural system.

The men of any party that do not see in the restoration and preservation of our soil fertility one of the greatest problems confronting this country are not statesmen, to say the least, and whether they ignore this great problem through ignorance or an insane political ambition makes no difference, for the result will be the same.

When we come to discuss the "high cost of living," any intelligent man can easily satisfy himself that the prices received by the farmer is not the cause of it, and surely the cause should be known before a remedy can be found and intelligently and effectively applied. A good example to show that the price the farmers get is not the cause of the high retail price of meats is afforded by comparing the price at which meats are retailed to the consumer on the Isthmus of Panama by the commissary department with the prices paid by Washington consumers for like cuts. I will insert a table in the RECORD showing these prices, and the facts set out therein may surprise you. It shows that we are paying in Washington from 31 to 200 per cent more than is charged to the consumer on the Isthmus:

Table C.

Article.	Retail price, delivered to consumer by commissary department, Isthmian Commission.	Retail price, delivered to consumer by Washington retail dealers.	Per cent of increase.
Mutton:	*Pound.*	*Pound.*	
Stewing	$0.06	$0.12½	108
Forequarter	.08	.12½	56
Beef:			
Stewing	.08	.15	87
Soup	.05	.15	200
Chuck roast	.12	.18	50
Rib roast	.16	.22	37
Porterhouse roast	.20	.35	75
Sirloin	.19	.25	31
Steak—			
Chuck	.12½	.18	44
Round	.13	.25	92
Rib	.18	.25	40
Sirloin	.19	.25	31
Porterhouse	.20	.35	75

To understand the full importance of these figures you must take into consideration the fact that the meats sold on the Isthmus are bought from the Beef Trust, and therefore include the price received by the farmer; the expense and profits of the Beef Trust; the cost of transportation from New York to the Isthmus, a distance of nearly 2,000 miles; the expensive cold-storage proposition that must be provided in transporting it and keeping in a tropical country after it arrives; and the cost of distributing it to the consumer. But for the expense incurred in handling the meat after it reaches New York it could no doubt be sold for considerable less than the prices quoted. Those who have just returned from the Isthmus and who have investigated the matter thoroughly say that the quality of the meat sold there is as fine as any sold here in Washington.

I think you will all agree with me that if meats were sold as cheaply in this country as they are on the Isthmus, even allowing for the added expense of transportation, icing, and so forth, necessarily incurred by the commissary department, there would be little cause to complain of the high cost of meat.

It seems to me that the figures I have shown in the tables inserted in the RECORD prove conclusively that the high cost of meats and other farm products is caused by what is added to the price of the product after it leaves the farmers' hands, and that it must be accounted for by our expensive and indefensible system of distribution.

But whoever is responsible for the increase in the price of the product after it leaves the farm, one thing is certain, that to punish the farmer for the high cost of living by putting his products on the free list, without investigation or information, is like arresting an innocent man and throwing him into jail without a hearing or a trial while the real culprit goes free.

I realize how futile it is to stand here and plead the cause of the western farmer before a political party intoxicated with power and that always has been controlled by the solid South and the great cities and congested centers of the country, combining all the elements that are consumers only of the products of the great West, and who, therefore, have no other interest in the agricultural industry than to make its products as cheap as possible, and then to create conditions under which the farmers will have to purchase their products at the highest possible price. I know this will seem like a rather strong statement of the case, but it is abundantly borne out by the speeches that have recently been made on the floor of this House. Let me quote some of them.

The gentleman from New York, the Hon. FRANCIS B. HARRISON, in speaking for the Canadian reciprocity treaty on February 13, 1911, said:

> The recent election, bringing about the first overthrow the Republicans have sustained in many years, was freighted with one great demand—the demand of the people of our congested cities to take the taxes off from food and clothing. In response to that mandate we are now taking the first step. From the east side of New York City a million voices are raised in appeal to you that you should make this bill a law. From every city in the East they cry out to you.

Speaking on the woolen bill, on July 30, 1912, he said:

> This Democratic Congress was sent here by the consumers of the country and not by the producers. Your Tariff Board report, to which you make reference, is a producers' report. It deals exclusively with the difference in the cost of production, if any, here and abroad.

This gentleman, voicing the sentiments of the Democratic Party, does not want any investigation as to the cost of production on the farm. He does not want to know whether the farmer is getting too much or too little for his products. All he wants is that the farmer shall be compelled to sell his products cheaper than he does now, regardless of consequences.

Another gentleman from New York, the present governor of that State, while discussing the tariff question on the floor of this House on August 5, 1912, said:

> The Democrats must keep the tariff to the front. It will never be settled until it is settled right, and it will never be settled right until it is settled by the friends of the consumers.

The genial leader of the majority, the Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, said on June 10, 1912:

> I believe in relieving the men who work in the factories and in the foundries and who have to purchase their daily bread.

And so I might continue to quote; but what is the use, for the Democratic Party not only declares that it stands for cheaper food, but that its method of accomplishing this is to reduce or cut off entirely the duty on farm products, which shows that it means to make the farmers stand the reduction, for, as Mr. HARRISON says, the Democratic Party is under no obligation to the producers of these products, but only to the consumers. Well, these gentlemen may be able to force down the prices of the farmers' products enough to satisfy even their unreasonable views and policy, only to find their own constituents without the means to buy them at any price. History has always repeated itself, and always will as often as like conditions prevail.

Many of the would-be reformers, whom nature has endowed with more ability to talk than to think, tell us that the remedy for the high cost of living is to get two or three million city people to go back to the farms and raise more farm products at a less price—which would mean at no profit—in order that those who remain in the city might have their cost of living reduced. The people who thus moved into the country, in order to live, would have to work from 12 to 16 hours a day and practice the strictest economy. If they did this and managed intelligently, the cost of food might be reduced, but even then the plan would utterly fail unless the farmers could buy as much cheaper as they would have to sell cheaper, and in order to make this possible the city people would have to work as many hours per day as the farmers—say 4 hours longer than they do now—and then do without many of the luxuries they now indulge in. This might make the plan feasible and successful, but no reformer of social conditions has ever suggested that any other class of people should be compelled to work as long hours as the farmer has to do or get along with so few luxuries. The workers of every other industry or calling are demanding shorter hours and higher wages—which means an increased cost of their products—and as they are now pretty thoroughly organized they are gradually enforcing their demands. At the same time they are demanding cheaper food, and instead of even attempting to remedy the evils of our absurdly expensive system of distribution they propose to make the farmer carry the load. In other words, they propose to get their increased leisure and comforts at the expense of the farmers, regardless of the fact that the burdens of this kind already borne by the farmer is the cause of his sons and daughters leaving him to become competitors in the already overcrowded occupations of the cities.

No country can long be prosperous that does not maintain a proper balance between agriculture and the industrial occupations, and that balance has already been seriously affected in this country. If you want to stop the steady flow of farmers' sons and daughters to the cities, all you have to do is to so legislate as to assure to the farmer safe and reasonable profits for his industry and the trick is turned.

Some would-be reformers tell us that if we could furnish proper amusement for the farmers' families their young people would not leave the farm. Such talk is the sheerest nonsense. If you can bring about conditions under which the farmers will have a few dollars left after paying for the absolute necessaries, they will look out for their own amusements and ask no favors.

Nero tried to pacify a robbed and dissatisfied public by various kinds of amusements, but the plan failed as it always will. All the farmer asks is justice and a fair field in which to work, and if you deny him this you will not only ruin his industry but you will make it impossible for any other industry long to prosper. [Loud applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, under the general leave to print already granted, I submit for printing in the RECORD an article written by Hon. William Randolph Hearst to the editor of the Washington Post.

The article referred to is as follows:

NEW YORK, *April 18, 1913.*

To the Editor of the Washington Post:

Mr. Wilson lately revived the ancient Federalist custom of a speech to the assembled representatives in Congress, personally instructing them upon their duties and obligations to the administration.

It seems to me that the significance of this presidential performance has been largely overlooked.

JEFFERSON'S COURSE.

Is it not worthy of note that the last President to indulge in this formal procedure was John Adams, the last Federalist President, and that the first President to dispense with this ceremonious custom was Thomas Jefferson, the first Democratic President?

In the early days of this Republic there were two distinct lines of thought in the politics of the country, and two different bodies of citizens supporting these lines of thought.

TWO OPPOSING VIEWS.

On the one hand were the Democratic Republicans, who believed both in the letter and in the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, who were convinced that a new order of things was both advisable and advantageous, that the old-established systems of government by a superior class were failures, and that government by all the people was not only the most just and righteous but the most practical and successful form of government that could be devised.

On the other hand were the Federalists, who regarded radical innovations in government as more or less dangerous, and believed that for the American Government to be entirely safe and sound it must be modeled largely upon the established forms of government in the older European countries.

DREAMS HAVE COME TRUE.

This division of opinion and policy, even among patriots at that early date, was entirely natural and temperamental. Men of conservative

thought, like Hamilton, were Federalists, and believed in the established order of things. Men of original and adventurous thought, like Jefferson, believed in a new and better order of things and dreamed of a greater and nobler nation than had ever been known, built on the firm foundations of justice and equality, of liberty and opportunity.

These dreams have come true; but in those early days there was not sufficient experience in popular government to guide all men to a confidence in the new order of things, and so the Federalists, with their belief in the established order of things, continued for a while to form a formidable party.

At this day Federalists still exist, but not in sufficient numbers to form a separate party, and so they are found scattered through the other parties, and sometimes in commanding positions in one of the other parties.

FOND OF ENGLISH SYSTEM.

The distinguishing mark of the Federalists from the beginning has been their special admiration for, and confidence in, the English system of government. Hamilton, the real creator of the Federalist Party, carried an inclination to incorporate the English procedure into our American form of government so far that he was accused by Jefferson of a secret desire to make the United States a monarchy.

We can hardly believe that even the most extreme Federalist would have been willing to go to that length, but most certainly the Federalists as a whole were apparently unable to understand and appreciate the beauty, the simplicity, the humanity, and the practicability of Jefferson's distinctively American ideas, and turned invariably to the more autocratic and aristocratic methods of the mother country.

The Federalist method of a speech by the President to Congress was a mere adaptation of the British usage of a speech to Parliament from the throne.

The aristocratic Adams approved it and practiced it.

But Thomas Jefferson, who founded the Democratic Party and introduced into American political life the simplicity which has since characterized it, adopted the modest democratic method of writing a message to Congress, expressing his views and offering suggestions for legislation.

RETURN TO THE SPECTACULAR.

It is a singular thing that for 113 years great Democrats, from Andrew Jackson to Grover Cleveland, and great Republicans, from Abraham Lincoln to Theodore Roosevelt, should have followed the simple, modest, and democratic method of Thomas Jefferson, and that only in the Democratic administration of our day is return made in this presidential speech to the ceremonies and somewhat spectacular procedure of the close of the eighteenth century.

President Wilson, in the introduction of his speech to Congress, explained his somewhat sensational performance by stating that he wished to show that "a President was a human being."

Since the time of John Adams there has been no one in public life except Mr. Wilson who believed that a President could possibly be considered anything else than a human being.

NOT EXEMPT FROM HUMAN WEAKNESSES.

If, however, Mr. Wilson's suspicion is correct—and there has lately arisen among independent and intelligent American citizens a belief that there is something superhuman and supernatural about a President—Mr. Wilson has effectively dispelled that superstition by proving that a President can possess all the purely human weaknesses, including vanity and a craving for newspaper notoriety.

The significance and importance, however, of President Wilson's performance lie mainly in the federalistic flavor of it, and in the possible consequences to the American Nation of a Chief Executive with a federalistic viewpoint.

The idea that a ruler must occasionally reveal himself to the people or to their representatives in order to prove that he is merely human is a charmingly federalistic conception.

The disposition to revert to the formality and ceremony of the old-established English system is another characteristic indication of a federalistic frame of mind.

A POSSIBLE DANGER.

This mental disposition is not so vital, unless it is indicative of the peculiar inability of the old-time Federalist to understand and appreciate the immense superiority of our own American ideas and institutions—unless it expresses an unfortunate and unwarrantable tendency to overestimate the notably inferior institutions of foreign nations, particularly of England.

The fear that Mr. Wilson's federalistic frame of mind may threaten exactly this danger is strengthened by other of Mr. Wilson's actions and utterances.

Mr. Wilson gained his degree of doctor of philosophy by an essay which contended flagrantly in the face of fact that the English parliamentary form of government was superior to the American congressional system.

AMERICAN SYSTEM SUPERIOR.

The very obvious and almost universally admitted truth is that there is no such practical and efficient system in the world as our American congressional system, with its committee organization.

As a matter of fact, England at this day, in order to perform her pressing governmental business, is compelled to modify her parliamentary system which Mr. Wilson so admired, and to consider the adaptation and adoption of the American system which Mr. Wilson so disparaged and despised.

To be sure, this essay of Mr. Wilson's was written some time ago, and might be considered an early and outgrown expression of a federalistic affection for England were it not that Mr. Wilson has only comparatively recently delivered an address in which he declares that he gets his information on world events from the columns of the London Weekly Times.

The London Times proudly advertises this utterance in a circular, which reads as follows: "Some short time ago President Woodrow Wilson, when speaking at the annual dinner of bankers of New York, said:

"'To get the news of the world I subscribe for the weekly edition of the London Times.'"

The manager of the London Times then proceeds to dilate upon his departments of world news and world business, and closes with the polite suggestion that the "inclosed form should be used by intending subscribers."

Certainly the London Times is, or at least once was, an excellent paper, but there is no publication on the face of the earth so completely and absolutely saturated with the English prejudice toward all other countries, and toward America in particular, as the London Times.

ALARMING TO AMERICANS.

In view of which, it is astonishing, if not alarming, to American citizens to think that their Chief Executive gets his "news of the world" and, to a certain extent, his views of the world and his views of business from the columns of this biased English journal.

Some American citizens are followers of Jefferson and have studied the attitude of England in Jefferson's time during the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812. Other American citizens are disciples of Abraham Lincoln and have read of the acts and animus of England during the Civil War. All of these citizens will wonder what effect this prejudiced English information of "politics" and "business" from a colored English source will have upon the mind of an American President. Many American citizens will seriously consider whether this insidious English influence will tend to prejudice the presidential mind against the methods and systems and institutions of his own country, no matter how provenly successful those institutions may be.

Many thoughtful citizens will be led to ponder on how far Mr. Wilson's attitude toward the American protective tariff is influenced by his federalistic frame of mind and his English sources of information.

Mr. Wilson's opposition to the protective tariff is not inherently or essentially Democratic.

WILSON AN ENGLISH FREE TRADER.

Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, recognized the principle of protection and advocated discriminating duties in favor of American shipping and reciprocity treaties in favor of American trade.

Mr. Wilson is fundamentally opposed to the principle of protection, and his idea of radical, ruthless tariff reduction is but an expression of the English free-trade theories of Cobden and Mill.

Mr. Wilson is an English free trader.

He may obscure his utterances, but he can not conceal his acts.

Mr. Wilson's political economy is the political economy of another nation and of another age.

It is the political economy of a nation that is passing and of an age that is past.

Mr. Wilson's theories are the theories of books, and of British books, but of British books that are no longer believed by the patriotic and practical and progressive Englishmen of to-day.

The United States of America have given an example to the world in progress and prosperity, in advancement and enlightenment, in happiness and contentment.

The nations of the world have turned toward this country in admiration and amazement.

The methods and systems and institutions of our country have been studied and imitated in every foreign nation, except, perhaps, in England.

FEDERALISTS ALONE IN THE DARK.

England is slow to learn and reluctant to learn, but, nevertheless, she is beginning to learn, and the most advanced and intelligent thought in England to-day is in favor of an imperial federation, with free trade among its component States and colonies, but with a policy of protection toward the rest of the world.

Germany and France have long prospered under protection, and through intelligent appreciation and imitation of other American ideas and institutions.

The realization that this country is the greatest country in the world and the appreciation of the causes which have made it the greatest country in the world are almost universal throughout the world, except among the few remaining Federalists of the United States of America.

If there is to be tariff modification, the modern American policy should be the original Democratic policy of reciprocity and discriminating duties in favor of American products, American manufactures, American commerce, and American trade.

In our tariff we have a weapon with which we can withstand the tariff weapons of other nations, but we must not abandon our weapons until other nations are ready to abandon theirs.

WHAT BECOMES OF RECIPROCITY?

In the reduction of our tariff through reciprocity we have a method by which we can compel the reduction of the tariff of other nations, but of what value will be a policy of reciprocity which does not go into effect until after our tariff reductions have been made?

If we are to make tariff concessions which will be encouraging to the products and valuable to the producers in other nations, we should compel reciprocal concessions which will be equally stimulating to the products, equally beneficial to the producers, to the farmers, to the manufacturers, and the laborers in our own country.

Through reciprocity tariff reduction can be made coincident and coextensive with trade expansion.

Through reciprocity the injury to our manufacturers, to our farmers, to our laborers, through the invasion of our markets by foreign products, would be compensated for by the advantages obtained by our manufacturers, our farmers, and our laborers in the opening of foreign markets to our trade and our produce.

MOTIVE AN UNSELFISH ONE.

In the advocacy of intelligent reciprocity rather than reckless and ruthless tariff reduction and commercial destruction I have no selfish motive.

I have cattle ranches in Mexico, and it is proposed under Mr. Wilson's policy to bring beef free into the United States.

It would advantage me considerably, from a merely sordid point of view, to have Mexican beef allowed free into the United States market.

But as a patriotic American citizen and a Jeffersonian Democrat I do not believe that Mexican beef or any other Mexican product should be allowed free into the markets of the United States until American goods are allowed free into the markets of Mexico.

Under Mr. Wilson's program it is proposed to allow white paper free into the markets of the United States from Canada.

I use over $6,000,000 worth of white paper every year, and, from a merely selfish financial point of view, it would benefit me enormously to have white paper admitted free into the markets of the United States.

NATION'S INTERESTS ABOVE PARTY.

But, again, as a patriotic American citizen and a Jeffersonian Democrat, I do not believe that white paper or any other Canadian product should be admitted free into the United States until the products of the United States, or at least corresponding products of the United States, are admitted free into the markets of Canada.

The Canadians scornfully rejected our proposals of reciprocity.

Are we in return to give them the full advantage of reciprocity without securing any reciprocal advantages for ourselves?

I am loath to criticize the policy of the Democratic Party or of any man whom I labored to elect, but I am an American first and a Demo-

crat afterwards, and I can not consider the interests of my party above the interests of my country.

I shall hope to see the Democratic Party fulfill its duty and rise to its opportunity.

I shall support it gracefully when it is right, but criticize it regretfully when it is wrong, and I shall continue to implore it not to be led by a federalistic fetich away from the fundamental principles of Thomas Jefferson, who was always not only a great Democrat but a great American.

WILLIAM R. HEARST.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I know that no words that I can say will prevent the passage of this bill. The legislative steam roller, well oiled and ready for operation, is waiting on the other side of the House to roll over us and effectually silence all opposition. Nevertheless, I feel that I can not discharge the constitutional duty which devolves upon me as a Member of this House without recording my protest against the passage of this most unwise, unjust, unscientific, and unstatesmanlike tariff measure.

It would seem that the lessons of our political history ought to give pause to the gentlemen on the other side before they pass a bill fraught with such certain disaster to the industrial prosperity of the country as is this bill. Irrespective of the merits of the controversy as to whether an ultimate free trade or a protective policy is best for this country, our history makes clear, I think, that when industries have been built up and have for years been operated under a protective tariff, to suddenly remove that protection or to so suddenly reduce the tariff as to amount to revolution, the result always has been and always must be widespread and terrible disaster. If it should be determined that it is for the interest of this country to go to a free-trade basis, the result should not be reached all at once, but very gradually. The reductions in the tariff provided by this bill, instead of becoming operative all at once, should be spread over a period of five years, unless its authors intend to bring a terrible shock, if not total destruction, to many of the great industries of the country. If this bill is passed into law there is nothing surer than that the people of the country will have another object lesson like that of 1894 to 1897 of the harmful results that always have come and always will come from radical and sudden reductions in the tariff upon the products which our people are producing. The result must be the stopping of the wheels of industry, for a time at least if not permanently. Our industries are all adjusted to the conditions produced by the protective tariff; wages, cost of material, salaries, and everything making up the cost of production are determined in very many of our industries, if not in all of them, by our tariff policy. Remove the protection heretofore afforded them, or greatly reduce the duties, and there must inevitably be a lowering in the price of wages to somewhere near the standard of our competitors, as well as in the cost of all the other things that enter into production. This means an inevitable business and industrial stagnation with consequent labor struggles, lack of employment, and the privation and suffering that comes with it. There is nothing surer, in my judgment, than that the passage of this bill into law will shut up many of the mills and factories and slow everything down, just as the Wilson bill did in 1894. There can be no revival from the resulting depression until an adjustment in the cost of wages and other elements that enter into production have been reached. Only the blindest adhesion to a theory, stripped of all practical experience or knowledge, could hide from the gentlemen on the other side of the House the results to flow from their action.

I belong to that class who for a few years past have been inveighed against, ridiculed, and condemned by many of those who think they see a new light. I am a protectionist and believe firmly in the doctrine that it is for the country's interest, and for the interest of every part of it, too, that our people should buy as far as possible the products of our own labor. This not only keeps our enormous labor population employed, but it keeps our money at home; and individuals, as well as nations, grow rich and prosperous not by what they buy of others, but by what they produce and sell to others.

Nothing seems clearer than this: When you buy any article, whether of necessity or luxury, you are paying not just for the material that is in it, you are paying for the labor that it cost to produce it. When you buy domestic goods you are buying domestic labor, and when you buy foreign goods you are buying foreign labor. This is elementary. Everybody who thinks ought to know this. Now, the capacity of this country for consumption is very large, but it is by no means unlimited, and when the law makes it for the interest of our people to buy foreign goods, that simply means that the law makes it for the interest of our people to buy foreign labor to the exclusion of our own. The people have only so much money to spend in supplying their wants, and whatever they spend for the products of foreign labor obviously can not be spent for the products of our own labor. Supplying our necessities by buying foreign goods means by so much displacing the products of the labor of this country. It has been estimated by some of the friends of this bill that one of the effects of it will be increased importations of products affected by the proposed changes in the tariff to an amount equal to one-third of the total consumption of those products. I think it will turn out, if this bill becomes a law, that the increase in importations will be in much greater proportion than that. In many cases all the goods we consume will be imported. But in any case, so far as we import foreign goods, do not forget that we are paying for foreign labor, and so far as these foreign goods displace goods of home manufacture they are displacing American labor, which must inevitably be turned out upon the street. The American laborer will have been driven from the employment with which he is familiar by the action of his own Government, which has furnished him no other job, no other means of livelihood, and has not created conditions which will enable anybody to supply him with such employment. The man who has any practical knowledge of business and knows what must be the inevitable result of the passage of this bill is overwhelmed with feelings of sorrow and regret that our country must pass through another period when many of our industries will be idle, when want and hunger will stalk abroad in the land, and when soup houses will keep the breath of life in the idle until our people come again to another period of industrial sanity and intelligence.

I wish now to consider in detail some of the provisions of this bill, and especially those which will disastrously affect the industries of my own section.

SUGAR.

California has, since the passage of the Dingley bill, been a large and increasing producer of beet sugar. There are now 13 factories in the State, as follows:

Alameda Sugar Co., Alameda County; Anaheim Sugar Co., Orange County; American Beet Sugar Co., Chino, San Bernardino County; American Beet Sugar Co., Oxnard, Ventura County; Corcoran Sugar Co., Kings County; Holly Sugar Co., Orange County; Los Alamitos Sugar Co., Orange County; Spreckels Sugar Co., Monterey County; San Joaquin Valley Sugar Co., Kern County; Santa Ana Cooperative Sugar Co., Orange County; Southern California Sugar Co., Orange County; Sacramento Valley Sugar Co., Glenn County; and Union Sugar Co., Santa Barbara County.

These factories produced in 1912 168,765 tons (of 2,000 pounds) of sugar, consumed 1,037,499 tons (of 2,000 pounds) of beets, which were grown on 112,000 acres of the land of the State. This industry represents a total investment in California of $19,904,823. As indicating the value to our State of this industry I call attention to the following statement of—

Local expenditures in 1912.

For beets (showing the total value of the crop to the farmers of the State)	$6,701,582.82
For labor in factories and fields	3,939,165.01
For railroad freights	1,811,112.46
For fuel oil	503,789.90
For lime rock	211,162.69
For bags	391,564.93
For other supplies	542,598.11
Total	14,100,922.92

We think in California that this industry should not be needlessly sacrificed to meet the views of the refiners of cane sugar and the importing interests. Who is paying for the expensive propaganda lately being carried on to remove the tariff on sugar? Not the consumer, for sugar is furnished to consumers in this country cheaper, with two or three exceptions, than anywhere else in the civilized world. This propaganda is being carried on and paid for by the refining interests, who are, of course, interested in cheaper foreign raw cane sugar and in removing from their field the only competitors they have—the beet-sugar factories of the country.

A little attention to the history of sugar prices must convince anyone that free sugar means destruction to the beet-sugar industry of this country. Owing to the high percentage of sugar in our beets—sometimes as high as 22 per cent—the factories of California can survive free sugar if any can. But many of our factories, if not all of them, would find it impossible to run at a profit unless there is a great readjustment of wages and a lowering of the price of beets. Actual cost per pound at factory of producing beet sugar was estimated by an expert in the business in 1909 at 2.88¼ cents. In the year 1912 the cost was certainly more than this. Last week refined sugar was selling in New York at 4.06 cents per hundred pounds wholesale. Remove the duty—1.90 cents per pound on refined sugar—and it is easy to see what would become of the beet-sugar man. There are other elements to be taken into consideration. For example, beet sugar has to be sold at from 10 cents to 30 cents per 100 pounds less than cane sugar, or an average of 20 cents per 100 pounds. Assuming that the freights

from beet-sugar factories to market are the same as from the refineries, the figures would stand thus:

	Cents.
Cost of producing beet sugar	2.88¼
Present wholesale price in New York	4.06
Less duty	1.90
	2.16
Less differential	.20
	1.96
Loss	.92¼

If it can be claimed that sugar prices at present are abnormally low, let us take another date—say, January 1, 1912:

	Cents.
Wholesale price of granulated in New York	4.75
Less duty and differential	2.10
	2.65
Cost of producing beet sugar	2.88¼
Loss	.23¼

I think the year 1912 was a normal year in sugar prices, and I have seen no figures by any authority on the subject showing that beet sugar has been produced in this country at a less average price than 2.65 cents per pound. Some of the factories might be able to meet these figures, but most of them could not and without protection would be obliged to suspend operations.

Is this result desired by the people of the United States? I do not believe it. It is not only not for the interest of the people of California, but it is not for the interest of the people of any part of the country that the beet-sugar factories should be put out of business. They have been the only regulator of prices in this country. In the fall, when the product of the beet-sugar factories have come upon the market, prices always drop, and remain low as long as they are in the market. Any unprejudiced student of the subject, I think, must conclude that a removal of the tariff, thus eliminating the bulk of the beet-sugar product, would not be to the ultimate advantage of the consumers of this country. Its only competitor, the beet-sugar factories, out of the way and the International Sugar Trust, which controls prices everywhere else in the world but here, would fix the price of our sugar, and be assured it would not be lower to the consumer than it is now.

Instead of destroying our domestic sugar industry in a vain effort to secure cheaper sugar for the consumer, the wise business policy for us is to foster and stimulate our domestic production in every possible way. Germany has been doing this with splendid results. She has gradually increased her production until now it has reached 2,500,000 tons annually. She not only has a prohibitive protective tariff, but formerly paid a bounty to stimulate production. If the present policy of protection could be continued for another 15 years and it was known now that this would be the policy, at the end of that time we would, by the natural increase in production, be producing in this country and our colonial dependencies enough sugar to supply our people with the total amount consumed. There is practically no limit to the possible increase in the production of beet sugar.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYES. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. What proportion of the sugar of the United States at this time is made from beets?

Mr. HAYES. I will produce those figures in a moment.

Our total consumption of sugar for 1913 is estimated at 3,675,000 tons.

I might say that in California there will be a greater increase than is figured upon on account of the dry weather there, which will prevent in places where the sugar factories are in operation, for instance, the planting of the usual amount of beans, and the farmers will put in beets in place of those beans, because they can get the water to irrigate them and it will be profitable to irrigate them, whereas it would not be to irrigate beans.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WEAVER). Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYES. Yes.

Mr. QUIN. What per cent of the sugar produced in the United States is beet sugar?

Mr. HAYES. I will give the gentleman the figures.

The sources of supply under present tariff conditions are as follows:

	Tons.
Louisiana	300,000
Beet sugar	625,000
Porto Rico	300,000
Philippines	200,000
Hawaii	500,000
Total domestic	1,925,000
Cuba	1,650,000
All other countries	100,000
Total	3,675,000

If we could keep at home the vast sum that we pay to foreigners for this 1,750,000 tons of foreign sugar, it would be a great business advantage to this country.

There is another strong reason for stimulating the production of beet sugar in this country. A crop of beets is the greatest restorer of a worn-out soil in the world. This has been repeatedly shown, not only in this country but in Germany, France, and other lands. In the last 30 years Germany has increased its crops of wheat, rye, barley, and oats 80 per cent by the culture of sugar beets.

From whatever point the matter is looked at, to destroy this great and growing industry, and by so doing put our people absolutely in the power of the great International Sugar Trust, seems to me a piece of foolish, insane, criminal folly, for which the guilty party will be held by the people strictly to account.

LEMONS.

Lemon culture is one of the new industries in our State. Fifteen years ago lemons for shipment to the eastern markets were almost unheard of, the total production being about 250,000 boxes. In 1911 the crop was 2,273,000 boxes and last year 2,000,000 boxes. The total consumption of lemons in this country is about 4,000,000 boxes. So that we are now producing in California about one half the lemons consumed and are importing the other half almost entirely from Sicily and Italy. In the last three years the acreage planted to lemon trees increased 43 per cent. It is therefore perfectly apparent, since we are known to have two or three hundred thousand acres of land suitable for lemon culture, that under the present conditions in 15 years more we should be producing in California practically all the lemons consumed in this country. Would this not be a most desirable condition of affairs? Would it not be better to be paying the farmers and laborers of southern California for growing our lemons than to pay the Italian and Sicilian for growing them? I venture to think that it would.

What will be the effect upon the lemon industry of the reduction of the tariff from 1½ cents per pound to one-half cent per pound? The ultimate effect will be to confine the California product to the country west of Denver—certainly west of the Missouri River. I think there can be no other result, and a little attention to the figures produced before the Committee on Ways and Means will demonstrate this.

Mr. Powell, whom I regard as the best-posted man in the world on the lemon industry of California, testified before the Ways and Means Committee that the average cost of producing a box of lemons in California was last year $1.88 f. o. b. Mr. Osborn, representing the importing and foreign interests in lemons, testified that it cost $1.65 per box f. o. b. the vessel to produce a box of Sicilian lemons. The freight to any point east of the Missouri River from California is 84 cents per box. The freight on foreign lemons to New York, after deducting all rebates, in 1,000 box lots—and they all come in large lots—is 24 cents per box. Taking the estimate of the representative of each interest of the cost of production the comparison would stand thus:

Cost of production California per box	$1.88
Freight	.84
Laid down east of Missouri River	2.72
Cost of production Sicilian per box	1.65
Freight	.24
Duty at one-half cent per pound per box	.39
Laid down in New York	2.28
Margin in favor of foreign lemons	.44

On this basis in a contest for the lemon market east of the Missouri River it is easy to see what will become of the California lemon. It will not be in it. It can not be marketed in that region in close competition with the foreign article.

Mr. Powell in his testimony before the committee insists that the Osborn figures are much too large and that the real cost of Sicilian lemons is not to exceed 90 cents per box. If Mr. Powell is correct in this, it only makes the case of the California lemon still more desperate. It is only fair to say that Mr. Osborn on his side of the case stoutly declares that Powell's figures as to cost of producing California lemons are much too high, but he does not profess personally to have made any examination of such cost, and bases his statement on old estimates of cost made by others without adequate data, in some cases on results in a single orchard. Such a basis of cost would be manifestly unfair.

Misleading statements have been made based on the results obtained by the Limonera Co., of Santa Paula, Cal., and the

large profits made by them on lemons. This orchard I have myself examined. I have no hesitation in saying that it is one of the finest, if not the finest, orchard in the world; certainly I have never seen one so fine. It produces a very large proportion of fancy lemons. It is not a type of the ordinary 10, 20, or 30 acre lemon orchard of California. The facts are that even with a protective tariff of 1½ cents per pound the profits in lemon culture have not been sufficiently large to cause an abnormally large increase in the acreage planted to lemons. Since the passage of the last tariff act the increase in lemon trees is only 43 per cent. This industry has been built up with the protective tariff, the principal factor that made it possible. The present tariff is not large enough to make up the difference in freight and in cost of production here and abroad. Take this protection away, or two-thirds of it away, and the result must be that the industry will languish, if it is not entirely destroyed.

There is a reason for protecting the lemon and other industries of California, I wish to remind the House, that does not exist in most cases; namely, the long and expensive freight haul to reach the principal markets of the country. I believe, and I think the country believe, that in order to somewhat offset this handicap and enable the people of California to develop their industries reasonable protection is justified if it ever is justified. Our opponents are fond of pointing to the Panama Canal and saying, in answer to this, that when that is completed this handicap will be removed. Californians hope that in some commodities the handicap of large freight charges may be lessened, but of course it never will be removed. And as to lemons it will not materially affect the situation. Lemons are a perishable commodity, and the long sea voyage in a tropical climate will increase the loss by decay or increase the cost for transportation on account of the long period of refrigeration, or increase both the loss and the cost of refrigeration, so that in the case of this commodity the great advantage is not apparent. In fact, I do not expect to see lemons shipped by the canal in any large amount.

Mr. Chairman, there are other industries of our State that will be disastrously affected by the passage of this bill, among them olives, olive oil, beans, walnuts, and dried fruits. I will not now discuss them in detail, but will do so when consideration of each is reached under the five-minute rule. The fact that we are far off on the western rim of the continent, far removed from the great consuming markets of the country, seems not to have had any consideration at the hands of the Ways and Means Committee. Most of our great industries will be hard hit by this bill, and the markets of this country which we heretofore have enjoyed under protection will by this bill be largely taken away from us and turned over to the foreigner. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CURRY].

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, free trade, or a tariff for revenue only with incidental protection, which is the nearest possible approach to free trade in this country, is a fraud, a delusion, and a snare, and can only be supported by fallacious reasoning.

Political economy, while based on certain fundamental economic axioms and accepted rules of right and wrong governing business dealings between man and man and nation and nation in the production and distribution of wealth, is not an exact science as arithmetic and geometry are exact sciences. Every country must develop a political economy of its own, suitable to its physical conditions and to the occupations, character, and habits of life of its citizens. Experience from the beginning of the Government has proved that a protective tariff is necessary for the prosperity of our people.

Our Government owes its citizens protection from foreign invasion, whether that invasion comes in the shape of bombarding men-of-war and devastating armies, or whether it comes in the shape of passenger and freight ships loaded with cheap labor and cheap goods.

The tariff is not a law of the Medes and Persians. Its very nature makes the revision of at least portions of it frequently necessary to meet changed and changing conditions governing the production and distribution of wealth and the revenue needs of the Government; but in any revision of the tariff the principle of protection to home industry—to American labor and American capital—should always be kept in view. The first tariff act under the Constitution, in 1789, recognized this principle, and, among other reasons for its enactment, stated one to be for "the encouragement and protection of manufactures." From that day to this the material welfare of the people of the United States has always wonderfully developed and their manufacturing and agricultural industries have prospered under the policies of a protective tariff, while a tariff for revenue only, with incidental protection, has always proved disastrous to the prosperity of the country and has resulted in financial panics and terrible business distress.

The present tariff should be revised, but it should not be tampered with under excitement. Changes should not be made under the influence of partisan fervor, or enthusiasm, or byplay, but should be made only after calm and serious consideration as to the effect it will have on the revenue of the Government and the prosperity and happiness of the people.

I believe the time has come when reciprocity trade treaties should be made the handmaiden of our protective-tariff policy.

I recognize the fact that the tariff should protect an industry or product only as long as it needs protection and for the minimum amount necessary to insure it against unprofitable competition with foreign articles or products in the American market, and that an American product or manufactured article that is wholesaled for exportation cheaper than it is wholesaled for home consumption should be placed on the free list.

Some sections of the Underwood bill I should like to vote for, but you are depriving me of that privilege by forcing it through the House as a whole; and as a whole it will cheapen men more than it will cheapen commodities; it will throttle American enterprise and strangle American industry, and it will not produce the wherewithal with which to purchase the "full market basket" you so boastfully proclaim it will provide. The present method of revising the tariff can not but be as it always has been—unsatisfactory.

On account of the lack of definite information as to the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, and on account of the many diverse interests of the different sections of the United States, it is almost impossible for Congress, as a body, to frame an equitable and just tariff law covering all protected articles and articles on which are charged an import duty for revenue only. I hope the time will come in the not far distant future when a nonpartisan board or commission of tariff experts, after a thorough investigation of conditions and of the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, will report their findings to Congress, and a just tariff measure will be enacted, and that it will be adopted schedule by schedule and item by item; to be changed from time to time, a schedule at a time or an item at a time, as conditions and occasion and the welfare of the people may require. Enacting an entire new tariff law, including in it all the articles on which a duty is levied, is wrong. The Members of Congress can not master all the details of such a bill during one session of Congress, and with the exception of those particular items in the bill that will affect their personal calling or business, the people are not given sufficient time to inform themselves as to the effect the measure will have on their prosperity and happiness.

Protection to American industry has resulted in protection to American labor and a high rate of wages and reasonable hours of labor, as well as protection to American capital and the encouragement of American enterprise.

Our internal commerce amounts to more than the combined international commerce of all other nations, of which we also have our share, and it certainly, therefore, must be worthy of our first consideration and protection.

The railroad mileage of the United States is one-half of the railroad mileage of the world, and our country yearly produces one-half of the mineral wealth, one-third of the agricultural wealth, and one-third of the manufacturing wealth of the world, and this has grown from small beginnings under the fostering care of a protective tariff.

The success of any project or enterprise depends on proper organization, intelligent direction, unity of action, and favorable conditions.

Organized labor has done more to shorten the hours of labor, increase the wages, and better the conditions of the American working man and woman than has any other single influence, but without the protection to American industry extended by the tariff the efforts of organized labor could not have achieved the success it has in this country. The protective tariff made the conditions for organized labor favorable. When that protection is withdrawn the condition of the American artisan will retrograde, and will be no better than is that of his fellow in Great Britain.

Cromwell once said: "If there be anyone who makes many poor to make a few rich, that suits not commonwealth." That statement is as true to-day as it was when Cromwell uttered it.

Some people have referred to the protective tariff as the "mother of trusts and swollen fortunes," and have said that the existence of trusts and overgrown fortunes in our country is directly due to the protective tariff. The fact of the matter is that the patent laws of our country and the corporation laws

of some of the States are more responsible for the formation and existence of trusts and the accumulation of great individual fortunes than is the tariff. Placing an article in which they deal and which they manufacture on the free list will not destroy trusts. Neither can any tariff law alone stop the drift toward the centralization of wealth and of power and the accumulation of great fortunes by the few which are sapping the foundation of our general prosperity and threatening the stability of our Government. That will require other remedial legislation; and I may say here that the income tax will not remedy that evil. Great Britain is a free-trade country, and the income tax she levies is burdensome, and yet Great Britain is the home of trusts and of great individual fortunes. Her business organization is founded on trusts. It is true that in our own country many trusts have been immorally and illegally formed, and, in my opinion, the tariff on any trust-controlled article should be lowered, and in many instances repealed. The tariff bill before Congress, if enacted, will not destroy trusts. One of its provisions gives the beet-sugar industry notice to wind up its affairs and get out of business inside of three years, and will destroy the only competitor the Sugar Trust has in this country, and will not in the long run result in the reduction of the price of sugar to the consumer. In my own State of California there are 13 beet-sugar factories, which last year turned out 168,765 tons of sugar, made from 1,037,499 tons of sugar beets, grown on 112,003 acres of land.

The cost of the production of beet sugar in California in the year 1912 was as follows:

For beets	$6,701,582.82
For labor in factories and fields	3,939,165.01
For railroad freights	1,811,112.46
For fuel oil	503,789.90
For lime rock	211,169.09
For bags	391,504.93
For other supplies	542,598.11
Total	14,100,922.32

The amount invested in factories, land, and equipment is $19,904,823.21.

The Alameda Sugar Co. had made arrangements to put up a beet-sugar factory at Meridian, in Sutter County. They contemplated spending $2,000,000 on the plant and acreage. They have stopped construction, although $45,000 worth of steel intended to be used in the construction of the factory is on the ground.

The United States consumes of sugar per annum 3,500,000 tons. It produces of domestic cane from—

	Tons.
Porto Rico	300,000
Louisiana	300,000
Sandwich Islands	550,000
Domestic beet	650,000
Total	1,800,000

The balance, 1,700,000 tons, is obtained chiefly from Cuba.

The domestic cane-sugar supply has reached its limit of productivity. The prospect of making our country self-supplying, therefore, lies in the expansion of the sugar-beet industry.

The refining—so called—of Cuban sugar consists in the decolorizing of it at factories located at a few seaboard points. Nothing is produced, and only factory wages are distributed.

The beet-sugar industry employs the farmer to produce the beets from which it extracts the sugar. There is surely a difference of advantage to our Nation between merely washing raw cane sugar grown and purchased abroad and the manufacture of beet sugar, which is the product of beets grown on our soil, and for which the farmer receives at the very lowest price 2 cents a pound.

Any legislation which will destroy or prevent the expansion of the beet-sugar industry will be detrimental to the State of California and to the Nation.

It is not true that with the removal of the tariff on sugar the people will save $52,000,000 per year, that being the present total of sugar duties. The cost of sugar will follow the law of supply and demand, and to the extent that the present domestic supply is reduced to that extent must foreign sources be drawn upon, and with this increased demand the price of raw sugar will advance.

If the Government desires to cheapen the cost of sugar to the consumer—and it is as cheap to-day as it ever has been—its policy should be to encourage the multiplying of beet-sugar factories and let the competition between them take care of the selling price, as has been abundantly demonstrated during the past two years.

Without a due measure of protection the beet-sugar industry can not continue, and its stoppage means a check to the prosperity of the farmers and communities where beet-sugar factories have been located.

Mr. Chairman, I have a telegram here from Mr. L. B. Mallory, chief clerk of the Assembly of California, which I will read:

SACRAMENTO, CAL., *April 22, 1913.*

Hon. C. F. CURRY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

I have the honor to hand you herewith copy of assembly joint resolution No. 18, adopted by senate and assembly and approved by the governor, relative to the protection of the California beet-sugar industry in the enactment by Congress of laws affecting tariffs on imports into the United States.

Whereas in the process of tariff revision by Congress, the indicated tendency is toward an abolition of all duties on imported sugar; and
Whereas such a policy would be calamitous to the cane and beet sugar industry of the Nation at large, and especially to the beet-sugar business of the State of California, which produces 165,000 tons per annum, or one-quarter of the beet-sugar output of the United States; and
Whereas the annual consumption of sugar in our country is now 3,500,000 tons per annum supplied, viz, from domestic cane grown in Porto Rico, Louisiana, and Sandwich Islands 1,100,000 tons, from beet sugar manufactured in 16 States 650,000 tons, making 1,750,000 tons, the balance being purchased from foreign countries and refined by a few corporations on the Atlantic seaboard, who are clamoring for free sugar in order that they may check the further invasion of their markets by the constantly growing beet-sugar industry; and
Whereas our Nation's beet-sugar output has increased from 40,000 tons in 1897 to 650,000 tons in 1912, a rate of increase greater than can be shown in any country in Europe during an equal period of time, while our cane-producing districts have apparently reached the limit of their productivity; and
Whereas this country should, and can, become self-supplying in the matter of sugar through the development of the beet-sugar industry, now involving the use of only 450,000 acres of land against 274,000,000 acres adapted to the cultivation of the sugar beet; and
Whereas the development of the industry is checked by the menace of a free-sugar bill, which will subject this product to competition with cane and beet sugar produced under the low-wage conditions in the Tropics and Europe, and at prices delivered at our seaboards lower than, under our conditions, is paid to the farmers of our State for the sugar in the beet before it is manufactured: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California (a majority of all members elected to senate and assembly voting for the adoption of this resolution and concurring therein) requests the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress at Washington, and the President of the United States, that due regard be had, in the consideration of tariff revision, for the claims of the beet-sugar industry, which is so full of promise to our Nation, and that the principle governing the revision of the tariff in this regard be that the tariff should equalize the difference between the cost of production of sugar at home and abroad.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to each of the Members of Congress from the State of California, to be presented to the President and Congress.

L. B. MALLORY,
Chief Clerk of Assembly.

Under the protection of the tariff the horticultural and agricultural resources of California have been wonderfully developed during the past few years.

Manufactories of all kinds have sprung up over the State. To a great extent this development has been stopped because of the knowledge our people have of the blighting effect the tariff law it is expected this Congress will pass will have on the industries of California.

My State is one of the great bean-producing States of the Union, but the farmers of California can not stand competition with Mexican, Japanese, and Chinese beans with the tariff cut from 45 cents a bushel of 60 pounds to 25 cents a bushel.

Five years ago the Pacific coast had no competition from foreign beans, but beginning with the year 1909 a few beans from Japan made their first appearance in San Francisco. The varieties imported from Japan were at that time unknown and did not meet with a ready sale, but prices were made that were so attractive that they gradually worked into consumption. For three years—that is, from March, 1910, until March, 1913—the importation of beans from Chile, Mexico, China, and Japan amounted to 207,783 bags of 100 pounds each, or an average of 69,261 sacks a year. These figures explain the situation in a very few words and show how the importations of beans from the Orient, Mexico, and Chile have increased. All of these foreign beans are now known to the trade and are being quoted regularly, the same as are our staple California beans.

If the importation of beans has increased to such proportions paying a duty of 45 cents a bushel of 60 pounds, it can be readily seen that the importation of beans will increase much more and be a much greater menace to the bean-growing industry of not only California but of the Nation if the duty is cut to 25 cents a bushel, as proposed in this law.

Every pound of foreign beans imported into this country takes the place of just so much beans grown on our own soil.

In view of the fact that foreign importations have increased so rapidly under the present duty, why should Congress entertain a proposition of reducing the duty to the detriment of our home product? It certainly can not be for the reason that the price of beans to the consumer is high, for the consumer hardly ever pays more than 3½ cents per pound for beans. At this figure it is a cheap article of food, and it permits of the farmer raising beans at a fair margin of profit to himself. Below this

figure, however, it is not a profitable crop to the farmer and would eventually result in driving him out of the business.

In the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys there is produced under a normal crop about 2,000,000 sacks of beans, averaging 85 pounds to the sack, and this is less than half of the beans grown in the State. Great as this industry has grown to be in California, I believe that under proper tariff protection the acreage and production would be increased from year to year, but if the duty is reduced as contemplated in the Underwood bill it will result immediately in greatly reducing and curtailing the production and the acreage that will be planted and will eventually drive the bean farmers of California out of business. The price at which beans are now retailed to the consumer makes such a reduction of the tariff unnecessary and the contemplated reduction, if made, will be striking a fatal blow at what promises to be one of the most important farming industries in California. It is beyond my powers of reasoning to understand how the prosperity of this country or of any class of its citizens can be advanced and bettered by putting our people in direct competition with the coolie and cheap labor and cheap lands of Mexico, Chile, and of the Orient.

Over $200,000,000 are invested in the citrous-fruit industry in California; if this bill becomes a law no more acreage will be planted to citrous fruit in California.

The sweeping reduction of the tariff on deciduous fruits will stop further planting and make the present orchards unprofitable.

Within the past few years thousands of acres have been planted to filberts, almonds, and English walnuts. If this bill becomes a law not another acre will be planted, as it will not be profitable to grow them.

The consumption of pure olive oil in the United States is said to be 5,300,000 gallons per annum, of which 800,000 gallons are made from California olives and the balance is imported from Italy, France, Spain, and Greece.

The olive industry has been developed in California during the past few years, and even with the present tariff California olive oil can only be sold at a reasonable profit at a higher price than is commanded by the imported oil.

California now has 9,000 acres of olive orchards in bearing trees and 9,000 acres in growing trees not bearing.

In addition to the 800,000 gallons of olive oil produced in California last year, 4,000 tons of olives were used for pickling.

The reduction of the tariff on olive products proposed in this bill will stop further planting and will make the present orchards unprofitable; but should the present tariff be maintained California would in a few years be able to supply all the olive oil and pickled olives that would be used in the United States and might then stand a reduction without any material injury to the industry.

The Santa Clara and part of the Sonoma Valleys are covered with prune orchards. The small tariff placed on prunes by this bill will reduce the net proceeds of the prune orchardists so much that they will not receive a reasonable profit on the money invested and will discourage further planting.

The placing of wool on the free list will drive the sheepmen out of business, and it is safe to predict that within two years after this bill becomes a law there will not be 500,000 sheep left in the State of California where there is now about 2,500,000.

The California Cap Co., situated at Stege Station, in the city of Richmond, in my district, is very hard hit by the tariff reduction proposed in this bill. That company manufactures blasting caps, and the tariff on them has been cut from $2.25 per 1,000 to $0.70 per 1,000, which means that the company will probably have to go out of business if it stands. There are only three of these companies in the United States. Every blast of powder or dynamite is set off by one of these blasting caps, and it would be a very serious matter for the United States in time of war if it had to depend on foreign importations, as blasting caps are contraband of war.

Placing wood on the free list will not result in materially reducing the price of lumber, but that action must be entirely satisfactory to the Canadian lumbermen.

The Canadian people should congratulate themselves on their foresight in rejecting the reciprocity treaty. The Underwood bill gives them everything the treaty proposed to give them, and more, but does not exact from the Canadians anything in return.

Under this bill the growing of onions, asparagus, and potatoes will no longer be profitable in California.

I have only mentioned a few of the many industries in the State of California that will be made unprofitable by the enactment of the Underwood bill.

California is now one of the best protected and most prosperous States in the Union. Under this bill she will be the State whose agricultural and manufacturing industries are the least protected of any State in the Union. Her manufacturing and agricultural development will cease and her prosperity will be at an end.

The Underwood bill will reduce the revenue of the Government, injure business, put a stop to prosperity, and discourage enterprise, but it will not make it any easier for a man to earn a living for himself and family.

I suppose California ought to be thankful to the framers of this bill for putting teeth on the free list, but whatever gave them the idea that the American people will have any use for teeth, either natural or artificial, after the enactment of this law passes my comprehension, as they certainly will not need them for the purpose of mastication. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3321, the tariff bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 24, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 3961) providing for an amendment to section governing the compensation of registers and receivers of United States land offices; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3962) to amend chapter 90, Twenty-fourth Statutes at Large, page 373, approved February 3, 1887, and fixing term of office of electors of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3963) to amend the act of June 27, 1890, as amended by the act of May 9, 1900; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3964) for the relief of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3965) to establish a fish-cultural station in the southern section of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3966) to amend sections 2 and 3 of the act of June 27, 1890, in relation to pensions, etc.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3967) to amend an act to authorize the employment of volunteers to aid in enforcing the laws and protecting public property, approved March 3, 1863; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3968) to prohibit the interstate shipment or attempted shipment of convict-made goods or products of mines in which convict labor is employed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3969) to amend section 291 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 3970) to repeal section 5 of the act entitled "An act amending the charter of the Freedmen's Savings & Trust Co., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 3971) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside forfeiture and reinstate coal lease to the Sans Bois Coal Co., or to grant new lease thereof; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 3972) to simplify procedure in the law courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3973) to simplify procedure in the equity courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 3974) providing that storekeepers, gaugers, and storekeeper-gaugers shall receive per diem in lieu of subsistence not to exceed $1 per day; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 3975) to provide for the testing of electric meters in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3976) to amend an act entitled "An act for the widening of Benning Road, and for other purposes," ap-

proved May 16, 1908; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3977) to regulate the operation of automobiles in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3978) providing for the appointment of inspectors to take the state of the meters for the gas consumers of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3979) to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to procure postal cars and contracts for hauling them, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3980) for the erection of a public building at Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3981) providing for equipment of apparatus and operators for radio communication at all life-saving stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3982) to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3983) to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3984) to regulate the hours of labor on contracts with the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 3985) to fix the time when the sentence of a party convicted of crime shall begin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3986) to repeal an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy and all amendments thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 3987) to extend the franking privilege to literature published by boards of health of States and Territories in the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 3988) for the purchase of a building and lot as a mine-rescue station at McAlester, Okla.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 3989) to establish in the Department of Agriculture a bureau of farm power; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 3990) to extend the time for the completion of the Alaska Northern Railway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 3991) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 3992) to incorporate the Virginia Terminal Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3993) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain lands to be used as a sanitarium by the Fraternal Order of Eagles; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3994) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain lands to be used as a sanitarium by the Loyal Order of Moose; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3995) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain lands to be used as a sanitarium by the Order of Owls; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 3996) to amend an act granting to the Siletz Power & Manufacturing Co. a right of way for a water ditch or canal through the Siletz Indian Reservation in Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3997) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay and to distribute the balance now in the Treasury to the credit of the Alsea and other Indians on the Siletz Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 3998) to establish a school of aviation and meteorology at or near the city of Oswego, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3999) granting pensions to teamsters of the War of the Rebellion, from 1861 to 1865, inclusive; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 4229) to increase the compensation of rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4230) to provide for admission of volunteer soldiers and sailors who served in the United States Army or Navy in the War with Spain or the Philippine Insurrection, and who are afflicted with tuberculosis, to the United States Public Health Service sanitorium at Fort Stanton, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution (H. Res. 71) directing investigation of the health department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Resolution (H. Res. 72) expressing the opinion of the House of Representatives as to the propriety of a joint agreement between the various Governments of America for the mutual guaranty of their sovereignty and territorial integrity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution (H. Res. 73) to direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to report to Congress immediately what steps, if any, have been taken by them to enforce section 11 of an act approved March 4, 1913, entitled "An act to direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to bring a suit in equity in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia to dissolve the corporation known as the Washington Gas Light Co."; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RAINEY: Resolution (H. Res. 74) providing for an investigation of the Panama purchase; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 72) requesting the President of the United States to recommend plans for the continuance and enlargement of the powers of the Commission on Economy and Efficiency and to submit in budget form an estimate of appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. NORTON: Memorial of the Legislature of North Dakota, urging Congress to enact a law prohibiting the use of parcel post for the mailing of cigarettes or snuff, or any substitute therefor, within States prohibiting the sale thereof; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 4000) granting an increase of pension to Charles Bieger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

My Mr. CALDER: a bill (H. R. 4001) for the relief of Daniel J. Ryan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4002) for the relief of Paul Puttman; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, A bill (H. R. 4003) granting an increase of pension to John P. Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4004) granting an increase of pension to Lewis W. Markwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 4005) granting a pension to William Griffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4006) granting a pension to George C. Howland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 4007) granting a pension to Adam Roth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GORMAN: A bill (H. R. 4008) for the relief of Sandy Crawford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 4009) for the relief of R. D. Schackleford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4010) for the relief of Joseph W. Hawkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4011) for the relief of Greene County, Mo.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4012) for the relief of John Thomas; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4013) for the relief of Omar A. Du Esler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4014) for the relief of Louis Dunham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4015) for the relief of J. H. Alexander; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4016) for the relief of John Beverly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4017) for the relief of Josiah Baugher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4018) for the relief of Dennis Sullivan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4019) for the relief of A. P. Holcomb and the heirs of Samuel Thompson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4020) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church of Glasgow, Howard County, Mo.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4021) to correct the military record of Oliver T. Worman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4022) to correct the military record of Bennett Lopp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4023) to correct the military record of Rudolph Kraut; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4024) to correct the military record of Charles J. Lanning (to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4025) for the relief of Zalman H. Golden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4026) granting a pension to Jesse G. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4027) granting a pension to Amanda Sexton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4028) granting a pension to Narcissa E. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4029) granting a pension to Oliver P. Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4030) granting a pension to Martha E. A. Ackerman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4031) granting a pension to Stella Griffitts; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4032) granting a pension to Julia E. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4033) granting a pension to Otto H. Otten; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4034) granting a pension to Conrad F. Korthanke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4035) granting a pension to Vina Lindenbower; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4036) granting a pension to Mary Esser; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4037) granting a pension to W. L. Sharp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4038) granting a pension to Ira Gill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4039) granting a pension to Melissa R. Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4040) granting a pension to William David Allee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4041) granting a pension to Solomon Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H R. 4042) granting a pension to Thomas Payne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4043) granting a pension to W. K. Whittaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4044) granting a pension to B. F. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4045) granting a pension to John Gerdts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4046) granting a pension to Tazwell T. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4047) granting a pension to Solomon Coan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4048) granting a pension to John I. Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4049) granting a pension to Henry Otting; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4050) granting a pension to Martha Coslett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4051) granting a pension to August Brockman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4052) granting a pension to John M. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4053) granting a pension to Hannah P. Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4054) granting a pension to William England; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4055) granting a pension to Louisa K. Holbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4056) granting a pension to Jane D. Goss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4057) granting a pension to J. G. Dollison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4058) granting a pension to Glenn A. Means; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4059) granting a pension to Tim Clifford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4060) granting a pension to Keziah Phlegly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4061) granting a pension to George T. Beal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4062) granting a pension to Samuel Moser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4063) granting a pension to Robert S. Hoge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4064) granting a pension to A. A. McAllister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4065) granting a pension to James G. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4066) granting a pension to James M. Wilkerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4067) granting a pension to Sophrona Pursley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4068) granting a pension to Joseph Caton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4069) granting a pension to Thomas F. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4070) granting a pension to William F. Neet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4071) granting a pension to Dora Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4072) granting a pension to Ozias Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4073) granting a pension to Samuel M. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4074) granting a pension to Mrs. O. A. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4075) granting a pension to R. C. Goswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4076) granting a pension to Thomas B. Maberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4077) granting a pension to Paris G. Strickland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4078) granting a pension to Mrs. M. C. Bixby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4079) granting a pension to Helena Koester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4080) granting a pension to James J. Davison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4081) granting a pension to James T. Calvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4082) granting a pension to Leonidas H. Hightshoe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4083) granting a pension to James McCabe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4084) granting a pension to Joseph T. Kerby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4085) granting a pension to Lemuel Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4086) granting a pension to John B. Clements; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4087) granting a pension to Joseph L. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4088) granting a pension to James Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4089) granting a pension to James M. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4090) granting a pension to Thomas B. Maberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4091) granting a pension to Henry B. Meyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4092) granting a pension to J. B. Ashbrooke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4093) granting a pension to Carrie Hollenbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4094) granting a pension to Samuel Blackburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4095) granting a pension to James W. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4096) granting a pension to Andrew J. Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4097) granting a pension to Mary U. Isenberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4098) granting a pension to Matilda J. Sweaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4099) granting a pension to Austin Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4100) granting a pension to Benton C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4101) granting a pension to Mordecai Gladish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4102) granting a pension to John Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4103) granting a pension to Fay Milligan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4104) granting a pension to Louis Legune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4105) granting a pension to Rhoda A. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4106) granting a pension to Samuel Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4107) granting a pension to Nicholas Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4108) granting a pension to Lucy F. Melton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4109) granting a pension to John R. Cropp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4110) granting a pension to Mary A. Gurley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4111) granting a pension to Easter Henson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4112) granting a pension to George W. Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4113) granting a pension to J. J. Gilliland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4114) granting a pension to James Gladish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4115) granting a pension to Mary M. Varble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4116) granting a pension to Sarah F. Preston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4117) granting a pension to Jefferson Knaus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4118) granting a pension to Ella Mansell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4119) granting a pension to Mary Wehrmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4120) granting a pension to Mary Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4121) granting a pension to James G. Munday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4122) granting a pension to James W. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4123) granting a pension to R. H. Farrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4124) granting a pension to Harriet L. Gist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4125) granting a pension to Frank C. Barron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4126) granting an increase of pension to John Travis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4127) granting an increase of pension to Solon B. Hale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4128) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4129) granting an increase of pension to Michael Coplinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4130) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4131) granting an increase of pension to Oscar M. Peck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4132) granting an increase of pension to James A. Ellison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4133) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan C. Crane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4134) granting an increase of pension to James D. Ramey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4135) granting an increase of pension to George Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4136) granting an increase of pension to James T. Vincent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4137) granting an increase of pension to John T. Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4138) granting an increase of pension to R. R. Dill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4139) granting an increase of pension to David B. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4140) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Blackledge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4141) granting an increase of pension to Elbert Nugent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4142) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Waddle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4143) granting an increase of pension to W. R. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4144) granting an increase of pension to John Echoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4145) granting an increase of pension to John F. Mahnken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4146) granting an increase of pension to George T. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4147) granting an increase of pension to John S. Solomon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4148) granting an increase of pension to Jasper A. Gaddy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4149) granting an increase of pension to Mahlon N. Boardman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4150) granting an increase of pension to O. A. Stine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4151) granting an increase of pension to Marion Vest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4152) granting an increase of pension to J. D. Ginger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4153) granting an increase of pension to William P. Camp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4154) granting an increase of pension to Richard L. Drumwright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4155) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. E. E. Garner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4156) granting an increase of pension to Reuben S. Weldon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4157) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Davison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4158) granting an increase of pension to Louis F. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4159) granting an increase of pension to William E. Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4160) granting an increase of pension to James A. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4161) granting an increase of pension to John H. Bull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4162) granting an increase of pension to James C. Haden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4163) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Wilkerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4164) granting an increase of pension to Henry Bedwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4165) granting an increase of pension to William B. Gist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4166) granting an increase of pension to John W. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4167) granting an increase of pension to James Dodson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4168) granting an increase of pension to James Johnson, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4169) granting an increase of pension to Logan Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4170) granting an increase of pension to R. H. Askew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4171) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Sheridan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 4172) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca M. Gaunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4173) granting a pension to Helen Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4174) granting an increase of pension to Henry Ennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4175) granting an increase of pension to Michael Lensnick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4176) granting an increase of pension to Lewis S. L. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4177) granting an increase of pension to Henry Reimiller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 4178) granting a pension to Harry C. Ketchan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 4179) granting an increase of pension to Henderson Craft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 4180) for the relief of the family of Nicholas J. Marinos; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 4181) authorizing appointment of Hugh T. Reed upon retired list of the Army with rank of captain with 20 years' service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4182) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Taggart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4183) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4184) granting a pension to Elijah Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4185) for the relief of Bessie Meek, wife of Gordon H. Meek, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 4186) granting an increase of pension to David N. Fouts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4187) granting an increase of pension to George H. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4188) granting an increase of pension to Norman A. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4189) for the relief of Adam K. Danes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 4190) granting an increase of pension to Nellie N. Taft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4191) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Aggett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAUNDERS: A bill (H. R. 4192) for the relief of M. R. Flynn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 4193) granting a pension to Martha E. Brabson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4194) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Gilliss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4195) for the relief of the estate of R. G. Potter, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4196) for the relief of the Louisville Trust Co., administrator of the estate of Emily Oldham, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 4197) to correct the military record of W. H. Hall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4198) granting a pension to Laura Newman, née Mount; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4199) granting a pension to Missouri Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4200) granting a pension to Mary E. Shay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4201) to correct the military record of John W. Conklin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4202) granting a pension to Mary C. Bundy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4203) granting a pension to Cornelia Ewing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4204) to correct the military record of James M. Stroud; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4205) to correct the military record of John A. Rollo; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4206) to correct the military record of Daniel Robinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4207) to correct the military record of Charles D. Ward; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4208) to correct the military record of Charles Cummins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4209) to correct the military record of James Campbell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4210) granting an increase of pension to Perry Harris, alias James Sampson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4211) granting an increase of pension to S. K. Lowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4212) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Barthelman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4213) granting an increase of pension to Henry Jansen Oltman, alias Henry Jansen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4214) granting an increase of pension to Charles Saunders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4215) granting an increase of pension to James McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4216) granting an increase of pension to Robert O. Backus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4217) granting an increase of pension to Charles Fahnestock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4218) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Whisler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4219) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo F. Murden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4220) granting a pension to Lydia Erwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4221) granting a pension to James Allison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4222) granting a pension to Theodore Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4223) granting a pension to Elizabeth Simonson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 4224) granting a pension to Russella J. York; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS: A bill (H. R. 4225) granting a pension to Ross Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4226) granting a pension to Roxiana Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4227) granting an increase of pension to Winfield S. Sargent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 4228) granting an increase of pension to Milton H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of C. H. Beauchamp, of Los Angeles, Cal., against reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), memorial of the St. Louis Association of Credit Men, favoring the banking and currency reform law; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also (by request), memorial of sundry citizens of Shelby, N. C., against a reduction of the duty on monazite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 3422) granting a pension to Mary Cornish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of California: Petitions of R. M. Lamoreaux and 360 other beet growers, farmers, and other citizens of the following towns: Alameda, Alvarado, Artesia, Compton, Chino, Daly City, Hueneme, Los Alamitos, Los Angeles, Lompoc, Marysville, Meridian, Norwalk, Owansmouth, Oxnard, Pleasanton, Salinas, Santa Ana, Santa Maria, San Francisco, Soledad, Van Nuys, Watsonville, Buena Park, Bay City, El Monte, Gilroy, Hynes, Gardena, Huntington Beach, Lugo; the Farmers & Merchants' National Bank, Los Angeles; C. B. Wells, Oakland; Carl Raiss & Co., Braun-Knecht-Heimann Co., Langley & Michaels Co., Webster Manufacturing Co., John H. Spohn Co., Steiger Terra Cotta & Pottery Works, Bemis Bros.' Bag Co., Edward Wolf Co., and Swayne, Hoyt & Co., San Francisco; and Lets-Oliver Investment Co., Oakland, all in the State of California, protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Atlantis Greek Newspaper, New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation to remove the present duty on seedless currants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Committee of Wholesale Grocers, New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation placing raw and refined sugars on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Wisconsin State Millers' Association, Neenah, Wis., protesting against the placing of flour on the free list while retaining a duty on wheat and rye; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Day-Bergwall Co., Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the proposed increase of duty on vanilla beans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Milwaukee Bag Co., Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the proposed increase of duty on burlaps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Cutter-Hammer Manufacturing Co. and the National Distilling Co., Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Primos Chemical Co., Primos, Cal., favoring an increase of the tariff on tungsten metal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the East Buffalo Live Stock Association, East Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the removal of the present duty on meat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of E. E. Gaddis, Woodland, Cal., and 367 other citizens of California, protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of Leopold Cohn, W. J. Wallace, and G. J. Kehoe, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring amendment to the income-tax section of the tariff bill exempting mutual life insurance companies from tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employees of the Moehle Lithographic Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the proposed reduction of the duty on lithographed articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Sidney V. Lowell, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the clause in the tariff act prohibiting the importation of aigrettes, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Star Expansion Bolt Co., of New York, N. Y., protesting against the reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Baer Bros., of New York, N. Y., against the reduction of the duty on bronze powders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of the Pennsylvania Millers' State Association, urging that if a tariff be placed on grain an equalizing tariff be placed on the products of grain, etc.; that if products of grain be admitted free, grain be admitted free; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERRY: Petition of the Rhode Island Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, protesting against enfranchisement of women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry employees of the Warwick and Phenix Lace Mills, of Riverpoint, R. I., against the reduction of the tariff on laces and lace curtains; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Rhode Island State Federation of Women's Clubs, protesting against the placing of forest reservations in the control of individual States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the Rhode Island State Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring the passage of legislation prohibiting importation of wild-bird plumage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petitions of 35 citizens of the twenty-third New York district, against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 1,000 public-school teachers and students of the city of New York, favoring the passage of section 438 of the tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of the Pennsylvania Millers' Association, urging the establishment of a just parity in the tariff between the raw material and the manufactured products of grain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of the Commercial Club of Gering, Nebr., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METZ: Petition of sundry employees of the Moehle Lithographic Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the reduction of the tariff on lithographed articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORTON: Petition of Daniel Freeman, Alice B. Sargent, and others, favoring the passage of legislation prohibiting the importation of the plumage of wild birds for the use of milliners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of Cigarmakers' Union, No. 42, of Hartford, Conn., against free trade in tobacco and cigars with the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Woman's Club of Ansonia, Derby, and Shelton, Conn., favoring the clause in the tariff act prohibiting importation of birds for plumage, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of Hardford. Conn., against the location of the headquarters of the customs service at Bridgeport; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of W. Strother Jones, favoring an amendment to the income-tax section of the tariff bill exempting mutual life insurance companies from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Association of Window Glass Manufacturers, of Pittsburgh, Pa., against the reduction of the duty on window glass; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pencil Exchange, Jersey City, N. J. favoring tariff reduction in Schedule N, paragraph 473, leads not in wood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of sundry citizens of California, favoring an appropriation for the construction of a Millennial Dawn Temple in California in 1915; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Bronze Powder Works Co., of Elizabeth, N. J., and George Benda, of New York, against the reduction of the duty on bronze powder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of Paul Rieger & Co., of San Francisco, Cal., against the reduction of the duty on perfume materials; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Field & Cramer, of San Francisco, Cal., against making proceeds of life insurance policies paid upon death of person insured income and liable to tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of M. A. Newmark & Co., of Los Angeles, Cal., against the tariff on oats and letting in the manufactured article free; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, of San Francisco, against the proposed reduction of salaries of custom-house employees of the port of San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of sundry residents of the thirteenth congressional district of New York, protesting against the proposed income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *April 24, 1913.*

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday last was read and approved.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of papers, documents, and so forth, on the files of the Interior Department, which are not needed in the transaction of public business and have no permanent value or historical interest. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Joint Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments. The Chair appoints as the committee on the part of the Senate the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE]. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of the appointment of the committee on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

H. R. 1917. An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914;

H. R. 2441. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2973. An act making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution making an appropriation for defraying the expenses of the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives authorized to attend and represent the Senate and House at the unveiling and dedication of the memorial to Thomas Jefferson at St. Louis, Mo.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 2441. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2973. An act making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes.

H. R. 1917. An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

THE JEFFERSON MEMORIAL COMMITTEE.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 62) making an appropriation for defraying the expenses of the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives authorized to attend and represent the Senate and House at the unveiling and dedication of the memorial to Thomas Jefferson at St. Louis, Mo., was read the first time by its title.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I rise to make a request for unanimous consent to take up at this point this joint resolution, appropriating $2,500, $1,000 to be expended on behalf of the Senate and $1,500 on behalf of the House, to pay the expenses of the committees appointed by the Senate and House to attend and participate in the ceremonies incident to the dedica-

tion of the splendid memorial structure erected in St. Louis to the memory of Thomas Jefferson.

The ceremonies are to take place on the 30th of this month, and if the House joint resolution making the appropriation is to be acted upon and the sum to become available it should be acted upon by the Senate to-day.

I hope there will be no objection to the consideration of the joint resolution. I make that request, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution, which will be read at length.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sum:

For defraying the expenses of the members of the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives authorized to attend and represent the Senate and House at the unveiling and dedication of the memorial to Thomas Jefferson at St. Louis, Mo., on April 30, 1913, $2,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of which sum $1,000 shall be accredited to the Senate, to be expended under the direction and by the order of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and $1,500 accredited to the account of and expended under the direction and by the order of the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and by the Committee on Accounts of the House, respectively.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am not going to object to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution. I merely wish to state that I would not care to have it understood that this is to be pointed to as a precedent, and that bills and resolutions coming from the House will be acted upon without reference to the appropriate committees.

Mr. STONE. I think they ought not to be.

Mr. SMOOT. That is all I desire to say.

Mr. STONE. The exigency in this case is peculiar.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GALLINGER subsequently said: Some time ago I was appointed a member of the committee to attend the Jefferson memorial exercises at St. Louis on the 30th of this month. I find it will be utterly impossible for me to leave at that time, I therefore ask to be excused from service on the committee, and that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] be substituted as a member of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has heard the request. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I should like to say just a word on the same matter in regard to which the Senator from New Hampshire has addressed the Senate. I am in the same position as that stated by the Senator from New Hampshire for himself. I was appointed, and I find it impossible to go. I can not leave the business which I have here; and I desire to resign the appointment, and to have some one else appointed in my place. I am not prepared to say whom it will be, but I will bring the matter to the attention of the Chair a little later.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I was one of the Senators designated to go to St. Louis. I find that I can not very well serve upon the committee. I therefore ask to be excused, and that the President of the Senate appoint some other Senator in my place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] to serve as a member of the Jefferson memorial committee in place of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], who was relieved at his own request.

The Chair also appoints the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] to serve on the Jefferson memorial committee in place of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], who has been excused from service on that committee.

Mr. STONE, at his own request, was excused from further service on the Jefferson memorial committee, and Mr. HUGHES was appointed in his place.

Mr. ROOT, at his own request, was excused from further service on the Jefferson memorial committee, and Mr. ASHURST was appointed in his place.

Subsequently Mr. ASHURST, on his own request, was excused from service on the Jefferson memorial committee.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NEWLANDS presented a memorial of the Elko County Cattle Association, of Nevada, remonstrating against placing meat and wool on the free list, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WORKS. I present the memorial of James Leonard, of Monrovia, Cal., relative to the duty on citrus fruits. I ask that the memorial be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONROVIA, CAL.

As a general proposition, it will be conceded that the final and highest development of agriculture means the utilization of land for the crops which it is best adapted to produce. A beneficent autocratic power possessed of a comprehensive knowledge of world agricultural resources and a like inclusive grasp of industrial and transportation factors could so direct operations as to maintain an average of prices, equitable to consumers and agrarians, and could minimize reduplication of labor and eliminate wasteful periodic overproduction on the one hand and periodic scarcity on the other. Such a culmination of the growing recognition of social unity lies very far in the future, but a step in that direction was taken when David Lubin, a former Californian, founded the bureau of world crop reports under the auspices of the Italian Government.

With modifications incident to climate, territorial extent, and culture status, the same general proposition that land areas should be devoted to purposes for which they are especially qualified by inherent characteristics holds good with national divisions.

An import duty acting to create monopoly or entailing excessive cost of farm commodities to consumers would be a rank injustice and an inciting cause to social disturbance, the more so since its action would be insidious and the ultimate effect difficult to trace back to the motive cause.

An import duty functioned merely to establish a domestic agricultural industry is simply a temporary offset against the handicap of a similar foreign industry, fully matured, and as concerns any country of the Old World compared with the United States, operating under the different social conditions of denser populations. The basic justification of such an impost would be the probable resultant establishment of a domestic industry warranted by natural attributes and by home-market demands and which would hold rational promise of permanent adequate development.

If justified by fact as well as by theory, the more obvious effects of such an impost would be:

1. To preserve equilibrium of production by differentiating land areas according to capabilities and thus tend to equalize through long periods average returns for all farm produce.

2. To furnish consumers the particular product affected at a cost at least as low as that of the foreign article and to fully and equitably supply the domestic markets.

Judging the citrus tariff by the above conditions, we find, first, that it is not prohibitive. It hardly compensates for the difference in labor cost of production between domestic and imported fruit. Mediterranean growers still possess the immense advantage of a fully developed industry, cheaper freight rates of steamer shipments, and the practical subsidization of the industry resulting from the Italian Government's support of the manufacture of citrate of lime. The tariffs, therefore, do not debar Mediterranean growers from competing in United States markets on favorable terms, so far as concerns the ultimate cost of placing the orchard product before the consumer. This being a demonstrated fact, the question arises, How have the tariffs conduced to foster domestic citrus culture?

The answer, in general terms, is that they effect all that the American growers ask, namely, such a balancing of productive costs as will enable them through their superior talents for organization and better fruit to meet foreign competitors on fairly even terms in the home markets. Specifically the tariffs have minimized the importation of inferior fruit. Grades that would have been shipped on speculation to an open market, and which could have been put on the eastern seaboard at a figure less than the bare cost of production of domestic fruit, did not warrant risk in a protected market. In a word, the tariffs removed the American markets from the list of dumping grounds for the periodic surplusage of the Mediterranean crop. A market stability followed which encouraged American growers to extend their planting. Prices no longer fluctuated between absurd extremes, because the imposts acted in restraint of import gambling.

Taking up the specialization of land as the second justification for the citrus tariffs, we find that in California alone there are approximately 100,000 acres bearing groves owned by 12,000 orchardists. In years of normal weather conditions the yield will approach 40,000 carloads and is estimated to reach 75,000 carloads in the next decade. The annual freight revenues resulting to the benefit of thousands of stockholders and several hundred thousand railroad employees and dependants approximate $20,000,000. Land in citrus culture is permanently removed from competition with every other agricultural industry in this country. Without the tariffs most of this land would have been devoted to products competing with those of the Southern, Middle Western, and Eastern States. Because of the imposts which encourage citrus planting the farmer of the Middle West has received more for his grain than he otherwise would, the southern farmer more for his staples and the eastern farmer more for his. In addition, railroads and their multifarious interests have benefited by the best paying freight traffic of anything like equal volume in the world. Interstate commerce as a whole has benefited because the citrus freight revenues became of such magnitude as to promote the reduction of other freight rates. Here again the mid-western and southern producer has benefited.

Taking up the low cost to consumer as the third justification for the citrus tariffs, we find:

1. The average retail price has been as low, if not lower, than before the present tariff enactment. To properly estimate the significance of this fact it must be remembered that the retail prices of all commodities, taken as a whole, have increased in the United States during this period about 60 per cent and throughout the world about 30 per cent owing to the decreased purchasing power of gold.

2. With regard to the adequacy of the domestic citrus supply, there has resulted a year round equitable distribution to all sections never paralleled under the régime of the importers. As fruit is an essential part of a rational dietary and conducive to the general health, the importance of this perennial and even distribution merits consideration.

Recapitulating citrus tariff effects:

1. Specialization of land, removing great areas from competition with other sections.

2. Relatively cheaper fruit to consumers by about 30 per cent, and this in spite of the fact that the orchardists' labor and material expense has increased about 35 per cent.

3. A pronounced and far-reaching effect on freight rates, which has directly benefited stock, wheat, cotton, and general-produce shippers. Under the Interstate Commerce Commission railroad rates are made to bear a close relation to total traffic volume and total revenues. A reduction of citrus tariffs which would act to permanently check the ex-

pansion of an industry so productive of freight revenues as the citrus industry, must logically act to increase rates on other commodities to make up the difference.

While citrus tariffs have acted to benefit all agricultural interests and the public in general, they have not fostered monopoly. The area in the Southwest suitable for citrus culture is too vast to permit monopoly. In addition to the existent acreage of young and bearing groves, there are approximately 200,000 in California alone which are suitable for citrus culture. With conditions favoring market stability—and that implies an adequate tariff—domestic production for generations to come will be in excess of demand, with a constant tendency toward lower retail prices.

Returns: Considering the investment and constant risk, orchard returns will not average more than those of other lines of agriculture. The initial cost of putting citrus land under irrigation and preparing it for trees makes $500 per acre a reasonable valuation. In some sections cheaper land is available, but invariably there are offsets, such as distance from transportation lines, lack of handling and packing facilities, etc. A valuation of $1,000 per acre for a 6-year-old grove is a conservative total of the grower's actual investment and does not include his risk.

Growers' risk: The risk from orchard menaces are constant and arise from many causes, any one of which may effect widespread injury and loss. Sometimes a tree disease affecting bark or roots will sweep through a great territory entailing heavy loss. Again, some parisitic pest may threaten the whole industry with disaster. For instance, three years ago the discovery of a pest in one section of this State caused all the groves and all other feeding trees for the pest to be cut back to the bare trunk, entailing at least a three years' loss of crop. During the past two years the unprecedented cold has caused enormous loss. It is doubtful if citrus growers as a body have received enough during these two years to meet cultural expenses. This Duarte-Monrovia district, though small, is considered one of the very best, and has been regarded as practically immune from frosts. In the past two seasons the frost damage in this small foothill district will fall but little short of $1,000,000. Scores of growers have received no income at all from their orchards, and most other sections were much more severely injured than this. It is improbable that such extreme cold will occur again in many years. Still there is the chance that it will, and to cope with the possible emergency orchardists are installing heating apparatus at a cost of from $100 to $200 per acre.

Panama Canal: The advantage of the Panama Canal is frequently urged as compensation for a reduced tariff. That has yet to be demonstrated. It is now estimated that about 25 per cent of the California citrus crop will be shipped through the canal. Inland waterways do not complement the canal and are, in fact, in a shameful state of unpreparedness and inefficiency. About the only advantage from the canal discernable at present will be cheaper rates to the eastern seaboard for one-quarter of the California citrus yield and one-half of the crop is marketed west of Chicago.

Market security: Remove the sense of security arising from the tariff offset against cheaper production and cheaper shipment of Mediterranean fruit—which feeling of security induced citrus orchardists to expand the industry—and there will be no such increased production as will eventually restore to transcontinental carriers the freight volume diverted to the Panama Canal.

Effect of reduced citrus tariffs on freight rates: Owing to increasing expense of operation and maintenance, not a few railroad lines are hard pressed to meet fixed charges and provide for necessary betterments. The decreasing value of gold has a cumulative force with railroads. On the one hand shippers are fighting through the Interstate Commerce Commission for lower rates, and on the other labor unions demand and receive higher wages. Largely for a like reason supply companies demand and get higher prices for materials. If so large a revenue is permanently diverted from transcontinental carriers as the Panama Canal seems likely to accomplish eventually, and an inadequate citrus tariff tends to discourage such an extension of the citrus industry as looks toward a restoration of the freight volume through increased midland shipments, there must inevitably result a rise in short-haul freight rates over a vast inland section which can least afford it. The same argument is applicable to the tariffs on other Pacific coast fruits.

Disturbance of agricultural equilibrium: In earlier stages of national development it was impossible, even had there been a desire, to view agricultural resources as an entity. The result has been that whenever a new section was settled older sections have stagnated, often retrograded, until the compensation of a denser local population restored equilibrium by augmenting the home markets. The abandoned farms of New England attest this. The Middle Atlantic States are dotted with abandoned grain mills, which were driven out of business when the great western wheat lands were opened and eastern farmers could buy flour cheaper than they could produce it. Eastern stock farming became moribund when the droves of the western range found access to markets. In many sections hop farming languished and then died when the hop fields of the Pacific coast were developed. It has required decades—if it is even yet accomplished—to restore the agricultural balance. While the disturbance of conditions cited above were the unforeseen and probably unforeseeable results of bringing new areas into competition with sections originally developed from an insulated viewpoint and low horizons, practically the same effect would be produced by diverting the energies of an old settled territory into new channels. Since mortals are not prescient, these industrial readjustments are bound to occur; but it would seem that we were too intelligent a people to invite them needlessly and profitlessly. California is adapted by soil and climate to the production of fruit on an enormous scale, but the same soil and climate will produce an almost infinite variety of other crops. Horticulture requires a very heavy initial investment and the financial ability to wait years before reaping any returns. Furthermore, the California orchardist knows that in any event he must battle for his markets with the peasant fruit grower of the Mediterranean, the age of whose groves is reckoned by generations, and who has back of him his Government, the steamship companies, and the aggressive organization of importers, who, with few exceptions, are his countrymen. Take from the Californian the insurance of tariffs, which, while steadying the markets, are yet not prohibitive, and he will turn to products requiring smaller investments, involving less risk, and yielding quicker returns. Whatever else it may accomplish, it now appears almost certain that the Isthmian Canal will open the way for through steamship immigration to the Pacific coast States. The resultant greater working population will render possible the profitable cultivation of many crops now debarred by scarcity of labor. By the very nature of environing conditions the intending orchardist will, perforce, turn to southern staples, with the large probability of repeating some oft-repeated history. In this connection it is well to remember that the tariff reductions proposed affect the character of the future development of an enormous area in addition to the citrus lands.

Lemons: In the matter of lemon culture it is difficult to put into definite, coherent form the many causes which have militated against its proportionate development. A general and fairly adequate statement is that "orchardists have been learning their business for 20 years and only recently have mastered it." It has been necessary to compass through experience the whole industry from start to finish. Orchardists did not have the benefit of generations of familiarity with their undertaking. Naturally they underestimated its difficulties and were long in grasping its problems.

In tabulating my personal experience during 15 years I find:

1. A large proportion of the lemons first planted were of inferior varieties, many seedlings, etc. The fruit was rough, coarse, cured unevenly, and was of poor keeping quality. When this fact was apprehended, orchardists at once began to cut back their trees and bud them to approved varieties. Years were necessary to do this. Not all growers rebudded at the same time. It followed that grades were uneven. Splendid fruit might, in fact did, preponderate in later shipments, but during a long period there was a percentage of inferior fruit marketed.

2. In the beginning it was the usual practice for an orchardist to plant, say, four-fifths of his acreage to oranges and the balance to lemons. It proved a very unfortunate start. Oranges ripened and were shipped in bulk and returns received almost en bloc. Lemons ripened when the orchardist was busy irrigating or cultivating his major crop, and lemon picking was often irregular and hasty. Lemons required more care than oranges and returns dribbled in through a long season. The combination grower frequently came to look upon his lemons as the unremunerative source of trouble. He did not know how to prune and did not appreciate its value. He was a long time learning. He began in the belief that there was little difference between lemon and orange cultivation and was slow to see that his methods were at fault. Under the pressure of orange work, the smaller lemon orchard was slighted. Picking was done at odd times and too little attention paid to "sizing." The American grower was very careless in his handling methods and only after many costly lessons learned that a bruised lemon is a spoiled lemon. Also, that approved varieties picked at standard sizes will cure evenly to standard shipping sizes. When markets were poor he was prone to let his crop hang on the trees; when the markets improved he picked the trees bare and packed a most ridiculous assortment of sizes. Also, tree-cured lemons are inferior in acid content and in keeping quality.

3. In the methods of curing his product the American grower was as innocent of knowledge as in his cultural and field-handling methods. Old-style curing houses, built at great expense, were made dark and with little or no ventilation. He has learned differently, but he has paid the price.

4. In addition to faulty cultural, handling, and curing methods there was a further difficulty in shipping. In nine out of every ten citrus districts lemon culture was subordinate to orange culture. There were relatively few lemon groves of any considerable area. Very frequently it resulted that when lemon shipments were made there were not enough for, say, two cars, but more than enough for one. One carload would be shipped, and the balance held until another carload could be made up. Often a considerable time elapsed before sufficient fruit was received at the packing house to permit this, in which case the lemons that were prime when the first shipment was made had retrograded when the second carload was sent out. Or, as was often the case, the short load of good lemons was eked out with insufficiently cured fruit. In earlier years orange shipping, except Valencias, was finished when the lemon season was at it height, but it sometimes happened that the short car of lemons was pieced out with oranges and sent to an orange market.

Unless one has been familiar with the above-described factors, acting all through the lemon sections, it is almost impossible to measure their total effect, which was to discourage planting. The major handicap was complete ignorance of proper cultural, handling, and curing methods. In smaller districts, where the old practice of planting a portion of the orchard to lemons still obtains, it has been found expedient to so differentiate cooperative packing-house handling that one scientifically equipped house handles the output of several adjacent districts. This has been found best even where the hauling distance is considerable. Thus the La Manda Park house handles all the lemons—excepting two large groves, which ship independently—between Pasadena and Azusa. At San Dimas another modernly equipped house serves a like territory. Thus there are no longer the tag ends of shipments to hold over for the next car.

Besides the handicap of apprenticeship lemon growers have had from the first to contend with the hostility of the well-organized importers. When the McKinley bill was under consideration the country was flooded with pamphlets asserting that California lemons were deficient in acid content as compared with Mediterranean fruit. Agricultural Department chemists proved the contrary to be true, but the false claim had its effect. Opposition in many forms originating from the same source has made itself felt through the years. To-day the California lemon grower has mastered his business, and, if properly encouraged to utilize his costly experience, will give his home markets better lemons than the importers, at lower prices and in abundant supply, throughout the year.

JAMES LEONARD.

Mr. WORKS. I present a telegram, in the nature of a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of California, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CAL., *April 23, 1913.*

JOHN D. WORKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to the provisions of a senate joint resolution adopted by both houses of the Legislature of the State of California I herewith transmit to you a copy thereof.

Senate joint resolution No. 24, relating to the preservation of the natural conditions of Lake Tahoe and of establishing by judicial decree the conflicting claims to the use of the flood waters thereof.

Whereas Lake Tahoe, on account of its great natural beauty, is regarded as a valuable asset of the State of California by the citizens thereof, and many of such citizens have acquired vested interests on the shores of such lake; and

Whereas the State claims title to the major portion of the flood waters of such lake, which waters it hopes and expects in the near future to utilize for the purpose of generating power and of irrigating lands within its border, and for the domestic uses of its citizens; and

Whereas it has become the declared intention of the Reclamation Service of the United States to convert the lake into a reservoir for an irrigation system in the State of Nevada, and to that end to artificially lower the natural rim of the lake and to widen the outlet channel of the same, thereby making it possible to draw from such lake more water than can be supplied by its average natural rise of 2½ feet per annum; and

Whereas the plans of the Reclamation Service, if carried into effect, will infringe upon the vested legal rights of the State of California and its citizens, to their irreparable damage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and assembly jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California does hereby protest against any interference on the part of the Federal Government or its agents with the natural conditions of Lake Tahoe; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested to cause legal proceedings to be instituted in some court of competent jurisdiction in order to determine the respective rights of all persons claiming title to the flood waters of Lake Tahoe, and particularly to determine the rights of the United States of America, the State of Nevada, the State of California, and the Truckee General Electric Co.; and be it further

Resolved, That the attorney general of the State of California be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested to institute and prosecute as speedily as possible any action in the Supreme Court of the United States on behalf of the State of California and against the State of Nevada and such other claimants to the use of the waters of Lake Tahoe as may be properly joined as parties, in order to determine the respective rights of such parties to the use of such waters; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the United States Reclamation Service, and to each member of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

Respectfully, yours,

W. N. PARRISH,
Secretary of Senate.

Mr. WORKS. I present a telegram, in the nature of a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of California, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CAL., *April 23, 1913.*

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to the provisions of a senate joint resolution adopted by both houses of the Legislature of the State of California, I herewith transmit to you a copy thereof.

Senate joint resolution 1, relative to the continuation by the United States of surveys for the construction of storage reservoirs for the impounding of flood waters in the Sierra Nevada Mountains in the State of California, and asking that an appropriation be made for forwarding the work as speedily as possible.

Whereas the United States Government has for several years past been securing data, through the Geological Survey and the Reclamation Service, concerning the watershed of the west slope of the Sierra Nevada Mountains and the construction of storage reservoirs for the conservation of flood waters in the winter and spring; and

Whereas the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, of which these watersheds form the eastern rim, constitute a large body of the most fertile land to be found in any country, rivaling the far-famed Valley of the Nile in productiveness and capable of supporting a population of several millions when properly reclaimed and settled; and

Whereas in times of heavy snowfall and rainfall the volume of water coming down into the valleys is a continual menace to the rich lands adjacent to the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, thousands of acres of which are flooded in years of heavy rainfall; and

Whereas in the report of the Reclamation Service for the year 1907 the statement is made that if storage reservoirs were constructed at the sites surveyed it would greatly simplify the drainage problems of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and the lower Sacramento Valley by reducing the flood flow in the rivers; and

Whereas the flood waters so impounded would be of the greatest value to the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys and the State of California by being used for irrigation instead of being allowed to flow to the ocean, often doing incalculable damage to the valleys, 800,000 acres of the lowlands of which having been flooded in 1904: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and the assembly jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California memorializes the Congress of the United States for the continuation of said work of surveying and constructing storage reservoirs in the watersheds of the western slope of said Sierra Nevada Mountains on the tributaries of the Feather, Yuba, and American Rivers and other tributaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, carrying out all measures necessary for such work and making an appropriation of sufficient size to forward it as the more speedily solved; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be requested to take the necessary measures for hastening the survey and construction of such reservoirs in order to impound such flood waters and enable the problem of improvement and restraint of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers to be more speedily solved; and be it further

Resolved, That our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives be requested to use all honorable means to secure the action desired in this matter for the purpose aforesaid; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the respective Houses in Congress, and to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, including those to assume office on March 4, 1913.

Respectfully, yours,

W. N. PARRISH,
Secretary of Senate.

Mr. WORKS. I present a telegram, in the nature of a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of California, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CAL., *April 23, 1913.*

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to the provisions of a senate joint resolution adopted by both houses of the Legislature of the State of California, I herewith transmit to you a copy thereof.

Senate joint resolution 12, relative to action by Congress in directing an investigation through the Department of Agriculture of measures for protection of fruit from frost damage.

Whereas the great citrus belt of California has been visited by an unprecedented damaging frost involving a loss of many millions of dollars in the crop alone, as well as great damage to trees; and

Whereas great advancement has been made by both public and private experimentation in the protection of orchards all over the United States from the damaging effect of cold waves by means of heating pots and other methods of raising temperatures, the use of which has given perfect protection in some groves and has been of little benefit in others. The effect of frost damage on many fruits, particularly the citrus, is but little known and it is believed that large sums may be saved in this and other horticultural branches by a more thorough knowledge of the prevention of frost damage and the best means of determining to what extent citrus or other fruits have been rendered unfit for marketing. Large losses have been sustained which might have been prevented were more proper methods known; and

Whereas the interests of the whole country demand a thorough investigation of this question by the Department of Agriculture through the most competent experts obtainable. Such work adequately supported and ably conducted will save many millions of dollars losses to the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this being a Nation-wide problem we appeal to Congress to authorize and empower the Department of Agriculture to at once take up this question and employ the ablest and most competent men to be had for carrying on this work until a thorough knowledge shall be had of this question in its bearing on all branches of horticulture; and be it

Resolved, That upon the passage of this resolution the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, directed to forward a copy thereof to the Senators and Representatives of the State of California in Congress, and that a copy of the resolution be also transmitted to the governor of each fruit-growing State in the Union, requesting them to urge legislatures now in session to consider and take action in accordance with this resolution.

Respectfully, yours,

W. N. PARRISH,
Secretary of Senate.

Mr. WORKS. I present a telegram, in the nature of a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of California, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CAL., *April 23, 1913.*

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to the provisions of a senate joint resolution adopted by both houses of the Legislature of the State of California, I herewith transmit to you a copy thereof:

Senate joint resolution 25, relative to memorializing Congress regarding the citrus fruit industry of the State of California, and requesting our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use all honorable means to prevent a reduction in duties on citrus fruits below the point where the difference in the cost of production of the same would be equalized.

Whereas the citrus fruit industry is one of the great and important enterprises of this State, representing an investment of $200,000,000 and materially contributes to the upbuilding thereof; and

Whereas the rates of duty on citrus fruits should equalize the difference in cost of production between the United States and foreign countries; and

Whereas the present rates of duty bring to the Government a substantial revenue that has increased in recent years; and

Whereas a material reduction of the duties on citrus fruits would hamper and retard the growth and development of the State of California: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California jointly, That we respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States not to reduce the duties on citrus fruits below a point equalizing the difference in the cost of production of the same in the United States and foreign countries, and we earnestly request our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use every honorable means to prevent such reduction; be it further

Resolved, That the governor of the State of California be requested to appoint five citizens of California to present this memorial to Congress in behalf of this State; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be telegraphed to the President and to each of our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Respectfully, yours,

W. N. PARRISH,
Secretary of Senate.

Mr. WORKS. I present a telegram, in the nature of a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of California, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CAL., *April 23, 1913.*

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to the provisions of a senate joint resolution adopted by both houses of the Legislature of the State of California, I herewith transmit to you a copy thereof.

Senate joint resolution 26, relative to making investigations and experiments as to nature and cure of tuberculosis.

Whereas it appears that the loss of life and the suffering occasioned by the ravages of tuberculosis in its various forms in the United States are of such magnitude as to make the discovery of adequate means of eradicating that disease a matter of national concern; and

Whereas the greatest facilities, opportunities, and inducements should be afforded capable investigators with a view to discovering some practicable means for its control and cure: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of California and the Assembly jointly, That we respectfully urge on the Congress of the United States the immediate enactment of such laws and an appropriation from the Treasury of the United States of such sums as may seem advisable to Congress to afford to properly trained experts adequate means and opportunities to make the most exhaustive investigations and experiments as to the nature and cure of tuberculosis and as to alleged cures therefor, and that we further urge upon the Congress of the United States an appropriation of an adequate sum to be given as a reward to the discoverer or discoverers of effective means of curing tuberculosis on satisfactory proof of the effectiveness of such discovery and on a full and complete revelation of the effective means thus employed, so that the fullest publicity may be given thereto for the general benefit of the medical profession; be it further

Resolved, That each Senator and each Representative in Congress from the State of California be, and he is hereby, requested to use all honorable means to secure the enactment of such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forthwith transmitted by the chief clerk of the senate to the President of the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and a copy hereof to each Member of Congress from the State of California.

Respectfully, yours,

W. N. PARRISH,
Secretary of Senate.

Mr. WORKS presented a petition of sundry inmates of the Soldiers' Home at Santa Monica, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation transferring the Pacific Branch of the Soldiers' Home to the War Department, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., remonstrating against the submission to arbitration of the question of exempting American coastwise shipping passing through the Panama Canal from the payment of tolls, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I have received memorials from Henry S. Burrage, late chaplain Western Branch, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, of Cambridge, Mass.; from Joseph S. Smith, manager, National Soldiers' Home of Bangor, Me.; from Maj. William Warner, manager, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, of Washington, D. C.; from the Board of Managers of the National Soldiers' Home; and from Col. Edwin P. Hammond, manager, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, of La Fayette, Ind., remonstrating against reducing the number of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to five. I move that the memorials be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of Arizona, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Library.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on the Library and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 1.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the First Legislature of Arizona, in special session convened, respectfully represent:

That the title and possession of Monticello, the home place of Thomas Jefferson, is vested in Mr. LEVY, a private citizen of the State of New York, and the place is now practically in a state of ruin and decay;

That the title to the grave of Jefferson, wherein lie the remains of the author of the Declaration of American Independence and those of his beloved wife, and which grave is embraced within a space about 100 feet square of the grounds of Monticello, is vested in the descendants of Jefferson;

That access to the grave of Jefferson is open to his descendants but not to the general public, except upon the payment of a fee to Mr. LEVY, thus commercializing one of the most sacred spots in America; but no admission to the house of this great apostle of humanity is allowed to any person;

Now, therefore, it is peculiarly appropriate that this place should not be in private ownership, and it is peculiarly appropriate that Monticello, the home in life as it is the home in death of this great American, should be the common heritage of the people of this country.

It is especially fitting now for the people of the United States to obtain this hallowed place that they may keep and beautify and adorn it as a shrine to which every lover of liberty may go at will to pay his tribute of respect: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, urged to enact such legislation as may be necessary to vest in the United States the title and possession to the home and grave of Thomas Jefferson; and

Resolved further, That a copy of this memorial and these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Representatives of Arizona in Congress; and that our Representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to do all in their power to accomplish the enactment of such legislation.

MARCH 22, 1913.

Read the third time in full and passed by the following vote: 29 ayes, 3 nays, 1 absent, 2 excused.

H. H. LINNEY,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate April 7, 1913, by a vote of 17 ayes, 2 excused.

M. G. CUNNIFF,
President of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLIS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Hanover, Exeter, Concord, and Manchester, all in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the submission to arbitration of the question exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls through the Panama Canal, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey presented a petition of the Pennsylvania Millers' State Association, praying that if a duty be placed on grain an equalizing duty be placed on the products of grain, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PERKINS. I present a telegram, in the nature of a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of California, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CAL., *April 22, 1913.*

Hon. GEORGE C. PERKINS,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

I have the honor to hand you herewith copy of assembly joint resolution No. 18, adopted by senate and assembly and approved by the governor:

APRIL 18, 1913.

To the Governor:

Assembly joint resolution 18, relative to the protection of the California beet-sugar industry in the enactment by Congress of laws affecting tariffs on imports into the United States.

Whereas in the process of tariff revision by Congress the indicated tendency is toward an abolition of all duties on imported sugar; and

Whereas such a policy would be calamitous to the cane and beet-sugar industry of the Nation at large, and especially to the beet-sugar business of the State of California, which produces 165,000 tons per annum, or one-quarter of the beet-sugar output of the United States; and

Whereas the annual consumption of sugar in our country is now 3,500,000 tons per annum, supplied, viz, from domestic cane grown in Porto Rico, Louisiana, and Sandwich Islands, 1,100,000 tons; from beet sugar manufactured in 16 States, 650,000 tons; 1,750,000 tons, the balance, being purchased from foreign countries and refined by a few corporations on the Atlantic seaboard, who are clamoring for "free sugar" in order that they may check the further invasion of their markets by the constantly growing beet-sugar industry; and

Whereas our Nation's beet-sugar output has increased from 40,000 tons in 1897 to 650,000 tons in 1912—a rate of increase greater than can be shown in any country in Europe during an equal period of time—while our cane-producing districts have apparently reached the limit of their productivity; and

Whereas this country should, and can, become self-supplying in the matter of sugar through the development of the beet-sugar industry, now involving the use of only 450,000 acres of land against 274,000,000 acres adapted to the cultivation of the sugar beet; and

Whereas the development of the industry is checked by the menace of a free-sugar bill, which will subject this product to competition with cane and beet sugar produced under the low-wage conditions in the Tropics and Europe, and at prices delivered at our seaboards lower than, under our conditions, is paid to the farmers of our State for the sugar in the beet before it is manufactured: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California (a majority of all members elected to senate and assembly voting for the adoption of this resolution and concurring therein) requests the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress at Washington and the President of the United States that due regard be had, in the consideration of tariff revision, for the claims of the beet-sugar industry, which is so full of promise to our Nation, and that the principle governing the revision of the tariff in this regard be that the tariff should equalize the difference between the cost of production of sugar at home and abroad.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to each of the Members of Congress from the State of California, to be presented to the President and Congress.

L. B. MALLORY,
Chief Clerk of Assembly.

Mr. PERKINS presented a telegram, in the nature of a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of California, remonstrating against an undue reduction of the duty on citrus fruits, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a telegram, in the nature of a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of California, praying that an appropriation be made for the study of tuberculosis and the

alleged cures thereof, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented a telegram, in the nature of a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of California, praying that an investigation be made to prevent damage to crops by frost, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a telegram, in the nature of a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of California, remonstrating against any interference by the Government with the natural conditions of Lake Tahoe, Cal., which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also presented a telegram, in the nature of a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of California, praying for the construction of storage reservoirs to impound the flood waters of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, in that State, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Concord, N. H., and a petition of sundry citizens of Nashua, N. H., praying for the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. BURTON presented a resolution of members of the Woman's Franchise League of Bellefontaine, Ohio, favoring the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented a petition of members of the Park View Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation limiting the issuing of permits for the erection within the fire limits of dwellings of less than 16 feet frontage, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of W. H. Whiting and 117 other citizens of Barre, Charlton, Leicester, New Salem, Petersham, Princeton, and Spencer; of Norman S. Waite and 20 other citizens of Allston; of Charles H. Stearns and 38 other citizens of Brookline; of Frederick W. Mowatt and 20 other citizens of Lynn; of William C. Buck and 60 other citizens of Reading; of 51 citizens of East Douglas, Grafton, and North Uxbridge; and of the congregation of the Universalist Church of Beverly, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. McLEAN presented the memorial of James T. Fitton, of Rockville, Conn., remonstrating against the adoption of the proposed income-tax amendment to the pending tariff bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KENYON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Blackhawk and Ringgold Counties, in the State of Iowa, praying for an adjustment of the pay of railway mail clerks on account of the conditions brought about by the parcel-post law, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. PAGE presented a petition of Local Union No. 43, Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers, of Bellows Falls, Vt., remonstrating against the passage of the pending tariff bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER. I present a telegram relating to a feature of the proposed tariff law, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 23, 1913.*

Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Representatives of workmen affiliated with lithographic labor organizations, consisting of pressmen, transferers, engravers, artists, press feeders, stone grainers, and paper cutters, request a hearing before your committee on the proposed Underwood tariff bill. Trade much disturbed. Our representatives are opposed to radical reduction in the tariff incorporated in the Underwood bill. We represent 50,000 workmen.

W. E. COAKLEY,
Representative, 200 East Twenty-third Street, New York, N. Y.

JACOB M. COOPER.

Mr. KENYON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 754) for the relief of Jacob M. Cooper, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 12) thereon.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT AND LIVE-STOCK INSURANCE.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred Senate resolution 52, submitted by himself on the 17th instant, reported it without amendment, submitted a report (No. 14) thereon, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the report to the British Board of Agriculture and Fisheries of an inquiry into agricultural credit and agricultural cooperation in Germany, with some notes on German live-stock insurance, by J. R. Cahill, which was presented to both Houses of Parliament of Great Britain, be printed as a Senate document, together with the accompanying illustrations and letter.

SOIL SURVEY OF ESCAMBIA COUNTY, FLA.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred Senate resolution 46, submitted by Mr. BRYAN on the 15th instant, reported it without amendment, submitted a report (No. 15) thereon, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be reprinted 1,000 additional copies of the Soil Survey of Escambia County, Fla., for the use of the Senate document room.

CONTROL OF MONEY AND CREDIT.

Mr. FLETCHER. From the Committee on Printing, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 16, providing for the printing of 10,000 copies of the report of the Money Trust investigation, I report back a concurrent resolution, and I submit a report (No. 16) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. There is quite a demand for this report.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 6,000 additional copies of House Report No. 1593, Sixty-second Congress, on the "Concentration of control of money and credit," of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room and 4,000 copies for the use of the House document room.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. OVERMAN. I report from the Committee on Rules an amendment to Rule XII and ask that it be read, printed, and go over one day (S. Res. 64).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules, submits a report, which he asks be read. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That Rule XII be amended as follows:

"3. Immediately after and before the result of each roll call is ascertained and announced the Clerk shall call the names of the absentees."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over one day under the rule.

REPORT OF PARK COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 16).

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, on the 15th instant I submitted a document, being an abridgment of the Park Commission report of the District of Columbia, which, on my motion, was referred to the Committee on Printing for consideration. I am directed by that committee to report a resolution which I send to the desk, and for which I ask present consideration. I also submit a report (No. 17) thereon. The document to be printed accompanies the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire reports from the Committee on Printing a resolution and asks unanimous consent for its present consideration. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 63), as follows:

Resolved, That an abridgment of the report of the Park Commission and of the report of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, submitted to the Senate on January 15, 1902, be printed as a Senate document, with accompanying illustrations, and that 3,350 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Reserving the right to object, I ask what is the document referred to in the resolution?

Mr. GALLINGER. It is the report of the Park Commission. Very likely the Senator from Mississippi is familiar with it. It deals with the development of the city of Washington, so far as our parks are concerned. It is quite a large volume. It has been printed several times. It has been thought desirable, inasmuch as there are many calls from all over the country for the document, that we should print an abridged edition. To print the number named in the resolution will only cost $500.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

CLAIMS AGAINST MEXICO.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred Senate resolution 62, submitted by himself on the 21st instant, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 13) thereon, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President is respectfully requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to cause to be transmitted to the Senate—

First. A full list of the names of claimants, if any, and the nature and amount of the claims for damages to person or property made by citizens of the United States of America against the Republic of Mexico and filed or deposited with the Department of State at Washington, D. C., since the beginning of the Madero revolution in Mexico to the present time, together with the statement of fact on which said claims are based.

Second. A full list of the names of all citizens of these United States, if any, who while leading lawful and peaceful lives in Mexico have been killed or wounded in Mexico or driven out of Mexico by Mexican soldiers or other armed bands on Mexican soil, together with the facts and circumstances attending such killing, wounding, or forceful deportation.

Third. A full list, if any, of such peaceful citizens of the United States of America as have been forcibly seized and held prisoners for ransom in the Republic of Mexico during the time first mentioned, and what sums of money, if any, have been paid by any person or persons to secure the release of anyone so imprisoned or held.

Fourth. What redress, if any, has been offered by Mexico in the premises, or demanded by the United States of America, and the result of such offer or demand, and what assurance of protection to the lives and property of our peaceful, law-abiding citizens in Mexico does that Republic offer.

COL. RICHARD H. WILSON.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], the chairman of the Committee on Claims, is not present, but I see the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], who is second on that committee, in his seat, and I think what I intend to propose will be agreeable to him. The bill (S. 662) for the relief of Col. Richard H. Wilson, Fourteenth Infantry, United States Army, when introduced, was referred, inadvertently, I believe, to the Committee on Claims. It does not appropriately belong to that committee, and I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Claims be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. OVERMAN. The bill properly belongs to the Committee on Military Affairs and not to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. The bill was referred during the last session of Congress to the Committee on Military Affairs, and I think it is proper that it should go there now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Committee on Claims will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, on the 17th of March Senate resolution No. 13, relative to the employees of the Committee on Banking and Currency, was considered, amended, and agreed to. The chairman of that committee was not then present, and I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the resolution was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the resolution?

Mr. OWEN. It relates to the employees of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and was reported from the committee of which, I believe, the Senator from Mississippi is chairman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask, then, that the matter go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. OWEN. It has heretofore been reported by that committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But there was an amendment to the resolution made on the floor.

Mr. OWEN. I desire it to be reconsidered. I agree, however, that it should go to the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the vote by which the resolution was agreed to will be reconsidered, and it will be recommitted to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

AMENDMENT TO HOMESTEAD LAW.

Mr. BORAH. On April 9 I introduced a bill (S. 598) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend sections 2291 and 2297 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to homesteads," which I asked to lie on the table. I move that the bill be taken from the table and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 1348) to allow additional entries under the enlarged homestead act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 1349) admitting to citizenship and fully naturalizing George Edward Lerrigo, of the city of Topeka, in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 1350) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to designate certain tracts of land in the State of Nevada upon which continuous residence shall not be required under the homestead laws; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1351) for the relief of Mollie Richardson, heir of Stanford Mims, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES:

(By request.) A bill (S. 1352) to extend the time for the completion of the Alaska-Northern Railway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories.

A bill (S. 1353) to authorize the board of county commissioners of Okanogan County, Wash., to construct and maintain a bridge across the Okanogan River at or near the town of Malott; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1354) relating to the election of United States Senators; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1355) relating to easements in connection with reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. BURTON:

A bill (S. 1356) to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters,' approved June 21, 1906," approved June 23, 1910, and to repeal said original section; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 1357) granting a pension to Halle W. Dale; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 1358) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson Hurst; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey:

A bill (S. 1359) to amend section 1244, Revised Statutes; and

A bill (S. 1360) granting an honorable discharge to John D. Durie; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1361) for the relief of the heirs of Marianne Sainte Ana Schrepper; to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 1362) granting an increase of pension to Laura B. Hess; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 1363) making lands within the State of Oregon that have been withdrawn or classified as oil lands subject to entry under the homestead or desert-land laws; and

A bill (S. 1364) to amend section 2322 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to mineral locations; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1365) to appoint Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Anderson, United States Army, retired, to the grade of major general on the retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1366) to adjust the claims of certain settlers in Sherman County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 1367) for the relief of the estate of Richard W. Meade, deceased;

A bill (S. 1368) for the relief of Capt. Frank B. Watson, United States Army;

A bill (S. 1369) for the relief of the Snare & Triest Co.;

A bill (S. 1370) authorizing and directing the Secretary of State to examine and settle the claim of the Wales Island Packing Co.;

A bill (S. 1371) for the relief of the heirs of Lieut. R. B. Calvert, deceased;

A bill (S. 1372) for the relief of Capt. Frederick B. Shaw; and

A bill (S. 1373) for the relief of the estate of John Stewart, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

(By request.) A bill (S. 1374) granting an increase of pension to Stella May Dixon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 1375) to amend the act of July 2, 1890, entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies"; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 1376) for the relief of Jacob Mull (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1377) for the relief of Alfred S. Lewis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1378) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Morris (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1379) granting a pension to James Heavrin (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1380) granting a pension to George W. Moore (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1381) granting an increase of pension to Franklin R. Simmons (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1382) granting a pension to Lulu E. Springer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 1383) granting to the State of Utah 1,000,000 acres of public land within the State, to reimburse the State for expenses incurred in suppressing Indian disturbances from 1865 to 1868; and

A bill (S. 1384) granting to the State of Utah 1,000,000 acres of land to aid in the construction and maintenance of public roads in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1385) granting a pension to E. H. Maxfield, alias Hiram Maxfield;

A bill (S. 1386) granting a pension to Barbara B. Haws; and

A bill (S. 1387) granting a pension to Charles H. Hipp (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 1388) granting a pension to Ernest Hattier (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1389) granting an increase of pension to William T. Warrington; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 1390) granting a pension to Phoebe J. Burrows; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 1391) granting a pension to Frances M. Trippe (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1392) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Comstock (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1393) granting an increase of pension to Antoinette Platt (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 1394) granting a pension to William Irwin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Virginia:

A bill (S. 1395) for the erection of a memorial on the grounds of William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va., in honor of Hon. Peyton Randolph, first President of the Continental Congress;

A bill (S. 1396) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Matthew Fontaine Maury, of Virginia;

A bill (S. 1397) for the erection of a statue to John Marshall;

A bill (S. 1398) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. William Campbell;

A bill (S. 1399) to aid in the erection of a monument to Pocahontas at Jamestown, Va.; and

A bill (S. 1400) providing for the construction of an iron picket fence around the monument at Jamestown, Va.; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 1401) providing for the improvement of the roadway from the railroad depot at Fredericksburg, Va., to the national cemetery near Fredericksburg;

A bill (S. 1402) to correct the military record of Charles Anderson;

A bill (S. 1403) to place Dr. Henry Smith on the retired list of the Army;

A bill (S. 1404) to establish the Fredericksburg and Adjacent National Battle Fields Memorial Park, in the State of Virginia; and

A bill (S. 1405) for the correction of the military record of Capt. Dorsey Cullen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1406) to reimburse the estate of Gen. George Washington for certain lands of his in the State of Ohio lost by conflicting grants made under the authority of the United States; to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

A bill (S. 1407) for the relief of John F. Wingfield; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1408) granting permission to the Lynnhaven Terminal Corporation to improve the lower Chesapeake and Lynnhaven Bay by the construction of a breakwater; and

A bill (S. 1409) to promote the efficiency of the Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1410) for the promotion of Carpenter Joseph A. O'Connor, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of chief carpenter on the retired list;

A bill (S. 1411) providing for the promotion of Chief Boatswain Patrick Deery, United States Navy;

A bill (S. 1412) for the relief of James C. Hilton; and

A bill (S. 1413) to authorize and direct the President of the United States to place upon the retired list of the United States Navy late Midshipman John Benton Ewald with the rank of ensign; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1414) for the relief of Granville J. Kelly;

A bill (S. 1415) for the relief of Joseph T. Chance and the heirs of John R. Burton, deceased;

A bill (S. 1416) for the relief of Thomas Johnson or his legal representatives;

A bill (S. 1417) for the relief of the heirs of Lemmus J. Spence, deceased;

A bill (S. 1418) for the relief of Joseph C. Boggs;

A bill (S. 1419) for the relief of the heirs of William Samuel Custis;

A bill (S. 1420) for the relief of John Henry Edwards;

A bill (S. 1421) for the relief of R. H. Hayden and Emma Hayden, executrix of the estate of Logan F. Hayden, deceased;

A bill (S. 1422) to provide for the payment of certain moneys advanced by the States of Virginia and Maryland to the United States Government to be applied toward erecting public buildings for the Federal Government in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1423) for the relief of the heirs and estate of Joseph Blosser, deceased;

A bill (S. 1424) for the relief of the estate of William A. Coffman, deceased;

A bill (S. 1425) for the relief of the estate of H. F. Cocke, deceased;

A bill (S. 1426) for the relief of the heirs of Robert L. Martin;

A bill (S. 1427) for the relief of Bolivar Sheild;

A bill (S. 1428) for the relief of the estate of Simeon H. Wootton, deceased;

A bill (S. 1429) for the relief of the estate of Mary N. Cox, deceased;

A bill (S. 1430) for the relief of Bland Massie;

A bill (S. 1431) for the relief of Wesley Rankins;

A bill (S. 1432) for the relief of the heirs of William Walton, deceased;

A bill (S. 1433) for the relief of John W. Ritenour;

A bill (S. 1434) for the relief of Harrison Capp;

A bill (S. 1435) for the relief of James H. Hottel;

A bill (S. 1436) for the relief of Robert E. Jackson;

A bill (S. 1437) for the relief of the heirs of John E. Lewis, deceased;

A bill (S. 1438) for the relief of the estate of Branon Thatcher, deceased;

A bill (S. 1439) for the relief of Joseph E. Funkhouser;

A bill (S. 1440) for the relief of the estate of Jacob Cook, deceased;

A bill (S. 1441) for the relief of C. N. Rash;

A bill (S. 1442) for the relief of the heirs or estate of Samuel Sheetz, deceased;

A bill (S. 1443) for the relief of the legal representative of William C. Read;

A bill (S. 1444) for the relief of Abraham Kellar;

A bill (S. 1445) for the relief of heirs and estate of James Jones, deceased;

A bill (S. 1446) for the relief of Elise Trigg Shields;

A bill (S. 1447) for the relief of the heirs of John A. Jones, deceased;

A bill (S. 1448) for the relief of the estate of John Jett, deceased;

A bill (S. 1449) for the relief of the estate of Brandt Kincheloe, deceased;

A bill (S. 1450) for the relief of the heirs of J. D. Makely, deceased;

A bill (S. 1451) for the relief of the estate of George P. Loehr, deceased;

A bill (S. 1452) for the relief of Hulda V. Coffer;

A bill (S. 1453) for the relief of Mary E. Collier;

A bill (S. 1454) for the relief of the legal representatives of Alexander K. Phillips, deceased;

A bill (S. 1455) for the relief of Adam Carpenter;

A bill (S. 1456) for the relief of the heirs of William Downs;

A bill (S. 1457) for the relief of Edward B. Fox, administrator of the last surviving partner of the firm of Child, Pratt & Fox;

A bill (S. 1458) for the relief of the heirs of Richard S. Rew, deceased;

A bill (S. 1459) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Charles E. Mix;

A bill (S. 1460) for the relief of the heirs of Powhatan Perkins;

A bill (S. 1461) for the relief of the estate of John Anderson, deceased;

A bill (S. 1462) for the relief of H. L. Briscoe, heir of Sarah Briscoe;

A bill (S. 1463) for the relief of the heirs of Amanda M. James, deceased;

A bill (S. 1464) for the relief of the estate of Richard Wiseman, deceased;

A bill (S. 1465) for the relief of the heirs of John D. Rawlings, deceased;

A bill (S. 1466) for the relief of the estate of William Benton, deceased;

A bill (S. 1467) for the relief of the heirs of John Wescott;

A bill (S. 1468) for the relief of Emma C. Franner, George W. Seaton, Hiram K. Seaton, Howard Seaton, Mary Seaton, Blanche Seaton, George W. Taylor, Edward Taylor, and Catharine Pomeroy;

A bill (S. 1469) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Lee, deceased;

A bill (S. 1470) for the relief of C. A. Sprinkel;

A bill (S. 1471) for the relief of Edgar M. Wilson, administrator of Thomas B. Van Buren, deceased;

A bill (S. 1472) for the relief of William Corcoran;

A bill (S. 1473) for the relief of Frank Hoskins;

A bill (S. 1474) for the relief of Benjamin P. Loyall;

A bill (S. 1475) for the relief of Martin Maddux;

A bill (S. 1476) for the relief of A. O. Tucker;

A bill (S. 1477) for the relief of Tilman Jeter;

A bill (S. 1478) for the relief of Laura V. Phipps;

A bill (S. 1479) for the relief of Mary Cornick;

A bill (S. 1480) for the relief of the estate of Murray Mason, deceased;

A bill (S. 1481) for the relief of the estate of William J. Conner, deceased;

A bill (S. 1482) for the relief of the estate of Mary G. Temple, deceased;

A bill (S. 1483) for the relief of the estate of John Ivy, deceased;

A bill (S. 1484) for the relief of J. N. Whittaker;

A bill (S. 1485) for the relief of L. L. Scherer;

A bill (S. 1486) for the relief of S. W. Niemeyer;

A bill (S. 1487) for the relief of the heirs at law of Capt. John Lewis;

A bill (S. 1488) for the relief of the Richmond Locomotive Works, successor of the Richmond Locomotive & Machine Works;

A bill (S. 1489) for the relief of the Potomac Steamboat Co.;

A bill (S. 1490) for the relief of the estate of Ella P. Williams;

A bill (S. 1491) for the relief of the estate of Maurice T. Smith;

A bill (S. 1492) for the relief of John W. Fairfax;

A bill (S. 1493) for the relief of Ida Banks;

A bill (S. 1494) to reimburse William Van Derveer, of Millboro, Va., for excess revenue taxes assessed against and collected from him;

A bill (S. 1495) to compensate the Old Point Improvement Co. for the demolition and removal of the Hygeia Hotel property from the Government reservation at Old Point, Va.;

A bill (S. 1496) for the relief of Mary Eliza Woodhouse;

A bill (S. 1497) for the relief of Norval Cox and heirs of Robert Rollins, deceased;

A bill (S. 1498) for the relief of William Allman and others;

A bill (S. 1499) to reimburse J. H. Whealton for moneys paid by him as surety for C. W. Fullerton, late postmaster of Whealton, Va.;

A bill (S. 1500) for the relief of the heirs of Matthew Smith, deceased;

A bill (S. 1501) for the relief of Tyree Bros.;

A bill (S. 1502) for the relief of Luther H. Potterfield;

A bill (S. 1503) for the relief of Mrs. C. N. Graves, widow of R. F. Graves, jr., deceased;

A bill (S. 1504) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to try, adjudicate, and determine certain claims for compensation for carrying the mails and pay for the discontinuance of postal service;

A bill (S. 1505) giving jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to ascertain the interest of Anna M. Fitzhugh, and the value of such interest, in the wood taken from the estate of Ravensworth by the military authorities of the United States;

A bill (S. 1506) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the cases herein enumerated;

A bill (S. 1507) for the relief of the trustees of the Zion Methodist Church, of York County, Va.;

A bill (S. 1508) for the relief of George M. Fry;

A bill (S. 1509) for the relief of G. W. Browder;

A bill (S. 1510) for the relief of the estate of Thomas H. Nelson, deceased;

A bill (S. 1511) for the relief of William T. Miles;

A bill (S. 1512) for the relief of the estate of Arthur F. Clift, deceased;

A bill (S. 1513) for the relief of the legal heirs of the late L. Claiborne Jones;

A bill (S. 1514) for the relief of the heirs of James Bowles, deceased;

A bill (S. 1515) for the relief of the estate of James G. Hodges, deceased;

A bill (S. 1516) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of John Heater;

A bill (S. 1517) for the relief of E. A. R. Wyatt, heir of Edward A. Wyatt, deceased;

A bill (S. 1518) for the relief of the trustees of Carmel Baptist Church, Caroline County, Va.;

A bill (S. 1519) for the relief of the trustees of Urbanna Episcopal Church, Middlesex County, Va.;

A bill (S. 1520) for the relief of the trustees of Lebanon Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Shenandoah County, Va.;

A bill (S. 1521) for the relief of the estate of Peter McEnery, deceased;

A bill (S. 1522) for the relief of John S. Mann and the estate of Lewis W. Mann, deceased;

A bill (S. 1523) for the relief of W. T. Flippin, administrator of John F. Flippin, deceased;

A bill (S. 1524) for the relief of the estate of William D. Wright, deceased;

A bill (S. 1525) for the relief of Joseph H. Shafer;

A bill (S. 1526) for the relief of the Seaboard Air Line Railway; and

A bill (S. 1527) for the relief of Bella Crounse and other heirs of the estate of James Bell, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1528) granting an increase of pension to George W. Brown;

A bill (S. 1529) granting a pension to Joseph H. Mayo;

A bill (S. 1530) granting a pension to R. H. Catlett;

A bill (S. 1531) to restore to the pension roll the name of Jordan T. Fletcher;

A bill (S. 1532) granting a pension to James J. Boothe;

A bill (S. 1533) granting a pension to Lucy W. Lockwood;

A bill (S. 1534) granting a pension to George E. Harrison;

A bill (S. 1535) granting a pension to Mildred J. Almond;

A bill (S. 1536) granting an increase of pension to Florence P. Percy;

A bill (S. 1537) granting an increase of pension to Rachael Chambers;

A bill (S. 1538) granting an increase of pension to Sherwood C. Bowers;

A bill (S. 1539) granting a pension to Walter S. Buchanan;

A bill (S. 1540) granting a pension to Richard L. Miller; and

A bill (S. 1541) granting a pension to Roland B. Horsley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 1542) to place on the retired list of the Army the names of the surviving officers who were mustered out under the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 15, 1870; and

A bill (S. 1543) for the relief of Richard Hogan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 1544) for the relief of the estate of William Claunch, deceased;

A bill (S. 1545) for the relief of the estate of Ben Whitaker, sr., deceased;

A bill (S. 1546) for the relief of Joseph Ballou;

A bill (S. 1547) for the relief of Anthony, Eubanks & Co.;

A bill (S. 1548) for the relief of the estate of Jonathan B. Polk, deceased;

A bill (S. 1549) for the relief of the heirs or estates of William McClure and Margaret McClure, deceased;

(By request.) A bill S. 1550) for the relief of William A. Kinsolving;

A bill (S. 1551) for the relief of the estate of David W. Settle, deceased;

A bill (S. 1552) for the relief of the estate of Mary H. S. Robertson, deceased;

A bill (S. 1553) for the relief of the estate of George Vaught, deceased;

A bill (S. 1554) for the relief of the estate of William Thomas Lowe; and

A bill (S. 1555) for the relief of Gilbert Wilkerson and Jeremiah Sparks, alias Dave Sparks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OWEN (by request):

A bill (S. 1556) forbidding the importation, exportation, or the carriage in interstate commerce of watchcases made, in

whole or in part, of an inferior metal having deposited or plated thereon, or brazed, or otherwise affixed thereto, platings, coverings, or sheets composed of gold, or of an alloy thereof, bearing words or marks importing a guaranty or wear for a specified time, and of watchcases of less than 9 carat, bearing the word "gold," and of watch movements not properly marked in respect to the number of their jewels and their adjustment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 26) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Virginia:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) authorizing the Librarian of Congress to return to Williamsburg Lodge, No. 6, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Virginia, the original manuscript of the record of the proceedings of said lodge; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. JONES:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 28) authorizing the appointment of a board to ascertain and report to Congress the probable cost of acquiring lands on each side of Pennsylvania Avenue as sites for buildings necessary for the transaction of present and prospective governmental business; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUGHES:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 29) authorizing the President to appoint a member of the New Jersey and New York Joint Harbor Line Commission; to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $25,000 for the establishment of a fish-cultural station in the State of Montana, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that the act of August 24, 1912, be extended to apply to the Reclamation Service, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2973) making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $5,000 for the construction of a rostrum at the national cemetery at Florence, S. C., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $6,850 for expenses of the delegates to be designated by the President to the Fourteenth International Congress on Alcoholism, at Milan, Italy, September, 1913, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CHILTON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $1,491.92, to be paid to the Citizens Trust & Guaranty Co. of West Virginia, being the amount withheld by the Navy Department in making settlements under contracts Nos. 1008 and 1106, September 3 and November 1, 1902, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2973) making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. KENYON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $75,000 to investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice, and for farm demonstration work, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GRONNA submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $1,000 for a fair at Fort Totten, to be expended under the direction and supervision of the superintendent at that fort, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $1,000 for examination of the land embraced in Sullys Hill Park, to determine whether it contains valuable minerals, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors and peyote among Indians from $75,000 to $125,000, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $10,000 for placing the Government approach roadway to the Vicksburg National Cemetery, Vicksburg, Miss., in a state of permanent repair, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SHIVELY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $1,000 to pay O. M. Enyart for moneys paid and expended by him for the purchase of the copyright of Ben Perley Poore's Political Register and Congressional Directory of the United States, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. BURTON submitted five amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—W. T. RICE.

On motion of Mr. WORKS, it was

Ordered, That W. T. Rice be authorized to withdraw from the files of the Senate all papers accompanying Senate bill 7920, Sixty-second Congress, third session, entitled "A bill for the relief of W. T. Rice," no adverse report having been made thereon.

INVESTIGATIONS OF BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. OWEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 66), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed, by subcommittee or otherwise, to make investigations of banking and currency matters and to compile and prepare statistics relative thereto such as may be necessary, and to report from time to time to the Senate the result thereof, and for this purpose they are authorized to sit, by subcommittee or otherwise, during the sessions of the Senate or recesses thereof at such times and places as they may deem advisable, to send for persons and papers and administer oaths, and to employ such stenographic and clerical assistance, or otherwise, as may be necessary, the expense of such investigation to be paid for from the contingent fund of the Senate, and the committee is authorized to pay for such printing and binding as may be necessary for its use.

CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. OWEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 67), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the clerk to the Committee on Banking and Currency, whose employment was authorized by resolution of March 17, 1913, be paid at the rate of $3,000 per annum from miscellaneous items, contingent fund of the Senate.

STATISTICS RELATING TO WAGE EARNERS.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 68), which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Labor be, and he is hereby, directed to investigate and report, as far as it is practicable, upon the mortality and the disability by accident or by disease incident to or resulting from the various occupations in which the wage earners of the United States are engaged.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. ASHURST. I submit a resolution for appropriate reference.

The resolution (S. Res. 69) was read and referred to the Committee on Rules, as follows:

Resolved, That in accordance with the notice given on April 21, 1913, proposing an amendment to the standing rules of the Senate, there be added the following, to be known as Rule ——:

"*Resolved*, That no committee of the Senate shall sit behind closed doors: *Provided, however*, That this rule shall not apply to any committee considering treaties, executive business, or matters affecting foreign relations."

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. Mr. President, I wish to present a resolution and then I wish to ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. In this connection I desire to say that I have certain information in regard to the men employed in the Diplomatic and Consular Service which is very astounding to me.

In the Diplomatic Service of the United States there are 10 ambassadors—2 from the District of Columbia, 2 from New York, and 1 each from Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Missouri, and Washington—the salary of each being $17,500.

In the same service there are two classes of envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary, one class receiving a salary of $12,000, and the other $10,000.

Of the first class of ministers there are 8—2 each from New York, Maryland, and Illinois, and 1 each from Vermont and Pennsylvania.

Of the second class there are 27—5 from New York, 4 each from New Jersey and Illinois, 3 from the District of Columbia, 2 each from Pennsylvania and Minnesota, and 1 each from Delaware, Indiana, Massachusetts, Kentucky, Missouri, Kansas, and West Virginia.

Thus it will be seen that of the 35 ambassadors and ministers there are none from the South, counting Kentucky as a border State, while the District of Columbia has five.

The Consular Service is divided into classes, with consuls general ranking highest.

The consuls general of Class I, with a salary of $12,000, are but two in number, located at London and Paris, respectively, one being from Indiana and the other from Ohio.

Of Class II, with a salary of $8,000, there are 7 in all—2 from the District of Columbia, 2 from Ohio, and 1 each from Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Wisconsin.

Of Class III, with a salary of $6,000, there are 9 in all—1 each from Indiana, Illinois, Vermont, Missouri, South Dakota, and Washington, with 3 vacancies.

Of Class IV, with a salary of $5,500, there are 12 in all—2 from Ohio, 2 from Louisiana, 2 from West Virginia, and 1 each from the District of Columbia, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, North Dakota, Wisconsin, and West Virginia.

Of Class V, with a salary of $4,500, there are 17 in all—3 each from the District of Columbia and New York, 2 from Massachusetts, and 1 each from Indiana, Virginia, Wisconsin, New Jersey, California, Tennessee, and Oregon, with 1 vacancy.

Of Class VI, with a salary of $3,500, there are 9 in all—2 from Illinois, and 1 each from Oklahoma, Iowa, and Missouri, with 4 vacancies.

Of Class VII, with a salary of $3,000, there are 3 in all—1 each from New York, Colorado, and Illinois.

Of consuls general at large, with a salary of $5,000, there are 5 in all—1 each from New York, Maine, Kansas, and North Carolina, with 1 vacancy.

Out of the 64 consuls general, only 5, or 7 per cent, are from Southern States, while the District of Columbia alone is favored with 6. The aggregate salary of the 5 from the Southern States is $25,000, while the 6 from the District of Columbia have an aggregate salary of $45,000.

Under the consuls general there are 241 consuls, divided into 9 classes, with salaries ranging from $8,000 down to $2,000. Of those who receive over $2,000, 23 only are from Southern States, while the District of Columbia has 13, more than half of the least-paid consuls being from Southern States.

The salaries in the aggregate of consuls general and of consuls from all the Southern States amount to $84,000, while the aggregate salaries of those from Ohio alone amount to $103,500; those from the District of Columbia alone to $72,500; New York, $64,500; Illinois, $62,000; Pennsylvania, $57,000.

Posts in the Consular Service held by Democrats, especially southern Democrats, pitifully few in number, notwithstanding the insistent professions of recent Republican administrations of the nonpartisan character of the method employed in the selection of applicants for admission, subjecting them to a fair examination without regard to party affiliation or State of residence, are comparatively insignificant and inconsequential, and most certainly out of keeping with the importance of the communities and Commonwealths from which they come. An investigation of the consular list, with the salary class, will show this. An investigation of the department's method of examination in recent years will show that of 282 persons in the Consular Service, taking no account of vacancies, only 80, or 28 per cent, have ever taken any other than a political or favored examination; while by a special kind of examination brought into vogue by the Roosevelt administration and practiced under the Taft administration, the test has been so severely rigid as fully to warrant the suspicion that it was conceived and constructed to protect the favorites of those two administrations. An impartial and common-sense scrutiny of the practices of the Republican administrations and of the State Department must be convincing not only to that effect, but persuasive that the intent was also to hamper and discourage worthy and highly competent southern Democrats from aspiring to positions in the foreign service.

In short, over 200 of the persons now in the Consular Service have never taken any kind of examination to test their real fitness for their posts; and 95 per cent of that number are Republicans from Northern States, or from the District of Columbia, where residence in the social center in the vicinity of the White House has given them, through Republican Presidents, an open sesame to the best in the foreign service of the Government, from ambassadors to the cream of the Consular Service.

Mr. President, I wish now to call attention to the appointments from the States.

From Alabama there are only three consuls, the aggregate of the salaries of the three being $6,500. There are none in the Diplomatic Service.

From Florida there is only one, with a salary of $2,000.

From Mississippi there are four, with aggregate salaries of $7,400.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the one from Florida is in the Consular Service, is he not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. Yes; in the Consular Service.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no one at all from Florida in the Diplomatic Service.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I am including both the Consular and the Diplomatic Service in the statement I am now making.

From the District of Columbia there are 65, with salaries amounting to $205,350.

From Illinois there are 38, with salaries aggregating $157,300.

From New York there are 79, with salaries of $278,700.

From Ohio there are 39, with salaries of $142,000.

From Pennsylvania there are 60, with salaries of $194,100.

Taking this list by sections, Mr. President, from the Northeastern States there are 156, with salaries of $550,000; from the border States 52, with salaries of $182,225; from the Middle Western States 145, with salaries of $498,650; from other Western States 75, with salaries of $218,475; from the District of Columbia 65, with salaries of $205,350; from the 11 Southern States, with a population of over 23,000,000 people, there are only 80, with salaries amounting to $167,300, less than several of the States I have mentioned.

It must be remembered, Mr. President, that these consuls are supposed to represent not so much the diplomatic interests of the country but its business and trade. In my section of the country there is an immense development in manufactures and an immense sale of the products of our soil—perhaps the largest of any part of the United States when you take cotton and its products—yet there are only 80 consuls to serve us and not a single ambassador.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that he gives a little too much credit to these consuls when he says their duties are not so much diplomatic. They are not at all diplomatic.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. That is true; they are not at all diplomatic; they are purely of a business nature. That being the fact, I do not see why such an immense number should be appointed from the District of Columbia, which has no manufacturing or export interests whatever.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me an inquiry?

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator if it is not true that so far as ambassadors and ministers are concerned as a rule they have tendered their resignations to the President?

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I am talking about the present situation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; but will it not be remedied by the Senator's President when he reaches that point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I hope it will be remedied, but it seems to be going along very slowly. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I ask leave to print in the RECORD the table I have prepared, so that Senators may see exactly what the situation is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, leave will be granted.

The table is as follows:

Officers and employees of the State Department in Washington and in the Diplomatic and Consular Service abroad, with their number and aggregate compensation, by States.

	Number.	Compensation.
Alabama	3	$6,500
Arizona	0	.....
Arkansas	1	1,000
California	23	72,225
Colorado	3	6,000
Connecticut	16	27,800
Delaware	2	12,000
District of Columbia	65	205,350
Florida	1	2,000
Georgia	6	13,500
Idaho	1	4,000
Illinois	38	157,300
Indiana	16	50,300
Iowa	16	37,000
Kansas	8	24,200
Kentucky	9	31,700
Louisiana	8	19,900
Maine	12	36,900
Maryland	31	46,425
Massachusetts	29	94,000
Michigan	13	37,500
Minnesota	13	40,925
Mississippi	4	7,400
Missouri	16	72,500
Montana	2	5,000
Nebraska	6	26,600
Nevada	1	2,000
New Hampshire	5	11,500
New Jersey	15	65,200
New Mexico	3	11,000
New York	79	278,700
North Carolina	6	18,200
North Dakota	2	8,500
Ohio	39	142,000
Oklahoma	3	7,650
Oregon	3	9,500
Pennsylvania	60	194,100
Rhode Island	9	23,225
South Carolina	10	20,200
South Dakota	4	14,500
Tennessee	10	27,200
Texas	7	12,800
Utah	3	7,000
Vermont	6	29,100
Virginia	24	38,200
Washington	12	42,300
West Virginia	6	31,500
Wisconsin	10	33,625
Wyoming	1	5,000
New England States	77	222,525
North-East States—		
New York	79	278,700
New Jersey	15	65,200
Delaware	2	12,000
Pennsylvania	60	194,100
Total	156	550,000
Border States—		
Maryland	21	46,425
West Virginia	6	31,500
Kentucky	9	31,700
Missouri	16	72,500
Total	52	182,125
Middle Western States—		
Ohio	39	142,000
Michigan	13	37,500
Indiana	16	50,300
Illinois	38	157,300
Wisconsin	10	33,625
Minnesota	13	40,925
Iowa	16	37,000
Total	145	498,650
Other Western States	75	218,475
District of Columbia	65	205,350
Southern States—		
Alabama	3	6,500
Arkansas	1	1,000
Florida	1	2,000
Georgia	6	13,900
Louisiana	8	19,900
Mississippi	4	7,400
North Carolina	6	18,200
South Carolina	10	20,200
Tennessee	10	27,200
Texas	7	12,800
Virginia	24	38,200
Total	80	167,300
Vacancies	26	101,500
Grand total	676	2,145,928

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be adopted.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. Has the Senator's investigation gone to the extent of enabling him to state what is the political faith of these consular officers?

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. My information has been that they are almost wholly Republicans.

Mr. THOMAS. Since or before the election?

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. Both before and since. There have been very few changes. I ask that the resolution be read, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution, which will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 65), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is hereby directed to inquire into and report to the Senate the number of men in the Diplomatic Service of the United Staes and in the Consular Service, the States from which appointed, and the aggregate salaries of the appointees from the several States and the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, before the resolution is adopted I should like to ask its author a question. The Consular Service is entered, I understand, through competitive examinations. I should like to know whether it is the desire of the Senator from Alabama to abolish the custom or rule of the department with regard to the Consular Service, and open it up to purely political appointments?

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. In reply, Mr. President, I will say that I stated that over 200 of these consuls have never submitted to any examination whatever. They are in the service without an examination. I am not opposed to an examination to show the fitness of the men, but I am heartily in favor of every section of the United States having a fair and equal proportion of the officers who are appointed.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, so am I. I understand that there are a certain number—I have no doubt the Senator from Alabama has given the number correctly—who were in the service at the time the rule was promulgated by the State Department. I have suggested what I have solely to avoid any interpretation by my silence that I favor the abolition of the rule of merit which has been established and which I understand is now being enforced in the State Department. I hope that rule will continue, although in the very nature of things it ought to afford each geographical community or section of the United States a fairly equal representation in the service. That is true because men are very much alike all over the country.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. Yes; and I want to say, Mr. President, that it will hardly be considered possible by anyone on this floor that out of the 23,000,000 people in the South there are only 87 who are qualified to enter the Consular Service.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not think so; but it may be that the men from the South have not applied for entry to the Consular Service under this rule. I do not know whether they have or not. But if they have, and if competent men from the South have been denied appointment in order to appoint incompetent men, or less competent men, from the North, I should be the first to condemn a practice of that kind.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The two statements of the Senator from Iowa are not in accord with one another. If this has been a service based upon competitive examination, then of course the question who has applied is irrelevant. It seems that by some queer coincidence of politics with civil-service merit seven-eighths of the employees in the Diplomatic and Consular Service are Republicans. It seems that by some queer coincidence of politics with civil-service merit about three-fourths of the employees of the departments are Republicans.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Does the Senator speak from investigations that he has made in regard to the politics of these men?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am speaking from the facts with regard to the Diplomatic and Consular Service just presented by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I do not understand that the Senator from Alabama drew any distinction as to the politics of the men now in that service.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Wyoming is right about that; my inference was an inference; but they all come from the Northern States, and they do not come from the Southern States. They all come from the Republican geography of the

country, and none of them come from the Democratic geography of the country, and I drew the inference. I would suggest that the Senator from Alabama add something else to his resolution of inquiry, to wit, to find out what is the political faith of the men holding these places.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I have no objection at all to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I notice the Senator from Iowa spoke about competitive examinations. I have been here a pretty good long while. I have seen two men break into the Diplomatic Service from Mississippi on what are called competitive examinations. They are not competitive in any proper sense at all.

Then, as far as I am concerned, I believe that if the present administration does not change that, the confirmation of appointments ought to be resisted in this body. There is no use telling me that southerners are not just as fit for public employment in the Diplomatic and Consular Service as men north of the line. So far in the history of this country they have shown their equality in the field, in the forum, before the bench, and everywhere else, and they are equal with them.

I suggest to the Senator from Alabama that he add to the resolution a further inquiry as to the political faith of the incumbents of these offices.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I am perfectly willing to do that.

I wish to say further that I have never seen any notice of any vacancies that were about to occur and calling for men to stand an examination. I have had three men examined for the service from Alabama and only two of them were passed. I think if there had been notice when there was going to be a vacancy in the Consular Service there would have been a great many applications from Alabama or Mississippi or Florida of highly qualified men, graduates of universities, familiar with the manufacturing and industrial interests of the whole country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. At the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon, I want to add to my suggestion, in order to avoid complications, in view of the character of men who can change their politics quicker than any administration, that the inquiry be directed to their political faith at the time of their appointment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. There have been no appointments since the present administration came in that I know of, except two or three. I am perfectly willing to have the amendment suggested by the Senator from Mississippi added to the resolution.

Mr. WARREN. May I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I think I can speak rather freely on the subject, because the State I have the honor of representing in part has no representation whatever in either the Diplomatic or the Consular Service, aside from one secretary of legation.

Regarding the examination, my understanding has been that the departments have not called for examinations for specific places, but they have called for examinations of classes, and when those who apply have passed they are graded, and the places that may be open are filled by selection and acceptance from that class. In fact, there is a waiting list most of the time of those who have satisfactorily passed the prescribed examination.

I presume the Senator may be differentiating between those appointed under the old system and those appointed since the period of examinations began.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. No; I am speaking of the present system.

Mr. WARREN. I hope the resolution will be antedated to cover the previous time, so that we may know what percentage have gone into the service through the examinations and acceptance on their merits, supposed to be regardless of their political faith.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if it is not true that some kind of a certificate is required from a Senator or official in order that the applicant may stand this examination.

Mr. WARREN. I think he has to give references as to his character and standing.

Mr. BACON. The rule is that he shall present a request from the Senator or Representative that he be allowed to stand an examination.

Mr. WARREN. Still he can present it without the indorsement of a Senator or Representative.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It requires the recommendation of a Senator to get the examination. That, I am sure, has been the rule. The result was, as the Senate was largely Republican, that those requests came from the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. What I complain about is that Senators did not know when vacancies were going to occur and never heard of them so as to be able to advise their constituents. It is only when they make special requests that the privilege is granted. In the instance in my State, three or four men were examined, and I succeeded in getting two appointed. They passed the examination at a very high grade.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the junior Senator from Georgia whether if at any time a Democratic Senator indorsed anyone for an examination that indorsement did not go just as far with the department as though it had been an indorsement by a Republican?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have not the detailed information to be able to answer.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Alabama has just testified to the fact that, as far as he was concerned, it had.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. No; I said I had recommended some four gentlemen from Alabama for examination and only two who were permitted to take the examination passed.

Mr. SMOOT. Utah has not any representation in the Diplomatic Service. I find that, as far as the West is concerned, representation in both services is not very much greater than in the South; but there is a cause for that, Mr. President. The expense of coming here, where the examination takes place, from the Pacific coast is very great indeed. A great many people can not afford to incur the expense to come here and take the examination when they are not positive of an appointment after the examination is taken. I really believe that that is a part of the reason. Of course——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am satisfied that is not true as to my own State, because the distance is not very great.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not speaking of the South.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The people in our section are very fond of coming to Washington.

Mr. SMOOT. Particularly at the present time.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I do not think the criticism that is best founded is that which relates to the matter of the requirement of an examination. That is of recent origin, and the representation in the Consular Service as a result of that examination is a very small percentage of the consuls representing the United States in foreign countries. I doubt if there is one in fifty now serving who got there through that examination. Consequently that question does not materially affect the situation, so grossly unjust, which has been disclosed by the paper read by the Senator from Alabama. That situation has been caused by appointments under an altogether different system. That situation, with its gross inequality in representation among the consuls of the different sections of the country, has been caused by appointments outside of any examination, and that is an evil. The question is, How is it to be remedied? Everyone will recognize that it is an evil; everyone will recognize that it is a condition that should not exist, and which should not be allowed to continue to exist if there is any way to reach it.

So far as that particular order is concerned, I do not think there is anything in it that is to be very much criticized. I have had occasion myself to look upon it with favor. I think that possibly it is not an order which should be universal in its application and enforcement. I think it is very frequently the case that a man who could not stand the examination which is required by that order would make a first-class consul. I think it is very frequently the case that some man could be found who would make a better consul than any man who stood the examination. The best consular representative is not always the man who can stand the examination in foreign branches, because that is a very severe examination. I have had occasion to look at it, and it is one that, I am frank to say, I could not pass successfully; and I do not believe that any Senator here, unless he went back to school for a month or two and reviewed his studies, could pass it.

There are many young men who can pass that examination who have no peculiar qualifications for the Consular Service. On the other hand, there are a great many men, men of affairs, men of business experience, men of energy, men of initiative, who would make very excellent consuls—the best of consuls—who could not possibly pass the examination.

Therefore I think a better system would be one which, while adhering to the order of examinations as a general thing, would admit the propriety of making exceptions whenever it appeared it was to the interest of the public service that some man should be appointed to the Consular Service who did not possess the necessary familiarity with the higher branches of mathematics and other branches of knowledge which are required by that examination.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. BACON. With pleasure.

Mr. LODGE. I did not know that the applicants were examined in mathematics. I think of much more importance is the requirement that they should know one language besides their own. I think that must keep a great many very valuable men out of the service.

Mr. BACON. It does keep a great many out. I have had occasion to correspond at various times with the Department of State about that fact. In this country the knowledge of foreign languages is not general. It is extremely difficult for a man to know practically a foreign language who lives in America, because he hears but one language. A man may make himself quite proficient in a language while a student in college, but if he does not keep it up by mingling with those who speak that language in a few years he practically loses it. There is no question about that whatsoever.

Therefore, as suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts, that does debar a very large number of men who would make efficient consuls. While a knowledge of the language of the country in which the consul is to perform his duties is very important it is not essential. I think the rule ought to be relaxed.

Mr. OVERMAN. Will the Senator allow me to state a case right there that happened within my own knowledge?

Mr. BACON. With pleasure.

Mr. OVERMAN. A clerk in a department here who knew nothing about business except to do clerical work came to me and said he would like to get into the Consular Service. I asked him if he could speak a foreign language. He said, "No; but I am going to a night school here in Washington, and I think I can learn it." He went to the night school, learned the foreign language, and succeeded in passing the examination and was appointed. He knew nothing about the business matters of the country; he was purely a clerk; and yet he passed the examination. It is a rule that I think ought to be relaxed in some way.

Mr. BACON. I think the spirit which prompted that order, which was passed in the administration of Mr. Roosevelt, is to be applauded. It in a measure took the Consular Service out of politics. It did not altogether do so, because those who had to administer the law naturally were influenced in some degree by those who were in political affiliation with them, and there is a discretion even after the examination has been passed as to who shall be selected. So it did not entirely eliminate politics, but it did very largely do so. I think the purpose and spirit of the order are to be applauded.

Now, I do not think that in the administration of that order there has been any marked injustice. I think the Senator from Alabama does injustice to the department in the particular in which he mentions, to wit, that parties were not upon notice as to a vacancy and that therefore they had not an opportunity to make application for examination to fill that vacancy.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I said, if the Senator from Georgia will permit me, I did not know why it was, but we had no notice of the fact that there were any vacancies in the places of consuls, and therefore we had no opportunity of knowing, unless we went to the department and found out privately, whether there was to be a change in the future. Then there would be only one or two men appointed, so that there could not be any general system by which they could qualify themselves under the rules of the department.

Mr. BACON. I am in entire sympathy with the general purpose of the Senator from Alabama that there should be a change in this matter, and I am trying to show that the particular feature to which attention has been directed is not that of which there can be such criticism as, if sustained, will correct the evil. What I was about to say when the Senator interrupted me is that under this order no one is examined for any particular position. He is not examined, when it is found out that there is a vacancy in Bombay, for an appointment to Bombay. There is a general examination for the purpose of securing the names of those who will be deemed eligible by the President as proper men to appoint whenever there is a vacancy, just like there is, for instance, in the civil service. It is true that in the civil service there is some classification; the men stand an examination for clerks in some subdivision or something of that kind. But in this order there is a general standing program under which the President designates men for examination upon the recommendation of Senators and, I think, also of Representatives; I am not sure about that, I think so, however. In other words, he gives permission to them to stand an examination in order that by and under the evidence furnished by those examinations he may be in a position to judge whether the applicant is a man proper to be appointed or not. The names of the men who have passed the examination are put upon the list. They do not have to wait for a vacancy until the examination is ordered. Their names are put upon the list and then when vacancies occur men are selected from those lists and appointed to fill the places.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me a minute, I repeat it is of course perfectly natural when there are 100 men on a list and a dozen of them to be appointed that the element of personal influence should have some controlling effect. I have no doubt that it does. The order has in a great measure eliminated from the Consular Service the political feature, but, as I said, that does not reach the present evil.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Before my colleague passes from that will he let me ask him a question? Is it not the entire difference between the examinations for the Consular Service and the ordinary civil-service examinations that under the ordinary civil-service examination each State receives its due quota and three who stood the best examination are selected to the service, while under this examination quite a long list is made and the selection is made which pleases the appointing power best?

Mr. BACON. There is undoubtedly more opportunity for that to be done.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I wish to ask the Senator in this connection whether when such an examination is ordered the Secretary of State should not take the applicants from States that have not their pro rata of appointments?

Mr. BACON. The Senator anticipates me in that. I am trying to get to that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We were so anxious to hear the Senator on it that we wanted it before he got to it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to make the suggestion, I think there is one thing passed over in his very natural desire to improve the Consular Service by getting the valuable men who can not pass the examination. There is one great obstacle now in the present regulations. As Senators are well aware, all the consulates are graded. They are graded according to salaries. There are seven grades. Under the present regulations new appointments are made only to the two lowest grades. That is a thing which I think will, unless changed, interfere very seriously with getting the valuable men who can not pass the examination.

Mr. BACON. The Senator is entirely correct. The only mistake he made was in saying that I had passed it over. I had not got to it. I have been struggling for some time trying to reach it.

Mr. LODGE. I have no doubt that by the time the Senator gets through——

Mr. BACON. It will all be covered.

Mr. LODGE. He will have gotten every one of what he calls these valuable men, who can not pass the examination, out of the service.

Mr. BACON. That is not the purpose which I have in view. It is really difficult for me to continue the thread of what I am saying, not only because of the interruption but because of the different views presented by the different Senators who have made the interruption.

I was about to say that I am sorry the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] is not here, because I think he is really the author of that order. I had correspondence with him at the time he was Secretary of State and I have had conversation with him since then. I think the purpose was a laudable one.

I want to say as to the matter which was suggested by my colleague, and about which I intended to speak, that while there is no such hard and fast rule as is attempted to be laid down in the civil-service law with reference to the distribution of these officers among the States, I know that there has been expressed, and I believe honestly expressed, a desire through this examination in a measure to distribute these consular appointments in the different States.

But the difficulty is, as I said in the outset, that this affects a mere small fractional percentage of those who are in the Consular Service, and it would take half a century—certainly a quarter of a century—with the most rigid adherence to the purpose, to distribute them to the different States through this method of examination and to correct the evil as it now stands. The question is, What is to be done now? Ought it to remain as it is? Ought it to remain with one section of the country almost exclusively filling up the Consular Service, or ought it to be distributed?

I am very frank to say that while I believe that as a general rule there ought to be some relaxation of this order, and men who do not pass the examination ought to be appointed, I think in the present condition of affairs it ought to be very severely relaxed; and I believe it is the duty, not simply of a Democratic

administration, but that it would be the duty of a Republican administration if it were in power, to so change the present Consular Service as in some degree, at least, to make a due proportion of representation in this service for one part of the country as well as for the other.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. BACON. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not desire to interrupt the discussion, but I rise for the purpose of saying that when I get an opportunity to do so I shall ask that the resolution go over under the rule. I want to look into it a little more carefully.

Mr. BACON. Then, Mr. President, I have no desire to occupy the floor further.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. GALLINGER. I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. WORKS. Since we are still under the order of business of bills and joint resolutions, I want to offer——

Mr. THOMAS. I was under the impression that the order of morning business had closed.

Mr. WORKS. Morning business has not yet been closed, as I understand. I send to the desk an amendment which I desire——

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from California will permit, I ask that the resolution go over under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator will permit the resolution to be read as it now stands, it will then go over under the rule. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is hereby directed to inquire into and report to the Senate the number of men in the Diplomatic Service of the United States and in the Consular Service, the States from which appointed, the aggregate salaries of the appointees from the several States and the District of Columbia, and the political party with which such appointees were affiliated at the time of their appointment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over and be printed.

WASHED PAPER MONEY.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, if this is the proper stage of proceeding, I desire to present correspondence from 587 bank presidents and cashiers, representing every State in the Union, protesting against what is known as "washed money." I desire to ask that this correspondence be printed as a public document. My prompting in making this motion I feel is richly justified from this large amount of correspondence. I put myself in communication with the various banks of the country, and I have received protests, as I say, from 587 of them in every State of the Union, insisting that the method should be discontinued. For myself I feel that the country can not have too much of good, fresh, clean money.

I insist that after the Government having secured, as it has, the best art in the matter of engraving, thereby obtaining the deepest and most permanent colors, it ill becomes us to go through a Chinese laundering process of washing and fading out our money. This is the universal protest of bank presidents and cashiers throughout our country against this process of soapsuds and caustic soda by which the fine lines, the work of the artist and the engraver, have been practically obliterated and the colors destroyed so that it is impossible to detect whether or not notes are counterfeit.

I introduced some time since a paper, which was published as a document, entitled "Counterfeiters' delight," and its sentiments have been reechoed from one end of this country to the other. I feel that the United States Government, at least, is called upon to do as much as does the Government of Great Britain and the Governments of many other countries in turning out clean, fresh, crisp money. I have no sympathy with any process——

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. One moment. I have no sympathy with any process that shall keep alive and circulate among the people greasy, filthy rags, such as many that are now in circulation. I do insist that it should not be the business of a few men in the Treasury Department to establish machines to wash our paper money or to curtail its size. That is a matter which should be left with the people of the United States. Apropos of what I have said, I ask that this correspondence may be published as a document.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not like to interrupt the Senator from New Jersey, but I must insist upon the regular order.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I thought I had assent from the Vice President. I asked him if this were the proper stage at which to present this proposition, and, hearing nothing to the contrary, I assumed that it was.

The VICE PRESIDENT. May the Chair inquire whether the Senator's proposition is accompanied by a resolution?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. By only a verbal resolution, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. It is a request from the Senator from New Jersey that certain letters which he has received be printed as a public document. The correspondence is all upon one subject, and, as I understand, there are 587 letters.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. There are 587 letters, representing every State in the Union.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I hardly think that it is necessary to have those 587 letters printed as a public document, especially they being all one way and all protesting against one single object. I believe the Senator will secure just as much publicity for the statement——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am not looking for publicity. The Senator from Utah is entirely in error. I want to say that there are four banks in the State of Utah, the Senator's own State, that protest most vehemently against this process. I want to present to you—and I think the Senator will not object—a letter signed by a former Member of this body, W. M. Kavanaugh, of Little Rock, Ark.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I must again insist upon the regular order. This is all out of the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is objection to the request, and it is not accompanied by a resolution——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, I will reserve my privilege, and present the matter again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are not further concurrent or other resolutions, morning business is closed.

ASSISTANT CLERKS OR MESSENGERS TO SENATORS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I desire to call up Senate resolution 15.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution referred to by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], which was reported by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The proposed substitute will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committees on Coast and Insular Survey, on Enrolled Bills, on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department, on Expenditures in the Departments of Commerce and Labor, on Standards, Weights, and Measures, on Expenditures in the Department of State, on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game, on National Banks, on Public Health and National Quarantine, on Geological Survey, to Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands, on the Mississippi River and its Tributaries, on Pacific Railroads, on Railroads, on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard, on the University of the United States, on Woman Suffrage, to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service, on Indian Depredations, on Transportation and Sale of Meat Products, on Engrossed Bills, on the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress, on Private Land Claims, on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, on Revolutionary Claims, on Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia, on conference of the minority of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to employ one assistant clerk each, at $1,200 per annum, to be paid from "miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law: *Provided*, That if any of the committees recited above already have three employees the resolution shall not apply to them, except that this proviso shall not apply to the conference of the minority of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am informed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] will not further insist upon the amendment which he offered at the last session of the Senate. I therefore move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say that that will be perfectly agreeable to the Senator from North Dakota. He asked me to make the same motion, and I want to explain to the Senate, inasmuch as he is absent from the Chamber at this time, that it is satisfactory to him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment heretofore proposed by the Senator from North Dakota to the amendment of the committee in the nature of a substitute.

The SECRETARY. The amendment proposed by Mr. MCCUMBER was, on page 2, line 19, to amend the amendment by striking out "$1,200" and inserting "$1,400."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Mississippi to lay the amendment to the amendment on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the words "assistant clerk," in line 19, page 2, be stricken out and that the word "messenger" be inserted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I accept the amendment, so far as I can.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 19, after the word "one," it is proposed to strike out the words "assistant clerk" and in lieu thereof to insert the word "messenger."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah to the amendment reported by the committee in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee in the nature of a substitute as amended.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I think we ought to have a statement as to what the status of the measure will be as amended. The matter was before the Senate the other day, and there seemed to be very great differences of opinion as to what was the proper construction of this proposed measure. I should like to have it stated now what will be the status.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest that the Secretary read the resolution as reported from the committee. The Senator can get the information he wants from that. It is perfectly plain.

Mr. SMOOT. Omitting the long list of committees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Inasmuch as the Senator from Georgia wants to know what it is, the Secretary can read them.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I am induced to make the request from the fact that there was such a difference of opinion on a former occasion among Senators who are in favor of this measure as to what it meant. I want to know if they are now agreed upon it, and what it does include. Some Senators were of the opinion that it reduced all of these clerks or messengers, whichever you may choose to call them, to $1,200; but other Senators said that it only reduced a certain number of them to $1,200. Now, which is correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest that the resolution explains itself, and, if the Senator desires the information, the resolution may be read. There is not a particle of doubt about what it means.

Mr. LODGE. The resolution, Mr. President, if I may say so, does not explain itself. It cuts down a certain number of men who are now receiving as messengers $1,440.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no doubt about that fact. It is perfectly plain.

Mr. LODGE. That does not appear on the face of the resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It does appear on the face of the resolution.

Mr. LODGE. It is an inference naturally from it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; what the resolution does is this: There are now upon the rolls of the Senate 10 so-called special messengers, who have been detailed at the request of Senators to serve certain committees. This resolution does away practically with the details, and enables Senators to appoint those men as messengers to their committees, whereupon they cease to be special messengers upon the general roll of the Senate, and immediately thereupon their salaries are reduced from $1,440 to $1,200, and all the nominal committees of the Senate, some of which now have $1,200 men and some have $1,440 men, are put upon an equal footing. These men were named to the special-messengers' roll by the Senators who wanted them, and the Senators who wanted them will want them again; but now they go off of that roll and go on the roll as messengers of particular committees, and they go off the special roll at $1,440 and go on a committee roll as $1,200 men.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What I meant in saying that there could be no doubt about the resolution, was simply that there could be no doubt about that fact. The only danger is that the Sergeant at Arms might reappoint other men to fill the places of these men; but this is a party matter; it is done under the dictates of a majority caucus. I will say, by the way, that as an original proposition I was not in favor of giving any other assistance to seven or eight of these committees; but I am obeying that behest, and of course the Sergeant at Arms will obey it, and there will be no appointments to fill the vacancies upon the special list made by these appointments.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. He speaks of a list of special messengers. Are not all messengers carried upon a general messenger roll or messenger list?

Mr. WILLIAMS. They are; but these 10 or 11 men, or whatever the number may be—I have forgotten the exact number—have already been detailed to serve these committees. Nobody will be appointed to fill their places as messengers.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I understand that; but the Senator was not strictly accurate when he said there was a special messenger list.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I meant a detailed messenger list.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Is there a detailed messenger list? Are not these men detailed from the general messenger list?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That is what I wanted to know. Now, will the Senator inform us how many are on the messenger list of the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know.

Mr. SMOOT. Thirty-seven.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know that these 11 are there, and these 11 have been detailed.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. LODGE. There are 37.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Thirty-seven?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thirty-seven. This will reduce the messenger list from 37 to 26, and we will take care of them when we come to the appropriation bill later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee in the nature of a substitute for the original resolution as amended on motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should like to have the resolution as amended read, so that we may understand exactly what it is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committees on Coast and Insular Survey, on Enrolled Bills, on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department, on Expenditures in the Departments of Commerce and Labor, on Standards, Weights, and Measures, on Expenditures in the Department of State, on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game, on National Banks, on Public Health and National Quarantine, on Geological Survey, to Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands, on the Mississippi River and its Tributaries, on Pacific Railroads, on Railroads, on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard, on the University of the United States, on Woman Suffrage, to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service, on Indian Depredations, on Transportation and Sale of Meat Products, on Engrossed Bills, on the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress, on Private Land Claims, on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, on Revolutionary Claims, on Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia, on conference of the minority of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to employ one messenger each, at $1,200 per annum, to be paid from "miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law: *Provided*, That if any of the committees recited above already have three employees, the resolution shall not apply to them, except that this proviso shall not apply to the conference of the minority of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I want to make one explanation to the Senate about the last clause of the substitute. The minority conference have always had four employees. That is something that always has been granted by the majority to the minority, and of course we want to grant it now. Therefore this exception was made from the proviso.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the case, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, reported by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, for the original resolution as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. KERN. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock meridian.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Mr. THOMAS obtained the floor.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield for a moment to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. CHILTON. I desire to move at this time what would be the regular order, as I understand—that we take up Senate bill 577, authorizing the President to appoint an additional circuit judge for the fourth circuit, and consider it.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Colorado has given notice that he desires to speak to-day immediately after the routine morning business.

Mr. CHILTON. That is true, and he has kindly allowed me to make this motion.

Mr. BRISTOW. The bill will cause considerable debate before it can be passed.

Mr. CHILTON. How much time will it take?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do not know. I want the Senate to understand just what it is doing. I think we had better let the bill go over and take it up some other day.

Mr. CHILTON. No; that does not suit me at all. This is the regular order, and I do not want it to go over. Of course, if it is going to take up the Senator's time, I will give notice that when the Senator finishes his remarks I will make this

motion. I do not intend to have the bill keep going over all the time. It is the regular order; it is on the calendar; it is the only bill on the calendar; and I certainly can move to take it up or proceed with the regular order. I do not wish to disturb the Senator from Colorado, but I give notice that when he shall have finished, no matter when that time may be, I shall make this motion.

Mr. BRISTOW subsequently said: Mr. President, recurring to the bill to which the Senator from West Virginia has referred, I desire to say that I do not care to take any great length of time in discussing it. A very few minutes will satisfy me. If the Senator from Colorado is willing for it to be taken up now, I am perfectly willing that it shall be taken up and considered.

Mr. THOMAS. I was willing at the outset, Mr. President, but so much time has been consumed that I feel as though I should not be asked to yield the floor, because the matter might take more time than seems probable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

AMENDMENT OF ANTITRUST ACT.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I call up the bill S. 112, striking out the words "unreasonable or undue" inserted by the Supreme Court of the United States into section 1 of the act of Congress of July 2, 1890.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate, and the Senator from Colorado will proceed.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask the Secretary to read Senate bill No. 112.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 112) to restore section 1 of the act of Congress of July 2, 1890, chapter 647, Twenty-sixth Statutes at Large, to its original form as enacted by striking out the words "unreasonable or undue," inserted therein by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, introduced by Mr. THOMAS April 7, 1913, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the words "unreasonable or undue," inserted by the Supreme Court of the United States on May 15, 1911, by its decision of the case entitled "Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey et al. v. The United States," between the words "in" and "restraint of trade or commerce," where these words occur in section 1 of the act of Congress of July 2, 1890, chapter 647, Twenty-sixth Statutes at Large, page 209, commonly known as the antitrust act, be, and the same are hereby, stricken out and repealed, and that the said section of said statute be restored to its original form, structure, and meaning as the same was enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SEC. 2. That in all actions, civil or criminal, now pending or to be instituted against any person or corporation for a violation of the provisions of said act, and in all appeal from or writs of error to review any judgment, decree, or conviction rendered or secured therein, against any person or corporation by the United States, or by any person or corporation, the courts of the United States shall interpret and apply the said act according to its terms, language, and provisions as the same was originally enacted and as the same will read as hereby amended, and not otherwise.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am not accustomed to speaking from written manuscript. I prefer the more direct and satisfactory method of oral statement and discussion. I have made an exception, however, to the rule which I have generally followed, because of the importance, in my opinion at least, of the proposition which is involved in this bill, and also because I think it is a subject which requires precision of statement. I shall therefore trespass upon the patience of the Senate by reading what I have to say.

On the 15th day of May, 1911, the Supreme Court of the United States announced its opinion in the case of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and others versus The United States. The case had been submitted on March 16, 1910, after an oral argument of three days' duration. It was restored to the docket on April 11 following, and was reargued on January 12, 13, 16, and 17, 1911.

On May 29, 1911, the same court handed down its decision in the case of United States versus American Tobacco Co., which had also been twice argued and submitted. These decisions wrote qualifying words into a Federal statute which profoundly altered its meaning and restricted its purpose.

On July 26, 1911, the Senate referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce a resolution:

That the Committee on Interstate Commerce is hereby authorized and directed, by subcommittee or otherwise, to inquire into and report to the Senate at the earliest date practicable what changes are necessary or desirable in the laws of the United States relating to the creation and control of corporations engaged in interstate commerce, and for this purpose they are authorized to sit during the sessions or recesses of Congress, at such times and places as they may deem desirable or practicable; to send for persons or papers; to administer oaths; to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses; to conduct hearings and have reports of same printed for use; and to employ such clerks, stenographers, and other assistants as shall be necessary, and any expense in connection with such inquiry shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee.

In obedience to the requirements of this resolution, the committee conducted hearings extending over a period of more than three months, took much testimony, and made its report to the Senate on February 26, 1913. Its work was comprehensive. Its report is brief, concise, and illuminating. Whatever view may be entertained of the recommendations of the majority of its members, there can be but one sentiment as to the tremendous and immediate importance of the subject and the necessity for national legislation concerning it at the present session of Congress if possible—at the ensuing regular session in any event. And it is equally certain that this legislation should be comprehensive in its scope and unmistakable in its character; that it should be applicable to all persons and corporations engaged in interstate commerce; that it should be applied and enforced by executive agencies with promptness and efficiency, and that it should be relieved as far as Congress can relieve it from those perils of judicial decree which the existing law has encountered, with unfortunate results to it and to those whom it was designed to serve. Otherwise the enforcement of the antitrust laws, however complete in their purpose and clear in their details, will drift from the executive into the judicial department of the Government and, like some of their predecessors, be lost in the shoals and quicksands of construction and interpretation.

Believing that until the substance and the form of our scheme of government shall have undergone radical changes, some of which are concededly desirable, the power to legislate is vested in Congress, subject only to the Executive power of veto, I assert it to be both our right and our duty to make that power effective. It is our right under the Constitution. It is our duty if we would continue the right unimpaired and make our laws operative in the manner and to the extent that we enact them. The Federal courts long ago assumed the prerogative of pronouncing upon the validity of national statutes and have exercised it since the decision in Marbury against Madison. They have also exercised the right of construction, which is a perfectly legitimate one when confined to instances where language has been at fault with resulting ambiguities. And they have more recently changed the phraseology of a statute, which means legislation by decree. It is no reflection upon the integrity, the character, or the motives of judges to say this, for it is a self-evident fact and one which calls for counteraction by Congress if we would give effect to the popular demand as expressed in legislation. To do less is to renounce our powers in passive assent to their invasion by another department.

It was said many years ago that the power to interpret laws is the power which legislates. This is true, because the power may be and, in fact, is frequently applied to laws which are wholly free from ambiguity and which, therefore, interpret themselves. To undertake the construction of such a law is to distort its meaning and to change its application. This is but saying that such a law when interpreted is not the law as enacted; it is a different one, and becomes so by a process which is nothing less than legislation.

And the power to legislate by interpretation involves the power to interpret the same statute more than once and in more than one direction, so that the same law may be subject to change with every controversy that appeals to it for final solution. This is not a healthy condition of things, but it is far less dangerous to our institutions than one which rests upon the assumption of power to insert words and phrases into the body of a law by judicial decree. That is something more than interpretation; it is interpolation; it is legislating directly and specifically. And the power to interpolate words and phrases includes the power to strike out or subtract them whenever that may be the preferable or more expedient method of procedure. When one department of any government has authority to declare the laws of that government to be unconstitutional, to interpret their provisions when interpretation is to alter their meaning, to enforce them as interpreted to add words to or subtract words from them, and expound and enforce them as thus reconstructed, that department is supreme. It is a department in name only. Its attributes are sovereign in scope and character. It is the government for all essential purposes; and it is not a republican or representative government. It may be that the power to set aside laws of Congress because they are believed to be unconstitutional is indispensable to the integrity of our institutions. While I do not concede it, I enter upon no discussion of the question at this time. I shall content myself by referring to the historic fact that four attempts were unsuccessfully made by some of its framers to insert into the Constitution this power to declare laws invalid, each of which was rejected by decided majorities. From this I naturally infer that it has no place in our National Charter except as it has been located there by what is called "necessary implication." I maintain, however, that the common practice of

interpreting statutes and the later one of adding words to them by the courts are the natural offspring of this assumed power to set them aside altogether. I am mindful of the fact that the courts have always declared that they can not invalidate a statute if they can construe it conformably with constitutional requirements; that is to say, to their view of such requirements. This not only suggests—it invites construction, and precedent begets precedent; so that construction is frequently invoked, whether the statute impinges upon the Constitution or not. One canon of construction is to ascertain and then apply the legislative intent which will not be presumed to be in conflict with the limitations of the Constitution, and such intent must be gleaned from the phraseology of the law. But this may prove a difficult task, in which case the judges sometimes recast the statute. And so the latest phase of the development of this prerogative, where the meaning of a statute is challenged, is that if the intent can not be ascertained from the language employed, or if such intent does not conform to the judicial view of what it should be, the addition of a word or two by the court will supply the intent as the court determines it should be, and the decree is entered accordingly. In its last analysis the statute is changed to suit the views of the court, although there may be nothing ambiguous or unconstitutional about it. Is it extravagant to assert that through the evolution of this power to invalidate the laws of Congress we are being transformed from a republican to a judicial system of government?

Congress is frequently compared to the British Parliament, and as frequently contrasted with it. The House of Representatives is supposedly analogous to the House of Commons. The American Senate is sometimes facetiously, sometimes seriously, called the American House of Lords. But apart from the fact that money bills must originate with the House of Representatives, there is little resemblance between it and the House of Commons. Our powers are now limited, not only by a written Constitution, but by another department which asserts and exercises the power to examine, to construe, to approve, to change, or to invalidate the laws we enact. They become effective at the pleasure of the courts. The real analogy to the British Parliament, therefore, is furnished by the Supreme Court of the United States. Its laws, like those of the Parliament, are supreme. Its decrees, like those of Parliament, are not subject to change unless itself shall so declare. The President may veto what we do here, but we can override his veto. And he, with all his authority, can not lawfully insert a punctuation point between two words in any act of Congress, while the courts, under the exercise of a jurisdiction which, though conferred by the Constitution, is regulated by Congress, may declare its meaning and amend or set it aside at discretion.

If these conditions are to continue, if they are to be treated as a permanent feature of our national polity, I can perceive no certain relief from the evils which the so-called Sherman Act was designed to mitigate through any additional legislation which Congress in its wisdom may enact. For we can not safely assume that such legislation, however framed, will not suffer the same judicial surgery so recently administered to the parent law. We may safeguard our action by every known precaution that language vouchsafes; we may declare what construction that language shall receive, and yet awake some morning to learn from the courts that we never meant what we said, or never said what we meant, or did not mean to say what we said, or should have said something more or something less than what we actually said, and which is said for us, because we did not say what we should have said. And this final pronouncement becomes the law, not for all the people, but for those involved in the particular case. It is subject to readjustment in successive stages of future litigation. We may again resort to legislation and thus seek to reach the evil, but reach instead the same or more undesirable result.

Mr. Jefferson foresaw and deplored these conditions. In 1820 he declared that if the judges became the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions, we would be placed under the despotism of an oligarchy. A year later he thus wrote to a friend:

> It has long been my opinion that the germ of dissolution of our Federal Government is in the constitution of our Federal judiciary, an irrepressible body (for impeachment is scarcely a scarecrow) working by gravity by day and by night, gaining a little to-day and a little to-morrow, and advancing its noiseless steps like a thief over the field of jurisdiction.

But Mr. Jefferson's wisdom, though beyond that of nearly all his contemporaries, could not foresee that the judiciary, though working like gravity, would ever assume the power to write into an act of Congress words that were never meant to be there, and which Congress deliberately refused to put there, thus profoundly changing its scope and meaning and thereby transferring to itself the authority to execute or suspend its provisions.

Such a power is more than arbitrary. It savors of despotism. It is incompatible with free institutions. The courts of no other nation ever dared to exercise it. The people of no other nation would tolerate it. Plato said that government, by whatever name it might be called, would always be the government of the strongest man. We may paraphrase this aphorism by asserting that our Government, though called republican, is the government of the Supreme Court. Clothed with authority to set aside, to construe, and to make laws, it is above Congress, above the President, above the Constitution, and above the people. It is omnipotent.

Nothing more vividly illustrates the constant extension of judicial authority, and the far-reaching scope of its overshadowing prerogative, than the history of the fourteenth amendment. This child of the Civil War was designed above all other things to confirm and guarantee the civil rights of the negro, and to safeguard him against the menace of unfriendly State legislation. But for this reason it probably would not have been presented, and certainly would not have been ratified by the States.

I am familiar, in a general way, with the debates which attended its course through Congress, and with the emphasis which the courts have in more recent times placed upon the larger field it was designed to cover, that property as well as life and liberty was insecure and needed the protection of the Federal authority. I know that Senator Conkling reminded the circuit court of the ninth judicial circuit, in 1882, that when the amendment was first considered individuals and joint-stock companies were appealing for congressional and administrative protection against insidious and discriminating State and local tax laws. But such considerations were in those days of reconstruction as chaff before the wind.

The rights of the newly emancipated negro appealed to the dominant political party for adequate protection. That party desired to enfranchise him and use his vote to perpetuate its power. It responded by presenting and ultimately forcing the passage and ratification of the fourteenth amendment. Its beginnings are found in a resolution offered in the House by Thaddeus Stevens on December 5, 1865, proposing an amendment in these terms:

> All National and State laws shall be equally applicable to every citizen, and no discrimination shall be made on account of race and color.

From this germ sprang the celebrated amendment whose several provisions were unfolded as discussion of the subject proceeded in committee and on the floor. Throughout all the deliberations of that memorable period the civil rights of the freedman was the dominant note, the cardinal subject of consideration. These found expression in various forms and finally in that which became effective by adoption and ratification. Of this I think there can be no dispute. I shall therefore refer but very briefly to the debates which attended its course through the Congress.

Senator Howard, of the Reconstruction Committee, said:

> It establishes equality before the law, and it gives to the humblest, the poorest, the most despised of the race the same rights and the same protection before the law as it gives to the most powerful, the most wealthy, the most haughty. Without this principle of equal justice to all men and equal protection under the shield of the law there is no republican government and none that is really worth maintaining.

Senator Poland, in urging the provision for the equal protection of the laws, said:

> It is the very spirit and inspiration of our system of government, the absolute foundation upon which it was established. It is essentially declared in the Declaration of Independence and in all the provisions of the Constitution. Notwithstanding this, we know that State laws exist, and some of them of very recent enactment, in direct violation of these principles. It certainly seems desirable that no doubt should be left existing as to the power of Congress to enforce principles lying at the very foundation of all republican governments if they be denied or violated by the States.

Similar expressions from the lips of leading statesmen of that eventful era might be quoted, but it is unnecessary. We know that human rights were the transcendent issue, and that property rights were entirely secondary to their consideration. It may be that the property interests quietly but effectively made a Trojan horse of the amendment, whereby they might sometime gain access to the heart of the citadel. Subsequent events justify this assertion, for they have been the chief if not the sole beneficiaries of the amendment. It is indeed a striking commentary upon the wisdom and forethought of man that a fundamental addition made to the Constitution of the United States to protect and to preserve and enforce the civil and political rights of 3,000,000 of newly made freedmen has by judicial construction and application for nearly 50 years been converted into an effective agency for the accomplishment of almost

every end save that for which it was designed, and but for which it would never have been enacted.

The unfortunate people whom this amendment was chiefly intended to serve have been excluded from the ballot box and from juries. They have been subjected to discrimination in every direction. They have never been equal before the law. I say this in no spirit of criticism. I merely state a solemn truth. And these people have vainly appealed to the fundamentals of the fourteenth amendment and prayed for their vindication by the Federal courts many times through the intervening years. They have been told judicially that Congress was not empowered by the fourteenth amendment to enact so much of the civil-rights act of 1875 as was intended to secure equal accommodations at inns, places of public amusement, and in public conveyances without distinction of race or color, since the applicable provisions of the amendment have reference solely to State action (Civil Rights cases, 109 U. S., 3); that a State statute providing for separate railway carriages for the white and colored races and the assignment of passengers thereto according to their race deprived a colored person of no rights under the fourteenth amendment (Plessy *v.* Ferguson, 163 U. S., 537); that the equal protection of the laws is not denied to colored persons by a State constitution which makes no discrimination against them in terms, but which grants a discretion to certain officers which can be used to the abridgment of the right of colored persons to vote and serve on juries, but it is not shown that its actual operation is evil, but only that evil is possible under it. (Williams *v.* Mississippi, 170 U. S., 213.)

These and kindred decisions largely conclude the application of the amendment to personal guaranties. Their reasonings are the result of earnest contention and quite as earnest consideration. I pass them with two reflections. The first is that they chronologically follow the cases of Bowman *v.* Lewis (101 U. S., 22), the Slaughter House cases (16 Wall., 36), and Re Virginia (100 U. S., 313), which held in effect that the main purpose of the last three amendments was the freedom of the African race, the security and perpetuation of that freedom, their protection from the white men who had formerly held them in slavery, and the prohibition of the States by the fourteenth amendment from abridging the privileges and immunities thereby granted.

The other reflection is that the decisions denying the application of the fourteenth amendment to the colored race challenged the vigorous disapproval of Justice John M. Harlan. He dissented in toto from the conclusions of his associates, and insisted upon giving to the amendment that effect which its framers designed, extending its provisions for the protection of life and liberty, and the vindication at all times of the privileges and immunities of the citizen.

But those who invoked the provisions of the amendment for the protection of property rights and the vindication of property claims were more fortunate. The story is a long one, too long for this discussion, perhaps, yet most illustrative of its purpose; for it is a history of construction, whereby the whole scope, purpose, and effect of a constitutional provision have been transformed.

It begins with the Slaughter House cases, reported in Sixteenth Wallace, page 36, where a monopoly sought to evade the regulations of a State statute by invoking the shelter of the fourteenth amendment through the claim of taking property without due process of law. The Supreme Court, in this the first important controversy involving the amendment, declared the primary purpose of the first clause thereof to have been designed to confer citizenship on the negro race, and, secondly, to give definitions of citizenship of the United States and citizenship of the States, recognizing by these definitions the distinction between them. That the second clause protects from hostile legislation the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States as distinguished from those of citizens of the States. That it was not necessary to inquire into the full force of the clause forbidding a State to enforce any law which deprives a person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, since that phrase had often been the subject of judicial construction and was under no admissible view of it applicable to the present case.

It also held that the clause which forbids a State to deny to any person the equal protection of the laws was clearly intended to prevent the hostile discrimination against the negro race, so familiar in the States where he had been a slave, and for that purpose the clause conferred ample power upon Congress to secure his rights and his equality before the law. The right of the Louisiana butchers to protection against the operation of the Louisiana statute from the fourteenth amendment was denied, and the slaughterhouse monopoly was destroyed.

This great case was heard and decided in 1872 by judges occupying the bench when, or immediately after, the amendment was adopted. They were personally cognizant of its history, its causes, and its objects. They were conversant with its authors, its advocates, and its opponents. The opinion was delivered by Justice Miller, one of the greatest judges who ever adorned the bench. In his conclusions he thus disposed of the complainants' contention as to their rights under the amendment:

> It would be the vainest show of learning to attempt to prove by citations of authority that up to the adoption of the recent amendments no claim or pretense was set up that those rights depended on the Federal Government for their existence or protection beyond the very few express limitations which the Federal Constitution imposed upon the States, such, for instance, as the prohibition against ex post facto laws, bills of attainder, and laws impairing the obligations of contracts. But with the exception of these and a few other restrictions the entire domain of the privileges and immunities of citizens of the States, as above defined, lay within the constitutional and legislative power of the States and without that of the Federal Government. Was it the purpose of the fourteenth amendment by the simple declaration that no State should make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States to transfer the security and protection of all the civil rights which we have mentioned from the States to the Federal Government? And when it is declared that Congress shall have power to enforce that article, was it intended to bring within the power of Congress the entire domain of civil rights heretofore belonging exclusively to the States? All this and more must follow, if the propostion of the plaintiffs in error be sound. The argument, we admit, is not always the most conclusive which is drawn from the consequences urged against the adoption of a particular construction of an instrument. But when, as in the case before us, the consequences are so serious, so far-reaching and pervading, so great a departure from the structure and spirit of our institutions, when the effect is to fetter and degrade the State governments by subjecting them to the control of Congress, in the exercise of powers heretofore universally conceded to them of the most ordinary and fundamental character; when, in fact, it radically changes the whole theory of the relations of the State and Federal Governments to each other, and of both these governments to the people, the argument has a force that is irresistible, in the absence of language which expresses such a purpose too clearly to admit of doubt. The argument has not been much pressed in these cases that the defendants' charter deprives the plaintiff of their property without due process of law, or that it denies to them the equal protection of the law. The first of these paragraphs has been in the Constitution since the adoption of the fifth amendment as a restraint upon the power of the States. The law, then, has practically been the same as it now is during the existence of the Government, except as far as the present amendment may place the restraining power over the States in this matter in the hands of the Federal Government. We are not without judicial interpretation therefore, both State and National, of the meaning of this clause and it is sufficient to say that under no construction of that provision that we have ever seen or any that we deem admissible can the restraint imposed by the State of Louisiana upon the exercise of their trade by the butchers of New Orleans be held to be a deprivation of property within the meaning of that provision:
>
> "Nor shall any State deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."
>
> In the light of the history of these amendments and the pervading purpose of them, which we have already discussed, it is not difficult to give a meaning to this clause. The existence of laws in the States where the newly emancipated negroes resided which discriminated with gross injustice and hardship against them as a class was the evil to be remedied by this clause, and by it such laws are forbidden.

Four years afterwards Munn against Illinois was decided. In that great case it was held that down to the time of the adoption of the fourteenth amendment it was not supposed that statutes regulating the use or even the price of the use of private property necessarily deprived an owner of his property without due process of law. Under some circumstances they may, but not under all. That the amendment does not change the law in this particular; it simply prevents the States from doing that which will operate as such deprivation. That when the owner of property devotes it to a use in which the public has an interest he, in effect, grants to the public an interest in such use and must, to the extent of that interest, submit to be controlled by the public for the common good as long as he maintains the use. He may withdraw his grant by discontinuing the use. That rights of property, and to a reasonable compensation for its use, created by the common law, can not be taken away without due process; but the law itself, as a rule of conduct, may, unless constitutional limitations forbid, be changed at the will of the legislature. That the great office of statutes is to remedy defects in the common law as they are developed and to adapt it to the changes of time and circumstances. That the limitation by legislative enactment of the rate of charge for services rendered in a public employment, or for the use of property in which the public has an interest, establishes no new principle in the law, but only gives a new effect to an old one. (94 U. S., 113.)

The doctrine of these two cases seems incontrovertible. Its steady application to subsequent controversies involving them would have made trusts and combinations impossible. There could have been no trust question at this time to vex the liberties of the people or confound the faculties of statesmen. It was recognized and enforced in the so-called Granger cases and some others, but the decisions were obnoxious to the purposes

and developments of the great property interests. They were analyzed, criticized, dissented from, and denounced by certain sections of the press, by some of the law magazines, by lawyers, by laymen, and by some of the judges on the bench. Capital expressed concern, as it always does when laws and constitutions are expounded and enforced in opposition to its purposes, "lest investments be impaired and progress halt"

These tactics and influences have long since prevailed, and the principle announced and applied in the Slaughterhouse and Illinois cases have been asphyxiated by a continued process of adverse construction. It is true that no subsequent opinion expressly disapproves them. They are still occasionally quoted with that solemn dignity that is the due of the living to the dead, but their force and vitality are gone. They gradually but surely yielded to the lingering and lethal malady of construction. Step by step the inflowing tide of new decisions, which defined, confined, distinguished, modified, and attenuated, has overwhelmed them. In the process State courts, State statutes, the rules of the common law, the ordinances of great municipalities, the checks and balances of State constitutions, and solemn enactments of the Congress of the United States have been swept away. In consequence the authority of the Federal courts has been stretched over the entire domain of civil and criminal jurisprudence. The humblest controversies of these days are magnified into alleged transgressions of the sacred restrictions of the fourteenth amendment, relating to property rights, and Federal jurisdiction therefore attaches. All known forms of litigation either knock at the door of the Nation's courts or are carried there for determination under the far-reaching arm of the fourteenth amendment. It is said that 30 per cent of the business of these courts relies on that amendment for their jurisdiction, about 15 per cent of which involves its application to the facts in controversy. Every institution operating under charter, every person enjoying a franchise and claiming immunity from taxation or from local interference, every emigrant corporation from another State or from across the sea which fears or challenges the regulation of the local authority, every overcapitalized enterprise dropsical with watered bonds and stocks, demanding the right to tax its patrons without regard to its actual investment, every promotion dreading the inquisitorial powers of State tribunals operating under State laws, seek and find shelter under the protecting aegis of the fourteenth amendment as it has been defined, enlarged, and extended by the judicial authority of the Nation.

I shall not trace the development of this polity in detail. Anyone can do so who cares to arm himself with a digest of the Federal decisions. I feel impelled, however, to refer to some of its earlier stages.

As Justice Harlan dissented from the decisions invoking the principles of the amendment to safeguard the rights of persons, so Justice Field dissented from those in the Slaughterhouse case and in Munn *v.* Illinois, which involved the rights of things. That dominating personality declared at the outset for every demand of property under the amendment. His resentment toward the prevailing opinions of his brethren in these early cases breathes through every line of his vigorous protests. They are written in the spirit and with the zeal of the partisan. Those who challenged the soundness of the majority opinions found ample material for their opposition in his virile periods, and doubtless had an abiding faith in his ability to make them ultimately effective.

The opportunity came in California in 1882, in the case of San Mateo County *v.* The Southern Pacific Railway Co. (13 Fed., 722.) The railway company there contested the validity of certain taxes assessed by some of the counties of California against its property, and invoked the so-called prōperty clause of the fourteenth amendment for the defeat of the tax. Mr. Justice Field journeyed to San Francisco to hear and decide it. The railway company employed illustrious counsel to defend its contention. Among them were Roscoe Conkling and George F. Edmunds, who were Senators of the United States when the fourteenth amendment was enacted. These noted lawyers gave all their great talents to the cause. Their arguments were historical as they were legal. The accounts they then gave of the amendment's history have been since quoted in arguments and in the decisions in subsequent controversies. They prevailed in the instant case, and Justice Field incorporated them in a zealous opinion followed by judgment for the railway company. The following year this opinion was duplicated by the same justice in the cases of Santa Clara County *v.* Southern Pacific Co. (16 Fed., 385.) These decisions were written in deliberate disregard of the doctrines of the Supreme Court in the Slaughterhouse and Illinois cases. Mr. Justice Field in his last opinion did not so much as refer to either of them, although he quoted copiously from the arguments of Conkling and Edmunds in the San Mateo case.

Both were taken to the Supreme Court. The first was dismissed upon the ground that there no longer existed a cause of action. (116 U. S., 138.) The second was a series of cases which were affirmed because the tax complained of was void under the constitution and laws of California, in consequence of which the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States was not involved at all, hence Justice Field's elaborate dissertations upon it in the court below were entirely outside the record. (118 U. S., 394, 417.)

To this result he submitted, but with poor grace.

I regret—

Said he (p. 422)—

that it has not been deemed consistent with its (the court's) duty to decide the important constitutional questions involved, and particularly the one which was so fully considered in the circuit court, and elaborately argued here, that in the assessment upon which the taxes claimed were levied an unlawful and unjust discrimination was made between the property of the defendant and the property of individuals, to its disadvantage, thus subjecting it to an unequal share of the public burdens, and to that extent depriving it of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution.

The learned justice then proceeds very frankly to say why his regret is so profound. He continues:

At the present day nearly all the great enterprises are conducted by corporations. Hardly an industry can be named that is not in some way promoted by them, and a vast portion of the wealth of the country is in their hands. It is therefore of the greatest interest to them whether their property is subject to the same rules of assessment and taxation as like property of natural persons, or whether elements which effect the valuation of property are to be omitted from consideration when it is owned by them and considered when it is owned by natural persons, and thus the valuation of property be made to vary, not according to its conditions or use, but acording to its ownership. The question is not whether the State may not claim for grants of privileges and franchises a fixed sum per year or a percentage of earnings of a corporation—that is not controverted; but whether it may prescribe rules for the valuation of property for taxation which will vary according as it is held by individuals or by corporations.

Mark, now, the prediction:

The question is of transcendent importance, and it will come here and continue to come until it is authoritatively decided in harmony with the great constitutional amendment which insures to every person, whatever his position, the equal protection of the laws.

The learned justice was not content with the decision of the court that the things he clamored against were prohibited by the constitution and laws of the State of California. He was eager to crystallize his construction of the amendment into the law of the land, and impatient of his inability to do so in the instant case, while prophesying with truth that the corporate interests of the land would persevere in their efforts until their interests and ambitions rested under the shadow of the "great amendment."

It is an axiom of the law that those parts of a decision which are obiter dicta or unessential to the decision itself are outside the case. They are not authoritative. They may be persuasive but nothing more. Hence Justice Field's pronouncements in the California Tax cases in the circuit court have no place in the domain of case law. Yet I do not hesitate to affirm that they have for over 30 years been the magazine from which most of the weapons have been drawn for the demolition of the Slaughterhouse and Illinois decisions. During that period I have tried many cases and read many briefs involving the Protean phases of the fourteenth amendment, and have yet to be confronted with one which does not find its ultimate lodgment in these opinions. They prevailed long before Justice Field passed away. He lived to see them triumphant, to see the fourteenth amendment "authoritatively decided in harmony" with his conclusions. And he also lived to invalidate the decisions of his own court for a hundred years sustaining the power of Congress to levy an income tax, and to deny that authority to the National Government. This he regarded as an assault on capital. He said in the Income Tax cases (157 U. S., 607):

The present assault on capital is but the beginning. It will be but the stepping-stone to others larger and more sweeping till our political contests become a war of the poor against the rich, a war constantly growing in intensity and bitterness. If the purely arbitrary limitation of $4,000 in the present law can be sustained, none having less than that amount of income being assessed or taxed for the support of the Government, the limitation of future Congresses may be fixed at a much larger sum—at five or ten or twenty thousand dollars—parties possessing an income of that amount alone being bound to bear the burdens of government, or the limitation may be designated at such an amount as a board of walking delegates may deem necessary.

The learned justice thus clamored against the exercise of a legislative power which through the exigencies of war or insurrection might become indispensable to the Nation's very existence; a power wielded by every other nation in the world, a power sustained by the court itself from the beginning of its history. But it was wholly inconsistent with his own point of view, which long before had become the standard of his judicial utterances.

The contrast between himself and his great associate is graphically portrayed in Justice Harlan's comment upon the majority view of the court in these cases:

I can not assent to an interpretation of the Constitution that impairs and cripples the great powers of the National Government in the essential matter of taxation and at the same time discriminates against the greater part of the people of our country. The practical effect of the decision to-day is to give to certain kinds of property a position of favoritism and advantage inconsistent with the fundamental principles of our social organization, and to invest them with power and influence that may be perilous to that portion of the American people upon whom rests the larger part of the burdens of the Government, and who ought not to be subjected to the dominion of aggregated wealth any more than the property of the country should be at the mercy of the lawless.

While my own judgment coincides with the correctness of Justice Harlan's view, I intend no aspersion of the motives or sincerity of those who, like Justice Field, entertained the opposite one. Both these great jurists were men of transcendent ability, of irreproachable character, of undoubted patriotism. Each believed in the integrity of his own and the unsoundness of the other's convictions. Each felt and portrayed the deplorable consequences which in his judgment must ensue from the prevalence of the adverse doctrine, and each asserted in the most vigorous English his own contention. They only represented and expressed from the bench that eternal contest between government by the few and by the many, between oligarchy and democracy, between Hamilton and Jefferson—a conflict which can not be adjusted, which began with the earliest glimmerings of popular government, and which will never end until the last shall wholly triumph.

It is no disparagement of Mr. Justice Field, but rather a tribute to his dominating personality and powerful intellect, to assert that through his persistency the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States has been largely substituted for the Constitution itself, that it is now far and away the most important if not the most vital portion of that great instrument, and that in exalting it to this position its guaranties of life and liberty have shrunken into comparative unimportance. No word has been written into or taken from its structure. Construction has been the magic wand of its transformation. But who that defends the right to thus change a statute can affirm that the courts may not, should their judgment so decree, thus qualify or enlarge the Constitution itself by the prevailing judicial practice of addition and subtraction? What argument can be advanced to support the one which does not as well apply to the other? Why may not the wisdom or the emergencies of the future demand the same heroic methods of treatment for both statutes and constitutions? Those who regard the courts as sacrosanct may shudder at the thought of such a sacrilege, but I have yet to learn that the usurpation of power by any ruler halts with the first assertion of its exercise. The usurper—executive, legislative, or judicial—never belonged to the stand-pat wing of any party. He is compelled by the very fact of his usurpation to move on. He is a progressive in spite of himself, and his goal is only attainable by repeated acts of added usurpation.

The question is not whether the judicial arm of the Government would or would not exercise so dangerous a prerogative if possessed of it. We may safely assume that it would not, especially as that arm is now constituted. The question is whether the existence of such a power anywhere is compatible with the institutions of the country, and whether modern expansions of judicial power are not leading up to it. Apprehension, suspicion, fear itself are admirable qualities in the citizens of a republic. When aroused by the action of the ruler, they become potent elements for the preservation of the country's institutions. I am always glad to see public sentiment inflamed when anything unusual in government occurs. I rejoice when protests and unfriendly criticism follow the action of the public servant, and more so when they are stimulated by omissions of public duty. These things manifest a healthy condition of the body politic. "Look not for a time," said Wendell Phillips, "when the people are quiet and safe. At such a time despotism like a shrouding mist steals over the mirror of freedom." The sea keeps pure because it is ever in agitation. And republics are possible only when the tides of public comment and criticism ceaselessly ebb and flow.

Nothing in recent years has so powerfully arrested public attention and directed it toward the growing power of the judiciary as the Standard Oil and Tobacco decisions. The average citizen caught his breath when he heard them. The press held them up to the public gaze and turned them around and around so that they could be seen from every direction. Learned lawyers and essayists condemned and commended them. Preceding decisions involving the same statute and announcing totally opposite conclusions became familiar to everyone. The order of their occurrence is so admirably outlined in pages 4 to 10, inclusive, of the committee's report that I ask permission to here incorporate them in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the matter will be printed as requested.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The committee selects for the purpose indicated the following cases, all of which arose under the statute now being considered:

United States *v.* E. C. Knight Co. (156 U. S., 1).
United States *v.* Trans-Missouri Freight Association (166 U. S., 290).
United States *v.* Joint Traffic Association (171 U. S., 505).
Hopkins *v.* United States (171 U. S., 578).
Northern Securities Co *v.* United States (193 U. S., 197).
Standard Oil Co. *v.* United States (221 U. S., 1).
United States *v* American Tobacco Co. (221 U. S., 106).
United States *v.* Union Pacific Railroad Co. (not yet reported, opinion delivered Dec. 2, 1912).

The committee does not give a statement of the facts in each of these cases, for to do so would greatly prolong the report, and it will be taken for granted that those who are interested in the subject are already familiar with the facts as they appear in the Supreme Court reports.

The rule of law announced in United States *v.* Knight Co. and in Hopkins *v.* United States is that a restraint of trade however unreasonable is not prohibited by the antitrust statute, no matter how general or disastrous the interference or restraint may be upon commerce among the States, unless it directly affects such commerce. There is a general understanding among the judges and lawyers of the country that the Knight case has been overruled or modified in subsequent decisions. Undoubtedly it can be fairly inferred from the recent opinions of the court in like cases that, if the facts of the case were now presented, it would be held that the restraint was direct; but the rule of law established has never been questioned by the court and has been emphatically reasserted in every prominent opinion hitherto rendered. The committee does not bring these cases forward for the purpose of disputing the soundness of the rule under existing legislation. Its object is to disclose, as clearly as possible, the scope of judicial discretion, and therefore of business uncertainty which it creates. In every prosecution under the act wherein there is proven or admitted a contract or combination which restrains trade among the States, the first thing that the court must ascertain and declare is whether the restraint is direct or indirect. In the Knight and Hopkins cases, and others of that type, it was held to be indirect. In the Northern Securities Co., Standard Oil Co., and American Tobacco Co. cases it was held to be direct. It is obvious that the opinion of any given man in any given case upon this question, whether he be judge or not, must depend largely, not upon his learning in the law but upon his training and bent in the economy of commerce. The result has been, and necessarily will be, that the law officer of the Government before he institutes a prosecution must determine whether the restraint is direct and immediate, and the court in order to decide the issue must employ the functions of the legislator rather than the lawyer.

The consequence is twofold: First, the Department of Justice will ignore a great many unlawful transactions because there will be doubt as to whether the interference with interstate or international trade is direct or indirect; second, the business community has found itself, and will find itself, in a state of uncertainty as to whether a particular transaction is to be judged by the law of the State or the law of the Nation. It is not claimed that this undefined and undefinable field of judicial discretion can be wholly occupied by legislation, but it is manifest that it is the duty of the legislative branch of the Government to circumscribe it within the closest practicable bounds. The committee will recur to this subject in connection with another aspect of the judicial power, and contents itself now with a statement of its conclusion that there should be further legislation specifically prohibiting certain forms of association, combination, or monopoly which admittedly restrain trade and commerce among the States and with foreign nations, but which may be held by the courts to be indirect or remote interferences.

The committee has first referred to the point just mentioned, not because it is first in importance but because it first arose. It now passes to another and more serious weakness in the law as now interpreted.

In the Trans-Missouri Freight Association case there developed a controversy among the members of the Supreme Court that was carried on with unabated vigor through the 15 years intervening between the opinion in the Freight Association case and the opinion in the Standard Oil Co. case. In this period the vicissitudes of life and the changes upon the bench which necessarily ensued converted the opinion of the court in the Freight Association case into a single dissenting opinion in the Standard Oil Co. case, and the dissenting opinion in the former case into the opinion of the court in the latter case. In the Freight Association case Mr. Justice Peckham, in delivering the opinion of the court, said:

"Second. The next question to be discussed is as to what is the true construction of the statute, assuming that it applies to common carriers by railroad. What is the meaning of the language as used in the statute that 'every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, is hereby declared to be illegal'? Is it confined to a contract or combination which is only in unreasonable restraint of trade or commerce, or does it include what the language of the act plainly and in terms covers, all contracts of that nature" (p. 327)?

The learned justice answered the question thus propounded many times and in great variety of phrase in the course of the opinion, and the committee quotes some of these answers.

"When, therefore, the body of an act pronounces as illegal every contract or combination in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, etc., the plain and ordinary meaning of such language is not limited to that kind of contract alone which is in unreasonable restraint of trade, but all contracts are included in such language, and no exception or limitation can be added without placing in the act that which has been omitted by Congress (p. 328).

"But we can not see how the statute can be limited, as it has been by the courts below, without reading into its text an exception which alters the natural meaning of the language used, and that, too, upon a most material point, and where no sufficient reason is shown for believing that such alteration would make the statute more in accord with the intent of the lawmaking body that enacted it (p. 329).

"The arguments which have been addressed to us against the inclusion of all contracts in restraint of trade, as provided for by the language of the act, have been based upon the alleged presumption that Congress, notwithstanding the language of the act, could not have in-

tended to embrace all contracts, but only such contracts as were in unreasonable restraint of trade. Under these circumstances we are, therefore, asked to hold that the act of Congress excepts contracts which are not in unreasonable restraint of trade, and which only keep rates up to a reasonable price, notwithstanding the language of the act makes no such exception. In other words, we are asked to read into the act by way of judicial legislation an exception that is not placed there by the law-making branch of the Government, and this is to be done upon the theory that the impolicy of such legislation is so clear that it can not be supposed that Congress intended the natural import of the language used. This we can not and ought not to do (p. 340).

"The conclusion which we have drawn from the examination above made into the question before us is that the antitrust act applies to railroads, and that it renders illegal all agreements which are in restraint of trade or commerce as we have above defined that expression, and the question then arises whether the agreement before us is of that nature" (p. 341).

The issue was clearly joined by Mr. Justice White (now Chief Justice), who in his dissenting opinion, in which Justices Field, Gray, and Shiras concurred, thus stated the question:

"To state the proposition in the form in which it was earnestly pressed in the argument at bar, it is as follows: Congress has said every contract in restraint of trade is illegal. When the law says every, there is no power in the courts, if they correctly interpret and apply the statute, to substitute the word 'some' for the word 'every.' If Congress had meant to forbid only restraints of trade which were unreasonable it would have said so; instead of doing this it has said 'every,' and this word of universality embraces both contracts which are reasonable and unreasonable" (p. 345).

The distinguished justice begins his answer to the proposition just quoted as follows:

"I commence, then, with these two conceded propositions, one of law and the other of fact, first that only such contracts as unreasonably restrain trade are violative of the general law, and, second, that the particular contract here under consideration is reasonable, and therefore not unlawful if the general principles of law are to be applied to it" (p. 344).

Again:

"Its title is 'An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.' The word 'unlawful' clearly distinguishes between contracts in restraint of trade which are lawful and those which are not. In other words, between those which are unreasonably in restraint of trade, and consequently invalid, and those which are reasonable and hence lawful" (p. 352).

Again:

"If these obvious rules of interpretation be applied, it seems to me they render it impossible to construe the words 'every restraint of trade' used in the act in any other sense than as excluding reasonable contracts, as the fact that such contracts were not considered to be within the rule of contracts in restraint of trade was thoroughly established both in England and in this country at the time the act was adopted" (p. 354).

Again:

"Indeed, it seems to me there can be no doubt that reasonable contracts can not be embraced within the provisions of the statute if it be interpreted by the light of the supreme command that the intention of the law must be carried out, and it must be so construed as to afford the remedy and frustrate the wrong contemplated by its enactment" (p. 355).

It will be noted that but once in the dissenting opinion is the word "unreasonable" used to qualify the phrase "in restraint of trade." It is generally employed to qualify the word "contract." There is some difference between saying that there may be a reasonable interference with competition or freedom in trade or freedom to trade which did not, at the common law, constitute a restraint of trade, and saying that there can be, under our statute, a reasonable restraint of trade. But this was only the beginning.

Two years later the suit of the United States *v.* Joint Traffic Association came on for decision. Again Mr. Justice Peckham delivered the opinion of the court, and upon the point we are considering there seems to have been no change in the attitude of the members of the court toward it. It is instructive to observe, however, that in referring to Hopkins *v.* The United States, in which the opinion was handed down at the same term, the learned justice said:

"In Hopkins *v.* The United States, decided at this term, post, 578, we say that the statute applies only to those contracts whose direct and immediate effect is a retraint upon interstate commerce * * * the effect upon interstate commerce must not be indirect or incidental only" (p. 568).

Five years thereafter the well-known Northern Securities case was decided, and the struggle was renewed with intense earnestness. Mr. Justice Harlan rendered the opinion of the court, and this is the way he stated the question:

"Is the act to be construed as forbidding every combination or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce among the States or with foreign nations? Or does it embrace only such restraints as are unreasonable in their nature? Is the motive with which a forbidden combination or conspiracy is formed at all material when it appears that the necessary tendency of that particular combination or conspiracy in question is to restrict or suppress free competition between competing railroads engaged in commerce among the States? Does the act of Congress prescribe, as a rule for interstate or international commerce, that the operation of the natural laws of competition between those engaged in such commerce shall not be restricted or interfered with by any contract, combination, or conspiracy?" (p. 328).

In answering the question he probably goes a little further than Justice Peckham. He states as the conclusion to be drawn from former opinions of the courts:

"That the act is not limited to restraints of interstate and international trade or commerce that are unreasonable in their nature, but embraces all direct restraints imposed by any combination, conspiracy, or monopoly upon such trade or commerce; * * *. That every combination or conspiracy which would extinguish competition between otherwise competing railroads engaged in interstate trade or commerce, and which would in that way restrain such trade or commerce, is made illegal by the act; * * *. That to vitiate the combination, such as the act of Congress condemns, it need not be shown that the combination in fact results or will result in a total suppression of trade or in a complete monopoly, but it is only essential to show that by its necessary operation it tends to restrain interstate or international trade or commerce or tends to create a monopoly in such trade or commerce and to deprive the public of the advantages that flow from free competition (p. 331).

"Whether the free operation of the normal laws of competition is a wise and wholesome rule for trade and commerce is an economic question which this court need not consider or determine. Undoubtedly there are those who think that the general business interest and prosperity of the country will be best promoted if the rule of competition is not applied. But there are others who believe that such a rule is more necessary in these days of enormous wealth than it ever was in any former period of our history. Be all this as it may, Congress has in effect recognized the rule of free competition by declaring illegal every combination or conspiracy in restraint of interstate and international commerce" (p 337).

Mr. Justice Brewer was with the majority of the court in the Trans-Missouri Association case, and he concurred in the decision in the Northern Securities Co. case; but upon the question we are discussing he rejected the reasoning of Justice Harlan and adopted the views expressed by Justice White in the former case. He said:

"Instead of holding that the antitrust act includes all contracts, reasonable or unreasonable, in restraint of interstate trade, the ruling should have been that the contracts there presented were unreasonable restraints of interstate trade, and as such within the scope of the act. That act, as it appears from its title, was leveled at only 'unlawful restraints and monopolies.' Congress did not intend to reach and destroy those minor contracts in partial restraint of trade which the long course of decision at common law had affirmed were reasonable and ought to be upheld. The purpose rather was to place a statutory prohibition with prescribed penalties and remedies upon those contracts which were in direct restraint of trade, unreasonable, and against public policy. Whenever a departure from common-law rules and definitions is claimed, the purpose to make the departure should be clearly shown. Such a purpose does not appear and such a departure was not intended" (p. 361).

The Chief Justice and Justices White, Peckham, and Holmes dissented. Justice White, while discussing many phases of the relation between the General and the State Governments, finally rested his opinion upon the Knight case, holding that there was no direct restraint of interstate commerce. Justice Holmes, while concurring with Justice White, took occasion to say, in substance, that the method adopted by the defendants for the suppression of competition did not constitute a restraint of trade in the sense of the antitrust law.

With the Northern Securities case there terminated one distinct, striking period in the interpretation and application of the antitrust statute. It is needless to inquire at length whether or not the views of the court, as expressed in the opinions of Justices Peckham and Harlan, were in exact harmony with the common law as to the meaning or definition of the phrase "restraint of trade." Even if these learned judges were not quite successful in distinguishing the difference, at the common law, between a restraint of competition and a restraint of trade it still remains true that for more than 13 years repeated decisions of the highest tribunal of the country had declared that every contract or combination which prevented free competition was a restraint of trade, and that, if the restraint directly affected commerce among the States, then the contract or combination was unlawful, under the first section of the act.

Inasmuch as the committee is of opinion that legislation should be so clear in its terms as not to admit of unlimited judicial discretion, it pauses here a moment to point out just what the range of discretion was under the decisions ending with the Northern Securities case. It is manifest that the inquiry that the court was then required to make in each case was this: Has the evidence established a restraint of trade; that is to say, has the evidence established a contract or combination which interfered with free competition?

There was some, but not great, latitude for difference of opinion upon such an inquiry, and the uncertainty in the application of the law was reduced to a minimum; nor would the uncertainty have been much increased if the inquiry had been as to an unreasonable interference with free competition, which would have been the inquiry had the common-law understanding been strictly adopted by the Supreme Court.

If the more recent construction of the statute were in harmony with the earlier decisions, further legislation might nevertheless be required; but it is unnecessary to make the inquiry. That question is purely academic, for the later rulings have completely reversed the former ones, in so far as the phase of the subject now being discussed is concerned.

On the 15th day of May, 1911, the case of the Standard Oil Co. *v.* The United States was passed upon by the Supreme Court. Chief Justice White (formerly Justice White) delivered the opinion and reiterated, as the conclusion of the court, the views that he had so forcibly urged as a dissenter 15 years before. It was not necessary for the court to deal with the question at all, inasmuch as it found the defendants guilty of a restraint of trade under any and every meaning of the term, but for the very purpose, the committee assumes, of advising the country that a new rule had been adopted so that business might be guided by it, it was stated in the most emphatic way imaginable that the statute which declares that "Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations is hereby declared to be illegal" means that a contract or combination in order to be illegal must cause an undue restraint of trade. The following quotations from the opinion will need no comment:

"That in view of the many new forms of contracts and combinations which were being evolved from existing economic conditions, it was deemed essential by an all-embracing enumeration to make sure that no form of contract or combination by which an undue restraint of interstate or foreign commerce was brought about could save such restraint from condemnation. The statute under this view evidenced the intent not to restrain the right to make and enforce contracts, whether resulting from combination or otherwise, which did not unduly restrain interstate or foreign commerce, but to protect that commerce from being restrained by methods, whether old or new, which would constitute an interference that is an undue restraint" (pp. 59, 60).

Again:

"In other words, having by the first section forbidden all means of monopolizing trade—that is, unduly restraining it by means of every contract, combination, etc.—the second section seeks, if possible, to make the prohibitions of the act all the more complete and perfect by embracing all attempts to reach the end prohibited by the first section" (p. 61).

That the Chief Justice intended to announce a rule at variance with the declarations of Justice Peckham and Justice Harlan in the Trans-Missouri Freight Association and Northern Securities cases is made clear in the following extracts:

"The question is pertinent and must be fully and frankly met, for if it be now deemed that the Freight Association case was mistakenly decided or too broadly stated, the doctrine which it announced should be either expressly overruled or limited. * * * And in order not in the slightest degree to be wanting in frankness, we say that in so far, however, as by separating the general language used in the opinion in

the Freight Association and Joint Traffic cases from the context and the subject and parties with which the cases were concerned, it may be conceived that the referred to conflicts with the construction which we give the statute, they are necessarily now limited and qualified" (pp. 68, 69).

The learned Chief Justice contends that this rule of construction, which he repeatedly calls the "rule of reason," must be applied in order to prevent the entire overthrow of the statute.

It is one of the interesting things in our judicial history that so great had been the change in the personnel of the court that when the dissenting opinion of Justice White in 1896 became the opinion of the court in 1911 Justice Harlan was the only member remaining to protest against the reversal. He recorded his dissent in one of the most vigorous opinions that can be found in the reports, but for the purposes which the committee has in view it is not necessary to do more than to mention it.

Justice Harlan has passed away, and it may be assumed that the Supreme Court is now unanimously in favor of the doctrine so often and so ably promulgated by Chief Justice White. The rule was reasserted in the American Tobacco Co. case and has not since been questioned by any member of the court.

It is true that in the important opinion rendered in the suit of the United States v. The Union Pacific Railroad Co., Justice Day says:

"The act is intended to reach combinations and conspiracies which restrain freedom of action in interstate trade and commerce and unduly suppress or restrict the play of competition in the conduct thereof"—

Citing as authority the Joint Traffic Association case.

It is true also that the court quotes, with apparent approval, the following extract from Mr. Justice Harlan in the Northern Securities case:

"In all the prior cases in this court the antitrust act has been considered as forbidding any combination which by its necessary operation destroys or restrains free competition among those engaged in interstate commerce; in other words, that to destroy or restrict free competition in interstate commerce was to restrain such commerce."

But thereafter the court says:

"In the recent discussion of the history of the meaning of the act in the Standard Oil Co. and Tobacco Co. cases this court declared that the statute should be given a reasonable construction with a view to reaching those undue restraints of interstate trade which are intended to be prohibited and punished."

The fair conclusion is that it is now the settled doctrine of the Supreme Court that only undue or unreasonable restraints of trade are made unlawful by the antitrust act, and that in each instance it is for the court to determine whether the established restraint of trade is a due restraint or an undue restraint.

Whatever may be the opinion of the several members of the committee with respect to the soundness of the rule as now established, the committee as a whole accepts it as the present law of the land. It is profoundly convinced that, in view of the rule and its necessary effect upon the business of the country, the inherent rights of the people, and upon the execution of the statute it has become imperative to enact additional legislation.

Mr. THOMAS. True to his convictions, Justice Harlan again dissented from the reasoning, although accepting the conclusions of his brethren in these later cases. His opinion, Two hundred and twenty-first United States, page 106, should be carefully read by every man and woman in the land. He emphasized the fundamental proposition that Congress alone could amend its laws, that it had expressly refused to make the specific amendment to the antitrust act, which the Supreme Court had determined to make on its own account, and closed his discussion with the solemn warning that—

after many years of public service at the National Capital, and after a somewhat close observation of public affairs, I am impelled to say that there is abroad in our land a most harmful tendency to bring about the amending of constitutions and legislative enactments by means alone of judicial construction.

I think I have used no more forceful language, up to this time at least, Mr. President, than that employed by the learned justice. He continued:

The supreme law of the land—which is binding alike upon all, upon Presidents, Congresses, the courts, and the people—gives to Congress, and to Congress alone, authority to regulate interstate commerce, and when Congress forbids any restraint of such commerce in any form all must obey its mandate. To overreach the action of Congress merely by judicial construction—that is, by indirection—is a blow at the integrity of our governmental system, and in the end will prove most dangerous to all.

In a special message of July 7, 1910, to Congress President Taft said:

It has been proposed, however, that the word "reasonable" should be made a part of the statute, and then that it should be left to the courts to say what is a reasonable restraint of trade, what is a reasonable suppression of competition, what is a reasonable monopoly. I venture to think that this is to put into the hands of the court a power impossible to exercise on any consistent principle which will insure the uniformity of decision essential to just judgment. It is to thrust upon the courts a burden that they have no precedents to enable them to carry, and to give them a power approaching the arbitrary, the abuse of which might involve our whole judicial system in disaster.

Truer and wiser words were never uttered. Coming from such high authority they were entitled to unusual weight. They preceded the decisions by more than a year. When these came they contained no indication that the President's counsels had ever been heard, much less considered, by the majority of the court.

Having emphasized the evils associated with the judicial administration of the statute, and having declared that the amendment if made by Congress would impose upon the courts the duty of administering it, the country very naturally expected from the President some expression of disappointment if not of disapproval of the court's announcements. But with an easy complacence worthy of Polonius he hastened to express his approval of them. He voiced his satisfaction with their conclusions quite as vigorously as he had previously asserted his objections to them. They seemed to him to be consonant with the text of the law as they would be useful in the determination of future controversies arising under it. I do not wish to speak unkindly of our former Executive whose genial and companionable traits of character appealed strongly to all who came in contact with him and whose sincere desire to properly discharge the duties of this great office does not admit of question. But the best intentions are valueless when companioned by weakness and vacillation. The Executive who counsels with earnestness and with wisdom, but who applauds when his counsels are flatly rejected, can not long enjoy the confidence of the people or the respect of his coordinates. The President's change of front regarding this most important statute was one of the most unfortunate if not the most conspicuous of the many shifting policies of his administration, for it gave Executive sanction to a piece of judicial legislation against the enactment of which by Congress he had strongly and successfully protested. Moreover, he officially recognized the right of the courts to make and alter the laws of the Nation by judicial decree. The people were amazed at this inconsistency; they resented it, and their disapproval found subsequent expression in public discussion at the primaries, in the national conventions, and at the polling places. They have been impelled beyond all these. As the source and depository of all political power, they are asserting their right to finally determine for themselves the validity of the laws which their representatives make and which their courts transform. When they established this Government they divided its authority into three departments, coequal and coordinate. They do not view the usurpation by one of these departments of an authority conferred by them upon another with equanimity, and will prevent it if they can. They believe they can do so by setting these usurpations aside. That these acts of usurpation are called judicial decisions is beside the question. That does not detract from their inherent character nor mitigate their consequences.

The people are therefore beginning very seriously to consider whether they shall not appeal from these decisions to themselves and set them aside as they assume to set aside or reconstruct the laws of the land. Whether the people shall finally resolve to assert this right depends largely upon the courts themselves and upon such action as the Congress may take or may decline to take in the premises. It may be that the equilibrium between the departments can not be maintained; that the needs of the country have outgrown its continuance; that experience has demonstrated its impracticability. But if it is to be modified or readjusted or overthrown, we may be sure that the people will themselves ultimately so determine and rearrange the distribution of power as they shall deem desirable or necessary. Whether the process they adopt for the readjustment is to be the recall of decisions or some other process is unimportant. The fundamental factor in the equation is their right to make and enforce their own laws as a majority of themselves shall decide.

If Congress offends the electorate by running counter to its will, its Members may be recalled at the polls. If the President offends the electorate, he is shorn of his power by a withdrawal of popular confidence, and goes to the scrap heap at the end of his term. But if the courts persist in making or changing laws the people must seek other remedies, for the judges owe no tenure to the people. Between the courts and omnipotence nothing substantial intervenes. What, then, shall be done? The answer is obvious. It has been given, and the recall of decisions is on the high road of things that are to be.

I know full well that this power may be subject to abuse, but not more so, not as much so, in truth, as the abuse that has summoned it to the service of freemen. I know that the courts may be more deliberate than the mass, but the results of deliberation do not quicken and spread abroad the sense of injustice unless they be wrong. I know that the people in mass is called the mob, but the reproach is a slander on popular government. The people are always conservative. It was "the mob" which resisted the oppressions of the Crown, which sustained the newborn American Government, which condemned and overthrew the institution of slavery, which resists the encroachments of present-day plutocracy, and which is in rebellion against the exercise of political authority by the courts.

If those who decry or dread the potency of the recall can devise a better means of confronting and overthrowing this last manifestation of absolutism in a Republic, they owe it to themselves and the people to conceive and bring it forth, for the time for action seems at hand.

Solomon said there was nothing new under the sun. The assertion of the recall does not conflict with the wise man's

precepts. It is a new name for an old theory; a new method of applying an old remedy. The right has been successfully asserted several times in our history. In Cohens *v.* Virginia (6 Wheat., 264) the Supreme Court held that it had appellate jurisdiction of a controversy in which a State was a party. The people promptly recalled the decision by adopting the eleventh amendment to the Constitution.

The alien and sedition laws were Dead Sea fruits of the first Adams administration. They were offensive to the people of that era. They were not in touch with the spirit of our newly founded Republic. They were vigorously and effectively enforced by grand juries and by the courts. They aroused the implacable hostility of the masses, who rose in revolt against them. The people overturned the administration which was responsible for them, destroyed the party which enacted them, and then struck them from the statute books. They recalled the President, the Congress, and the laws themselves. During the progress of their political battle they were called mobs, rioters, and the rabble, unfit for self-government, and a menace to all forms of law and order. Their leaders were stigmatized as demagogues and charlatans, appealing to the baser instincts of the multitude for the gratification of ignoble and dangerous ambitions. But the cause was the old one of privilege against the masses in one of its many forms, and the masses won. The recall became effective, and the abuse against which it was then directed was swept aside.

In Dred Scott *v.* Sanford (19 How., 393) it was held that Congress could not lawfully exclude slavery from the Territories. This decision was recalled by the people, speaking through the rattle of musketry and the thunder of cannon during four long years of strife and bloodshed. They achieved their purpose at an appalling sacrifice of blood and treasure, and crystallized their ultimate decree in the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution.

It was held in the Income Tax cases that the Nation was without authority to raise revenues by that method. The sixteenth amendment has recalled the edict, and until some other decision shall narrow its purpose or deny its efficacy the General Government may lay the burdens of its operations upon wealth as readily as upon consumption.

I realize the force of the criticism that recall by constitutional amendment is the exercise of a fully conceded authority, while recall by popular vote is wholly beyond and above the recorded ways. But we can not amend the Constitution with the occurrence of every bad decision. The process is a tedious and involved one. It is not always possible of accomplishment. Nor can we longer rely upon its efficacy, for if laws can be interlined by judicial decree, so may constitutions be interlined. As laws have been made over by judicial construction, so clauses of the Constitution have been made over by judicial construction. The progress of a malady frequently makes ordinary remedies useless; the good physician resorts to more effective albeit more unusual ones when such an emergency confronts him.

The people of Great Britain and of her transoceanic dependencies, ourselves excepted, enjoy the blessings of liberty to a larger degree than any other nation. Their laws when enacted by Parliament are supreme. Their freedom needs no judicial guardian. They possess and exercise the power of recall. No majority of Parliament hostile to their will can survive. No serious division between their ministry and their commons can arise without being followed by a referendum. There the so-called mob hears, judges, decides, and acts for itself. Must we, their descendants, the inheritors of their institutions, shrink from the application of the same expedients when demanded by public exigency because conservatism retreats into its corner and protests against innovation?

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, if it will not interrupt the Senator, I should like to call his attention to the fact that the British Parliament since 1701, by the act of settlement, has exercised substantially the right to recall judges, and since that time they have had no trouble with their judges. Forty-eight of the States of the United States have two ways of removing judges. Thirty-six of the States have three ways of removing or recalling judges, and three States have four ways of removing judges. The United States can only recall by impeachment, a useless remedy except against criminal conduct.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Senator for his interruption.

The Rev. Myron Reed, a famous preacher of Denver, once said that the people might not always be right, but they always wabbled in the right direction. All of us, collectively, are the people, but the mass consists of those whom Lincoln called the common people, and whom he said the Lord loved, else he would not have made so many of them. These have always constituted the bone and sinew of the country, the very warp and woof of the national fabric. They make and mold the sentiment of the times. They shape our lines of action. They hold the Republic in the hollow of their hands. It is these people who are concerned in preserving our institutions, who are fully alive to the evils of the assertion and exercise of absolute power by any but themselves, and who propose in some effective manner to counteract its last and most sinister manifestation.

The proposal to strike from a statute a word not appearing upon its face is concededly paradoxical. It will doubtless be regarded by some as impossible; by others as absurd. Were conditions otherwise than as we know them to be, both these conclusions would be correct. But the law that is written upon the statute books is not the law that is enforced by the courts. They have rewritten it, and their record of the law supplants that of Congress for every practical and substantial purpose. As enacted by Congress, all restraints of trade were outlawed. As rewritten by the court, unreasonable restraints of trade are alone prohibited. The anomaly involved in the legislative repeal of an interpolated word is no more remarkable than was its insertion into the law by judicial enactment. The proposed repeal is nothing more than legislative restoration of the law to its normal status. If the act seems extraordinary, it must be remembered that the occasion requiring it is more so. If the method of our procedure is without precedent, it is because the exigency confronting us is of similar character. If we can not repeal the amendment of a national statute because the courts made the amendment, it must be equally apparent that the courts were without power to make it, and it is therefore void.

On the other hand, if such authority be lodged in the courts, any change they see fit to make in the laws is valid and binding upon all men. If that be true, the legislative power to amend and to repeal the laws extends to such changes as well as to the laws of its own creation. You can not deny to Congress the right to strike words out of a statute when inserted by judicial decree if you concede to the courts the power to so insert them. And the fact that the insertion does not appear upon the face of the law furnishes the strongest possible argument in support of the right to strike it out, for the law must be certain, explicit, and intelligible. All men are presumed to know it. None can plead their ignorance of it. Yet how can the law be known if its language is a lie and its recitals a mockery? The laws of Draco were suspended so far above the people that they could not read and therefore could not know them. All men have access to ours, but some of them mislead the reader, albeit their contents seem clear. To make them certain, to keep them explicit, every change in their structure or their substance should appear upon the statute books, and not buried under the ponderous phraseology of learned judicial opinions.

The amendment which I have proposed is demanded by the underlying principle of equality. Laws to be respected and effective must be impersonal and impartial. They must extend to and embrace all men alike. If aimed at particular classes, they must affect alike all members thereof. Failing this, they cease to be laws. They are pronouncements only. They crush some while exempting others. Their operation is spasmodic, fitful, and dependent upon conditions or contingencies whose existence or absence is determined by extraneous forces. They are invested with every element of painful uncertainty. Those who are immune to-day are to-morrow on the deadly circuit of their influence. Such a law is unworthy of a despotism; it should be impossible in a republic.

Such in effect, nevertheless, is our so-called Sherman law since the Standard Oil and Tobacco decisions. It is no longer of uniform operation. It is a yardstick that shrinks or stretches whenever invoked for public or private protection. It is controlled by a higher law called the rule of reason. This rule is lodged in the minds and is evolved from the mental processes of the judges. It holds the statute in solution and precipitates it or fails to do so, as every given case appears to warrant or require. Men can not safely embark in new enterprises or continue old ones while these uncertain and fitful conditions exist. That certainty of object and of expression which every statute should possess, that knowledge of their requirements and of the consequences of their breach to which every citizen is entitled, and that uniformity and impartiality of operation without which laws are tyrannies, oppressive, and unjust unite in demanding the immediate restoration of this important law to its original form and purpose. If this can not be done, it should be repealed unconditionally.

The people are seldom radical. They are law-abiding. They do not abuse their strength. They have never menaced any of the powers which they have delegated to their rulers. Every peril we have encountered, every abuse of authority, every perversion of the laws to untoward purposes, have proceeded from those who decry the populace, denounce them as mobs,

deny their right to govern themselves. Two years ago the mayor of New York City said:

No one, however rich, need ever be afraid of the people. The people are not revolutionary by nature. They are never dishonest. Even in the French Revolution, when they destroyed prisons and fortresses, not a bank was looted. The Bastile was torn down, but the Bank of France remained undisturbed.

It is, of course, true that the people of France in the frenzy of the moment, with centuries of oppression behind them and with power to avenge their accumulated wrongs, indulged in wild excesses of retaliation. But we must remember that it was the same people who visited stern justice upon the heads of their own monsters, and that the French Revolution has by the long since recorded verdict of posterity been recognized as the greatest single step forward in the history of civilization. And while we fervently pray and fondly hope that the recurrence of such an event may never mark or mar the progress of the race, we must realize that the surest method of its avoidance is to recognize and remove the causes which wrought the great upheaval.

The right to sit in ultimate judgment upon the validity of our laws rests and should rest with the people. They possess all power not delegated to the Government. They have expressly reserved it. They never delegated to any department the power to set aside the laws made by their representatives, unless they delegated it indirectly or by necessary implication. But that could not be, for their delegates to the constitutional convention several times declined to do so by express action. If its possession by any department is essential to the existence or the continuance of the Government, they should delegate it. But they can not be estopped from denying that they have indirectly done so merely because they have so long submitted to its assumption and exercise. And since evolution has transformed the judiciary into a law-making body, a condition has been evolved which the body of the people will meet and overcome if Congress does not do so. We must therefore rise to the occasion lest we fall with it. Should we fail to act, ours will then be the responsibility.

The most sinister effect of these decisions upon the public mind, and which I deplore as much as anyone, is the strength they have added to the apprehension that the Federal courts lean toward privilege and away from the masses. Those who so believe ground their faith upon the antecedent decisions involving the same statute upon the shelter afforded to centralized industries by the provisions of the fourteenth amendment as construed and enforced, by the gravitation of practically all controversies affecting corporate action and organization to the Federal jurisdiction, and by the general trend of Federal decisions. However much these views may be condemned the fact that they are entertained and expressed by a constantly increasing number of men and women in every section of the Union is so obvious that it can not be overlooked. However well or ill founded the sentiment may be, we must reckon with and do what we can to correct it. Yet this is not merely difficult; it is impossible while they can find support in the decisions which are the equivalents of legislation, which relieve Congress of the consequences of enacting bad laws, if they are bad, by shaping them to the judicial view, and which deprive them of the merit of enacting good laws, if they are good, by recasting them into the judicial molds. The people must believe in the courts though they lose faith in all other governmental agencies, if the Republic shall endure. They will so believe so long as the courts conform both in the letter and the spirit to the limitations of the Constitution. If the popular confidence is ever wholly lost, the fault will not be theirs. It will be embedded in the history of the national jurisprudence, in the unfolding and the progress of its extension of power through the exercise of political authority, disguised under the forms of judgments and decrees.

Mr. President, since preparing my remarks upon this bill my attention has been called to Document 1106 of the Senate, a speech of Mr. Justice Holmes, delivered at a dinner of the Harvard Law Association in New York. I find among other admirable sentiments a passage that seems to me to be peculiarly apposite to this branch of the discussion. He says:

It is a misfortune if a judge reads his conscious or unconscious sympathy with one side or the other prematurely into the law, and forgets that what seem to him to be first principles are believed by half his fellow men to be wrong. I think that we have suffered from this misfortune, in State courts at least, and that this is another and very important truth to be extracted from the popular discontent. When 20 years ago a vague terror went over the earth and the word socialism began to be heard, I thought and still think that fear was translated into doctrines that had no proper place in the Constitution or the common law. Judges are apt to be naif, simple-minded men, and they need something of Mephistopheles. We, too, need education in the obvious—to learn to transcend our own convictions and to leave room for much that we hold dear to be done away with short of revolution by the orderly change of law.

Coming from such a high and pure source, Mr. President, I think I am justified in saying that it outlines a thought which has frequently occurred to me that the fear of something that is to come, which is expressed either by the word "socialism" or by some of its equivalents, has unconsciously, perhaps, thrown an influence about and around the judges of the courts as well as legislators and societies which expresses itself in preventing by some anticipatory course the things which are thus dreaded. Many decisions have been rendered which never ought to have been rendered, because they do not conform with the letter and spirit either of statutes or of constitutions. The singular thing is that history has not taught eminent men everywhere the great truth that nothing can arrest, although many things may impede, the general progress of humankind and the onward march of civilization. This fact is well expressed by the recent historian of the Roman Empire, who says that "when the times are ripe for great political changes neither parties nor statesmen can alter the stern logic of facts."

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, would it interrupt the Senator if I would put a question to him, or would he prefer to wait until he has completed his remarks?

Mr. THOMAS. If it is merely a question, I would be glad to answer it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is a question that involves a short discussion.

Mr. THOMAS. Then I would prefer to finish, because I have already consumed more time than I should have done.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will question the Senator, then, with his permission, at the close of his speech.

Mr. THOMAS. So far as I am concerned, the Senator may do so, if the Senate will bear with us.

It has therefore seemed to me pertinent to introduce the bill to which my remarks have been directed, and which proposes to repeal the amendment of the so-called Sherman Act by the decisions in the Standard Oil and Tobacco cases, restore the law to its original phrascology, and take from the courts the power of future legislation upon the subject. That Congress has power to do this does not admit of doubt. That by so doing and by further legislation qualifying and restricting the appellate power of the Circuit and Supreme Courts, Congress can remove practically all the evils demanding the recall of decisions by popular vote seems to me reasonably clear. We may thus satisfy all sorts and conditions of men, including those who favor and those who fear this efficient weapon of modern political warfare.

The power to enact laws includes the power to amend or to repeal existing ones. This power has in recent times been unsuccessfully challenged in those States which have adopted the initiative and referendum as regards laws enacted by direct legislation. I know of no exception to it save as to laws relating to the issue of bonds and securities which are contractual in their nature and which are frequently made nonrepealable until the obligations created by them shall have been discharged. The fact that the courts have amended a statute should prompt instead of deter legislative action concerning it.

Surely an amendment so effected can not operate both to change the law and render it immune to legislative action, especially when, as here, the judicial amendment is one which the legislative body expressly refused to enact and one which largely defeats the purpose of the law by making its operation depend upon the court's own view of each particular case as it arises thereunder. For since this amendment nobody knows nor can know what the law against combinations in restraint of trade is. The law is what a majority of judges may determine it to be from time to time, and a majority of the judges on the bench to-day may not be the same majority next year. A majority of the judges thought very differently about the law three or four years ago. A future majority may go back to the previous opinions or reject all of them for some other and different one. This is a situation where the law and the discretion of the court are identical, and all because it has inserted the word "unreasonable" into the body of the law—a word general and indefinite in its meaning, one which defies the lexicographers and illustrates the epigram of George Eliot that we are sometimes unable to define a thing in language except by defining and distinguishing it from something else. Let us, therefore, bring order out of this chaos by restoring the statute to its original structure and prohibiting all future alterations of it save as they may be made by ourselves.

This action should be accompanied by a prohibition upon all the courts against any further or other alteration of the phraseology of the statute, a precaution equally desirable in all future legislation relating to the same subject, bills concerning which will, I presume, receive the early consideration of the Senate. Our refusal to do this will subject future laws to the same judi-

cial perils which the pioneer statute has encountered and in the end may be made to express not what we meant but what the courts believe we should have meant.

The almost limitless range of the jurisdiction of the Federal courts should be restricted in the early future, and the appellate powers of the Supreme and circuit courts should be regulated without delay if we would check the rising tide of popular demand for the recall of decisions. I have said that the authority of the Supreme Court to alter a law on appeal rests upon acts of Congress. This is a fact with which all lawyers are familiar. As Congress gave so it may take away the unlimited right of review. It has done so in the past; the events of recent times require that it should do so again.

Section 2 of Article III of the Constitution declares that:

In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls, and those in which a State shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all other cases before mentioned the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

This clause confers appellate jurisdiction upon the Supreme Court, but the extent and mode of its exercise is left to the discretion of Congress. The latter may therefore impose, and has at all times imposed, such limitations upon the right of review as has seemed just and proper. Its power to do so has always been recognized.

It will be safest—

Said Hamilton—

to declare generally that the Supreme Court shall possess appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, and that this jurisdiction shall be subject to such exceptions and regulations as the National Legislature may prescribe. This will enable the Government to modify it as will best answer the ends of public justice and security. (Federalist, No. 81.)

When, in 1788, the Virginia convention assembled to ratify or to reject the proposed Federal Constitution, Patrick Henry argued earnestly against its adoption. One ground of his opposition was the rticle relating to the judiciary. He feared the extent to which the power therein conferred might be carried, and foresaw the annulment of laws enacted by the people's representatives. He warned his countrymen against the proposed Federation, and apprehended the possibility of forcible resistance to the aggressions of the Central Government.

Old as I am—

He said—

it is probable I may yet have the appellation of rebel.

It was John Marshall, afterwards the great Chief Justice, who opposed him and who reassured the convention. Said he:

The honorable gentleman says that no law of Congress can make any exception to the Federal appellate jurisdiction of facts as well as law. He has frequently spoken of technical terms and the meaning of them. What is the meaning of the term "exception"? Does it not mean an alteration and diminution? Congress is empowered to make exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction as to law and to fact of the Supreme Court. These exceptions certainly go as far as the legislature may think proper for the interest and liberty of the people. (Elliot's Debates, vol. 3, p. 559.)

In his Lectures on Constitutional Law, Justice Miller (p. 345) says:

The Congress, therefore, can control very largely the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court. It has been done so by passing laws at various times regulating that jurisdiction. One of its earliest enactments upon the subject was that no ordinary suit between individuals could come to the Supreme Court for revision unless the amount involved was over $2,000. It is now $5,000, and it has been urged that this should be enlarged to ten or twenty thousand dollars, either by the creation of some intermediate appellate tribunal or otherwise.

Judge Cooley declares in his Principles of Constitutional Law (p. 177) that—

The two very effective restraints which the legislature may interpose to the abuse of executive and judicial authority are: First, that which consists in the control over their jurisdiction; and second, the proceeding of impeachment. Much of executive authority comes, not from the Constitution, but from statute, and what is thus given may at any time be taken away. The same is true of the courts. Some of them are purely statutory courts and may be modified or abolished; all of them derive the most of their jurisdiction from statutes, and whenever this is abused it can be restricted or taken away. But it may also be modified or taken away on grounds of expediency or policy merely.

And Justice Story adds the weight of his great authority to the proposition in this language:

The appellate powers of the Supreme Court are not given by the judicial act of 1789. They are given by the Constitution. But they are limited and regulated by that act and other acts on the same subject. And when a rule is provided all persons will agree that it can not be departed from. (2 Story Con., 1773.)

If the power of Congress to strip the courts of appellate jurisdiction ever admitted of doubt, it was dispelled by the case of Ex parte McCardle and the legislation which determined and disposed of it. The student of American history will discover nothing of greater interest and importance than the events comprising that unique controversy, which illuminates with flash-light brilliancy the authority of the Congress to abridge the political attributes of the judiciary by laying an interdict upon the sources of its origin.

This case, like the fourteenth amendment, was an outgrowth of the Civil War. Among the acts of reconstruction was one which divided the Southern States into 10 military districts, the chief administrative heads of which were officers of the Army. This, like all the acts of reconstruction, was bitterly contested, not alone by the people of the South but by the President and his advisers. Under its operation northern as well as southern citizens were arrested for alleged offenses and their lives were placed in jeopardy. To relieve this unlooked-for condition the act of February 5, 1867, was passed, giving the right of appeal to the Supreme Court in habeas corpus proceedings arising under the reconstruction act. One W. H. McCardle, the editor of a newspaper in Mississippi, having been arrested on complaint charging him with libel and inciting to insurrection, availed himself of the benefits of the act, petitioned unsuccessfully for the writ, and appealed therefrom to the Supreme Court. His appeal was founded upon the contention that the reconstruction acts of Congress were unconstitutional and therefore void.

Popular sentiment voiced the impression that the Supreme Court would so decide, in which event the entire fabric of reconstruction would collapse, and with it the fortunes of the party which erected it. But that party controlled both Houses of Congress by formidable majorities, and their leadership was in the hands of the ablest men of the Nation. If the danger which menaced the very life of the party could be avoided by legislation, the pathway could be readily cleared. If not, the country must await the predicted catastrophe.

The leaders of the majority rose to the occasion. They invoked the authority conferred upon Congress by article 3, section 2 of the Constitution and determined to destroy the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court over the McCardle case. They accomplished their purpose by adding a short section to a pending bill, providing for writs of error to the Supreme Court in suits against revenue officers. This section merely repealed so much of the act of February 5, 1867—

as authorizes an appeal from the judgment of a circuit court to the Supreme Court of the United States, or the exercise of any such jurisdiction by such Supreme Court on appeals which have been or may hereafter be taken.

This measure naturally evoked vindictive opposition, but was passed, vetoed, and passed over the veto, thus becoming a law; after which a rehearing of the McCardle case was granted. Counsel for appellant earnestly contended against the power of Congress to legislate a case out of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court which had been taken there under existing laws, which had been argued and submitted, and which was on the eve of final decision, especially when such legislation, though general in terms, was notoriously and avowedly designed by its authors to affect that particular case. He said:

This court is coexistent and coordinate with Congress, and must be able to exercise the whole judicial power of the United States, though Congress passed no act on the subject. The judiciary act of 1789 has been frequently changed. Suppose it were repealed. Would the court lose, wholly or at all, the power to pass on every case to which the judicial power of the United States extended? This act of March 27, 1868, does take away the whole appellate power of this court in cases of habeas corpus. Can such results be produced? We submit that they can not, and this court, then, we further submit, can go on and pronounce judgment on the merits, as it would have done had not the act of March 27 been passed.

This case had been argued in this court fully. Passing then from the domain of the bar, it was delivered into the sacred hands of the judges, and was in the custody of the court. For aught that was known by Congress it was passed upon and decided by them. Then comes, on the 27th of March, this act of Congress. Its language was general, but as was universally known its purpose was specific. If Congress had specifically enacted "that the Supreme Court of the United States shall never publicly give judgment in the case of McCardle, already argued, and upon which we anticipate that it will soon deliver judgment contrary to the views of a majority in Congress of what it ought to decide," its purpose to interfere specifically with and prevent the judgment in this very case would not have been more real or, as a fact, more universally known. Now, can Congress thus interfere with cases on which this high tribunal has passed or is passing judgment? Is not legislation like this an exercise by the Congress of judicial power?

A more signal instance of deliberate interference with the decision of a specific existing controversy can not well be imagined. The law was retroactive in its operation, and intended to be so, since it deprived the court of jurisdiction duly acquired before its enactment; it was so designed because the law-making power apprehended the nature and dreaded the results of a decision perhaps already agreed upon. The court might with much reason and certainly with a large degree of contemporary popular approval have declined to recognize the ex post facto feature of the statute while bowing to the mandate in futuro, but it did not do so. The statute was

recognized in its entirety by a unanimous bench, and the right of Congress to make exceptions to and regulate the appellate jurisdiction of the court, both as to pending and to future controversies, was fully upheld.

It is quite true—

Said the Chief Justice, speaking for the court—

as was argued by counsel for the petitioner, that the appellate jurisdiction of this court is not derived from acts of Congress. It is, strictly speaking, conferred by the Constitution. But it is conferred "with such exceptions and under such regulations as Congress shall make." It is unnecessary to consider whether, if Congress had made no exceptions and no regulations, this court might not have exercised general appellate jurisdiction under rules prescribed by itself. For among the earliest acts of the First Congress, at its first session, was the act of September 24, 1789, to establish the judicial courts of the United States. That act provided for the organization of this court, and prescribed regulations for the exercise of its jurisdiction. The source of that jurisdiction and the limitations of it by the Constitution and by statute, have been on several occasions subjects of consideration here. In the case of Durousseau *v.* The United States (6 Cranch, 312) particularly the whole matter was carefully examined, and the court held "that while the appellate powers of this court are not given by the judicial act, but are given by the Constitution," they are nevertheless "limited and regulated by that act, and by such other acts as have been passed on the subject." The court said further that the judicial act was an exercise of the power given by the Constitution to Congress of making exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. "They have described affirmatively," said the court, "its jurisdiction, and this affirmative description has been understood to imply a negation of the exercise of such appellate power as is not comprehended within it."

The principle that the affirmation of appellate jurisdiction implies the negation of all such jurisdiction not affirmed having been thus established, it was an almost necessary consequence that acts of Congress providing for the exercise of jurisdiction should come to be spoken of as acts granting jurisdiction and not as acts making exceptions to the constitutional grant of it. The exception to the appellate jurisdiction in the case before us, however, is not an inference from the affirmation of other appellate jurisdiction. It is made in terms. The provision of the act of 1867 affirming the appellate jurisdiction of this court in cases of habeas corpus is expressly repealed. It is hardly possible to imagine a plainer instance of positive exception.

We are not at liberty to inquire into the motives of the Legislature. We can only examine into its power under the Constitution, and the power to make exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of this court is given in express words.

What, then, is the effect of the repealing clause upon the case before us? We can not doubt as to this: Without jurisdiction the court can not proceed at all in any cause. Jurisdiction is power to declare the law, and when it ceases to exist the only function remaining to the court is that of announcing the fact and dismissing the cause. And this is not less clear upon authority than upon principle. It is quite clear, then, that this court can not proceed to pronounce judgment in this case, for it has no longer jurisdiction of the appeal, and judicial duty is not less fitly performed by declining ungranted jurisdiction than by exercising firmly that which the Constitution and the laws confer. (7 Wall., 512–514.)

The appeal was therefore dismissed, and since all others arising under the same laws were prohibited the latter continued in full force and operation until they had effectuated their purpose. They may have been invalid. Congress may have exceeded its powers in enacting them, but it made its will effectual by depriving the judiciary of all power to place its veto upon them. The time is at hand when it should place a similar restraint upon the courts with reference to its existing and prospective antitrust legislation. It will thus destroy the incentive to delay the operation and defeat the requirements of such laws by litigation challenging their validity and designed to substitute the social and economic views of the judges for those of the Nation. It will thus put an end to the transfer of the administrative functions of these laws from the executive to the judicial department, a transfer which is not only opposed to our theory of government but which renders them practically ineffective. For it is self-evident that if each alleged violation of the laws must go through all the tedious processes of litigation, and then be disposed of upon its own particular facts, their operation is blocked through the sheer inability of the courts to dispose of them. Moreover, each instance becomes a law unto itself, and the statute instead of being a rule of conduct may become a juggler's wand, performing wonders that serve to amaze and deceive. The counsel of St. Paul to be all things to all men should never operate as a rule of construction for the written laws of a self-governing people.

Judicial administration is not only uncertain and variable in its operation but tedious and expensive as well. The record in the Standard Oil case embraces about 12,000 pages of printed matter bound in 23 volumes. This consisted for the most part of testimony involving transactions covering a period of some 40 years. It was begun in November, 1906, and ran over a period of nearly 5 years. The Tobacco case presents a similar condition, having been commenced in July, 1907. The expense attending their prosecution was prodigious. Other equally important proceedings arising under the same law are dragging their slow length along, and generations may come and go while the long procession of offenders against the law marches wearily from the commencement of suits against them in the trial court to the court of last resort. The interval is apt to be occupied with proposed changes in the law, with certain changes of sentiment as to its efficacy, with profound distrust of those public officials charged with its enforcement, but hampered by the pitfalls and technicalities of judicial procedure. The first pronouncement, however compliant with the purpose of the statute, is apt to be attended with reasonings not at all in accord with previous ones emanating from the same source, and this stimulates dissatisfaction as it begets lack of confidence in the wisdom of the bench. Every argument conspires for the withdrawal of the administration of these laws from the courts, and this can be effectuated only by denying their right to invalidate or to review them.

The majority report of the committee declares that if the prevailing method "continues in force the Federal courts will, as far as restraint of trade is concerned, make a common law for the United States, just as the English courts have made a common law for England." But the English common law consists of rules and customs deriving their force from decisions, and proceeding from what the Supreme Court of the United States in Kansas against Colorado calls "a first statement" or original announcement of the doctrine followed by its application to a present controversy. This makes a precedent for the solution of future controversies of similar character, and the system is evolved through a long line of rulings. The common law does not proceed from statutes, nor can it prevail when a statute conflicts with or changes it. But that common law which the Federal courts will make, so far as restraint of trade is concerned, will found itself on written laws which are altered or amended by decree. It is, in other words, the change of the written statute which will constitute the national common law. No such system is possible in any other country; it can flourish here only by altering or setting aside the written mandates of the National Legislature. To call it a system of common law is a misnomer; it is an anachronism, indefensible by reason, unsupported by precedent, unwarranted by the Constitution, and condemned by the principles of justice.

The policy which I propose should be welcomed more heartily by the courts than by any other branch of the Government. The country, like the committee, "has full confidence in the integrity, intelligence, and patriotism" of the Federal courts, and the latter surely desire that such confidence shall continue unimpaired. If this is to be, they can not longer enjoy this "vast and undefined power in the administration of the statute under the rule which has been promulgated"; yet will they continue its exercise unless Congress intervenes and forbids it. The practice has prevailed too long to be voluntarily abandoned. It has crystallized into a habit whose indulgence naturally yields to the influence of opportunity.

The denial of the right of review will relieve the courts of a vast and ever-increasing responsibility. They will be no longer burdened with a duty whose proper discharge seems to require the making and the administration of laws. They will resume their proper function of expounding and applying statutes to the solution and determination of controversies. They will again take their normal places in the machinery of government and the apprehensions and resentment of men now justly aroused by their assumptions of political authority will pass away.

If Congress, when a Federal statute is changed by the judgment of a court, would at once annul the change by appropriate legislation, the evil would be largely minimized. But such a course, at all times difficult, might for many reasons be impossible in the presence of great exigencies. And Executive disapproval might at times render such legislation useless. It is far easier to insert "thou shalt not" in the body of a statute designed to correct a crying evil or to effectuate a needed change, and thus prevent the creation of a status, than to deal with the status after it shall have been created.

The majority report truly asserts that "the people of this country will not permit the courts to declare a policy for them with respect to this subject. If we do not promptly exercise our legislative power, the courts will suffer immeasurable injury in the loss of that respect and confidence so essential to their usefulness. It is inconceivable that in a country governed by a written Constitution and statute law the courts can be permitted to test each restraint of trade by the economic standard which the individual members of the court may happen to approve. If we do not speedily prescribe, in so far as we can, a legislative rule by which to measure the form of contract and combination in restraint of trade with which we are familiar, or which we can anticipate, we cease to be a government of law, and become a government of men, and, moreover, of a very few men, and they appointed by the President."

We have been becoming such a Government throughout the last 50 years. We have witnessed with but little protest the

judicial transformation of the fourteenth amendment, the vast stretch of Federal jurisdiction through its potent and prolific agency, the shearing away of the national authority to tax incomes, the enactment of statutes by decree. A few more advances and the judicial department becomes the Government. The people are alive to the danger and are looking to us to avert it for them. They believe with Lincoln that "the candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court the instance they are made in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal."

The duty resting upon us as the people's representatives because of these conditions should be recognized and performed. We should neither evade nor postpone it. The issue is a grave one. We must meet it calmly and with courage. We are vested with ample authority to dispose of it. The people who have clothed us with this authority expect us to exercise it. The cause is theirs. We must not fail them, nor falter. The Supreme Court amendment to the antitrust act should be repealed, and the courts forbidden to hereafter change its text or modify its prohibitions.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. I have listened with great interest to his clear and strong speech, and no one can join more vigorously with him than myself in the denunciation of judicial legislation; but the question in my mind is as to whether this was a case of judicial legislation or simply a case of judicial construction. The Senator complains that the court read into the statute the word "unreasonable," and made the statute apply only to unreasonable restraint of trade. As I read the decision, the word "unreasonable" does not apply to restraint of trade, but simply to the restraint of competition. I understand the position of the court to be that they were called upon to determine what the words "restraint of trade" in the statute meant, and in discharging that duty they could not fail to recognize the fact that the words "restraint of trade" had a well-defined meaning at common law, and that doubtless Congress used those words in their common-law sense; and they held that at common law "restraint of trade" did not cover all restraints of competition; that at common law there were reasonable forms of restraints of competition that did not constitute restraint of trade and which were not subject to the condemnation of the law. If that be true, did the court go beyond its legitimate function in defining the words "restraint of trade"? Did the court go beyond its legitimate function when it declared that Congress used that term in the common-law sense? Did it go beyond its legitimate function when it declared that at common law a "restraint of trade" did not cover reasonable restraints of competition? Was not that all that the court decided in that case?

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator put that to me as an interrogatory?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not think that either the language or the intention of the court is susceptible of such a modified interpretation. It was not the first decision of that eminent tribunal which involved a construction of this law. Those familiar—and I assume that all lawyers are familiar—with the general course of decisions in which this law was sought to be applied to existing conditions, and which are admirably outlined in the report of the committee to which I have several times referred, know that various attempts were made to secure just that construction to which the Senator refers; but in each instance a majority of the court declined to do so, and, among other things, upon the ground that the use of the words "restraint of trade" had obtained a definite meaning at common law which meaning did not permit that construction.

I think that Judge Taft, afterwards President of the United States, in the Addyston Pipe case, in Eighty-fifth Federal Reporter, took that position, the case having been tried before him originally.

The Senator will, of course, also recall that in the Trans-Missouri Freight cases the emphatic pronouncement of the court was that the law meant what I have contended it must mean, and which does not admit of the modified construction or interpretation to which the Senator refers. He must also know an effort was once made to secure an amendment of that statute in Congress, and that the report of the Committee on Commerce, of which the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] was the chairman, to this body expressly pronounced against any such amendment or addition to the statute, and that the President of the United States himself, as I have shown, in a message to the Congress—I think it was in a message to the Congress—not only advised against a change, but pointed out the inevitable consequences of the change of the law as the Senator has interpreted the decision to have done.

I might also go further and call the attention of the Senator to the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Harlan in the identical case, which, to my mind, is the most emphatic, logical, and unanswerable refutation of that construction that can be found anywhere in the judicial literature of the country.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate just for a moment in further reply to the point made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS]. I had occasion, when the question came before the Committee on the Judiciary to amend the antitrust law, to examine into the subject, and made the report to which the Senator from Colorado has referred. I think Senators who will examine the common law—and I took pains to examine it on that occasion—will find that the doctrine of reasonable restraint or unreasonable restraint applies only in those cases at common law where a man sells out his business or trade in a given locality and agrees to abstain from engaging in that business for a limited period of time or within a limited area. In reference to that class of contracts, the doctrine of reasonableness applies; but to no other contracts, where it is simply a question of whether it is a general restraint or not. I think that is the common law of England, and there is nothing in any of the decisions to the contrary. So that any contention by the Supreme Court that such is the law is a mistake.

I recall the incident at that time, when the opinion was first delivered from the bench orally on a certain Monday, as is the custom of the court. Judging from the newspaper reports, the court used the term "reasonable" or "unreasonable," but afterwards, as Senators will find if they examine the opinion of the court, the court abandoned that phrase, and used the phrase "rule of reason," and I would suggest to the Senator from Colorado that he modify his bill so as to hit that particular phrase in the opinion.

ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT JUDGE.

During the delivery of Mr. THOMAS's speech,

Mr. THOMAS. I yield for a moment to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON].

Mr. CHILTON. I ask for the following unanimous-consent order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia submits a request for unanimous consent, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from West Virginia asks unanimous consent that on Monday, April 28, 1913, immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 577) authorizing the President to appoint an additional circuit judge for the fourth circuit, and before adjournment on that calendar day will vote upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendments that may be offered, and upon the bill—through the regular parliamentary stages—to its final disposition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BACON. What is the bill?

Mr. CHILTON. It is the bill to provide for an additional circuit judge for the fourth circuit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and the order will be made.

After the conclusion of Mr. THOMAS's speech,

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 62) making an appropriation for defraying the expenses of the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives authorized to attend and represent the Senate and House at the unveiling and dedication of the memorial to Thomas Jefferson at St. Louis, Mo., and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BACON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 1 hour and 13 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 28, 1913, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 24, 1913.

SUPERVISING INSPECTOR OF STEAM VESSELS.

William J. MacDonald, of Michigan, to be supervising inspector of steam vessels for the fourth district in the Steamboat-Inspection Service, Department of Commerce, vice Joseph J. Dunn, deceased.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

John J. Bell, of Michigan, to be collector of customs for the district of Huron, in the State of Michigan, in place of John T. Rich, whose term of office expired by limitation January 8, 1913.

William H. Berry, of Pennsylvania, to be collector of customs for the district of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, in place of Chester W. Hill, superseded.

COMMISSIONER OF LABOR STATISTICS.

Charles P. Neill, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

AUDITOR FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Edward Luckow, of Wisconsin, to be Auditor for the Navy Department, in place of Ralph W. Tyler, resigned.

AUDITOR FOR THE STATE DEPARTMENT.

Edward D. Hearne, of Delaware, to be Auditor for the State and Other Departments, in place of Frank H. Davis, resigned.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Hayes H. Lewis, of Florida, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Florida in place to Joseph E. Lee, superseded.

James Coffey, of South Dakota, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of North and South Dakota, in place of Willis C. Cook, superseded.

COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND FISHERIES.

Hugh M. Smith, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, in the Department of Commerce, vice George M. Bowers.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION.

Alexander R. Magruder, of Maryland, to be secretary of legation at Copenhagen, Denmark, vice Norval Richardson.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Charles A. Woods, of South Carolina, to be United States circuit judge, fourth circuit, vice Nathan Goff, resigned.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Samuel J. Graham, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Attorney General. (Position now vacant.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Anthony van Wagenen, of Iowa, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Iowa, vice Frederick Faville, whose term has expired.

John A. Aylward, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin, vice George H. Gordon, whose term will expire at the close of April 25, 1913.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named citizens of the United States to be assistant dental surgeons in the Dental Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 23d day of April, 1913, subject to the examinations required by law:

Williams Donnally,
Vines L. Turner, and
George C. Kusel.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

A. A. Leach to be postmaster at Dadeville, Ala., in place of H. E. Berkstresser. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1913.

Claude McMillan to be postmaster at New Decatur, Ala. Office became presidential July 1, 1912.

Elizabeth Simpson to be postmaster at Hartsells, Ala., in place of S. H. Sherrill. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1913.

O. L. Woodfin to be postmaster at Uniontown, Ala., in place of May T. Fowler. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

ARKANSAS.

Pearl Berkheimer to be postmaster at Augusta, Ark., in place of A. B. Lippman. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1913.

T. G. Robinson to be postmaster at Marvell, Ark., in place of John W. Terry. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1913.

John D. Wilbourne to be postmaster at Pine Bluff, Ark., in place of Fred C. Furth. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1910.

CALIFORNIA.

Percy B. Brown to be postmaster at Holtville, Cal., in place of James S. Bridenstine. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1913.

Albert E. Dixon to be postmaster at Point Loma, Cal., in place of Albert E. Dixon. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1913.

John M. Jolley to be postmaster at Oceanside, Cal., in place of John M. Jolley. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

CONNECTICUT.

John J. Cassidy to be postmaster at Woodbury, Conn., in place of William L. Judson. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

John Joseph Molans to be postmaster at Seymour, Conn., in place of Harvey S. Halligan. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

GEORGIA.

William B. McCants to be postmaster at Winder, Ga., in place of Job R. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1912.

David P. Philips to be postmaster at Lithonia, Ga., in place of William R. Watson. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1913.

HAWAII.

Harry D. Corbett to be postmaster at Hilo, Hawaii, in place of George Desha. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1913.

A. F. Costa to be postmaster at Wailuku, Hawaii, in place of M. T. Lyons. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

J. M. Souza to be postmaster at Kohala, Hawaii, in place of Arthur J. Stillman. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1913.

IDAHO.

Manford W. Harland to be postmaster at Troy, Idaho, in place of F. Beckman. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1913.

ILLINOIS.

W. H. Chapman to be postmaster at Clifton, Ill., in place of Robert L. Lutton. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

George A. Griffith, sr., to be postmaster at Rankin, Ill., in place of William L. Spear. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

William Twohig to be postmaster at Galesburg, Ill., in place of Omer N. Custer. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

INDIANA.

Fred G. Rice to be postmaster at Roachdale, Ind., in place of Charles McCaughey. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1913.

Robert E. Springsteen to be postmaster at Indianapolis, Ind., in place of Robert H. Bryson. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

IOWA.

J. F. Goos to be postmaster at Sabula, Iowa, in place of Walter E. Newsome. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1912.

KANSAS.

George W. Barker to be postmaster at Minneapolis, Kans., in place of Lewis Pickrell. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1912.

L. D. Cassler to be postmaster at Canton, Kans., in place of David K. Fretz. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1911.

Frederick M. Cook to be postmaster at Jamestown, Kans., in place of William R. Ansdell. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1912.

J. O. Ferguson to be postmaster at Independence, Kans., in place of Henry W. Conrad. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1912.

Agnes H. Gallagher to be postmaster at Summerfield, Kans., in place of William A. Fleming. Incumbent's commission expired April 17, 1912.

L. G. Wagner to be postmaster at Sylvia, Kans., in place of Joseph E. Aldrich. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

J. J. Wilson to be postmaster at Moran, Kans., in place of Clark C. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

KENTUCKY.

Charles E. Lightfoot to be postmaster at Cloverport, Ky., in place of Robert L. Oelze. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1913.

LOUISIANA.

Mattie D. Boatner to be postmaster at Vidalia, La., in place of Charles Moritz. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1913.

Overton Gauthier to be postmaster at Jennings, La., in place of Edward I. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1913.

MAINE.

R. T. Flavin to be postmaster at West Paris, Me., in place of Clarance L. Ridlon. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1913.

MARYLAND.

Sherlock Swann to be postmaster at Baltimore, Md., in place of William H. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

MICHIGAN.

Theophilus Belanger to be postmaster at River Rouge, Mich., in place of Maynard Palmer. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1913.

MISSISSIPPI.

Truman Gray to be postmaster at Waynesboro, Miss., in place of James R. S. Pitts. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1912.

James C. Jourdan to be postmaster at Iuka, Miss., in place of David A. Adams. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1913.

W. M. Noah to be postmaster at Kosciusko, Miss., in place of Fannie Hillerman. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1913.

Lillie W. Nugent to be postmaster at Rosedale, Miss., in place of Lillie W. Nugent. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1913.

Henrietta Welch to be postmaster at Carrollton, Miss., in place of Henrietta Welch. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

MISSOURI.

Charles B. Bacon to be postmaster at Marshall, Mo., in place of Leonard W. Van Dyke. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

Robert J. Ball to be postmaster at Gallatin, Mo., in place of Clifford M. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1912.

A. P. Beazley to be postmaster at Eldon, Mo., in place of Elmer E. Hart. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Thomas A. Dodge to be postmaster at Milan, Mo., in place of Benjamin F. Guthrie. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1913.

John S. Fowler to be postmaster at Cole Camp, Mo., in place of Cord P. Michaelis. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1913.

Absalom L. Galloway to be postmaster at Cassville, Mo., in place of John A. Livingston. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1913.

John Hetrick to be postmaster at Laclede, Mo., in place of Albert J. Caywood. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1912.

A. H. Martin to be postmaster at Perry, Mo., in place of William F. Norris. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

MONTANA.

J. P. Lavelle to be postmaster at Columbus, Mont., in place of E. B. Thayer. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1913.

Eugene L. Poindexter to be postmaster at Dillon, Mont., in place of Grace Lamont. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1913.

George E. White to be postmaster at Manhattan, Mont., in place of Caspar L. Gayle. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

NEW JERSEY.

William H. Cottrell to be postmaster at Princeton, N. J., in place of Charles S. Robinson, removed.

E. T. Lanterman to be postmaster at East Orange, N. J., in place of Marcus Mitchell, deceased.

Albert L. Williams to be postmaster at Vineland, N. J., in place of Walter S. Browne, deceased.

NEW MEXICO.

W. E. Foulks to be postmaster at Deming, N. Mex., in place of Edward Pennington. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1912.

NEW YORK.

Peter M. Giles to be postmaster at Le Roy, N. Y., in place of George E. Marcellus. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1913.

John Soemann to be postmaster at Lancaster, N. Y., in place of John F. Hein. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

OHIO.

Charles R. Gerding to be postmaster at Pemberville, Ohio, in place of James H. Muir. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1913.

Forrest L. May to be postmaster at Dayton, Ohio, in place of Frederick G. Withoft. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1912.

Albert G. Witte to be postmaster at Elmore, Ohio, in place of Harlow N. Aldrich. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1913.

OKLAHOMA.

O. H. P. Brewer to be postmaster at Muskogee, Okla., in place of Alice M. Robertson. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

Sam Flourney to be postmaster at Elk City, Okla., in place of F. E. Nichols. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

D. M. Hamlin to be postmaster at Newkirk, Okla., in place of Edwin F. Korns. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1913.

OREGON.

L. F. Reizenstein to be postmaster at Roseburg, Oreg., in place of Charles W. Parks. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1913.

R. E. Williams to be postmaster at The Dalles, Oreg., in place of Edgar Hostetler. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1913.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Hugh Gilmore to be postmaster at Williamsport, Pa., in place of Allen P. Perley. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1912.

T. H. McKenzie to be postmaster at Barnesboro, Pa., in place of James E. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1913.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

James R. Montgomery to be postmaster at Marion, S. C., in place of James W. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1912.

P. M. Murray to be postmaster at Walterboro, S. C., in place of Bernhard Levy. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1913.

TENNESSEE.

Horace L. Browder to be postmaster at Sweetwater, Tenn., in place of Richard N. Hudson. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1912.

J. R. Brown to be postmaster at Cleveland, Tenn., in place of James I. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

Henry Estill to be postmaster at Winchester, Tenn., in place of Joseph C. Hale. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1909.

Wiley Sublett to be postmaster at Estill Springs, Tenn., in place of Thomas J. Littleton. Incumbent's commission expired November 23, 1907.

TEXAS.

B. M. Burgher to be postmaster at Dallas, Tex., in place of Sloan Simpson.

N. A. Burton to be postmaster at McKinney, Tex., in place of Samuel H. Cole. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1912.

Joseph R. De Witt to be postmaster at Brackettville, Tex., in place of Henry J. Veltmann. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

Norman H. Martin to be postmaster at Weatherford, Tex., in place of Robert B. Milliken, deceased.

J. B. Phillips to be postmaster at Howe, Tex., in place of Laban B. Ruth. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1912.

R. S. Rike to be postmaster at Farmersville, Tex., in place of Edward W. Morton, deceased.

Sam D. Seale to be postmaster at Floresville, Tex., in place of William Reese. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1913.

J. W. White to be postmaster at Uvalde, Tex., in place of Guido R. Goldbeck, resigned.

VIRGINIA.

William C. Johnston to be postmaster at Williamsburg, Va., in place of Thomas C. Peachy. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

John E. Rogers to be postmaster at Strasburg, Va., in place of Asbury Redfern. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Arthur W. Sinclair to be postmaster at Manassas, Va., in place of Howard P. Dodge. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

WASHINGTON.

F. A. Kennett to be postmaster at Prosser, Wash., in place of Thomas N. Henry. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1911.

W. H. Padley to be postmaster at Reardan, Wash., in place of William H. McCoy. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1913.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Talbott H. Buchanan to be postmaster at Wellsburg, W. Va., in place of William R. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1912.

Jerry W. Dingess to be postmaster at Huntington, W. Va., in place of James W. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1913.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 24, 1913.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

William H. Osborn to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

SURVEYOR GENERAL, OREGON.

Edward G. Worth to be surveyor general of Oregon.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Samuel Butler to be receiver of public moneys at Sacramento, Cal.

Lee A. Ruark to be receiver of public moneys at Del Norte, Colo.

William A. Maxwell to be receiver of public moneys at Denver, Colo.

Sam Mothershead to be receiver of public moneys at Burns, Oreg.

Nolan Skiff to be receiver of public moneys at La Grande, Oreg.

L. A. Booth to be receiver of public moneys at The Dalles, Oreg.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Onias C. Skinner to be register of the land office at Montrose, Colo.

John H. Bowen to be register of the land office at Springfield, Mo.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Rhydon M. Call to be United States district judge for the southern district of Florida.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

J. L. Camp to be United States attorney for the western district of Texas.

H. Snowden Marshall to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

William J. McDonald to be United States marshal for the northern district of Texas.

John H. Rogers to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Samuel Houston Thompson, jr., of Colorado, to be Assistant Attorney General, vice John Q. Thompson, deceased.

POSTMASTERS.

INDIANA.

R. E. Springsteen, Indianapolis.

KANSAS.

Jefferson Dunham, Little River.
William A. Matteson, Abilene.

KENTUCKY.

Mary Alice Sweets, Bardstown.

NEW JERSEY.

W. H. Cottrell, Princeton.

OKLAHOMA.

O. H. P. Brewer, Muskogee.

OREGON.

Frank S. Myers, Portland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *April 24, 1913.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father in heaven, so move upon our hearts that the Godlike may be in the ascendency as we pass along life's rugged way; that we may leave in our wake a record of which we may justly be proud, which those who shall come after us may follow with impunity; that at the end of our earthy sojourn we may be fully prepared to enter upon the work which waits on us in the great beyond. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE NATURAL CONDITION OF LAKE TAHOE.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent that senate joint resolution 25, relating to citrus fruits in California, and house joint resolution 18, both of the Legislature of California, be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to print the resolution mentioned——

Mr. RAKER. Two of them.

The SPEAKER. In the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to get the attitude of the other side of the House on the question of printing memorials of legislatures in the RECORD. It is the practice to print these in the Senate. I notice nearly every day in the RECORD gentlemen drop in the basket a number of memorials or resolutions of legislatures. If it is the intention to allow one gentleman the privilege of having printed in the RECORD upon presentation in the House resolutions adopted by a legislature, I submit the same privilege should be extended to every other gentleman of the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I think about the most harmless thing that a man can do is to print something in the RECORD. If it is couched in respectful terms and is orderly, I see no objection to a Member of the House printing something in the RECORD if he thinks it is of any benefit to anybody. As a rule, I think the place where you can bury a thing the deepest is in the record of this House.

Mr. MANN. A number of gentlemen on this side of the House, new Members, have already been to me at different times in the session and asked whether it was the practice and custom of the House to ask unanimous consent to print these resolutions in the RECORD. I have stated to those gentlemen it was not the custom of the House to do that——

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN (continuing). And hence they have been dropped in the basket. Take, for instance, a resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of New York. Every Member would have the same right to acquire some prominence in connection with the matter by asking unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD, and how many times it might be printed I do not know. If that side of the House is not going to object, I do not know that I will, with the understanding that if other gentlemen ask that privilege it will not be objected to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wish to say this to the gentleman from Illinois. I think that the question of unanimous consent must be determined in each instance, and we can not fix a uniform rule about them, and I would be unwilling now to make an agreement fixing a uniform rule, but I think the gentleman knows, so far as I am personally concerned, that I am not given

much to making objections of that kind either on that side of the House or this side of the House.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Alabama, true, does not object, but somebody usually on that side of the House has objected in the last Congress.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER]?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. I desire to ask if it would not be a better practice for those Members desiring to print resolutions of this character in the RECORD to get unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the RECORD and then carry these resolutions as a matter of extension of their remarks, rather than ask the House for unanimous consent to have these resolutions printed.

Mr. MANN. That has always been the practice heretofore.

Mr. GARNER. That accomplishes the result that the Member desires, and at the same time it does not put the House in the attitude of giving unanimous consent to have these resolutions printed in the RECORD, and therefore each one taking the responsibility for having it done, but it then throws the responsibility on the one individual Member who extends his remarks.

Mr. RAKER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to withdraw my request, and I then ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman already has that privilege, as has everyone in the House.

Mr. RAKER. That is not upon this bill.

The SPEAKER. Of course, these resolutions are on this bill.

Mr. RAKER. I have some more here that are not on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] a question. Was not there a regulation or a rule agreed to here during the last Congress that speeches that are printed under leave to print and similar matters to that should be printed in the back of the RECORD?

Mr. GARNER. In the back part of it.

Mr. MANN. There was no regulation. There was a general agreement to that effect.

The SPEAKER. Was it not a regulation by the Joint Committee on Printing?

Mr. MANN. I think not.

Mr. RAKER. My idea is to have these printed at the end of the proceedings to-day.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to know this for the benefit of gentlemen who want to print speeches.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN].

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, as a business man and farmer, I desire to address the committee briefly on the tariff bill now under consideration.

That the country demands a revision downward, that the Payne law was unsatisfactory, and that certain reforms were needed was proclaimed yesterday on the floor of this Chamber by that stalwart Republican from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. Naturally, he claimed that the Democratic majority would be ultraradical and fail to meet the demands of the country to equalize the burdens of taxation and reduce the high cost of living.

Having trained so long in a camp granting special privileges to a few favorites, it is impossible for him to divest himself of the fetish of high protective duties. The wish is father to the thought in his case.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] makes no admissions of wrongdoing on the part of the Ways and Means Committee and the Republican Party of the Sixty-first Congress when he headed that committee and ably led his party on the floor of the House.

Apparently he has learned little or nothing by the disastrous defeat of his party two years ago and again in 1912. He is tied hand and foot to his idols, and I fear will never be able to appreciate the lessons of those two memorable campaigns.

It now only remains for the Democratic Party to pass the excellent bill before us.

While some of us plead for free cattle, free sheep, free eggs, free butter, and free wheat to keep pace with the items in this bill on the free list, such as lumber, wool, cotton, shoes, hides, swine, meats, milk, and so forth, we yielded in the end to the opinions of the majority in the Democratic caucus.

On eggs and butter the duty is cut in two as compared with the Payne law, thus reducing the cost to the consumer.

A tariff for revenue has been good Democratic doctrine preached from every platform throughout the land for years, finally winning in 1910 and 1912.

Truth is mighty and must prevail, and the aphorism of the martyred President Lincoln that you could "fool all the people a part of the time, a part of the people all the time, but not all the people all the time" was again exemplified in a forceful manner.

The woolen and cotton schedules are greatly reduced—from 25 to 60 per cent.

The metal, wood, wool, cotton, chemical, and glassware schedules were reduced to a revenue basis and must result in immense benefit to the people.

While cutting down the duties a due regard was had to the need of revenue for the expenses of the Government economically administered.

It became necessary to keep many articles on the dutiable list for this purpose, but a proper regard was always had to the consumers, who heretofore have borne more than their share of the burdens of taxation.

On the question of favoritism in the past by the Republican Party in protecting certain manufactures, notably steel, iron, glass, lumber, and woolen products, I may be able to enlighten the committee as to the results of this policy. Having made my home in Pittsburgh from 1875 to 1889, I am familiar with the records of many of the beneficiaries of the policy of our friends on the other side of this Chamber.

In the early sixties three gentlemen in moderate circumstances at the time purchased half interest in two small iron mills on the banks of the Allegheny River in Pittsburgh belonging to the late Anthony J. Kloman, whom I knew very well. One of these parties died a number of years ago. The two remaining are very wealthy indeed. One of them is fearful of dying rich and is endowing various institutions trying to spend his yearly income. He owns a house and grounds on Fifth Avenue, New York City, valued at $5,000,000, and an extensive estate in Scotland. It must be said of him that he is a most estimable gentleman, with brains and ability that enabled him to accumulate all his hundreds of millions, but largely through the favors granted him by our Republican friends in the shape of legislation.

In 1875 it was my privilege to occupy a suite of rooms on Smithfield Street and Sixth Avenue in the same city—just 38 years ago. I rented desk room to a young man who represented his uncle, then the owner of a flouring mill and some coke ovens south of Pittsburgh. He claimed that he did not wish to pay more than $10 per month.

This sum was agreed upon, and he was my tenant for several months. From this small beginning the gentleman has managed to accumulate, largely through the favoritism of a high protective tariff, two or three hundred millions of dollars. He is now building a home on Fifth Avenue, New York City, a residence to cost $3,000,000.

In 1876, just 37 years ago, in a visit to the Edgar Thompson Steel Works, at Braddock, near Pittsburgh, I observed a bright, intelligent looking young man engaged in manual labor in the yards. Upon inquiring of my friend, the manager, I was told that he had "blown in" from the Allegheny Mountains a few weeks previous, and that it was his intention of putting him in the office. That gentleman is conceded to be the best posted man on the steel industry in the world, and is rated above $100,000,000. He, too, owns a magnificent residence on Riverside Drive, New York City, occupying an entire block and valued at $5,000,000.

It has been my privilege to know all three of these gentlemen, and can testify to their moral worth and their standing as citizens. They are gentlemen of the highest probity in business, and no criticism nor censure can be visited upon them for the great success achieved. The fault lays entirely with the system in vogue in this country since the Civil War, inaugurated and maintained by the Republican Party.

These cases could be multiplied many times over in the various protected industries of the country. The protection of "infant industries" and "to maintain a high standard of wages for the American workman" was the plea that made the continuance of high protective duty look well to the people, fooling them for years. It is now conceded that the first should have been stopped many years since, and the latter never did protect the laboring man; the latter maintained decent living wages only through the power and influence of well-organized unions. There is something radically wrong with a system of government that produces such results. It destroys competition and kills opportunities. It was responsible largely for the great trusts of this country, that finally became a menace to free government. The good old Democratic doctrine, "equal opportunities to all and special privileges to none," should, and will, prevail under the present tariff bill.

Now, a few words on the proposed income tax, which is a part of the bill under consideration. While not satisfactory in some respects, it is the most equitable and just measure for the honest distribution of the burdens of taxation. It puts the tax where it properly belongs—on men and women with incomes exceeding yearly $4,000. The section to which I took exception was that under "G," placing sums returned as dividends or premium abatements on life and endowment policy contracts of life insurance. It is contended by the policyholders and the companies themselves that all mutual organizations, like fraternal societies giving insurance, should have been exempt entirely from this law.

The committee have placed mutual fire insurance companies and mutual savings banks on the exempt list, while mutual life insurance companies, on analogous lines and collecting in advance more premiums than are necessary to cover their prospective liabilities, are taxed. Inasmuch as these mutual fire insurance companies and mutual savings banks are entirely relieved from taxation under paragraph G, as above mentioned—a very excellent ruling, by the way—why should not the same be applied to mutual life insurance companies? The so-called dividend or abatement of premium is not in any sense an earning or a profit. It arises from three sources: First, a more favorable mortality than that expected by the careful selection of risks; second, a higher rate of interest than that provided for by law on reserves; third, a saving in the expense charges provided for administration purposes. It is evident to every fair-minded person that no tax should be placed upon this item, as it is in the nature of a double tax, being deducted from the abatement upon policies of life insurance. It is a charge upon the frugality of the millions of insured members who have taken this step to provide for dependent ones or for old age. The act of August 28, 1894, section 32, provided that—

> Nothing herein contained shall apply * * * to any insurance company or association which conducts all its business solely on the mutual plan and only for the benefit of its policyholders or members, and having no capital stock, and no stock or share holders, and holding all its property in trust and in reserve for its policyholders or members; nor to that part of the business of any insurance company having a capital stock and stock and share holders which is conducted on the mutual plan, separate from its stock plan of insurance and solely for the benefit of the policyholders and members insured on said mutual plan, and holding all property belonging to and derived from said mutual part of its business in trust and reserve for the benefit of its policyholders and members insured on said mutual plan.

The decision of the Committee on Ways and Means to expedite the passage of this bill, so that the business interests may know what to expect, is highly commendable. While it may not suit everybody nor provide for the various interests affected, it is upon the whole a sane, safe, patriotic measure that must eventually secure the purposes in view. The fair and equitable adjustment of the tariff on a revenue basis—the only justification for a tariff tax—will result in bringing about the needed relief to the great masses of consumers of the country.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND].

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, although the custom duties furnish a little better than $300,000,000 annually for the support of the Government and the internal-revenue taxes furnish but little under the same amount for the Government's maintenance each year, there is no controversy of moment concerning the latter form of taxation. But about the tariff there has raged a controversy from the beginning of the Government up to the present time. In every political campaign since 1872, save the campaign of 1896, the tariff has been the important question. The public press has been replete with editorials and utterances concerning it. Congressional debate is full of it, and it constitutes a great portion of our private conversation. I suppose more speeches have been made about the tariff than about any other one subject connected with American politics. It is natural, where there is so widespread an interest and so much discussion, that there should be many different opinions, and therefore we have a great variety of ideas, theories, and notions concerning this very important matter.

Differences of opinion are found not only between the great political parties in the country, but between members and factions of the same political party. We have those who believe in an absolute sweeping away of all tariff duties. They are the free traders. We have the high protectionists, who believe the tariff duties should be raised so high that nothing could come into this country that might compete with an American product. We have those who believe in gradual reductions, and others who favor sweeping reductions, and recently a distinguished Democrat, the governor of one of our oldest Commonwealths, presented in a semiofficial way his views of the subject. He appears to hold that at the base of all lies reciprocity; that the necessaries of life, save only those that are manufactured in the State of which he is governor, should be admitted free of duty; and that all the raw material used in the manufactures of that great State should also be free of duty—a proposition that can not fail, when properly apprehended, to be extremely popular in the section of the country in which he resides. But possibly it will not excite so much enthusiasm among those who produce the necessaries of life and the raw materials in other parts of our territory.

Now, for a great many years there has been a feeling in this country, well-nigh universal, that the tariff duties ought to be reduced in amount, and there have been many earnest advocates of tariff reduction on both sides of this Chamber. In my opinion, the greatest danger to the establishment and continuance of low tariff rates is in the unyielding mental attitude of the extremists on this tariff question. I admire the high protectionist. I believe he is a somewhat extravagant patriot; I think his patriotism savors of chauvinism; but, nevertheless, he feels in his heart that this country of ours is so good that nobody else in the world should have any part of it or should have any opportunity in it, and that everything that is good and valuable about it should be retained and held for those who, like himself, love it. One can not help but admire the loyalty of that kind of doctrinaire.

Then there are others that I also admire—men who take a broad view of all the world's commerce and say, "Let us be of a great fraternity and trade and deal with one another and be commercial brothers." The high protectionists and the free traders make it difficult to secure a genuine tariff revision downward. The first, when the power is with them, raise the duties so high and make them so prohibitive that the people revolt and place the power to make rates in other hands; then if the free traders have their way about it the cuts will be so deep and the free list so large the shock will cause a change of sentiment, and, as a distinguished Member of this House so often said, the pendulum will swing the other way and we will go back to high protection.

Between these extremes lies a middle course, a safe and a sane one, which, if followed, will, in my judgment, lead to a substantial reduction of tariff duties, and the new rates when written in the statute book will remain there long enough for the country to become accustomed to them, and prosperity will bless the effort, enterprise, and labor of a great people at peace and content. [Applause.]

The Democratic Party is not a free-trade party. It has never, so far as I know, declared in favor of free trade. I take it that the fundamentals of the Democratic doctrine may be found in that celebrated declaration in the report of Secretary Walker, and while, as opinion and sentiment have changed throughout the country, there has been sometimes a leaning one way and then another way, after all this declaration, in the main, has been adhered to by the Democratic Party. I desire to read, if I may, the six cardinal principles laid down by him:

First. That no more money should be collected than is necessary for the wants of the Government economically administered.

We speak of a tariff for revenue only, and we mean by that a tariff levied for the purpose of raising revenue; not alone a tariff upon articles that are unlike those produced in this country, but a tariff levied upon various articles for the purpose of obtaining revenue for the wants of the Government. And this bill is in accord with the proposition which I have read. The amount to be raised should equal that needed for the conduct of Government affairs, economically administered.

Second. That no duty be imposed on any article above the lowest rate which will yield the largest amount of revenue.

Reiterating the purpose and the object of levying tariff duties; not to protect this industry or to encourage that industry, but to secure the needed funds to carry on the Government's affairs.

Third. That below such rate discrimination may be made, descending in the scale of duties, or for imperative reasons the article may be placed in the list of those free from all duty.

We have seen fit—we, the majority in this House—to place many articles in this bill upon the free list, because we believe that there were and are imperative reasons why that should be done. An eminent English historian said:

Ideas which change the face of the world spring from nations in a state of suffering, not from nations in comfortable circumstances.

There is now demand for legislation to relieve those who bend beneath the burden of constantly advancing cost of the necessaries of life. We seek to bring about a change of condition before the people suffer. We look into the future to discover, if we can, what will come if there be no change. We bring this reform measure into the House to prevent increased suffering and to lighten the burdens the people must bear so long as they live under the present laws. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Fourth. That the maximum revenue duty should be imposed on luxuries.

Fifth. That all minimums and all specific duties should be abolished, and ad valorem duties substituted in their place, care being taken to guard against fraudulent invoices and undervaluations, and to assess the duty upon the actual market value.

The House majority, of course, know that ad valorem duties are subject to criticism. From the protectionist standpoint strong and valid criticism may be made. The lower the price of the taxed article the greater the need of protection, but if the rate is ad valorem the less the amount of duty to be paid. The higher the price of the taxed article the more need of importations, but the greater the amount of the duty the more the check upon such importations. But this is from the outlook of the protectionist, who is not much concerned with the tariff as a producer of revenue.

We acknowledge the danger of fraudulent importations; but we believe that, upon the whole, the best results will be obtained—not from the protectionist's standpoint, but from a tariff-for-revenue standpoint—in these ad valorem rates; and in the new bill, wherever we found it possible to avoid a specific duty we did so, and made the rate ad valorem instead.

Sixth and last—and I was about to say best—that the duty should be so imposed as to operate as equally as possible throughout the Union, discriminating neither for nor against any class or section.

Gentlemen, we may disagree upon tariff rates; we may disagree upon tariff theories—you may be for protection, you may be for free trade, you may be for a tariff for revenue—but there ought to be no disagreement among us upon the proposition that, whatever rates are adopted, there should be no discrimination against any class of our people or against any section of our country. [Applause.]

I desire to call the attention of the House to a remarkable change that is now taking place, and has been taking place for a number of years. I refer to the proportionate decrease in the amount of our exportations of foodstuffs and the proportionate increase in our exportations of manufactured articles. The figures are to me somewhat startling.

In 1880 the total value of our manufactures exported amounted to $122,000,000; in 1890, $179,000,000; in 1900, $485,000,000; in 1912, $1,020,000,000. A remarkable growth, indeed.

In 1880 the share of our foodstuffs in our total exportations was 55.8 per cent; in 1890, 42.3 per cent; in 1900, 39.8 per cent, and in 1912, 19.5 per cent.

From 55.8 per cent of our total exportations in 1880 they had shrunk in 1912 to 19.5 per cent. During that same time manufactures exported had increased, as shown by the following figures: In 1880, 14.8 per cent of the total exportations; in 1890, 21.2 per cent of the total exportations; in 1900, 35.3 per cent of the total exportations, and in 1912, 47 per cent of the total exportations.

To summarize, from 1880 to 1912, the exportations of foodstuffs had decreased from 55.8 per cent to 19.5 per cent, while the exportations of manufactured products had increased from 14.8 per cent to 47 per cent.

Gentlemen, this indicates a great change in our economic conditions. It seems to me that when any manufacturer or any producer in the United States is able to send a large portion of his product abroad and compete in the markets of the world for the trade of the world that producer or manufacturer ought in reason to be able to hold his own in his own country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Of course no one wants to penalize a great manufacturer or a great producer because he exports his product. We glory in the increase of our exportations; but may we not with fairness say, "You, who by your skill and by your business sagacity can go into the markets of the earth and compete with all who meet you there, with their cheap labor, their cheap land, and all that, and compete successfully, we have an abiding conviction that you can compete in the markets of the United States without the bolstering-up process of the high protective tariff." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And so the majority in making up this bill have given attention to the growth of our export trade and have noted the concerns and the industries that can and do export so much to the other nations of the world.

Of course the majority in making up this bill do not claim to be infallible. There may be valid criticism that can be urged against the pending measure. There may be mistakes that ought to be corrected, and I hope will be corrected; but the majority have tried to accomplish these things: First of all they have sought to bring about in this country by means of the tariff and tariff reductions honest and fair competition in the markets of America. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In providing our manufacturers and our producers all the opportunities and advantages they need to expand their business enterprises and grow great and wax prosperous we must not forget the debt we owe to the great consuming masses of this country. They are as much entitled to a competitive market in which to buy their goods as the manufacturer is entitled to a protected market in which to sell his goods. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And it appeared to us that those who wanted the protected market were a little too greatly favored in the past and too much consideration was given to their desires and to the things that would make for their welfare. We concluded to put in a stroke for the great mass of the American people who are doing the buying in this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And so it is the aim of the majority to establish in this country a competitive market; competition from within and limited competition from without, in order that there may be the least possible danger of monopoly in any of the markets of the United States.

Second, the majority have tried to adjust the tariff rates so that sufficient money may be raised to pay the operating expenses of our Government. No one can tell just exactly what revenue will come from a tariff bill until it has been tried. We shall probably find that the customs duties will be decreased from $80,000,000 to $90,000,000 annually. We are making up that amount by the imposition of an income tax, so there may be provided a sufficient amount of money for the needs of the Government.

Third, an effort is made to give relief to our fellow citizens who have been crying out against the high cost of living. We have tried to make a tariff law not only for the advantage of the manufacturer and the producer, but for the benefit of the consumer as well.

I desire in the time I have remaining to call attention to certain of these schedules that have been attacked in the press and elsewhere. We passed a bill in the last Congress known as the farmers' free list, and in that bill we put flour on the free list. The work of that Congress was approved by the Democratic convention of Baltimore, and we feel that those things for which we stood prior to election we should stand for now after the election and the approval of them by the convention of our party. Therefore in making up this bill rye flour and buckwheat flour and wheat flour, with a limitation to which I shall hereafter refer, were placed on the free list.

We placed rye, out of which rye flour is made, upon the free list. There were reasons why that could be done. We received in the year 1912 a total revenue from rye of a little over $13,000, a small amount, and the total revenue from rye flour was less than $90. Now, there was no use of keeping either of these articles upon the dutiable list for the sake of the petty revenue produced, and therefore we placed both of them upon the free list.

From buckwheat flour we received a revenue of $211.05, and we received from buckwheat $3,025.36. There was no reason, from a revenue standpoint, why these articles should remain on the dutiable list, so they were put on the free list.

Now, when we come to wheat and wheat flour a different situation presents itself. And right here, in line with what I said a moment ago about exports, I would like to call attention to these significant figures. In 1900 the exports of wheat amounted to 102,000,000 bushels. In 1910 they amounted to 30,000,000 bushels, a decrease in 10 years in the exportation of this product from 102,000,000 bushels to 30,000,000 bushels. In 1910 the value of our exports of wheat was $47,806,598, and just two years later, in 1912, it was $28,477,584, a loss in the two years from 1910 to 1912 of over $19,000,000. To-day there is less than 4 per cent of our production of wheat exported from the

United States. Now, for comparison, let me call your attention to the exports of wheat flour.

In 1910, when we exported better than $47,000,000 worth of wheat, we exported $47,621,467 worth of flour, but in 1912 the exports of wheat showed a loss of $19,329,014, while the exports of flour showed a gain of $3,378,330, the value of the exports of flour in 1912 being $50,999,797. Therefore we find wheat decreasing, so far as exportation is concerned, and flour increasing, indicating that the wheat of this country is being manufactured by the millers here and sold abroad, and our flour makers are able to grind the wheat, make the flour, transport it over the sea, invade the markets of the world, pay the tariff duties of foreign countries, and compete with the millers of the world. Fifty million dollars and over of the product exported in 1912! We find, too, there is a considerable revenue derived from wheat imported into this country under the rate of 25 cents a bushel.

There were imported 2,684,381 bushels in 1912, and the Treasury of this country was enriched by tariff duties assessed thereon to the amount of $352,245.46, more than a third of a million. During the same period from flour imported into this country we received in duties $166,444.52.

Mr. Chairman, in view of this situation we did not care to deprive the Treasury of revenue. We purposed to make a deep cut anyhow. Wheat was not put upon the free list, but retained upon the dutiable list with a duty of 10 cents a bushel, a cut of 60 per cent in the rate. We believed that if flour were placed upon the free list the millers, who are now able to sell $50,000,000 worth of their products in other countries, would be able to protect themselves here at home from foreign competition; but in order, as we thought, to silence any charge that we were indifferent to the welfare of the flour makers, we introduced in this bill two provisions favorable to the millers of the United States; first, the provision that wheat flour coming into this country from any country that imposed a duty upon American flour should bear a rate of duty of 10 per cent ad valorem, so the reduction on wheat is from the specific 25 cents to the specific 10 cents a bushel and on flour from the ad valorem 25 per cent to the ad valorem 10 per cent. Canada has a duty upon American flour of 60 cents a barrel. France has a duty upon American flour; Germany has a duty upon American flour. Nearly all of the European countries save England have duties on American flour, and wheat flour coming from any of those countries into the United States will pay a tariff rate of 10 per cent. But certain gentlemen say: "Do not you know that just the moment this bill becomes a law Canada, through her Governor General or some other official who has the power, with one stroke of the pen will strike out the duty now imposed on American flour, so that Canadian flour may come into the United States." No, Mr. Chairman, we do not know it, nor does any one else know it, but those acquainted with the history of recent tariff enactments have good reason to believe that Canada will do nothing of the kind.

We had here for consideration a reciprocity bill not very long ago, and we may as well admit in the house of its friends that Canada had about everything she wanted in that reciprocity pact. If there was anything that Canada desired that was not in there it was because Canada did not make known that fact to the United States authorities. Canada was willing that her wheat might come into this country free and that wheat from this country might go into Canada free, but, mark you, Canada was not willing that flour might go from the United States into Canada free of duty in return for free entry of her flour into the United States, but insisted on a rate of 50 cents a barrel. If we are to judge the present by the recent past, we have good reason to believe that Canada is very much averse to allowing American flour a free market in Canada for the sake of having Canadian flour come into the United States free of duty. When we think of the over 7,000 mills in this country making flour and the less than 700 in Canada, the name that American flour has not only here but wherever flour is sold, and the $50,000,000 of this product going out annually to other than American markets, we are apt to believe that the miller of Canada will hesitate a little while before he will ask to subject himself to the competition of the American miller who is conquering the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Second, we have changed the drawback clause. Heretofore the American miller might import wheat into this country and grind it and then upon exporting the flour obtain from the Treasury as a drawback not 99 per cent of all the duties he had paid, but 99 per cent of about 70 per cent of the duty he had paid, because 30 per cent of wheat is converted into wheat screenings, bran, and wheat offal and about 70 per cent of it is made into flour.

Upon the exportation of the flour under the law now proposed, with bran and wheat screenings upon the free list, the American miller can buy his wheat abroad, pay 10 cents a bushel upon it when it comes in here, grind it into flour, dispose of his screenings and bran wherever he pleases, and receive back upon the exportation of that flour 99 per cent of all the duty that he has paid. This means that the American miller can for export purposes bring into this country all the wheat he wants at a rate of 1 mill on the bushel. Has he very much reason to complain?

When we come to oatmeal and oats we find a situation somewhat like the flour and wheat situation. We collect in duties upon oatmeal and rolled oats $6,767, and we collect in duties upon oats $408,155.75, nearly half a million dollars. We did not feel justified in losing half a million dollars of revenue by putting oats upon the free list. We have a production of oatmeal and rolled oats in this country of greater value than $41,000,000. We export $376,000 worth of our production, and the total amount imported is only $40,000. We could not see the necessity, under these circumstances of sacrificing $408,000 worth of revenue, and so we put a duty of 10 cents a bushel upon oats.

Now, I desire to refer to one other matter, and then I am done, and that is the matter of print paper. In this bill we have permitted the entry of news print paper, valued at not more than 2½ cents a pound, free of duty. Under section 2 of the Canadian reciprocity act, which, although the act itself was not approved by the Dominion of Canada, became a law and is now in force, print paper for newspapers and books, worth not exceeding 4 cents per pound, is admitted free of duty if manufactured from wood or wood pulp subject to no export restriction.

Time will not permit me to dwell upon the methods employed by our Canadian friends to remove the restrictions and at the same time make sure that neither wood nor pulp would be exported from Canada into the United States. During the past year, out of 112,000,000 pounds of print paper imported into this country 64,000,000 pounds came in free of duty. We reduced the classification rate from 4 cents to 2½ cents. The paper that may come into this country free of duty under the proposed bill is paper which, I think, is never sold even at the mill at less than about $1.85. It is the cheapest kind of paper and used for newspapers. It is made principally of mechanically ground wood pulp, the cheapest kind of pulp made; but perhaps a fifth of the stock used in making such paper is chemical pulp, a pulp differently prepared and more expensive. Under section 2 of the reciprocity act wood pulp and chemical pulp, bleached and unbleached, may be admitted into the United States free of duty. If print paper up to 2½ cents per pound in value is to go upon the free list, it seems but fair and right that the pulp used in making this paper should go there too. That was done. Now, we felt that we were bound to take this step in reference to print paper. The Democratic convention at Denver five years ago adopted a platform in which there was this provision:

> Existing duties have given the manufacturers of paper a shelter behind which they have organized combinations to raise the price of pulp and of paper, thus imposing a tax upon the spread of knowledge. We demand the immediate repeal of the tariff on wood pulp, print paper, lumber, timber, and logs, and that those articles be placed upon the free list.

We have kept the promise that the party made to the people, but in doing it we have tried to do injury to no industry and to no person. We have determined to a nicety the limits within which news-print paper may be described and have put upon the free list the pulp from which it is made.

Gentlemen, there is some gratification and some satisfaction in the knowledge that amid all the storm of criticism which has come upon the bill and will come upon it, under the shadows of the fears that have been expressed as to its effect if enacted into law, it is generally admitted that the Democratic Party in the preparation of this measure has observed the pledges it made to the people of the United States, and that now in power it is doing the things that it advocated when it was not charged with the control of the Government. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to yield back the balance of his time.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back six minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think that I have caught up with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] yet, and I would like to yield on this side before he yields to another speaker on his. I would like to say to the gentleman from New York, in order to obviate any further trouble about yielding back time, that I suggest we agree when the time is not all consumed the Chair will not charge it to either of us.

Mr. PAYNE. I think that is a good suggestion.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS].

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, the enactment of the tariff bill now under consideration in the House of Representatives will mark the end of the antiquated and discredited policy of high protection which has been in force, except for a brief period under the Wilson law, ever since the Civil War. The high rates of duty which were originally levied in 1862 and 1864 were intended to meet the extraordinary expenses of war times, and not only have they ceased to serve this purpose, but they have become a heavy burden on the community.

During the Civil War our industries were unable to supply the local demand, and the United States Treasury was in need of additional revenue. High-tariff rates were levied at that time not to lessen importations, not for protection, but because importations would continue in spite of the duty imposed. These rates were intended for revenue only, and not for protection to favored manufacturers.

But when the end of the war came the Republican Party realized that it had in its possession a valuable political asset, and Republican revisions upward occurred in 1875, 1890, 1897, and 1909 to the benefit of an influential minority of the people.

This trend upward received a slight check in 1883. In 1894 a genuine attempt was made to modify the tariff policy of this country. Unfortunately, the Wilson Tariff Act went into effect during the time of a great commercial depression which followed the financial and commercial crisis of 1893.

THE WILSON ACT.

The next presidential election was contested, not on the tariff grounds, but on other issues. At the time of the election of 1896 there had been no opportunity to fairly judge the effects of the Wilson law commercially and politically. The people of the country decided that campaign on issues entirely apart from those involved in the tariff discussion. The failure or success of the Wilson bill in the public mind was not the paramount issue of the campaign and received but little attention. The general depression had decreased both importations and internal revenue, and when the Republicans in 1897 revised the tariff they took advantage of the lack of public attention on the subject and of the opportunity which the need of greater revenue presented to draw a high-protective bill.

It is difficult to determine the effect of the Wilson Act. In speaking of the tariff act of 1894, Prof. F. W. Taussig, in his Tariff History of the United States, says (p. 319):

It (the Wilson Act) went into effect shortly after an acute commercial crisis, and in the worst stage of a period of depression. The crisis and the depression were due, in this case as in others, to a long and complex set of causes, some of them still obscure even to the best informed and most skilled observers. That the tariff act played any serious part in bringing them about would not be maintained by any cool and competent critic.

THE DINGLEY ACT.

The Dingley bill, which in 1897 repealed the Wilson Act, was the highest protective measure the country had yet seen, and as enacted the bill was practically a raise of about 10 per cent over the McKinley Act of 1890.

The Spanish War, following immediately after its passage, diverted public attention and presented new issues to the people, and a wave of great prosperity and industrial activity overswept the country. At this same time there also appeared a general increase in the prices of commodities. The high-protective tariff, in many instances prohibitive, had enabled the American manufacturers to combine and form monopolies and extort unusual prices from the American consumers. The issues of the Spanish War and commercial problems largely diverted public attention, with the result that the tariff entered little into the discussions of the presidential campaign of 1904.

THE PAYNE ACT.

The demand, however, for a lower tariff, which those in control of the Republican Party successfully struggled against, became more and more insistent until, in the platform of 1908, this demand was recognized, and a promise by the Republicans to revise the tariff was inserted. That this promise would not be carried out was freely predicted by the Democrats.

On the issue stated in their own platform to be "unequivocally" for tariff revision, which revision was explained by all the Republican speakers, including the candidate for President, to mean a revision downward, the Republicans were elected. A revision was undertaken, but in open defiance of the most solemn and specific pledges made to the people of this country the Republicans revised the tariff not downward, but upward.

CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION, 1910.

Faced with an ever-increasing cost of living and betrayed by the promise of the Republican Party to reduce the burdens of the tariff, the people turned to the Democratic Party. In 1910, one year after the passage of the Payne law, a Republican majority of 45 in the House was turned into a majority for the Democrats of 63. The rebuke which was administered to the high-tariff party is too well known for me to dwell on.

THE SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS.

Intrusted with the responsibility of one of the two Houses of Congress, the Democratic Party showed promptly the sincerity of the pledges which it made to the people during the congressional election of 1910. Tariff bills placing many of the necessities of life on the free list and revising downward the tariff schedules on chemicals, metals, cotton, wool, and sugar passed this body by practically a unanimous Democratic vote, but were defeated either by a Republican Senate or by the veto of a Republican President.

These bills, though they failed to alter the law, are important in that they showed to the people of this country the intention of the Democrats to carry out the pledges which they made to revise the tariff downward. Our party reiterated its pledges to lower the tariff duties when it adopted its platform at the national convention at Baltimore.

The tariff plank in the Democratic platform of 1912 stated:

We favor the immediate downward revision of the existing high and, in many cases, prohibitive tariff duties, insisting that material reductions be speedily made upon the necessaries of life. Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products and articles of American manufacture which are sold abroad more cheaply than at home should be put upon the free list.

THE UNDERWOOD BILL.

On this platform the Democratic Party received the indorsement of the Nation. A Democratic President was overwhelmingly elected; the Senate was made Democratic, and two-thirds of the membership of the House was chosen from the candidates of our party. Upon receiving this mandate from the people preparation was made at once to fulfill our promises. The Ways and Means Committee of the House, which, under the Constitution, originates all revenue measures for the Federal Government, went to work immediately upon the convening of Congress. Hearings were held and experts were consulted, and the committee applied itself to the preparation of the tariff bill now under consideration.

As a majority member of the Committee on Ways and Means which presents this bill, I can assure the House that the tariff has been revised not with the idea that the duties imposed were benefits to be given to favored industries, but that the tariff was a form of taxation which should be placed where its burden was least felt. On luxuries we placed as great a duty as possible without making them prohibitive; on the necessities of life we placed as low a duty as consistent with raising the revenues of the Government.

To the free list has been added many of the necessities of the table and of the home. The placing of meat and fish and many vegetables on the free list and the reduction in wool and cotton clothing and in many other articles will lighten the burdensome cost of living for every citizen.

That this bill introduces a material modification of the economic policy of our Government is not questioned. It is a change in the interest of the consumer.

The following table is instructive in this connection. It gives the average rates of duty for each tariff schedule under the Payne Act and the estimated rates of duty for the Underwood bill, and also shows the percentage of change in the average duties which we propose to make.

Comparative summary of average ad valorem rates of duty by schedules.

Schedule.	Average rate of duty.		Reduction in per cent of duty.
	Payne law, 1912.	Estimates for a 12-month period under H. R. 3321	
A. Chemicals, oils, and paints	25.9	19.6	24
B. Earths, earthenware, and glassware	50.7	33.1	34
C. Metals, and manufactures of	34.3	20.1	41
D. Wood, and manufactures of	12.4	3.5	74
E. Sugar, molasses and manufactures of	48.1	35.9	25
F. Tobacco, and manufactures of	82.1	84.9	[1] 2
G. Agricultural products and provisions	29.0	16.8	42
H. Spirits, wines, and other beverages	83.9	83.3	0
I. Cotton manufactures	45.5	30.4	33
J. Flax, hemp, and jute and manufactures of	45.1	26.0	42
K. Wool and manufactures of	55.9	18.5	67
L. Silks and silk goods	51.5	43.9	16
M. Pulp, papers and books	21.4	11.8	47
N. Sundries	24.7	33.2	[1] [2] 33
Total, all schedules	40.12	29.60	26

[1] Increase in rate.

[2] Increase due to transfer of laces and embroideries from Schedules I, J, and K to Schedule N, which luxuries pay duty of 60 per cent.

BUSINESS AND THE TARIFF.

The greatest benefit to the greatest number has been the controlling basis for the changes summarized in the above table. At the same time the committee has not been unmindful of that provision in the National Democratic platform adopted at the Baltimore convention, which stated that our system of tariff taxation is intimately connected with the business of the country and that we favored the ultimate attainment of the principles which we advocate by legislation which will not injure or destroy legitimate industry. Business is too much dovetailed and labor too immobile to justify too sweeping a reduction of the tariff, which, while it would ultimately be a benefit, would in its immediate effect bear so grievously on a minority as to cause inexcusable hardship.

On the other hand, the committee has realized that "business" is sometimes guilty of going on what may be called a "sympathetic strike." The Ways and Means Committee has made every effort to get at the facts, and we believe that we are offering a tariff bill which is economically sound, a bill which takes from the minority the discriminatory advantages which they have enjoyed but have not shared, and which gives to the majority its fair proportion of the benefits of our American markets and industries.

IMPORTANT ITEMS IN THE BILL.

It is not possible to enter into a discussion of the specific benefits which will accrue to the manufacturer and consumer when the rates in the new bill go into effect. Coal, lumber, and structural steel, however, may be mentioned. These items are used by all. The manufacturer needs lumber and steel to construct his factories, and coal for power; the workingman needs building material for his house, and fuel is absolutely essential.

COAL.

Bituminous coal has carried under the Payne law a rate of 45 cents a ton, or, reduced to an ad valorem equivalent, 13.66 per cent. In the Underwood bill all coal is free. Last year there were importations of 868,181 tons of coal, all of which paid this rate of 45 cents. Coal in this bill is free, and our eastern markets should receive cheaper coal through competition with the mines of Canada.

LUMBER.

Sawed boards, planks, laths, shingles, and other sawed lumber, which under the Payne law carry an average duty of 8.63 per cent, are free in the penning bill. The value of importations of these materials was $19,757,000 for 1912, on which $1,705,000 duties were paid. The proposed change should lessen the cost of the construction of the home and the factory.

STRUCTURAL STEEL.

Structural steel, which is used so extensively in building our office buildings and factories, the duties on which have increased the cost of construction in this country, has been reduced from the present rate of 23.20 per cent to 12 per cent.

WOOL MANUFACTURES.

The reductions in the tariff on wool manufactures, it is said, will destroy that industry. This prophecy is, of course, not true. Up to the present time this industry has been the beneficiary of a prohibitive tariff, and naturally a reduction of that tariff to a competitive basis will force a readjustment which will place the industry ultimately on a sounder economic basis and free it from the uncertainties of legislation. Destruction will not follow the enactment of the new Democratic law.

The new bill has many substantial concessions in favor of the wool manufacturer. Annually this industry uses about $14,000,000 worth of chemicals and dyestuffs. The Underwood bill either places on the free list or reduces the rate of duty upon the following articles: Acetic acid, bichromate of potash, hyposulphite of soda, carbonate of soda (crystal), logwood extract, and sulphuric acid.

The most important concession, however, in the law to the wool manufacturers is free wool. For years they have carried a burden of 45 to 50 per cent upon their chief raw material. It has tied up annually thousands of dollars and so increased their cost of production that they have been excluded from foreign markets, where they would be forced to compete with their foreign rivals, who have free raw wool. Under the rates of the Underwood bill all the wools of the world—those from Australasia and Argentina especially—will be accessible to them, and they will be able to buy their chief raw material at the same price as their French, German, and English competitors.

Manufacturers at the time of a tariff reduction bring many imaginary ills upon themselves. Wool manufacturers do it in particular. They have gotten so in the habit of looking to legislation for support that they have convinced themselves that their industrial existence depends upon it. Reduction in the tariff is to them destruction. The fact of the matter is, wool manufactures in this country are the result, not of the tariff, but of the skill and initiative of the American business man. The tariff has and will continue to assist him, but at best it is a negative factor. Without the aggressiveness and courage of the leaders in the industry, nothing could build up industry. Manufacturers are in a mental attitude toward the tariff from which they must be freed. In the past a suggestion of a reduction in the tariff has created a mental panic; in many cases the manufacturer gives up without trying to face the new conditions caused by tariff changes. In the majority of cases individual effort and determination could overcome the threatened danger, and the domestic industry would be stronger for the struggle. In 1894 and 1895, even when the tariff changes were accompanied by a depression caused by bad crops and other factors beyond the control of legislation, those wool manufacturers who stayed with their mills were able to compete with the foreigner and make money. It was those who gave up in despair without a fight who were said to have failed. The success of the wool industry under the Underwood rates depends very largely upon the attitude of the manufacturer himself.

COTTON MANUFACTURES.

The cotton industry has also benefited by the reduction in the tariff on chemicals and dyestuffs. This industry uses approximately $5,000,000 worth of these materials annually. They include acetic and tannic acids, caustic soda, chloride of lime, and vegetable dyes. It is well known that the American cotton mills, because of cheap cotton and the automatic loom, can produce the coarse cotton goods as cheaply as any other mills in the world. Still a duty is placed upon similar goods by the Underwood bill imported into the United States, and this duty increases with the fineness of the goods in recognition of the disadvantage under which the American producer of fine goods labors compared with the producers of the coarser grades.

THE BOOT AND SHOE INDUSTRY.

The Underwood bill places boots and shoes upon the free list. At the same time it puts practically all the materials entering into boots and shoes on the free list. Among these materials are hides and sole, patent, and upper leather. The duty on tannic acid has been reduced from 25 cents to 4 cents per pound. There has also been a decided reduction in the duty on all the minor materials used by this industry.

The American boot and shoe industry has no equal in the world. It can compete successfully in foreign markets with the foreign producer.

The duty on shoes is at present of little assistance to the industry. The reductions contemplated in this bill on the materials used in the manufacture of shoes will lessen their cost and aid the manufacturer to compete more advantageously in foreign markets.

Following is a table showing some of the materials which enter into the cost of making shoes on which there will be a material reduction in the rate of duty:

Boots and shoes.

Article.	Rate of duty on ad valorem basis.	
	Under Payne law (fiscal year 1912).	Under H. R. 3321.
Cattle hides	Free.	Free.
Sole leather	5.00	Free.
Grain, buff, and split leather	7.50	Free.
Patent, etc., leather weighing not over 10 pounds per dozen hides	29.55	Free.
Patent, etc., leather, weighing over 10 and not over 25 pounds per dozen hides	24.99	Free.
Patent, etc., leather weighing over 25 pounds per dozen hides	25.60	Free.
Upper leather dressed, n. s. p. f.	15.00	Free.
Calfskins	15.00	Free.
Leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps	15.00	Free.
Shoe machinery	45.00	Free.
Coal, bituminous	13.66	Free.
Coke	20.00	Free.
Borax, crude	11.82	Free.
Nails:		
Wire	7.16	Free.
Cut	13.54	Free.
Hobnails	16.70	Free.
Tacks	14.00	Free.
Wood alcohol	20.00	Free.
Lumber for boxes	7.00	Free.
Studs and rivets	43.58	20.00
Shoe knives	41.98	27.00
Shoe lacings, cotton	53.96	25.00
Tannic acid and tannin	73.04	10.40
Castile soap	16.20	10.00

Boots and shoes—Continued.

Article.	Rate of duty on ad valorem basis.	
	Under Payne law (fiscal year 1912).	Under H. R. 3321.
Borax, refined	21.22	1.31
Sal soda	20.93	16.25
Glue	30.00	10 to 25
Dextrin and substitutes	42.42	23.33
Cotton thread	31.54	19.29
Linen thread	37.06	25 and 30
Silk thread	25.00	15.00
Cotton lining cloth	31.50	25.00
Braids	60.00	50.00
Cotton webbings	60.00	25.00
Cotton goring	60.00	50.00
Silk gorings	60.00	50.00
Buttons	43 and 48	15 and 40
Hooks and eyelets	45.00	15.00

COST OF LIVING.

"Massachusetts," says the report on the cost of living of that State in 1910, "comes far from feeding itself. In consequence of our extremely small percentage of agricultural workers and the excess of population in proportion to available farm land, the State is mainly dependent on outside sources for its food supply." Without doubt the removal or reduction of the duty on foodstuffs will bring added prosperity to the people of Massachusetts, and especially to those living in a large city like Boston. The Underwood bill proposes to remove many of the restrictions upon the importation of the necessities of life, which are now practically inaccessible to the New England States. Upon the enactment of the Underwood bill factory centers will be able to draw from Canada and other foreign countries for their food supply.

The high cost of living is probably the chief cause that led the people to demand a general revision of the tariff. Consumption in the United States is rapidly overtaking production, and the importation of foodstuffs will soon be a necessity. It is therefore the duty of the Democratic Party to do all that it can to relieve the consumer, and as a result sharp reductions have been made in the necessities of life.

MEATS.

The Underwood bill has placed on the free list bacon, hams, fresh beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork. Under the present law the duty on bacon and ham is 4 cents per pound, and on the fresh meats 16 per cent. This reduction will be of decided advantage to the consumer. The importance of the United States as an exporter of meats is growing less and less each year, and the amount exported is insignificant in comparison with home consumption. Argentina and Australasia are the important meat-exporting countries, and the United States can not expect to compete with them in the European markets. On the contrary, national prosperity demands that we take advantage of this supply. The importation of beef and mutton from these countries has in the past been comparatively small, but with the removal of the duty it will undoubtedly increase, and there will be a lowering of the price.

The reduction of the duty on cattle from approximately 27 per cent to 10 per cent will open to the cattle feeders of the Middle West the range cattle, known as "feeders," from Mexico, and ultimately this will have a tendency to lower the price of meat.

The duty on poultry when dead has been reduced in the Underwood bill from 5 cents to 2 cents per pound, and poultry when alive from 3 cents to 1 cent per pound. Fish have been placed on the free list. These facts should appreciably lower the price of these articles in the Boston market.

DAIRY PRODUCTS AND VEGETABLES.

Among the articles placed upon the free list by the Underwood bill are cream, milk, and potatoes. And the duty has been cut in two on butter, cheese, and eggs. The duties on vegetables, berries, and fruits have also been reduced. It is upon such products as these that the tariff operates directly, and freer trade in them with Canada must mean a benefit to the consumer in the eastern cities. It will enable the eastern markets to avail themselves of seasonable advantages and to purchase the vegetables and small fruits which mature late in Canada, and an appreciable decline in price may be expected on turnips and potatoes.

The duty on hay has been reduced by the Underwood bill from $4 to $2 per ton. Dairy farmers in Massachusetts do not raise all the hay that they need, and this factor in the law will make it possible to buy hay from Canada, rather than from the Western States, and thus save a large part of the freight.

FLOUR.

The United States is rapidly approaching a point where it will not produce enough wheat to supply the needs of the people. Naturally the first place to which we will turn to make up any deficit will be Canada. Recognizing this condition of affairs the Underwood bill has reduced the duty on wheat and placed flour on the free list.

NECESSITIES REDUCED.

Many other products might be mentioned upon which the Underwood bill either reduces the duty or places on the free list. The chief ones are enumerated in a following table. The duty on sugar has been reduced, and in three years it will go on the free list. This will mean an immediate reduction in the price of this commodity.

The immediate effect of the tariff upon prices is a question upon which many men differ. While admitting that it is a complex subject, it can be said that the benefits of tariff reductions on food products are likely to appear more quickly than on other products. No one will accuse the Massachusetts Cost of Living Commission of 1910 with believing that all our ills could be solved by the removal of the tariff, yet it said:

Its (the removal of the tariff) importance comes from the fact that we are soon going to buy a material part of our food outside our own limits. It would further have the very beneficial consequence of removing what chance may now exist to "corner" food products—a chance that puts the public at the mercy of the speculator and the trust. To some extent, also, it would lessen our dependence on the seasons and the weather. Bad harvests rarely occur over all the world.

This same commission summed up in its report the principle which has guided the Democrats in framing the Underwood bill. It says:

We submit, therefore, that it is a wise economic policy to give the people free access to those articles of food that call for the bulk of the expenditure of the masses. For purpose of revenue it may be wise to tax somewhat the comforts, and the heaviest duties should be levied on the luxuries, but the food necessities of life should be "free."

A table showing the reduction in duties on the necessities of life follows. The reductions are material ones, and will greatly benefit the consumer.

Necessities of life.

Article.	Rate of duty on ad valorem basis.	
	Act 1909 (for fiscal year 1912).	H. R. 3321.
Bacon and hams	16.72	Free.
Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork, fresh	15.90	Free.
Fresh milk	14.91	Free.
Cream	6.06	Free.
Milk, preserved, etc	27.95	Free.
Oatmeal and rolled oats	16.75	Free.
Potatoes	47.87	Free.
Rye flour	13.69	Free.
Swine	13.81	Free.
Wheat flour	25.03	Free.
Buckwheat flour	25.00	Free.
Corn	16.75	Free.
Corn meal	11.50	Free.
Fresh-water fish	6.72	Free.
Herring	12.86	Free.
Fish, n. s. p. f.	13.32	Free.
Mackerel, halibut, or salmon	16.21	Free.
Cotton cloth	42.75	26.44
Wool cloth	94.03	35.00
Cattle	27.07	10.00
Sheep	16.41	10.00
Barley	43.05	25.08
Macaroni	34.25	25.81
Oats	38.74	28.57
Cleaned rice	54.05	33.33
Wheat	20.03	14.29
Butter	25.51	12.00
Cheese	31.79	20.00
Beans	25.48	15.62
Eggs	36.38	14.28
Onions	46.42	26.67
Peas	14.36	9.55
Cabbages	26.21	15.00
Prunes	12.23	7.29
Raisins	26.60	21.82
Sugar	48.54	36.25
Lemons	64.85	24.03
Pineapples in bulk	29.26	17.86
Poultry, dead	35.60	18.18
Poultry, live	13.10	6.67
Vinegar	33.03	17.39

LABOR.

A world-wide market for food will prevent monopoly. Cornering the market will be out of the question, and that the wage earner will benefit by being able to buy his supplies in an open

market is indisputable. Moreover, the opening of our ports to an increased supply of free raw materials will enable our manufacturers to expand our export trade. This will mean an increased demand for labor.

The wage earners of this country are to receive a further advantage under the provisions of this bill. Not only have import duties been lowered on the necessities of life and monopolies prevented, but the burdens of taxation have been more equitably distributed.

THE INCOME TAX.

A tax is to be levied on the incomes of those who demand the greatest assistance from the Government in protecting their property and who are most favorably situated to meet this expense. This tax will be levied on all who have an income in excess of $4,000 and will replace the revenue now obtained by taxes on the necessities of life. The present import duties on sugar, breadstuffs, meats, and dairy products amount each year to about $60,000,000. As shown by the table above, practically all of these necessities have been placed on the free list or reduced by a large margin. The $60,000,000 now obtained by a tax on food, which constitutes the greater proportion of the expenditures of those of modest means will, under the provisions of our bill, be raised by an income tax instead.

CUSTOMS ADMINISTRATIVE FEATURES.

The committee has not been content merely to change the provisions of the bill which now impose inequitable taxes. We have gone further, with a view to improving the effectiveness of the administration of the customs laws.

Numerous frauds have been brought to light of late which confirm the general opinion that our import duties are not properly executed. The Ways and Means Committee have taken into consideration the changed conditions which the expansion of our commercial relations has brought about. The administrative features of the bill have been so modified as to make it possible to collect the duties imposed by law. The powers of the customs officials to get at the facts with regard to prices and values of articles of foreign manufacture have been materially increased for this purpose.

These changes are too technical, for the most part, to be taken up here in detail, but I wish to point out one of the important additions which we propose to make in this bill which will reduce fraud by undervaluation to a minimum.

THE "ANTIDUMPING" PROVISION.

The paragraph covering this provision is called the "antidumping" clause, and stipulates that whenever articles are exported to the United States of a class or kind produced here, if the actual selling price to the American importer is less than the fair market value of the same article when sold for home consumption in the exporting country, there shall be levied, in addition to the usual duties, a special, or "dumping," duty of 15 per cent on the difference between the normal market value and the price at which it was sold for exportation. This dumping duty is to apply, whenever there is occasion, to all goods on which there is less than a 50 per cent rate.

Inasmuch as the regular duties are levied on the selling, or invoice price, it has been difficult to detect fraud by undervaluation, although the local market price of the exporting country was well known to our consular service and customs collectors. The dumping duty will serve as an automatic check against fraud, in that importers will find it to their disadvantage to place a value on merchandise which is below its fair market value, for this practice would at once place them under suspicion in case of deliberate undervaluation, or subject them to a surtax of 15 per cent in case goods were being dumped on our market.

Another feature of this new provision is that there will be increased stability in prices. The dumping duty will discourage foreign countries from unloading a large temporary surplus on our markets, which tends for a period to disturb prices and to unsettle business. Obviously this provision will be a great benefit to the American producer.

An indirect benefit, and a very important one, which arises from increased uniformity in prices and the absence of unnatural fluctuation in market values is that the revenue of the Government will be more dependable and more accurately estimated. This tariff bill has been drawn on a revenue basis. We wish to make sure that there will be sufficient funds available to run the Government. On the other hand, we do not wish an unwarranted surplus, which means excessive taxation. In order to determine with any exactness the amount of revenue to be expected from the different tariff schedules, we must have a definite basis for our calculations. The market values of articles in the country from whence exported are easy to ascertain, and will afford the assistance which is so essential to a satisfactory administration of our customs laws.

The dumping provision has been in effect in Canada since 1907 in practically the same form as proposed in the committee's bill. We have every assurance that it has been successfully used there; and inasmuch as Canada is one of our nearest competitors, it behooves us to take a like action to insure us against discrimination.

NEW INDUSTRIAL ERA.

There comes a time in the industrial development of every country when its manufacturers must turn their attention to the conquest of world markets. In the United States we have had up to the present time a vast domestic market, which has grown relatively less and less in comparison with our expanding industries. Production is rapidly overtaking consumption, and thoughtful manufacturers realize that unless they increase our export trade the domestic market will soon mark the limits of their development. Industrially, we have progressed to a point where such tariff rates as are embodied in the Payne-Aldrich law cease to encourage industry, but impede and arrest it. Blind to the changes which have taken place in our industrial life during the last decade, the Republicans have stubbornly adhered to a worn-out and obsolete system of exclusion and are now relying upon the prejudices of the people to defeat the careful reforms of the Democratic Party.

The sweeping victory of the party last November was not only a demand to revise the tariff in the interests of the consumer, it was a demand to revise it in the interests of the industrial classes and the manufacturer as well. At that time the Nation turned its back on the policy of national exclusiveness and faced the world in contest for industrial and commercial supremacy. If our manufactures are to expand, if the facilities of the Panama Canal and the unlimited opportunities of the markets of South America and the Orient are to be availed of, the barriers which hold the manufacturers of the Nation back must be removed; artificiality in industry must be eliminated, and the manufacturer must learn to face foreign competition at home so that he may successfully meet it in neutral markets abroad. Our permanent industrial strength lies in the reduction of the tariff.

CONCLUSION.

The consumer above all others will be benefited by the enactment of the new tariff law. He has faced during the past decade a rising cost of living, which is in large part due to the prohibitive tariff of the Republican Party. The Democratic Party does not claim that the downward revision of the tariff is a panacea for all our social and economic ills, but it does claim that in so far as the tariff, either actually or potentially, burdens the consumer, it should be changed, and the lowering of tariff duties is the principal need of the day. The time has come in our national development not only when our manufactured goods must seek markets abroad, but when the consumer must import from abroad a part of his foodstuffs. Trade is reciprocal. We can not expect to sell abroad if we do not buy abroad. Freer trade in food and raw materials means industrial strength and relief to the consumer. It is thus that the producer and consumer stand together, the beneficiaries of the new era in American tariff legislation.

The Democratic Party proposes with the enactment of the new tariff bill to remove present discriminations in the law, to encourage increased expansion in our export trade, to provide for a more stable and economic basis for our business interests, and by a change in the rates of duty and through the medium of an income tax and better provisions for the administration of our tariff laws to more equitably distribute the burdens of taxation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I believe that when this bill is enacted and industry has adjusted itself to it the tariff will be out of politics and there will ensue a period of unprecedented industrial activity in this country.

This is the people's tariff bill. It marks a new era in the social and industrial development of our great country.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PETERS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. In reference to subsection 7 of paragraph J of section 4, do I understand that makes a reduction of 5 per cent in the rate of duties imposed in the bill on goods which are imported in American bottoms?

Mr. PETERS. Yes; it does.

Mr. MANN. Does that mean that on all goods which are imported in American bottoms the tariff rate will be 95 per cent of the rate fixed in the bill?

Mr. PETERS. No.

Mr. MANN. I am not playing upon words. Of course, if there is a reduction of 5 per cent, that leaves 95 per cent, as I understand it, and 95 per cent will be the amount to be paid.

Mr. PETERS. No; the regular duties will be paid, and there is to be a rebate from those duties of 5 per cent to the importer.

Mr. MANN. Would the gentleman read the paragraph and see what it says?

Mr. PETERS. Will the gentleman give the page?

Mr. MANN. Well, I do not remember the page.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman from Illinois will allow me to answer the question I will be glad to do so.

Mr. MANN. Certainly; I want to get the information.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is a rebate allowed of 5 per cent on the duties collected at the customhouse from any goods coming in an American vessel. Now, to illustrate, it brings it to a very simple proposition. If there is a ship which comes in and the importer gets goods from the customhouse, the duties on which amount to $1,000, there will be a discount of 5 per cent, which means $50 will be taken off, and he will pay the customhouse tax of $950.

Mr. MANN. That is what I understood; it is a discount, not a rebate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; it is a discount.

Mr. MANN. Now, a further question I wish to ask the gentleman is, What effect will that have upon subsection 1 of paragraph J, which imposes a duty of 10 per cent discriminatory against all vessels which brings goods in paying the same rate of duty as vessels of the United States?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman misinterprets the two sections. They are not involved at all. Subsection 7 of paragraph J gives a discount on goods coming into this country. Subsection 1 is a reenactment of the present law and has been a reenactment of the present law for many years.

Mr. MANN. I understand that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I admit the language of it is considerably involved, but it was not changed because it has been construed by the courts, and we left it alone.

Mr. MANN. I am very sure the gentleman will, if he reexamines that carefully, because he will find reason for changing it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all, because the gentleman does not realize the purpose of the two sections.

Mr. MANN. I do realize the purpose of the two sections.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If he does, the gentleman readily sees there is no conflict between them at all, because section 1 is to be applicable when a country discriminates against our ships going into their ports and has nothing whatever to do with goods coming from other ports into our ports. It is for an entirely different purpose, but when we reach that section I will be glad to explain it further.

Mr. MANN. I will call attention to it, and I hope the gentleman will be here to explain it then if I have an opportunity to address the House.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. PETERS. Certainly.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is it the opinion of the Member from Massachusetts that the placing of boots and shoes upon the free list will help the New England boot and shoe industry?

Mr. PETERS. I think the boot and shoe industry under the provisions of this bill receives very great and substantial advantages.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then it will be a benefit rather than a detriment to the boot and shoe business in Massachusetts to put boots and shoes on the free list?

Mr. PETERS. I believe the provisions of this bill are a great advantage to the boot and shoe industry of the United States.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am asking a specific and direct question, and the gentleman should give a specific and direct answer.

Mr. PETERS. I am giving a specific and direct answer, and if the gentleman does not like my answer that is not my fault. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. AUSTIN. I will ask the gentleman another question. He speaks about securing free coal under the operations of this bill. Does that mean Massachusetts will secure its coal supply from Newfoundland or continue to buy coal from West Virginia?

Mr. PETERS. The gentleman realizes that it depends upon the market price at the point to be delivered. I suppose some of the coal will be brought down from the Nova Scotia Peninsula or else the rate from Tennessee be lowered.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if I could name this bill I would change its title so it would read "A bill to lower wages, to close factories, to spread disaster broadcast in the United States, and build up industries abroad." [Applause on the Republican side.] I believe the bill if enacted will bring about those results.

I am sorry to be called upon at this time to defend the protective policy of the Republican Party which in the past has brought the greatest measure of prosperity to the American people they have ever enjoyed since the beginning of the Republic.

Experience of the past brings me to believe the rates of duty provided for in this bill, if enacted into law in their present form, will not bring the people of this country the relief which its friends predict, but will have a very opposite effect.

Nineteen years ago the Democratic Party, then having control of both branches of Congress and the Executive, presented a bill in general terms and principles remarkably similar to this bill. It was known as the Wilson-Gorman bill and was enacted into law, and the results which followed are well known to that portion of our population who were then of age. The authors of that bill predicted that with its passage great happiness and prosperity would come to the people of the United States. They claimed values to the consumers would be lowered; that increased employment would be given to our labor; that an increased demand for labor would increase wages; and that increased wages would reflect prosperity upon the whole land; that the laboring man would be able to purchase more of the necessities of life for his daily wage, and that, although prices would be lowered to the consumers, no producers thereby would be injured. At that time prominent Republicans opposed that measure most vigorously and urged, as Republicans urge now, that inadequate tariff rates on American-made products would flood our markets with foreign goods produced by foreign cheap labor, and that increased importations would curtail home production and employment of American labor and result in hard times. Whose contention was right then? It is all a matter of record, and I beg of you not to close your eyes to it.

It will be remembered that in 1892 the people of this country were prosperous. The crops were never more bountiful than during that year. The factories never ran more at full time than then. Labor demanded the highest scale of wages that had ever been paid in the factories or on the farms of the United States, and prosperity was everywhere to be found in this country. By just such misrepresentations by politicians from the platform and through yellow journals and magazines as have been so much in evidence of late the seed of discontent was sown until the people believed they should have a change. A change was made and was made at a time when our fields of golden grain throughout the land were most bountiful. Our factories were running full blast, labor was receiving remunerative wages, capital realized fair to extraordinary returns for investments, our banks were well filled, and our mines never more productive.

The change was made, it came upon us quickly, for almost in the passing of a night and the twinkling of an eye something caused a halt; property values shrunk more than one-half; factories closed down or ran on short time; fires were extinguished in our smelting furnaces; bank failures occurred daily in every State in the Union, and $2,000,000,000 worth of railroad property went in the hands of receivers; laboring men were dressed in rags and tramping the country far and wide seeking employment; poverty and suffering existed in humble homes, and Coxey's armies marched toward the Capital. The change transformed a land of sunshine and plenty into one of destitution and discontent. What was the cause? Can any intelligent man attribute all this disaster to other than that Democratic tariff law, which opened wide the gates of that wall of protection which had been built about the Nation by the Republican Party? Under that Democratic measure the products of foreign countries, produced by the cheapest labor in the world, flooded our markets, and, due to idleness, the purchasing power of the great masses of our people was either cut in two or completely destroyed. Can any honest man say, in a firm belief, any other cause than this Democratic tariff law occasioned all this distress? Identically the same policies and the same theories of that tariff law are set forth in the present bill. Can any man point out any difference between the two, except that the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill provided for higher rates of duty than does this bill?

At the time of the consideration of the Wilson-Gorman bill the free-wool era had just been ushered in by just such rainbow prophecies of the glorious results that would follow as have

been heard from the champions of the present bill. On one of these occasions Hon. William M. Springer, of Illinois, said:

Pass this bill and thousands of feet heretofore bare and thousands of limbs, naked or covered with rags, will be clothed with suitable garments, and the condition of all the people will be improved. It will give employment to 50,000 more operators in the woolen mills; it will increase the demand for wool, and prices will increase; and with increased demand for labor wages will increase. Those who favor its passage may be assured that they have done something to scatter plenty o'er a smiling land.

In a way the buoyant prophecies of this gifted statesman were realized. Plenty was scattered o'er a smiling land, but not America—it was England. Before this Democratic experiment in tariff for revenue only had been in operation six months the woolen mills of England were working overtime and bread lines and soup houses and other forms of public charities were supporting the idle operators of the American woolen mills. It had the result of distributing plenty to the people of a smiling land across the sea—the opposite effect to that predicted by this illustrious statesman.

William Jennings Bryan, on the floor of the House, on January 13, 1894, said:

Speaking for myself it is immaterial, in my judgment, whether the sheep grower receives any benefit from the tariff or not. Whether he does or does not, I am for free wool in order that our woolen manufacturers, unburdened by a tax upon foreign wool and unburdened by a like tax upon home-grown wool, may manufacture for a wider market.

Under the legislation advocated by Mr. Bryan, a measure not very different from the one now under consideration, the American manufacturers with free wool lost one-half of the American market and sold in foreign markets in such small proportions that it did not faze the plenty and prosperity that was scattered o'er the smiling land of England and all Europe, for while the woolen manufacturers were greatly depressed in this country they prospered as never before on the other side of the Atlantic, where the *Wilson-Gorman law had bestowed a gift of many millions of dollars worth of American business to exultant English manufacturers.* Helmuth Schwartz & Co.'s annual report for 1895 declared:

The dominant factor in the past 12 months has been the recovery and rapid development of export trade of wool and woolens to the United States under the stimulating influence of free wool and lower tariff rates on woolen goods.

That year—1895—thanks to Mr. Bryan and other gentlemen who enacted the Wilson-Gorman tariff law, was described as "*the most prosperous, judging by the volume of exports, that the English manufacturers of woolens had enjoyed since 1890.*" This beneficent Democratic tariff law endowed many an English woolen manufacturer with the means of adequately supporting the honors of knighthood granted by a grateful sovereign.

The gleeful Bradford Journal, in its annual review of the English woolen trade for 1895, spoke of the year as the most extraordinary of the waning century and attributed the great prosperity to the more reasonable tariff adopted by the United States.

The London Times joined in the chorus of rejoicers and said:

There is room for doubt whether outside the West Riding of Yorkshire it is at all generally realized that the year 1895 witnessed a revival of the worsted industry of such magnitude as to be a matter not only for local but for national congratulation. After long years of depression, the varying, sometimes doubtless, intermitted gloom, which had lately become painfully intense, the great manufacturing district of which Bradford is the center, was visited last year by the full sunshine of prosperity.

All of which the London Times proceeded to attribute, roughly speaking, to the Wilson tariff, which came into effective operation in the last months of 1894 in place of the "strangling system of duties" associated with the name of McKinley.

There was your smiling land. There was the bountiful and the plenty.

My friends, I will, in the time given to me, try to touch the high spots in a few of the schedules on which you have been working so industriously with your pruning knife. I will take up the things in which the people I have the honor to represent directly, in the eighth district of Michigan, are most interested. You propose, as the Irishman did with his dog, to take a little bit off of the sugar schedule at a time, so that it will not hurt so much.

That is the way the Irishman cut his dog's ears. He cut a little from them every day, so that it would not punish the dog so much. You propose by this bill to put sugar on the free list at the end of three years, and at the present time to lower the duty a little over 25 per cent below the duty now provided for by law. There has not been one scintilla of evidence presented to the Committee on Ways and Means in their hearings before they began the fixing of rates in this bill; there was not one scintilla of evidence presented to the Hardwick Sugar Investigating Committee from any source, except the Sugar Trusts and two canning companies, asking for a lower rate of duty on sugar. None at all. One Frank C. Lowry is very much in evidence in the handbook printed by our Democratic friends, members of the Ways and Means Committee. Who is Frank C. Lowry? He is the paid lobbyist of the sugar refining companies of New York and the sales agent for the Federal Sugar Co., of which Mr. August Spreckels is the president. He claims to be the secretary of a wholesale grocerymen's association, and when before the Hardwick committee, and when before the Committee on Ways and Means in January last, Mr. Lowry admitted under oath there had never been a meeting of more than himself and one other member of that wholesale grocerymen's association, which is advocating free sugar, and such meetings were held when he, Mr. Lowry, called upon the grocerymen, who permitted him to use their names. He further admitted there never was any weekly, monthly, semiannual, or annual dues paid by any member of the association. They never had a meeting. There was no organization whatever, but he, Mr. Lowry, had received many thousands of dollars from this Mr. Spreckels, president of the Federal Sugar Co., to send broadcast over this land as coming from this association literature asking Members of Congress to vote for free trade on sugar.

Who is Mr. Spreckels, and what firm does he represent? There are many of the Spreckels family, all estimable gentlemen. I disagree with them in their political views; that is all. Mr. August Spreckels, if I am right, is president of the Federal Sugar Refining Co. of New York. Mr. Lowry, his representative, testified before the Hardwick investigating committee that of the $10,000,000 of stock issued by that company only about $3,200,000 had been paid in cash, and all the balance of the $10,000,000 of stock was watered stock.

I asked him if the pump had not been kept going industriously when they ground out that stock. [Laughter.] He made the statement—and perhaps the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] will attempt to answer this point, too—Mr. Lowry made the statement or complaint that a certain firm in the State of Michigan had a very large amount of common stock, and because of his complaint of that amount of common stock the interesting fact was brought out concerning the common stock in his own company.

He stated that two-thirds of the stock issued to the Michigan Sugar Co. was common stock and therefore watered stock. This statement is incorrect. The Michigan Sugar Co., when organized, purchased eight sugar factories in the State of Michigan, two of which have been dismantled and moved to another part of the country, and the new capital put in by the new organization represents the preferred stock, and all the capital invested in all those factories when they were first built represents the common stock, or the most of it, at least. One million or a million and a half out of some ten or twelve million dollars' capital is the only amount of watered stock in the concern, as I remember the testimony, and the testimony presented to the Hardwick committee bears out that statement.

There are in the State of Michigan to-day 16 sugar factories, representing an investment in plants and working capital of nearly $20,000,000. There are 32,000 farmers in the State of Michigan raising sugar beets, among whom those factories last year distributed $8,000,000 for the purchase of beets. Those factories pay in freight to the railroads of Michigan nearly $2,000,000 per year. They turn out from $12,000,000 to $15,000,000 worth of finished product—granulated sugar—each year. The people of that State consume about one-half of that sugar.

Heretofore, before those factories were built, we exported that money to some foreign country and furnished employment to foreigners to produce the sugar which we in the State of Michigan consumed. To-day we are not only producing all the sugar we consume, and therefore keeping the money at home, but we are making and exporting from the State to other States from $6,000,000 to $8,000,000 worth of sugar each year.

There are located in the United States over 70 beet-sugar factories making granulated sugar. I believe but one out of the whole number produces raw sugar—a factory in California, owned, I believe, by the Spreckels. And, by the way, before I get away from the Spreckels, who are so industrious, and before I get away from Mr. Lowry, whose handwriting is clearly seen all through the sugar schedule of this bill, for it is evident our Democratic friends have listened attentively to Mr. Lowry and the Spreckels family in writing the tariff schedule on sugar, I want to say that there is another Mr. Spreckels in San Francisco, who was a most ardent supporter, personally and finan-

cially, so I am informed, of President Wilson last year. There is no discredit in that, but if newspaper reports are correct this Mr. Rudolph Spreckels, who lives on the Pacific coast, is now slated for appointment as minister to Germany. And between August Spreckels, of New York, and Rudolph Spreckels, of San Francisco, God help the sugar industry in the middle. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

The beet-sugar crop comes on the market generally in the fall, in October, and goes off the market in May, and during the time when the domestic product is on the market the lowest price of sugar exists that can be found in the land at any time of the year. Why? Because beet sugar is sold in nearly every State in the Union, and is sold at a lower price than refined sugar made from cane; not because it is not equal in quality, but because of the keen competition between those seventy-odd beet-sugar factories in this country. The price of sugar is brought down to a minimum to the consumer, and the very instant our domestic sugar goes off the market up goes the price of sugar in New York.

There never has been a time in the history of this land, except once, when sugar was as low as it is to-day. That time was when the McKinley law was in effect. Sugar was then upon the free list, and, in order to protect the domestic industry, a bounty of 2 cents a pound was paid by the Federal Government. At no other time in our history has the price of sugar been as low to the consumer as it is to-day.

Mr. Lowry, who evidently aided so much in the preparation of this bill, made the statement under oath to the committee that in this country refined sugar was always sold at the lowest price in the city of New York. A gentleman from Michigan engaged in the beet-sugar industry followed him, and his testimony under oath was most convincing evidence in support of adequate protection to the home industry, and showed the utter falsity of Mr. Lowry's statement. In part it is as follows:

I venture to say here, and I will give specific illustrations of the truth of my statements, that there was not a minute between the 10th day of October, 1912, and the 1st day of January, 1913, when the cost of domestic sugar delivered at any point in the United States, from the Mississippi River to the Allegheny Mountains, and between the Ohio River and the Canadian boundary, was not less than the quotation in New York. The highest price of sugar in the territory mentioned would be the price in the Twin Cities, Minneapolis and St. Paul, where the rate of freight is 30 cents. The maximum base price of beet sugar in the time indicated was 4.50; add 30 cents freight to it and you get a quotation of 4.80 in the Twin Cities, whereas the quotation in New York itself was 4.90. A few days after this, open 4.50 quotations went into effect, the price of domestic beet sugar in the Twin Cities and throughout that section of the country where the freight rate is highest, declined to a 4.35 basis, and add 30 cents to that and you get 4.65, the delivered price.

Take it in the city of Chicago. The city of Chicago has been buying beet sugar during this interval at a base price as low as 4.20, whereas the cash price in New York, with the exception of one or two refiners who cut it 5 points, has been, during that period, 4.90. The delivered price of beet sugar in the city of Chicago has been as low as 4.42½, and I know some sales that were made at 4.40, delivered in Chicago, whereas the price of cane sugar in New York was 4.90. You take, for instance, Cincinnati. The prevailing price for beet sugar in Cincinnati during this time had been 4.40 plus 19½ cents for the delivered price, and that makes 4.58½ cents, the delivered price in Cincinnati, as against 4.90 in New York.

Now we will take the city of Detroit: 4.40 plus 17½ cents makes 4.57½ cents in Detroit as against 4.90 in New York. I say, gentlemen, that the delivered price of beet sugar in the United States between the dates indicated—when the beet crop came on the market and the 1st day of January—and in the territory described has been below the price of cane sugar in New York, thus controverting the statement that has been made here that the price of sugar in New York, under the eaves of the refineries, is the lowest price of sugar in the United States. I have given the distinct statement here and the quotations are before me. The proof is right here, and if any gentleman desires to have this substantiated any further than by my naked statement, which I have given under oath, I will furnish you invoices and settlements to substantiate every word I have said.

Not only has the delivered price of beet sugar throughout this great interior district been lower this year than the price of cane sugar at the very doors of the eastern refineries but beet sugar has been sold all this season in every State in the Union except six or eight, and in nearly every market it has entered the delivered price of beet sugar has been from 40 to 50 cents per 100 pounds below the delivered price of cane sugar in that same market.

Were there time I could show you that this is no unusual condition. I could show you that a year ago the advent of beet sugar not only checked the arbitrary high price of cane sugar, fixed by the very refiners who are here asking for free trade or low duties, but forced these same refiners to drop their prices from 1½ to 2 cents per pound throughout the entire United States.

Now, why has this condition prevailed? Because these seventy-odd beet-sugar factories are competing with each other in this territory, and there have been only three potent cane refineries competing with themselves on the selling price of cane sugar. This is the reason that the prices of beet sugar during the beet-sugar season, in which we are now engaged, have been made independent of the price of cane sugar, and the low quotations that I have just given you are brought about by this competition between the beet-sugar people themselves. That is what I am getting at, and I bring it out for this purpose that if you wish to throttle that kind of competition and to turn this market over to the three refining companies who are asking for a low tariff or free trade on sugar you will introduce into the economic policy of this country the absence of that competition which you are trying to give to the people of the United States in order to regulate the price of foodstuffs.

Now, you have your choice of placing this matter of price in the hands of a great number of people who are competing for the market or putting it in the hands of three concerns. There is the whole question in a nutshell. Why? The honorable committee, in the report of the majority members of the committee accompanying their last bill on sugar, said that the cost of sugar in Germany, raw sugar, ranged from 1.96 to 2.07, and that the cost of refined sugar in Germany was 2.41½. The Michigan Sugar Co., I think, buys its sugar as cheaply as does any other company, and the Michigan Sugar Co. has paid for the extractable sugar in the beet during the time that it has been in operation $2.62 a hundred before beginning the process of manufacturing.

Gentlemen, raw material before it is touched in the factories costs $2.62 per hundred, and the cost of the sugar in Germany raw, ready for refinery, or refined sugar ready for the table is the price indicated, and there is but one thing for the domestic industry to do if they compete without a tariff with the foreign sugar—go out of business.

To drive it further home, Cuban sugar is selling to-day in New York for February, delivered, at 2 7/8 cents per pound in bond. You add 1.35 (round numbers), the Cuban tariff on that sugar, and you get 3.41, but leave out the tariff and that Cuban sugar, laid down in New York at the present daily quotation, costs but $2.06 per hundred pounds. I say that with that cost on foreign sugar they must go out of business unless something stands between them and that cost of foreign sugar, and when the domestic beet sugar goes out of existence you come to this one thing: That you have removed the only competition that stands between those three men and the feeding of 90,000,000 people with a necessity of life.

Gentlemen, if you put the great sugar industry upon the basis of free trade this is what you will do: You will make it possible for the great refining industries of this country which have the capacity to refine all the sugar 150,000,000 people would consume without adding any machinery to their present equipment, to arbitrarily fix the price of sugar, and you will put the consumers of this country in one of two positions. If the price does not go down to the consumer, then the domestic industry can survive, but under that condition you will rob the Treasury of the United States of more than $50,000,000 revenue which it is now collecting on imported sugar, and you will put that much money into the pockets of the refiners at New York. Or, if the price of sugar is lowered to the consumer just the amount of the reduction of the duty, you will then wipe out of existence this domestic industry, and as soon as that has been accomplished, once more the great refining interests of this country will control the supply of our sugar.

Go back only to 1911, during the summer months, when there was no domestic sugar upon the market, and what do we find? We found sugar in New York going as high as 7½ cents per pound f. o. b. New York. What was the occasion of that increased price of sugar, jumping up from 5½ cents per pound to 7½ cents per pound? It was because of the publications in the papers of New York that the price of refined sugar was based upon European raws, f. o. b. New York, or in bond in New York, plus the duty, which gave a quotation of $6.40 per hundred pounds for raw sugar, duty paid, delivered at the refineries in New York. Then they added to that amount 40 cents for refining and 60 cents per hundred pounds for profit and sold it at 7½ cents per pound, and claimed that they were justified in charging that price. Also remember at that time there was no beet sugar for sale. I obtained through the Treasury Department a certified copy of all of the importations of sugar into this country during those months, and for 12 months prior to that time, in every port of entry in the United States and from every country in the world from which a pound of sugar came, and there were no importations from Europe during the whole 16 months, with the single exception of confectionery sugar, which sold at 14 cents a pound. So the statement that European raws were selling on the New York market for $6.40 was incorrect. The highest price paid for any sugar in any month during the whole 16 months was $2.74 a hundred pounds. The sugar-refining companies of this country could have made a normal profit and put that sugar on the market for $5.20 a hun-

dred pounds, but they charged 7½ a pound for it because there was no domestic competition. Yet our Democratic friends wish to wipe out of existence this domestic sugar industry of this country for the purpose, they say, of lowering the price, and thereby benefiting the consumers.

My Democratic friends, you have gone one step further. Boneblack is used in the refining of sugar. It is used chiefly in this country by the sugar-refining companies. Heretofore it has been on the protected list. You have now placed it on the free list, so that the Sugar Trust can buy abroad what boneblack is used—some 36,000,000 to 40,000,000 pounds a year—to aid in further lowering the cost of production, to punish domestic industries. The beet-sugar manufacturers use no boneblack at all.

Gentlemen, if your theories in 1894 were correct—that free trade would build up industries in this country, thereby aiding the laboring men of this country, and aiding also the consumer—if your arguments then were correct, your arguments to-day are correct. But were they correct then? No. You will admit and every other honest man will admit that you made a grievous mistake then.

One man said to me the other day, "Don't talk about the panic of 1894, 1895, and 1896; it is so far back I can't remember it." He reminded me of the Irishman when the girl in the hotel brought him a bowl of soup. He asked what kind of soup it was. She replied, "Ox-tail soup." "Begorra," said he, "that is from a long ways back, isn't it?" [Laughter.]

It is a long ways back—20 years—yes; but I was on earth at that time and in business. I was then in the flour-milling business, and I want to answer the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND] in regard to flour, for I have some knowledge of the manufacture of flour. I put $20,000 into a flour mill, and I remained in the business just as long as my money lasted, and when the company busted I went out of business; that was in 1896.

The gentleman from Minnesota tries to justify the lower rate of duty on wheat and free trade in flour. You may say that it is not free trade in flour; but it is free trade in flour in every sense of the word, because every country that wants our markets for their flour will take advantage of this proviso and remove their import duty; but it will not benefit our millers, for we do not sell flour to countries engaged in exporting flour to the United States.

What is the existing law? The gentleman from Minnesota, a gentleman for whom I have the highest regard, has by his industry taken care most thoughtfully of the great flouring mills of Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth. Under existing law these mills can to-day import wheat in bond, mill it in bond, and ship it abroad without the payment of duty; but under existing law the by-products—bran and middlings—must also go abroad if milled in bond, and if it remains here it pays duty.

There is another provision of law under which the mills can bring in wheat from Canada, Alberta, and Saskatchewan, the greatest wheat country in the world, pay the duty of 25 cents per bushel, and when shipping abroad the manufactured product can get a drawback of 99 per cent of the duty paid; but this payment of duty on the by-product is the sticker. Some mill men appeared before the Ways and Means Committee four years ago begging the committee to put this by-product on the free list because they could not ship these by-products abroad. I know as a miller, from the experience I paid for, what this means.

Now, what have you done, my Democratic friends? You have provided in your bill that wheat can be imported into this country, and when the chief product of the raw material is shipped abroad, which is the flour out of the grain, no duty shall be collected upon the by-product, or in other words, that 99 per cent of the duty paid shall be refunded to the miller as a drawback.

Therefore under this bill you make it possible for the great mills in that country, some of which turn out as many as 12,000 to 15,000 barrels of flour a day, to import all the wheat they need for grinding flour for export without the payment of any duty at all except 1 per cent on 10 cents a bushel, and most of these great mills have water power which enables them to drive out of existence any mill which does not have cheap power.

What does it mean to the miller, my friend? It means free trade in wheat for every mill that wishes to grind flour for export.

I wish that some men in my State could take care of the industries of Michigan as well as the gentleman from Minnesota and other members of the committee have taken care of the great flouring mills of the Northwest. The gentleman says that our exports in agricultural products have fallen off. If they had increased he would have contended that we could compete, so why is this not positive proof that we need more protection?

Replying to his statement about increased exportations of manufactured goods and decreased exportations of agricultural products, I would say there has not been the change which the gentleman from Minnesota indicates. While it is true that the volume of our manufactured goods exported in 1910 is much greater than the value of our manufactured goods exported in 1880, it is equally true that the volume of our manufactured goods in 1910 is much greater than in 1880.

In 1880 we made $5,000,000,000 worth of manufactured goods, of which we exported $122,000,000 worth, or 2.4 per cent of our production. In 1910 we manufactured $21,000,000,000 worth of manufactured articles, of which we exported $667,000,000 worth, or 3.1 per cent of our production.

It will thus be seen that in 1880 we consumed at home 97.6 per cent of the manufactured articles we produced, while in 1910 we consumed 96.9 per cent of the manufactured articles we produced.

The Democratic policy says we must give our entire attention to enlarging our foreign trade, and the gentleman from Minnesota contends that if our manufacturers can export to the markets of the world we should greatly reduce our tariff and permit the manufacturers of the world to come here and compete in the United States with our own manufacturers. The fallacy of the argument is this: The Democratic Party would look after the 2 or 3 per cent of manufactured articles which we export, while the Republican policy would guard our home markets, which consume 97 to 98 per cent of the manufactured articles which we produce. Under the Republican doctrine our home manufacturers have increased their production from five to twenty-one billion dollars since 1880, whereas they have only increased their export trade from one hundred and twenty-two to six hundred and sixty-seven million dollars in the same time. In other words, the Republican Party thinks it a matter of greatest importance to the welfare of the people of the United States that the home markets, which consume 97 to 98 per cent of all our manufactured products should be most jealously guarded and that we should take potluck with the other nations of the world with the 2 per cent we send abroad. Moreover, we believe in such a law that will enable our manufacturers to increase the volume of their products in 30 years from five billion to twenty-one billion dollars rather than to follow the Democratic doctrine which would stop these manufacturers and give foreigners access to our markets, the greatest markets for manufactured articles in the world.

Now, I want to quote the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. He said yesterday in his remarks that his party would not injure a legitimate industry. If free trade is an injury to legitimate industry, what do you call the growing of wool? Is that a legitimate or an illegitimate industry? Free wool, as was the case under the Wilson-Gorman law, will destroy or greatly retard the woolgrowing industry and the sheep industry in this country unless the cost of living may keep up the price of mutton.

Therefore, by placing wool upon the free list, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and his party have branded the wool industry of this country as an illegitimate industry. When wool was placed on the free list in the Wilson-Gorman bill in 1894 our flock of sheep dwindled from about 50,000,000 head to 35,000,000 head inside of 36 months, and the value of sheep dwindled from $5 and $6 per head to from 75 cents to $1.50 a head. I remember in the winter of 1895 and 1896, in my home city, of seeing sleighs with hayracks upon them coming into town with the carcasses of sheep piled up like stacks of hay—your choice for 75 cents. Low cost of living all right, but the devil of it was nobody had the 75 cents. [Laughter.]

Mr. AUSTIN. What do they sell for to-day?

Mr. FORDNEY. The Tariff Board report shows that in 1911 the average sheep in the country was valued at $5.30 a head. Last fall during the campaign I saw a consignment of 100 head of 8-month lambs sold at the rate of $6.86 per head. I sold wool in the State of Michigan in 1896 for 7 cents a pound under free trade on wool. I went out of the business because I lost my farm. The man who held the mortgage changed places with me. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. What will 8-month lambs be worth under the Underwood bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, it will be like the fellow down at Chase's Theater this week. He was employed by a gang of thieves to assassinate people. He said that he would charge $15 a head for killing young ladies, $10 a head for married women, $5 a head for married men, and old maids for 15 cents a bunch; and the latter is about what those lambs will be worth. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Alabama said the country is waiting for this bill to become a law. It is, with fear and trembling, my Democratic friends. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The people of Dayton, Ohio, waited for the flood, with fear and trembling, and it came, and what was the result? The people at Johnstown, Pa., a few years ago waited for the flood to come onto them after the great dam at the foot of a lake had broken, and when the flood came, what happened? The people of the country in 1894 waited for the Wilson-Gorman bill to become a law. It became a law, and heaven knows and you know what it brought—disaster, poverty, hunger, idleness, closed factories, and widespread ruin. It not only brought this, but it brought Coxey and his army to Washington, and when he got here what did he find? He found signs down here along the paths, "Coxey, keep off the grass." [Laughter.] The Russians waited at Port Arthur for the Japanese to come; they came. The Russians flew. Anyone who waits for destruction waits with fear and trembling, as the people of the United States wait for this bill to become a law.

Our good friend the President, in his message to Congress, said:

Whetting our wits, the object of the tariff.

He is somewhat late with this remark. The Wilson-Gorman bill was the originator of these words. That bill sharpened the wits of the voters in the United States, and at the November election of 1896 they went into the voting places all over this land with pencils sharpened at both ends and for a succeeding period of 16 years with whetted wits outwitted the free traders.

What have you done for the farmers of this country in this bill? You began with a pruning knife, sharp and keen, and you never failed to clip the feathers of a farmer every time his head bobbed up. You have left the duty on rye and on hops only, as it is in the present Payne tariff law.

I have figured on the basis of your reductions on the agricultural products, on just some of the products in the State of Michigan, which I have the honor in part to represent, and taking some products of the farm, not including animals, poultry, fruit, and so on, but just grain, potatoes, hay, etc., and from a fair estimate, if the reductions of the duty you have made will lower the price of those articles to the consumer the amount of duty removed, it will cost the farmers of Michigan from $75,000,000 to $100,000,000 a year to sustain the Democratic Party in power. They will willingly pay for their folly. The man who dances must pay the fiddler. The voters last fall danced, and the fiddler is at work. They will pay that price for two years, but as certain as the day follows the night, my friends, put this bill into effect and they will pay you back in your own coin.

You have reduced their wheat 60 per cent below the rate now fixed by law. You have placed potatoes on the free list as in 1894, when I saw potatoes sell for 12½ cents per bushel in the State of Michigan, and as a farmer sold them myself that year—one wagon load—the balance I fed to the hogs and then sold the hogs at 3 cents a pound. [Laughter.] I sold that load of potatoes for 12½ cents per bushel in the city of Saginaw in 1896. We had a most bountiful crop at that time, and that year Canada shipped into the State of Michigan, through the ports of entry at Port Huron and Detroit, a thousand and five carloads of potatoes, selling them at 12½ and 15 cents per bushel wholesale, and I never saw so many people hungry for potatoes in all my life. Why, they were so low in price it did not pay to steal them even. [Laughter.] Horses were so cheap one could afford to go afoot. [Laughter.] The very best of cattle, 3-year-old steers, I sold from my farm in 1895, in the State of Michigan, 3-year-old fat cattle, for $22 a head which would now bring me from $90 to $120 a head. Did free trade have anything to do with those values?

You propose to lower the price of those articles to the consumer. You certainly will lower prices. No intelligent man will dispute it; but by lowering prices the natural consequence is that the price of labor will also go down, and when the laboring man's purchasing power is lowered in a greater proportion than the necessaries of life, have you brought living any nearer to him? You know, my friends, that when you last had the power to put upon our statute books a free-trade bill—as you may call it, because there is a lot of free trade in the bill—and had exercised that power 3,000,000 of laboring men in this country were out of employment, which then constituted one-half the laboring men of the United States, and the wages of the other half were cut in two. Did you bring the necessaries of life any nearer to the consumers by such action than they are to-day? You will agree with me that we are fairly prosperous in this country to-day. You talk about extending our products across the sea, extending our commerce, getting a greater proportion of the world's markets than we now enjoy. The committee has an abundance of evidence before it that in England, Germany, and France, where the highest wages in any foreign country in the world are paid, the wages of those countries are less than half what is paid for the same class of labor in American mills and on American farms. How can you, my friends, meet the competition of foreign products of the farm and factory where labor enters largely into the cost of production? How can you meet the competition of that cheap labor in foreign countries unless you force the American standard of living and the American standard of wages down to the level of the cheap labor of the Orient and of Europe? [Applause on the Republican side.]

That kind of reasoning, my friends, was patented by an ex-Senator from the State of Indiana when he said in a speech that he favored a law, and he said that law can be written and shall be written, that will lower the hours for a day's work in this country. "I favor a law," said he, "and that law shall be written, that will increase the day's pay for that labor. I favor a law," said he, "and that law shall be written, that will lower the cost of the product of that man's labor." Oh, what nonsense. A barber a few days ago said to me it was practical to put into effect such a law. I said, "My friend, you know more about your own business than about any other man's business. You will admit that, will you not?" "Yes." "You are a barber working 10 hours a day." "Yes." "You are now cutting a man's hair, for which you charge 25 cents." "Yes." "Now, to lower the cost of the product of your labor is to lower the price for which you are cutting a man's hair." "Yes." "How are you going to work 8 hours a day instead of 10, cut men's hair for 15 cents instead of 25—lower the product of your labor—and yet increase your income? Tell me that, will you?" He said, "Oh, well, now, Mr. FORDNEY, that is not a fair illustration." "Well, it is one you know all about, and when you figure it out I will then listen to you in regard to the product of some other man's labor." And he has not figured it out yet. That is exactly identical, my friends, with your proposition, and as Congressman Springer claimed 20 years ago that by lowering the rate of duty on woolens and putting wool upon the free list we would give employment to 50,000 more employees in the woolen mills of this country; that we would increase wages, increase the demand for labor, and lower the price of the product to the consumer. That is what you propose to do now.

You certainly will lower the price to the consumer, but you will not bring the products which make up the necessaries of life any nearer to the poor people than they are to-day. You are mistaken, my friends. Aye, I give you credit for being candid, and I will say to the chairman of that committee, as I have often said before, that I hold him in the highest esteem and as a most estimable gentleman. I only differ with him in my political views. I believe I am right and that he is wrong in his conclusions. I appeal to you, before you force upon the people of this country this bill of which you are the author and which, in my opinion, will bring back practically such conditions as this country experienced from 1894 to 1897, to be most careful in your consideration of the rates you are fixing.

Who came before the Committee on Ways and Means asking for lower rates of duty? The importers of this country in great numbers. One gentleman from New York, as I now remember, a man by the name of Goldman, asked for lower rates of duty on wool and woolens, because the woolen mills of this country, as he said, were making excessive profits, and when pinned down to the facts in the case he knew nothing about any profit that any factories in this country were making. But he did know that in his own business, as a manufacturer of ready-made clothing, on a $200,000 investment, $50,000 of which was invested in machinery—and he also said that he borrowed some money—he did $3,000,000 worth of business per year; that he had reaped the magnificent profit of 9 per cent on $3,000,000, or $270,000 profit on a capital of $200,000, and was complaining about the great profits that the woolen manufacturers have made, but not asking for any lower rates of duty on his own products—ready-made clothing.

Gentlemen, what does the Tariff Board say about wool? They say that the rates of duty as provided for in the present tariff law, or some of the rates, are too high. But I can not find in their report a single utterance to the effect that 11 cents a pound on wool of the first class is too high—on a 50 per cent shrinking wool—to give adequate protection to the woolgrowers of this country.

The importations of class 1 wool are about a 50 per cent shrinking wool. They show that the cost of production of our best wools, wools of the first class, in this country are from 11 to 12 cents per pound after crediting up to the flock all the money received for the sale of sheep and lambs. They find that in South America, after giving the same credits to the

flock, wool is produced there at from 4 to 5 cents per pound. They find in Australia, after giving the same credits to the flock, that there is practically no charge to the wool of Australia, except in the most remote parts of the country. So when Australian wool comes to the markets of the United States and meets the wool produced by the woolgrowers in this country, the American goes onto the market with a cost of 11 and 12 cents per pound on wool in the grease and meets the Australian wools with no charge against it. The wool of Australia is practically a by-product. Is it possible, then, for the American woolgrowers at that cost, under free wool, to compete in the markets of this country with foreign wool with very slight cost? I can not see that it is possible for them to do so.

Under the McKinley law the wool clip in the United States had reached 348,500,000 pounds in 1893, the largest clip ever grown in this country; nearly double the largest clip ever grown in Great Britain up to that time and when that country grew all the combing wool for the world's use; as large as the wool clip of Argentine Republic as late as 1888; as large as the wool clip of Australia as late as 1895; and equal to one-third of the available wool supply of all manufacturing nations as late as 1860.

The wool clip of the United States in 1893 was worth to the farmers of the country $52,200,000. The clip of 1896, according to current estimates, would not exceed $21,000,000 in value. That is what free wool did for our farmers the last time the experiment was tried by a Democratic Congress.

The Wilson-Gorman tariff law, as has been said, put raw wool on the free list and provided duties ranging from 40 to 50 per cent ad valorem on manufactured goods. The present Democratic tariff bill proposes to place raw wool on the free list and reduce the duties on manufactured goods to 35 per cent ad valorem. This bill is therefore a very much more radical measure than the Wilson-Gorman law of 1894, that whetted our wits so keenly. On the great amount of foreign goods that will come into the United States the rates in this bill are nearly one-third lower than the law of 1894, which brought ruin to the woolgrower and manufacturer alike. Wool values shrunk during the life of that bill from 40 to 50 per cent; the value of sheep shrunk more than 50 per cent; and the growing of wool and the raising of sheep was not profitable to the farmers of the United States. Since the repeal of the Wilson-Gorman law, in 1897, wages in the woolen mills of America have advanced on an average more than 50 per cent. These American wages are more than twice as high as English wages in the same calling, according to the comparisons presented in the Tariff Board's report. The wages of men engaged in the woolgrowing industry of the United States have also greatly increased since 1897. Yet the Democratic leaders, blind to the teachings of experience, have now brought forward a tariff measure calculated to wreck the woolgrowing and wool-manufacturing industry even more completely than they were wrecked by the law of 1894, that great wit whetter.

Representatives of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, in presenting their views to the Committee on Ways and Means in the hearings during the month of January last, said in part:

> Accepting in good faith and with full confidence in its sincerity the assurance of the new administration that no legitimate business will be injured by the contemplated revision of the tariff, the National Association of Wool Manufacturers appears before your committee to urge a counsel of caution by indicating the conditions under which the woolen industry has been developed in the United States, and the impossibility of its continuance unless the rates of duty and the method of their application are such as will, under all the varying conditions of trade and fluctuations of values, permit the domestic manufacturers successfully to meet the competition of their foreign business rivals. The woolen industry claims its place among the legitimate businesses of the people, for it was brought into existence in consequence of various Federal laws enacted for the express purpose of developing that business in this country. Its existence has been possible only because of such laws, and the operations and conduct of the business have been in strict conformity with law, the domestic woolen trade having been in an unusual degree free from complaint of lawbreaking.
>
> Simultaneously with the competition for labor there was created by the increasing productive capacity a competition in the sale of products that has steadily reduced the margins of profit now in the case of the woolen industry the normal manufacturing profit is probably less than that of any of the other domestic industries and is certainly as little as in the woolen industry of Great Britain or the other manufacturing countries of Europe.

How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. FORDNEY. In the 10 minutes I can not say all I would like to say; but I do want to say this, my friends: When the Republican Party went out of power in 1893 and the Democratic Party came into power it has ever since been claimed by the Democratic Party that the Republican Party left matters in such shape that the result was a panic because of a depleted Treasury. This morning before coming to the House I picked up a Treasury report, and I find that to-day there is in the Treasury of the United States in the redemption fund and in the Treasury to redeem gold certificates outstanding and in the general fund $1,256,000,000 of gold coin and gold bullion. Never in the history of the world was there ever more than $600,000,000 in any treasury in the world.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman state how much surplus the Republican administration left in the Treasury on the 4th of March?

Mr. FORDNEY. Of this year?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend, they left you with enough to run the machinery of the Government, and now, when prosperity is abroad over the land, you have not yet had to resort to the issuing of Government bonds. But heaven knows you will if you put this bill into effect. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I want to call your attention to this fact, that you can not hereafter claim that because of the condition of the Treasury and because of the condition of our revenues as compared with our expenditures you can attribute the next panic to the administration of William H. Taft. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You may say that we have a little more surplus in the Treasury to-day than we had a year ago. Is it due to the economy of the Democratic Party, when, during the last session of Congress, you admitted that you made greater appropriations than had been made by any previous Congress? I set about the other day to figure how long it would take to accumulate a fund sufficient to meet the annual expenditures of the Federal Government with such appropriations as you made last session; and at the rate of a dollar a minute, in order to create that fund, I found that it would have had to been started 200 years before the birth of Christ, and then you would not have enough to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You are spending some money, and that money must come from some direction. The people of this country must pay it. You propose to put sugar on the free list, and there has never been a country under the sun in modern times that ever had sugar on the free list except England for a short while.

Mr. HARDWICK. England never did have a duty on sugar until after the Boer War began.

Mr. FORDNEY. I excepted England, the gentleman will observe, but it is true that from 1660 down to 1874 England maintained a duty on imported sugar, and at one time, as late as 1840, that duty ranged as high as 38 cents per pound. In 1874 she placed sugar on the free list and at that time was refining at home 95 per cent of her home consumption. Sugar remained on the free list in England from 1874 down to 1901 and during that period most of her refineries were relegated to the scrap heap. That is England's experience with free sugar. At the time of the Boer War she again placed a duty on sugar of 90 cents per 100 pounds, and in 1908 lowered the duty to 40.1 cents per 100 pounds. She is now refining about 45 per cent of her home consumption. Therefore during the past 253 years England has maintained a duty on sugar nine-tenths of the time. Her experience with free trade on sugar is anything but an argument in favor of your free-sugar proposition. As soon as they got into that trouble they put a duty on sugar.

There is no country in the world except England where a dollar will buy more granulated sugar than it will buy in the United States this very minute. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But when you consider a man's daily purchasing power, rather than his pay in dollars and cents, and that is the real test of the cost of living, you will find the average laboring man can buy 43 pounds of sugar for a day's work in this country, whereas an Englishman can buy but 21 pounds for his day's work. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Permit me for a moment to refer to cotton. You come from the land of cotton, my Democratic friends, and you have paid your respects to the cotton-manufacturing industry of the North. How? One Mr. Parker, of South Carolina, president of 16 cotton factories, testified before the Committee on Ways and Means that we could stand a reduction of duty on cotton goods. I asked Mr. Parker whether there was any difference in the scale of wages paid in his State or in his part of the South as compared with the rate of wages paid in the cotton mills in the North. You remember much has been said about the pauper wages paid in the cotton mills in the State of

Massachusetts. Mr. Parker said he found upon investigation that there was no practical difference between the rates of wages paid in his locality and in the North.

Now, since Mr. Parker made that statement I have been investigating, and let me tell you what I find. I find the highest wages paid in the cotton mills of any State in the Union, with the single exception of Pennsylvania, are paid in the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. And how about the hours of labor?

Mr. FORDNEY. I am basing the rate of wages upon the same hours per day.

I find, moreover, the lowest scale of wages paid in any State in the Union, except Tennessee, which has but few mills, are paid in the two States, North and South Carolina, where Mr. Parker's factories are located.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. That is right.

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me tell you what that difference is: Basing the average wages paid in the cotton mills in North and South Carolina on 300 days' employment the wages are 85 cents a day—the magnificent sum of 85 cents a day in North Carolina and South Carolina. In the same way, basing a man's pay on 300 days per year in the North, and especially in Massachusetts, what did I find? I found the rate of wages paid in cotton mills in the North to be 62 per cent higher than the rate of wages paid by Mr. Parker.

Consider that, gentlemen. Adequate protection to the products of the factories in North and South Carolina means destruction to the cotton mills in New England. You say we can export some of our cotton products. That is true of certain grades where machinery does the largest part of the manufacturing. We find that cotton factories in the United States last year, with 29,500,000 spindles, consumed practically 5,000,000 bales of cotton, while England, with 54,200,000 spindles, consumed but 3,500,000 bales. What does that prove? It proves that we are making the coarser grades of cotton where machinery does the largest portion of the work of production, and that England, with her cheap labor, is making the higher grades of goods which require a larger amount of hand labor. That is what it proves.

France to-day admits our raw cotton free of duty, but she imposes a very high rate of duty on manufactured goods. If a manufacturer from the United States to-day took into France knit goods, such as hosiery and knit gloves, the product of one bale of raw cotton manufactured, he would have to take along a sum equal to the price of 11 bales of raw cotton to pay the duty on the manufactured product of that one bale of manufactured cottons. That is what France is doing to protect her cotton mills.

If you go to Germany it is about the same. Further than that, the railroads of Germany impose a higher freight rate on imports going into Germany from a seaport to an inland town than on goods that originate in Germany; but in order to encourage the exportation of her goods she gives a lower rate of freight on goods from an interior town to a seaport, where the goods are to be exported, than she gives on goods for consumption within the boundaries of Germany.

Germany would give us anything on this green earth under a reciprocity agreement if she could only get into our markets with her raw sugar free. She is the great beet-sugar producing country of the world, and Mr. Lowry states that the German farmer receives more per ton for his beets, delivered at the factories in Germany, than the farmers of this country receive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman give me a few minutes more?

Mr. PAYNE. How many minutes? The gentleman knows that my proportion of time is over now.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes. Will the gentleman give me 10 minutes?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; I will give the gentleman 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. The statement of Mr. Lowry is absolutely incorrect. It is as misleading as all other statements made by that free-trade lobbyist of the Sugar Trust in this country. They have in Germany cooperative factories, where the farmers own the stock of those factories. When those farmers haul their beets to the factory they get an average price of $4.45 per ton. That was the price for beets last year, according to German statistics. But when the season's grind has been turned out, for the purpose of evading a corporation tax, instead of paying a dividend to their stockholders, they call back the farmers who furnished the beets and pay them their profit as an increased price upon their beets, and not as a profit upon their stock. That is for the sole purpose of evading the payment of a corporation tax. But the factories that are not cooperative paid last year in Germany $4.45 a ton for their beets, containing a fraction above 17 per cent of saccharine content, whereas the factories of this country last year paid $6.50 per ton for beets containing a 15 per cent saccharine content. That is the difference between the price paid in this country and the low price paid in Germany. In France the price received by the farmers was $4.22 a ton for beets containing 17 per cent of sugar.

In Germany and France this industry has gone on for a hundred years, and the farmers have become educated so that they get a larger percentage of sugar in their beets by more intense or practical cultivation. And there is extracted to-day from a ton of beets in Germany, testing 17 per cent, 30 to 40 pounds more sugar than can be extracted from a ton of beets in this country, testing exactly the same percentage, due to the greater purity of the sugar content. So that the price of the sugar content in the beets of the factories in Germany is one-third to one-half lower than to the factories of this country. The contention of the gentleman from New York on that point, therefore, is absolutely wrong.

Now, as a compliment to my friend from New York, Mr. Goldman, who wants a lower rate of duty on woolens—the Tariff Board, whose report you absolutely ignore, a report made by three Republicans and two Democrats, a unanimous report, does not recommend rates for us to fix in the law, but furnishes us with the facts as it finds them. They followed the wool from the sheep's back to the man's back, as an illustration, and what did they find? They found that it required 9.7 pounds of wool to make an average suit of ready-made clothing that sells in the market for about $23. They found, without crediting the farmer with the interest invested in the sheep, he made 68 cents profit on that 9.7 pounds of wool. Figuring 6 per cent interest on the money invested left him 20 cents profit on that 9.7 pounds of wool, which is practically a fleece and a half, or the wool from a sheep and a half. They found, when following the cost to the factory, that the farmer received 16 cents a pound for the wool, and the manufacturer paid 23 cents for the wool delivered at his factory. When sold as cloth to make the suit of clothes, the manufacturer's product was 17 cents on the pattern for a suit of clothes.

But when it went to Mr. Goldman, of New York, to manufacture ready-made clothing, when he converted that cloth into a suit of clothes, his profit was $2.25. He sells the suit of clothes for $16.50, and it is retailed for $23. That is according to the report of the Tariff Board. So the farmer made 20 cents after allowing him interest on the money invested in his sheep, the woolen manufacturer made 17 cents, and Mr. Goldman makes $2.25, and then the retailer in some way gets $6.50 for his trouble, insurance, expense, and profit.

I ask you which of the four men needs protection, Mr. Goldman, the retailer, the farmer, or the manufacturer? Remember, my friends, that the manufacturers of woolen goods to-day in this county are employing 200,000 American workmen. Are you going to, by closing the doors of these factories, turn one-half of these laboring men out of employment as you did in 1894, cut the income of the other half in two, and do likewise with the 275,000 men in your cotton mills? According to your promise you are going to reduce the price by one-half, and yet you are going to make this a land of sunshine where milk and honey will flow, where men can sit around in idleness, have more to eat, more to wear, more to say, and less to do. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] That is your proposition.

In conclusion, gentlemen, in preparing this bill you have repudiated the Tariff Board and its reports; you have turned a deaf ear to the sworn testimony of our manufacturers, preferring to accept statements from importers as to the cost of manufacturing; you have closed your eyes to what past experience has shown; and, in short, in the fixing of tariff rates you have inaugurated a guessing contest of heretofore unheard of magnitude upon the result of which hangs the industrial welfare of our Nation.

I thank you, gentlemen. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. How does the gentleman figure that the panic of 1893 was caused by a tariff law that was not enacted until 1894?

Mr. FORDNEY. Anticipation, my friend, is everything on this earth, and if anticipation will bring on a panic, what will the enactment of the law do?

Mr. GORDON. One other question. How does it come that this bill, which is a lower tariff rate in its average than the Wilson law, has not brought on a corresponding panic?

Mr. FORDNEY. Because the coffers of the laboring men and the banks are full to overflowing, and they will not feel the effect of it until their hard-earned savings have been depleted. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL].

A REPLY TO REPUBLICAN CRITICS.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, the new Members of this House on the Democratic side have during the past few days been repeatedly advised with paternal solicitude by the minority as to what position we should take with reference to the pending tariff bill. We have been chided for doing all we could in the Democratic caucus for the industries of our own States and for supporting the bill now after it has been indorsed by an overwhelming majority of the Democratic House. We have been told that the leaders of the Democratic Party are trying to coerce us by withholding patronage and by delaying committee assignments until after the tariff bill has been passed. We are told that we are being bossed, and that it is cowardly not to break away from the Democratic leaders, and thus create a spirit of revolt in the ranks of the Democracy of the country.

I come from a section where there is but one party, and that party is sometimes divided into two factions—the "ins" and the "outs." The assets, the stock in trade, of the "outs" is to create a spirit of dissatisfaction, of restlessness, of revolt among the rank and file of the "ins," and thus pluck away some of the support of the majority. It is an old, old game; but, Mr. Chairman, I did not expect to find any of this caliber of peanut politics in this great body. When I was a schoolboy in the country I read with cordial interest and even with a feeling of reverence the inspiring speeches of the reformers and leaders of the minority party in the Congress of the United States. I noted that the minority was always opposed to what was actually being done; but somehow I got the impression that these leaders of the minority were inspired men. In my childish mind I could see them—great tall men, with soulful eyes, each wearing a white plume, sitting on a prancing charger, leading the toiling masses out from the boudage of the majority into lavish wealth and boundless freedom.

But since coming here I find that they are not wearing any white plumes, and they are not even sitting on a horse. They are sitting on the fence waiting to find out what position the Democratic majority will take, so they can oppose that position. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As to our being coerced by delaying committee assignments, the Committee on Ways and Means asked the Democratic caucus for instructions on this point, and that committee was instructed to delay all other matters and devote themselves now to this tariff legislation, because the people are demanding and have a right to expect immediate action in the interest of the legitimate industries of the country. The new Members participated in giving these instructions, and the new Members on the Democratic side are satisfied.

As to the other charges against the Ways and Means Committee and against the President of the United States, that the new Members are being whipped into line by withholding patronage, I wish to speak as one of the new Members. The men whom I have recommended for postmasters have been nominated. I have been in Washington for two months. I have visited the President, and I have been thrown with the Speaker of the House and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. I live at a hotel with several members of the Ways and Means Committee, and I have never had one word of advice, a suggestion, or a request as to how I should vote, what I should do, or what I should not do. It remains for me as a new Member to be called upon to express profound and lasting gratitude for paternal solicitude as to how I should vote, sympathetically and repeatedly expressed by both prongs of the forked minority of the House. [Applause and laughter.]

To the able and respected floor leader of the long prong of the forked minority, whose chief at the November election was retired permanently to private life because he is a natural-born private citizen, I wish respectfully to say that whether the new Members have rings or ropes in their noses, as he expressed it, we are voluntarily and vigorously in favor of this tariff revision downward in the interest of the American consumers, and we will fight for this bill as it came from the Democratic caucus, his graceful effort to cause dissension to the contrary notwithstanding. No one knows better than he that the surest way to destroy a party is to create discord in its ranks.

To the able, eloquent, and very noisy leader of the other and shorter prong of the minority, sometimes called Bull Moosers, I wish to say, with respect, that his solicitous concern lest the new Members on the Democratic side by voting with the majority should be called cowards and weaklings is gratefully appreciated. But Bull Moose has been analyzed, and the analysis at the November election showed only 1 per cent Moose and the other 99 per cent is being used here, as it was successfully used with the Republicans, in an effort to confuse and disrupt the Democratic Party, if possible, by dissatisfying the new Members.

If it had been left to the new Members, several other articles which the farmers have to buy, such as hats, clothing, all woolen garments, matches, buttons, brooms, books, paper, pottery, and cutlery, including castor oil, would be added to the free list, and our revenue would come from the income tax and luxuries, including beverages, silks, rubber, and diamonds. You high-tariff gentlemen should be satisfied and thankful for an average reduction of only 26 per cent, as this bill carries.

We, the new Members, come fresh from the homes and firesides of the people. We have felt their pulse. We know their hopes, their expectations, and their demands. We are determined to obey them. The American people have expressed their will in unmistakable terms by indorsing not the Republican high-tariff platforms but by accepting the Baltimore Democratic platform for a revision of the tariff downward and by directing and ordering the Democratic Party to assume full responsibility and to express that will in definite, concrete action in the interest of the producing, toiling, consuming masses who give character and hope to this Republic. [Applause.]

The people have willed it, and it is your duty and mine to obey their will by enacting into law this tariff bill, which is the longest step taken within a hundred years in giving justice to the rich and the poor alike by creating equal, competitive mobility of opportunity in our approach to a real democracy.

The new Members feel the solemn pledges made our people, and with all the courage and manhood we possess this new Member will fulfill those pledges by supporting a Democratic measure which the people on last November ordered enacted into law.

Gentlemen, your game is moss covered [laughter and applause], your methods are crude, the new Members on this side are happy, and Democracy is united and triumphant.

Our leaders are not enforced, but selected voluntarily and joyously, and we shall fight this battle for the plain people of America honestly, courageously, and loyally to the end.

In the Democratic caucus I worked earnestly for the industries of my State. If I should write a tariff bill there are several changes I would make in this bill. Several provisions do not please me or my home people, but on the whole the bill is Democratic and is in line with the Baltimore platform. So much better is it than our present tariff laws, that as a Democrat I shall defend it all the way against the Republican attacks. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In doing this I am only obeying the will of my people and the people of the entire country, who have decreed by their ballots that the laborer, the producer, and the consumer shall be freed from the oppressive hand of the privileged classes who have been in partnership with the Government to plunder the toiling masses and rob them of their just share of the products of their labors. A new era has come, a new day is approaching when the burden of the oppressed shall be lightened, and men and women and children in all walks of life shall be free. The Democratic Party has been commissioned to work out this high destiny, and with our able leaders working in harmony with these patriotic men, we shall not fail to serve faithfully and well those who have trusted and commissioned us. [Tremendous applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have remained here for two days listening to the arguments expressed on this floor, and to my surprise I find the minority party presenting the views that this great Government is the guardian of the industries of this Nation. I hold to the tenet that this Government does not hold the dollar above the man. I hold to the tenet that this Government should levy tribute for no purpose except to defray the honest and legitimate expenses of the Government economically administered. I hold to the tenet that a tariff to protect industries is unconstitutional. I hold to the tenet that this Government is for the people and not for the privileged classes. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] told you that the old Republican ship was soon to come into port in the shape of a dreadnought. I thought he discovered last November that this great ship which has been afloat on the seas of politics for 60 years had been loaded with a cargo of special privileges, combines, monopolies, trusts, and a high-

protective tariff. Does not the gentleman know that ex-President Roosevelt scuttled the ship, and she now has her stern sticking above the waters, a sad memento of the pristine glories of the old Republican Party? I want to say to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] that we have no oligarchy, as he describes, that framed this tariff bill, but a band of patriots united in one important purpose, and that is to give to every man, woman, and child in this whole Republic a square and honest deal. That band of men had no whip, as he said, held over them by the White House, waiting for the shaking of the plum tree. I want to say the President of the United States needs no defense at the hands of this Congress. The American people have confidence in him. They know that he is standing for the plain people of this country. They know that the President of this Republic is not marching hand in hand with the great protected industries and the special privileged classes to oppress the people.

I want to say to my distinguished friend from Wyoming, when he said that way back yonder the old patriarch stood out with his staff and saw the star of Bethlehem and went to see the newborn Saviour, and he said those shepherds now in the West were being oppressed because of the fact this Democratic Congress was threatening them with free wool. Well, I want to tell him those shepherds in Palestine did not go and say to the mother of the Saviour, You must pay tribute on wool. Is it possible that this Republican from Wyoming wants the cold winds of the fall and winter to fall against the bare bones of the little boys and girls of this country? Is it possible that the owners of the great flocks of sheep want to hold up the price of wool so that the poor people of this country can not buy woolen clothing? I want to say to my friend that the great Woolen Trust, the great manufacturers of this country, do not intend these producers of wool to get any more for it, even if there were a 50 per cent protective tariff on it. They control the price of wool; the producer has nothing to do with it. Do you not know free wool will not reduce the price of wool one dime? When you analyze it, the great trust that controls the buying of hides for the shoe industry, the great trust that controls the buying of wool, will not let the producers of this country fix the price. That is as absolute as the law of the Medes and Persians. [Applause.] My friend then discussed the sugar question. Why, I did not know that the American Government owed any special duty to any man engaged in any industry to be fed out of the pockets of labor. Listen. In the State of Louisiana, according to the figures, there are 329,000 acres of land under sugar-cane culture; there are only $30,000,000 invested, and this Government permits a tax of $115,000,000 a year, $4.92 to the average family of five, to be collected out of the pockets of the people of this country to protect the sugar and the beet industry of this Republic. The evidence before the Committee on Ways and Means shows that the sugar industry, so far as the beet business is concerned, can prosper under free sugar.

Do you not know that under the figures submitted you can give $30,000,000 to the cane-sugar planters of Louisiana, and in addition thereto give them $258 per acre for every acre of land that they have under culture and have a few dollars left out of this $115,000,000 that you collect every year in the shape of a tariff that goes only one-third to the Government? My friend then talks about the laboring man and the farmer. He does not know what a farmer is. He knows of the ranchman and the landlord. I will tell him what a farmer is. He is a patriot who gets up at 4 o'clock in the morning, goes out to the barn and feeds his mule; gets back, eats a little breakfast, gets on that mule and goes to the field and plows hard until 12 o'clock. The dinner horn blows, he takes out, he trots up to the house, eats a little dinner, hurries back to the field, and plows right along as long as he can see. [Applause.]

You talk about being a friend to that fellow! I tell you what you Republicans have done. You put a high tariff on the plow which he uses, on the harness he puts on his mule; you put a high tariff on the lumber in his house and on the bed he sleeps in. You put a tariff on the brick which he put into his chimney. You placed a tariff on his wife's dress, and you put a tariff on the wire fence that goes around his field, and on the wagon with which he hauls his produce to town. Do you tell me you know that man? You could not have known him or you would not have treated him so mean.

You did not stop with that. You built great battleships out of his pocket and provided for a big standing army. He kept these big factories that you have been protecting with these special privileges going. He is the man who has kept all the wheels of the factories that you pretend have been running for the interests of the laboring men moving. He is the man who keeps the salaries of the Congressmen paid. You certainly can not be his friend! [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is the policy of the Republican Party to keep poor people poor. You do not want them to get up in life. You want to build fortunes for multimillionaires, to be guarded by the battleships you have been building out of the pockets of the poor man.

I want to say that these farmers had a reckoning last November. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They sent a crowd to Congress that is going to stand up for them. They put a President in the White House who is going to stand up for their cause. The farmer is a patriot who has fought the battles of this country. He is the fellow who caused the flag to float over this building. He is the fellow that won our independence from Great Britain. He is ready now to defend this Government when enemies attack it, and I for one am going to stand by him and fight for his rights. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The farmer that I know down in the vegetable district is the man who with his wife and his family, from the little child of 4 years old up to the young lady with the sweet bloom of health upon her, is out in the field at work from early dawn to as late as they can see at night, working those vegetables, so that the family can live, even if they have been constantly robbed by the tariff barons and overcharged by the transportation companies. And I want to tell you something else: You Republicans have kept this man from getting the value of his products. The transportation companies of the country have charged him about 55 per cent of the gross value of his vegetables to get them to the markets. And then you have had him taxed to death for the fertilizers and agricultural implements which he uses to make his crop. We are going to put all agricultural implements of every kind, together with lumber and barb wire, on the free list.

But I want to say that those are the people democracy is going to help; those are the people the Democratic Party is going to stand up for.

You talk about these great special industries you have been standing for. You want them to steal from the people so that they can help the laboring man, do you? Let us see. You give to the shoe industry the privilege to rob him on his shoes and to the hat industry to rob him on the hat he wears and to the clothing industry the privilege of robbing him on his clothing, and you charge him a tariff on the bucket in which he carries his food and 20 per cent on the bread and biscuits in that bucket. You charge him a tariff on the house in which he has to live. Do you mean to tell sensible people that you believe in the laboring man? You import all the foreign scum of creation here to lower the price of his wages. Are you his friend? Do you believe in protecting these great industries and at the same time having a free market for labor? You want all the competing forces of alien races, the inferior races of this world, to be brought in here and placed in competition with the Caucasian labor of America. Do you not know that labor receives its rights only through organization? I believe in unions; I believe in labor organizations. That is the way the laborers get the value of their work, and even then they can not get a sufficient value. Do you not know that the great railway companies of this country to-day would not be paying the laboring man half the price they do if it were not for all the transportation men and shopmen having their various unions and organizations? That is plain. Every man knows that it is true. Do you not know that when this great strike occurred up at Lawrence, Mass., in that woolen industry which you gentlemen had given a privilege to rob the people all the way from 75 to 125 per cent, that those little children, although they were working in a woolen industry, were going around half naked and without a rag of wool on them?

That is the way you favor the laboring man. Is it not time to let democracy stand up and do something for the people of this Republic? Is it not time for you to say, "Let democracy put in force a bill that stands for the integrity of manhood; that stands for womanhood; that stands for patriotism?" Let democracy put in a bill that is going to take away all special privileges; that is going to break down monopoly; that is going to stop the great forces of the money power from reaching out in every direction, even to the little $25,000 crossroad banks in Mississippi, bossing them with a tyrannical hand and a Shylock spirit.

Why, my friends, you know you have sent out literature in every style, type, shape, and form, for the purpose of fooling the American people. You even have it so now that every cashier of a little crossroad bank, will put his thumbs in the armholes of his vest and talk about "we." He thinks he is like Mr. John D. Rockefeller. He thinks he is like Mr. Carnegie. He is a protectionist. He believes you ought to give some great manufacturing interest the privilege of robbing all the people.

I do not think that any industry ought to want to reach down into the pockets of the people of this Republic and take away

from them an unfair proportion of the rewards of their toil; and for one, I am going to stand by this bill. I am going to stand by the Democratic leader. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am going to stand with the President of this Nation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CRISP). The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the time is controlled by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to yield further time to the gentleman from Mississippi, but the gentleman will understand that that would interfere with the allotment of time to be given other gentlemen.

Mr. GUDGER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] may be willing to be given the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] 10 minutes of his time.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] apportion some of his time?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], and at the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] is recognized.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, this bill is an open and confessed assault upon the doctrine of protection. There is no concealment. There is no pretense of incidental protection, but the assault is made upon the protective system as vicious and unconstitutional.

When every civilized government except England adopts the principles of the protective tariff, and England is back-pedaling on her free-trade theories, it is left for the Democratic Party in the face of logic, fact, and experience to revamp her old-time traditional free-trade notions.

According to the protective theory the tariff walls should be high enough to shut out all foreign products except:

(1) To admit foreign goods that can not be produced at home or that are produced here in insufficient quantity to supply the demand.

(2) To admit foreign goods for the purpose of raising revenues.

(3) To admit foreign goods whenever in default of proper regulations monopolies or near monopolies of the home market have been created.

In such cases if the monopoly is beyond the reach of regulation of preventive law, until such regulations could be provided I would knock holes in the tariff big enough to let in competition until the home market should be supplied at fair prices.

According to the protective theory the competition that ensues between home manufacturers insures the lowest prices compatible with a living American wage. The height, therefore, of the tariff wall is negligible, provided that it shuts out foreign goods that can be produced here.

Considered from the protective theory alone there is no need to split hairs in the ascertainment of the exact rate which will admit foreign goods at the precise point where the American manufacturer exacts more than a reasonable profit. But when it is used as a fiscal agency, there the problem is more complex, because the rate must be fixed at a point that will produce the desired revenue and still preserve a fair measure of protection, and when it is sought to make tariff rates so as to raise a definite revenue, and at the same time to make them the instrument with which to destroy monopolies, the problem is vastly more difficult.

The Democratic Party has set out to accomplish a number of desirable things by a tariff law:

1. To abolish monopolies.
2. To reduce the cost of living.
3. To raise necessary revenues.

Free trade will never abolish monopolies. It may afford a temporary relief, but eventually it drives the monopoly into international combination beyond the reach of any control.

Free-trade England started the ball rolling 140 years ago with a Coal Trust. She has her trusts in shipbuilding, copper, tobacco, textiles, and 35 or 40 others, all of monopolistic character. You may assume that a protective tariff fosters monopolies, if you please, yet it is clear that free trade does not prevent them.

Banking will foster bank robberies if you have no laws against burglaries, but would you abolish the banks to get rid of the robbers?

The combinations of purse and effort of many men make possible achievements utterly impossible to the individual. Without them we would not have a railroad, a telegraph, a steamship, nor any of the great producing plants that are putting at the command of the average citizen comforts, raiment, and subsistence, denied to the kings of 100 years ago.

I harbor no prejudice against big business simply because it is big. For 30 years I have believed that the Government must control big business or big business would control the Government. I have seen its growing power in this country. The average citizen is convinced of their undue power in the Government. Believing that by secret alliances with the leaders of both the old parties that they exercised such control, the people in wrath turned against the Republican machine, which was in power, and put the Democratic Party in control, not that the Democratic Party heretofore had proved itself less amenable to big business than the Republican Party had been, not because they believed in the Democratic idea of the tariff, but rather in the hope that the Democratic Party, taking counsel with what had befallen the Republican Party, would destroy special privilege and surround big business and all other business within the jurisdiction of Congress with such proper hedges and regulations as would safeguard the Government from their undue influences and would strictly confine these great combinations within the proper sphere of their legitimate actions.

If under the protective system advantage has been taken by these unregulated combinations to create monopolies, the remedy is not to strike down American industries and surrender our markets to the foreigner, but the true remedy is regulation by law that will destroy the monopoly.

Without effective laws to restrain monopolies and prohibit restraints of trade, peculiar alliances between the interests profiting by a high tariff and powerful representatives of the Republican Party, aided and abetted by powerful representatives of the Democratic Party, have grown up under a high tariff.

The incalculable power of colossal millions—millions in banking, in commerce, in transportation, in manufacturing—confederated upon concerted lines of control, going the way of all human nature, and like the daughter of the horseleech continually crying, "More, more, more!" constitutes an invisible government that has stood behind the chairs of authority and has created an atmosphere throughout this broad land under the influence of which the editor at his desk, the voter at the polls, the legislator at the capitals of States and Nation, and even the judge upon the bench, fawns and cringes.

And so it is charged, and the people have come to believe, and the fact has been, that the high tariff, in the absence of proper regulations and criminal law, fosters monopoly, and the demand of all parties has been for a revision of the tariff downward, but that demand does not imply the abandonment of the protective principle.

The demand for revision downward is a "short cut" to correct alliances between crooked business and crooked politics that have been eating the hearts of the people.

In the absence of proper laws to restrain monopolies a speedy cure is sought in the tariff, but nevertheless a great majority of the American people believe in the protective tariff.

The Democratic Party has no commission from the people to pass a free-trade measure. They have no commission to strike down protection. Even the minority who voted for Mr. Wilson are greatly divided upon this question.

And in a free Congress—free from the duress of official patronage, free from the domination of caucus, and free from boss rule—I do not believe that the representatives of the Democratic Party in this House, with the opportunity given them to examine for themselves, with the right given them to decide for themselves, schedule by schedule, free from duress, would ever offer such a bill as this.

Free trade does not prevent monopolies, nor will the opening of our markets to foreign competition, but it will, on the contrary, stimulate and encourage international trusts and combinations which will be utterly beyond control or regulation.

On the other hand, a protective tariff is the only defense against international monopolies by shutting them out, while leaving the Government a free hand with which to deal with all domestic restraints of trade monopolies and extortions through regulations of law.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a Republican—a life-long believer in the doctrine of protective tariff. As a member of the Progressive Party I still hold to that doctrine. But in common with many other believers in protection, I think many of the rates should be reduced, so that, in the absence of other proper regulations, the Government will have some control over trade combinations that are exacting unreasonable profits. Yet I still believe that if you destroy the protective principle these international combinations will form, and they are forming, international combinations which will place the whole subject matter beyond the control of the American Congress.

It has been loudly heralded that the proposed bill will reduce the cost of living.

No one more powerfully supported the Democratic claims in the Sixty-second Congress and in the recent campaign than the present Secretary of the Treasury. He and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means agree that this bill may not much reduce the cost of living. But now that the Democratic Party is installed in power and required to redeem its promises, they have begun to look around for a soft spot to fall on.

If correctly reported, in a recent interview the Secretary says, substantially, that the lowering of the tariff may help some in lowering the cost of living after a while, but he is convinced now that the real cause of the high cost of living is bad roads, poor farming, and inefficiency in production and distribution. This looks like hunting a hole to crawl into. Still I think he is nearer right now than he was when on the stump claiming, in chorus with his Democratic brethren, that the high tariff was the cause of the high cost of living.

I fear the effect of this bill in reducing the cost of living will be a great disappointment to the people of the country and to its authors. The political parties of this country are confronted by a situation that is not to be relieved by infinitesimal changes in the cost of lemons, sweet oil, or other comestibles.

We are in the midst of a great social movement that is stirring to the depths every civilized country in the world. It is a natural evolution to higher standards; it is the searching, striving of humanity for betterment; it is the demand for enlarged social justice; it is the demand of the people for the protection of the home; the sweetening of the lives of the toiling millions; for the abolition of special privileges; for the destruction of that invisible government that has been in control for selfish and corrupt purposes. And it is not to be appeased by any makeshifts of the tariff, important as that may be.

The Republican leaders proclaim this movement to be the "fanaticism of unbalanced enthusiasm." They affect to believe that it is a small shower and will soon be over. And through their blindness and disbelief 4,000,000 voters of the Republican Party left it and, taking with them the heart and soul of republicanism, formed the Progressive Party. Owing to this division, the Democratic Party has been put in power by a minority of the votes, and they can not expect to remain in power by sending to the people a bill of this character, which, at the best, confessedly now, will affect the cost of living but slightly and which will, I fear, have very disastrous effect upon the industries of the country.

Now, in respect to revenues. Your Democratic platform proclaims the astounding doctrine that a protective tariff is unconstitutional, though in practice you distinctly abandon that and, taking the middle of the road, adopt the tariff for revenue only, adopting high protective rates in many of your schedules. Do you really believe it unconstitutional to protect American workmen by design but perfectly all right if you do it without intending it?

You are intending to kill off monopolies; to raise the necessary revenues, by lowering the tariff as nearly as possible to a free-trade basis, and claiming that you will not hurt our industries. Well, then, if you reduce the tariff one-half, double the quantity of goods must be imported to raise the same revenue; and if they come in, somebody in America will be hunting another job and Democratic Congressmen will be in the searching party. And if, as you claim, the effect will be not to close American factories, but that they will continue to supply our markets, then goods can not come in in greater quantity than at present; and with your lowered rates what becomes of your revenues?

Upon either horn of the dilemma you will be impaled. If your low tariff lets in a flood of foreign goods, you drive American workmen out of employment. If the flood does not come, your revenue will fail. Let the American workman hunt another job; let him go back to the farm, you say. The puddler, the machinist, the spinner, and the weaver are no more fitted to go back to the farm than my friend BURKE here or MURDOCK over there would be fit to do a day's work in the harvest field.

It is all very well to talk about our market lying beyond the seas, but the greatest market in the world is our American market. Our first duty is to hold to it. You can not do that if you throw open our doors to foreign competition.

If you can pay the American scale of wages and still capture a foreign market, go to it, but we have a cinch on a market that is worth all the European markets put together, and our first duty is to hold to it.

Every foreign workman making goods for American consumption that could be made here throws an American workman out of a job.

Your bill will transfer a large part of our spinning industry to England. Great reductions in the tariff on woolens will eventually and inevitably transfer to French, German, and English weavers part of the work done now by Americans.

Your bill will transfer the plate-glass industry to Belgium.

You strike the farmer at every step, the manufacturer and the workingman indiscriminately, not intentionally but none the less disastrously.

A large part of our revenues is habitually raised by a tariff whatever party is in power. This involves careful study of the rates necessary to be laid, whether they be laid for the simple purpose of revenue under a "tariff for revenue only" or under a tariff under the "protective" scheme.

The latter policy, to which the Progressive Party adheres, requires that the tariff should be taken out of partisan politics and the facts carefully ascertained by a nonpartisan commission and rates levied that will be just high enough to preserve the difference between the American and foreign scales of wages, plus a fair profit to the American manufacturer on all goods that can be produced in this country.

Your bill has been prepared in the same old way. Prepared by a few in secret and forced through a caucus with haste utterly incompatible with intelligent consideration, you have simply taken a leap in the dark. I admire the skill of the select handful in steering through a Democratic caucus a bill which in its entirety commands the entire and sincere approval of few Democrats here and at home.

I make these criticisms in no partisan spirit.

I read the inaugural address of President Wilson, and I regard it as one of the greatest state papers published since Lincoln's time. It was of necessity general in its terms, but as a Progressive of 30 years' standing that message was progressive enough for me, and if President Wilson can unite the warring, clashing elements of his party in a sincere and harmonious adherence to the general sentiments he uttered on that occasion and hammer those sentiments into concrete expression in the statute books, and if he can demonstrate that his tariff views are correct, the Democratic Party will be in the saddle for the next 20 years. But there was one false note in that message, and it was Mr. Wilson's views upon the tariff. The people of this country are not with him on the tariff.

On his progressive policies the Progressive Party will support him. They can not follow him on the tariff. We stand in this Congress few in numbers, but backed by 4,000,000 of voters, and we are pledged to support every genuine progressive doctrine whatever may be its label.

Progressives are sneered at in this Hall, on both sides of this House, revealing the reactionary elements here, but progressivism has become popular, so popular that there is a race now with the old party leaders to get their bills in first to show the voters how progressive they are; but, irrespective of the author, the Progressives will support every real progressive measure presented, whether by Democrats or Republicans.

There is an element in the Democratic Party that is hostile to Mr. Wilson's progressive views; there are the same irreconcilable elements in the Democratic Party that divided the Republican Party. A majority of the American people are opposed to the Democratic doctrines of the tariff.

A powerful element in the Democratic Party is standpat and reactionary and at heart opposed to every progressive doctrine.

On these rocks the Democratic bark will go to pieces.

The Democratic assault upon the productive industries of the country and the lack of Democratic cohesion to the progressive doctrines will result in the filling of these benches with Progressives at the next election.

So far as this bill is concerned, it is not the manner nor methods nor influences that were invoked that is the real issue, but it is the bill itself, and it is its effects upon the people and their industries for which the Democratic Party must be responsible.

There are sections of this bill for which I would like to vote. I would vote for the income tax; and there are many other sections to which I could give my hearty approval, but the bill is presented with intentional adroitness, perhaps, by those who intend to force it through, so that it must be voted for in toto, and under such circumstances I am impelled to dissent, for I believe the bill to be a perilous assault in many of its parts upon the industries of the country, far exceeding in injury any good there may be in it.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution making an appropriation for defraying the expenses of the Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives authorized to attend and represent the Senate and House at the unveiling and dedication of the memorial to Thomas Jefferson at St. Louis, Mo.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution 1.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 6,000 additional copies of House Report No. 1593, Sixty second Congress, on the Concentration of Control of Money and Credit, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room and 4,000 copies for the use of the House document room.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. PAGE and Mr. LANE members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Department of the Interior.

THE TARIFF.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I trust I shall not be guilty of presumption, as one of the new Members of this House, in attempting here to express my sentiments upon the legislation now under consideration. For while I have no hope of influencing the minds of those who see fit to differ from us, it is proper, and, indeed, expected, that we shall give to the American people the reasons for the faith which we proclaim.

It is futile to seek to harmonize the differences between the Democratic and Republican Parties upon the subject of tariff taxation. Those differences are fundamental. The conflict which has for many years been waged between them upon this subject is as irrepressible now as when the difference was first emphasized by the respective followers of Hamilton and Jefferson. It is not a conflict merely between two theories as such. It is not a dogmatic clinging to a fetich on the one hand, or a fine-spun, visionary policy upon the other. It is, and has always been, a clear-cut fight between right and wrong, between justice and injustice, between the rights of the people and the demands of their despoilers.

The Democratic Party proceeds now, and has always proceeded, upon the doctrine upon which our political founder planted his faith, "Equal rights to all, and special privileges to none." [Applause on the Democratic side.] While the Republican Party proceeds now, and has always proceeded, upon the antithetical doctrine of "special privileges to some, and equal rights to none." Such a course as has been consistently followed by our opponents was destined to inevitable disaster, as they themselves can now abundantly admit.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are to-day facing a condition, not an unexplored theory. We are facing a condition which abundantly justifies the action we shall take at this session of Congress, and a condition which is the culmination of a remarkable series of historical events. In the beginning let us not lose sight of the fact that the tariff, so mythical and nebulous to the average man, is nothing more nor less than a tax. The only fundamental difference between it and other forms of taxation is that it is collected indirectly, while other forms of taxes are collected directly from the taxpayer. But stripping it of its technical import, we find the tariff a vehicle of extraction whereby the people are caused to let go something that is theirs through the agencies of government.

All taxation, in theory at least, not only National but State, county, and municipal, is based upon the needs of the government. The government, so-called, being the mere agency through which the people transact the business of the people, it must therefore follow, as the night the day, that the people's agents have no legal nor moral right to collect from the people more than is necessary to carry on the people's business with intelligence and economy. I take it that no political economist, of whatever school, will deny this principle. It therefore follows that those who are charged with the conduct of the people's business must first ascertain the needs of the government in the matter of revenues, and lay their taxes according to those needs. This is true, whether the taxation be direct or indirect. This is the principle upon which the Democratic Party is now proceeding and upon which it has proceeded in the past.

But our adversaries, both the Republicans and the so-called Progressives, who are a mere branch shot out from the trunk of Republicanism, have always proceeded and are now proceeding upon the contrary idea, that you must find out how much protection the favored few demand and then regulate your revenues and expenditures in accordance with that demand. In other words, that the primary object of taxation is not to raise revenues for the expenses of the Government, but that the primary object of taxation is to protect a few people at the expense of the many; and if the Government in this adventure obtains money in its Treasury some method of expenditure will be discovered which will not only dissipate it but furnish an excuse for additional taxation upon the same theory.

Before I proceed further, permit me to call attention to a proposition which has been urged here on this floor by our Progressive friends. They seem to have adopted as the cardinal plank in their platform the proposal to regulate the tariff by means of a so-called tariff commission, stating that neither the Democrats nor the Republicans know anything about a just and equitable tariff. In so far as they claim that the Republicans know nothing about it, I heartily concur. I think the Progressives are experts on the subject of Republicanism, having recently themselves departed from that fold.

I take it for granted they are correct when they say the Republicans can not scientifically revise the tariff, but I must respectfully dissent from their claim that the Democrats can not scientifically or properly revise the tariff, because, in my opinion the bill now under consideration successfully refutes that statement. But I desire to inquire of our Progressive friends, so called, if neither the Republican nor the Democratic Party can revise the tariff intelligently or scientifically, how can the Progressive Party, which has neither pride of ancestry nor hope of posterity, in the face of a hundred years of tariff agitation and legislation, claim to be able to revise it scientifically merely by the appointment of a Tariff Commission, which will be no more scientific than the members of the Ways and Means Committee on either side of this House? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Another thing I should like to ask our Progressive friends: When did the American people by any constitutional enactment or by their consent ever agree to delegate to any commission, large or small, the power of legislation, and especially the power of legislation in the matter of taxation? That power is granted solely to the Congress by the Constitution, and that power can not be delegated by Congress to any body outside of Congress, and the people would not consent for it to be so delegated. There is no more important question that confronts the American people to-day than the question of taxation, for the power to tax carries with it the power to destroy and the power to confiscate, and the American people have never yet, and, in my opinion, never will agree that a commission of experts, so called, shall have the power to tax them and take from their pockets that which is theirs even for the support of the National Government.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota and Mr. HULINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I regret I can not do so, because I have only a few minutes. If I have time enough when I conclude my remarks, I shall be glad to yield to the gentlemen.

As was so well said by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. UNDERWOOD] in his opening remarks upon the pending bill, prior to the Civil War the Government of the United States and the people thereof, including manufacturers of every kind, had prospered under a system of comparatively low tariffs.

Even those who timidly advocated the doctrine of protection for its own sake only sought to apply it to the infant industries, in order to enable them to get upon their feet and flourish without protection. But when the great Civil War came on, and methods of raising enormous sums as revenue were to be devised, the tariff on imports was vastly increased—not even then as protection to the manufacturer, but purely and simply as war measures, because even the Republican Party at that time would not have dared to raise the taxes except they could justify their conduct by the exigencies of war. After the war was over, and the blood of North and South had been spilled upon every battle field, the cry then went up that the Government is enormously in debt as a result of the war, and that the taxes can not be reduced. At the same time the manufacturers, always seeking bounties, always asking to be placed upon stilts built by the Government, having been permitted to taste the sweets of high protection joined hands with the Republican Party, and from then until now have fastened upon the people this unjust and iniquitous system of taxation. Notwithstanding the war has been over for more than half a century, the Republican Party has gradually and stealthily increased the burdens of taxation to the extent that the American people are demanding relief, and in their search for the agency through which that relief shall be vouchsafed to them have turned to the Democratic Party, which has always been the political refuge of the weary and heavy laden.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman permit an interruption and answer a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. If the gentleman will wait until I conclude my remarks, I shall be glad to yield.

But it is useless, Mr. Chairman, to ruminate among the dusty archives of ancient Republican history. The more recent history of the Republican Party, as enacted by the modern combination of politico-commercial statesmen of that party, furnishes us ample food for reflection and consolation. But before I go into that I desire to call attention to the result of the tariff legislation to which I have just called your attention.

In addition to laying and collecting heavy and unnecessary taxes upon the people, not for their own good, but for the protection of a favored class who have satiated their bounty-loving appetites in the vitals of the people, the Republican Party has fostered, encouraged, and built up a system of combinations and aggregations of wealth such as the world never dreamed of before. Great monopolies, winked at by the Republican Party, have sprung up like mushrooms overnight, and through their ability as favored, petted, pampered interests, have extracted unjustly from the American people millions upon millions of money which never reached the vaults of the Treasury and never was intended to reach them. Not only this, but through the unholy alliance between crooked business and crooked politics, we have not only been robbed of our money, but have been robbed of many of our political ideals of governmental justice and purity. We have seen these giant aggregations of wealth, made fat and sleek at the people's expense, sweep down upon the Congress of the United States demanding not only that they be permitted to dictate the people's laws, but shall name the people's officers. We have seen them in the corridors of State legislatures dictating the election of United States Senators sent here, not to represent the great masses of the people, but to represent the special, bounty-loving, favor-seeking unspeakably selfish interests which sent them here. We have, under this system, seen the rights of the people trampled under foot. We have seen profits increase to fabulous proportions upon watered stock. We have seen the cost of living rise gradually under this system until it is with difficulty that the professional man or the skilled laborer is able to accommodate his needs to his earnings, to say nothing of the vast numbers of unskilled laborers throughout the vast extent of our country. And all this, under the Republican Party, in the interest of labor and infant industries.

They tell us that protection is necessary. Necessary for what? At first they told us it was necessary in order to encourage our infant industries, but they did not cease, but increased protection, after the industries ceased to be infants and became giants. They then told us protection was necessary in order to help the laboring man. But we have seen the cost of living increase under this system almost 50 per cent in the last decade, while the increase in wages of laboring men has been much less than 20 per cent.

Yet the Republicans have not diminished their protection nor folded their generously protecting arms. Then driven into the corner on both these propositions as to infant industries and labor, they now assume a new position, namely, that the protective theory ought so to be adjusted as to equalize the cost of production at home and abroad, with a fair profit to the manufacturer. Yet no Republican has yet been able to fix a standard of wages abroad which should be adopted, because of the fact that in one country of the Old World wages are at one figure, and in another country at another, and still another somewhere else. So that no just standard can be fixed as a basis upon which to act that would not give either too much protection or too little protection, according to the Republican doctrine. So that inevitably the Republican Party is driven from one extreme to another, and driven from pillar to post in its effort to justify before the American people their unfair, selfish, corrupt, unwise, and unpatriotic methods of taxation which bears largely upon the problem of the distribution of our wealth.

These conditions had grown so intolerable among the people that in 1908 even the moss-backed and fossilized Republican Party was forced to adopt a platform declaring for a "revision" of the tariff. The people had begun more forcibly than ever to realize that a tariff is a tax, and that a protective tariff is a special tax against the masses for the benefit of a few. Therefore the people demanded relief, not only from the taxes themselves but from the condition brought about by this system which enabled a few men to control the markets of the country, fixing the price of that which the people had to sell as well as what they had to buy. So the Republican Party, realizing its danger, realizing the fact that the American people are constantly becoming more intelligent and discriminating, and realizing that whilst they had been able to "fool some of the people all the time and all the people some of the time" they could not longer fool all the people all of the time. Thus they in their platform in 1908 promised to "revise" the tariff. But the people were suspicious of this promise and asked whether the Republican Party proposed to "revise" the tariff upward, as it had always done before, or whether they proposed to revise it downward, as the people demanded.

You will remember that Mr. Taft, who was a candidate for President upon that platform, realizing the predicament in which the party found itself, in his speeches constantly stated that the kind of a revision the Republicans meant was a revision downward in behalf of the consuming masses. The people took him and his party at their word—which they have never done except to their sorrow. They elected Mr. Taft President upon the faith of the promise which he made to them. After he was inaugurated, he called the Congress in extra session to revise the tariff downward, ostensibly. After spending many months here a bill was perpetrated on the American people called the Payne-Aldrich law—very properly named, in view of its effect upon the people—which was discovered to be a revision of the tariff upward instead of downward. The rest of the story is familiar to us all. Of what avail will it be to recount broken promises, numberless as the sands of the sea? Of what avail to bring fresh before this Congress and before the people their shameless betrayal by the last Republican administration? What shall we accomplish merely by recounting the failure of one set of men to do their duty unless we shall follow that recital with the accomplishment of our own mission as Members of this body?

What, therefore, Mr. Chairman, is our mission to-day as Members of the Congress of the United States? What commission do we hold from the people, and how shall that commission be executed? Certainly no Democrat can maintain that he holds any commission here to protect the favored classes to the detriment of the unfavored masses. Certainly no Democrat can maintain that he is here to continue longer the blighting system of graft and greed fastened upon us by the Republican Party. Certainly no Democrat can maintain that he is here to assist in the further looting of the people, even though it be possible to accomplish the act without the knowledge of the victim. Certainly no Democrat can maintain that the present artificial and medicated commercial and economic and industrial status of the United States should be longer maintained. Certainly no Democrat can maintain that the handicaps which have restricted our commercial supremacy in the past should be longer permitted to endure. And certainly no Democrat can maintain that this Government is obligated, legally or morally, to guarantee the protection of the hothouse to industrial enterprises if they can not stand in the fresh air of free and open competition.

Realizing, therefore, that we are here to carry into effect the mandate of the people we have offered to this House and to the country the Underwood bill, now under consideration. Seeking, therefore, to keep unbroken our pledges to the American people we are offering to them something the Republican Party has never given nor offered—an honest tariff law. A tariff based upon the competitive principle. A tariff which will appeal to the great masses of our people as fair and just, despite the howling and squealing of those who are incidentally pushed from the public trough, whose benefits they have monopolized and squandered for half a century. We are offering a tariff which seeks not to destroy any legitimate industry, but seeks to inoculate into all lawful industry the germs of a healthy life. We seek to substitute the real for the artificial. We seek to replace fundamental falsity with eternal truth. We seek to convince the American people that they can conquer by the sheer force of their superior ability, of their inventive genius, of their wonderfully resourceful activities, without applying the artificial stimulants thought necessary to revive an ebbing life. We are seeking by this law to wipe out favoritism and to legislate for the whole people. We are seeking to divorce big business from big politics, and make it unnecessary for the great commercial fabric of this Nation to depend upon the bounty and favoritism of the people's Government in order to succeed. We are seeking to subvent the socialistic tendencies of the times, which are the direct result of the maintenance of Republican policies. For the ultimate conclusion of republicanism is socialism. For if it be true that the Government, as such, owes it to a favored class to protect them in their commercial enterprises, in order that profits may be vouchsafed to them, why not go one step further and declare that the Government, as such, owes it to all the people to not only protect, but actually to conduct all commercial enterprises in order that something of profit may be vouchsafed to all the people? One doctrine is as tenable as the other. Both are founded in falsehood. Both are contrary to the theory upon which all free governments are

founded. Both are founded upon the false notion that the Government owes everything to the people, or a favored few of them, and that the people owe nothing to the Government.

But if it be denied that Republicanism leads inevitably to socialism, it can not truthfully be denied that Republicanism, with its selfish, un-American, and mendacious favoritism, has been largely responsible for the growth of socialism. You can not unjustly hoist one class of our people without unjustly lowering the other. You can not, by Government aid, create enormous wealth without creating unwholesome want. Recognizing these fundamental truths we are proceeding upon the only sound and honorable course by proposing to hoist no man at the expense of his neighbor. We are proposing a tariff bill which refuses to recognize the protective theory as worthy of any place in the political thought of a free people. We are proceeding upon the time-honored Democratic doctrine that all taxes of every description and from whatever source collected shall be for revenue only, a doctrine which has brought the Democratic Party safely through the tempestuous waters of more than a hundred years of strife and turmoil into a welcome and a tranquil harbor.

We have heard much from our Republican calamity howlers about destruction and ruin to business on account of this tariff. This "stop-thief" cry has been heard so often in this country that it will no longer alarm sensible people. It is but the wail of the political and commercial coward. It is an effort to frighten honest and legitimate business into the belief that the Republican Party is the reservoir of all their prosperity, and the advent of Democracy the harbinger of shrinking profits and soup houses. Such an argument can emanate only from a dishonest mind. It is but an effort to carry out the long-established policy of the Republican Party in fooling the American people. But, thanks to the intelligence and wisdom of the people, this cry of fear will find no response in the hearts of the people. I have heard so much during this debate of the crumbling of industries, of smokeless stacks, and dollarless banks, that I am convinced that unless the Nation goes out of business the Republican Party, what little of it remains, will be sorely disappointed. For it is fear upon which that party has fed by day and falsehood upon which it pillowed its head by night. And realizing now that the people have repudiated it for its sins, it seeks again to raise its prostrate form through fear and falsehood, unwilling to profit by its own mistakes or to be purged in the crucible of public opinion.

I predict for this tariff bill a career of great success. I need not go into the reasons for this prediction, for whether the prediction prove correct or incorrect, the reasons therefor would not be interesting. But I feel justified in so predicting because of the fact that it is an honest and faithful effort to carry out the wishes of the people, expressed at the polls on election day. It is an honest effort to break down the wall that has protected a few at the expense of the many. It is an honest effort to readjust our commercial fabric in harmony with modern tendencies. It is a faithful effort to keep our promises. It is our plighted faith, our sacred honor, our life and all for which we fight to-day. And we ask the American people to be not frightened by the scarecrow placed before them by the Republican mischief makers, but to adjust themselves honestly and patriotically to the new duties with faith and hope and determination to prove the utter falsity of the doctrine that American energy, genius, brain, and courage can not conquer the markets of the world unless they are subsidized by the people's Government.

We have heard much of so-called Republican prosperity. We have seen the rich grow richer, and we have seen poverty and squalor and ignorance and vice increase in the great centers of our population. We have seen a few men pile up fortunes like Ossa upon Pelion, seeking later to soothe their consciences by the endowment of colleges and libraries, giving their bounty-gotten wealth back to those from whom they did not take it. We have seen the mansion of the magnate with one eye and with the other the hovel of the toiler. We have heard with one ear the music and laughter of the guilded salon and with the other the cry of hunger from the street. We have seen wealth centralized in the hands of a few to such an appalling extent that it is said now that 90 per cent of the total wealth of this Nation is owned by less than 10 per cent of the people. And yet this is called prosperity. Republican prosperity. God save us from such a prosperity. The mission of the Democratic Party to-day is so to adjust the laws of this Nation as to bring about equality before the law to every man, high and low alike. Not necessarily equality of brain or wealth or physical force, but equality of opportunity, and a Government which does not vouchsafe to its people equality of opportunity is not a free Government and can not long endure.

For what shall it benefit us to know that on yesterday we walked upon the mountain top, if to-morrow our children shall grope in the darkness of the valley? What shall it benefit us to know that yesterday we sat at a table laden with sweet morsels from the corners of the earth, if to-morrow our children shall feed upon the husks of the swineherd? What shall it benefit us to know that yesterday we basked in the splendor of palatial beauty, surrounded with all that art and wealth and culture can supply, if to-morrow we shall sit upon the doorstep of a stately poorhouse, a sovereign pauper? Give us, then, a prosperity which shall endure not for a day nor for ourselves alone, but one which may be bequeathed to all the people and for all time. A prosperity which shall be planted squarely upon the bedrock of eternal justice, instead of perpetual duplicity. A prosperity which shall not find its lodging place alone among those who need it not, but a prosperity which shall descend on all the people alike, as the refreshing rain descends from Heaven. A prosperity which shall find true realization in the Jeffersonian, Democratic, American doctrine of "Equal rights to all, and special privileges to none."

In the past, Mr. Chairman, when the people have called upon the Republican Party for relief from the burdens of unjust taxation they have acted as if they were of those who, having ears hear not, and having eyes see not. When the people have asked for free lumber in order that they might build humble homes in which to abide, the Republicans have responded by placing acorns upon the free list. When in the past the people have asked for cheaper fuel in order to keep their bodies warm, the Republican Party has responded by placing ashes on the free list. When in the past the people have asked for cheaper meat upon which to feed themselves and their children, the Republicans have responded by placing bones upon the free list. When we have asked for cheaper shoes, they have given us free spunk. When we have asked for cheaper milk, they have responded with free dragon's blood. When we have implored them to give us cheaper beef and pork, they have responded by placing hoofs and horns upon the free list. When we have asked for cheaper sugar, they have handed us untaxed ipecac. When we have prayed for cheaper iron and steel, they have responded by placing junk upon the free list. When we have asked for cheaper clothing so that we might protect ourselves from the winter's chill, they have cheerfully responded with free rags. When we have implored them to give us a cheaper beefsteak, they have replied by placing teeth upon the free list. When we have asked them for bread, they have responded with free apatite.

And so on, from bad to worse, the shameful story runs ad infinitum. But the dawn is now appearing. A better day is approaching. Democracy rules in this Nation and all is well. Along with acorns we give free lumber. Along with ashes we give free fuel. Along with bones and hoofs and horns we give free meat. Along with spunk we give them free hides and shoes. Along with dragon's blood we give them milk. By the side of ipecac we give them sugar. Along with junk, including the Republican Party, we give them cheaper iron and steel. Along with the rags we give them cheaper clothing. Along with teeth we give them beef, and along with apatite we have given them bread. Not only is this true, but through the income tax, which is now a part of our fundamental law by reason of the efforts of the Democratic Party, we shall shift some of the burdens of taxation from the poor to the shoulders of the rich. We shall lighten the load now borne by the workingman and transfer it to those who have prospered at his expense. We shall attempt to equalize the burdens of the Government no less than its benefits.

To this end, therefore, we invite the cooperation of all forward-looking, patriotic men. We ask your aid in establishing again the just doctrine of competitive superiority as against paternal favoritism. We ask for nothing except that justice may dwell among our people; that capital shall receive a fair profit upon its investment and energy; that labor may receive a full day's wage for a full day's work, and that he may go into a market where the laws of nature and of trade shall govern to buy the things that are necessary for his life. We believe this tariff bill will accomplish this purpose, and we open our faces to the rising sun with hope and confidence, inviting all who believe in genuine reform to join our ranks. The Democratic Party has always been the party of reform. It was the Democratic Party that first began to agitate the income tax. It was the Democratic Party that first began to agitate the question of the election of Senators by the people. It was the

Democratic Party that first declared in favor of the publicity of campaign funds. It was the Democratic Party which first declared in favor of the physical valuation of railroads. It has been always the Democratic Party which has thundered against the abuses of benighted and defunct Republicanism, and it is to our party that the people look to-day for the redress of their grievances and the lightening of their burdens. Let us hope that its mission may not fail; that it may reconstruct the broken fragments of public confidence into a more enduring liberty, which shall find fruition in the realization of a government of, by, and for the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, as I recall how the people of this country have returned to their allegiance to the Democratic Party, after wandering off after false gods, I am reminded of an incident that occurred down in Christian County in the good old State of Kentucky. There was a young man who married a rich man's daughter, and by force of circumstances he was unable to make a conspicuous success at providing a living for them. Finally, after a large family had grown up about him, he said to his father-in-law, "If you will give me a team of mules and $200 I will go to Colorado and try to make an honest living for my family." The old man, weary of the burden himself, gave him the $200 and the team of mules, and the son-in-law started in his canvas wagon for Colorado, where they have to irrigate the soil in some places in order to get sufficient moisture to grow a crop. He planted his crop of corn, and when it got almost large enough to "lay it by," the irrigation became defective, the corn dried up, and he made nothing in Colorado. He said to his wife, "I guess we had better go down into Kansas. We can not make anything here. We do not understand this irrigation business, anyway." So he moved his family into Kansas, and the next year planted another crop of corn. When it reached the same period of development, one of those hot Kansas winds came along and parched it and dried it up, so that the corn crop was a failure in that State. His money was gone, his mules were thin, and he said to his wife, "I hate to go back to the old man, but I can not live out here. I am bound to go back, though it be humiliating to me. I know they will tease and torment me because I am returning to the parental roof, but I can not see my babies starve to death. I can not see them cry for the food and raiment which I can not give." So he loaded them in his canvas wagon and started back to Kentucky. All the way home he wondered what excuse he could give for returning, but just as he turned over the hill in sight of his old home, he saw a bunch of pokeberries in the corner of the fence. Stopping his wagon, he got out into the fence corner, pulled a bunch of the berries, mashed them into ink, and wrote on the side of his wagon his reasons for returning. And I think the reasons which he gave on the side of his wagon will apply with equal force as the reasons for the return of the American people to the fireside of Democracy at the present time. These were the reasons which he gave:

Colorado irrigation,
Kansas winds and conflagration,
High tariff and taxation,
Bill Taft's administration,
Roosevelt's vociferation,
Hell-fire and damnation,
Bring me back to my wife's relations.

[Laughter and applause.]

I trust that I am not incorrect in assuming that something of the same feeling actuated the American people and caused them to return to the fold of the Democratic Party, where "equal rights to all and special privileges to none" shall be the motto. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON].

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in his inaugural address, leaning down from the heights of altruism and talking down to his followers in a language that none of them understood, the President explained to them that the Nation was intending to use them "for a large and definite purpose." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

This gave general satisfaction until it was explained to them that it did not involve their employment in official capacity. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The Postmaster General, however, as the connecting link between altruism and appetite, is understood to be giving diligent consideration to a method of simplified civil-service examination of fourth-class postmasters, designed to give the Government an opportunity to use the brethren more largely for "definite purposes." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

In this way the carnal man is being sustained while his rudimentary spiritual part is being ministered to by homeopathic suggestion.

Next to the last election the most interesting convulsion of nature is the Democratic rush for office.

In filing a bill of particulars of "the large and definite purpose" to which he conceives the Democratic Party to have been called by more than a million votes against them on the tariff question [laughter], the President starts with "a repeal of a tariff which cuts us off from our proper part in the commerce of the world, violates the just principles of taxation, and makes the Government a facile instrument in the hands of private interests."

This easily separates itself into three parts.

First. The present tariff "cuts us off from our proper part in the commerce of the world."

Second. It "violates the just principles of taxation."

Third. It "makes the Government a facile instrument in the hands of private interests."

This sounds realistic, and when the people heard it they shivered and felt a vague and sinister tariff influence going through their pockets and stealing away their commerce.

Mark Twain, commenting upon the maxim that "honesty is the best policy," says:

This is a superstition. There are times when the appearance of it is worth six of it.

[Laughter on the Republican side.]

There is also a certain impressiveness about saying solemn things in a solemn way with solemnity.

THE INSPIRED INSTRUMENT.

The instrument by which, in the language of the President, the "commerce of the world" is to be opened to us, by which "the just principles of taxation" are to be established among us, and by which this Government is to be emancipated from the thraldom of "private interests," is this bill, framed after three weeks of testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, where only "private interests" were heard. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Let us examine how this bill proposes to give us a quitclaim deed to the commerce of the world, to whiten the ocean with ships running to and fro between our ports and the ports of other nations, and to keep the sea so hot with cabled orders for our products that parboiled whales will lie belly up all the way across. [Laughter and applause.]

Let us examine how this bill proposes to establish "just principles of taxation," so that all the taxable world with shining faces will stand waiting at our ports of entry and our income-tax offices, anxious to contribute to a tax millennium.

Let us examine how this bill proposes to loosen the strangle hold of "private interests" and banish them forever from unlawful sustenance.

"OUR PROPER PART."

First, then, what is our present commerce with the world and what is our "proper part" in it?

Last year the exports and imports of the international commerce of all the world amounted to $35,000,000,000. Of the exports of that commerce we sold 12.9 per cent and of the imports of that commerce we bought 9 per cent—that is, we sold more than we bought, and unless the fundamental bases of political economy are to be broken up and cast upon the rubbish heap of rejected theories, it is better to sell our surplus abroad and get other people's money for circulation among ourselves than it is to have no surplus and to buy abroad and send our money abroad to enrich other people at our own expense.

Therefore, our "proper part" in the commerce of the world would seem to be to sell all we can abroad and buy what we need, just as it is good business for a farmer to make his farm as productive as he can, sell what he can, and buy what he must.

Second, what is our domestic commerce, what is its relation to the commerce of the world, and why should we give it away to other nations?

Here in America we have a trade among ourselves of $36,000,000,000, in which we buy and sell among ourselves fifteen times as much as we sell abroad and twice as much as all the other nations of the world import.

Our water-borne traffic, coastwise and otherwise, connects with a network of 250,000 miles of railroad over which 61,000 locomotives are hauling the products of the prosperity of 100,000,000 people, whose prosperity is increased or diminished accordingly as they are employed or unemployed, and this bill proposes to divide this market and this prosperity with other nations which protect their markets against us.

The Detroit River floats more tons of freight in eight months of navigation than the Suez Canal floats in a year, and it floats most of it in American ships manned by American men, owned by American capital, built by American labor out of American material, cut, dug, and framed out of American

mines and forests, and above most of these ships floats the American flag [applause on the Republican side], and this bill proposes to rust the heart out of our domestic commerce for the benefit of foreigners.

MAINTAINING THE STANDARD OF AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP.

How does protection "cut us off from our proper part of the commerce of the world?"

The Republican theory of protection is that duties should be so levied as to equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, and that to ascertain that difference with scientific accuracy we should have a tariff commission whose business it should be to ascertain the cost of production at home and abroad, so that we may fix the standard by which to measure duties.

Why should duties be so levied as to equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad?

First. Because if duties are raised above the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad it invites domestic monopolies to overcharge domestic consumers.

Second. Because if duties are fixed below the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad it invites foreign monopolies to participate in our markets and force down the wages of American labor.

Third. Because we hold the quality of American citizenship above dollars and cents. We are not only growing and making commodities but we are growing, and by our naturalization laws making American citizens who are being called upon to participate more and more directly in the making of laws and constitutions, and we can not afford to lower the standard of American citizenship. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Fourth. Because protection of American labor and American industry means protection of American manhood and American citizenship. We can not lift the rest of the world up to the level of American citizenship, and we decline to lower the level of American citizenship down to the level of foreign citizenship by forcing American wages down to the level of foreign wages. [Applause on the Republican side.]

BUYING ABROAD.

All commerce has two ends—one the buying end, the other the selling end—and the Democratic theory is to increase our buying abroad and by consequence to decrease our selling everywhere.

Is this the way to increase "our part in the commerce of the world"?

But in order to buy we must have something to sell with which to get money to buy [applause on the Republican side], and the more we buy abroad the less we make at home, and the less we make at home the less we have to sell, and the less we have to sell the less money there is in circulation, and the less money there is in circulation the more people are thrown out of employment, and the more people are thrown out of employment the more the slums of big cities are populated. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The more we buy abroad the more money we send abroad, and the more money we send abroad the more we drain our own arteries of trade and swell the arteries of foreign trade.

The more money we send abroad the more we stimulate foreign production and depress our own.

The more money we send abroad the more money we take out of the pockets of American labor and put into the pockets of foreign labor.

THE INTERESTS THAT FRAMED THIS BILL.

Is this our "proper part" in the commerce of the world?

In what way does protection make the Government, in the language of the President, the "facile instrument of private interests"?

There are a good many private interests in this country.

We have thirty-five and a half million people here engaged in gainful occupations. Of these, twelve and a half millions are engaged in agriculture, eight and a half millions in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits, six millions in trade and transportation, and eight and a half millions in professional and domestic service.

Comparatively few representatives of these "private interests" were heard by the committee which framed this bill, but importers' interests and foreign manufacturers' interests were represented there as never before.

The special interests which helped to make this bill were not the men of genius, courage, and ability who have lighted the fires of our furnaces and given employment to millions of our people; not the American farmer, who has pushed our frontier westward to the Pacific Ocean and built the American schoolhouse on the edge of every clearing; but importers' associations like the Italian Chamber of Commerce of New York, subsidized by the Italian Government to obtain low duties or no duties on Italian products; importers' associations like the Merchants' Association of New York; importers' associations like the Merchants' Reform Club of New York—these are the "interests" that helped to make this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Men who want to carry out the broad, patriotic, and nonsectional ideals of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], who declared a year ago that "we in the South intend to make New England millmen come and put their mills in the South or else go out of business"; these are the men who framed this bill.

Men who want to increase the flocks of Australia, South America, and South Africa, and drive the flocks of the United States to the slaughterhouse; these are the men who framed this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Men who want to reduce or remove the protection of American farmers and promote the prosperity of foreign farmers; men who want to fertilize the beet and cane fields of the rest of the world with American money and drive American farmers, planters, and laboring men out of business; these are the men who framed this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In this way is our Government to be made to discriminate against our own people, who are taxed to maintain it, and made the "facile instrument" of foreign monopolies?

In this way are foreign looms and foreign machinery to be set humming to the tune of new industry, while our own gather rust and cobwebs?

In this way are the patriotic interests of this Government to be made subservient to the views of cloistered professors of free-trade political economy? [Applause on the Republican side.]

THE DEMOCRATIC "FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE."

How does protection "violate the just principles of taxation," and what are these "just principles of taxation," anyway?

In your platform you "declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government under the Constitution has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue."

It is a "fundamental principle," then, of the Democratic Party that protection is unconstitutional.

But if protection is unconstitutional, how did it happen that the first tariff law ever passed was avowedly a protective tariff law and was framed in part by men who had just finished framing the Federal Constitution, and was reported by James Madison and signed by George Washington?

Were Washington, Adams, Madison, and Monroe unpatriotic and unconstitutional when they helped to make that first protective tariff law and put it on the statute books as a part of the national celebration on the 4th day of July, 1789?

If they were unpatriotic and unconstitutional, is the President patriotic and constitutional?

But if protection is unconstitutional, why is it not unconstitutional all the time?

If it is unconstitutional to protect one thing, why is it constitutional to protect another?

If it is constitutional to retain an inadequate duty on wheat, why is it unconstitutional to protect rye? Is wheat constitutional and rye unconstitutional?

If it is constitutional to retain an inadequate duty on cattle and sheep, why is it unconstitutional to protect hogs? Are hogs unconstitutional and cattle and sheep constitutional?

If it is constitutional to retain an inadequate duty on cattle and sheep, why is it unconstitutional to protect beef and mutton? Are cattle and sheep on the hoof constitutional and their meat unconstitutional?

If it is constitutional to protect Texas Angora goat hair, why is it not constitutional to protect wool? Is goat hair constitutional and wool unconstitutional?

You talk about your devotion to the interests of the farmer, but you have never lost an opportunity to injure him.

You made Canadian reciprocity a law and you refused to repeal it three times after Canada had repudiated it.

In that law you juggled with your "fundamental principle," that protection is unconstitutional, and advertised your deep damnation of "private interests" by making wood pulp and print paper unconditionally free, regardless of whether Canada accepted or rejected reciprocity, and this you did to curry favor with the newspaper "interests."

The effect of this bill also, according to John Norris, of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, will be "to admit news-print paper and mechanical pulp free of duty from all the world without qualification of any sort." The President's press agent is obviously not forgetting his newspaper relations.

In that law you juggled again with your "fundamental principle" by taking the duty off from the farmers' wheat and retaining a duty of 50 cents a barrel on the millers' flour. If it was constitutional to protect the miller, why was it unconstitutional to protect the farmer?

In that law you juggled again with your "fundamental principle" by taking the duty off from barley and keeping a duty of 45 cents a hundred on barley malt.

If it was constitutional to protect the brewers' malt, why was it unconstitutional to protect the farmers' barley?

In that law you juggled again with your "fundamental principle" by taking the duty off from rye and keeping a duty of $2.60 a gallon on whisky. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

If it was constitutional to protect the distiller of whisky, why was it unconstitutional to protect the farmers' rye?

In that law you juggled again with your "fundamental principle" by taking the duty off from meat on the hoof and keeping a duty of a cent and a quarter a pound on dressed meat.

If it was constitutional to protect the packer's dressed meat, why was it not constitutional to protect the farmers' cattle, sheep, and hogs?

If it was constitutional then to protect beef and mutton and was unconstitutional to protect cattle and sheep, why is it unconstitutional now to protect beef and mutton and constitutional now to protect cattle and sheep?

Is your "fundamental principle" reversible? Is your "fundamental principle" a thing of time and expediency?

Does the statute of limitations run on your "fundamental principle" in two years? [Applause on the Republican side.]

A LOAF OF BREAD.

Thinking to catch the city vote in the North and knowing you will get the Southern vote from force of habit [laughter], this administration now talks about low rates on the "market basket." This is only another way of telling the people who live in cities that farmers are getting too much for what they have to sell, because the people who live in cities are paying too much for what they have to buy, and amounts to an assessment of the farmer to make up for the profits of city dealers.

You are cutting the duty on wheat down to 10 cents a bushel in this bill. Why do you not take it off entirely? Do you think to fool the farmer by keeping a little duty?

The great Canadian Provinces of Manitoba, Alberta, and Saskatchewan, with a total area equal to about 10 States the size of Michigan, and containing almost as much wheat land as lies west of the Mississippi River, are growing an average of 24 bushels of wheat to the acre, against an average of 15 bushels here.

Under a protection of 25 cents a bushel the price of our wheat has averaged about 10 cents a bushel higher than the price of Canadian wheat. With a duty of 10 cents the difference in favor of the United States will be all the way from 3 cents down to nothing.

A bushel of wheat makes 60 loaves of bread, and one-sixtieth of 10 cents is one-sixth of a cent, and one-sixtieth of 3 cents is one-twentieth of a cent.

I leave it to the "higher mathematics" of the President to answer whether any consumer has ever had to pay one-sixth of a cent more for a loaf of bread by reason of protection to the farmer's wheat, the reduction of which will make him millions of dollars poorer. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And I leave it to candid men everywhere to say whether when this bill has gone into effect and you have made the farmer millions of dollars poorer a loaf of bread will be likely to be sold one-twentieth of a cent cheaper.

SUGAR.

In the same way you propose to save money on sugar.

The estimated population of the United States is 97,160,336, and the total consumption of sugar in the United States in 1912 was 3,504,182 long tons, or 7,849,367,680 pounds.

The per capita consumption of sugar in the United States, then, last year was 81 pounds.

One million six hundred and sixty-four thousand eight hundred and sixty-three long tons, or 47.5 per cent of the total amount of sugar consumed in the United States last year, came from Cuba, and 47.5 per cent of 81 pounds, the amount consumed by each person, is 38.4 pounds.

Nine hundred and forty-three thousand seven hundred and sixty-nine long tons, or 26.9 per cent of the total amount of sugar consumed in the United States last year, came from our insular territory, and 26.9 per cent of 81 pounds is 21.8 pounds.

One hundred and six thousand three hundred and fifty long tons, or 3.1 per cent of the total amount of sugar consumed in the United States last year, came from the world outside of Cuba and our insular territory, and 3.1 per cent of 81 pounds is 2.5 pounds.

All the rest of the sugar consumed in the United States last year—789,200 long tons or 22.5 per cent of the total amount consumed—was made from domestic beets and cane, and 22.5 per cent of 81 pounds is 18.2 pounds.

Now, the duty on the 38.4 pounds of Cuban sugar consumed by each person, at 1.348 cents per pound, is 51.76 cents; the duty on 2.5 pounds of sugar coming from the world outside Cuba and our insular territory, at the full duty rate of 1.685 cents per pound, is 4.21 cents; and no duty was collected on insular sugar.

Therefore, the total duty paid, theoretically, by each person in the United States on all the sugar he or she consumed last year was 55.97 cents.

By this bill you propose to charge a duty of 1.256 cents per pound on all 96° sugar coming from the world outside the insular territory of the United States and Cuba for three years, and for all sugar coming from Cuba you propose to charge a duty of 1.005 cents per pound.

Assuming, for the sake of illustration, that Cuban and other foreign sugar will enter our market in the same proportion as now, the duty on the 2.5 pounds of sugar consumed per capita by the people of the United States coming from the world outside the insular territory of the United States and Cuba at 1.256 cents per pound will be 3.14 cents, and the duty on the 38.4 pounds of Cuban sugar consumed by the people of the United States per capita, at 1.005 cents per pound, will be 38.59 cents, and the total duty paid by each person will be 41.73 cents.

Therefore, since, under existing law, each person theoretically pays a duty of 55.97 cents a year on the 81 pounds of sugar that he consumes in a year, and since under the proposed law he will pay a duty of 41.73 cents a year, he will save the difference between 55.97 cents and 41.73 cents, which is 14.24 cents a year.

Therefore, each person will be saved, theoretically, the munificent sum of 14.24 cents a year for three years. After that you propose to arrange it so that he can riot in a total surplus of 55.97 cents a year saved on sugar.

But only two-thirds of the 81 pounds of sugar consumed per capita per annum in the United States is consumed as sugar; the rest is used in manufactured products like candy, gum, and condensed milk.

Therefore the change in duty on one-third of the sugar consumed by each person will never be perceptible to consumers but will be absorbed by manufacturers, so that the amount of sugar actually consumed by each person per annum as sugar is 54 pounds, and the amount theoretically to be saved per capita during the next three years will be only 9¼ cents a year. After that the amount theoretically to be saved will be 37.31 cents a year.

But assuming, for the sake of argument, that it is better to save 9¼ cents a year for three years and after that to save 37.31 cents a year on sugar and reduce the revenues of the Government derived from sugar by over $50,000,000, what certainty can we have that everybody can carry home a half a cent's worth more of sugar a week in his market basket?

What assurance have we that the sugar refiners will not take possession of the market and raise prices after you have destroyed their competitors, the beet and cane sugar industries of the United States?

But if the refiners do not take all of our half a cent a week on sugar which you propose to save for us, what assurance have we that our half a cent a week will run the long gantlet of intermediate dealers between the sugar fields and the consumer?

Or, if the refiners do not control prices against us, and if the intermediate dealers do not absorb our half a cent a week apiece, what assurance can we have that the inexorable law of supply and demand will not deprive us of our half a cent a week apiece and raise the price of sugar when our own beet and cane sugar growers are driven out of business?

WOOL AND WAGES.

In the same way you propose to save money on wool.

You have coldly calculated the labor cost at home and abroad and deliberately intend to sacrifice American labor and American industry in the interest of foreign labor and foreign industry.

You know that it costs the American manufacturer more to build and equip a factory than it does the foreign manufacturer, because the American manufacturer pays better wages than are paid abroad; and you deliberately require that the American manufacturer shall pay lower wages or build no more factories.

You know that when the foreign manufacturer begins to dig for the foundations of his factory it costs him 40 cents a day in

Belgium, 64 cents a day in Germany, and 80 cents a day in England for diggers, whereas it costs the American manufacturer not less than $2 a day.

You know that when the foreign manufacturer proceeds to lay the walls of his factory it costs him only 64 cents a day in Belgium, $1.04 a day in Germany, and $1.68 a day in England for brick and stone masons, whereas it costs the American manufacturer not less than $5 a day.

You know that the foreign manufacturer pays only 40 cents a day in Belgium, 64 cents a day in Germany, and $1.04 a day in England for hod carriers, while the American manufacturer pays American hod carriers not less than $2 a day.

You know that the foreign manufacturer pays carpenters only 56 cents a day in Belgium, $1.04 a day in Germany, and $1.60 a day in England, whereas American manufacturers pay carpenters from $3 to $5 a day.

You know that the foreign manufacturer pays painters only 56 cents a day in Belgium, 96 cents a day in Germany, and $1.44 a day in England, whereas American manufacturers pay American painters $3 to $4 a day.

You know that the foreign manufacturer pays plumbers only 64 cents a day in Belgium, 88 cents a day in Germany, and $1.60 a day in England, while American manufacturers pay from $5 to $6 a day.

You know that the foreign manufacturer pays skilled mechanics 64 cents a day in Belgium, $1.04 a day in Germany, and $1.36 in England, while American manufacturers pay skilled mechanics anywhere from $2.50 a day upward.

You know that it costs the American manufacturer from 45 to 51 per cent more to build a factory than it does the foreign manufacturer.

You know that when the foreign manufacturer proceeds to make cloth the average wages paid weavers on the continent of Europe are $6.50 a week, and in England $9 a week, while the average wages paid weavers in America are $13 a week.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WINGO). Will the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON]?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. How does it come that the wages of free-trade England are so much higher than in the protected countries on the Continent which you mention, namely, Germany, Belgium, and others?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. That is an ancient question. It has been asked a great many times since I have been here——

Mr. GORDON. Well, answer it.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan (continuing). I am going to be candid with the gentleman—and I have answered this question this way before—I doubt if there is any scientific, accurate way of stating the reason why wages are higher in England than they are on the Continent, any more than there is of stating why wages are higher in Germany than in Belgium.

England has a different industrial system than Germany. If you say it is the tariff that makes the difference, your logic will fail there; that is, provided you want to discuss the matter in a fair and dispassionate way. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HELGESEN. If you can not make them understand why, I suggest you ask if free trade brings such high wages in England, why the wages are not higher than in America.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I want to be perfectly fair, and I do not believe in discussing these matters in a petty, cheap way.

You know from the Tariff Board's report that the average wages paid 10 of the highest-paid German weavers are $7.12 for a week of 55 hours, while the average wages of 10 of the highest-paid weavers in similar American mills are $17.34 a week.

You know that the average wages of weavers in France are 81.77 cents a day.

You know that the wages of woolen weavers in England range from $5.47 to $6.68 a week, while the average wages of woolen weavers in the United States are $3.50 a *day*.

Knowing these things—knowing that foreign wages range all the way from a third to a half of the wages paid here—knowing that labor and machinery are no more productive here than there, because machinery can be run no faster here than there without injury to the fabric; knowing that it costs twice as much to spin a pound of yarn or a yard of cloth here as it does there; knowing that a duty of 50 per cent is necessary to equalize conditions here and abroad, you cut the duty down to 35 per cent and deliberately require the American manufacturer to pay lower wages or go out of business.

"THE EXCITEMENTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF GREATER FREEDOM."

You know that it costs the American woolgrower 11 to 12 cents to produce a pound of wool; that it costs the woolgrower of Argentina 4 to 5 cents to produce a pound of wool; that it costs the Australian and New Zealand woolgrower practically nothing to produce a pound of wool after crediting the flock with other products; and knowing that the American woolgrower can not compete with the foreign woolgrower, you deliberately propose to remove the whole duty from all wools, washed and unwashed, and drive the American woolgrower out of business.

When you do this you know that the American manufacturer will have to pay lower wages or go out of business; you know the American laboring man will have to take lower wages or no wages; you know that his purchasing power will be reduced and that he will deposit no more money in savings banks; and you know he may have to wear shoddy, which you have made free presumably to meet that emergency; but superciliously smiling down from your height of temporary power you invite him to warm himself with the consolation that he is giving the foreign laboring man more work to do; and the President invites him to warm himself with his pleasant little sarcasm in his address to Congress about getting accustomed to "the excitements and responsibilities of greater freedom." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Greater freedom to do what? Greater freedom to watch his savings dwindle away? Greater freedom to look for work while his family is in want?

You know that when you make raw wool free you will drive American sheep to the slaughterhouse.

But you invite the American farmer to console himself with the knowledge that he is promoting the sheep-raising business of Australia, South Africa, and South America, and discipline himself by getting accustomed to "the excitements and responsibilities of greater freedom."

Of course, when you have destroyed the sheep business, the prices of mutton and lamb will go up and with fewer sheep to kill, the prices of beef, pork, chicken, and eggs will go up, but the man out of work and the shepherd without a flock can console themselves by thinking how they are helping the shepherds of Australia, South America, and South Africa, and the weavers of Europe, and how much better it is to give than to receive, anyway. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

A MATTER OF NO CONCERN.

With the cocksureness of a man accustomed to instruct the immature minds of youth, the President, in his address to Congress, undertook to settle in eight minutes problems which have vexed the minds of statesmen for more than a hundred years. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

To him and to you it is a matter of no concern that all the nations of the world, except England, protect their markets against us and against all other nations.

To him and to you it is a matter of no concern that the colonies of England, including Canada, protect their markets against us and against all other nations, except England.

To him and to you it is a matter of no concern that Canadian newspapers are jubilant over our invitation to her to share our markets with us at the expense of our own people.

To him and to you it is a matter of no concern that Canadian millers and wheat growers are well pleased with conditionally free flour and 10-cent wheat, because it will save them the long haul to Europe and wipe out the international boundary line between them and our 100,000,000 population market.

To him and to you it is a matter of no concern that conditionally free flour and 10-cent wheat will force the price of American wheat down to the level of Canadian wheat and make the American farmer millions of dollars poorer.

To him and to you it must be particularly pleasant to read in the London Daily News that your bill is "a staggering attack on the whole fabric of protection—the heaviest blow protection has received since Peel established free trade in England 70 years ago."

THE "CHIEF SUFFERERS."

With uplifted eyes and the nasal twang of hypocritical piety you told the American farmer and the American laboring man in your platform that they were the "chief sufferers" by reason of protection. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Is it because of your sympathy with the farmer's "suffering" that you propose to lower the duty on the farmer's wheat and give the Minneapolis millers a license to range at will over the wheat fields of Canada and the United States and in combination with Canadian millers to dictate terms to farmers? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Is it on account of your sympathy for the "suffering" of farmers that you propose to cut the duty on oats from 15 cents

to 10 cents a bushel and put oatmeal and rolled oats on the free list? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Is it on account of your sympathy with the "suffering" of farmers that you propose to cut the duty on barley from 30 cents to 15 cents a bushel?

Is it on account of your sympathy with the "suffering" of farmers that you propose to cut the duty on hay from $4 to $2 a ton?

Is it on account of your sympathy for the "suffering" of farmers that you propose to make rye free?

Is it on account of your sympathy with the "suffering" of farmers that you propose to make potatoes free?

Is it on account of your sympathy with the "suffering" of the best-fed, best-paid, best-housed laboring man on earth that you propose to drive him into competition with foreign labor?

Again, I call attention to the Chaplain's prayer, "Since cant and hypocrisy are the worst of sins, preserve us, O Lord, from these." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

HIGH PRICES.

You talk about "private interests," but by this bill you will either centralize industries in the hands of a few great corporations by driving small competing industries to the wall or you will drive our industries out of business and turn our $36,000,000,000 market over to the exploitation of foreign monopolies which will raise or lower prices at will.

You charge in your platform that protection makes high prices, but prices are high the world over, and the Republican Party has not put a tariff wall around the world.

Mr. GORDON. It has not jurisdiction.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Prices are high, but protection has not made them high.

Prices have been going up alike in free trade and protected countries for the last 15 years. In the campaign of 1896 you Democrats said more money makes higher prices, and you demanded the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1 to make more money in order to make higher prices.

More money does make higher prices, and in the 15 years from 1896 to 1911 the world's supply of gold increased from $202,251,600 a year to $461,000,000 a year.

More money does make higher prices, but it is only money that goes into use and circulation that affects prices, and in Democratic administrations the quantitative theory of money ceases to act affirmatively, because in Democratic administrations money refuses to go into circulation and is hidden away in fear. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Prices are high, and one reason why prices are high is because certain kinds of people feel more exclusive if they pay exclusive prices, and our merchants always try to accommodate.

There are certain kinds of people who actually feel superior because they eat expensive things. With these people superiority and exclusiveness come through the stomach and not through brains. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Prices are high. A picture, by Rembrandt, of a woman picking a hen sold awhile ago for $250,000. [Laughter.]

Prices are high. If a carload of eggs should go to smash, it would cause a flurry in Wall Street. [Renewed laughter.]

Alimony is high. [Laughter.] I noticed the other day that a complainant in a divorce suit was demanding $125,000 a year alimony. She said it was necessary to enable her to maintain her standing in the society in which she moved. [Laughter.] I reckon it was. [Laughter.]

Life is cheap and prices are high. We read in the papers of some poor devil worn out with the struggle of life offering his body for sale for dissecting purposes, and in the next column we read of an expensive dinner being given to an aristocratic bulldog [laughter]—in New York. [Renewed laughter.]

Life and death are full of contrasts. It cost $200,000 to bury King Edward, and when some of us were being shown through the crematory connected with the quarantine station at Honolulu I saw a small tin can containing the ashes of an unknown man which had been there on a shelf for more than seven years. It did not cost much to bury him, poor fellow. [Laughter.]

Prices are high. It is getting so some people are afraid to go on living on account of the income tax and afraid to die on account of the inheritance tax and the undertaker's charges. [Laughter.]

Prices are high, and we are high with them. When the high cost of living struck Kansas an inspired commentator put it this way—he said: "We build schoolhouses and we send our children away from home to be educated." [Laughter.]

We grow weeds and buy vegetables. We throw away ashes and buy soap. We go fishing with a $10 rod and we go hunting 10-cent game with a $50 gun and a $20 dog. [Laughter.] Prices are high. [Laughter.]

But there are other causes of high prices than the increase of gold and one of these causes is found in the law of supply and demand. This question of prices is almost as difficult for a Democrat as that one about the difference in the scale of wages between England and Germany and between Germany and Belgium.

In the 10 years from 1900 to 1910 our population increased 21 per cent, while dairy cows increased only 20.4 per cent, and other cattle decreased 18.6 per cent, and sheep decreased 14.7 per cent, and hogs decreased 7.4 per cent. This in itself is enough to account for the high price of meat.

If on the six and a half million farms in this country 2 bushels of wheat or corn or oats or rye or barley could be grown where only 1 is grown now, or 2 head of cattle or sheep or hogs could be grown where only 1 is grown now, the problem of high prices would be swiftly solved, but it is a poor way to solve it by cutting down the price of what the farmer grows to sell upon the mistaken theory that because the people who live in cities are paying too much for what they have to buy the farmer is getting too much for what he grows to sell. [Applause on the Republican side.]

THE FARMER IS NOT RECEIVING HIGH PRICES.

There is another cause of high prices, and that is the movement of our population into cities. Every man or woman who leaves the farm reduces the number of producers of food.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Give me five minutes more.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The most ominous fact of modern conditions is that 46 per cent of our population is congested in cities, and this bill is a bid for the city vote.

These people are told that they are having to pay too much for what they have to buy because the farmer is getting too much for what he has to sell, but, as the Secretary of Agriculture says in his report for 1910, "The price received by the farmer is one thing; the price paid by the consumer is far different."

As a result of an investigation covering 78 cities scattered throughout the United States it was found that on the whole the farmers were not getting 50 per cent of the city retail price of things which they produce, and the Secretary of Agriculture winds up this part of his report by the statement that "the conclusion is inevitable that the consumer has no well-grounded complaint against the farmer for the price he pays."

COUNTING THE DOLLARS OF DEMOCRATIC APPROPRIATIONS.

This administration went into power with a full Treasury and abundant revenues, clamorously denouncing the "lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses," and ever since that time the Ways and Means Committee has been busy devising ways and means to meet appropriations until the total of appropriations and contract obligations voted in the last session of the Sixty-second Congress have outrun the appropriations and authorizations of the last session of the last Republican Congress by $86,860,049.22 and amount to $1,175,604,134.21.

We are told that a Treasury expert can count 4,000 silver dollars in an hour, and that in a day of 8 hours he can count 32,000 silver dollars.

Counting at that rate he can count a little less than a million dollars in 31 days, but if the appropriations and contract obligations of the last session of the Sixty-second Congress were converted into silver dollars and a Treasury expert were called upon to count them, when he had counted a million dollars he would be only at the beginning of the count.

In 10 years, counting at the rate of $4,000 an hour, he would have counted only a little over $119,000,000, and if he should keep on counting until he was old and gray and his eyes grew too dim to see and his ears too dull to hear the clinking coin, and the undertaker finally knocked at his door, he could not finish counting the dollars of Democratic appropriations and authorizations in the last session of the Sixty-second Congress, and no man since the days of the scriptural patriarchs has lived long enough to count them. [Laughter.]

THE VICE PRESIDENT'S SUGGESTION.

This money is drawn from American citizens, and if they complain the Vice President, who has talked more since he entered upon his "four years of silence" than ever before in his life [laughter], and to less purpose [laughter], has had the happy thought to advise them that the quietus long ago advocated by Karl Marx of repealing the laws of descent and cutting off the right to transmit property by will may be applied to them. [Laughter.]

There are crowds in great cities, and crowds breed demagogues. There are crowds in tenement districts, where people

are stacked up story above story, whose daily existence depends upon steady work, and if hard times should come back as a result of this bill this ill-advised suggestion of the Vice President will furnish the text of many a harangue by many a demagogue, with his flaring torch, talking at night from the curb under the shadow of great buildings, owned by colossal capital, to men out of work with families in want.

This is a time of national unrest, and I appeal to every patriotic American who holds a public place to stop playing for party advantage by sensational means, to stop playing to the galleries, to stop trying to outdo some one else in sensational utterances, and try the effect of sober sense and honest work. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH] is recognized.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, it is undoubtedly somewhat presumptuous for a brand-new Congressman, and more particularly a brand-new Bull Moose Congressman, to undertake to address the august, dignified American Congress, especially so, as I have been told, that the new Congressman who succeeds in finding his way through the vast maze of marble halls in this Capitol Building during his first term has accomplished all that can be expected of any new man. But, Mr. Chairman, judging from the vast number of Members of this House here present at this moment, I take it that many of the older Congressmen are still lost in the maze of marble halls in this Capitol Building. [Laughter.]

We Progressives are frequently referred to by our opponents as Bull Moosers, and the term is intended by them for ridicule; but, Mr. Chairman, a herd of 4,000,000 militant, young, and vigorous Bull Moose is a magnificent sight when compared to a slow-moving band of 3,000,000 elephants, whose clumsy bulk impede their progress, or a group of 6,000,000 jackasses frightened by their own bray. [Laughter and applause.] I have been amused and pleased to hear our Democratic and Republican friends talking loudly about their desire to give every man, woman, and child in this broad land a square deal. Amused at their evident anxiety to adopt the term made famous by our great leader, and pleased because some of the gentlemen appear to be in dead earnest about it.

Mr. Chairman, to a freshman in the House of Representatives of the greatest Nation on earth the explanation of the gentleman from Alabama, together with the special plea he made for the child of his brain, was very interesting and to some extent instructive.

Especially the reasons given for the income-tax section of this bill—deficit, $68,000,000; income, $70,000,000.

I believe the gentleman is absolutely sincere in his desire to carry out the pledge of his party platform. He certainly made a splendid speech from his standpoint, and I am frank to say that if I could admit his premise I should be compelled to agree with his conclusion.

But I find myself unable to do either.

Among other things, he said:

> Our great responsibility is the interest and rights of the great mass of the consumers among the American people. From our viewpoint industry must be considered as secondary to the rights of the consumer.

That doctrine, Mr. Chairman, would be wise indeed if we could separate those interests.

We have in this Nation about 6,000,000 laboring men, who, with their families, number nearly 30,000,000, or about one-third of our entire population.

And whatever affects the interests of the laboring man affects directly the farmer and every other citizen in our country.

The plea of confession and avoidance of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] would have been held good by the American jury had it been filed in time.

He has filed his plea, however, after the case has been tried and a verdict rendered, and his motion now for an arrest of judgment will be denied.

However, it has long been held in all courts that an honest confession is good for the soul.

In giving his reasons for the overthrow of his party the gentleman, among other things, said:

> In the first place, we stubbornly resisted reasonable reforms. Why we did so it is hard to say. Perhaps the truculent manner in which those reforms were advanced may have had much to do with our course. No man likes to be seized by the throat. No man who is a man will stand being threatened, especially by a reformer.

My answer to the gentleman's reason, as stated, is that in this case the reformer was a vast majority of the American people, and I take it that it is the bounden duty of the Representatives of the people who come to this legislative Hall to obey the orders given by those reformers. Again he says:

> The second reason for our dismissal was the fact that the country, I am sorry to say, desires a revision of the tariff much farther-reaching than the Payne law.

Again I say I can not conceive why the gentleman should regret that the country, if the country is advised, should require and demand a much farther downward revision of the tariff than was granted in the Payne law. Further he says:

> It can not be denied that subsequent reports of the Tariff Board have confirmed, in part at least, the country's judgment with respect to Schedule I and Schedule K, cotton goods and woolen goods.

And again:

> We failed to move with the age. That was the head and front of our offending. The Republican chieftains could not adjust their views to modern schools of thought.

Again I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts "honest confession is good for the soul."

One more quotation from the gentleman's speech, in which he says:

> Men sometimes forget their promises. Suppose that the Democrats fail to carry out their radical program. Will the country return at once to our party? I doubt it. The people wish to try some of these new ideas and are willing to risk the consequences of their proving disastrous. The Republicans have not given them the legislation which, wisely or foolishly, they wish. If the Democrats follow our example, it need surprise no one should the people turn to the Progressive Party.

I think the gentleman is absolutely right in his premise and in his conclusion. [Applause.]

That the leaders of the Democratic Party throughout the country are not united in their support of the Underwood bill is evidenced, not only by the fact that they were unable to agree in caucus, but that the Democratic governor of Massachusetts, in a special message to the legislature of that State, denounced this bill as a nonprotective tariff for revenue only—unreciprocal, destructive, downward revision.

And he further stated to the legislature:

> It is your right, it is your privilege, it is your duty to memorialize Congress in behalf of this Commonwealth against such a peril to the interests of Massachusetts.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, if what the governor says about the effect of this bill upon Massachusetts is true, it is also true concerning every other State in this Union.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the majority, upon whom rests the grave responsibility of tariff legislation, would present the subject to the House in separate bills, which would enable me to vote for a substantial downward revision of some of the important schedules, such as the woolen, cotton, and sugar schedules.

Can any intelligent, fair-minded man contend, after our experience with the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act, that the tariff is rightfully a political issue?

Political battles have been fought, and millions of dollars have been spent by the Republican and Democratic Parties, in a vain attempt to settle the tariff question as a political issue. For more than 50 years a purely local economical business question, affecting most vitally the interests of all our people, has been used, or rather misused, by the old parties for political advantage; and now, after all these years of trial and tribulation, as if we need a still further object lesson, the Democrats are about to put through this House a tariff measure which has been kicked up hill and down by members of their own party.

It is a bill which to some extent, at least, is an attempt on the part of the Democratic Party to keep its platform pledge; but, if we can believe the papers, it could not be passed without the tremendous power of political patronage.

The prospect of patronage plums to be handed out as soon as the tariff bill is passed is exceedingly effective. We are told through the columns of the public press that the President is using his high office to force Members of Congress to favor this bill.

Many Democrats believe they will be doing an irreparable injury to their States if they vote for the wool, cotton, and sugar schedules of this bill.

Every special interest in the Nation has filed its brief and used every ounce of pressure to have certain schedules of this bill defeated in this House, and they will naturally keep up their fight in the Senate. And when this bill becomes a law it will represent a compromise between the power of special privilege and the power of political patronage.

Mr. Chairman, our Democratic brethren told us in their national platform that a protective tariff was unconstitutional. And now with a hundred and fifty Democratic majority in this House we find Democrats from the sugar States, Democrats from the cotton States, and Democrats from woolen industry

States demanding a protective tariff on those schedules in this bill which directly affects the people of their particular sections.

All of which demonstrates beyond dispute the utter futility of attempting to adjust tariff rates by making them a political issue.

Mr. Chairman, the Progressive Party in this, as well as in many other matters, comes forward with the only rational solution of this great economic question and presents an amendment providing for the establishment of a nonpartisan scientific tariff commission which shall investigate all tariff schedules and report to the President of the United States and to both branches of Congress the cost of production, the efficiency of labor at home and abroad, capitalization, and industrial organization, and efficiency and the general competitive position in this country and abroad of all industries seeking protection from Congress; the revenue-producing power of the tariff and its relation to the resources of the Government; the effect of the tariff on prices; the operations of middlemen; and the purchasing power of the consumer.

We intend that this commission shall have absolute power to elicit information, and for that purpose the commission should prescribe a uniform system of accounting for the great protected industries, to the end that the American laboring man shall secure his fair share of the benefits of a protective tariff. And to the end that when all the facts are ascertained, if it shall appear in any given case that the tariff benefits no one but the bondholder at the expense of the consumer, it may be abolished.

There are various reasons, Mr. Chairman, for the creation of a nonpartisan, scientific tariff commission, but there are none more important than its removal from the field of partisan politics and the acknowledged inability of the average Member of Congress to understand its intricate details.

The brilliant and lamented Dolliver, of Iowa, died as the direct result of his unceasing labor to master the woolen schedule and present it in all its marvelous detail to the Senate. He did master it with that splendid mind, and he did present it with his God-given power of speech in such a manner that even the agents of special privilege were compelled to admit that he had exposed its inequities. And, Mr. Chairman, I am firmly convinced that if the Republican Party had even at that time been able to heed his advice, broken the spell of the special interests, and followed his leadership, it would be sitting in the seat of power to-day.

Dolliver saw the vision and read the future.

How can any Member of this House discharge the duties resting upon him in the consideration of this tariff bill without knowing whether the rates imposed by the bill are a true measure of the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad?

If the duty in a given case is too low, you wrong the labor of this country, and if it has been placed too high, you just as surely wrong the consumers of the country.

Every Member of this body, before he is called upon to vote for or against any schedule in this bill, should be fully advised as to the probable effect of the law upon the country.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, at least so far as the minority—perhaps I should say the principal minority—is concerned, we are compelled to proceed without any possibility of knowing definitely whether we are discharging our obligations to the people whom we represent.

Our Democratic brethren pledged their party to a tariff for revenue only, and declared the protective principle to be unconstitutional. And yet, are they now in a position to know that they are keeping that pledge?

It can not be denied that the new economic and industrial conditions in this Nation require the most careful study and the most complete investigation in the enactment of tariff legislation.

Our Democratic friends call themselves "revenue-tariff men." They do not object to the tariff, but are opposed to its protective features, especially when it affects some article in which they have no local or special interest.

Our Louisiana brothers are revenue-tariff men on lumber, wool, and cattle, but they believe in the protective-tariff principle as applied to sugar.

Our Democratic Members of the House and Senate from the woolen-industry States are warm and faithful advocates of protection on wool, but they are revenue-tariff men on sugar.

The absolute truth is that practically all the opposition to the protective system in the United States is of that kind.

Duties on imports, Mr. Chairman, are indirect taxes, and we all know that any indirect tax bears proportionately much harder on the poor than on the rich.

To my mind, therefore, it naturally follows that an indirect tax for the sole purpose of raising revenue is much more indefensible than an indirect tax imposed for the purpose of protection.

If the chief object is one of revenue to defray the necessary and legitimate expenses of the Government, why not accomplish that purpose by direct tax, as is contemplated by the income-tax section of this bill?

Such a method of taxation, under proper regulations and limitations, would serve every purpose and would at the same time result in a much more economical administration of the Government. The man who pays a direct tax knows what he pays and watches its expenditure.

Mr. Chairman, everybody knows that a tariff for revenue only may easily become a tariff for protection, and very high protection, on the specious plea that the revenue produced is required to defray the expenses of the Government. The real free trader will tell you that the difference between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff is the same as the difference between petty larceny and grand larceny.

Why not raise the curtain and stand out in the open? Why not be perfectly sincere? If revenue is the only question involved, then the indirect tax is unnecessary; and, besides, very frequently results in incidental protection.

If our Democratic friends are right, all the revenue required to run the Government could easily be produced by a direct tax on incomes, inheritances, and successions.

In any event, upon the theory of a revenue tariff the duties should fall only upon such commodities as are not produced in this country.

We of the Progressive Party believe in the protective-tariff principle. The American protective system has become an established institution, and when properly safeguarded and honestly regulated, by a nonpartisan, scientific tariff commission, free from the abuses to which it has been put by the overlords of special privilege, will guard the American workingman in every legitimate way against the underpaid labor of Europe, and will give to the American producer the American market when he makes honest goods and sells them at honest prices.

Thomas Jefferson, the founder of Democracy, recognized and favored the principle of protection and advocated discriminating duties in favor of American shipping and reciprocity treaties in favor of American trade. And, Mr. Chairman, the great body of the American people, irrespective of party name, are in favor of the protective principle in tariff legislation to-day.

The ordeal through which the Ways and Means Committee passed in defending this bill in the Democratic caucus emphasizes the utter absurdity of attempting to treat the tariff as a political issue, to be definitely and finally settled by any political party.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, the two old parties, better known just now as the majority and second minority parties, are afraid to drop this bone of contention over which they have growled and snapped at each other for more than two generations, and by means of which they have alternately hoodwinked the people into giving them the offices. Because they know that, with the tariff out of politics, the advanced position now occupied by the Progressive Party on all social and industrial questions affecting the vital interests of the people is such that they never can hope to overtake us by means of the most ardent lip loyalty to progressive principles.

It is true that since the November election the Republican and Democratic Parties are falling over each other in a grand rush to clean their feet on our doormat, but they can not hope to fool the people by such antics.

Why, Mr. Chairman, some of our Republican brethren have gulped down the initiative and referendum, and are now gingerly reaching for the recall. Others are protesting loudly that they always did have a fondness for the minimum wage for woman, abolition of child labor, and equal suffrage for woman. But, my brethren, you will find it difficult indeed to fool the people a second time with the taste of the last dose of medicine which you gave them still bitter in their mouths.

In 1908 you promised them a downward revision of the exorbitant tariff, responding then, for political reasons, to what you recognized as a very general demand for a speedy correction of the long-standing tariff abuses. The people still believing in your lip loyalty to their just demands returned you to power.

You refused to take advice and follow the lead of men like Dolliver, LA FOLLETTE, CUMMINS, and BRISTOW in the Senate, and MURDOCK, NORRIS, POINDEXTER, COOPER, and others in the House.

You bowed your heads to the edicts of the invisible Government, and in less than 18 months the people changed a Republican majority of 45 in this House to a Democratic majority of 62, and 2 years later completed the job by estab-

lishing a Progressive Party in Congress and making you the second minority party in the Nation.

Be not deceived, my brethren of the revenue-tariff faith, your success in the last two elections is by no means an indication that the American people have abandoned the protective-tariff principle. Your victory was not due to the strength of your cause or of your party, but was the result of a cave-in of the Republican Party, as well as a revolt on the part of progressive men and women of all parties against the domination of special privilege in the affairs of government.

The line is clean cut and distinct between the majority and the first and second minority parties on the tariff question. The Democrats are for a revenue tariff only, and claim that wages are not established by tariff rates. The Republicans are for a high protective tariff and claim that wages are established by tariff rates. The Progressives are for protection and equalization of competition by a tariff commission, with power to ascertain all the facts which properly enter in the making of a tariff rate. The Progressive Party believes that wages are affected, but by no means established by tariff rates; and that a tariff commission should have plenary power to ascertain whether or not the labor employed in protected industries is receiving a fair and just proportion of the benefits of that protection. How, I inquire, Mr. Chairman, can all these important facts be ascertained, and how can the Ways and Means Committee, which reported this bill to the House, arrive at any definite conclusion as to how their action in any of these schedules will affect the country under the system employed by the committee in making up this bill? It is an undeniable fact that the great highly protected textile industries of the country employ the poorest-paid labor in this country.

Wherever the committee increased or decreased the rate on any schedule, we ought to be furnished with correct and reliable information concerning the difference in overhead charges—cost of labor—and the value of imports in each case.

We have no complete or detailed report from the Ways and Means Committee, in which their reasons are stated for the changes they have made in these tariff schedules.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, the committee should report to the House the cost of production at home and abroad—the rates of duty here and in other countries, the extent of competition, if any, and all other information which is necessary to determine the correctness of the rates, which they ask us to establish by this bill.

THE INCOME TAX, ITS INEQUALITIES.

In 1894 Congress passed an income-tax law. The operation of that law was never tested. It was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Aside from the corporation-tax law, now in force, our Democratic friends have had no experience and very little material upon which to base the second section of this bill.

In attempting to accomplish the double purpose of reducing the cost of living and restoring competition, they have been compelled to make up the loss in revenue by direct tax. Three-fourths of the several States some months ago ratified the amendment to the Constitution, which permits Congress to pass an income-tax law, and therefore it may well be assumed that the people of this country, or at least a majority of them, are in favor of the income tax. Personally I am and have been for many years in favor of an income tax. A direct tax upon incomes, inheritances, and successions. The present bill, however, in my judgment contains many inequalities and unjust discriminations.

HOW IT WILL BE APPLIED.

The man whose income is a salary of two thousand or three thousand or thirty-nine hundred dollars, or the man whose only income from other sources is two thousand, three thousand, or thirty-nine hundred dollars will pay no tax under the provisions of this bill. The bill imposes upon the entire net income of the individual over and above $4,000 a normal tax of 1 per cent. Upon that part of the individual's net income over $20,000 and under $50,000 an additional tax of 1 per cent is provided, and upon that part of the individual's net income over $50,000 and under $100,000 an additional tax of 2 per cent. Upon that part of the individual's net income in excess of $100,000 it provides for a maximum tax of 3 per cent. In arriving at the net income the bill allows certain deductions, such as the necessary expense of carrying on any business, all sums paid by the individual as interest on indebtedness, also National, State, county, school, and municipal taxes, loss in trade, or from fires, storm, or shipwreck, worthless debts charged off during the year, and reasonable allowance for wear and tear of property used in business, dividends upon the stock of any corporation or company. The bill also provides for certain exemptions, interest upon the obligations of a State or any political subdivisions of a State, and upon the obligations of the United States, the principal and interest of which are now exempt by law from Federal taxation, the salary of the present President of the United States, the compensation of judges of the Federal courts now in office, the compensation of all officers and employees of a State or any political subdivision of a State. Why should these exemptions be allowed?

It appears also that dividends upon the stock of corporations are exempt, the reason presumably being that all such profits are now taxed at the uniform rate of 1 per cent under the corporation-tax law. The bill also provides that whenever possible the tax shall be payable at the source of the income. This would mean that the man or the corporation paying his or its employees an annual salary of more than $4,000 must make return to the Government of that fact, and must withhold from the salary of the employee and pay to the Government the proper amount to cover the income tax upon the salary. The same provision applies to lessees or mortgagors of real or personal property, trustees, executors, administrators, and receivers. This provision to me seems an invasion of the rights of the employees.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

The man whose income is $10,000 will pay 1 per cent on $6,000, or $60. The man with an income of $30,000 will pay 1 per cent on $26,000, or $260; then he will pay the additional tax of 1 per cent on $10,000, the amount of his income above $20,000, or $100. His total tax, therefore, will be $360. The man with an income of $125,000 will pay 1 per cent on $121,000, or $1,210; also an additional tax of 1 per cent on $30,000, that part of his income between $20,000 and $50,000, or $300; also the additional tax of 2 per cent on $50,000, that part of his income between $50,000 and $100,000, or $500; also an additional tax of 3 per cent on $25,000, that part of his income over $100,000, or $750. His total tax, therefore, will be $1,210 plus $300 plus $500 plus $750, or $2,760.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield me three minutes more?

Mr. MURDOCK. I will yield the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Where does the gentleman from Kansas get the three minutes? I have no objection to the gentleman from Alabama yielding him three minutes, or I will yield the gentleman from Kansas three minutes out of his time to-morrow, but I am obliged to hold closely on account of the time yielded to me.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, Mr. Chairman, we have yielded one-half of the time to one-third of the membership, but I will not be parsimonious about the matter and will yield the gentleman from Illinois three minutes. But before yielding to him, in my own time, I would like to answer a question that he asked. He asked the question why we excepted the salary of the President of the United States to-day. I call his attention to the fact that the Constitution of the United States has prescribed that we can not diminish the salary of the President during his term of office. In President Lincoln's time that matter came before the Attorney General of the United States, and he decided that the tax would be equivalent to diminishing the salary, and for that reason the salary of the present President was not taxed. I now yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Again, if Mr. Brown has an income of $3,500 from salary, he will pay no tax; and if Mr. Smith has an income of $3,500 from dividends, he will pay a tax of 1 per cent, or $35. His tax is to be paid direct by the corporation before the dividend is declared. It will, therefore, be seen that it may not come out of the dividends at all, but may be paid by the corporation from savings from other sources, such as wages to labor, clerk hire, and so forth.

Again, if Mr. Jones has an income of $4,500 from salary, he will pay a tax of 1 per cent on $500, or $5, to be deducted by his employer; but if Mr. Black has an income of $4,500 from dividends, there being no exemption, he will pay a tax of $45, while Mr. Green, who has an income of $4,500 from rents, will be allowed the exemption and his tax will be but $5.

A still further illustration of the inequalities of this bill in operation as between rents and dividends might be made, as follows:

Mr. A has an income of $60,000 from rents. He pays a tax of 1 per cent on $56,000, or $560; also an additional tax of 1 per cent on $30,000, or $300; also an additional tax of 2 per cent on $6,000, or $120, or a total tax of $980.

If Mr. B has an income of $60,000 from dividends, he will pay a normal tax of 1 per cent on the total amount, or $600.

In other words, the man who has an income of $60,000 from rents will pay $980 tax and the man who has an income of $60,000 from dividends will pay but $600.

I am unable to understand the logic of the discriminations affecting different kinds of property in the proposed bill.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, permit me to say that I believe every true citizen, whether in or out of Congress, desires that the prosperity of the country and of our people shall continue under whatever tariff may finally be enacted by this Congress.

And while we differ very sharply as to methods, I am certain our aim is the ultimate prosperity and happiness of our common country. [Loud applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. GUERNSEY].

Mr. GUERNSEY. Mr. Chairman, the passing of the Federal Government under complete control of the Democratic Party on the 4th of March last—and southern control at that—foreshadowed changes in our governmental policies, but none foresaw that the most radical changes in the fiscal policy of the Nation since its formation were to be proposed and such as are presented by Chairman UNDERWOOD'S revenue-tariff, free-trade measure now under discussion.

This measure will put in force new methods for securing revenue for the support of the Government that not only will affect the wealthy of the country but those of most moderate means. It will compel the curtailment and in many instances the closing down of great industries that have been established under the protective-tariff system as the business of this country to-day is adjusted to a protective-tariff system.

The measure before the House was prepared with absolute disregard as to the cost of production abroad; absolute disregard of the effect of foreign competition; in absolute disregard of the extent that labor in the United States may be discharged as the result of increased importations from abroad.

In the campaign of 1912 and earlier in this House it was charged by Republicans that the Democratic Party was a free-trade party. With great heat this charge was denied here and denied throughout the United States prior to the election of 1912, yet the Underwood bill—the administration bill it may well be called—approaches nearer a free-trade measure than any tariff law ever presented to an American Congress. Its free list is of greater length. Imports aggregating last year more than one hundred millions, which paid a duty under existing law, would enter the country free under the provisions of this bill.

MORE FOREIGN GOODS.

Under the free-list provisions of the bill and the radical lower rates of the dutiable list importations from abroad will increase enormously. Every dollar of foreign product or merchandise that enters the country will replace labor and production here. Our money will be spent in the employment of labor abroad instead of at home.

Advocates of this measure claim it will lift the burden of taxation from the average man and lower the cost of living. Nevertheless the measure plans to collect from the country millions of dollars more than the existing law collects, and should its enactment be followed by stagnation in business it will add to the burdens of the people, and, instead of reducing the cost of living, as claimed by many, it will reduce living.

It is contended by those in charge of the bill that a protective tariff creates trusts, but regulation of tariffs will not prove the solution of the trust question, and, as many of the so-called trusts are to-day international in their scope, it is probable that the tariff reductions will have little effect upon them and in many instances greatly add to their advantage.

WILL LOSE CUBAN TRADE.

It is claimed for the measure that it will extend our foreign trade. It is obvious that it will increase our purchases abroad but not probable that it will materially increase our sales across the water, while in Cuba the passage of this measure will probably result in the termination of the preferential treaty with that island and the loss of a large and growing trade in flour, potatoes, and other products of the United States that are now sold in the Cuban market under the treaty advantages.

If the preferential treaty with Cuba is terminated, as I believe will be the ultimate result of the passage of this legislation, the Cuban trade will be lost by us to Canada, who will capture it with her subsidized steamship lines that are now being extended from the Maritime Provinces to the West Indies.

The present administration has taken over the Government of the United States while the country is enjoying the full swing of business prosperity that has existed throughout the entire period of the last Republican administration—industrial prosperity unequaled in our history. Never have our agricultural interests been so active and the encouragement to develop and cultivate the soil been so great as in recent years.

WILL DISCOURAGE AGRICULTURE.

The policy of the Government should be to encourage these conditions, as upon the prosperity of the farmer depends the prosperity and future of the Nation. The measure before Congress holds out no inducements to our agricultural interests. Indeed, this bill seems to have been drawn wholly for the purpose of slaughtering the American farmer. None of his products are left untouched. It is far worse than reciprocity, as it places him in direct competition with the world. It will compel him to compete with the farming conditions of Europe, and may compel him to withhold his children from school and his wife from the household for work in the field.

This measure will not only bring depression to our agricultural interests, but to our manufacturing interests, if we can judge anything by our political history, which is full of the record of disaster that has almost invariably followed radical reductions in the tariff. Many times in the past 124 years, since the adoption of the Constitution, we, as a people, have changed our financial policy, sometimes from protection toward free trade, and as often been driven back to the policy of protection by hard experience.

FIRST PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

From 1812 to 1816 the country enjoyed its first real protective-tariff laws. During that period five in number were enacted, which increased the entire list of duties about 100 per cent. Under the policy the American market was reserved for the American manufacturer, and notwithstanding the severe drain of the war with England the country was more prosperous and wealthy at the close of the war than at its beginning.

ACT OF 1816.

April 27, 1816, Congress by an act greatly reduced the duties, with the result that business depression came over the country. Henry Clay described the effect some years later:

We behold—

He said—

general distress pervading the whole country; unthrashed crops of grain perishing in our barns for want of a market; universal complaint of the want of employment and consequent reduction of the wages of labor. Property of the Nation has on an average sunk not less than 50 per cent within a few years.

TARIFF OF 1824.

May 22, 1824, Congress passed a new tariff act. It was a protective tariff, and was followed by business revival. The factory, the farm, our shipping, mercantile, commercial, and every branch of business enjoyed great prosperity. In 1828 the duties were further increased by Congress. Mr. Clay, in an eloquent speech in the United States Senate on February 2, 1832, said:

If I were to select any term of seven years since the adoption of our Constitution which exhibited a scene of the most undisputed dismay and dissolution it would be exactly that term of seven years immediately preceding the establishment of the tariff of 1824. If a term of seven years were to be selected of the greatest prosperity which the people ever enjoyed it would be exactly that period of seven years which immediately followed the passage of the tariff law of 1824.

TARIFF OF 1832.

On July 14, 1832, a new tariff law was enacted to reduce the duties to a uniform level of 20 per cent ad valorem. The reduction was gradual and extended over a period of several years, but its effect on business was disastrous. One writer charges it generally to being the cause of the great financial crisis of 1837. He said of it:

Within five years a panic swept over the country that almost beggars description for its severity and its distress. Not only were manufactures prostrated, but commerce, navigation, mining, and especially agriculture shared in the general wreck. Mortgages were foreclosed and forced sales made in every direction.

TARIFF OF 1842.

In 1840 the voters of the country rose in their might and drove from power the party that they held responsible for the tariff of 1832, and on August 30, 1842, another protective law became effective. During its existence, a period of four years, business of the country recovered and financial distress and depression passed away, and the prosperity of the agricultural and manufacturing interests were restored.

TARIFF OF 1846.

The Walker tariff, as the tariff measure of 1846 is often called, was a low-tariff measure and is often pointed to by the Democratic Party as the tariff that brought the greatest and most beneficial results to the country, thereby justifying low tariff rates.

But conditions other than tariff affected that period. Successful war with Mexico and the expenditure and distribution

of $150,000,000 in the country in order to carry on the war stimulated industry. Gold was discovered in California, giving further impetus to business, while famine in Ireland made enormous demands for our breadstuffs.

As time passed on, however, the benefits of these unusual conditions passed away, and March 3, 1857, the duties were further lowered by Congress, and there followed business depression in all classes of industry. President Buchanan, in a message to Congress late in 1857, called attention to the situation in the following language:

In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions and elements of national wealth we find our manufactures suspended, our public works retarded, and private enterprise of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want.

With these distressing conditions throughout the country the demand for a revision of the tariff system became imminent, and it was revised along the lines of a protective tariff, which went into effect on March 2, 1861, at the very close of the Buchanan administration.

TARIFF OF 1890.

The McKinley law, as the law of October 6, 1890, is generally known, was a protective-tariff measure, but before its effect could be judged the election of November, 1890, occurred and a Democratic majority was chosen in the House of Representatives, and with the impetus thus gained two years later the Democratic Party elected Grover Cleveland President and secured control of the Senate as well as the House.

For a long period protective tariffs had been in force and a demand existed in the country for a trial of lower customs rates. In response to this the Democratic Party sought to enact legislation in accordance with the Democratic ideas of tariff reform.

TARIFF OF 1894.

August 27, 1894, the Wilson-Gorman bill became a law, and became such without the approval of President Cleveland, who withheld his signature. The measure was publicly condemned by the President and later by the country. It was a low-tariff measure, and its effect on business was destructive. Farm values throughout the country went to the lowest point that they had reached for many years. All classes of farm products and stock were practically without a market. Unemployed men swarmed the country in every direction in search of work. Able-bodied men accepted labor at wages that gave them practically nothing but their board. Manufacturing everywhere was at a standstill, trade and commerce were paralyzed. The Government revenues fell to so low a point that it was compelled to issue bonds to pay its running expenses. These conditions not only followed the enactment of the 1894 law, but began to accumulate some time prior to its enactment in anticipation of its results. Again the country turned after this bitter experience to a protective tariff, with the result that in the elections that followed in 1896 the Republican Party was returned to power in both branches of Congress, and William McKinley was elected President of the United States.

TARIFF OF 1897.

In 1897 the Dingley tariff law—probably the most skillfully drawn protective-tariff law that this country has ever known—was placed on the statute books of the Federal Government. The results that followed this law were most strikingly beneficial. Business of the country was restored to a sound financial basis. Prosperity burst forth in every line of industry. Since its enactment farms and the mills have flourished to an extent unequaled in our history as a Nation. The results of the measure vindicate to the very last degree the wisdom of the protective-tariff system for this country.

The tariff law of 1909 continued in force the protective policies under which the Nation had made such great progress since the enactment of the law of 1897.

In the light of the history of tariff legislation of this country, can it be expected that the radical lowering of rates proposed by the Underwood bill will be beneficial? How can we view the provisions of the bill other than with alarm?

The Democratic Party is not unlike a man who has just inherited a rich estate. Will the party be able to carry it on, continue its prosperity, and increase it, or will it, through the adoption of most violent and radical changes in the fiscal policy, experimental and uncertain in result, stop production, ruin the estate, and leave it mortgaged and in bankruptcy?

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST NEW ENGLAND.

An examination of the proposed tariff law leads me to believe that it is not only built along free-trade lines, but it intentionally discriminates against industries of the New England States. For years Senators and Representatives of the West have been charging that New England was unduly favored in tariff legislation, and I believe that the same feeling is entertained in the South, as during tariff discussion within two years a prominent Member from a Southern State declared on the floor of the House that he was in favor of a tariff that would close the cotton mills of New England and force them to move to the cotton fields of the South, where they belonged. Congress and the Presidency are to-day in control of southern men.

WOOLEN INDUSTRY.

The tariff bill itself bears evidence of this discrimination. It makes radical reductions in the duties on cotton goods. It is especially aimed at the great woolen industry of New England. It is toward the manufacturer of woolen goods that the full force and fury of this Democratic revision seems to be directed. Here we find the most severe cuts in the rates. These mills are to-day in sharp competition between themselves. Add foreign competition and many will be compelled to close their doors.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee asserted here on the floor but yesterday that the old, worn-out mills were being sustained through tariff legislation. Did he refer to the woolen industry of New England? There may be some such mills, but the vast majority of the New England woolen mills are the most modern in equipment and up to date in construction to be found in this or any other country.

SHOE INDUSTRY.

That leading industry in New England, the shoe industry, seems also to have been selected for sacrifice, as shoes have been placed on the free list. Why does the Democratic Party favor endangering the shoe industry of the New England States? American shoe machinery will be set up in Europe, operated by the low-cost labor of foreign countries, and our markets supplied by the foreign article. This must be the inevitable result.

SARDINE INDUSTRY.

The New England fish industry is also the subject for severe attack by the provisions of this bill. The rates proposed for the sardine packers of Maine threaten to transfer a great portion, if not the whole, of that important industry to Canada, an industry which has built up and maintains large communities along the coast of Maine. If present wage scales are maintained for those employed in this industry, competition with the Canadians will be impossible, and much less with Norway, which is a strong competitor for the American market, and where, I am told, the labor of girls employed is from 18 to 20 cents and men from 40 to 50 cents per day.

MAINE PULP AND PAPER INDUSTRY.

A New England industry of great importance, not only to New England but to the country, is that of paper making. In the State of Maine alone there are 44 pulp or paper mills in operation. They represent investments of more than $40,000,000 in mill properties and employ more than 15,000 men. One company alone—the Great Northern Paper Co.—has an investment of more than $18,000,000 employed in paper making. It employs 1,500 men in its mills and in getting the raw material from the forest about 3,500 men, and produces 565 tons of paper per day.

These paper companies are developing the resources of the State. They are developing the heretofore undeveloped water powers of the State. They are developing properties, towns, and communities, often in the very wilderness of Maine. They are supporting thousands of people of the State, giving millions of tons of freight to railroads, and furnishing business to the business men of Maine, large and small.

The future of the State of Maine depends to a great extent upon the continuance and development of this great industry. There is an empire undeveloped in northern Maine, though it is in the older part of the United States. It is a vast territory containing millions of acres of unbroken forest that slopes toward the St. John's waters and is drained by that important river. On this territory it is estimated that there is about fifty millions of cords of pulp wood, which would supply an annual stock forever, by cutting at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, to paper mills producing 2,000 tons of news-print paper per day.

Great paper mills are on the eve of construction along the St. John River in Canada. Pass this bill unamended and you will insure the delivery of the great wood products from more than 4,000,000 acres of Maine forests to paper companies along the St. John, in New Brunswick, for manufacturing into a finished product to the upbuilding and growth of the Dominion of Canada, not alone for the present, but for all time.

Pass this bill unamended and you will prevent the development of this great raw-material producing territory within the United States and prevent the development of its vast undeveloped water powers, estimated to be equivalent to 200,000 horsepower, now running to waste. To my mind, the situation I

have just mentioned presents a most forcible illustration of the possibility and probability of driving by legislation raw material out of the United States for manufacture into a finished product in a neighboring country. The northern Maine situation should cause Congress to pause and give to it its fullest consideration, as it is of the greatest importance. This bill will decide as to whether water power to the extent of hundreds of thousands of horsepower shall be developed and employed in the manufacture into a finished product raw material within our own country, for our own people, and the development of our natural resources.

KEEP RAW MATERIAL AT HOME.

Amend this bill so as to give this great industry fair treatment and reasonable protection. Give to it at least such protection as the Mann report said it should have, and in so doing you will legislate to save to the people of the United States the enormous natural wealth in raw material in northern Maine, and in so doing you will legislate to develop the resources of the country and upbuild the United States. My time to speak on this subject is too limited to do it justice, and I can not find language strong enough in which to condemn this legislation which will turn over to Canada the products of one of our great forests, and at the very time when the Canadian Provinces are passing restrictions that compel the manufacture within the Dominion of Canada into finished products, the products of her forests. In view of our own situation and the ease with which we might reserve these natural resources to ourselves—in view of the attitude of the Dominion and Provincial Governments—this legislation as proposed is unexplainable, unless, as it has seemed to me, that there is a well-determined purpose to discriminate against the New England States.

CANADIAN POTATO MENACE.

One of the chief food products of the country is potatoes. One of the great potato-growing sections of the country is New England and particularly the State of Maine. This industry in Maine is exceptionally exposed to foreign competition. On three sides the State is surrounded by Canada. Across the international line farm lands equally as good as those within the State are valued at 30 to 50 per cent less. Farm labor per month is proportionately less. The potato pickers of Aroostook County last fall were paid from $2.50 to $3 per day, while at the same time in the Annapolis Valley, in Nova Scotia, the same class of labor was receiving $1.50 per day.

The Democratic tariff bill selects this great food product grown in New England States for sacrifice, placing it on the free list and placing it there now, with the result that it will imperil the price of the crop this year; placing it there in the face of the fact that foreign potatoes can enter the markets of New York and Boston, the great potato markets of the East, at water rates far cheaper than northern Maine potatoes can be transported to such points by rail.

DANGER OF FOREIGN POTATOES.

The danger of this foreign competition is clearly shown by the extent that foreign potatoes entered these markets during the last fiscal year, even with the present tariff in force. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, there were imported into this country from England 3,377,426 bushels; from Scotland 4,645,877 bushels, and from Ireland 4,606,981 bushels of potatoes, which, together with some other importations, brought the total amount of potatoes imported up to nearly 14,000,000 of bushels, which paid the duty of 25 cents per bushel and entered our markets. With that duty removed foreign potatoes many times that amount will annually be imported and take from our farmers our markets to that extent.

MAINE FARMERS INJURED.

Add to the foreign competition the competition of Canada, with her lower-priced lands, lower-paid labor, and cheap water transportation from the Maritime Provinces to Boston and New York markets and it will be seen that the Maine potato grower will, under the provisions of the pending bill, suffer from severe shrinkage in his land investment and in loss of market for his product. All considered, the present 25 cents duty is none too much to properly equalize conditions with the potato producer, foreign or Canadian.

If this administration believes that a reduction in the potato tariff should be made, it should be made gradually; only a portion should be removed at this time. The immediate free listing of this important product, in the production of which so many have their all invested, will bring financial ruin to large numbers of farmers in the New England States. If this provision in the bill free listing potatoes is allowed to stand and become a law, the Democratic Party must be held accountable in the elections to come for whatever distress and disaster follows. This tariff discrimination against potatoes is particularly unjust in view of the fact that the framers of the bill in dealing with other important food products not grown in New England dealt differently.

UNFAIR DISCRIMINATION.

The great wheat-growing sections of the Northwest are allowed to retain a duty of 10 cents a bushel on wheat to guard their product against the wheat fields of Canada. The rice of Texas and other Southern States is amply protected under the provisions of this bill for the well-known reason that in the South they are making at present large investments in rice culture and a protective tariff is necessary to promote the industry; consequently the rice growers are taken care of. The producers of pineapples, oranges, and grapefruit in Florida are allowed protective duties, and the Louisiana sugar grower is given three years in which to adjust his business to the proposed free listing of his product.

I assert again that the Underwood tariff measure now before Congress contains in its provisions deliberate, intentional, and unjust discriminations against the manufacturing and agricultural interests of the New England States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect when I came to Congress to take part in enacting a tariff measure for the benefit of Canada, or, to be more accurate, I did not expect to be compelled to oppose certain items of a measure that protects Canadian industries at the expense of the agricultural and milling industries of this country.

I had always believed that there was a clear line of demarcation between free trade, tariff for revenue only, and a protective tariff, and that any bill or measure that was proposed or enacted into law in this Congress would be based upon one of these policies; but it is apparent that the measure now before the House for consideration is neither a protective measure, nor a tariff-for-revenue-only measure, nor a free-trade measure.

Mr. Chairman, whatever it may be, certain features of it and certain items in it are against the best interests and welfare of the people of this country. I call the special attention of the House at this time to the items affecting wheat and the manufactured products of wheat, oats and the manufactured products of oats.

This measure places the raw material on the protective list and the manufactured product on the free list. In my limited experience, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I have never heard of such an economic propaganda being proposed. I know of no other country that has ever attempted or that now has such a provision in its tariff regulations. I know of no other country that has attempted to discriminate against its own manufacturers, its own workers, and its own producers for the benefit of the people of a foreign country.

On the contrary, every country that has a tariff gives the advantage to the importation of raw material, so that its mills and its factories may furnish employment for its labor. Every country on the face of the globe gives its manufacturers, its laborers, and its producers at least an equal opportunity with the foreign competitors, and many give them an advantage. For example: In Belgium, Russia, and British India there is a duty on flour, while wheat is free. In the United Kingdom, Denmark, Netherlands, and China both wheat and flour are free. In all other wheat and flour producing countries there is a duty on both wheat and flour, and the duty on flour is at least compensatory to that on wheat. But this bill proposes a duty of 10 cents per bushel on wheat and a like duty per bushel on oats. At the same time it proposes to admit the manufactured products of these cereals free. What basis there is for such procedure is absolutely inconceivable.

Mr. Chairman, the framers of this bill recognized the necessity of protecting the farmer by placing a duty of 10 cents per bushel on wheat and oats. Immediately following is a provision admitting the manufactured products of wheat and oats free, which nullifies the benefit that the farmer would get from the protection put upon his products. When flour is placed on the free list, can anyone show, by any process of reasoning, that the farmer will retain his protection of 10 cents per bushel on his product, which the authors of this bill concede he is entitled to? It does not require much investigation for anyone to discover that the very thing which by this bill it is conceded the farmer is entitled to is immediately, in the same bill, taken from him.

It is not for me, Mr. Chairman, to question the motives of the makers of this bill. I am simply going to confine myself to pointing out to this House before it casts its votes for such an unfair, unjust, and discriminatory measure its inequality and iniquity.

Not being content with attempting to make the farmer believe that he is being protected to the extent of 10 cents per

bushel on his products, the framers of this bill also try to placate the flour producer by inserting a clause providing for a contravailing duty of 10 per cent ad valorem on flour imported into the United States from a country imposing a duty on flour made in this country. By writing into the proposed law this contravailing clause the authors of this bill also admit and affirmatively declare that the American manufacturer of flour needs a compensatory duty of 10 per cent ad valorem to equalize the handicap imposed upon him by placing a duty on the raw material. The contravailing clause is an admission by the framers of this bill that the American miller needs a compensatory duty to enable him to compete with the Canadian miller on an equal basis.

But of what benefit, Mr. Chairman, is the contravailing clause? Will not Canada immediately remove the duty on flour imported from this country and thus be enabled to export her flour into this country free of duty? Does anyone for an instant believe that Canada will fail to avail herself of the opportunity afforded of trading a market of 8,000,000 people for a market of 95,000,000 ; ople? Is it not a fact that under normal conditions the average price of wheat per bushel in Winnipeg is 10 cents less than in Minneapolis? And as proof of this proposition, Mr. Chairman, I wish to insert in the RECORD a table prepared by the Tariff Board showing the average monthly prices from 1905 to 1910 of wheat in Minneapolis and Winnipeg:

Minneapolis and Winnipeg prices and the advance of Minneapolis over Winnipeg prices, page 97 of Senate Document 849, Sixty-first Congress, third session, being message from the President of the United States transmitting in response to Senate resolution of Feb. 23, 1911, a report from the Tariff Board relative to various commodities named in the proposed Canadian reciprocity measure.

	Minneapolis prices.	Winnipeg prices.	Difference.
			Cents.
1905.			
January	$1.13⅞	$1.00	13⅞
February	1.16	1.01¾	14¼
March	1.11	.92⅜	18⅝
April	1.09	.91½	17½
May	1.15½	.91	24½
June	1.10¼	1.01⅜	8⅞
July	1.09¼	1.07½	2
August	1.09⅝	1.01	8⅝
September	.82⅞	.77½	5⅜
October	.84⅛	.77	7⅛
November	.84½	.77½	7
December	.87⅜	.76⅜	11
1906.			
January	.83½	.76½	7
February	.82⅝	.76⅝	6
March	.75⅞	.72⅜	2½
April	.80⅜	.78⅝	1¾
May	.82¼	.79⅛	2⅛
June	.84⅜	.83⅛	1¼
July	.78⅜	.79½	1
August	.75	.74½	½
September	.70⅝	.72	2
October	.76½	.75⅛	⅜
November	.80	.73⅜	6⅝
December	.81	.73⅛	7⅞
1907.			
January	.79⅜	.72½	7
February	.84⅜	.75½	8⅞
March	.81⅛	.75½	5⅝
April	.82½	.77	5½
May	.99⅜	.87⅛	12
June	.99½	.89½	10
July	.99	.91¼	7¾
August	.95⅞	.89½	6⅜
September	1.07½	1.02	5½
October	1.17	1.13	4
November	1.03	1.02	1
December	1.08	1.05⅛	3⅛
1908.			
January	1.10⅛	1.08⅛	2
February	1.04	1.06	2
March	1.07½	1.09½	2½
April	1.00	1.01	½
May	1.08⅜	1.14½	5⅞
June	1.09	1.05½	3½
July	1.15½	1.04¾	10¾
August	1.23	1.06½	16½
September	1.02⅛	.98¼	4
October	1.02⅞	.98	4⅞
November	1.08½	1.03⅜	4⅛
December	1.06½	.97⅛	9⅜
1909.			
January	1.07⅜	.99¼	7⅛
February	1.12½	1.07	5½
March	1.16	1.10⅛	5⅞
April	1.26⅜	1.23¼	2⅛
May	1.29½	1.23	6½
June	1.34½	1.31	3½
July	1.31⅛	1.30	1⅛
August	1.37½	1.13	24½
September	1.01½	1.00½	1

Minneapolis and Winnipeg prices and the advance of Minneapolis over Winnipeg prices, etc.—Continued.

	Minneapolis prices.	Winnipeg prices.	Difference.
			Cents.
1909—Continued.			
October	$1.03⅞	$0.99⅜	4½
November	1.06⅜	.98½	8⅜
December	1.13¼	.98½	14¾
1910.			
January	1.15½	1.04	11½
February	1.14	1.02½	11½
March	1.14	1.04	10
April	1.11½	1.03½	8
May	1.11	.97½	13½
June	1.05	.89½	15½
July	1.25½	1.17½	7⅝
August	1.15⅝	1.05½	9⅜
September	1.11	1.05	6
October	1.07¼	.98¾	8½
November	1.04⅜	.91½	12⅞
December			

These tables show that the Minneapolis prices have been higher than the Winnipeg prices sixty-five times, while the Winnipeg prices have been higher than the Minneapolis prices only six times. They show that during these 72 months covered by these tables the Winnipeg prices have been 5 cents higher than the Minneapolis prices only once, while the Minneapolis prices have been more than 10 cents higher than the Winnipeg prices eighteen times and more than 5 cents higher forty-five times.

Is it not a fact that the Canadian miller enjoys transportation facilities equal with our own miller? Is it not a fact that, as far as the cost of transportation is concerned, he can place his flour in the markets of this country as cheaply as can the home manufacturer? In this connection I wish to submit a report which I received from the Secretary of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which shows that the cost of shipping wheat and flour from Winnipeg to Boston and from Minneapolis to Boston is approximately the same, and that the cost of shipment from Emerson to Port Arthur is about the same as the cost of shipment from Pembina to Duluth.

Is it not a fact that the fertile Canadian wheat fields produce on the average 4 bushels more per acre than do the wheat fields of the United States? In this connection I wish to call attention to the average wheat yield per acre of the three great wheat-growing States—Minnesota, North and South Dakota—in 1911 and 1912, and also the average wheat yield per acre of the wheat fields of western Canada:

Wheat yield per acre.

	Bushels.
Minnesota:	
1911	10.1
1912	15.5
North Dakota:	
1911	8.0
1912	18.0
South Dakota:	
1911	4.0
1912	14.2
Western Canada:	
1911	18.2
1912	18.6

Not wishing to tire the House by going into a detailed statement of the resources and productiveness of Western Canada as a wheat-producing country, I wish to quote what Mr. Fisher, former secretary of agriculture of Canada, said during the recent reciprocity controversy:

If reciprocity is going to result in our northwestern farmers selling their wheat to the United States market, why will they do it? Simply because the price the American miller will pay for it will be higher than the Canadian miller has been willing to pay for it. If 1,000,000 people in 1909, cultivating 7,000,000 acres of wheat, produced 147,000,000 bushels, what will the people of the Canadian Northwest produce when that country is fairly well filled up and we have five or six millions between the Great Lakes and the Rocky Mountains? That estimate of the future population of the Northwest is not an extravagant one, nor need we look very far ahead for these results. When that comes the Canadian Northwest will produce 1,000,000,000 bushels of wheat. I venture to say that the farmers will need not only the home market and the American market but also the European market in which to sell the wheat.

Not only has Canada boundless wheat fields but she has excellent mills, that are to-day capable of grinding 111,000 barrels per day. The capacity of these mills is being rapidly increased, and it will be increased far more rapidly if the proposed measure becomes a law.

Is it not a fact, Mr. Chairman, that the proposed tariff law gives the Canadian miller free access to our market, and that for every barrel of flour that comes into our market from 4½ to 5 bushels of the home market for home-grown wheat is displaced? Will not the American farmer be compelled to sell his wheat to the home miller for as low a price as the Canadian farmer sells

his wheat to the Canadian miller, or take his choice of selling his wheat for export or cease growing wheat? Where, then, is the protection for the farmer proposed by this measure? Where, then, are the producers of 621,000,000 bushels of wheat going to market their product? In what respect does the proposed law protect the farmer in the enjoyment of his home market? Is it not apparent from what I have stated that the placing of a duty of 10 cents per bushel on the importation of wheat into this country is simply a blind to hoodwink our agriculturists?

Mr. Chairman, I have dwelt at length upon the competition that the American farmer and miller has to fear from Canada, because she is our next-door neighbor and has the greatest wheat fields, developed and undeveloped, in the world, and she has and is building the finest mills in the world. She has more coal in the ground and greater water powers than any other wheat-producing country. Can we comprehend all this and at the same time believe that the home market of the farmer and manufacturer is secure if such a measure is passed?

But Canada is not the only country, Mr. Chairman, that can take advantage of this law. Great Britain is in a position to take advantage of it at once. She has great mills and is the clearing house for the surplus wheat of the world.

The Argentine Republic, with a population of only 5,000,000, produces annually from 175,000,000 to 200,000,000 bushels of wheat and only needs 25,000,000 of it for her home market. The balance she can export in either the shape of flour or wheat. She enjoys water transportation direct to the doors of our markets, and that is the cheapest kind of transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I might go on and take other wheat-producing countries and show the probability of their becoming rivals in our own markets, but I have confined myself to those which are not only probable competitors but which I consider absolutely certain to become active competitors in our markets.

Is it not apparent that the measure under consideration, first, concedes that the farmer is entitled to protection of 10 cents per bushel on his wheat; second, concedes that the miller is entitled to a countervailing duty of 10 per cent ad valorem on his flour as a compensatory duty to make up the loss to him for the 10 cents a bushel duty he has to pay on his raw material? Third, is it not also apparent and can any other conclusion be drawn but that the farmer and the miller are deprived of the benefits which the framers of this bill declare they are entitled to?

And we, as Members of this House, are asked to vote for that sort of legislation, which, upon its face, brands it as unjust and unfair.

The authors of this bill, astute men as they are, having recognized the fact that they have robbed the miller of his home market, have incorporated in this bill a "drawback clause" calculated to give him an export market in exchange for the home market taken away from him. If this provision is of benefit to the miller, how will it benefit the farmer? What benefit will he derive from the fact that legislation is enacted enabling the miller to manufacture foreign wheat into flour without paying any duty on that wheat? Does not 30 per cent of every bushel imported under the "drawback" come into competition, in the shape of by-products, with the produce of the farm? And is it not a fact, that while the miller has turned over his mill to the manufacture of imported wheat into flour under the "drawback" that the demand of the miller for home-grown wheat is lessened? This "drawback" can only be taken advantage of by the milling company which owns several mills. The small mills of the country can not take advantage of it, as under the provisions of the drawback the miller must specifically identify the exported flour as being made from wheat that he imported before he is entitled to his drawback, and in order to do this he must set aside one or more mills for the manufacture into flour of nothing but imported wheat. It is obvious that the small mills can not take advantage of this provision, and there are over 11,000 small mills in this country, distributed over every State in the Union.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield for a moment?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I would rather not, as I close my speech in a few moments.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious to me, and I believe it is to everyone who has given the matter careful consideration, that the provisions of the proposed law that I have called attention to are manifestly unwise, unjust, and unfair, not only to the farmers and the millers but to all who form a part of our whole industrial and economic system.

One of the most distinguished men on the Ways and Means Committee admitted to-day that the only difference it made was 1 mill on a bushel of wheat. Gentlemen, can you go through all the forms provided for collecting the duty on wheat, get the drawback, and pay back to the Government anything? Is it not an unnecessary expense heaped upon a trade, and for what? For the purpose of deceiving the farmer and deceiving the miller. There may be some slight advantage to the large miller, but none to the small miller, and there is not a particle of advantage to the farmer. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee determined to rise, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3321, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution making an appropriation for defraying the expenses of the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives authorized to attend and represent the Senate and House at the unveiling and dedication of the memorial to Thomas Jefferson at St. Louis, Mo.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

APRIL 23, 1913.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the committee appointed to attend the unveiling of the Jefferson memorial at St. Louis, Mo. Regretting that I will be unable to attend the exercises or serve in any capacity, I am,

Very respectfully,
J. W. COLLIER,
Representative Eighth District of Mississippi.

The SPEAKER appointed Mr. BORLAND as a member of that committee.

TARIFF REPORT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution I send to the desk in relation to an additional print of the tariff report. I find that we can not get enough under the order of the House, and I am obliged to get them by a concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 7.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 20,000 additional copies of the report of the Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 3321, 15,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, to be apportioned as follows: Two thousand to the Committee on Ways and Means, 1,000 to the House document room, 12,000 to the House folding room, and 5,000 for the use of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321, the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the tariff bill, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, although this is my second term, I confess that I still feel some embarrassment when I rise in the House of Representatives, and see all the seats filled and the galleries full to overflowing, and it is hard for me to overcome that embarrassment and properly address myself to the business of the House—the tariff bill under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, this bill to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, is only different from other Democratic tariff bills in the past in that it cuts a little deeper, is a little more drastic, and is a little more reprehensible than former measures, and also contains the income-tax feature.

Aside from that you could almost imagine it to be the same handiwork of the committee that framed the Mills bill of 1888 and those again who wrote the Wilson bill of 1894. The same old stock arguments that have been handed down by Democratic Ways and Means Committees since 1846 are used here. They evidently go on the theory "that there is nothing new under the sun," especially in the ideas of Democracy. Like the laws of the Medes and Persians, they are immutable.

Mr. Chairman, the people and the Government of the United States have been the most prosperous in the last decade of any nation in this or any other like period of the world's history.

There has been greater advancement in all material things than ever before, and we think in moral and mental attributes as well. Our people have been better fed, better clothed, better warmed, better taught, and better protected in all essentials than ever before in our history—not that we have been free from hunger, want, and suffering, or from oppression and outrages of various kinds. Unfortunately, we will probably never be free from such misfortunes and calamities, but we have had less of these than at many other periods in our history.

Mr. Chairman, it was inevitable that at a time of such unprecedented prosperity some abuses should arise, some mistakes be made. It has been found that certain interests were benefiting by the mistakes and abuse which crept in during this great period of development, of exploitation, and national prosperity. The entire people have become convinced of that fact and have been clamoring for corrections of abuses, for laws curbing special privileges, and for the checking of unlawful combinations in restraint of trade.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] referred with some pride in his opening speech on this bill to that period prior to the Civil War when, under Democratic Congresses, this country levied low tariff duties under which both the Government and the people thrived and prospered. He evidently got those ideas from some of the reports of later Democratic Ways and Means Committees who were endeavoring to justify their attempts to put this country on a free trade or tariff for revenue basis and not from competent records written by members of his own party.

DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENT TELLS OF DEMOCRATIC TARIFF DISTRESS.

Mr. Chairman, President Buchanan in his first annual message to the Thirty-fifth Congress speaks differently of those good old times so graphically described by the gentleman from Alabama. President Buchanan had this to say of the condition of the country, the finances, and the distress of the people:

> We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet notwithstanding all these advantages our country, in its monetary interests, is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions of agriculture and in all the elements of national wealth we find our manufactures suspended, our public works retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want. The revenue of the Government, which is chiefly derived from duties on imports abroad, has been greatly reduced, whilst the appropriations made by Congress at its last session for the current fiscal year are very large in amount.
>
> Under the circumstances a loan may be required before the close of your present session; but this, although deeply to be regretted, would prove to be only a slight misfortune when compared with the suffering and distress prevailing among the people. With this the Government can not fail deeply to sympathize, though it may be without the power to extend relief.

Does this extract from the message of a Democratic President correspond with the claims of universal prosperity in ante bellum days? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, by an unfortunate contretemps, which it is not worth while to discuss at this time, the Democratic Party has again come into control of the affairs of this Nation.

That party has been a splendid minority party in the past. As an instrument for holding in check the majority it has been excellent, but as a majority party history shows that partisan Democracy has never measured up to the standard necessary for the welfare of the American people.

Like individuals and families, the only way a political party can grow is by correcting its mistakes, initiating new methods, profiting by past failures, and trying to attain to higher things. Has the Democratic Party grasped this fact? No; it is attempting to better the condition of the American people by materially reducing the purchasing power of the majority of that people by striking a body blow at the greatest factor in our national prosperity, the agricultural classes of our country. This class, by the very nature of things, distribution, diversity of products, and economic position, becomes the prime factor in our development and material welfare, and fortunate indeed is the nation which by fostering care and jealous guard maintains agriculturalists as the bulwark of its moral and physical well-being.

AX, NOT JACKSCREW, USED ON FARM PRODUCTS.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama said that in framing this bill they had attempted to use a jackscrew and let rates down gradual, and had not used an ax. The gentleman should have qualified the remark with an exception as to agricultural products, to which, with but few exceptions, they have applied the ax most ruthlessly; also to the lumber industry of the country, including lath and shingles.

He says agricultural products were only reduced 42 per cent, but in reality it was lowered double that amount, and the leaving of 10 cents a bushel tariff on wheat was simple irony when flour was placed on the free list, the only result being to injure the farmers' home market, the milling industry, and to destroy his opportunity for getting any better than an export price for his heretofore differential or milling grades. The products of the agriculturalists of the United States placed on the free list are bran and wheat, screenings, broom corn, buckwheat and buckwheat flour, corn or maize, corn meal, cotton, flax straw, berries, hides of cattle, lard, meats of all kinds, including fresh beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, bacon and hams; milk and cream, including preserved or condensed; oats (10 cents a bushel), oatmeal, rolled oats, and oat hulls; potatoes, dried, desiccated, and so forth; rye and rye flour; skins of goats and sheep; swine or hogs; tallow; wheat (10 cents a bushel), wheat flour, and semolina.

Agricultural products not on the free list have been reduced in many cases more than 50 per cent—wheat from 25 cents to 10 cents a bushel, but is practically free when flour is made free.

Hay was reduced from $4 a ton to $2 a ton, 50 per cent, and apples from 25 cents a bushel to 10 cents a bushel, or 2½ cents the bushel less than the Canadian rate.

REPUBLICAN PARTY KEPT FAITH WITH FARMERS.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a widespread belief in this country that Canada, our northern neighbor, was in no sense of the word a fruit country; that the seasons were so cold and capricious there that it was next to impossible for them to raise even the hardier varieties of fruits. And I suppose such is the opinion of the Ways and Means Committee which is responsible for this bill; otherwise I can hardly conceive that they would have put the tariff on apples down to 10 cents a bushel, which is 2½ cents less than the tariff rate charged by Canada. The Republican Party in framing tariff measures has always attempted to keep faith with the agricultural classes, and up until two years ago, when Mr. Taft was unfortunately advised to negotiate the Canadian reciprocity misnomer, in which he was so ably abetted and backed by the Democratic Party, no Republican has attempted to double-cross them. Mr. Taft, backed up by Senator Beveridge, of Indiana, and by ex-President Roosevelt, of Oyster Bay, and by the majority of the newspapers of the country, who hoped for a personal gain in free printing paper, stood for a reciprocity, which was a gold-brick fake to the American farmer, and that more than any other one thing contributed to his being retired to private life. His being unfortunate in his advisers did not excuse or lessen his responsibility.

The Republican Party, realizing that Canada's great orchard country lay contiguous to ours, and not wishing to turn our great market of scores of manufacturing cities in close proximity to Canada over to them on equal terms with the farmers of New York, Michigan, Ohio, Missouri, and all the other great apple-producing States, who help to build our roads, our bridges, our schoolhouses, and to support our county and State governments, put a tariff of 25 cents a bushel on Canadian apples to equalize those burdens and to insure to the American growers their home market. The result has been very beneficial to the industry, and the prices have been satisfactory to the American grower and not excessive to the consumer. The growing of orchards has been stimulated until thousands of acres of orchards have been planted, extending from New York to Georgia and all along the great Appalachian chain, Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, and many other States adding to their orchard area very extensively, hoping to reap profits from a growing industry.

AMERICAN APPLE MARKET TURNED OVER TO CANADA.

Canada, on account of a 25-cent duty against its apples, has been forced to market its surplus abroad, and take the risks attendant on distant shipments by both rail and water. Canada has not been adding to her orchard area as has the United States, still its surplus sales have been considerable for the past few years. In 1910 Canada bought from the United States 59,071 barrels of apples, valued at $261,792, and sold abroad the same year 1,040,000 barrels for $4,418,567, her exports exceeding her imports by five to one. In 1908 she exceeded that. In 1910 Canada also shipped 8,126,984 pounds of dried apples. Without any commercial orchards of consequence the Dominion

is shipping a surplus of green and dried apples equivalent to 6,000,000 to 8,000,000 bushels of apples. What is it capable of doing when the tariff rate is placed so low that it is more profitable to sell in the United States than to ship abroad? I hear my Democratic friends saying that it will cost as much, or more, to raise apples in Canada than in the United States. I think they are mistaken, for successful raising is one that demands eternal vigilance to keep down fungus diseases and insect pests, and every mile you travel south from the most northerly point they can be raised those fungus and insect pests become more numerous and virulent. The successful grower of apples or any other kind of fruit in the mild climates will earn all profits he can get out of the business, and should be protected against those countries that do not help to maintain this one.

QUESTION: WHO ARE NONCONSUMERS?

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama yesterday laid great stress on what they were going to do for the great consuming class in the country. I can easily comprehend the difference between a producing class and a nonproducing class, but I must confess I find it impossible to understand what the gentleman denominates the great consuming class. I find it utterly impossible to differentiate as to consumers. We are all consumers, and I maintain that the gentleman's measure, while it will undoubtedly reduce the cost of living in some instances, will do infinitely more harm than good, because every million of dollars he lowers the purchasing power of the American producers by giving their market to foreign producers takes just that much wealth from the development and growth of our own activities and lessens our own general welfare beyond recall. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama very eloquently told of how they were going to secure eighty to one hundred millions of revenue from the income tax, and when I looked at his figures I found that out of a total population of nearly 100,000,000 people there were only 425,000 people who they estimate would have net incomes of $4,000 or more—less than one-half of 1 per cent of our population. Are we to judge from the fact that the agriculturists of the country are hit the heaviest in this tariff bill that you consider a large majority of this income from the "malefactors of great wealth" will be derived from the agricultural classes, and help to reduce their arrogance and pride? No; I am satisfied you had no such thought, and I have no doubt that the farmer was practically left out of your calculation in preparing this table, yet he produced values in 1910 of nearly $9,000,000,000, or almost two-thirds as much as was realized on all the manufactured products of the United States, including repairs in that period. He paid out nearly $700,000,000 for labor in 1910, and $130,000,000 for agricultural machinery and more than $114,000,000 for fertilizers.

FARMER LABORS LONGEST FOR LEAST GAIN.

Of the wealth he creates he probably gets the smallest net gain of any line of business in the United States, puts in the longest hours at labor, endures more hardships incident to exposure to variable weather and climatic conditions, has fewer of what are termed comforts of life and more of its vicissitudes than any other class. He stands to lose his all by flood or drought, by hot winds or frigid weather, by chinch bugs, boll weevil, Hessian fly, San Jose scale, army worms, insects, or fungous diseases that prey upon the products of his toil, and last, but not least, Democratic tariff revisionists who openly say they are going to reduce the cost of his products and cut the cost of living to the consumer by making it possible for increased importations from abroad of all those things which he produces.

They expect to compensate him for his losses by giving him free agricultural machinery, free binding twine that is now on the free list, and yet the Statistical Abstract shows that from 1900 to 1910 there was not a dollar's worth of agricultural machinery imported into the United States, while we exported more than $28,000,000 worth in the year 1910.

Putting agricultural machinery on the free list is simply buncombe. There was never a protest from any agricultural machinery manufacturers against their product going on the free list. No other country makes as good a class of agricultural machinery as we do, and our farmers would not buy foreign implements if they were imported. Your putting this product on the free list will not cause any foreign capital to engage in its manufacture for export to this country, for they well know that a succeeding Congress can and probably will change that provision in the law.

WASHINGTON STATE COMPLETELY DEPRIVED OF PROTECTION.

Mr. Chairman, there are none of the products of my State that this bill fails to put on the free list or reduce to a minimum—lumber, shingles, lath, fish, flour, rye and rye flour, oatmeal and milling products; barley, 54 per cent of present rate; barley malt, 60 per cent; wheat, 10 per cent—practically free; oats, 50 per cent reduction for feed, free as far as milling oats is concerned, as oatmeal is free; hay, 50 per cent reduction; cattle, reduced 62½ per cent; beef, free; horses valued at $150 or less, 54 per cent; at over $150, 60 per cent reduction; mules valued at $150 or more, 77½ per cent reduction; mules valued at $150 or less, 60 per cent reduction; horses and mules, average, 60 per cent reduction; sheep, 61 per cent reduction; wool, free; mutton, free; hogs, free; lard, pork, hams, bacon, free. On shingles alone my State, which produced 59.6 per cent of the entire output of the United States as compiled by the 1910 census, making 8,879,467 thousands out of a total of 14,907,371 thousands, total of the United States, worth on an average of $1.81 per thousand.

Mr. Chairman, this price of $1.81 a thousand in 1909 at the factory does not seem excessive to me. I hardly think the people who made them for that price can ever become "malefactors of great wealth" or bloated capitalists, yet they are a great factor in the welfare of my State, and at the price mentioned produced that year $16,066,405 worth, giving employment to thousands of people and diffusing this vast sum into the arteries of commerce in my State. The Ways and Means Committee has ruthlessly "jackscrewed" duty on this product "with an ax," reducing the rate from 50 cents the thousand shingles to the free list. Yet we are told here this is a gentle reduction that will work no harm.

The present small tariff on shingles is one sufficient to keep the industry in the United States, because with shingles on the free list the American manufacturer can not compete with the cheap Hindu labor of Canada and must needs shut up shop. Shingles, too, let it be explained, are not the product of the Lumber Trust, but, instead, are made almost solely by concerns of limited capital.

What has been said of shingles will apply equally to lath and many other products ruthlessly put on the free list. Another product of our American farmers is wool, also placed on the free list under this bill.

SIMILAR ASSAULT MADE ON AGRICULTURE IN 1888.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives in 1888 evolved a tariff much like this one, not quite as drastic, but bad enough. In the report made to Congress by the Ways and Means Committee they had this to say about wool:

> The repeal of all duties on wool enables us to reduce the duties on manufactures of wool $12,332,211.65. The largest reduction we have made is in the woolen schedule, and this reduction was only made possible by placing wool on the free list.
>
> A duty on wool makes it necessary to impose a higher duty on the goods made from wool, and the consumer has to pay a double tax. If we leave wool untaxed, the consumer has to pay tax only on the manufactured goods.
>
> We say to the manufacturer we have put wool on the free list to enable him to obtain foreign wools cheaper, and send them into foreign markets and successfully compete with the foreign manufacturers. We say to the laborer in the factory we have put wool on the free list so that it may be imported and he may be employed to make the goods that are now made by foreign labor and imported into the United States.
>
> We say to the consumer we have put wool on the free list that he may have woolen goods cheaper. We say to the domestic woolgrower we have put wool on the free list to enable the manufacturer to import foreign wools to mix with his, and thus enlarge his—the domestic woolgrower's—market and quicken the demand for the consumption of home wool, while it lightens the burden of the taxpayer.

The Democratic minority in the Senate had this to say about wool in the same Congress:

> The minority are firmly convinced that besides the incalculable advantage to the whole country which would result from the placing of wool upon the free list, it is easily demonstrated that no class will suffer, but that each will reap his share of the benefit. We will import more wools, of course, and in no other way can our great factories prosper, because their capacity is beyond our own wool production. The manufacturers will export woolen goods as we now export cotton and leather, and the demand for the wool will better the wool market and encourage production, while the average woolgrower himself will reap from cheapened clothing more benefits than he ever did from a tax on his product which he must himself pay.

WILSON BILL DUPLICATE OF MILLS BILL.

Mr. Chairman, the Mills bill, fortunately for the country, I think, never became a law, but five years later the Wilson bill, with much the same provisions, did become a law, and the Ways and Means Committee that brought it out used the same arguments with reference to the manufacturer, the producer, and the consumer as did the committee reporting out the Mills bill. They told how free wool would stimulate the manufacturers of woolens to the great benefit of the owner and his factory help, so that he not only could control his home market but compete on an equality with the manufacturers abroad. They had this to say:

> This House in two Congresses in recent years having after full debate passed laws putting wool upon the free list, it is not deemed necessary in this report to attempt a restatement of the reasons for

doing so. It is enough to say that the tariff upon wool while bringing no real benefit to the American woolgrower, least of all to the American farmer—most all woolgrowers in this country are farmers—who in any balancing of accounts must see that he yearly pays out a good dollar for every doubtful dime he may receive under its operation, has disastrously hampered our manufacturing industry and made cruel and relentless war upon the health, the comfort, and the productive energy of the American people.

With free wool we anticipate great benefits to consumers of woolen goods, a revival of the woolen industry such as that which followed the tariff of 1857, and a steadier and better market for the American woolgrower.

PRICES CHEAPENED, BUT NO MONEY TO BUY.

Mr. Chairman, the Wilson bill was passed, and for three years we existed under it. The manufacturer who was to have free wool, so that he could buy foreign wool and manufacture so cheaply that he could compete with his goods in the markets of the world, found that he could not operate with free wool and cheaper labor—both of which he received under the Democratic tariff bill—as his home market had been practically destroyed by the effects of this measure and the purchasing power of the Nation reduced to the lowest ebb. The factory employee found the promise to him of steadier work on account of free wool did not materialize. In many cases he found himself without work at all at any price. The consumer could possibly have purchased not only his woolen goods some cheaper, but almost everything else. The truth of the matter is he found them relatively much higher than before, as he was pretty generally without the necessary medium of exchange at any price, and the poor wool producer, who had been promised an increased demand for his product and cheaper goods to counteract any lower price, found himself pretty generally without the price to purchase the cheaper goods promised him; the demand for his wool greatly diminished, as well as the price for both the wool and the sheep, each having decreased some 50 per cent, the flocks oftentimes more than 100 per cent. I tell you, gentlemen, those times made sheepmen throughout the United States "red-headed" mighty fast. With the recollection of those conditions, it really seems incredible to think that the same destructive measures are again about to be enacted into law; and as in all former Democratic measures, the agricultural classes, on whose prosperity very largely depends the general welfare of our country, have received least consideration. The farmer is not only the greatest producer of wealth, but is also the greatest consumer. The census of 1910 gives the rural population of the United States, including towns of less than 2,500, as 49,348,883, out of a total population of continental United States of 91,972,266, or practically 54 per cent of the total, who receive their principal sustenance directly or indirectly from agriculture. In addition to that, probably 25 per cent of the balance receive their living indirectly from agriculture. Take agricultural machinery manufacturing alone, which has salaried employees and wage earners numbering 75,000 people, who on a basis of four to the family would represent practically a quarter of a million people, getting their livelihood from that industry, and 90 per cent of their products are annually consumed by the American farmer. Great quantities of almost every commodity are consumed by those who comprise 54 per cent of the total, and on the prosperity of that 54 per cent is largely dependent the welfare of all. You can not reduce their purchasing power without hurting those engaged in every other line of human endeavor, and I reiterate that any Government that thinks it can become more prosperous by reducing the income of its agricultural classes is making an economic mistake from every viewpoint, and I can not see by what process of reasoning the products of one class of people are placed in competition with the products of the world for the benefit of another class.

WHY PROTECT MANUFACTURER AND NOT PRODUCER?

If wool can be produced abroad cheaper than in this country, is not the producer of that commodity as much entitled to protection as the manufacturer of the product is against the cheaper-made goods from abroad? Under the special plea of benefit to the consumer all agricultural products are practically placed on the free list or greatly reduced.

Why, Mr. Chairman, I notice that the Ways and Means Committee has seen fit to reduce the tariff on peanuts from one-half of a cent a pound, as it now stands, to three-eighths of 1 cent a pound, and on shelled peanuts from 1 cent a pound to three-fourths of a cent a pound, a reduction of 25 per cent in the present duties. I think this reduction is totally unwarranted and will work a hardship on a great many people who are engaged in a business that does not now pay any greater reward than they are entitled to. The total acreage in peanuts in 1909 was 869,887, which produced 19,415,816 bushels, valued at $18,271,929. North Carolina, Georgia, Virginia, Florida, Alabama, Texas, Louisiana, Tennessee, Mississippi, Arkansas, South Carolina, Oklahoma, Missouri, New Mexico, California, and Kansas, respectively, raise peanuts, North Carolina standing first, with 195,134 acres, and Kansas last, with 48 acres. Peanuts imported in 1910 amounted to 29,276,235 pounds, worth $1,234,088. The largest peanut-raising State in the South is North Carolina, with 195,134 acres, producing 5,980,919 bushels, worth $5,368,826. North Carolina paid out for fertilizers that year to enable them to raise all crops $12,262,533; $5,444,950 for labor. The expense for fertilizers alone was an average of $1.23 per acre for each acre of peanuts raised, or $240,014.82 for the crop.

"PEANUT POLITICIANS" MOVED BY SYMPATHY FOR PEANUT CONSUMERS.

Mr. Chairman, I presume this reduction in the tariff on peanuts was prayerfully and tearfully considered by the Ways and Means Committee. No doubt their hearts were wrung by the cry of the consumers of peanuts for a little larger glass or bag for 5 cents, and it will be the consumer and not the vender that will profit by this reduction, and if this lower tariff should result in some millions of pounds more coming from Spain, Italy, Mexico, and other foreign countries, and reduce the price a little lower to those who are paying taxes to support the governments of the various States in this country now engaged in raising this product, your committee will feel that it did not act in vain and no doubt you will expect the raisers of peanuts to hereafter speak with pride of their "peanut politicians." [Applause.] The peanut raisers, the potato growers, and all the vast army of agriculturists in this country should rise up and call you blessed, for what they get comes easy—they only work 16 hours a day for it.

Mr. Chairman, I notice on page 104, beginning at line 15, in the list the following: "Bagging for cotton," and so forth. I congratulate the cotton raisers of the South that they are to have free bagging for cotton, and the southern Members here are to be felicitated for being able to scoop their Democratic colleagues from the great wool States of Ohio, Montana, and Colorado. You get free covering for your cotton raisers, but make your woolgrowers pay 25 per cent ad valorem for the bag that carries his free wool. Likewise, the Pacific States wheat raiser; you put his wheat on the free list when you let flour come in free, but you make him pay 25 per cent ad valorem on his grain bag in which he exports his wheat to the Liverpool market, and you make the same material free to your cotton raiser, sending his product to the same or other markets. This is Democratic equality. I congratulate the cotton raisers and those Members who were able "to put this over."

MIRACLE OF MANNA FROM HEAVEN MAY BE REVIVED.

Mr. Chairman, on page 115, line 11, article 545, I observe manna comes in free under this bill. I think the people of the entire country are to be congratulated on manna being left on the free list, for after this law has been in effect for a year or two they will probably long for the manna with which the Lord God of Hosts fed the Israelites without cost and without price, and it will no doubt be a welcome adjunct to the bill of fare at free soup houses and other charitable institutions should conditions prevail after the passage of this act such as followed the enactment of the Wilson bill in 1894. May God forbid! [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3321, the tariff bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD, at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m., the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, April 25, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 4231) to make appropriation for the strengthening and construction of levees along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers in the vicinity of Cairo and in Alexander and Pulaski Counties, Ill.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 4232) to amend section 1440 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4233) levying a tax on wines made of pomace or blended with pomace; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 4234) providing certain legislation for the Panama-California Exposition, to be held in San Diego, Cal., during the year 1915; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 4235) authorizing the manufacture of cigars of imported tobaccos in bonded warehouses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 4236) providing for an additional associate justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: A bill (H. R. 4237) to establish an agricultural experiment station at Overton, Clark County, Nev.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 4268) to amend an act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4269) providing for the discontinuance of the grade of post noncommissioned staff officer, and creating the grade of warrant officer in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4270) for the erection of a Federal building for the United States post office at Warren, R. I.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4271) to amend section 13 of an act entitled "An act to promote the efficiency of the militia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4272) for the purchase of additional land and for repairing the Federal building at Bristol, R. I.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4273) referring the claim of the State of Rhode Island to the Court of Claims for adjudication; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution (H. Res. 75) calling for information from the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture concerning Pitt River project, California; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. GARDNER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 73) providing for the establishment of a hospital ship in connection with the American fisheries; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CALDER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 74) authorizing and directing the President of the United States to issue medals to the survivors of the Battle of Gettysburg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 75) appropriating $25,000 for meeting the expenses of an international congress of the educators of the leading nations of the world; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of California, favoring an appropriation for the investigation and treatment of tuberculosis; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of California, favoring the construction of reservoirs for the storage of surplus flood waters of Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. BELL of California: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, asking Congress to empower the Department of Agriculture to make an investigation of measures for protection of fruit from frost damage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, protesting against the proposed reduction of the duty on citrus fruits below the point where the difference in the cost of production of the same would be equalized; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of the Legislature of California, against the reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of California, against the reduction of the tariff on citrus fruits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of California, asking rights to waters of Lake Tahoe; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of California, favoring an appropriation for the investigation and treatment of tuberculosis; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of California, favoring an appropriation for construction of reservoirs for the storage of flood waters of Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 4238) granting a pension to John E. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4239) granting a pension to William C. Wittfelt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4240) granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Sterry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4241) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Fisk; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4242) granting an increase of pension to Jane Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWDLE: A bill (H. R. 4243) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Cadle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4244) for the relief of heirs of Hugh McGlincey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRODBECK: A bill (H. R. 4245) granting a pension to Mary M. Krafft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4246) granting an increase of pension to William Seaburg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4247) for the relief of the estate of Ferdinand E. Kuhn; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: A bill (H. R. 4248) for the relief of Nelson D. Dillon, executor of Harriet A. Dillon, deceased, widow of Robert Dillon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 4249) to correct the military record of E. J. Sanders and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4250) granting a pension to Elizabeth Youngblood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4251) granting a pension to Manerva Hedges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4252) granting an increase of pension to David Mooney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4253) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Blaney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4254) granting an increase of pension to William Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4255) to correct the military record of John Bassles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4256) to correct the military record of Frank Baldy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4257) to correct the military record of Lewis Corfman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 4258) granting a pension to Katie M. Hale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 4259) granting an increase of pension to John W. Huff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 4260) for the relief of Thomas H. Thorp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 4261) granting a pension to Oscar C. Oliver; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4262) granting a pension to James C. Presley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4263) granting an increase of pension to David Branson, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4264) granting an increase of pension to William R. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4265) granting an increase of pension to John R. Mullennix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 4266) granting patent to certain lands to the legal heirs of W. F. Nichols; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WINSLOW: A bill (H. R. 4267) granting a pension to Alexander Frazier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 4274) granting a pension to Elizabeth Kenyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4275) granting an increase of pension to Joseph N. Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4276) granting an increase of pension to Emeline F. Vickery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4277) granting an increase of pension to Mary Denny; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4278) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Boylan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4279) granting an increase of pension to James C. Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4280) granting an increase of pension to Flora A. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4281) granting an increase of pension to William J. Knowles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4282) granting an increase of pension to William L. Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4283) granting an increase of pension to Catharine J. Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4284) granting an increase of pension to Amanda S. Carr; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4285) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ella Fales; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4286) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4287) for the relief of Frank M. Horton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4288) granting an increase of pension to Johanna Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Cigar Makers' International Union of America, against unlimited free trade with the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of A. Epstein, Herman Remirs, Henry Bishoff, A. F. Reniere, Andrew C. Rouch, and E. T. Landon, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against imposing a tax upon proceeds of life-insurance policies and favoring amending the tariff bill so as to exempt from income tax mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Shelby, N. C., against the reduction of the duty on monazite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York Zoological Society, favoring the clause in the tariff bill prohibiting the importation of wild-bird plumage, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of sundry citizens of Gloucester, Marblehead, and Newburyport, Mass., and the Universalist Church of Beverly, Mass., favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls or the arbitration of the question at issue with the British Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Otto Kirach and other employees in the lithographic industry, against the reduction in duty as proposed in paragraph 333 of the tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles P. Baumgartner and 20 other shoe workers in Newburyport, Mass., against any radical change in the tariff on boots and shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Va., favoring the passage of legislation making a reform in the present banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of David Starr Jordan and George Archbald Clark, Stanford University, Cal., protesting against the reducing of the force of Government agents on the fur-seal islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Manufacturing Perfumers' Association of the United States, New York, N. Y., protesting against the removal of oils and other materials from the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Plattsburg, N. Y., protesting against the passage of legislation for the reorganization of the customs service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of M. Turkeltaub & Son and Doblin, Schamberg & McKeown, New York, N. Y., protesting against the reduction of the tariff on vegetable ivory buttons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the J. Wilcakes Co., New York, N. Y., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Snow Steam Pump Works, Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against any reduction of the present tariff on machinery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Waring Hat Manufacturing Co., Yonkers, N. Y., and the United Hatters of North America, Locals Nos. 7 and 8, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against any reduction of the present duty on hats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York Association of Biology Teachers, New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation prohibiting the importation of the feathers and plumes of wild birds for commercial use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of 15 citizens of the twenty-third New York district, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of the National Association of Railway Commissioners, favoring an appropriation of $4,500 for blanks for annual reports of railroads by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Levi Strauss & Co. and 56 other business houses of San Francisco and Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Citrus Protective League, Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the reduction of the tariff on citrus fruits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Civic Improvement Club, Morgan Hill, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation for the preservation of the Niagara Falls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Harry B. Gregory, Santa Barbara; Home Industry League, San Francisco; Chamber of Commerce, Sacramento; Frank A. De Cray and Catherine A. Wilkins, Santa Cruz, all in the State of California, protesting against the reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of A. W. Scott, jr.; J. S. Dunningan; the Ames Harris Neville Co.; and the W. A. Plummer Manufacturing Co., all of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the reduction of the tariff on jute bags and burlap; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVY: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, favoring the clause exempting from taxation all mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Local Unions of New York, N. Y., against free trade with the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pennsylvania Millers' State Association, urging that if a tariff be placed on grain an equal tariff be placed on the products of grain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Ignaz Strauss & Co., William Meyer & Co., H. Jacquin & Co., of New York, N. Y., against the assessment of any fee in relation to the filing of protests against the assessment of duties by the collector of customs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Petition of Mr. W. B. Martin and 1,941 other citizens of the following cities and towns in the State of California: Alameda, Alvarado, Anaheim, Arroyo Grande, Artesia, Bay City, Berkeley, Betteravia, Blanco, Buena Park, Casmalia, Castroville, Chino, Compton, Concord, Daly City, Del Monte, Downey, El Monte, Foxen, Gardena, Garden Grove, Gilroy, Gonzales, Guadalupe, Harris Station, Hollister, Huntington Beach, Hueneme, Hynes, King City, Lompoc, Long Beach, Los Alamitos, Los Alamos, Los Angeles, Marysville, Meridian, Monterey, Moss, Nipomo, Norwalk, Oakland, Oceano, Orby, Orcutt, Owensworth, Oxnard, Pacific Grove, Pleasanton, Puente, Salinas, San Francisco, San Juan Bautista, San Luis Obispo, Santa Ana, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Santa Maria, Sargent, Soledad, Spence, Spreckels, Van Nuys, Watsonville, Whittier, Wilmington, and Woodland, protesting against the proposed reduction in the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of Rev. A. Morrill Osgood and sundry citizens of Maynard, Burlington, Carlisle, and Stow, Mass., also of William C. Buck and other citizens of Reading, Mass., favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls or submitting to arbitration the question at issue with the British Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of sundry mills of the United States employing dyers and finishers of cotton corduroys, velvets, etc., favoring the present rates of duty under the act of 1909, schedule I; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. Wiss & Sons Co., of Newark, N. J., against the reduction of duty on scissors and shears; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of sundry citizens of Shelby, N. C., against the reduction of the duty on monozite and thorium; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Walter Travers Daniel against the proposed income tax on yearly dividends in mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of sundry citizens of the thirtieth district of New York, favoring an amendment to the income-tax section of the pending tariff bill, with reference to the tax proposed to be levied on life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *April 25, 1913.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God and our Father, ever ready to hear the prayers of Thy children, we would draw near to Thee with open hearts that we may receive of Thy spirit sufficient unto the needs of the hour; that we may control our thoughts and direct our ways in consonance with our highest conceptions of right and truth and justice that we may render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and unto God the things that are God's, and so fulfill the law and the prophets. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal as read will stand approved.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice the Journal shows that yesterday the Speaker accepted the resignation of Mr. COLLIER from the committee to attend the exercises in regard to the Jefferson memorial and appointed another Member of the House to succeed him. I do not desire to be captious in the matter, but I would like to inquire what authority there is by this House for the appointment of anyone to attend those exercises?

The SPEAKER. Well, the Chair will state to the gentleman that that is not the only difficulty about that committee. When the resolution was passed during the last Congress the Speaker studied a good while to determine whether he really could appoint on that committee any Member of the Sixty-second Congress who was not going to be a Member of the Sixty-third, and so on; and the Chair really did not know whether he had any authority to do that or not, but it seemed to the Chair the only thing to do——

Mr. MANN. The Speaker will remember the resolution which was passed in the last Congress was a simple House resolution. I suppose the gentleman who drew it drew it in conformity with the idea of a Senate resolution, which was somewhat similar——

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Forgetting the distinction between the two bodies, the Senate being a continuous body and the House not being a continuous body. That resolution provided for the appointment by the Speaker of 12 Members of the House to attend those exercises and the Speaker exercised that power. When the Congress adjourned that power under the resolution ceased.

The SPEAKER. Well, did the committee cease?

Mr. MANN. Well, that is another question. The House since then has passed a bill appropriating money to pay the expenses of that committee. I do not know whether the Speaker had taken it into consideration or how many members were going to resign. I have noticed since the appropriation was cut down a very large number of distinguished gentlemen not connected with this House have declined to go. I did not know how many would decline to go——

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the best of his recollection about this is that he was notified that Mr. COLLIER could not go and Mr. BORLAND wanted to go, or something of the sort, before this cut was made in the appropriation.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I did not refer to Mr. COLLIER in that connection. I said gentlemen not connected with this House.

The SPEAKER. Mr. COLLIER did not want to go on account of this tariff bill, he being a member of the Ways and Means Committee. That is his reason. Of course, everybody knows a ticket from here to St. Louis costs $23, sleeper $5, three or four meals will run it up to three or four dollars more, tip to the porter, and so forth, altogether would increase the actual expenses of a trip from here to St. Louis to $30 and $30 back; hotel bill there, and so forth; but that had nothing to do with Mr. COLLIER declining to go, but the reason was because he wanted to be here, being a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MANN. I am very sure that Mr. COLLIER would not have declined to go, even if there had been no appropriation on that account. I wanted to call attention to it because I think the House ought to remember when it passes resolutions of this sort that one House has no authority beyond its term of office.

The SPEAKER. The Chair entirely agrees with the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. We understood that when the original resolution was passed at the last session.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman was here and permitted this appropriation to pass the other day, and, so far as that point is concerned, other Members did not raise any sort of objection to it. Of course that does not preclude him from making this statement; and the Chair was in doubt, and is yet, whether or not that resolution that was passed in the last Congress was such a resolution as authorized the committee appointed to do anything beyond that Congress, but acting under the circumstances the Chair was not going to raise any such question himself.

Mr. MANN. I certainly do not desire to be understood as in any way criticizing the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that.

Mr. MANN. I did not raise the question on the floor the other day when the appropriation passed, it is true, although I stated privately that I did not understand how anybody could spend the money, because there was not any committee authorized to do anything.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

There was no objection.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I had no intention to participate in the general debate on this bill; the new Members on the Democratic side were sent here to act, not to talk.

The 14 distinguished Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee, who have spent months of time and labor in the preparation of this measure, are much better prepared to enlighten the House and the country upon its provisions than other Members can possibly be; and while I concur in the judgment of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that the country has a right to expect and demand of the majority in this House prompt action on its part, I believe that the comparatively short period of time allotted to the large majority upon this side of the Chamber might wisely have been awarded to the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

But, Mr. Chairman, while in attendance at the session of the House yesterday I propounded certain questions to two distinguished Republican Members, who are among the oldest in point of service and certainly among the ablest in ability on that side of this Chamber; I refer to the two gentlemen from Michigan, Mr. FORDNEY and Mr. HAMILTON.

At the conclusion of his speech I asked the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] by what process of reasoning he was able to conclude—as he had alleged in his remarks—that the panic of 1893 was caused by the Wilson-Gorman tariff law, which was not enacted until August of 1894? To this he replied that the country had been convulsed with the panic of 1893 in anticipation of the enactment of that law, which was about one and one-half years subsequent to the commencement of the panic.

I then inquired of the gentleman from Michigan why it was that no panic had resulted from the induction into office of a Democratic administration this year and the introduction of the Underwood bill, which provided for a lower average of tariff rates than had the original Wilson bill introduced in December of 1893? To this the ingenious gentleman from Michigan replied that the workingmen of this country had saved so much money under the Republican administration that they refused to permit a panic this year, or words to that effect.

The other gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] read into his speech some figures prepared by President Taft's Tariff Board, showing the comparative rates of wages paid in the cotton and woolen mills of England, Germany, Belgium, and other European countries, and these figures disclose that the rates of wage paid cotton and woolen mill employees in England are very substantially higher than in any of the countries on the Continent of Europe, all of which have the protective-tariff system.

At that point I asked the gentleman from Michigan to explain why wages were twice as high in free-trade England as they are in protective countries on the Continent, and why these low-wage countries which are much nearer England than they are America do not flood England with cheap goods and capture her home and foreign markets, and the gentleman from Mich-

igan admitted that he did not know and could not explain this apparent repudiation of Republican campaign logic by cold facts collected by a Republican administration.

The remarks of both the distinguished gentlemen from Michigan, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD announces this morning, are withheld for revision and "will appear hereafter."

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that these are pertinent illustrations of the "pro-bunco-publico" argument of Republican campaign orators which have been dinned into the ears of the American people during the past 20 years.

A government can no more create prosperity among its people by increasing taxation than an individual can lift himself by his boot straps; the first violates the laws of political economy and of common sense as much as the latter does the law of gravitation, and it is high time that the American people, and especially their National Representatives, got back to bedrock principles in dealing with the tariff question.

In 1896 the Republicans ran away from a discussion of the money question because it was politically expedient to do so and easier to raise the vast sums of money used by them in that campaign by promising to increase tariff rates than by agreeing to maintain the gold standard, which required no change in the existing law. If the Republicans had been free to reduce some of the exorbitant rates of the Wilson-Gorman law and then let the tariff alone, the people of this country would have been saved most of the cruel extortions to which they were later subjected by the trusts and combinations which were the legitimate brood of the prohibitory rates imposed by the tariff law of 1897.

But the men who had contributed the millions of dollars to carry the election of 1896 demanded their "pound of flesh," and were represented in the United States Senate by the men to whom the money had been contributed and who wrote into the bill the rates demanded and the Dingley law was the measure of their demands.

The War with Spain and the steady increase in the production and supply of gold which injected into the arteries of trade and commerce a life-giving stimulus akin to fresh pure blood in the human body resulted in the quickening of trade and industry to such an extent that the great body of the people were insensible to the legitimate results bound to follow the prohibitory rates imposed by the Dingley Act.

Thoughtful people were quick to observe the effect which these extortionate rates of duties were bound to produce. Sheltered from competition from all foreign countries, it was as natural for the domestic manufacturers to form combinations as it is for the sparks to fly upward.

In his last public utterance made just before his assassination in 1901, President McKinley, who had approved the Dingley law, appealed for a modification of its rates in language as earnest and strong as political consistency would permit. Then Roosevelt succeeded to the Presidency and McKinley's appeal went unheeded.

Consummate politician that he was, Roosevelt saw the possibilities for raising campaign funds in the exorbitant tariff schedules and made good use of them in 1904, as the recent publication of the campaign expenses in that year prove.

Roosevelt spoke guardedly at times about revising the tariff through a tariff commission, but it was obvious that he was simply reminding the protected interests of their obligations to him for permitting the scandalous rates of the Dingley law to remain in force.

He hotly denied that prohibitive tariff rates encouraged the formation of trusts and combinations, as charged by the Republicans of Iowa in their platform, and otherwise behaved in a way that won him the enduring friendship of the men who own and control many of the largest trusts in this country.

William H. Taft, in announcing his candidacy for the Republican nomination in 1908, declared in favor of a reduction of tariff rates and admitted that the tariff raised prices; this was a new Republican departure and caused much political trouble and turmoil later on; just when the foreigner quit paying the tariff was not disclosed, but Taft admitted that he no longer did so.

Taft's subsequent nomination and election was followed by one of the saddest political tragedies in our history; Taft really wanted to reduce the tariff, but his party had been mortgaged to the tariff beneficiaries in exchange for campaign funds and was powerless to carry out its pledges to the people, and the Payne-Aldrich law, revising the tariff up instead of down, was the result.

What followed is recent history. This administration came into power under a solemn pledge to revise the tariff downward, "unmistakably downward," and I believe that this covenant with the American people will be faithfully kept.

The bill now before the House is unmistakable evidence of the earnest purpose of the Democratic leaders to keep faith with the American people, and it will pass this House in due time, make no mistake about that.

If influences elsewhere are successful in stuffing this bill with the odious features so characteristic of Republican legislation upon the tariff, the responsibility will not be ours unless we adopt it.

Political death, swift and certain, awaits any Democrat who now doubts or falters. We were sent here to prepare and pass a tariff law which will bear the test prescribed by the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore; if any Democrat in whom the people have reposed trust and confidence now betrays them, it were better for him that a millstone were tied around his neck and that he were then cast into the bottomless sea. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose, in the time which I shall occupy, to discuss the various theories upon which the different political parties in this country would write tariff laws. I do not propose to pay any attention to the tariff question as an academic proposition. It seems to me that the country during the past four years has had a surfeit of tariff discussion and that what the people are interested in now more than anything else is the purpose and the effect in a practical way of such tariff legislation as any political party proposes to the American people. I shall occupy my time, therefore, first, in submitting some general observations upon the effect and purposes of this proposed law, intended, at least, to be of an entirely practical nature. And then, if time permits, I shall hope to pay some attention to the details of one of the schedules of this tariff law which is of greatest interest to the great industrial State which I in part represent upon this floor.

Before proceeding, however, I want to accept this opportunity to put into the RECORD, on behalf of his Democratic colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means and on behalf of his party associates on this floor, a grateful acknowledgement of the large debt which our party and our country owe to the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] His name will go down in the history of the Republic along with those of other great legislators of past days, enduringly associated and linked with a great revenue measure. He will take his place when this law goes upon the statute books amongst the immortals of this Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.] His unfailing courtesy, not alone to members of this committee and members of his party in the House, but to Members generally and to those citizens of the country who have come here to see us because interested in this legislation; his uniform good judgment and sound common sense; his consummate tact and his infinite patience under any and all circumstances, have been the most powerful factors in making this great bill what it is. [Applause on the Democratic side.] His party can never pay to him the debt which it owes, unless—perhaps I should say until—it rewards him with the honor of the only office in the Republic which is larger in power and responsibility than that which he now occupies. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. QUIN. We are going to do that.

Mr. PALMER. I have seen suggestions—principally in a hostile or, at least, critical press—that the name of another, or the names of others, will necessarily be linked with his in giving a title to this great tariff bill. There has been cooperation on the part of others in high official place in the preparation of this bill, and I am glad that that is so; but there is no man in the Nation, in public station or in private life, who believes that any other has had sufficient to do with the preparation of this law to permit his name to be linked with that of OSCAR UNDERWOOD as its maker. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There is another thing I want to remark before I begin what I intended to say. Some reference has been made upon the floor and elsewhere, principally by these neophytes in legislation who come here as so-called "Progressives," by way of severe criticism of the methods which have been employed in the preparation of this bill and its submission to the Congress. I think I can say with entire truth that no tariff bill which has ever been presented to the House of Representatives has received more careful study, thought, attention, and consideration at the hands of its makers than has this bill. We have been studying this question, yes, we have been writing this bill, constantly for more than two years in the Committee on Ways and Means. We began with the opening of the Sixty-second Congress, even before, and by bringing into the House various laws amending various schedules in the bill we were compelled, even had we not

been willing, to give the deepest and closest attention to the question as far as those particular schedules were concerned. Upon the elections in the country going in favor of the Democratic Party, when it became apparent that it would be our duty to write a general revision of the tariff laws, the Committee on Ways and Means began its open sessions.

It listened to manufacturers and others interested, coming from all parts of the country, for nearly 30 days, sitting from 10 o'clock in the morning, almost daily, far into the night. Since that time its members have granted informal hearings to perhaps thousands more who have been interested on both sides of this great question.

There has not been a day since the opening of the Sixty-second Congress, more than two years ago, when the experts employed by the Ways and Means Committee have not been at work compiling statistics and gathering facts and lending assistance to the members of the committee in the preparation of the various schedules in the law; and when these hearings, formal and informal, had been completed the Committee on Ways and Means, or the majority members of it, in accordance with the custom that has obtained in this House during all its history, went into executive session apart from their brethren of opposite faith and spent nearly two months and a half in daily sessions writing the details of this proposed law.

When that work was completed, in striking contrast with the precedents in this House, the bill was published to the country and given to our opponents at least three weeks before they were asked to consider it or vote upon it in committee or in the House. Four years ago the first knowledge which the minority, then the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means, had of the terms of the Payne bill was when it was laid in front of them in the Committee on Ways and Means and they were asked to vote upon the proposition of reporting it to the House. This year the bill was in the hands of the Republicans in this House and in the hands of the people of the country for three weeks, and during most of that time the Democratic membership of this House considered the bill in caucus, where every Member was given the fullest, the freest, and fairest right, not only to discuss every single item in it but to amend it in every particular in which he desired to submit his proposition to the caucus.

There never has been a time, I repeat, when there was such careful, thorough, and painstaking consideration of the terms of a bill, or such an earnest and honest effort to give every man a fair and free chance to express his views and impress them upon the legislation of his country, to participate in which he was sent here by his people.

There can be no question as to the attitude of the American people with respect to the present tariff law. The demand for a substantial reduction in the rates of duty has been long continued, insistent, and widespread. It began before the enactment of the present law, became louder on account of the failure of that law to satisfy in any part the claims of its sponsors, and is to-day so general that it is accepted by all parties as, in itself, ample justification for an immediate and thorough revision of the tariff rates. No issue in the history of the Republic was ever more squarely presented to the people, more thoroughly discussed by the people, nor more definitely settled than this.

The Democratic Party, therefore, approaches the work now in hand with no misgiving as to the popular call for action and with no doubt that its action, as indicated by this bill, responds to the will of the people plainly expressed. We entered into solemn covenant to do this thing, and we present this bill as the redemption of our obligation. If enacted into law in substantially its present form it will meet with the approval of the Nation and remain upon the statute books for years to come as the happy solution of a long-vexed question if, and only if, two conditions obtain after its enactment. It must have the united support of the political party which is responsible for it, and it must permit American industry to proceed toward the capture of a larger share of the world's markets without causing an embarrassment, resulting from the changed conditions, sufficient to bring distress to any large body of our people. We who so firmly believe that every tax law should be written without fear or favor, we who have long and hitherto fruitlessly contended that the protective system is built upon a structure of special privilege for the few at the expense of the masses of the people must be quite as deeply interested in the permanency of our work as in the mere doing of it. If it shall so turn out that the Underwood law shall be so weakly nourished in the confidence of the people that it fails to survive the great test of the next popular election, our wasted effort will be a small burden for us to carry compared with the increased iniquities that will be heaped upon an unsuspecting people by the sudden return to the oppressive system of taxation from which we hope to relieve them by this bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Theory may write a tariff bill but it will not keep it on the books. [Applause on the Republican side.] I am glad we all agree about that. Economic truths may govern in the framing of a revenue law, but political and business conditions are more important in sustaining it when framed. [Applause.] We shall shut our eyes to the strong possibility of a repudiation of the time-honored theory upon which the Democratic Party would write its revenue measures if we do not consider with great care the political and business conditions of the times and so write the details of the law based upon that principle, and so present the finished work to the country as will most strongly appeal to the sound political sense and the good business judgment of a people peculiarly wise in political thought and exceptionally keen in business acumen.

No tariff bill has ever remained long upon the statute books which failed to enlist the united support of the party which was responsible for it. The Wilson law received its death knell when a Democratic President denounced it in unmeasured terms. The Payne law never had a chance to live after a large section of the Republican Party had left upon it the scars which resulted from efforts to strangle it at its birth. A great people will never accept the handiwork of men who quarrel over their creation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We have, I hope, learned of history. The opposition of the Republican remnant upon this floor and elsewhere, like that of the Progressive embryo [laughter], will be readily discounted. The people expect it. Opposition of any considerable element within our own party, unless it be that of special interests, whose antagonism may be considered a credit to the bill, will doom the law to an early repeal.

Realizing these things, and having no hope or thought that the tariff can ever be settled upon its economic truths without resorting to its political phases, I am one of those who view with equanimity the so-called invasion of the rights of the legislative branch of the Government which is involved in the close cooperation in the preparation of this bill which has obtained between the Executive and both branches of the Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

That cooperation gives promise of the prompt completion of a well-settled program and foreshadows the hearty support of this bill by the great leaders of our party in public station and in private life. I indulge the hope that this unity of party support, when we shall have finally presented the bill to the country as a finished piece of legislation, will not be marred even in slight degree by the opposition of those Representatives whose particular localities have necessarily suffered more than their duty to the people they immediately represent permits them to promptly forget. Heretofore the greatest obstacle which the Democratic Party has met in its desire to be intrusted with the people's commission to rewrite the revenue laws has been the fear—sometimes well grounded in the outspoken zeal of men who in the catalogue go for Democrats—that special interests of special localities might sway a considerable number of our party's representatives from the true Democratic purpose. This fear has been largely dispelled by the action of our party upon this bill. It ought not now to be realized in any degree by the failure of Members on this side of the Chamber, however few in number, to forget their selfish local or political interests in the common purpose to execute the plain mandate of the people to reduce the burden of tariff taxation for the benefit of all. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

No man can get all he wants in legislation. This bill is not as I would have written it if I had alone been intrusted with its preparation. It is not as any one man would have written it. No tariff law ever was. But as a whole it is the best tariff law ever written, and it is the only one in the time of any Member of this body which has approached the true principle which should govern the levy of indirect taxes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Every man who calls himself a Democrat and knows why believes that. Therefore, in the interest of the permanent establishment of that true principle as the fiscal policy of the Nation, we should and must sink our individual views about particular items in support of the general proposition, forget the interests of particular localities in the accomplishment of the general good, and send this bill to the country with the solid, enthusiastic, and united support of the only political party from which, by reason of the present unusual political conditions, the country has a right to expect sufficient strength for some years to come to write its purpose into law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

No man will gainsay that the Democratic Party is pledged, both by its platform declarations and by the repeated assurances of its candidate for President, not alone to fix the tariff rates with the sole design of producing revenue for the Government, but to fix them in such a way as will not injure or destroy any legitimate industry. No change in any tariff law of any moment could be made without affecting industry. It would be a change not worth while if it did not. No change which is considerable enough to yield a benefit anywhere can be made without corresponding temporary impairment of the profits of industry pending readjustment to suit the new conditions. Every business man knows this. But such temporary impairment is a very different thing from that injury or destruction of legitimate industry which the people have a right to believe we will not permit.

I am not a protectionist in any sense, but I would hate myself if I thought I had been a factor in writing a law which would destroy any industry which could show under present-day economic conditions a right to exist without undue taxation of the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] However much we may disapprove of it, we can not fail to realize that in many lines of industry a partnership has existed, under Republican-made law, between business and the Government—a partnership which, so far as business is concerned, was entered into in perfect good faith. That partnership has continued through a long period of time, though at great cost to the people who had been deceived into permitting its inception, and it would be nothing short of a breach of faith for the people's representatives now to break that partnership by withdrawing suddenly and at one time all the capital which the Government contributed to the enterprise. Business has had fair notice that the terms of the partnership are to be modified, that the amount which the people will contribute to make the enterprise profitable for the working partner is to become rapidly less and less, and the share which business itself must contribute in the way of efficiency and economy in production must be steadily more and more. Business now may take notice that as to such enterprises as can not meet the new conditions, by reason of the neglect, refusal, or inability to employ that efficiency and economy which will permit industry to stand upon its own feet with less support from the Government, the people refuse to be longer taxed to accomplish the survival of the unfit. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I violate no committee secret when I say that the framers of this bill have kept present-day business conditions constantly in mind in its preparation. And I state it as my deliberate judgment that when this bill shall become a law and its effects have had an opportunity to spread through all the branches of American industry it will not cause any decrease in the aggregate production of industry in the country, and consequently will not impair the earnings of the labor of hands, which is at the bottom of all production. It may stop a wheel or drive the smoke from a chimney here and there. It will undoubtedly cause to some extent a readjustment of the uses of capital and a decrease of investment in industries where we do not excel, but that readjustment of capital will result in increased production by reason of larger investment in those lines of business endeavor where we do excel. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If the aggregate production remains the same, the demand for labor will continue the same; and if the demand for labor continues the same, the price of labor will not go down. Men get the best results from that line of endeavor which suits them best. Capital makes its best return out of that which it can produce the cheapest. When men who have capital to invest realize this, then the men who have labor to sell will give to their employers a larger return for their wage in their labor's production and will command a larger share in the product.

The increase of importations under the proposed law, by reason of the reduction in the rates, will constitute but a small percentage of the total production of the articles covered by the schedules of this law, and such increased importations, while resulting in increased competition and consequent reduction of prices to the people, will not result in a decrease of the aggregate production nor in a loss of reasonable profit to the producer. And this by reason of the operation of a well-known law of trade. Every dollar of imports must be paid for, and it is a truism with reference to the world's trade that this payment takes place not in money but, in the last analysis, in the product of the country for the export trade. Increased imports mean increased exports, and this enlargement of trade is bound to result in our people buying that which can be made cheaper abroad than here, while we sell abroad that which can be made cheaper here than there.

And it is only in exceptional cases that a reinvestment of capital or a readjustment of labor will have to be made, and in most of these it will be a gradual change. In the vast majority of the highly protected industries where our rates have been written at a figure slightly below the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad they will result in only a moderate increase of importations. These imports will be kept down to the point of safety to American industry by reduction in the price of the manufactured articles for the benefit of the home consumer—a reduction which will come from the profits, in too many cases grossly exorbitant, of the American manufacturer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have no fear that the American wage earner will suffer unless the American manufacturer shall feel that widespread distress on the part of labor is not too high a price to pay to compel a return to the old protective system [applause on the Democratic side] and deliberately close his mills and throw his labor out of employment in order to frighten the people of the country into a repudiation of this new policy. I have more respect for the patriotism of the American manufacturer than to believe that he will do this in any general way, and too much confidence in his courage and ability to expect him to feel the necessity of resort to such methods.

Under every law of business labor will be not the first, but the last, to feel the effect of the decreased price of the product to meet increased competition. And it is almost inconceivable that American business men will attempt to reverse the general rules of division of earnings for political effect. A reduction in the selling price of the product of any plant which makes the profit and loss account of the producer at the end of the year show a less favorable figure is charged up to the returns received by those who contribute to the product in the inverse order of the lien of their contribution. The original capital is always reached last in the distribution of profits.

Interest on that portion of the invested capital which is carried as funded debt is necessarily taken care of first. The absolutely first mortgage upon the business is the capitalized cost of labor, and the first charge to be met is the wages of that labor. Out of gross income, arrived at by deducting the costs of materials from the results of sales, must first be distributed wages; next, interest and depreciation of plant; and third, returns to the contributors to the capital fund. These last returns in manufacturing enterprises in this country have on the whole been so generous as to challenge the wonder of the world, and I am firm in the belief that the result of increased competition, flowing from a reduction of the tariff barrier, when charged against these returns of capital, will in but few cases reduce them below such a figure as money in other branches of business activity is wont to earn. And as long as capital receives a sufficient return to justify its employment production will go on, and all charges, prior in lien, to the returns on capital will be met.

Most American manufacturers, while publicly protesting that drastic cuts in the tariff rates will ruin their business, in private admit that under rates largely reduced they can survive without decreased production, though with less profits, if market conditions in all producing countries should remain normal. The great industrial bugbear seems to be the fear of overproduction in foreign countries, followed by flooding this market at prices which neither producer, home or foreign, could afford to make general. Many large operators in the textile trades and nearly all in the iron and steel industry—that unerring barometer of American business conditions—admit no fear of the foreigner's normal output, but profess to see destruction in the marketing of his surplus stock. It is a perfectly justifiable fear and one well calculated to give pause to radical tariff reductions. It brings us face to face with the most perplexing problem which we must meet in our effort to lower tariff taxation without injury or destruction to legitimate American industry. It is a problem which no body of tariff makers in the history of the country ever had to grapple with before—the problem growing out of the difference in the attitude of our country and that assumed by other producing nations toward trusts and combinations and its necessary corollary, the world-wide trust. In this country the tendency of public opinion, voiced in legislative enactment and executive action, is against these great combinations. Not only is their formation discouraged and anything which smacks of suppression of competition frowned upon, but such as have been formed in violation of law are being disintegrated and old competitive conditions, wherever possible, restored. In foreign producing countries the tendency is in the opposite direction. Not only are combinations of capital with resultant economies in production and suppression of competition permitted, but they are actually encouraged, fostered, and

participated in by the Governments themselves. What a cautious, law-abiding business man would do here at the risk of his fortune or his personal liberty brings a medal of honor from his Government to the great manufacturer abroad. In Germany there is at least one case of the Government itself, in effect, operating a great manufacturing establishment under a deed of trust of a former owner for the benefit of the employees, the factor of owners' profits being largely eliminated when the product enters the markets. More, subsidies and freight tariff rebates are the common practice to encourage foreign trade, and established Government agencies in nearly every market sell the manufacturer's product with little cost to him until his trade is finally rooted. These systems make the dumping of foreign surplus product in the American market a part of the regular business of the producer in those countries, and consequently compel the American manufacturer to meet competition under abnormal conditions under tariff rates levied with due regard for conditions that are normal.

To meet this situation we have done two things. In the case of world-wide trust, having their own plants everywhere and now permitting no imports into this country, we have placed their products on the free list. The American producer being a part of the world trust and helping to exploit this market by suppression of competition, it is believed that absolute free trade may encourage venturesome capital in foreign countries to oppose the un-American system now largely in vogue abroad, and thus enter our markets to the advantage of our home consumer.

Where the American branch of such world-wide trusts—as in the case of the Aluminum Co. of America—is unable, though having a perfect monopoly, to supply the home market and imports from its associates abroad yield large revenues to the Government, we have retained some duty upon the product for revenue purposes, but placed their trust-controlled raw material upon the free list, to encourage imports of the raw material for consumption here by such capital as will see the opportunity to get a part of this market by building plants to compete with the American branch of the trust. By such means no Democratic principle is violated. Trust-controlled products go upon the free list, except where no object would be gained except loss of revenue, opportunity is given for freer competition both at home and with foreign producers, and the evils to the consumer which flow from combination in restraint of trade, both domestic and international, are minimized so far as may be by a tariff law.

To meet the just complaint of the American manufacturer that he can not know what competition he must meet as long as the foreigner can sell here below his home market price and sometimes even below his cost of production, we have inserted in this bill what is known as the dumping clause, which provides:

That whenever articles are exported to the United States of a class or kind made or produced in the United States, if the export or actual selling price to an importer in the United States or the price at which such goods are consigned is less than the fair market value of the same article when sold for home consumption in the usual and ordinary course in the country whence exported to the United States at the time of its exportation to the United States there shall, in addition to the duties otherwise established, be levied, collected, and paid on such article on its importation into the United States a special duty (or dumping duty) equal to the difference between the said export or actual selling price of the article for export or the price at which such goods are consigned, and the said fair market value thereof for home consumption, provided that the said special duty shall not exceed 15 per cent ad valorem in any case and that goods whereon the duties otherwise established are equal to 50 per cent ad valorem shall be exempt from such special duty.

Mr. WALLIN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PALMER. Certainly.

Mr. WALLIN. How will you prevent the manufacturer on the other side giving a special discount on goods shipped over here?

Mr. PALMER. That would be a violation of this dumping clause, because it would be importing their goods into this country at a less price than the fair home market price.

Mr. WALLIN. Their invoices would show the fair market price, but they could easily have an understanding, and have a subsequent discount to go back, that would get the goods in here at the underprice just the same.

Mr. PALMER. That is simply assuming that this law is not going to be enforced. Every American manufacturer who complains of the dumping of foreign manufactures will tell you that he complains because he knows that his foreign competitor does this thing. If the American manufacturer knows it, his knowledge will be at the command of the administrative officers of the Government for his own interest, and there will be no difficulty in establishing the fact that the foreign manufacturer is dumping his product into this market at a price below his own cost of production.

Mr. WALLIN. That will be very hard to prove.

Mr. PALMER. We have provided carefully for the execution of this feature of the law by giving the officers of the Government the power to inspect the books of the foreign manufacturer, and if he is unwilling to yield to that request, then his goods can not come into this market.

Mr. COOPER. I understood the gentleman to say, in reply to the question of the gentleman at my right [Mr. WALLIN], that the American manufacturer would know whether goods were being dumped here in competition with his products, and that he would protest. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is making a straight protective argument. He is trying to protect the American manufacturer against unfair competition, according to his own statement. Is not that true? And that is unconstitutional, according to your party platform. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PALMER. I anticipated that some thoughtless person on the other side [laughter on the Democratic side] would ask some such question, and I will answer it by proceeding with the statement that under a high protective tariff such a clause would be further protection. Under a real competitive tariff it is simple justice. The Republican protective tariff works its purpose with truest fidelity to the real spirit of the principle when its rates are prohibitive. Prohibition of imports is the real thing in protection. It is what the manufacturer craves and what he has long secured in most cases, thanks to the willingness of the Republican Party to further enrich him at the expense of the people.

The chief relief which the consumer has been able to get in the past from the exactions of these high rates, normally prohibitive, has come from the willingness of foreign producers to dump their surplus here when conditions of trade abroad are abnormal at such low prices as permitted some competition here even after paying excessive customs duties. With the rates laid, however, as in this bill, on a competitive basis, permitting real and substantial foreign competition even under usual trade conditions, the American manufacturer has a right to expect that we shall keep steady the relative conditions which prevail when the law is written and under which they can continue to produce, though to somewhat less extent in some lines and with less profit in nearly all. That is the design of the dumping clause, and it will close the mouth of the American manufacturer against criticism of the law, while otherwise he would find a sympathetic audience in a people determined upon fair play.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. PALMER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. If the foreign manufacturer or producer, agricultural or otherwise, sends his surplus product over here at a very low price, will that be in the interest of the consumer here?

Mr. PALMER. Undoubtedly it would be largely——

Mr. COOPER. Is not the whole talk of the Democratic Party that the American consumer is their special consideration?

Mr. PALMER. Oh, but we want to be fair——

Mr. COOPER. Are you protecting the American manufacturer?

Mr. PALMER. We want to be fair to the American consumer and fair to the American manufacturer. [Applause on the Democratic side.] With a prohibitive rate the consumer has no chance except when the foreigner dumps his surplus here. With a competitive rate we give the consumer his chance and his consideration; and in order to be fair to the American manufacturer, after having given the consumer his chance, we say we will hold conditions where they are when we give the consumer this chance. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Has the gentleman from Pennsylvania, or anyone on behalf of the committee, made an approximate estimate as to what would probably be the increased imports under the new measure if enacted into law?

Mr. PALMER. I have not seen any estimate of that kind.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Has the gentleman from Pennsylvania any idea what the increased importations may reasonably be expected to be under these rates?

Mr. PALMER. I have seen no estimate. It is a difficult thing to estimate.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Does not the gentleman think it is an essential question in a tariff measure which may revolutionize or materially change the economic conditions of the country?

Mr. PALMER. They could not be large because they are limited to 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I notice the language used by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is that they expect material increases in importations, but no figures are given.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. PALMER. Not to ask me about figures, because I am not discussing estimates, for I do not have them now at hand.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania are talking at cross purposes. I think the gentleman from South Dakota did not ask for figures or estimates under the dumping clause, but estimates under the bill generally.

Mr. PALMER. I understood the gentleman from South Dakota to be talking about the dumping clause.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman must have made some estimates under the bill generally, because there is an estimate of customs receipts.

Mr. PALMER. My recollection is that they amount to two hundred and eighty-six millions. The report will show that

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. The report does not show the estimates as to what will come in under the increase of the free list. It gives an opinion as to what the importations will be made under tariff duties, but no estimate as to what may be expected as an increase in importations all along the line under the bill.

Mr. PALMER. I think if the gentleman will take the trouble to read the report, and I prefer that he should do that rather than to rely upon the memory of any man, he will find that the report goes fully into a comparative estimate of the importations and of duties under this law and the present law.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania permit an interruption?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. CULLOP. Will not the greater benefit resulting from the enactment of competitive rates be in the regulating of the sale of home products and thus preventing monopoly in regard to manipulation of prices of home production?

Mr. PALMER. Undoubtedly. I have tried to show that. It is our contention, and I think it is absolutely demonstrable, that the increased imports which will come through the custom-house by reason of decreased duties will result in sufficient competition with the American manufacturer to compel him to reduce the price of his product for the benefit and relief of the American consumer without decreasing his production sufficiently to interfere with the demand for labor. In other words, the reduction in price of the product of the American manufacturer, by reason of the competition resulting from decreased duties, will be charged in nearly every case against the profits which capital in manufacturing lines of industry now earns in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I have foresworn the pleasure of discussing the tariff problem as an academic or even economic question, and have evaded the duty of discussing this bill in some detail because I have felt that the effect of this law upon business is the thing in which the people of my own great industrial State are most interested. I am firmly convinced that, given the united support of our own party which will prolong its life until it can have a fair test, it will prove a boon to industry and a great benefit to all the people. It will reduce the price of many commodities which enter into daily consumption; it will push capital into lines where Americans readily excel and thus increase production here, and by removing the false work about the structure of American industry make it a stable and a self-sustaining structure ready to carry a greater share of the world's demands upon the product of capital and labor. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word or two about the metal schedule of this law. First, because our great State of Pennsylvania is perhaps more largely interested in that schedule than any other. For, as I have said on this floor before, in American industry to-day steel is king and Pennsylvania is the royal palace. Also because I had perhaps more to do with the framing of some of the details of that schedule than I had with any other schedule in the law.

A year ago, or a little more, we passed a revision of the steel and iron schedule through this House and through the Senate and up to the President where it was vetoed. It received little criticism worth while either in the House or in the Senate. It has received at the hands of the steel and iron manufacturers, of course, some criticism, but the most startling criticism which was made against the bill, and the one to which I desire to advert for a few minutes, was made by the then President of the United States when he attached his veto to the measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has occupied one hour.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yielded the gentleman further time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. What was it that just took place between the Chair and the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stated to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he had occupied one hour, and the gentleman from Alabama stated that he had yielded further time.

Mr. MANN. I suggest that these things be said so that the House can hear them.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. When the gentleman from Pennsylvania took the floor I yielded to him without limitation of time, and I called the attention of the Chair to the fact.

Mr. MANN. I was not criticizing the gentleman from Alabama or the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but the House desires to know how much time is yielded.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania any specific amount of time.

Mr. MANN. When the gentleman from Alabama yielded to the gentleman from Pennsylvania no one could hear what took place.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I trust this is not to be taken out of my time.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has unlimited time.

Mr. PALMER. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois knows that I do not often abuse the time of the House.

Mr. MANN. I assure the gentleman it is a delight to hear him at any time.

Mr. PALMER. And I shall not take up much more time. The President, as I was saying, declared in his veto message that consideration had evidently been given to the tariff rates upon the heavier forms of iron and steel, but little or no consideration had been given to the rates upon the finer forms of products of iron and steel covered by the schedule; and because, therefore, he was unwilling to agree that the rates upon the finer forms of steel and iron products should be cut so drastically as we had cut them, and for other reasons, perhaps, he would refuse to sign the bill.

Mr. Chairman, on the same day that the President of the United States was making that declaration to the American Congress one of the greatest manufacturers of these finer forms of iron and steel was making an exactly contrary declaration to the American people and to the world. Upon the same day that the President refused to sign a law which would have given relief to American consumers of the articles covered by this schedule, because the manufacturers of the finer forms of steel and iron could not stand the cut, the great firm of Henry Disston & Son was advertising in a copy of the Saturday Evening Post issued on that day, August 14, 1912, this significant and, to my mind, illuminating argument to sell their wares. They call it "a little incident with a world-wide meaning," and at the top of their advertisement they place the facsimile of a letter dated "Amboy, Minn., February 24, 1911," and which reads as follows:

DEAR SIRS: Please send me some of your saw-filing hints and a catalogue showing some of your products.

Gentlemen will remember that the Disston people are manufacturers of saws and tools, files, hammers, hatchets, trowels, and, in fact, about all of the small finer articles by way of tools in the iron and steel trade. Their correspondent goes on to say by way of postscript:

I sent to Germany for one of the best saws they could get, and when it came it had "H. Disston Sons" on it. Then I laughed.
S. O. WIEHL, *Amboy, Minn.*

Mr. Chairman, I should think he would laugh, and the President ought to have laughed, when he was upon the same day sending his message to Congress, over the fact that an American farmer out in Minnesota anxious to get the best and the cheapest tool that he could buy finds that he can get it after American labor at American wages has produced it in the city of Philadelphia, and after its producer has paid the freight tariff across the Atlantic Ocean and the custom tariff into Germany and the freight tariff back to Liverpool and the ocean freight to New York and the freight rates all the way up to Minnesota. I should think he would laugh; but they go on to say:

The first impression of this letter is one of amusement. Then its true and tremendous significance seizes upon the mind.

We could as well have quoted a similar letter that went to England and brought back a Disston saw. There are other countries where saws are manufactured, but in them all the same recognition of the Disston standard prevails.

Disston supremacy is not only world wide but world complete. It rests upon 72 years of progressive experience.

The demand for Disston saws has penetrated by sheer merit not only through every center of civilization but to every remote saw-using settlement and camp on the earth's face.

The Disston standard is everywhere held highest. In England and all her colonies—in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Tasmania, India; and in Germany, Russia, France, Austria-Hungary, and every European country, including Turkey and Greece; and in Egypt and north, south, east, and west Africa; and in China, Japan, Siam, Korea, Siberia—all Asia; and in the Philippines, Straits Settlements, Samoa, Sumatra, Java, Ceylon, Borneo, Hawaii, and South Sea Islands; and in Brazil, Patagonia, the Argentine, Chile, Peru, all South and Central America, and Mexico—in these and innumerable smaller saw markets the term "best" and the term "Disston" mean the same.

So much for saws and files and tools and hammers and hatchets and the finer products of the steel and iron schedules in this bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. As I understand the Disston statement, it referred to saws, but whether the President had saws in his mind is another question. He may have had cutlery or razors. In regard to razors the bill then reduced the duty to 35 per cent, while this bill raises it to 50 per cent. Unless the President was right, why did you raise that duty? Was it because of the hearings before the Senate committee that demonstrated the fact that under a 35 per cent duty the razor industry in this country, as well as other cutlery industries, must go? [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, the Disston people are referring, according to their advertisement, largely to saws, but they mention and picture all of their other products alongside of the advertisement.

Mr. PAYNE. They make machine-made goods.

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. And these people, who have to employ the hand labor to make the little things that are so numerous and are so widespread and involve such a large amount of capital, were the people the President evidently referred to, and the gentleman and his party has proved that the President was right in regard to this thing. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PALMER. Evidently there is a wide disagreement about what the President was referring to, even amongst his Republican friends, because last year, when this advertisement appeared. I called it to the attention of another distinguished Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means, not now a Member of the House, and he said that that might be true, just as the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] says about saws, but, said he: "There are other things in this steel and iron schedule in which you Democrats have ruined the American industry," and I asked him to name one and he picked out a different one. He said, "Watches, for instance." He said: "You have cut the entrails out of the watch business in this country." Why, that was so curious that it was funny, because in this very same magazine, on the same day, on the opposite side of the very same sheet was an advertisement of the American Howard watch in which they say, these American manufacturers of watches, "Six hundred thousand Americans go abroad every year. Once an American tourist preferred a foreign watch; now he goes to Europe with a Howard watch bought over here, or he comes back with a Howard watch bought over there." [Applause on the Democratic side.] I told a friend of mine who is a manufacturer over here in Baltimore about these advertisements. He is in the shoe business. Of course, he is a protectionist.

I think if I had been a shoe manufacturer in recent years I might have been a protectionist myself. He said, just as the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] said, that this may be true about saws and tools, files, hammers, hatchets, and may be true about watches, but it is not true about shoes. Every fellow in his own line of business believes he is up against the worst competition.

Mr. SWITZER rose.

Mr. PALMER. In just a moment. Well, I went out and bought another copy of the Saturday Evening Post. The first thing I saw was an advertisement of a great American shoe, the "Walk-Over." They call it themselves "the shoe for you," and they say, "More than 17,000 pairs bought every day. From Alaska to California, from London to the Fiji Islands, in 84 countries, Walk-Overs set the style for shoes." [Applause on the Democratic side.] I expect, if the gentleman will permit me, when I go out on the street and buy a copy of the Saturday Evening Post, I can prove to him, out of the mouths of the manufacturers of cutlery, that American cutlery are going abroad. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Why did you raise the duty in this bill from 35 per cent in your former bill to 50 per cent now? Now, this man of straw does not answer the question.

Mr. PALMER. Well, we made a change in the classification of pocket cutlery and razors, making two classifications instead of one, because we considered that one rate on all the pocket cutlery and all the razors would be prohibitive as to some while competitive as to others, and therefore, in order to induce competition for both branches, and especially to the more expensive grade of cutlery and razors, we made the two classifications instead of one as in the previous bill.

Mr. PAYNE. They are exactly in line with the President's suggestion, of course. If the gentleman will go far enough back—it will not be a great while ago—in the Saturday Evening Post, he will see gravely asserted there that the woolen schedule in the present law is 50 per cent higher than the woolen schedule in the law that preceded it. He can find almost anything in the Saturday Evening Post. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. PALMER. I am not speaking of correspondents' articles in the Saturday Evening Post, but about the admissions of American manufacturers placed in the paid advertising columns of the magazine to induce trade, and their admission must be taken as the truth, as far as the foreign trade is concerned.

Mr. PAYNE. May I ask the gentleman about the dumping clause, to go back to that? Of course, the gentleman knows that Germany and some other foreign countries pay an export bounty on goods in order to get them into this country, and in that way they are able to get them in. The Government even pays it, and in that way they are able to get into this country with their goods and get around the duty, and especially is that so on sugar and other items—and for the next three years there is a duty on sugar in this bill. This dumping clause does not seem to meet that proposition in any way. It is not the sale here by the manufacturer of an article cheaper than the price there. He gets the same price, but somebody else pays the bounty, and in that way he can get his goods in, notwithstanding the duty here.

Mr. PALMER. I think the gentleman from New York will find as to all of these items—he is speaking of the item particularly of sugar, I assume—that as to most of these articles in the export trade there is no bounty upon those which enter into competition with American producers, although there is a very considerable concession in freight rates and the establishment of commercial agencies by Governments abroad——

Mr. PAYNE. Established by the Government and paid for by the Government.

Mr. PALMER. In my judgment, that will not complicate the administration of this clause in the tariff law.

Mr. PAYNE. On the other hand, does not the gentleman think it will entirely nullify the effect of it if they ever get to that question and get beyond the question of undervaluation and the impossibility to prove it?

Mr. PALMER. I think it is just as easy to determine the market value of the article for the uses of the administration of this dumping clause as it is to determine the market value as the gentleman from New York wrote it into his bill, for administrative purposes. If one is impossible, the other is impossible.

Mr. PAYNE. And notwithstanding all that, we have this almost universal effort by fraudulent undervaluation to evade every ad valorem duty in the existing law; and the gentleman's bill only aggravates that by multiplying the ad valorem duties in this bill.

Mr. PALMER. I am afraid that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has not yet done us the honor to read the administrative features of this law or he would not make such a statement.

Mr. SWITZER. I have a constituent who manufactures galvanized steel sheets. He desires to know why you have changed the specific duty of $2.50 a ton on manganese to 15 per cent ad valorem, which he says now at present price will make it $8 or $9 a ton? I am asking for information. I am not acquainted with the steel or iron business personally. He says it is an increase of 300 per cent, and the tendency is to protect the United States Steel Corporation against independent producers like this steel plant in my district.

Mr. PALMER. I will answer the gentleman's question, but I do not want him to make a speech in my time. He asks for the reason for the change of this rate on ferromanganese. I had intended to leave that to the discussion of the bill under the five-minute rule, but I have no objection to saying now that our purpose in making the rate on ferromanganese was entirely as a revenue-producing proposition. The new rate does not protect the United States Steel Corporation. The fact is that ferromanganese in this country is not made for sale by anybody. The United States Steel Corporation makes ferromanganese for its own use exclusively, and does not sell a dollar's worth that I have ever heard of. All other consumers of ferromanganese in the country import it. And we have believed, in view of the fact that it is such a small part of the final cost of the

product of the steel manufactures of the land, that it was the proper place for the levying of a purely revenue duty. And we have come to the same conclusion in respect to that which the Payne committee came to and stood by until the pressure of American manufacturers became too strong for them in the Sixty-first Congress, and in conference they were compelled to take the duty off ferromanganese by a subterfuge, throwing it into the pig-iron schedule, where it had no business to be.

Now, let me tell you one thing further about ferromanganese. There is 1 per cent of it in a ton of steel. The present price of ferromanganese is unusually high. I think it is about $60 a ton.

Mr. SWITZER. It has been $180 a ton.

Mr. PALMER. Oh, no; it has not. I never heard of ferromanganese at $180. The gentleman is thinking of some of the other ferro alloys, which run to immense prices. It means, then, 60 cents worth of ferromanganese goes into a ton of steel, and our tax at 15 per cent means that the American steel manufacturers will pay a tax to the Government of 9 cents even at this high price upon every ton of steel produced. I have never believed that such a small tax could be carried into the final product of the steel and iron manufactures so as to be of any material harm to the consumer, and believe, therefore, that these steel and iron manufacturers ought to pay, especially with ore on the free list largely for their benefit, this small tax upon their product.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit one question?

Mr. PALMER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Does the Steel Trust make all the ferromanganese it uses? I understand it does.

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Then the trust would pay no tariff on ferromanganese, but the independent iron manufacturer would.

Mr. PALMER. I have said that.

Mr. COOPER. I did not hear the gentleman say it.

Mr. PALMER. I said exactly that, that there is no ferromanganese made in this country for sale. The steel and iron corporation makes ferromanganese for its own use, and all other producers of steel and iron buy ferromanganese from abroad. When the Payne law was written they had ferromanganese at even a higher rate than this.

Mr. COOPER. Then, if the gentleman will permit an interruption——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. PALMER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. If the Steel Trust makes its own ferromanganese and does not import any, and all the other manufacturers, the little fellows, do import it, the Steel Trust will not pay this duty, but the small manufacturers will. Will not that be the situation?

Mr. PALMER. Well, we can not write a law that will make everybody pay a duty at the customhouse.

Mr. COOPER. But we are expected to write a law that will not discriminate in favor of the trust and against the independent producers.

Mr. PALMER. This will not protect the United States Steel Corporation in any particulars, because it does not sell this article.

Mr. SWITZER. If the gentleman will permit, how does it help the poor man by placing a duty of 300 per cent on all that he uses?

Mr. PALMER. I have not said that this is written to help anybody. It is written in the law as a tax, which we think the steel and iron manufacturers ought to pay, and ought to be willing to pay.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. PALMER. Yes; but I am anxious to conclude.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. If I correctly understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania, he stated that this was an advantage to the Steel Trust to the amount of 9 cents a ton.

Mr. PALMER. Well, the gentleman has not understood me correctly, and I refuse to have remarks of that kind put into the remarks I may make. I refuse to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the gentleman will permit, the gentleman says there will be a payment to the Government of 9 cents a ton?

Mr. PALMER. At the present price, which is a high price.

Mr. MURDOCK. Under the gentleman's theory, who pays the tax?

Mr. PALMER. Of course the consumer pays the tax. No man now will argue anything to the contrary. The consumer pays it. There is no doubt about that. But we ought to levy the tax on the consumer, where, when the consumer does pay it, it will be so distributed as to be the least burden to him. I say, with reference particularly to ferromanganese, that there is not an item in all the tariff law which enters in such a small degree into the final cost of the product which the consumer does actually buy and use as it, and since we must levy a tax on the consumer, which the consumer must undoubtedly pay, to operate the Government, it is as easy a place as I know of, and a place where it can be laid with the least burden in all the length and breadth of this law.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. PALMER. I do; but I am anxious to conclude.

Mr. AUSTIN. I want to ask the gentleman one question. I want to know who appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means and asked for iron ore to be put on the free list?

Mr. PALMER. We put iron ore on the free list in the Underwood bill in the Sixty-second Congress. So far as I recall, there was not anybody who came before the Committee on Ways and Means and asked us to do it again. I suspect it was assumed we would.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is it not a fact that everybody who appeared here protested against iron ore being put on the free list, and that nobody asked you to do it?

Mr. PALMER. Well, it is also a fact that every American manufacturer, practically, who came before the Committee on Ways and Means during all our hearings protested against our reducing the tariffs to any degree. The problem we had to face was different from and harder than that which the Republican committees have always had to face. We were compelled to write this law in the interest of the people against the protests of these manufacturers, while all that you had to do was to write into the law what the manufacturers asked you to put there. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. AUSTIN. One more question. You say you are not writing this tariff bill in the interest of the manufacturers?

Mr. PALMER. I said we were writing it to be fair to the American manufacturers.

Mr. AUSTIN. Did it not appear in the testimony that a steel company located in the gentleman's district and in the gentleman's town imported 350,000 tons of iron ore from Sweden, upon which the duty is 15 cents a ton, and the gentleman placed that iron ore now upon the free list of this bill?

Mr. PALMER. Well, I thought the gentleman from Tennessee, after having tried that same thing two years ago, would desist from any further effort to link me up with a desire to make profit for the Bethlehem Steel Co., of my district. I treat that company as I would treat all others. We are playing no favorites.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am not linking the gentleman with the Bethlehem Steel Co. I am asking the gentleman if this record does not show that statement to be true?

Mr. PALMER. I do not know whether it does or not. But I know that this is true, that the Bethlehem Steel Co., which operates in my district, does import iron ore. I say that frankly. And we did put iron ore on the free list. The gentleman knows as well as any Member of this House, however, that that was not done by reason of any effort on the part of the Representative of that district to get a special privilege for a producer in his district [applause on the Democratic side], because he knows, and has been told before, and knows it to be a fact that the present Representative of that district is not in any sense a spokesman for a great protected interest, either the Bethlehem Steel Co. or any other.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am not stating or insinuating——

Mr. PALMER. But implying——

Mr. AUSTIN. I am asking you if the record does not show what I have stated, and that the remission or the placing of iron ore on the free list benefits the steel corporation in your district to the extent of $42,000 a year on importation of Swedish iron ore alone, taking that amount of money out of the Treasury and turning it over to the Bethlehem Steel Co.?

Mr. GORDON. What of it if it does?

Mr. PALMER. No; that is not an accurate statement. I go as far as the truth will permit any man to go when I say that iron ore is imported by the Bethlehem Steel Co. and that we have put iron ore on the free list. But iron ore is imported by many other independent steel or iron makers of the country besides the Bethlehem Steel Co., and the gentleman knows that. And I will say another thing to the gentleman, that the Bethlehem Steel Co. are large producers of the kind of steel which takes ferromanganese, and that company will pay a bigger tax on its ferromanganese by reason of the change in this law than

it will save by the putting of iron ore on the free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt just at this point?

Mr. PALMER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LLOYD. In conversation with Mr. Schwab last night he made the statement that the worst enemy to the profits of the Bethlehem Steel Co. in the United States was their Representative in Congress, Mr. PALMER. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PALMER. Well——

Mr. LLOYD. And, further than that, he said that he himself had put into the business $35,000,000 in seven years and that he had made 20 per cent on his investment during that time. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PALMER. I did not expect to go into any discussion about the politics of my district, but I think it is probably fair to say this, which states the full fact, that, while it may be true that the Bethlehem Steel Co. is pretty violently opposed to the present Representative of that district in Congress, the opposition of the Bethlehem Steel Co. is entirely confined to that of its chief owner, to the struggle of Mr. Schwab himself to keep me out of Congress, and while he may boast that he is my chief political enemy, I thank God that the men who work in his mills are my best political friends. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has stated that the tariff on ferromanganese is a tariff for revenue only. In view of that statement, and in view of the statement that the gentleman at the left [Mr. LLOYD] has made regarding what Mr. Schwab said, do you not think it would be a very good idea for the Democratic Party, as a revenue measure only, to continue the tariff on Swedish iron ore imported by the Bethlehem people, who have made 20 per cent upon their capital during the last several years, and make them pay a little of the money for the carrying on of this Government?

Mr. PALMER. I have explained to the gentleman why we put iron ore on the free list. The iron ore in this country is practically controlled by the trust. The chief help which the independent can get, which he wants to get in fighting the trust, is free iron ore from abroad. If, after the statement I have made, the gentleman gets any satisfaction out of the fact that the Bethlehem Steel Co. will perhaps save a litle money by free iron ore, he is entitled to it. It has not been enough to win the Bethlehem Steel Co. over to my support. I know that.

Mr. SUMNERS. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that this bill reduces the tariff on the articles that the Bethlehem Steel Co. produces?

Mr. PALMER. Oh, very largely. We reduce the average ad valorem rate of duty under this schedule from 34.35 per cent to about 20 per cent. We reduce it all along the line, on every article which is produced by the Bethlehem Steel Co. in my district, and we have put upon the free list one of the chief products of the Bethlehem Steel Co.—steel rails. I do not believe any Member on this side has a right to play favorites with the interests of his own district, and my people do not expect me to do it.

I want to add just one thing about ferromanganese, so gentlemen may understand. Perhaps no tariff bill can be entirely scientific, but we are trying at least to write a bill which will be logical and symmetrical. I believe that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], when he indulged in tariff making, tried to have logic and symmetry at least throughout his bill. We put ferromanganese in with ferroalloys of other kinds, just the same as the gentleman from New York did. Ferrosilicon, ferromolybdenum, ferrotitanium, ferrotungsten, and all those ferroalloys, all made in the crucible like ferromanganese, ought under every reason to bear the same rate as ferromanganese; and so we put them all in one paragraph at one rate, as the Payne bill did. And we have restored the symmetry of that section of the bill which was destroyed when the American manufacturers mustered sufficient influence in the other branch of this Congress, and with the conferees, to hide ferromanganese in the pig-iron clause, in order to deceive the people into the belief that it was paying a higher duty than it really was.

Mr. HARDY and Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH rose.

Mr. PALMER. I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH].

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I am asking this question purely for information. Why was rice left on the dutiable list?

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman from Michigan will excuse me.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. The gentleman is a member of the committee.

Mr. PALMER. I said a while ago, and the gentleman wants to be fair, that I did not intend to discuss the whole bill, but that I intended to pay some attention to the metal schedule.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HARDY. Is not the Bethlehem Steel Co. a rather large exporter of steel and iron?

Mr. PALMER. Very.

Mr. HARDY. The drawback clause will enable them to get back a large part of such duty as they pay on imported articles, while the smaller manufacturer would pay that duty and never get anything back.

Mr. PALMER. That is quite true.

Mr. MURDOCK. If I understand the gentleman, steel rails are on the free list?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman expect any change in price by reason of that, or what will be the result?

Mr. PALMER. I frankly doubt whether there will be any change in the price of steel rails by their being put on the free list, because, as we all know, there is one of those world-wide trusts in the matter of steel rails. In effect, the manufacturers of steel rails the world over have agreed upon a division of territory and the fixing of prices with respect to the entire world, except South America, which is a free and open market to the manufacturers of steel rails both in this country and abroad, and where they are able to get steel rails at a considerable less price than we do in this country or Europe.

We put rails on the free list with the thought that if that agreement should fall down, if there should be a break in it by reason of the disaffection of the foreign or the American producer, the American people might then get some benefit from free rails in this country.

Now, they tell us that these high tariff rates have been made in the interest of American labor. They tell us, especially with respect to the steel and iron schedule, that the rates were made as they were in order to keep American labor employed. I think we have shown that if the production continues the same labor will continue to be employed, and what we will do by the passage of this law, amongst other things, will be to compel the American manufacturer to sell to the American people his product at as low a figure as he sells it to the Fiji Islander and the Patagonian. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how the division of time rests between this side of the House and the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has used 6 hours and 2 minutes and the gentleman from New York has used 6 hours and 44 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman from New York desire to proceed?

Mr. PAYNE. I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the high example set by our Democratic President in drawing attention to his tariff message by an address from "the throne" is of greater value to the people of the United States than would appear at first blush. In smashing the dull routine of a century and returning to the more or less monarchial but presumably anti-Jeffersonian methods of a Washington and an Adams, the President, who proclaims "a new freedom" from a condition of industrial and national thralldom, the horrors of which are more or less chimerical, has made the millions of victims of this sort of political philosophy "stop, look, and listen." In an age which is somewhat iconoclastic, when froth passes for substance and audacity for truth; when satiated mortals with easy money weary of the workshops and markets and yearn for novelty and sensation, he has compelled "a sitting up" and a "taking notice" which augurs that the tariff question, despised and derided during the recent presidential campaign, will again be considered as of vital importance to public welfare.

FACE THE ISSUE SQUARELY.

Standing upon the Democratic platform and inveighing against the protected industries of the country as "hothouse" growths to be immediately destroyed, the President has awakened employers whose indifference to political intrigues is appalling, as he has stirred the wage earners generally to a realization of their danger.

But, thanks to President Wilson's novel expedient, all the people are beginning to inquire about the tariff. They have learned that the Democratic Party does not propose only to find jobs for its followers but that it intends to squarely face the issue which it has raised with the Republican Party. It is going to attempt to prove that the Republican policy of pro-

tection to American industry, the policy which has raised the American wage standard above all others in the world, is wrong and must be overthrown.

It is not exactly what a majority of the people expected would happen. Those who knew even a little about the question were not prepared to hear so positive and emphatic a stand against protection as the leaders of the party now in power have taken. Hence it was a real service the President performed when he ascended the rostrum in the House to make his daring deliverance.

A TARIFF PRIMER.

It is because I believe there is urgent need for publicity and careful study of the tariff question that I have written my address in the form of "a tariff primer," which I send to the desk of the Clerk, whose assistance I shall ask in propounding the questions therein noted:

Question (by the Clerk). When was the first tariff act passed?

Answer (by Mr. MOORE). The first act passed was a tariff act. It was approved by President George Washington July 4, 1789, and was regarded as an American declaration of commercial independence.

Question. What was its purpose?

Answer. To support the Government, discharge the debts of the United States, and to encourage and protect manufactures by levying duties on goods, wares, and merchandise imported. These purposes were specifically set forth in the first section of the act, and they were intended to relieve the Colonial States of the necessity of purchasing supplies abroad, to keep our money in the United States, and to discourage paternalism.

THE FIRST ACT FOR PROTECTION.

Question. Did this first act of Congress stimulate and encourage American manufactures?

Answer. It not only stimulated and encouraged them, but it gave confidence and hope to the youth of America and made us a manufacturing as well as an agricultural Nation.

Question. To what extent has the tariff system thus begun been continued?

Answer. There have been various changes in the tariff system according to the views of political parties which have happened to be in control of affairs. What is now known as the Republican Party has usually favored the levying of tariff duties sufficiently high to cover the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. The Republican platform of 1912 reaffirmed this position, declaring that "the Republican tariff policy has been of the greatest benefit to the country, developing our resources, diversifying our industries, and protecting our workingmen against competition with cheaper labor abroad, thus establishing for our wage earners the American standard of living." The Republican platform further declared that "the protective tariff is so woven into the fabric of our industrial and agricultural life that to substitute for it a tariff for revenue only would destroy many industries and throw millions of our people out of employment. The products of the farm and of the mine should receive the same measure of protection as other products of American labor."

DEMOCRATS AND HARD TIMES.

Question. What is the Democratic attitude toward the tariff?

Answer. Although Thomas Jefferson and other early Democrats believed in the encouragement of American industries and the imposition of tariff duties for that purpose, the Democratic Party has taken issue with the Republican Party in certain of its platforms and has contended that what Republicans call protection was unwarranted by the Constitution of the United States and that tariffs should be levied only for the purpose of raising revenue. This was the position taken by the State of South Carolina in 1832, when it nullified the tariff acts of 1828 and 1832. The Confederate Constitution of 1861 also denied the right of the Government to levy "any duties or taxes," "to promote or foster any branch of industry," holding that such duties should be levied only for revenue to carry on the Government. During the administration of Grover Cleveland, the so-called Wilson-Gorman bill was passed under Democratic auspices, and while it undertook to levy duties for revenue only, it did fix certain protective rates, but none of them sufficient to bring in enough revenue to run the Government. The result was that many American industries, forced to compete with cheap foreign labor, were obliged to discontinue business, hundreds of concerns became bankrupt and hundreds of thousands of people were thrown out of employment. The full effects of this disastrous Democratic bill were felt from 1893 to 1897. Not only did the Government have to issue bonds to meet its obligations incurred during this period, but it was further humiliated by having to permit thousands of its factory workers to go to free soup houses for sustenance.

FARMERS AND MILL MEN HURT.

Question. Who do you think were most affected by the change?

Answer. In the last analysis, the workingman and the farmer. When the employers found they could not compete successfully with the foreign manufacturers they closed their mills. For a time the workmen were able to live upon the savings they had accumulated under the McKinley protective-tariff law which preceded the Wilson-Gorman Act, but after their savings were gone, they were without the means to purchase food. Thus the farmer lost his best customer. Prices came down and commodities were cheap, but the earning power of the consumer was destroyed. It made little difference to him if he could buy a suit of clothes or a horse and wagon for $5 if he did not have the $5, and thousands of them did not have the $5. The distress in the cities was greater than it was on the farm, because the farmers could get along with what the farms produced, but they could not sell their produce at a profit. On the other hand, the city workman's cellar was empty, and if he had no wages he was in a bad way. One of the lessons of that unhappy period was the determining of the very close relationship between the producer and the consumer. It proved that their interests were identical and that in times of adversity there was little or no difference between them.

END OF CHEAP GOODS.

Question. What efforts were made to correct the distressing consequences of this Democratic policy?

Answer. The people who had suffered as a result of Democratic blundering restored the Republican Party to power and in 1897 a new tariff bill, framed for purposes of protection and commonly known as the Dingley bill, was enacted. This new law raised a tariff barrier against the tremendous volume of foreign imports that had "made goods cheap" under the Wilson law, compelled the return to the United States of capital that had gone to Europe, Canada, and other countries, and being in the nature of a guaranty to business men that they could resume their enterprises, and to farmers that they would again have an American market for their products, the tide of prosperity returned to the United States and instead of bankruptcy there was great rejoicing in American homes.

RESTORATION UNDER DINGLEY BILL.

Question. Can you give some data pertaining to this progress under the Dingley bill?

Answer. Yes; the "Tariff Handbook," just issued by the Democratic Ways and Means Committee (April, 1913), although not thoroughly reliable, quotes the number of establishments engaged in manufactures as being 214,954 in 1904, at the beginning of the Wilson law, and 266,805 in 1909, under the Dingley law. During this five years capital invested increased from $12,515,788,542 to $18,151,053,523; the number of wage earners, independent of salaried and other workers, advanced from 5,220,461 to 6,310,454; wages jumped from $2,461,279,407 to $3,231,207,579; the cost of material used increased from $8,343,639,649 to $11,928,209,567, while the value of the manufactured products advanced from $14,470,690,353 to $20,234,488,582. The dutiable list under the Dingley law in 1909 affected 6,052,312 wage earners in a total of 242,029 establishments representing a capital of $17,148,987,686. The Dingley law was successful as a promoter of industry within the United States and as a revenue raiser. It aimed to levy duties on imports that were in the nature of luxuries and contributed more than one-third of the total revenue of the Government. Under it wages steadily advanced throughout the United States, while there was also a steady increase in the cost of the products of agriculture. It is true that while the mill worker obtained higher pay it cost him more for the supplies he purchased from the farm, but it is also true that during the period of the Dingley law the hours of labor were generally reduced, the comforts of living were everywhere increased, and the people, without regard to section or employment, enjoyed conveniences, comforts, pleasures, and even the luxuries of life, to a greater degree than ever before in the Nation's history. Nevertheless, because of certain alleged inequalities in a few of the provisions of the Dingley law, and because its free list was not extended, there was an incessant agitation against it.

SAPPERS AND MINERS AT WORK.

Question. How long was the Dingley law in force?

Answer. It was effective from the date of its approval July 24, 1897, until the Payne bill went into effect August 5, 1909.

Question. What was the reason for this change?

Answer. One reason was that the Democrats who were out of power were continually misrepresenting the tariff question, contending that it created trusts and large enterprises and that under it Americans acquired wealth too rapidly. Republicans generally were too busy with their business affairs to answer these accusations and finally the people began to accept them as true. Another reason was that the growth of population in the United States due to the inspiration of our success and prosperity, having given us the greatest home market in the world, had invited the attention and concern of other great nations which coveted our purchasing power and sought to break the firm hold our protective laws gave us upon our own trade. With establishments that cost less and with labor that was skilled but poorly paid, they knew they could compete for the American dollar in the American market, if their cheap goods could be gotten over our tariff wall. Another reason for the change was that our own people had forgotten our former distresses; in fact, we were restive under too much prosperity. In response to what the Republican Party leaders believed to be a popular demand, although there are many reasons for believing that the demand was skillfully worked up by the foreign enemies of the protective system, the Payne bill was enacted into law. It having been contended that some of the rates in the Dingley law were too high and that the tariff should be revised downward, the Payne law undertook to make reductions in duties, but this did not satisfy the enemies of the protective system within the Republican Party or without.

REPUBLICANS YIELDED TO CHANGES.

Question. Did the Republicans change the Dingley law?

Answer. In the platform of 1908 the Republican Party declared in favor of a revision of the tariff at a special session of Congress. It did not say that revision should be a downward revision, but it did declare against "excessive duties," although maintaining that "the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries." Moreover, inasmuch as certain trade agreements with Germany and other countries had been made by President Roosevelt, which seemed to give undue advantage to foreign goods over those of American production, the platform declared for a maximum and minimum tariff by which the President might thereafter be guided when the opportunity to make favorable treaties should arise. In consequence of this party pledge a special session of Congress was called, which resulted in the passage and approval by President Taft of the so-called Payne bill of August 5, 1909, the existing tariff law.

PAYNE LAW GROWTH PHENOMENAL.

Question. Did the Payne bill revise the tariff downward?

Answer. It did revise the tariff downward, and while attempting to maintain the protective principle it equalized certain duties that had been objectionable, and altogether proved a most effective revenue measure. Under the Payne law the industries of the country continued to thrive and wages continued to increase, while the hours of labor and working conditions generally improved. The value of manufactures in 1912 far exceeded $20,000,000,000, the farms produced nearly $9,000,000,000, our imports exceeded $1,000,000,000, and our exports exceeded $2,000,000,000. In view of attacks upon both the Dingley and the Payne laws, it is noteworthy that our population increased from 90,000,000 in 1909, when the Payne bill went into effect, to 95,000,000 in 1912, the latest estimate of the Census Bureau. The wealth of the people of continental United States advanced in those three years from $150,000,000,000 to $175,000,000,000, making an increase in per capita wealth from $1,656.42 in 1909 to $1,834.17 in 1912, the highest aggregate ever attained by the American people.

PEEVED AT PARTY PROGRESS.

Question. If the people enjoyed such wonderful progress, why did they complain?

Answer. They listened to ambitious politicians, agitators without conscience, journalistic party builders, magazines seeking pap, essayists who found it more profitable to write fiction than to work, theoretical college professors, nonproducers generally, and a few sincere reformers, usually misinformed and frequently misled. They contended that the Payne bill was devised in the interest of Schedule K and one or two other horrifying exhibits, which very few of them understood and which fewer undertook to investigate. Color was given to their agitation because in a speech at Winona President Taft made reference to Schedule K as "indefensible," and also because in a reciprocity treaty with Canada the President, without consulting Congress, undertook to make a reciprocal arrangement which most Republicans believed would be disadvantageous to the United States. The President appeared to have been in accord with Mr. Roosevelt and the newspapers upon this question, but the farmers of the country took umbrage at the reciprocity arrangement and joined in the assault upon Schedule K, which had protected the American woolgrowers and manufacturers of wool, largely because they believed reciprocity with Canada as proposed would have the effect of reducing the farmer's prices for the products he had to sell. Thus Schedule K became a scapegoat of the tariff and an excuse for opposing the Republican ticket. But when the Democrats obtained control of the House of Representatives in the Sixty-second Congress and attempted to revise Schedule K in response to the hue and cry that had been raised against it, President Taft was twice compelled to veto their bills. He declared that "more than a million of our countrymen are engaged in the production of wool and the manufactures of woolens; more than a billion of the country's capital is invested in the industry"; and then, adding that "five millions of the American people will be injuriously affected by any ill-advised impairment of the wool and woolen industries," he declared it essential to "proceed prudently in dealing with them upon the basis of ascertained facts rather than hastily and without knowledge to make a reduction of the tariff to satisfy a popular desire."

HAMMERING THE MANUFACTURERS.

Question. Can you explain the prejudice against the wool and cotton schedules?

Answer. It was due very largely to the fact that the disrupters of the Republican Party were intent upon having a "goat." They needed somebody to club, and they picked upon the so-called "robber baron" manufacturers. Since the manufacturer is really the "maker" of raw materials, he is absolutely essential to the welfare of the producer, but no one cared to tolerate him as an economic necessity. The manufacture of cotton goods, particularly of hosiery, languished under low rates imposed by the Dingley law, but began to flourish, giving steady employment to thousands of mill hands, under higher rates accorded by the Payne law. As to this change of rates there was bitter contention, and while hosiery prices were not advanced to the consumer, the mill-worker consumers were better able to buy farmers' products than theretofore.

The wool schedule (Schedule K), however, was the chief bone of contention. The manufacturers were denounced as "malefactors," notwithstanding they were giving employment to tens of thousands of people, many of whom were females, whose mill wages were higher than they could obtain in department stores or in domestic service. The compensatory rates of Schedule K were jeered at and denounced, and this notwithstanding that these rates were designed, first, to protect the American woolgrower against the cheaper wool of Australia and other countries; second, to protect the American woolsorter against the cheaper woolsorter wages of England, and then to protect the American scourer of wool against the scouring wages of England, and so on along the line of the processes of manufacture in the carding, combing, weaving, dyeing, and finishing stages. In each particular occupation overhead charges abroad were one-half what they cost the American manufacturer and the wages were from 50 to 75 per cent less than in the United States. It made no difference, apparently, that every one of these separate branches of industry, from the herdsman who attended the sheep to the jobber who disposed of the cloth to the merchant tailor and the consumer, were imperiled by foreign competition; the manufacturers of the cloth were held up to ridicule and opprobrium.

INJUSTICE TO MAKERS OF CLOTH.

Question. Were the assaults upon the manufacturers justifiable?

Answer. Here and there, no doubt, manufacturers or jobbers made money out of the wool business. It is to be presumed that they had a right to expect to make a profit, otherwise they would not take the risk of venturing upon such an enterprise. But many of them did not make money, and dozens of them were ready to certify that they would take contracts if a steady market for their goods could be guaranteed, to deliver cloth to the consumer for a net profit over their other expenses of 5 cents per yard, or 17½ cents for the 3½ yards of cloth necessary for a suit of clothes. But the manufacturer was not believed. It was still contended by those who sought to use him as the "goat" that he was the man who pocketed the difference between the price the farmer got for his wool to the $20 or $25 paid to the department store for a suit of clothes. In "The New Freedom," Woodrow Wilson, now President, even went so far as to state emphatically that the manufacturer also pocketed the tariff. The truth is that every dollar of tariff is collected by the Government and saves the people, who are both

the producers and the consumers of the land, the expense of internal taxation, which Mr. Wilson and his party now propose to impose upon them; and to say that the manufacturer of cloth is the recipient of the tariff, except to be protected against the lower cost of production abroad, is as absurd as it is to insist that the wool grower of the United States does not actually receive the 11 cents per pound which the Government levies upon foreign wool in the grease. That the farmer should receive it directly in person, and thus deprive the Government of its revenue, would be as preposterous as it would have been to give every citizen 16 silver dollars for 1 gold dollar, as many people really believed would happen if the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, now the Secretary of State, had succeeded in breaking up the Republican Party with his "16 to 1" propaganda.

HIGH COST OF LIVING MISREPRESENTED.

Question. How do you account for the difference between the manufacturer's profit, say 5 cents per yard on cloth, and the price of a suit of clothes?

Answer. About the same way that we would account for the difference in the price of eggs from the time the good farmer's wife in Kansas sells them to the buyer at 12 cents a dozen, to the time they are delivered to the housewife in the big cities at from 40 to 50 cents per dozen. It costs something to maintain an establishment which sends out buyers to meet the farmer's wife. That adds labor and expenses to the cost of 12 cents per dozen; and then it costs something for crates and packing and hauling to the railroad station; that must be added. Then it costs something to build railroads which provide the transportation to the storage warehouses; that should be added to the 12 cents per dozen. And then it costs something to build storage warehouses and set up chemical appliances necessary for the maintenance of the proper degrees of temperature; add that to the 12 cents per dozen. And then it costs something to keep those warehouses going from April or May when the hens are laying, until the snow is on the ground and the price of eggs has advanced—that costs something. Then the jobber or the middleman must be accounted for in disposing of the eggs by the millions, to millions of consumers whose prosperity is essential to their ability to purchase the eggs. And the retail grocer must be accounted for, having his rent to pay, his bookkeeper and clerk hire, his newspaper advertising, his delivery service; all this has to be accounted for. And then the telephone service installed for the lady who buys eggs from the retail grocer and wishes them delivered in packages wrapped with golden string, in wagons handsomely painted and decorated, by delivery boys in brillant uniform. These all cost money and it must be added to the original 12 cents a dozen cost of eggs. And if, perchance, these eggs should be brought out of storage at Christmas time and be served in one of the great hotels of an eastern city, or even in St. Louis or Chicago where the freight rates would be cheaper, an allowance must be made for the excellent style and taste in which the eggs are served, for the flowers that decorate the table and the halls, and for the music that percolates through the palms in "Peacock Alley." These and other trimmings are now required by at least a portion of our modern society, and they all cost money. The farmer does not get the cost of the extras in the original price of his eggs, because the other laborers who appear upon the scene demand compensation for their services.

TARIFF HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH IT.

Question. What has the tariff to do with that?

Answer. With due respect to those who connive at the defeat of the Republican Party, and who blame the tariff for the high cost of living, it has nothing to do with it under the sun. When the maker of the American cloth, whose employees and associates, from the grower of the wool to the weaver, delivers his 3½ yards to the consumer, the tariff protecting all the industries along the line, has been paid. And if 3½ yards were sold at a fairly high price of $3 per yard, or $10.50 for the suit, the "crime of the tariff" was wholly within the $10.50. If the finished suit was sold for $25, the tariff had nothing to do with the difference between $10.50 and $25, except as there may have been some duties upon the trimmings entering into the fashioning of the suit. Therefore, "the high cost of living" that entered into that suit of clothes after the cloth was laid down at $10.50, and which could have been avoided by the consumer making up the suit with his own thread and needle, is chargeable wholly to the agencies he employed, including cutters and seamstresses, to do the work for him. It is labor that gets the difference in the cost between the cloth and the price of the suit, except as the wholesaler, the merchant tailor, or the department store may require or exact a profit. By the same token it was the dozens of agencies and the many kinds of labor employed between the cost of eggs at 12 cents per dozen in Kansas and 50 cents a dozen in New York that derived the benefit of the intervening 38 cents. It was not the tariff at all. The tariff upon eggs was sufficient to induce the eastern buyer to abstain from buying foreign eggs and to induce him to buy Kansas eggs, and the wool-tariff schedule has the same relation to the purchase of foreign or domestic materials. It is obvious that if the Kansas farmer, dissatisfied with the 12 cents a dozen he received for the eggs, desired to take the risk of holding them and preserving them until December and then delivering them in person to the consumer in New York, he could have obtained the ruling retail price, but if he did not want to take the chance of holding the eggs and carrying them in person to the consumer and of sorting the good eggs from "the rots and spots," then it is fair to make an allowance to those who assume the risk, by investing capital and employing labor to distribute his supplies at any season of the year—in times of scarcity as well as in times of plenty. The cost-of-living problem requires a treatment of reason.

THE BUNCOMBE SERVED TO THE PUBLIC.

Question. Were the people informed upon these conditions?

Answer. It is doubtful whether the people stopped to consider them. As a rule they were "too busy" to do more than read the "scare headlines" in the newspapers, and the newspapers finding the people liked sensation, gave them plenty of it. The campaign of 1912 was prolific of denunciation of the rich. Anything in the nature of faultfinding with men who had succeeded in their business was "good stuff" for the Democrats and those who were seeking power by the overthrow of the Republican Party. Even the Decalogue was brought forth as a good thing and a new(?) thing by which people should be guided in the future. The Democratic orator made merry with the mills. He taught the workman to be unhappy and pictured frightful conditions of employment which did not exist. He talked of "watered stock," and of the wealth of J. Pierpont Morgan, and all this he blamed on the Republican tariff. He continued this incessantly in the endeavor to array class against class, although he knew full well that the matters of which he complained were subject to local regulation by law and not by the revocation of customs duties that would destroy the industries. Some years ago it was generally charged that Henry H. Rogers, a man of great wealth, was another such "incubus" as the late Mr. Morgan, but upon the death of each of these gentlemen it was observed that neither the financial nor the industrial worlds stood still; and it was further observed that neither of them carried away the vast accumulations they were supposed to control. To those who stopped to think it was apparent that the money of a Rogers or the money of a Morgan was, after all, the money that is working day by day in the construction and operation of the railroads and the other great enterprises which have brought the East and the West and the North and the South together in bonds of common interest. But while this sort of buncombe seemed to weigh with the unthinking, it is a curious fact that the workingmen were piling up their savings in the banks and savings funds of the country, and that these very moneys were being invested in railroad and other corporate enterprises, through which the workingman depositor was actually obtaining interest on "his investment." The viciousness of these political assaults upon industry is illustrated by the fact that in 1910 there were approximately 273,000 wage-earning depositors in one Philadelphia saving fund, who had $111,000,000 invested in the upbuilding of railroads and other great enterprises throughout the country. Doubtless many of these depositors were not aware that in listening to the enemies of a Republican tariff they were actually encouraging the depreciation and destruction of their own property.

MOLDERS OF PUBLIC OPINION.

Question. Did the newspapers have anything to do with this agitation?

Answer. They certainly did. They had a large interest in the tariff law. What the President had attempted to do in the matter of Canadian reciprocity included free trade and lower duties with respect to printing paper and wood pulp and other articles of Canadian production, and the success of the treaty would have been of great advantage to these powerful molders of public opinion. But Congress did not approve the treaty which the President had made and many of the newspapers were hostile in consequence. The attacks upon the Payne law were renewed, a division arose in the Republican Party, and repeated arguments in favor of the maintenance of the protective system, notwithstanding the few objectionable items in the thousands of items of the bill, did not avail. One of the chief reasons for Republican defeat, apart from continued political agitation, was the opposition or indifference of the newer

generation of voters, who, having no recollection of the Wilson-Gorman period and being themselves prosperous, assumed that a change from Republican policy would do no harm. "What is protection to you?" asked the college professor of the student, whose remittances from home were regular and ample in 1912. "And what is protection to you?" asked the political agitator of 1912 of the bricklayer earning his $6 a day. And generally the answer came swift and smart, "Don't worry; forget it." And so they voted. The effect of their vote was to declare against the Payne law, notwithstanding it brought about our greatest prosperity. You see the "Don't Worry Club" lives up to its motto with respect to the tariff when Uncle Sam is working.

A STUDY IN FREE LISTS.

Question. Did the Payne law increase the free list?

Answer. It increased the free list even to a greater extent than ever before, but still maintained sufficient revenue to meet the needs of the Government. Imports admitted free under the Payne law in 1912 were valued at $881,512,987, or $105,000,000 more than in 1911. The free imports were greater under the Payne law than under any Democratic law. More goods were admitted free than came in subject to duty. The percentage of free goods imported was 53.73 in 1912, or 3 per cent more than in 1911, a percentage higher than that of the Wilson-Gorman law, which attained 48.56, but notwithstanding this exceedingly high percentage of free imports which cut the revenue from $326,561,683.14 in 1910 to $304,899,366.08 in 1912, the duty collected per capita in 1912 was $3.15 against $3.25 in 1911, $3.50 in 1910, $3.21 in 1909, $3.13 in 1908, and $3.72 in 1907. And while under the Payne law the duty per capita was steadily falling, proving that the so-called "tariff burden upon the people" was being reduced, the imports per capita were steadily rising, having reached the high mark in 1912, to wit, $16.94, or twice the volume of per capita imports of 15 years before. But while the much-berated tariff was thus being reduced the internal revenue, which is derived directly from the people, was advancing from $246,212,644 in 1909 to $321,612,200 in 1912, or more than was collected from the tariff, without any special complaint from anybody except the producers of liquors and tobacco and the dealers therein. In fact, the imperceptible burden of the tariff, estimated at $3.15 per capita, the maintenance of which has a direct relation to the employment of millions of farm and factory workers, was anathema, while the greater and more direct burden of the internal revenue aroused no wonderment and scarcely any comment. Thus it appears that the people had come to believe that it would be better for them to increase their own internal taxes rather than to share their burden with the foreign business man who desired to worm his way into the American market or the importer who preferred to spend American money in foreign countries.

DISPLACEMENT OF AMERICAN BILLIONS.

Question. Is the extension of the free list good for the country?

Answer. The protectionist does not think so, and yet to gratify what seemed to be a popular demand the Payne law brought in in 1912 the largest volume of free goods ever imported. The value of these free foreign goods in that year was $881,512,987. In plain English, we sent that much money abroad to buy foreign goods in one year, when we might just as well have spent it in our own country. The year previous, 1911, we sent abroad $777,000,000; in 1910, $761,000,000; in 1909, $600,000,000. The total amount for foreign purchases sent out of the country under the much-maligned Payne law in less than four years of its operation was approximately $3,000,000,000. The money that thus left the country to buy foreign goods under the free list would have been sufficient to build 10 Panama Canals. But we preferred to send that money abroad, and we did so. Among the articles admitted free of duty were hides and skins valued for 1912 at $102,000,000. They were put on the free list because the people were led to believe the trusts, supposed to control American hides, would destroy the tanners and shoemakers. When the duty was removed from hides the price of hides went up and the price of shoes did not come down, and it also developed that the so-called trusts were as influential in the control of foreign hides as they were of the domestic. The Government lost the duty which had in 1908 amounted to $1,959,434.73. Another item on the free list was coffee, imported in 1912 to the value of $117,000,000; it was made free because the agitators or the manipulators did not want to pay a duty. The consumer got no benefit from the repeal of the duty because the export country levied an export tax on coffee and accepted for itself what the United States had given away. The importer was relieved of the duty, but the consumer paid for coffee at the same old rate. It was not a reduction of living-cost, but a deliberate subterfuge operating to deceive the people while pretending to work in their behalf, and yet the people believed the agitators for free hides and the agitators for free coffee, just as they were led to believe the agitators against the Payne law.

WE GET "ART"; THEY GET MONEY.

Question. Have you any other illustrations showing how the people are fooled?

Answer. Yes; "art works" is suspicious. When the Payne committee yielding to "unselfish" clamor put "art works" upon the free list in 1909 the idea was to encourage art and to win over a few of the "old masters" for American art galleries. In 1909 "art works" came in free to the value of $549,661. In 1910 they jumped in value to $19,114,407.19. In 1911 the value of these "art works" coming in free had reached $21,045,921, and in 1912 they climbed to the enormous value of $35,116,930.75. This was a direct displacement of $75,000,000 of good American money in four years, not for food or necessities, but for "art works," upon which to feast the eyes and inspire the applause of the connoisseur. The people, or somebody claiming to represent them, demanded "free art," and they got it by "blowing in" $75,000,000 of American money for the enrichment of foreign artists and picture dealers. The much heralded purchase of a single painting from one of the English collections, at a cost of $500,000, is a reminder that if that money had remained in the United States where it was earned, it would have been sufficient to pay $1,000 a year to 500 men, who could thus have supported a population of 2,500 in any city or village of the United States for a whole year. If these items, wisely or unwisely yielded in the Payne law, reacted upon the American people, imposing upon them a charge rather than a relief, they are to be continued in the Underwood bill in greater volume and for the avowed purpose of encouraging foreign competition.

THE UNDERWOOD BILL AND ITS MEANING.

Question. What do you mean by the Underwood bill?

Answer. The bill introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who is chairman of the Democratic Ways and Means Committee, and the exponent in the House of Representatives of the theories of Woodrow Wilson, the newly elected President of the United States.

Question. Were the Democrats commissioned by the people to write a tariff bill embodying the ideas of President Wilson?

Answer. The Democrats think they were, although apparently a majority of the voters of the United States are not in sympathy with Mr. UNDERWOOD or Mr. Wilson. The protectionists of the country divided their votes between Mr. Taft and Mr. Roosevelt, so that Mr. Wilson was elected although he is the leader of a minority party.

Question. What is the objection to the tariff plans of Mr. UNDERWOOD and President Wilson?

Answer. They are believed to be destructive of the industries that have been created in the United States under a protective tariff system. They are not actually for free trade with foreign nations, but they are so close to it in an effort to force competition upon the foreigners' terms as to discourage American enterprises and drive existing industries out of business. We have always boasted in this country that it was a land of opportunity, and we have flattered ourselves that the energetic young American was entitled to the fruits of his toil. If he should undertake to start a mill under the proposed new system, those who work for him could not expect to earn more than is now obtained for similar work in foreign countries, because the right of protection against the lower wages paid abroad would be denied. In other words, the opportunity to start the mill in this country would not be worth while, and the wage earner as well as the mill owner would both be out of employment.

THE PRESIDENT'S HOTHOUSE BANANAS.

Question. Wherein does President Wilson approve of any such doctrine?

Answer. In numerous speeches and particularly in a book entitled "The New Freedom," published this year, 1913, in which, to illustrate his belief with regard to the tariff, he refers to the very improbable "privilege" of raising bananas in Connecticut or Michigan.

"If we should undertake to raise bananas under such circumstances," says the President with a slight show of sarcasm, "we shall have in Connecticut or Michigan or somewhere else miles of hothouses in which thousands of happy American workingmen, with full dinner pails, will be raising bananas, to be sold at a quarter apiece." But growing more serious the President adds, "What I am trying to point out to you now is that this 'protective' tariff, so called, has become a means of fostering the growth of particular groups of industry at the expense of the economic vitality of the rest of the country."

all of which he likens to a garden that must be thoroughly weeded out. In this same chapter, without regard to the difference in wage and living conditions and of the cost of production at home and abroad, the President asks where and when it happened that the "boasted genius of America became afraid to go out into the open and compete with the world?"

The question has the true ring of the jingo, but the answer is that a $3 wage in the United States can not compete with a $1 wage in Germany without the loss of $2, nor can an educated civilized American make much headway if he has to compete in living conditions with coolie labor. "It is a condition that confronts us, not a theory."

FORBIDDEN TO IMPROVE ON NATURE.

Question. Has the President given these views to Congress?

Answer. The President briefly reenforced these views in a personal address to Congress. In calling the extraordinary session to consider the Underwood tariff bill, the President insisted that industrial conditions had so changed in the United States and some of them had developed so rapidly that it was our duty now to rid ourselves of all kinds of "artificial advantage" and to "thrive by the law of nature." "Our task," said the President, speaking of tariff schedules, "is to square them with the actual facts. The sooner that is done the sooner we shall escape from suffering from the facts and the sooner our men of business will be free to thrive by the law of nature—the nature of free business—instead of by the law of legislation and artificial arrangement."

"We must abolish," said President Wilson, "everything that bears even the semblance of privilege, or of any kind of artificial advantage, and put our business men and producers under the stimulation of constant necessity to be efficient, economical, and enterprising, masters of competitive supremacy, better workers and merchants than any in the world. Aside from the duties laid upon articles which we do not and probably can not produce, therefore, and the duties laid upon luxuries and merely for the sake of the revenues they yield, the object of the tariff duties henceforth laid must be effective competition, the whetting of American wits by contact with the wits of the rest of the world."

A BOLD NEW PHILOSOPHY.

Question. Is the President preaching a new philosophy?

Answer. Evidently the President has thought out a new philosophy which he proposes to try out on the people. It is in the nature of a program more universal than the "busting of trusts" by President Roosevelt or the altruistic hopes and expectations of President Taft. It is even broader than Mr. Bryan's free-silver issue or his government control of railroads. Mr. Wilson proposes to make progress by halting progress; by destroying much of the great work that has been done under Republican rule and attempting a reconstruction upon the ruins. We are no longer to labor for the success of our own enterprises, but we are to stop where we are and penalize ourselves by stagnation and losses until the other nations have an opportunity to catch up with us. The President has made a bold stroke to harmonize the races, to remove impediments in the course of human progress which, in some respects, have been insurmountable since the beginning. He has started out to obtain an equilibrium of all the people of all the earth by checking the high tide of American progress until the sluggish waters in European and Asiatic channels have reached our level or we have been reduced to theirs. We might just as readily expect to see an equilibrium maintained between the waters of Lake Erie and the rapids of Niagara by a philosophical removal of the falls, as the attainment of the President's equilibrium of the industrial and living conditions of all nations. Since no such change in our economic life as is proposed in the President's philosophy is likely to occur in our own generation, when the cold necessities of earning our bread and butter by the "sweat of the brow" still stares us in the face, it would seem an idle waste and a needless sacrifice to thus expose our homes and firesides to a prospect so intellectually well conceived but so practically impossible. As it is evident "the billing and the cooing" of the doves must ultimately yield to the building of the nest, so it becomes the human race to provide for its future happiness and comfort; and the United States method of doing it has been successful under Republican administrations. We can not live upon philosophy and, as Owen Meredith sagely observes, "civilized man can not live without cooks."

FIRST THE COMPETITOR, THEN THE HOME.

Question. To what extent would President Wilson's destruction of "artificial advantage" affect the trade and commerce of the United States?

Answer. So far as manufactures affected in one way or another by tariff duties are concerned, it would apply to nearly all of the industries, which in turn are supported by nearly all of the raw products of the United States. It would apply in one way or another to 270,000 establishments that are "artificial," in which upward of 7,700,000 people are employed and in which more than $18,000,000,000 are invested. (Abstract Thirteenth Census.) It would undoubtedly close up many of the mills and factories where direct competition with foreign enterprises would give the foreigner the advantage in the cost of labor and material. Emerson said, "If a man can write a better book, preach a better sermon, or make a better mousetrap than his neighbor, though he may build his house in the woods, the world will make a beaten path to his door." But President Wilson says, in effect, if a man write a book, or if he raise potatoes, he shall not sell them except at the foreign price; if he rear a mill, he shall yield to his foreign competitor; and if he be dissatisfied with his wages under the "artificial arrangement" of protection, he shall remove to Europe or go unemployed. He says it is time to break up the industrial establishments if they can not operate on equal terms with those abroad; and this in spite of the Biblical injunction that "if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." (I Timothy, Chap. V, verse 8.)

PERTAINING TO PROTECTION BY COPYRIGHT.

Question. Does President Wilson apply this doctrine to the publication of books?

Answer. He does not. The preparation of books is brain labor, while the work of the mill man is hand labor. The President's publication, "The New Freedom," which insists that protection from foreign labor shall be removed from the mill worker and the farmer, is "copyrighted" against domestic competition, and "all rights are expressly reserved" against foreign competition. So that the President's rule does not work both ways. And yet Woodrow Wilson, the eminent scholar and author, is entitled to protection and royalties for the product of his brain and pen, a protection which should not be denied the man on the farm or the plodder in the mill.

Question. In what respect has the gentleman from Alabama indorsed the views of President Wilson?

Answer. In so shaping his tariff bill as to discourage American enterprise and industry and encourage foreign competition, to the end that cheaper goods shall be supplied to the people though their wages be lowered and their employment taken away. The Underwood bill threatens the destruction of the sugar industry in the United States, menaces the cotton and wool industries, except as it will have no influence upon raw cotton but to increase the sales of American raw cotton in foreign lands, and while admittedly destroying $100,000,000 of revenue collected at the customhouse from importers of foreign commodities attempts to make up that deficiency by an income tax levied directly upon some of the people, and only some of the people, whose offense is that they have been industrious and thrifty.

INCOME TAX AN UNNECESSARY MAKESHIFT.

And while an income tax properly graduated may be a fair way of raising revenue, as proposed in the Underwood bill, it is special to a certain class of citizens; it will be an unending annoyance to honest business men and farmers who are struggling to make both ends meet; it will encourage deception and fraud in the making of returns, and will discourage investments in industrial or labor-employing enterprises. It will raise an army of inquisitors and tax collectors and prove a direct charge upon the responsible citizen who, because he is responsible and law-abiding, is generally compelled to bear the burden of the shirk. There is small warrant for such an experiment at this time, in view of the fact that at the close of 1912, with the Payne tariff law still in operation, the United States Treasury showed a surplus of $37,224,502. The best the Democrats hope to do in substituting an income tax for the tariff is to obtain a surplus of $1,335,000 at the close of the first fiscal year. And this upon the mere guess (see majority committee report) that the income tax will yield a per annum total of $68,750,000. The margin is so close that the shadow of a deficiency is already apparent, for the bulk of the income tax must necessarily be collected from a few of the large and prosperous States that are to be robbed of both protection and prosperity. Verily, "the penny and the cake" shall "walk the plank" together.

Question. Has the gentleman from Alabama given outward expression of his belief in President Wilson's theories?

Answer. Mr. UNDERWOOD has frequently declared in debate that he is opposed to protection. During the secret caucus of the Democratic Party, considering the sugar schedule, Mr. UNDERWOOD was quoted as having resisted the appeals of some of his Democratic brethren who had the temerity to insist upon protection for the men who are employed in the sugar industry

in Louisiana and for other interests. As reported in the Philadelphia Record, Mr. UNDERWOOD spoke for the President and his party.

THE SUGAR INDUSTRY TO GO.

"The President only asked us for two things in that bill," he said. "He asked us for free wool, and the committee gladly gave it to him. He asked for a change in the sugar schedule, and the committee did as he asked. I appeal to you in the name of the President and the party to stand solidly behind the President and the committee on this question.

"If we as a party are to do the things we have promised to do, we must have party solidarity. The President's position on sugar is perfectly fair; there is no principle involved that is different from the principle of free sugar.

"The sugar growers of Louisiana have been brought up as a hothouse growth; that is true. They have invested many millions in their industry. Free sugar will destroy them; that is conceded; and it is only proper that their industry must give way. The President felt that it would be fairer to all concerned that these sugar growers be allowed three years in which to liquidate. They have much paper in the banks; they have suffered from two bad crops; and to put sugar on the free list to-day would damage them greatly. By giving them three years in which to liquidate we will give them time to get their houses in order.

"They can straighten out their affairs, fix up their financial matters, use their lands and mills for other purposes. Three years is a short time; and while I personally have little use for protection, we must not forget that this industry is the result of the protective theory, and we should give them time to right their affairs."

OLD MILLS MUST DIE.

Question. Has the gentleman from Alabama conceded the destruction of other industries?

Answer. Yes; he has been equally frank on other occasions. Concerning the duties upon wool and woolen clothing discussed in the secret Democratic caucus April 18, the Washington Herald had this to say:

"Opposing the amendment to put ready-made clothing on the free list, Leader UNDERWOOD conceded that the rates of the wool schedule would hurt many industries. He said he was inclined to believe that many mills would be put out of business. He insisted that there were factories in this country equipped with inefficient plants, and that they were badly administered, and he had no doubt they would go out of commission upon the approval by the President of the pending bill. Mr. UNDERWOOD declared that many woolen factories were maintained under the special privilege of protection. He said that, economically, they had no place in the industrial life of the land. They were 'hothoused' under protection conditions, and could not expect to survive under the competitive conditions that would result from the adoption of the new tariff."

LIVING COST REDUCED BY WAGE REDUCTIONS.

There is no mistaking the issue. As the matter now stands, the Democrats, who are in complete control of the Government, propose to destroy protection, as Republicans understand it, and to substitute "free competition" with all the world, except that duties shall be levied upon imports for purposes of revenue. Whereas last year, under the Payne law, we collected upon imports over $304,000,000, they propose to collect only $200,000,000, and recover the remainder by an inquisitorial and direct income tax upon the people. They contend that in this way they can reduce the price of eggs, potatoes, and meat, but they fail to take into account the losses that will fall upon the farmers who produce those commodities if the industrialist or the millworker, who is dependent upon "artificial arrangement," is shoved out of his job by foreign cheap labor. Mr. Wilson and Mr. UNDERWOOD have made it perfectly clear that they propose to stand or fall upon the truth or falsity of their theories. They are undertaking to reach the unattainable by equalizing a 100 per cent civilization with a 33 per cent industrial condition. They are keeping faith with their party.

PLAYING UP TO THE FOREIGNER.

Question. Is the Underwood bill favorable to the foreigner?

Answer. Its sponsors frankly declare they want "competition." They do not mean by that that if we have mills manufacturing metal, or wool, or cotton goods, or chemicals that there shall be more mills in the United States, but they do say that whatever mills we have shall not be increased by encouraging our own trade until we have first stood the ruinous competition of England, Germany, and other countries, which have every advantage in the matter of wages and cost of production. They make no account of wages at all, and pretending they want cheapness to destroy the trusts and monopolies, they encourage the migration of workmen and the transfer of capital to foreign countries, where, if the trust or combination be international in character, the place of manufacture is of little concern to the manipulators. One of the curious guesses in the report upon the Underwood bill is that by the transference of raw materials and other commodities from the Payne free list to the Underwood dutiable list there will be such an influx of imports anxious to pay duty that there will be realized at the customhouse $102,403,000 to aid in making up the deficiency that will result from the reckless reduction of duties generally.

AND THE TRUSTS ARE NOT COMPLAINING.

Question. Explain that point about the trusts.

Answer. I will. If it is cheaper for the International Harvester Trust, or for any iron and steel trust, or for any textile trust, or for any sugar or tobacco trust to do its manufacturing in England, France, or Cuba, of what advantage to the people of this country would it be to remove the duty upon any of the articles thus produced? Such trusts would want the duty removed. If Mr. Carnegie has as much money invested in foreign steel mills, where labor is cheap, as he has in mills of the United States, where labor is high, or if the Harvester Trust is availing itself of cheap labor in the factories it operates in foreign lands, why would they want a duty imposed upon anything they make abroad if they can still control the market of the United States? Under these circumstances it is improbable the price of reapers and mowers would be lessened to the farmer whether the duty is on or off. Thus the individual or independent operator is set upon "the sliding board" and all industry drifts into the maw of the combination with the greatest power and the most money and they save the duties.

SAVING SOMETHING FOR THE SUGAR IMPORTER.

There has been so much special pleading for the "poor consumers" of sugar emanating from the importers' offices in New York as to lead to the suspicion that the wealthy gentlemen who pay the import duty, amounting to $56,000,000 per annum, and who now have to meet a fair American competition which enables sugar to be sold at retail for 4½ cents a pound, are not wholly disinterested in the destruction of the industry in Louisiana and the West; but the Underwood bill proposes to take the duty from sugar even though the duty paid by these importers, which the Government stands to lose, if reduced to the pound consumed, precludes a lessening of the retail price. The Sugar Trust is not opposing the removal of the duty on sugar.

Question. How was the Underwood bill prepared?

Answer. By the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee holding secret deliberations. It was drawn in defiance of those whose business and employment were involved and was then submitted to the Democratic caucus, which also met in secret. After the party caucus had deliberated upon it in secret it was returned to the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee, by whom it was made public three days ago—April 22. It is a document of 218 printed pages, a hurried comparison of which with the Payne law of 1909 shows it to be in title and text a direct contradiction of the policy of protection.

A LITTLE SPECIAL PRIVILEGE; THAT'S ALL.

Question. How does the Underwood bill differ in title from the Republican law of 1909?

Answer. The contrast in title is significant. The Republican law was entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and *encourage the industries of the United States*, and for other purposes." There is nothing to "encourage the industries" in the Democratic bill, the title of which is "A bill to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes." A better title for the Democratic bill would be "A bill to encourage foreign competition and to reduce American production," for this, in fact, is substantially the purpose of this bill, except as to raw cotton.

Question. Does the Underwood bill provide for any protection at all?

Answer. None on principle, but a little on "special privilege."

Question. Name some of the "special-privilege" items.

Answer. Cotton, as stated, does not need any protection. It is an American monopoly, sold largely abroad, and is therefore on the free list; but several of the cotton-growing States are taken care of in relation to cattle, cotton bagging, Angora goat hair, press cloth, citrus fruits, peanuts, briar wood, and so forth. The desire to destroy protection in chemicals, earthenware, iron and steel, woolen and cotton goods, and other factory products, however, is not applied in the bill to shipowners, who are offered a direct bonus of 5 per cent over foreign competition; that is to say, the bill is consistent in its purpose to destroy protection, except in the case of a few political friends whose "ox is gored."

Question. What is the objection to the 5 per cent ship subsidy?

Answer. In some respects the 5 per cent protection or subsidy to shipowners may be a good thing. It proves the inconsistency of the Democratic position. As most of the ships that would be benefited belong to so-called trusts, like the Standard Oil Co., "the taxing of the rich and the relieving of the poor," which the gentleman from Alabama in his opening speech proclaimed to be the purpose of the Democratic Party, is not apparent in this case.

WAS THE FARMER TREATED FAIRLY?

Question. Is there a report accompanying the Underwood bill?

Answer. Yes; there is an explanatory report which was put into print for distribution day before yesterday. In his opening address the gentleman from Alabama followed substantially the lines of this report.

It is a labored effort to find excuses for the drastic and unscientific changes contemplated in the bill. It first contends that the people got along happily under revenue tariffs until the Civil War, and then complains of the higher tariffs since existing. It fails to note that all the real progress of the Nation occurred under Republican tariffs since the war. Now it finds that the Payne Tariff Act of 1909, which gave us a surplus of almost every commodity, including free imports, was responsible for the high cost of living—an economic phenomenon in no way special to the United States. Again, the committee fails to recognize the steady employment of labor at increased pay and reduced hours. Nor does it consider the advantage to the agricultural population whose farm products, sold in the cities, advanced 93.2 per cent in price from 1897 to 1910, while city-made clothing, sold to the farmer, advanced only 35.8 per cent in the same period, and house-furnishing goods only 24.2 per cent. And as to this it may be explained that the differences between Republicans in the campaign that elected Mr. Wilson were due largely to the persistent untruths that were circulated with regard to the high cost of living. The farmer was told he paid too much for his clothing. The figures just presented (and they are taken from the committee's report) show that the price of farm products advanced under the Payne law more than twice the amount of advance upon clothing prices. The farmer profited under the tariff more than the industrialist, but he was lied to and made to believe the industrialist was not his friend.

PROSECUTING THE TRUSTS.

Because of the organization of large combinations of capital made necessary since the Civil War by increased public demand for transportation and other utilities and commodities the tariff is blamed for certain bad trusts, and this in spite of the fact that Grover Cleveland, the last Democratic President of the United States, and his Attorney General, Mr. Olney, refused to proceed against unlawful combinations, although they have since been successfully prosecuted under successive Republican administrations. And there is a peculiar effrontery about this, in view of the free-trade provisions of the Underwood tariff bill, which operates directly in the interest of the sugar, iron and steel, oil, match, salt, chemical, and other trusts large enough to have an international "gentlemen's agreement," by which they may crush out their independent American competitors, avoid the tariff, and put the revenue burden upon the lessened earning power of the American people.

POPULATION RISING TOO RAPIDLY.

The report holds the Republican tariff responsible for the utilization of our natural resources. This is amusing. It deplores the fact "that the protection system has been greatly influential in maintaining a too rapid rate of depletion of natural resources in order to satisfy the constantly increasing demand of a rising population." Evidently, it expects a rising population of 95,000,000 to adopt the idealistic, but nonbread-winning, theories of President Wilson to discard "the artificial arrangement" and return to the "laws of nature." We are not to erect any "hothouses" to protect our plants; we are to leave them naked to the tender mercies of the beautiful snow. Why eat salad which is raised under glass when you can get any old grass by rooting in the ground?

Question. Then you do not regard the Underwood bill as a "scientific production"?

Answer. It is neither scientific, practical, patriotic, nor just. It is guesswork—a mere stab at rates in order to justify the Democratic contention. The loudest howl of the campaign demagogue who pretends to represent the people has been levied against luxurious living. The Democrats said they would punish the luxurious. They were "dead against the wallflowers and the dress-suit fellows." Heaven forbid that anyone should ever see a Democrat riding in automobiles or going to theater parties in "swallowtails." Perish the thought that any true Democrat should ever wash with castile soap or deny "pot licker" for the city brew.

DEMOCRATS WANT MORE PERFUMED SOAP.

Question. And how did the Underwood bill meet this delicate political situation?

Answer. By reducing the duty on perfumed toilet soap from 50 per cent ad valorem under the Payne law to 40 per cent ad valorem under the Underwood bill. The aroma of victory, the spoils of war, have beaten down the soap-fat brood, and the Democratic Party has emerged from the backwoods. It demands soap, foreign soap, perfumed and Frenchified, and instead of raising the duty on this exquisite and deliciously flavored compound de luxe it adds it to the "bath of nature" and admonishes the thrifty farmer's wife to chuck her fat to the pigs. In their abhorrent list of luxuries the Democrats have admitted "china, porcelain, Parian, and crockery ware, painted or decorated," at 15 per cent less duty than the Payne law imposed; and "manufactures of marble, onyx, alabaster, and jet," not used extensively by the "downtrodden," they have admitted at 5 per cent less; and these are but a few of the efforts to relieve the poor and punish the rich. Verily, the Democratic orators are "sure friends" of the "downtrodden" before election, but they like "the trimmings" after.

PUNISHING THE OLD ESTABLISHED HOUSES.

Question. Have you any further comments on the report?

Answer. Yes. The report undertakes to prove, as the gentleman from Alabama did in his argument, that by arresting the woolen and cotton industries—because they have successfully used old machinery and equipment for 50 to 60 years—the men who engage in manufacturing enterprises will be taught to adopt the methods of foreign competitors in equipment and efficiency. It was formerly the rule in certain sections of the country to induce our enterprising citizens to undertake the construction of mills, and they were frequently offered local inducements and free taxes for a period of years. Under the new system, as proposed, this is no longer permissible, for the man who dares to invest his money in a manufacturing enterprise, or who dares to borrow money for that purpose, must understand at the start that he must adopt the foreign methods and that he must employ only those who are willing to work at the foreign wage. This is surely un-American. Moreover, he is told that if he enters into the manufacture of linoleum, for instance—linoleum being a poor man's commodity—that on burlap, which is his raw material and which he acquires from foreign sources, because it can not be made in the United States in competition with the wretched labor of India, he must pay a duty, while there must be a reduction upon the duty on linoleum itself. Or if he undertakes to erect a mill to grind wheat, he must expect to pay a duty upon the Canadian wheat, which is his raw material, while Canadian flour, manufactured by his foreign competitor, may come in free. Or if he undertakes to make carpets, he must stand for a reduction of duty upon his finished product, while he pays duty upon the dyestuffs that are amongst his raw materials.

INCONGRUITIES IN THE BILL.

Among the other incongruities of the Underwood bill is its treatment of umbrella manufacturers. The bill admits finished umbrellas ready for sale at a lower rate than it imposes on the component parts of an umbrella. Hence, the foreigner is enabled to get his umbrellas into the American market cheaper than it costs the American maker for his raw material.

Question. You have referred to burlap, what about bagging?

Answer. It may be pardonable for the gentlemen who come from the cotton States to take care of their own, and without intending to be invidious, it seems they are doing it in this bill. They have taken burlap off the free list, it being the raw material used in the manufacture of linoleum, but they have carried "bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and similar fabrics" to the free list, together with "press cloths of camel's hair." In other words, while taxing the manufacturer of linoleum, umbrellas, and so forth, upon their raw material, the bill removes the duty from the raw material of the cotton planter and the cottonseed-oil manufacturer. Thus, a little bit of "artifice" seems to have been injected into the "laws of nature."

SMALL CHANCE FOR YOUNG AMERICA.

Question. Is there anything in the bill to encourage an ambitious boy?

Answer. There is nothing in the bill or the report to encourage any boy to exercise his brains or ingenuity for the advancement of the industrial welfare of his country. If he undertakes to engage in any enterprise involving employment of labor which is paid higher wages than is paid the cheap labor of

Europe he must expect to face a foreign competition that will crush him at the outset of his business career. He is caught between the upper and the nether millstones. And unless he is big enough to establish foreign connections, or can tie up with some trust that is able to defy American regulation, he must go down with the independent "little fellow" whose quietus is established by this bill. There is one way, however, by which an energetic young American may make money temporarily under the new system. He can buy out the stock of manufacturers who are driven to the wall, or of dealers in commodities who have been foolish enough to keep on hand supplies purchased at American prices until the flood gates are let down to foreign cheap goods. He may then do business as an auctioneer, or with the great department stores whose splendid advertising facilities will enable them to draw upon the savings of those who are in quest of bargain sales. Or, if he be clever enough, he may be able to locate in Canada or Europe a market for the machinery of dismantled American mills.

THE ABYSS OF DREAMS AND DOUBT.

Question. Does the bill attempt to regulate the trusts?

Answer. It does not. The Democratic Party has pretended that it would kill the trusts, but this bill will aid rather than hinder them. The Underwood bill stands pat on cotton. It pretends to on tobacco, but gives free trade to the Philippines. It is cruel to the sugar planter and the woolgrower, and is utterly offensive to the independent industries. It proposes to discipline the manufacturers of the country and all their employees by eliminating the profits and reducing the wages. There is no relief to those who look for a continuance of prosperity, but, on the contrary, the bill imposes an additional burden of unnecessary taxation. It is a bill in the interest of the speculator, the juggling importer, and those who control big business. It is an inducement to the business man to move to Canada or to Europe, and is altogether a surrender of the greatest prosperity of the greatest of nations to agitators and theorists, who neither know nor seem to care how great the havoc they invite. Speaking broadly, there is nothing in this bill for the American farmer, nothing for the American workingman, but everything for the foreigner. Recklessly and with deliberation the bill as written plunges the substance of our national progress into the abyss of dreams and doubt. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT].

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, as I rise to speak to-day I am reminded vividly of the conditions when I first entered Congress 20 years ago. Then, as now, there was a Democratic President, a Democratic Senate, a Democratic House of Representatives, with a Democratic Speaker, who avowed his belief in free trade. A tariff bill was then, as now, the prime object of the Democratic Party. It was under the charge of a brilliant, cultivated, charming man, with the auspicious and prophetic name of Wilson, a college professor, a native of Virginia, a man undoubtedly of noble aspirations for the good of the whole country, but, as we Republicans thought, with erroneous theories on the tariff and with some sectional prejudices. On the day when the bill passed this House there was the most open exhibition of excited enthusiasm I have ever witnessed here, and that Mr. Wilson was borne about this Hall on the shoulders of some of his younger supporters, among whom I remember the stalwart form of the present dignified Secretary of State, amid the cheering of the Democratic side. But that was the last enthusiasm the Wilson bill ever evoked, and the only cheers it ever occasioned afterwards were the cheers that rang throughout the whole United States for its repeal. It went from this House to the Democratic Senate, where it was mangled and tortured into that form of perfidy and dishonor in which it was finally presented to the world as a bastard, the Democratic President refusing to authenticate it by his name.

I wonder if the analogies which are so striking in the early stages of this bill will continue to the close. That no one will know for months and perhaps years. But I am ready to admit that this bill in its present form, despite its numerous inconsistencies, goes far to carry our Democratic theories and fulfill Democratic pledges and gratify the reliable Democratic States. And if it becomes law I am ready to wait and stake the future of the two parties on its results. If, as they promise, it reduces the cost of living without lowering the scale of wages or exterminating and banishing great industries, I will admit they were right and we were wrong. I am ready for the test. And I am also ready to admit that the former Wilson bill came into the world under most unfavorable circumstances, while present appearances indicate that for this bill the industrial and financial condition of this country and the world will be most auspicious.

And so recognizing that this bill is a fair exponent of the Democratic theory and will test the antagonistic principles of the two parties, we can only await with patience and fortitude its results. Accidents of trade, of crops, of financial stringency, or business depression in Europe, of peace or war may accelerate or retard its natural effects, but they are sure to reveal themselves, and the country is sure to feel and to judge them. For that verdict we Republicans can afford to wait. If they have discovered a magical method of furnishing the consumers cheaper goods while keeping the producers busy at higher wages, we will all join in applauding their success. But if they do not materially cheapen the cost of living, or accomplish it only by such importations of cheap goods as close our mills and drive our workmen into idleness, then all will join in punishing them for their failure.

I do not mean to enter upon any general discussion of the evils of this bill. It would take too long and has been done most satisfactorily by the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee. I stand upon the broad Republican ground that a tariff should give protection to all the productive enterprises of every section of the country sufficient to enable them to cope successfully with the cheaper labor of other nations. The amount of protection should be measured by the difference of labor cost, so that our high standard of wages may be maintained. I believe that conditions have so changed that the old Republican theory of protection is outworn and obsolete and must be modified, and I think if we had recognized and admitted this earlier the Republican Party would stand better to-day. Formerly the main object was to make sure that the protection was high enough, and if it chanced to be unnecessarily high, so that all foreign competition was absolutely prohibited, no harm was done, for domestic competition could be relied upon to keep down prices and prevent exorbitant profits. But since the development of trusts and large combinations, which annihilate domestic competition, it has been important that the duties should be so scientifically arranged that they would be just high enough to prevent large foreign importations when domestic prices were reasonable, but would encourage foreign importers to be keen competitors of American producers if they attempt to raise prices so as to obtain exorbitant profits.

Because of these changed conditions the Tariff Commission has become valuable and indispensable to study for us thoroughly the industries, both abroad and at home, and give to the framers of tariff laws the exact facts on which they can base the rates and meet the modern necessities. Of course, prices are constantly fluctuating, both here and abroad, and it will be impossible to fix all duties so that they will exactly and permanently equalize the labor costs of different nations; but to approximate that should be the aim of every Republican tariff law, and an impartial, judicial, nonpartisan tariff commission, like the one which the Democratic Party has just abolished, is a necessary step toward that goal. The Democratic Party scorns the assistance or judgment of such a nonpartisan commission. They do not pretend or attempt to fix duties so as to equalize labor conditions or prices. They aim to raise revenue only, regardless of the effect on our producers. And having no universal standard, they naturally fall into favoritism and sectionalism.

The country has come to believe that the Republican tariff was too high; that it unreasonably increased the cost of living; that large interests were unduly instrumental in framing it and reaped undue profits from its protection. It is useless now to discuss the merits of this popular criticism, because the Republicans in Congress have now committed themselves to a course which in the future prevents a repetition of any such suspected abuses. The new Republicanism has pledged itself to a scientific tariff, based upon the report of a nonpartisan tariff board of experts. That raises the simple issue of protection between the two parties. Do the people want a tariff bill like this, which avowedly disregards in fixing duties the difference in labor cost here and abroad and has no rule or standard except revenue tempered by favoritism and sectionalism, or do they want a scientific, impartial, business tariff of protection? I have little doubt which the people of my district will prefer. This bill injures seriously too many local industries to become popular there. Scattered throughout New England are innumerable small factories which will find existence a struggle under this law, and I apprehend danger for even some of the largest.

Close to my home is a striking example of the inconsistency and sectional favoritism of this bill. The Ludlow Co. makes, among other things, bagging, which is used to cover bales of cotton. The duty on it now is only six-tenths of a cent per square yard, which is only 10 per cent ad valorem—an ex-

tremely low duty. Its main foreign competitors are in Calcutta, where the jute of which it is made grows, and where laborers are paid from $1 to $3 per month, working 81 hours per week. If there is any industry which needs protection it would seem to be this, which must import its raw material and its machinery and compete with the cheapest labor in the world superintended by Englishmen and equipped with the same machinery. Their protection is now only 10 per cent, so small that Calcutta bagging now comes in and supplies about a quarter of the market and pays a revenue to our Treasury. It would seem there need be no change there. It would seem that both under the Republican theory of protection and the Democratic theory of a tariff for revenue this small duty should be maintained. But this bill strikes off all duty in order that the southern planter may hope to save 3 or 4 cents on the covering for each bale of cotton, which is worth from $50 to $75. They take away all protection, they take away all revenue, they annihilate a flourishing industry in order that the southern planter may have the advantage of Calcutta labor and save a few cents, though even that will be short lived, for when the Indian manufacturer has gained a monopoly of the market he will have no consideration for the southern planter, there will be no American competition, and up will go the prices. It seems to me a barefaced and short-sighted attempt to save money for the planter of the South at the expense of the manufacturer of the North.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the gentleman will permit, does not the gentleman think that the cotton planter of the South ought to have his bagging and ties free as much as for the farmer of the West to get his binding twine free?

Mr. GILLETT. Oh, that is not a fair comparison.

Mr. HARDWICK. Why should not they be treated alike?

Mr. GILLETT. There was never any binding twine imported, so free binding twine has never made any difference.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does it not affect the price?

Mr. GILLETT. Not a particle. When binding twine was put on the free list there had not been any importations of binding twine for years. It was apparent that the tariff was prohibitory and it was put on the free list. What was the result? Still there were no importations of binding twine. Apparently there was not any made that could compete with us, even without a duty, and from that day to within a very few years there was no competition on binding twine and it could well afford to have that duty taken off.

Recently there has been a little importation, and from whom? Has it come from countries like India, where labor is employed at 50 cents a week? Why, no. The only place that binding twine has been imported from is the only country that I think we do not need to have any protective tariff against—from Canada. And it was produced there, I presume, simply because the agricultural-implement industry moved over there from the United States, and in that connection they made binding twine and sometimes dumped their surplus into the United States. So that has no analogy at all. It differs from this in the fact that when that was put on there was no importation of binding twine, whereas now in cotton bagging there is an annual importation of 20 per cent of all that is used, and the only nation that ever has made binding twine in competition is a nation where the standards of labor and living are almost like those in the United States, and not, as in the case of cotton bagging, so low and inferior that no one will pretend that there can be equal competition between us.

There is another factory in my district which is likely to be closed by this bill. It manufactures celluloid or fiberloid. That is an invention of American brains. Later it was taken up and our machinery was copied in Europe. It has had a high protective tariff, under which it has prospered. I think the duty has been unreasonably high, but there has been keen competition among the American manufacturers and prices have been much reduced and have steadily trended downward. This bill has lowered the duty from about 75 per cent to 15 per cent, a rate at which we can not compete with German and French labor, and at the same time, as if this was not enough, a duty has been laid on one of its main ingredients, camphor, which is admitted free in the other countries. So you increase the duty on the raw material and take off three-fourths of the duty from the finished product. Moreover, the industry has just been introduced in Japan and a superb plant, costing a million dollars, has been completed there, equipped with the best American machinery, built by American architects, and American mechanics have been taken over there to superintend it and train the cheap Japanese labor to compete with us—with only 15 per cent duty.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman kindly yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman that the chief competition in articles of celluloid comes to-day from France and Germany.

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. And, leaving out of account this question of the future competition with Japan, the rate of 15 per cent ad valorem in our bill on the moderate kind of celluloid articles represents exactly the difference that the manufacturers here pay for their materials of manufacture as compared with foreigners.

Mr. GILLETT. It represents no difference as to the difference of wages paid.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. No; we do not take that into account; they have been competing in that respect heretofore, but in material the 15 per cent exactly balances the French and German cost.

Mr. GILLETT. Then the purpose of the committee was to put us on an exact par with them in the cost of materials of which the celluloid is made and not take into account at all the difference in wages.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. In other words, to put our manufacturers on a competitive basis with the foreign manufacturers.

Mr. GILLETT. I am very glad to know that is the project—that they shall absolutely have no protection at all, but are simply put on an equal footing. That is what you mean by a competitive basis. That is exactly the theory which I supposed this bill was founded upon; it is the theory of free trade, and with that theory you will, I believe, wipe out this factory of ours, for the cheaper wages of Germany and France can easily undersell us; and with this new plant in Japan it will be but a short time, with their cheap labor, when Germany and France will also be driven out of our market.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman courteously yield again?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It is difficult for anyone to foretell what the Japanese may or may not do.

Mr. GILLETT. I recognize that.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I think it is fair to say up to the present time their labor has been cheap only in the amount of wages paid, but it has been very expensive labor in the cost of the product they turn out.

Mr. GILLETT. This new plant, which is about ready to start, will test the justice of the gentleman's expectations; and I think this extreme reduction of the duty on fiberloid or celluloid and the avowed purpose to cut off all protection against the different cost of labor in Germany or France or Japan is characteristic of this whole bill and stamps it as a free-trade experiment.

It was expected that this bill would provide an income tax, but I think many of the original supporters of such a tax will be grieved by the use made of it here. It was advocated as a tax to be reserved for cases of great emergency, and yet now $70,000,000 are to be raised by it in a period of profound peace and unexcelled prosperity in order that salutary protection may be taken away from some of our industries. I criticize, too, the provision exempting from tax all incomes under $4,000. The great majority of our people never hope to have $4,000 a year, and they would be glad, if they could be assured of that income, to pay a liberal tax on it to the Government. But by making the limit of exemption much smaller, say $1,000, a most important and desirable result could be attained. Then every one who earned over a thousand dollars a year would have a direct, personal, and keen interest in the expenditures of the Nation. I do not care how small the tax—let it be a half of 1 per cent, which would 50 cents on an income of $1,100 and $5 on an income of $2,000—but let it rise and fall with the expenditures of the administration. If the administration was economical, the tax would be only five on two thousand, but with increasing expenditures the tax would have to be increased. Then for the first time every citizen with an income over $1,000 would have a personal interest in Government expenses. Then would be brought to the notice of each man what kind of housekeeping there was at Washington. To-day the ordinary voter is entirely ignorant and indifferent as to the expensiveness of the administration. The taxes are indirect; he does not feel that he is paying them, and as long as his locality gets what it wants he is regardless of what may be wasted in other localities. A Congressman is praised in proportion to the national money he gets spent in his district, and the more extravagant he is the more popular. An honest zeal for economy means to him only a loss of votes. I recently heard a Congressman say that if he wished to be popular he would vote against every tax and and in favor

of every appropriation. Under such conditions you can not expect economical results. The Nation needs sorely some device to excite in the ordinary citizen a study of national expenditures. Nothing would accomplish it so effectively as imposing on him a small income tax, which should vary according to the amount the Nation spent.

There never was a time when such a device was more needed than just now. One of the most marked and obvious developments of recent years has been the enlarged scope of the activities of the National Government, and the subject has been debated as incessantly as such an interesting phenomenon deserves, and I do not intend to add my comments to the general discussion. Being by tendency a Federalist, I see nothing disquieting or alarming in most of the new features of Federal power. But there is one phase of the situation or trend which is seldom mentioned, but which, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, has attracted my attention and concern, and that is its effect upon our national expenditures. I do not mean so much the expense of these new activities—though in some cases that is vast enough—but I mean more the constantly growing and unchecked and endless expense which results and will result from the new attitude of the people toward the National Treasury.

I doubt if there is any phase of the new Federalism where the growth is more prodigious or to me so appalling as here. The people seem of late to be learning to look on the Federal Treasury as a vast reservoir from which they can draw endlessly without exhausting it, and which will be kept full without any burden on them. Consequently, each person's interest and constant endeavor seems to be to get for himself and his neighborhood as large a share as possible of this free and gratuitous outflow.

Such a state of mind on the part of our constituents is dangerous in several ways. It is demoralizing in the same way that gambling is demoralizing to the individual, by inducing the belief that work and industry and self-sacrifice are superfluous, that wants can be gratified without effort, and that it is not honest exertion alone that is rewarded, but that there is an easy way by which the same reward will fall in your lap without struggle or self-denial; that there is a father of boundless wealth who can gratify all your wants without expense to you and that self-denial and economy are as superfluous as they are inconvenient.

Nothing is so fatal to industry and enterprise as such a feeling. It is most unfortunate for man or nation to learn to rely for success on anything except his own steady effort. Yet such a feeling is spreading all over the country.

And the people seem to be learning to believe not only that Federal laws make prosperity but that they keep the Treasury full without expense to them, and that the special occupation of each Congressman should be to decide how that Treasury can be emptied with most direct benefit to his locality. The very immensity of our country makes such a belief and habit dangerous. It is impossible for different sections to understand the comparative needs and claims of each other. Their knowledge of conditions is not accurate enough to give them a sound basis for judgment, and there is not enough mutual sympathy and acquaintance to make them fair-minded in their decisions, so that there is a constant struggle of each to obtain all that it can; and this, of course, leads to combinations, mutual concessions, and shameless logrolling, all of which add expense and outlay to the Nation.

The fact that our national taxation is largely indirect and its burden unfelt by the mass of the people increases this tendency and encourages the desire to enlarge the national activities and divert, as far as possible, burdens from the State and municipality to the Nation.

And so an administration can rush into expenses beyond its income without incurring that severe rebuke which would be sure to follow if the people had to directly open their purses to make good the deficiency. The only check here is the impending disgrace of a bond issue. In England an administration whose expenditures exceeded its income by $20,000,000 would be thrown out of power as incompetent and extravagant, and yet we allow our expenses to exceed our income by $100,000,000 and the people, instead of being disturbed and rebuking us and demanding a stricter economy, clamor loudly for still larger outlays and are heedless of the deficit.

England raises the bulk of her revenue by permanent taxes which require no action by Parliament from year to year; but in order to adjust the income closely to expenses certain taxes are voted only a year at a time, and the rate is raised or lowered according to the necessities of the year. For many years the only taxes so treated were the income tax and the tax on tea, but recently beer, tobacco, and spirits have been included in the same class. These are all taxes which the people feel at once, which they fret under and wish to be relieved of, and will only endure when satisfied of their necessity; and so the popularity of the administration is always concerned in their reduction, and there is a constant stimulus toward economy.

England needs such a stimulus less than we do because she has a tremendous influence for economy in the fact that no appropriation can be made except when recommended by the Crown, which means by the ministers. Parliament can reduce expenditures below the estimates of the ministry but can never increase them. This gives vast power to the ministry and is a prodigious buffer against extravagance.

We see too often in our appropriation bills illustrations of the danger pointed out by Lowell in his work on the Government of England, that "expenditures directly caused by the irresponsible action of private members may originate in personal or local feeling, and then be adopted through heedless good nature or skillful logrolling." I think we should do well to borrow from the longer experience of England and have a purely revenue tax like this which the people would directly and keenly feel, which would move up and down automatically with the condition of the Treasury, and which would act as a constant admonition to the administration and the party in power to be thrifty and economical.

This income tax would fulfill those conditions if it applied to all incomes over $1,000. As provided in this bill, no one with an income less than $4,000 is reached by it, and consequently less than one-half of 1 per cent of the people pay it or feel it, and its effect in awakening an interest in economy among the people is insignificant. For that reason I hope the bill will be amended, and a small tax imposed on incomes between $1,000 and $4,000, and thereby the interest of a great and influential body of citizens will be aroused in national taxation and a wholesome change will be initiated in the attitude of the American people toward national expenses.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FALCONER].

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman, in the time allotted to me this afternoon I am going to talk to an item in the free list of the proposed tariff bill involving an industry of much importance to the State of Washington.

In passing, however, I wish to observe that to the new Members on the floor of the House there have occurred some interesting incidents that have added just a little zest and interest to the proceedings. We have been highly entertained the past few days by the efforts of the two old parties in their endeavor to parade the legislative inconsistencies of the opposing forces.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, opening the debate last Tuesday on the Republican side, partially stated a fact when he said in effect that the downfall of the Republican Party was due in a large measure to the self-centered egotism of the men in control—men who had become intoxicated with power acquired by long continuance in office, and who, through disregard for the demands of the people generally, had caused an unrest and resentment on the part of the people which resulted in defeat for the Republican forces at the polls in the recent election. He might have gone further, indeed, and said that the same arrogant disposition of the men at the head of affairs in this Nation was supported by a silent and unseen influence which held in its greedy fingers the reins governing political and legislative action.

It was this silent influence which, in some localities in this country, exploited men, women, and children in certain industrial centers that other men and combinations of men might reap unearned and dishonest riches.

It was this silent influence that brought about a condition where one man of vast wealth disregarded the demands of the Congress of the United States and refused to appear before its committee.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, in glowing terms of praise, referred to the gentleman from New York as the master American mind in the science of tariff, and probably rightly so, and then proceeded to explain that this man in whom the country had much confidence was outvoted in the Ways and Means Committee and forced to give his name to a bill that he did not wish to father, but which he finally accepted and, out of deference to his confrères "complained not."

The conclusion is that the arrogant mind of powerful forces overrode the judgment of the tariff expert, resulting in dissipation and ruin to the Republican Party.

I take it, sir, that the other side of the House will agree with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House, demonstrated by the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, are still of the opinion that the tariff problem is a local proposition.

In the district in which he resides he finds it convenient to place the raw material on the free list and a duty on the finished product, inconsistent with the conclusion that in the West the raw material should be taxed and the finished product free. Iron ore to the Bethlehem Steel Co. free; their finished product taxed. Wheat and cattle to the western miller and butcher taxed, but flour and dressed beef free.

The gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House have frequently referred to the Progressive forces, here represented, as misled enthusiasts, following the lead of one man. The Progressive forces are aware that in the recent campaign their party was headed by a man who is the greatest constructive genius produced by this or any other country in this generation. The Progressive forces are graced by the men who are recognized leaders in the thought and action of American life.

American history, speaking from its thousands of pages, proclaims that the potential force back of every great movement is not the councils or assemblies of men, but the earnest purpose and dynamic force within the heart and mind of one or a few men.

But, Mr. Chairman, limited time demands consideration of the tariff relative to the shingle industry.

In considering the effect of the tariff bill now presented by the Ways and Means Committee on the red-cedar shingle industry I submit that while the red-cedar shingle industry is a comparatively small factor in the commerce of the United States, it is an industry that means much to the people of the State of Washington, and particularly that portion of the State lying on the Pacific coast west of the Cascade Mountains. About 68 per cent of the entire quantity of shingles manufactured in the United States are manufactured in this territory, and within the next few years the shingle industry of the United States will be pretty largely confined to the Pacific coast, since the white cedar of the Central States and the cypress of the Southern States is being manufactured into lumber products bringing greater returns to the operators. There are 410 shingle mills operated in the State of Washington, having a yearly capacity of 45,000 carloads. You note that I use the word "capacity" and do not mean the output. These mills employ about 15,000 men, over 99 per cent of whom are white men eligible to citizenship in the United States.

The shingle industry is one of the largest industrial factors in western Washington. When the shingle mills are running and employees are kept in steady employment the merchants have no occasion to complain of poor conditions. But when the shingle mills of western Washington are closed down the effect is immediately felt by practically every commercial line in the State. Taking up the features of the independent shingle mill—that is, the mill that is not combined with the lumber-producing mill—the great bulk of raw material used in the manufacture of shingles is composed of short, broken, and refuse cedar. As a matter of fact, many of the mills to-day through the country, built at a cost of a few thousand dollars—and there are many of them—are a large factor in helping to develop logged-off lands of western Washington. The man who owns a few acres of logged-off land and wishes to develop it finds it to his advantage to have a market for his picked-up shingle timber in a local mill, for he not only spends his time in converting this rough stuff into shingle bolts, but at the same time finds that the stumpage price he gets for this material gives him a very good day's wage in connection with his labor, for realizing $1 a cord stumpage, together with $1.50 for labor involved in cutting a cord of shingle bolts, he finds that he can earn better wages than he could get from day labor working in an industrial center and away from his family. And further, every stick of broken and refuse timber that is taken by this method from his land helps to improve the land and put it in a condition where it is less expensive to clear for dairying and agricultural purposes.

The majority of shingle mills in western Washington are mills that take this kind of material. Under the present law we have a 50 cents per thousand duty on shingles. Previous to the Payne-Aldrich bill we had a duty of 30 cents per thousand. At the hearings before the committee it was proved to the satisfaction of the members that 30 cents was not a sufficiently high duty to put the Washington manufacturer on a working basis with the British Columbia manufacturer.

The labor conditions in the shingle mills of western Washington are as wholesome and as satisfactory as are to be found in probably any industry in the country, and the average shingle weaver is an expert in his line, giving the best possible service and demanding a high scale of wage. They demand and receive a high scale of wage, and are entitled to it from the expert workman's standpoint.

The mills while in operation are generally run under high tension and at full capacity, and the shingle weaver who meets the demands of his occupation realizes that he is in hazardous work.

Out of the 15,000 men employed in the shingle industry in the State, there are thousands of men whose hands bear evidence that they are employed in a hazardous industry. There is probably no class of men who have a finer regard for their responsibility to the men who employ them than the employees in the shingle industry.

The amount of money involved in the raw material in a thousand shingles is about 20 cents. Putting shingles on the free list is not only cutting out the entire value of the raw material, but takes 30 cents off of the labor involved in the production of a thousand shingles. So this bill presents the fact that it is neither the intention of those who have framed the bill to make an allowance for the raw material or to give any protection to the men employed in the labor of producing shingles.

I have previously stated that the capacity of the shingle mills in western Washington is about 45,000 carloads per annum. I will say here that the output of shingles is very much less than that amount, because of the fact that on an average the shingle mills of Washington are shut down several months each year, due to an overproduction of shingles in the United States. With that condition obtaining in our own country there is certainly no demand for the importation of shingles from a foreign country. There is probably no manufacturing line that makes a stronger demand for economy of management than the shingle-manufacturing industry, due to the ups and downs and irregularities of the shingle market.

If a shingle operator could make 20 cents a thousand it would be considered a splendid return for the money invested in his plant. Looking at the matter from this angle, if we would allow 20 cents as the average for raw material and 20 cents for the manufacturers' profit, it would mean that $1.50 to $1.75 would go to labor. There are few industries in the United States where the product gives such a large per cent to labor, and it will appear that the Ways and Means Committee have overlooked the necessity of giving proper consideration to this feature of the shingle industry.

If this bill becomes a law we find the shingle manufacturers of Washington confronted by conditions obtaining in British Columbia which will operate greatly to their disadvantage. From the best authority I have been able to get the shingle mills of British Columbia could produce 50 per cent more shingles than they have produced the last two years, and the only reason that the British Columbia mills, with cheap labor and cheap raw material, have not run to full capacity is the fact that the 50 per cent duty has kept them out of our territory. It has been suggested by those who favor taking the duty off of this product that the Canadian mill operators have already, during the past few years, been shipping shingles into the United States. That within itself is an argument showing that labor and stumpage conditions over there are such as to give them a great advantage over the manufacturers of our own country, and this advantage is due to the cheap labor and stumpage of British Columbia. British Columbia has all the advantages of natural timber resources to be found in the State of Washington, and greater advantages, due to the fact that the shingle manufacturers and lumber manufacturers have not operated in that territory for any great length of time. For hundreds of miles along the coast lines of British Columbia and Vancouver Island are to be found fine stands of cedar timber, with the finest kind of transportation facilities, and stumpage on this timber is much less than the stumpage on a like quality of timber in the State of Washington.

There is already a large number of mills in British Columbia, and with the Underwood tariff bill in effect there is much timber there to furnish raw material for a large number of additional mills.

Only a small portion of British Columbia timber is exported to the United States, and on this that is exported from Crown grant lands there is an export duty of from $1 to $3 per thousand feet. In addition to this, there is a transportation expense and towage amounting to about $1 a thousand feet for bringing these logs from Vancouver to the Puget Sound mills. The logger in British Columbia handling cedar logs would prefer to sell his logs in Vancouver on the British Columbia side at a price of from $2 to $4 per thousand less than he would sell the same quality of logs to the American mill operator and assume the risk of transportation.

This gives to the Canadian manufacturer an advantage averaging 30 cents a thousand added to the difference in labor, which makes the present duty a necessity in order to put the Washington manufacturer on a par with his British Columbia competitor.

Seventy-five per cent of the labor employed in the mills of British Columbia at the present time is oriental, Chinese, Hindu, and Japanese labor, whose methods of living would not appeal to the average white laborer. Their wages are very much less than the employees in the American mills, and the wage earner of Washington is not now and never will be in a frame of mind to accept wages on a par with the oriental.

The cheap-labor factor involved in this matter has been thoroughly presented to the Ways and Means Committee in former investigations of this industry, but I again call the attention of the Members of the House to some of the details. It will be conceded that the natives of India, the Hindu, are British subjects and have a right, under the laws of Great Britain, to enter the Dominion of Canada, providing they can pass the proper medical examination and have in their possession sufficient money at the time of entering to insure them a competency until they have had reasonable time to obtain employment. Twenty-five dollars has been fixed by the officials of British Columbia as a sufficient amount to pass an Asiatic immigrant into the Province. The Chinese are permitted to enter into and work in British Columbia upon a head tax of $500 in each case, after having successfully passed the medical examination. From an economic standpoint it costs $500 to introduce a Chinese workman to employment in British Columbia, and that amount, borrowed at 7 per cent, is equivalent to about 12 cents per working day. While $500 per capita might seem to be a barrier to the entry of these people, it does not operate to keep the Chinese out, for in less than three years, 1907 to 1909, 8,000 Chinamen entered Vancouver, British Columbia.

Under the terms of the treaty of Japan and Great Britain, ratified by the Government of the Dominion of Canada, Japanese subjects have the right to freely enter British Columbia for the purpose of employment. It has been suggested that there is an official understanding whereby only 500 Japanese per annum are to be given passports entitling them to work in the Dominion of Canada. This, or a similar agreement, has been in effect for a number of years prior to 1907, and yet since that time many thousands of Japanese have immigrated into British Columbia, so that at the present time about 80 per cent of the labor employed in these mills is oriental, receiving a much less wage than is paid the American workman—in fact, a wage that any self-respecting American workman would refuse to accept.

These are the relative conditions obtaining in Washington and British Columbia at the present time; but if the Underwood bill becomes a law it is very probable that conditions will be greatly altered in the State of Washington as well as in British Columbia; for there are many men now engaged in the manufacture of shingles in the State of Washington who, under the advantages offered in British Columbia in cheaper timber and cheaper labor, would be forced to retire from business, and naturally they would look for locations in British Columbia, which would result in building up the shingle industry in British Columbia to the detriment of that industry in the State of Washington. As a matter of fact, a number of Americans have already purchased tracts of timber in British Columbia, thus fortifying themselves in the event that shingles are placed on the free list. One shingle operator, who is now employing 130 men in the State of Washington, and who is known as one of the oldest and most substantial shingle operators in the State, personally stated that if the duty was removed from shingles that he would immediately proceed to the erection of a mill in British Columbia, where he would manufacture a tract of timber that he recently purchased. His argument was that the Canadian railroads gave 5 cents a hundred pounds better rate to eastern markets than the American rates, which means the benefit of 8 to 10 cents per thousand. He further stated that the fact that the bolt camp men of British Columbia were receiving less money for their labor was one of the factors that made him decide on this change of location.

Further, he took the position that British Columbia, with her unlimited shore line, bestudded with the best quality of cedar, and accessible ocean shipping facilities, offered an excellent opportunity to the enterprising shingle manufacturer when the Panama Canal opens. In foreign ships, with cheaper freight rates than the American, he could, and would, ship his shingles to all Pacific and Atlantic coast cities, with all the advantages of the open market. Hence it would seem that the anticipated improvement in the shingle industry of the Washington mills caused by the opening of the Panama Canal may not materialize, and our manufacturers will find the competition above referred to.

The shingle industry is a distinct industry from the lumber industry. A man of comparatively small capital can engage in the shingle industry and use his capital in connection with his own labor, and in that way get a good living wage; while the combination lumber and shingle mill takes much capital and, as a matter of fact, those plants are in the hands of men of large means. Many of these lumber manufacturers have large tracts of timber land on the Canadian side, and they offer no opposition to free lumber and shingles. They are in a position where it will do them little injury, but the man with just sufficient means to engage in the shingle industry will be forced to stand the brunt of this free-trade experience. While it may seem to those having the making of this bill in hand that the shingle industry is an item of small importance in the general industrial field, yet it would seem that 15,000 workmen, supporting from 50,000 to 75,000 people, is an item worth while and worthy of the consideration of the men who have the affairs of this Government in hand.

From the standpoint of conservation there may be some argument why lumber should be put on the free list, but there is certainly no argument advocating free shingles that can be sustained. In the early history of the lumber and shingle industry in the State of Washington, the finest quality of cedar was manufactured into shingles, as is practically the case now in British Columbia, but of late years the logged-off lands from which the timber was cut years ago and from which the No. 1 timber was removed, to-day furnishes the raw material for the shingle mill. A few years ago this same material was rolled into heaps and burned in the process of land clearing. And, further, the refuse from the lumber mills which was discarded to the slab pile and the refuse burner is to-day manufactured into shingles, a by-product of the lumber business, thus at the present time making use of material that under less favorable conditions was necessarily wasted. A practical millman knows that it costs more to manufacture shingles from second and third grade material than it does from No. 1 material, and with the duty removed from shingles it is a question whether or not much of this material will not again be destroyed rather than compete with mills on the other side of the line that are cutting better grade material. There does not seem to be a single good reason why shingles should be put on the free list, and it appears to one who is familiar with the business that the Ways and Means Committee has overlooked the significance of the shingle industry.

You are removing the duty on shingles, bringing the American manufacturer into competition with the shingle manufacturer of British Columbia. Your action is entirely to the advantage of the foreign manufacturer, and you are asking and receiving nothing in return. You propose to put shingles on the free list, but on practically everything that the shingle manufacturer buys in the equipment and operation of his plant is a heavy duty.

Schedule C of the Underwood bill provides:

SCHEDULE C.—*Metals, and manufactures of.*

	Per cent ad valorem.
Earthenware, crockery, dishes	40
Boiler iron	15
Bands	12
Bands coated with zinc or tin	20
Mill shafting	10
Nails	10
Wire rope	30
Anvils	15
Blacksmith's hammers, wedges, tools	10
Bolts, butts, washers	15
Spiral nut locks and lock washers	35
Cast-iron pipe	12
Chains	20
Cutlery	25
Files and rasps	25
Rivets, studs, or steel points	20
Crosscut and mill saws	12
Wood screws	25
Locomotive wheels	25
Steam engines and locomotives	15

Foodstuffs that furnish his bolt and logging camps, in the main, are heavily taxed:

SCHEDULE G.—*Agricultural products and provisions.*

Cattle, 10 per cent ad valorem.
Horses and mules valued at $200 or less, $15 per head.
Horses and mules valued at more than $200, 10 per cent ad valorem.
Sheep, 10 per cent ad valorem.
Barley, 15 cents per bushel of 48 pounds.
Barley, pearled, hulled, or patent, 1 cent per pound.
Macaroni, 1 cent per pound.
Oats, 10 cents per bushel of 32 pounds.
Rice, cleaned, 1 cent per pound.
Wheat, 10 cents per bushel.

Biscuits and bread, 25 per cent ad valorem.
Butter and butter substitutes, 3 cents per pound.
Cheese and substitutes, 20 per cent ad valorem.
Beans, 25 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.
Eggs, 2 cents per dozen.
Hay, $2 per ton.
Peas, green or dried, in bulk, 15 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.
Split peas, 25 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.
Straw, 50 cents per ton.
Vegetables, not heretofore mentioned, 15 per cent ad valorem.
Dried fruits and berries, 1 cent per pound.

SCHEDULE N.—*Sundries.*

Harness, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Your economics are based on a strange principle, giving everything to the foreigner and receiving nothing in return. It would appear more reasonable to at least keep the duty on American forest products until such time as the Dominion of Canada removes her export duty, for it would be possible to get logs from British Columbia and from the Dominion of Canada to furnish the raw material for our mills; then we could still continue to operate our mills on this side of the line, and by so doing not only give employment to men now located in their respective localities, but give the mill owner an opportunity to receive the benefit of the money already invested in mill construction in our country. In this connection I quote from a letter received to-day:

If you want to put the hundreds of little shingle mills that give employment to thousands out of business take the tariff off of shingles. It is absolutely a question of living with us that we should be protected, and for at least 50 cents a thousand. We use timber that would be a complete waste were it not for this industry.

ROCKPORT MILL CO.,
By GEO. C. LEMCKE, *President.*

This is characteristic of letters written by many operators, including P. S. Mendal, Custer, Wash.; M. W. Parish, Custer, Wash.; Kanaskat Lumber & Shingle Co., Tacoma, Wash.; Newcomb & McDaniels Shingle Co., Stanwood, Wash.; Douglas Fir Sales Co., Portland, Oreg.; Alex Polson, Hoquiam, Wash.; Anacortes Chamber of Commerce, Anacortes, Wash.; Rucker Bros., Everett, Wash.; High Point Mill Co., High Point, Wash.; Bertrain Shingle Co., Lynden, Wash.; Henry Carstens, Seattle; John McMasters Shingle Co., Seattle; Index-Galena Co., Index, Wash.; Buckeye Lumber Co., Seattle; Shingle Manufacturers' Association (representing 175 mills), Seattle; Pacific Coast Shippers' Association, Seattle; Woods Creek Mill Co., Monroe, Wash.; C. A. Blackman & Co., Everett, Wash.; Wilcox Shingle Co., Aberdeen, Wash.; Grays Harbor Shingle Co., Aberdeen, Wash.; East Hoquiam Shingle Co., Aberdeen, Wash.; Aberdeen Lumber & Shingle Co., Aberdeen, Wash.; Northwestern Lumber Co., Hoquiam, Wash.; Clough-Hartley Co., Everett, Wash.; Hoquiam Commercial Club, Hoquiam, Wash.; Cooperative Shingle Co., Bothell, Wash.; Everett Commercial Club, Everett, Wash.; Edmonds Mill Co., Edmonds, Wash.; Crown Lumber Co., Mukilteo, Wash.; A B C Shingle Co., Edmonds, Wash.; A C Mill Co., Edmonds, Wash.; Union Shingle Co., Edmonds, Wash; Wasser-Mowatt Shingle Co., Edmonds, Wash.; Seattle Chamber of Commerce, Seattle; Seattle Commercial Club, Seattle; Coats Shingle Co.; Consolidated Lumber & Shingle Co., Bellingham, Wash.; the Atlas Lumber Co., Seattle; the Reliance Co., Seattle, Wash.

In conclusion I submit a copy of resolutions adopted by the International Shingle Weavers' Union of America, in convention at Olympia, Wash., January 4, 5, and 6, 1909:

Whereas during the past 10 years there has been a tariff of 30 cents per thousand on shingles imported by the United States;

Whereas during all this time the imports of Canadian shingles into the United States have steadily increased, have doubled in the last few years, and in the years 1907 and 1908 reached the large total of 8,999 carloads, through which the wage loss to the white workmen in the Washington shingle industry amounted to approximately $1,000,000, or practically $40,000 per month;

Whereas the shingle manufacturers in British Columbia are able to inflict this enormous loss on the wage earners in the Washington shingle industry through the employment of Asiatics, who compose 80 per cent of the working forces in the British Columbia shingle mills, and who accept a very much lower wage compensation and a very much lower standard of living than can the all-white labor of the Washington shingle industry;

Whereas the white wageworkers in the Washington shingle industry have better and higher conceptions of the industrial, social, hygienic, and moral well-being and, realizing the ideals of their race and Nation, have trained themselves to conform to a standard of living in accordance with American ideas of American civilization;

Whereas the increasing imports by the United States of Asiatic-made shingles of British Columbia constitute a menace to American institutions by driving white workmen out of the Washington shingle mills, depriving these workmen of the means to maintain themselves and families, thus lessening the amount of money available to farmers, merchants, and other business men in the United States;

Whereas the wage earners in the Washington shingle mills have been enforcedly idle nearly 12 months during the past 24 months;

Whereas they are, to a great extent, engaged in producing shingles from fallen, fire-blackened, and other cedar that would be otherwise wasted and be a dead loss to the State and to the Nation;

Whereas the first consideration of the United States Government should be the welfare of its own citizens; and

Whereas it is understood that some misinformed people now advocate the reduction of the present tariff of 30 cents per thousand, which is even now an inadequate protection against Asiatic shingles made in British Columbia; wherefore, for these reasons we respectfully and firmly protest against any reduction of the present tariff, and we do earnestly and strongly urge all legislatures to save the industry and to protect our necessary wage interest by fixing an adequate protective tariff against Asiatic-made shingles, a tariff of preferably 50 cents per thousand:

Voted, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each member of the Washington State Legislature, with the request that they memorialize Congress to grant the Washington shingle industry an adequate protective tariff of preferably 50 cents per thousand;

Voted, That the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and United States Congressmen from shingle-manufacturing districts covered by the International Shingle Weavers' Union of America be furnished with copies of these general resolutions.

J. C. BROWN,
President International Shingle Weavers' Union of America.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] is recognized. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I was very deeply interested in the address of my standpat friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. It was to me a new performance. I have heard that on some former occasion some Member of the House procured another Member to ask him questions in order to emphasize his speech, but this is the first time I have ever observed that a Member of the House was driven to the necessity of obtaining the services of the reading clerk to ask him questions in order to emphasize his speech. After all, it may be a convenient practice, because it seems to me that a man can better answer questions that he himself writes than he could answer questions asked by some one on the outside. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I am glad, however, to see my Republican friend go in partnership with a Democratic reading clerk for any purpose. [Laughter.] There is but one objection I can find to that performance, and that is that, as the boys back in my district would say, I do not think he "toted fair." I believe he ought to have "swapped work" with the reading clerk and permitted him to answer some questions. Knowing the reading clerk (H. Martin Williams), as I do, I believe if he had done that the speech would have been a much better speech. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

I have not made any arrangements with anyone to ask me questions, and I presume that there will be none propounded, so I will content myself with making my own speech unaided.

Mr. Chairman, I realize, as everyone must realize, that the Democratic Party is to-day on trial before the American people as judges, and for the present that party must stand or fall by the verdict rendered.

This bill was prepared by a Democratic committee, revised and approved by a Democratic caucus, will be passed by a Democratic Congress, and signed by a Democratic President. It is an honest and a consistent effort of the Democratic Representatives to fulfill the party's pledges made to the people in the platform upon which a Democratic President and this Democratic House were elected. Personally I did not favor some of the rates fixed, but I believe it is a good bill as a whole, and that it will be beneficial to the country at large. It is a party measure, and as a Democrat I shall vote for it, and am willing to politically sink or swim, survive or perish, as the fortunes of my party shall decree.

There is no question but that a great majority of the people of this country have come to realize that the tariff taxes now imposed, especially upon the necessaries of life, are too high, and that the burdens now borne by the consuming masses are too great. All political parties admit that fact, and all of them have promised to give relief.

The Republican Party in its platform of 1908, in response to a growing demand, even in its own ranks, promised, if successful in that contest, a speedy revision of the tariff. True, the words of the platform were not clear as to the character of the promised revision, but Mr. Taft, the candidate for the Presidency upon that platform and the authoritative spokesman of his party, construed this declaration to mean a substantial downward revision. No intelligent man ever believed that the leaders of the Republican Party intended to have the voters of the country believe that an upward revision was contemplated.

President Taft, after his election, in good faith, as I believe, called Congress together in extraordinary session to carry out the promises of his party. That Congress did pass the so-called Payne-Aldrich law, but instead of revising the tariff downward they made the monumental mistake of revising it upward, thereby violating the promises its platform and its

leaders had made to the country, deceiving the voters, and betraying the people who trusted them.

In my opinion, if the Republicans in the Sixty-first Congress had been true to the people and faithful to their promises, Mr. Taft would have had no opposition in his own party for renomination, and would have been reelected and in the White House to-day.

The Democratic Party has for many years contended that the tariff taxes were too high, especially upon the necessaries of life, and promised in its platform of last year that, if successful, they would favor a prompt revision and a reduction of import duties, and thereby lessen the burdens of the toiling masses. In obedience to that well-known party principle, and in fulfillment of our promises made to the people in that campaign, we are here in extraordinary session, called by President Wilson, to redeem our pledges. We should be, and we will be, true to our constituencies and true to the promises we made to them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It has always been, and now is, a difficult problem to revise and to rearrange the tariff duties upon the 4,000 articles embraced within a general tariff law, as each section and each district represented in this House is anxious to be fairly and justly treated in the reductions made. Of course all Democrats agree, as I do, to the time-honored principle of our party, that all tariff taxes should be levied for revenue only, and not for protection.

Speaking for myself, I may say that I believe that this Government has no right, and ought not to be permitted under the Constitution, to use the taxing power for any other purpose than that of raising revenue to pay the necessary expenses of the Government, and I dare say the framers of the organic law never intended that it should be used for any other purpose. This position is and has long been a cardinal doctrine of the Democratic faith. Still, we know that a tax levied, even for revenue only, when placed upon articles from foreign countries that are imported, and that come into competition with similar articles produced here necessarily carries some incidental protection, and, naturally, every section desires, in the readjustment of rates of duty, to get its fair share of the incidental benefits that must follow the imposition of taxes upon competitive articles from abroad. This bill, I believe, to be, as a whole, reasonable and fair and one that will do but little, if any, injustice to any section of the country, but one that will be of great benefit to the country at large, and especially to the toiling millions, whose only investment is the labor of their hands and who must buy all of their food and clothing.

This bill is not as I would have written it, and doubtless no man in this House would have written it exactly as it is. The able chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. UNDERWOOD, has frankly stated that it is not as he would have written it, but I think that we who are Democrats recognize that in preparing the bill the committee has made an honest effort to carry out the principle for which our party stands, and an honest endeavor to fulfill our promises to the people.

The Democratic Party has always favored lower taxes upon the necessaries of life that are required for the comfort, the welfare, and the pleasure of the inmates of our American homes, and have contended that the highest taxes should be placed upon the luxuries of life to be borne by the wealthy, who are better able to bear them. That principle has been followed in this bill and I believe will be approved by the country.

I understand that there has been some alarm felt and expressed because of reductions of tariff duties upon some farm products which are largely produced in Missouri and in the district that I represent, and I desire to speak briefly of some of the provisions of the bill, especially from the viewpoint of my constituents.

The people of that district are as intelligent, industrious, and patriotic as any to be found in this Republic, and as their Representative I shall try to now and at all times look at proposed legislation from their standpoint, as well as to consider the general good of the whole country.

Lumber, corn, meat, hogs, and potatoes are by this bill placed upon the free list, but I am convinced that no country can produce any of these, pay the freight, and sell them in any market in which we sell in competition with us. We export more of these commodities than we import, and so long as we are large exporters of these products the home producer need have little fear of injurious competition from abroad.

The lumber interests in my district are fast disappearing, as our forests have been mostly denuded and timber is rapidly disappearing; but even if this bill should cheapen the price the home builder, the home owner, and the farmers who must buy lumber and building materials far outnumber those who manufacture and sell.

Corn and hogs are not imported into this country now and can not be profitably imported and sold here in competition with the home producers. No protection upon them is necessary, and even if a tariff should be imposed it would be without effect.

Potatoes are not grown to any great extent in my district; only about 100,000 bushels are produced annually, which is not enough to supply the demand for home consumption. The price will probably not be materially affected in Missouri; but even if reduced, it will be to my constituents as a whole not an injury but a benefit.

Meat is placed upon the free list, but the farmers and stock raisers of my district do not sell meat but do sell the live stock. The price of meat in recent years has been relatively too high as compared with the price of cattle and hogs by reason of the packers in the United States being in a combination and the prices fixed and controlled by the Beef Trust. It is hoped and believed that by placing meat upon the free list that it will give some relief to the people of the country, who have been compelled to pay exorbitant prices in the past, without any reference to the price paid to the stock raiser for his cattle and without any benefit resulting to him.

A tax of 10 per cent ad valorem is placed upon cattle, which will be a fair protection to the stock raisers of my district and the entire country against competition from Canada, Mexico, or any of the other foreign countries.

When the reciprocity bill was considered two years ago I made a speech in which I gave as my opinion that even with free trade Canada could not produce wheat, pay the freight to our markets, and sell in competition with our farmers. I believed this statement to be true at that time, and I believe it to be true to-day. But this bill does not place wheat upon the free list, but imposes a duty of 10 cents per bushel upon all importations, and certainly no well-informed man will claim that with a tax of 10 cents per bushel upon wheat that the farmers of Canada or of any other nation on earth can pay that tax for the privilege of bringing their wheat into this country, and pay freight charges in addition, and compete with the wheat producers in any section of this country, and especially in an interior State like Missouri, so far from the Canadian border. The tax of 10 cents per bushel carried in this bill is just as much protection to the farmers of Missouri as the present rate of 25 cents per bushel would be.

There is no industry in the district that I represent that will, in my opinion, be perceptibly affected by the enactment of this bill, but even if, as a result of its enactment, a slight reduction should follow in the prices of some of our products—including lumber, corn, wheat, cattle, meat, and potatoes—the answer is, there are many more people, even in that district, who buy and consume lumber, bread, meat, and potatoes than there are who produce them, and the producers of these products will not lament the fact if the toiling masses should get some relief against the present high cost of living. But even if there should prove to be some reduction in the price of some of the products mentioned, there will be a corresponding benefit to the producers of these commodities in the reduced price of things that they must buy that will more than offset any loss sustained.

This bill places upon the free list and will, we believe, reduce the price of all farm implements, salt, sugar, boots, shoes, and clothing that the farmers buy, which I believe will more than compensate them for any reduction in the prices of the commodities that they produce.

The income-tax feature of this bill is one that has been advocated by the Democratic Party for many years, is approved by the country, and is generally conceded to be equitable and just. We are sometimes told that no punishment should be inflicted upon a man for his thrift. This law is not proposed as a punishment, but for the purpose of equitably distributing the burdens of taxation.

I have a profound admiration for a man who by his industry, his intelligence, and his management honestly accumulates great wealth, but I have a genuine sympathy for the more unfortunate man, who is often as honest and industrious as his prosperous brother, but who, without his fault, by mismanagement or otherwise, has utterly failed in a financial way, and who is not only poor and homeless but compelled to toil for his daily bread.

Paying taxes is not a delightful exercise at best, and no man really enjoys that performance. Some writer of doggerel verse has said:

No one gets all he wants,
And none gets what he axes;
But if he did he'd want the earth
And then growl about the taxes.

I once heard a very important lawsuit argued in the supreme court of my State. The purpose of the suit was to break the will of a testator upon the ground of his mental incapacity to make

it. As evidence to sustain this contention it was shown that he in his lifetime used every art known in his day to dodge the payment of taxes. Such a judicial finding as that would reflect seriously upon the sanity of many of our wealthy men and so-called captains of finance of this age of the world.

Taxes are a burden that must be borne by the public in some way. The theory of paying taxes is that we pay for the protection to life and property furnished and guaranteed by the law. Therefore the more property we have to protect the more benefit we get from the law and the more taxes we should pay. This principle is recognized and followed in school districts, cities, counties, and States. In all of these smaller subdivisions of government we pay taxes in proportion to the assessed value of our property; but under the present system no man pays taxes upon his wealth, his lands, his bonds, or his income for the support of the Government, but all taxes for that purpose have been paid by the consumers of the country when they purchased the taxed articles. We have paid taxes, not upon what we had, not according to the benefits received, not according to our ability to pay, but the wealthy have paid taxes according to the amount and value of the taxed goods they elected to buy, and the poor have paid taxes according to the value of the necessaries of life they were compelled to buy. Hence it may be logically asserted that the poor man with a large family has paid more taxes to support the Government than the wealthy man with a small family.

The Democratic Party has long contended that the present system of taxation, standing alone, is neither equitable nor just, and has advocated the enactment of an income-tax law. Such a law was passed by Congress during Cleveland's administration, but was declared by the Supreme Court to be unconstitutional. Since that time a constitutional amendment has been submitted by Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the States authorizing the enactment of such a law, and now at the first opportunity offered this Democratic Congress proposes to enact this bill to carry out the policy that the Democratic Party has long favored and advocated.

The proposed law exempts $4,000 to every individual or family and provides for a tax of 1 per cent upon all incomes in excess of $4,000 per annum up to $20,000, with an increasing rate of tax upon incomes up to $100,000 per annum, and upon incomes in excess of that amount the rate is to be 4 per cent.

This tax is, to my mind, the fairest tax ever levied against mortal man, as it places a small part of the expenses of the Government upon the wealth of the country that is best able to pay it and who enjoy the greatest benefits under it. Under this law it is estimated that $70,000,000 per annum in revenue will be realized annually, which will to that extent lessen the taxes now being paid upon other commodities and has made it possible for this Congress in this bill to reduce the tariff taxes upon the necessaries of life that are now used in every home of the land.

This is a good bill and one that I believe to be for the benefit of the whole country and especially for the toiling masses. It is a Democratic bill prepared by Democratic hands proposing to carry out Democratic policies and attempting in good faith to fulfill our promises to our Democratic constituencies. It should and will be promptly passed by this Democratic House. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to congratulate the Ways and Means Committee and the Democratic Party that we have before us a measure which lifts some of the burdens off of the shoulders of the masses and lets the wealth of the Nation carry a part of its legitimate load—a bill which lifts the tax from the breakfast and dinner table of the unfortunate poor and places it upon the plethoric income of the more fortunate rich.

And right here I want to emphasize what is a fact. I am in favor of this bill not because I am bound by any caucus but for the reason that in the main it represents the sentiment of the people of my State and of my district. My people are dependent upon the products of the soil. Moderate competencies are with them the rule, while swollen fortunes are practically unknown, and they have never been here knocking upon the doors of Congress asking for special favors. For years they have been carrying an unjust portion of the burden of taxation in that everything they had to buy was purchased in a restricted market and at enhanced prices, while everything they had to sell was regulated by the prices in the world's market, and I am here to use my vote and my voice to the end that this burden shall now be more equitably distributed.

Last year I went before my people and advocated free sugar; also announced my full approval of the terms of the Farmers' Free-List Bill passed by the lower House of the Sixty-second Congress. I explained why I was for free meats, free sugar, free farming implements, lumber, and other products. My position was indorsed, and therefore I feel that when my voice is raised in favor of this bill I am but voicing the sentiments of my people.

My State raises sugar beets, and we also have a beet-sugar factory. But when I learned that sugar was shipped from California and Colorado points, the freight rate absorbed by the manufacturer and the product sold in the eastern market at a price lower than that charged the consumer at the point where the sugar was manufactured, it was clear to my mind that an unjust tribute was being exacted. Furthermore, when the testimony was given that the Union Sugar Co. of California, last year paid 100 per cent profit and that on January 6 Colorado beet sugar sold in New York for 4.60 and in Denver for 5.20, I could not help but feel that the Denver consumer was not getting a fair deal.

After evidence had been brought out to show that Colorado beet sugar had been shipped as far east as Pittsburgh, freight to the amount of 80 cents per hundred paid upon it, and then was sold cheaper than it was sold to the Colorado consumer, Mr. F. B. Case, of California, a beet-sugar manufacturer, explained this process, and his explanation is of such interest that I quote it. You will find it on page 2431 of the Tariff Hearings. Mr. Case said:

> Our surplus product must find its market in some consuming community. We therefore ship the sugar which is not consumed at home to the Missouri River, the Mississippi River, Chicago, and as far east as Cincinnati and Pittsburgh. To ship our sugar this long distance requires payment of an excessive freight rate. Were we not permitted to receive more for our sugars at home than we receive in Cincinnati and Pittsburgh we would go out of business entirely.

A more indefensible proposition than this was never advanced. The admission that the home consumer, adjacent to the factory, has no advantage in the facility with which the product is delivered to him and has to pay more than has the consumer 2,000 miles away is a frank confession of pernicious looting, which I believe will be made impossible by this new tariff law.

No one for one moment believes that Colorado or California sugar is sold in the East at a loss. Therefore it inevitably follows that there is a margin of profit in the freight paid and in the difference in price at which the product is sold at home and in the East which would provide ample margin for reduction in selling price to meet new tariff conditions without affecting the price paid the farmer for his beets. Swollen profits would be diminished, but no honest industry would be injured.

A few months ago there came to my desk a circular issued by a banking and brokerage firm of classic Boston, in which a plea was made for a "safe and sane" revision of the tariff. It was pointed out that wonderful prosperity had followed in the wake of the protective policy, and while here and there might be rates which needed a slight adjustment, nevertheless it would be well to not make any radical reductions—it would be better to "let well enough alone."

Naturally I was interested in learning who were the parties who did not want to be disturbed, and in turning over the pages of the literature sent to me I find that the brokerage firm has listed a number of stocks for sale, and the statistics which I propose to give are those quoted by this firm of bankers and brokers.

First, let us take the Draper Co., of Hopedale, Mass., manufacturers of cotton machinery. And in passing I would like to call the attention of our Massachusetts friend, who so much dreads the effect of the new tariff rates, to the fact that even in these prosperous times of Payne-Aldrichism there are serious labor troubles at the Draper plant at Hopedale, just as there were in Lawrence but a short time ago.

And speaking of the situation at Hopedale, I want to call your attention to the following item from the Washington Herald of this morning, which would go to show that the operator who seeks a part of the benefit of Payne-Aldrichism receives bullets as his dole:

> STRIKER KILLED IN FIGHT WITH POLICE.
>
> HOPEDALE, MASS., *April 24, 1913.*
>
> Emilo Dacchiocchia, strike picket, was shot and killed to-day during a battle between the police and the Industrial Workers of the World strikers, a half mile from the Draper mills. The strikers claimed that Dacchiocchia was shot by a policeman. The police refused to discuss the shooting.

The operatives fail to see how any of the blessings of high protection find their way into their dinner buckets.

The Draper Co.—

Says the circular—

> has had a remarkable record. Its distribution during the past 12 years—not including a stock dividend of 50 per cent in 1902—has ranged from 8 to 30 per cent. In the 12 years from 1901 to 1912, inclusive, the company has paid a total of 184 per cent per share, or the equivalent of 15.33 per cent per annum, not including the 50 per cent stock dividend.

No wonder they want "safe and sane" revision which will not disturb their opportunity to make unjust earnings.

Next we have the Queensbury Mills, of Worcester, Mass., manufacturing mohairs, alpaca luster yarn, mohair serges, and alpaca linings. The company has only been in business for 13 years, but, the brokers inform us, the shares of par value of $100 have an actual value of $343, and—we again quote literally—

The Greenwood Mills, which was taken over by the Queensbury in 1907, has, since its merger, averaged an annual income of 12 per cent on its capitalization. During this same period the average annual net earnings of the old Queensbury Mills alone have exceeded by several times the dividend requirements of the preferred stock of the new corporation.

Then we have the Bates Manufacturing Co., of Lewiston, Me. It is capitalized at $1,200,000 and has a surplus of $2,514,831. Annual dividend rate, 10 per cent with occasional extras. Last year its net earnings were 33 per cent of the outstanding stock, and the average dividend for the last eight years was 18.37 per cent. They manufacture quilts, ginghams, damask tablecloths, seersuckers, and dress goods.

The Farr Alpaca Co., of Holyoke, Mass., has paid 24 per cent per annum during the last three years. In 1909 it paid 40 per cent in cash and 100 per cent in stock.

And while we have all been bombarded in the past few months by the makers of hats, who implored us to keep on a heavy duty for protection needed, we find that the John B. Stetson Co. is doing quite well. Here is the dividend record: 1902, 17 per cent; 1903, 20 per cent; 1904, 20 per cent; 1905, 25 per cent; 1906, 25 per cent; 1907, 25 per cent; 1908, 50 per cent; 1909, 25 per cent; 1910, 50 per cent; 1911, 25 per cent; 1912, 50 per cent. An average of 30.2 per cent for the last 11 years, or for every dollar originally invested the plant has paid back $3.32 in the past 11 years.

As to the Dartmouth Manufacturing Co., of New Bedford, Mass., the brokers inform us that "the dividends for the past three years have been 16 per cent per annum. In 1909 the company paid 13 per cent, together with a stock dividend of 100 per cent, and in the two preceding years the distribution has been 66 per cent for each year." This company makes fine cotton goods.

The Berkshire Cotton Manufacturing Co. averaged 20 per cent per annum during the past three years.

The Singer Manufacturing Co., handling over 80 per cent of the world's output of sewing machines, is to be affected by the new tariff legislation, but it probably will survive the shock, as we find that it has declared two stock dividends since 1900, one of 200 per cent and one of 100 per cent, and the cash dividends range from 7 to 40 per cent.

It is no wonder that these beneficiaries of an unjust system desire to be left alone.

I remember in one of my reading books in school in the old days that there was a poem in regard to a vindictive beggar who sat at the roadside and threw a stick or a stone at each passer-by who did not contribute to his earnings. When remonstrated with he assumed an air of injured innocence and asserted that "all he asked was to be left alone." So it seems to be with these beneficiaries of special privilege. They have swatted us right and left for lo, these many years, and now, when it happens that we are in a position to demand fair play, they assure us that "they are quite content, and all they ask is to be left alone."

And now I want to say a few words to our friends on the other side. If you were one-half as solicitous of the farmer when in power as you are when out of it, we would have been much better off. For 44 years you had the power, and during that time what has been done for the farmers whose votes you are seeking now? You have seen where the farmers produced crops which cost the consumers $13,000,000,000, and yet the farmers received but $6,000,000,000 of that amount. It was not until the last session of Congress that any effective action was taken to remedy this condition, and with the coming of the new division of marketing we can see a ray of hope.

Again, you have seen the farmer paying 7, 8, and even 10 per cent for the money needed to develop his little property while his French competitor paid but 4.3 per cent and the other Continental farmers faring equally well, and what have you done about it? It remained for us to reach this day before a start was made to the end that we can establish a system of agricultural credits and secure needed relief. Under a fake system of benefits accruing from protection you have occasionally taken a few sheets of paper from off of the burden carried by the agricultural interests, and at the same time you have dumped into the farmers' load a few leaden weights in the form of swollen profits to accrue to the manufacturers on the things that the farmers had to buy.

I have known what it is to farm, and speaking as the representative of an agricultural district I say to you that what we want is performance and not promise. We have seen immense fortunes built up for the few, but we have also seen the many toiling in order to secure even a bare living, and while we begrudge to no one the benefits gained by thrift and industry, we do protest against a system which concentrates these benefits instead of distributing them.

Again, on that side I have heard occasional reference made to the "bread lines" and the "soup houses," which are predicted by you to result as a consequence of the passage of this legislation. Let me tell you, gentlemen, that but once in Kansas have I seen the "soup house" and the "bread line," and that was on the 19th day of January, 1912, when a Democratic mayor of the Republican capital city had to dig down in his jeans to pay for food to relieve the hunger of the poor unfortunates who had failed to find a full dinner pail under the Payne-Aldrich tariff.

In conclusion I wish to state that I am for this bill because I believe it carries out our platform pledges—it is an unquestioned revision downward.

I am for it because it will ultimately lead to lower prices to the consumer and cheapen the cost of living.

I am for it because it will impel our manufacturers to become more efficient and progressive, and will thus open up to us the markets of the world.

And I am for it because it is a real step toward fair trade, and with it in operation the doors of opportunity will be thrown open to the many while special privilege is curtailed of power and is compelled to carry a due share of the national burden which it has so long avoided. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, in the concluding chapter of the ninth or last volume of Dr. Ridpath's great History of the World the author, after reviewing the struggles and achievements of men and the rise and fall of nations, with the poise and justice of the historian, lays at the doorway of the human race a most terrible indictment, as touching the greed and the avarice of man. Says Dr. Ridpath:

The first and most general truth in history is that men ought to be free. If happiness is the end of the human race, then freedom is its condition. And this freedom is not to be a kind of half escape from thralldom and tyranny, but ample and absolute. The emancipation in order to be emancipation at all must be complete. To the historian it must ever appear strange that men have been so distrustful of this central principle in the philosophy of human history. It is an astonishing fact that the major part of the energies of mankind have been expended in precisely the opposite way—in the enslavement rather than the liberation of the race. Every generation has sat like a stupid image of Buddha on the breast of its own aspirations, and they who have struggled to break their own and the fetters of their fellow men have been regarded and treated as the common enemies of human peace and happiness. On the contrary, they have been saviors and benefactors of whom the world has not been worthy. The greatest fallacy with which the human intellect has ever been beguiled is that the present—whatever age may be called the present—has conceded to men all the freedom which they are fit to enjoy. On the contrary, no age has done so. Every age has been a Czar, and every reformer is threatened with Siberia.

Thus we see that the progress, the evolution, and the partial liberation of the human race from the bondage and the enslavement of those in authority have been accomplished not by the will but over the protest of those who would keep their fellows in servitude.

Typical of this repression of the ambitions and of the aspirations of men has been the smothering of the people in their effort to lift themselves from the slough of ignorance to the table-lands of education and enlightenment, but no more so than the system of heavy taxation that ever stifles and thwarts them in their upward strivings.

It will be impossible, Mr. Chairman, within the short time allotted to me in this discussion to more than hurriedly review the history of American tariff enactments, or to even discuss in detail the various schedules of the pending bill. Therefore, I content myself with reviewing merely isolated contentions of tariff barons in exacting from the masses of the people the heavy toll imposed upon them and the dire consequenses that follow such exactions upon the individuals who pay the toll, as well as arresting the development of a nation's greatness.

In all probability it is well within the memory of the youngest Member upon this floor when the Republican Party claimed first that the tariff was not a tax, but when driven to the wall upon this absurd contention they finally admitted that while it was a tax, yet as an excuse for its imposition they said that the foreigner and not the American paid the tax.

Now, let us analyze the first contention, absurd even as that is. If the tariff is not a tax, it can neither benefit the manufacturer nor hurt the consumer. Therefore, if no one is affected

by the tax, why impose it? Why legislate tariff acts if the tariff is not a tax? Why encumber the books with tariff enactments? Why keep a lobby constantly in Washington at great expense if the tariff is not a tax and no one is to profit thereby?

But the high protectionists finally admitting that the tariff is a tax, and asserting that the foreigner pays the tax as a justification for its existence, let us analyze in the second place that absurdity.

Surely, if a tax and the foreigner pays it, this should not affect the American consumer, as the foreigner is not only benevolent, but becomes a philanthropist and lifts the tax from the American consumer and pays it, that the American manufacturer may thrive and prosper.

The late James G. Blaine, as I now recall, was one of the first high priests of protection to admit that the American consumer paid the tax. Upon his return to the United States from Florence, Italy, where he had been sojourning for several months in quest of health, he entered vigorously into the presidential campaign of 1888 in behalf of Mr. Harrison, and gave utterance to this strange and paradoxical statement: That while the tariff was a tax and the American and not the foreigner paid it, yet the tax was so deftly collected that the American consumer did not feel it; thus giving evidence that the Republican Party was not only the greatest aggregation of confidence men in the country, but by a system of shoplifting and legerdemain had become the most successful freebooters and kleptomaniacs that ever infested a civilized community. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, ordinarily, we might not advert and give time to such an absurd and staggering statement as this, were it not for the fact that Mr. Blaine at that time and for years had been the most stupendous figure and the popular idol of his party. But let us analyze even this statement, and see if it will bear the light of reason.

A tax paid by the American, and yet so deftly collected that the American could not feel it when paid. How strange! How utterly strange!

Suppose that Mr. Blaine, upon leaving his hotel in Italy, had on his person $500 in money, which amount was only sufficient to liquidate his hotel bill and to buy his passage upon the boat to his American home, and yet before the payment of his hotel bill and the purchase of his ticket, some pickpocket chanced along and lifted the purse of the Plumed Knight so deftly that this great Republican did not feel it at the time; but I venture to assert that when the time came to pay his bill and to buy his ticket he would have been short of the wherewithal to meet his obligation, whether the pickpocket was either deft or crude in filching from him the coin of the realm.

But another great Republican statesman later gave utterance to a similar and no less anomalous statement. Mr. McKenna, a Republican Representative from California, and now a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, at the first session of the Fifty-first Congress, and at page 4992 of the RECORD, while discussing the McKinley bill, used this language:

> The important thing is not that the tariff is a burden on the individual.

And, consistent with all high protectionists, the tariff has never been a burden to the individual nor to the poor. Continuing, Mr. McKenna says:

> It is not a burden on him, not because it is indirect, but because he does not feel it, or if so, he feels it as the horse feels his rider, not burdened by him, but encouraged by him and animated to swifter flight and to victory in the race.

This great statesman and jurist, whom we all honor for his much learning, says that the important thing about the tariff is not that it is a burden upon the unfortunate man who has the tax to pay, and affirms that it is not a burden on him not because he says it is indirect in its collection, but because the Government employs its subtle hands as a kleptomaniac and takes the money not openly and fairly and squarely by presenting a bill of particulars, nor collects it even as decently as the highwayman who lies in ambush in the dark of the night, sandbags the wayfarer, and robs him of his purse.

The Democratic Party maintains, sir, that no duties levied upon importations are warranted by the Constitution, except for the purpose of carrying on the functions of government economically administered. Mr. Cooley, in his Constitutional Limitations, says:

> A tax on imports, the purpose of which is not to raise revenue, but to discourage and indirectly prohibit some particular import for the benefit of some home manufacture, may well be questioned as being merely colorable, and therefore not warranted by constitutional principles.

But once the thin edge of the wedge of high protectionism having entered into the body of taxation, it has been constantly driven to its very head by those who sought and who have become its beneficiaries.

The heavy expenses growing out of the Civil War made it necessary—

> For the establishment of heavy internal-revenue taxation, and along with it the imposition of correspondingly heavy customs duties, primarily designed to place domestic producers upon a basis of equality with foreign producers, who would otherwise have had the advantage owing to the burden of domestic taxation under which the home producers were laboring—

Says the report on the present bill.

So this was the excuse, and justifiably so under the peculiar circumstances, for the imposition of tariff duties. But the Civil War closed nearly a half century ago and the burdens of taxation have been increasing with the years, while American energy and American opportunity which, would otherwise conquer the world commercially, have been stifled and repressed with the resultant that the consumers have paid exorbitant prices for manufactured articles and American employment has been limited and restricted. Surely it is now high time that the war taxes of 50 years ago should be lopped off and that the handcuffs that bind American prowess should be broken.

> The land was doubly taxed we thought,
> To carry on the war;
> Now war to a period has been brought,
> Still more the taxes are.
> Strange conduct this, all must allow;
> Hush! Let your murmurs cease,
> We pay the double taxes now
> To carry on the peace.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Perhaps the tyranny of unnecessary taxation has never been more concretely expressed than in the opinion delivered by Chief Justice Marshall in the case of McCulloch against State of Maryland (Wheaton's Reports IV, p. 327), when he said:

> An unlimited power to tax involves necessarily a power to destroy, because there is a limit beyond which no institution and no property can bear taxation.

And again this maxim of the law is made as tersely, perhaps, by Justice Miller (U. S. Sup. Ct. in Loan Assn. *v.* Topeka, 20 Wallace, 657). This distinguished jurist says:

> To lay with one hand the power of the Government on the property of the citizen and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation. This is not legislation; it is a decree under legislative forms.

So we have, Mr. Chairman, these two startling indictments made by the Supreme Court of the United States and laid at the very doorway of the Republican Party, and yet in the face of this indictment and with the protests that have been raised by an impatient and groaning tax-burdened people the Republican Party would continue to raise all taxes, perpetuating under the guise of law a system of robbery by exploiting the people's substance. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

> In vain we call old notions fudge,
> And bend our conscience to our dealing,
> The Ten Commandments will not budge,
> And stealing will continue stealing.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Perhaps there has never been a greater protectionist than the late Charles Henry Carey, who upon one occasion said that he verily wished that the ocean were a flame of fire, in order, I suppose, that the ships which sail from this land to that, and which act as it were like the "shuttles of the loom, weaving the web of concord among the nations," might be consumed upon a sea of conflagration. And yet we have in this House today not a few Members who in a measure indorse the sentiments of Mr. Carey. The venerable gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], during the tariff debate two years ago, said from his place upon this floor that the tariff could never get too high for him.

The present system is not only archaic and obsolete, if we are to set our faces toward the rising and not toward the setting sun, but is out of harmony with all true progress of the day.

One of the greatest fights that was ever witnessed in the British Parliament was the struggle to overcome and repeal the corn laws, which were made especially for British aristocratic landlords, and with the repeal of the corn laws English tariff restrictions were generally modified and England at once leaped forward, and by a system of freer trade relations conquered the world commercially.

The recent efforts of the Chamberlains, the Bonar Laws, and the Arthur Balfours, backed by the wealth and the aristocracy of England, for the past 10 years have failed to turn back the hands of the clock of progress. The recent contest in behalf of tariff reform in England—tariff reform there meaning the opposite of what it does here and a return to higher tariff protection instead of reduction of tariff duties—has been unavailing, though led by some of the most resourceful and astute statesmen of the British Parliament. England has perhaps

never been so much agitated concerning her trade relations, and especially concerned about her safety from sanguinary and hostile attacks of her neighbor across the North Sea, as she is to-day. The tariff on imports with preferential duties to her over-sea dominions has been the watchword and slogan of the Unionist Party for quite a dozen years.

England has succeeded in linking her daughter lands to her as though with hoops of steel, and with all the clamor and the protestations on the part of the Unionist Party for a still closer attachment in the way of preferential and discriminating tariff duties between the mother country and her over-sea lands the English people will not forsake their one great principle that has made their country not only the invincible mistress of the high seas but carries her commerce triumphant into every port and makes the seas white with British sails.

So, Mr. Chairman, we must not be content with the markets we have, but we must break the shackles and manumit American commerce, and with American skill, American ingenuity, and American activity conquer the world commercially.

We are living in a strange and in an unusual time. There is no place for the laggard, and there must be no place for the pampered favorite who is clothed and hothoused by American protection. The world to-day thinks and speaks in continents and not in sections or segments. There are to-day but 8 great nations and less than 20 great surviving tongues of the many hundreds that murmur their babble here and there.

The sensory arteries of commerce and of trade are so acute, girdled by rail and circumventing the earth by electrical wires, that the smallest incident affecting a single community may be felt and grow into transcendent importance in the remotest part of the world. We can not afford to let slip the opportunity to be in the vanguard of the great struggle that lies in the immediate beyond. Blessed by a country remote from the antagonisms and jealousies of European lands, already burdened beyond endurance with military and naval armaments, overcrowded populations, restricted opportunities, and narrowed states—isolated as we are, I say, with no neighboring jealousies or bickerings to confront and embarrass us, we should stand first in commercial supremacy upon the completion of the first half of the twentieth century.

Our great neighbor to our north, a field promising with the outlook of opportunity, is anxious to receive the products of our factories in the making of the Canadian Government pregnant with the possibilities of the years to come, while the Central and South American States, an empire infinitely larger than our own, yet await the magic touch of America's hand to open the door of hope and progress there. The great Panama Canal, the product of American money and American genius, at a cost to us of nearly $500,000,000, is yet to prove a short cut and a gateway not only to the continent lying south of us, with illimitable opportunities, but affording us a quicker route to the Orient and to the industrial and commercial development of both Japan and China.

Our protective duties are many times higher than they were a century ago, while this country was yet an infant and in its swaddling clothes, for we have excluded imports, restricted competition, lessened efficiency, dulled our wits, and have produced monopolies, combinations, and trusts. If high protectionism is a panacea for our ills, its beneficence should be generally diffused and widespread; otherwise it can not justifiably have any place in our economic life.

Any great American system should stand for the virtues and not for the vices; for the extension of the horizon and not for the circumscribing of our visions; for the uplift and not the depression of the people, giving equality to all men alike and special privilege to no men; for the breaking of the shackles that bind the feet of progress; in short, that man himself, free, unhampered, with his face to the rising and not to the setting sun, may have as his conquest the wages of his energy and the fruit of his legitimate skill. This must have been the vision of the early patriots of this Republic in their dreams and concepts of a nation's greatness.

But has the present system produced such opportunity or given equality to all alike? Do not our industrial centers bear evidence of the pauperized myriads of human beings wrecked in health, depleted in stature, hopes blasted, ambitions thwarted, and over whose heads hang the lowering clouds instead of the sunlight of opportunity and equality? And what is the resultant? For every Dives, wrapped in luxury, living in his palace of marble and of gold, there lies at the rich man's gate a Lazarus, aye, hundreds of paupers who have been denied the crumbs that fall from the protectionist's table. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Nothing but our richness of natural resources has prevented or delayed even worse conditions. It is not protected largess which the people want; they want only justice—simply free and exact justice. The American laborer, both man and woman, has been used up by the highly protected "mill." They and their offspring have gone in the dividends, while their wrecked bodies have been thrown as so much refuse upon the culm bank or junk heap of American industry.

We have allowed our factories, after using up a generation of Americans, to swallow up the incoming immigrant "as if he were the soulless raw material of manufacture," while our hillsides and valleys are untilled and the price of food products empties the market basket.

Our industrial system is out of joint; the premium on factory work must be taken off; the proper economic relation between manufacturing and other lines must be restored. We must encourage agriculture, let efficiency have a chance, break up the controlled relations of our systems of transportation with large manufacturing interests, and maintain the "open door" of industrial success.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, any great system of right should stand the test when the straightedge of justice is applied thereto. Somebody must suffer as a result of high discriminating duties. That the manufacturer prospers by it will not be denied; that the general public has its coffers depleted may not successfully be gainsaid. But the excuse has been that the wage earner, that the factory hand, if you please, has become the beneficiary of high protectionism and that he as well as the manufacturer must not enter into competition with the foreign manufacturer or with the foreign laboring man. The highest schedule in the Payne-Aldrich bill is the woolen schelule, known as Schedule K, of an average protection of 97 per cent upon the various grades of woolen manufactures.

Who shares this profit? How much is given to the man who labors for the woolen mills? The investigation held by a special committee of the last Congress reflects this fact: That at Lawrence, Mass., one of the great woolen centers of this country, where a jargon of 17 languages is heard, the average wage is $7.30 per week, in this age of the high cost of living. And, moreover, sir, in this same community seven people and more were compelled to occupy and sleep in the same little room.

Who is receiving the immense profits arising from the tariff duties on woolen manufactures? The wearers of woolen clothes certainly pay the freight, and I deny that those who labor in the mills share a just proportion of the profits.

What was once a considerable part of our virile citizenship has passed through the "mill"; the result is manifest in the diminished birth rate, in the spread of tuberculosis, deformed bodies, child slavery, overcrowded, disease-breeding factory tenements, and many more of the untoward elements, Mr. Chairman, that should find no place in the growth and life of American citizenship.

The preservation of the race and of our institutions calls for heroic treatment in the amelioration of American factory conditions.

We have, sir, bondholders and masters who have kept in servitude from time to time the sons and daughters of Adam's race. We are reliably informed in a certain Great Book, which I commend to gentlemen on that side of the aisle, that for 40 years a great people seeking their liberty wandered in the Egyptian wilderness, but all this while were the slaves of the Pharaohs, who would not let the people go. This great Egyptian ruler was one of the most pronounced standpatters in all the history of the world. Plague and devastation too numerous to mention here were from time to time visited upon this monarch, but his heart was hard, his neck was stiff, and still he would not let the people go.

The Lord, patient and sometimes angry, continued to accompany the visitations of His wrath by physical evidence of His displeasure, but still Pharaoh would not let the people go. And for more than 40 years the American people have been wandering in the morass of Republican misrule and Republican maladministration. Pride of the past blinded the party, greed led it astray, and unholy alliance with special privilege encompassed its defeat.

Promise after promise had been made that our economic life would be changed; that the door of hope would be opened; that the shackles would be broken and liberty and opportunity again given to those who toil and to those who spin, whose yoke is always heavy and whose burden is never light. But this party and those privileged interests that held the first mortgage upon the sponsors of that party were likewise stubborn, their necks were stiff, and they, too, would not let the people go. And I here declare that the greatest standpatters in the world's history, in my opinion, have been the Egyptian Pharaohs and the Republican priests of high protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The facts of yesteryear are not to determine our course. The glories of Democracy in times past will not settle the economic

questions of the present, for as so admirably stated by our great President in his official message before the joint session of the Congress:

We are to deal with the facts of our own day, with the facts of no other, and to make laws which square with those facts.

The American voter has recorded his clear verdict between privilege and the people. Democracy is triumphant. Our plain duty is to record that verdict in the laws of the land by the prompt passage of this bill. Our President, standing, as it were, upon a mountain top viewing with impartial and patriotic eye the mistakes of the past, sounds the clarion note that a change must come if America and her institutions are to keep abreast with these stirring times, and with his face resolute to duty he bids us to follow. Shall there be one on the Democratic side who will not buckle on his armor, who will not gird about him the sword of truth, challenging the forces of privilege, the ramparts of protectionism, and the fortifications that have successfully baffled the patriots of the past? Our duty is clear. We will take the fort. We will rout the minions of privilege and of pelf and with courage undaunted we will not falter, but will restore this Government to the people, who will preserve its flag in time of war and whose "stricken love and confidence we can not survive." [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and other members of that committee familiar with every detail of this bill have presented to us in their discussion an able and clear analysis thereof. I shall therefore not presume to discuss the bill as a whole. In the time which the Democratic leader has assigned to me I purpose to consider some of the objects sought to be attained by this legislation which extend far beyond the mere making of a reduction in tariff rates and to notice some of the criticisms which have been directed against Members of the majority, especially the new Members, for having reached an agreement to support the bill by a compromise of their differences. Finally I shall consider criticisms directed against those features of the bill which affect the agricultural classes and shall speak of the remarkable solicitude for the laboring class shown at this late hour by the Republican Party. The fact that I am a new Member and one of the Representatives of the greatest agricultural State in the Nation gives me warrant, I trust, for occupying for a brief space the time of the House.

As I understand the responsibility of the Democratic Party at this hour, it is not merely to reduce the tariff and at the same time produce the needed revenue for the Government. The people demand, and the highest interests of the Nation require, that, as far as is consistent with existing conditions, a tariff bill be passed which will permit the industrial development of the Nation along the lines of its natural adaptation. In no other way can we attain to enduring strength and maintain our present position when our natural resources shall have been reduced to a parity with those of older nations with which we are industrial competitors.

Gentlemen on the other side of the House complain of alleged inconsistencies in the bill. The Democratic Party is not building the tariff policy of the Nation; it is reconstructing that policy which the Republican Party fashioned. The country does not expect, and certainly gentlemen of the opposition should not demand, that with one effort the Democratic Party bring perfect symmetry and beauty to that monstrosity of which the opposition were the architects and builders. As stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], no individual agrees with all the provisions of the bill. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] undertook on the opening day of this discussion to criticize individual Members, who were opposed to some feature of the bill drawn by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, for not having combined and defeated it. The Republicans would have liked very much to have had us do that. The reason why we did not do it is because we believe this bill as a whole is a compliance with the preelection pledges of the Democratic Party, and if enacted into law will give to the people of the Nation substantial relief from the injustices of the tariff which the Republicans made. We had sense enough to know that agreement could be reached in no other way than by individuals making concessions for their constituents in behalf of the common good, in the benefits of which common good their constituents would participate and thereby receive compensation for that which they had surrendered. This tariff bill, like every tariff bill, is a matter of compromise, a matter of give and receive.

We were told by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] that some substantial provisions of the present law—Schedule K, for instance—did not accord with the views of that distinguished gentleman [Mr. PAYNE] whose name is attached to that law. This gentleman is commended in extravagant terms not only for having supported but for having fathered this offspring of the Republican Party. Greater love hath no man shown than this, that during all the years Schedule K has played the rôle of highwayman for the woolen manufacturer this gentleman, out of consideration for the good name of the Republican family, has held back any denial of its paternity. Yet Democrats are criticized for having surrendered minor differences to make certain the passage of this piece of great reconstructive legislation. If we would only get into a row among ourselves, if every Member would stand out stubbornly for everything he wants, we would be doing just what the Republican Party wants us to do and just what the country does not want us to do.

Our Republican friends, in their efforts to dissatisfy the country with this bill, take each business separately and dwell upon what this bill compels it to give up, but they make no mention of what benefits each business receives from the bill. To state what any class gives up does not state the effect of the bill on that class unless you state what it receives in return.

Great solicitude for the interests of the American farmer has been shown by the gentlemen on the other side of the House in their discussions, and grave apprehensions are expressed as to the effect of this bill on him. Protect the American farmer, they insist. Protect him how? How have they sought to serve him when they had the power to serve? They put the shadow of a duty on his products, but left on his back the burden of an exorbitant tariff on the things he must buy. They gave him the shadow while they took away from him the substance—substance which he has gathered from the markets of the world. By his industry and genius he produces more than the Nation consumes. Whatever tariff wall you put around his products, he must go over it to seek a market for his surplus, and the price at home and the price abroad are fixed in the markets of the world in open competition with the earth.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If it is not going to hurt the farmer to take the tariff off, how is it going to benefit the consumer?

Mr. SUMNERS. Does the gentleman mean by taking the tariff off agricultural products?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes. How can it benefit one without hurting the other?

Mr. SUMNERS. We say it will not hurt the farmer for the reason that what the farmer gives up he will get back under the benefits of this bill and more besides.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It will cheapen his commodity, will it not?

Mr. SUMNERS. It will cheapen some of his commodities, not the staple crops. I think nobody would deny that. You are going back to the great industrial sections of this country, may I say—and I mean it in no offensive sense—undertaking to make the men who work in the great factories believe that they get no benefit by the reduction. I am going back to Texas and tell my people that it will cheapen some of their minor products; then I am going to show them some of the benefits which this bill gives them in exchange for that which they are compelled to surrender.

The Republican Party is quite willing to give the farmer a tariff on those products the price of which is fixed in the markets of the world and therefore could not be increased by the tariff. In addition, it would gladly foster rural industries here and there in the hope, I dare say, of drawing recruits to strengthen its decimated ranks entrenched around the great tariff-favored industries of the city.

This is not all surmise. On the opening day of this discussion, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], representing one of the greatest manufacturing districts, used this significant language:

Yet we know in our hearts that duties on manufactures and duties on farm products must go hand in hand. How long did the protective system in England last after the repeal of the corn laws? Just about as long as it took the indignant British farmer to join with the free trader and wipe the whole slate clean.

Is it not fair to suspect, in view of this language and of Republican discriminations against the agricultural interests, that this is the fountain from which springs the concern for the American farmer? Well can the manufacturer afford to give the farmer 16.75 per cent tariff on corn, for instance, as the law now provides, when the whole Nation imports a negligible quantity and the corn grower, after supplying the entire home demand at a price fixed in the free markets of the world, exports $29,000,000 worth annually. The manufacturer can well afford this concession, which concedes nothing, if the farmer will pay

him at least 50 per cent more for his clothes than he could have bought them for in the markets to which he sent his corn for sale. This represents the sort of reciprocity which the Republican, representing the highly protected manufacturing interests, is offering to the farmers of the Nation as a basis for a political alliance with them.

While this bill removes this sort of pretended protection for the farmer, it gives him plows, harrows, reapers, drills, planters, mowers, cultivators, thrashing machines, cotton gins, and all other agricultural implements free of duty. On these he now pays an import duty of 15 per cent ad valorem. Bagging for his cotton is free of duty under this bill, as are also boots and shoes, sewing machines, leather, harness, saddles, saddlery, hoops and bands of iron for baling cotton, nails and spikes, horse and mule shoes, salt, lumber, fencing wire, and other important articles. In addition to the free list, the following are some of the important reductions in tariff duties carried by this bill.

Woolen dress goods, from 99.70 to 35 per cent.
Ready-made woolen clothing, from 79.56 to 35 per cent.
Flannels for underwear, from 93.29 to 25 and 35 per cent.
Woolen blankets, from 72.69 to 25 per cent.
Cotton underwear, from 60.27 to 25 per cent.
Stockings, hose, and half hose, from 75.38 to 50 per cent.
Shirts, collars, and cuffs, from 64.03 to 25 per cent.
Ready-made wearing apparel, from 50 to 30 per cent.
Handkerchiefs and mufflers, from 59.27 to 30 per cent.
Cotton thread, from 31.54 to 19.29 per cent.
Gloves, from 44.15 to 31.77 per cent.
Anvils of iron and steel, from 32.11 to 15 per cent.
Bolts, from 20.59 to 15 per cent.
Chains of all kinds, from 46.59 to 20 per cent.
Pocketknives, from 77.68 to 40 per cent.
Scissors and shears, from 53.77 to 30 per cent.
Table and butcher knives, forks, etc., from 41.98 to 27 per cent.
Files, etc., from 60.47 to 25 per cent.
Tinwares, from 45 to 25 per cent.
House or cabinet furniture of wood, from 35 to 15 per cent.
Sugar, from 48.54 to 36.25 per cent.
Red lead, from 60.35 to 25 per cent.
White lead, from 38.01 to 25 per cent.
Castile soap, from 16.20 to 10 per cent.
All bricks, from 30.23 to 10.28 per cent.
China, crockery ware, from 55 per cent to 35 or 50 per cent.
Wire rope and strand, from 49.84 to 30 per cent.
Common window glass, from 46.38 to 28.20 per cent.

There are something more than 4,000 items affected by this bill. The result is a reduction from the average rate under the present law of 40.12 per cent ad valorem to an average of 29.60 per cent ad valorem. Thus it will be seen that most of the articles which constitute the farmer's necessities have been put on the free list or a most material reduction made in the present tariff rate. This he has received in exchange for the surrender of the shadow of protective benefit with which the Republican Party has sought to deceive him into supporting its fallacies.

Of course the benefits which the farmer receives through this bill in the reduction of the tariff on clothing, furniture, and so forth, are shared by all the people. However, I have given especial consideration to the effect of this bill on the agricultural classes because of the desperate efforts which the high protectionists are making to establish an alliance with a part of the farming classes by magnifying the effects of the reductions of the tariff on farm products and undertaking to hide the substantial benefits which the bill gives them.

Nevertheless, I can not conclude without reference to the deep concern which the high protectionists are manifesting in another most important class of American citizens—that class known as the American workingman. Oh, the fathomless depths and sublime heights of that love—generous, full, and complete—finding, however, its only manifestation in Republican protection of industries per se.

"Shield the American laborer from the pauper laborer of Europe," you cry, while you fill your factories with thousands upon thousands of these pauper laborers, brought here to compete with the American workingman on his own soil, and to beat down his standard of living, in order that dividends may be greater and that you may be in a better position to starve him into submission when desperation drives him to strike for a living wage. The fact is that the whole burden of the tariff-created and tariff-supported industries, in their final transmission, rests on the laboring man and on those industries of the Nation which sell their products in competition with the world. The industry which can not sustain itself without help from the Government has no strength to yield for the sustenance of another.

But the Democratic Party is not an enemy to the manufacturing interests. The tariff-protected manufacturers bless the Republican Party for its bounty and are condemning in unmeasured terms the insistence of the Democratic Party that they relieve the industry of the country from a part of the burden of their weight. The future will prove the wisdom of the Democratic course; will prove the wisdom, in so far as the welfare of the now protected manufacturing interest itself is concerned. That interest had better begin to put a little weight on its own legs. The time may come when it will need the strength to stand alone even. This thing is certain: The longer you postpone granting substantial relief to the American consumers the more radical their demands will be and the stronger their forces will grow.

I submit that that party is not a true friend of the manufacturing interest which advises that interest to disregard the will of a determined people, asking only for that which they have a right to demand. I ask you, and the Nation asks you: Will you ever grow brave enough and strong enough to bear the flag of commerce to victory in the industrial conflict of the world if you are forever to be held in the lap of the Nation and fed from a bottle?

I am sure I have no sectional prejudice. I would not consciously do injury to any man; certainly I would not want to embarrass those Democrats who have come here from the manufacturing section. It is nothing to be a Democrat down in my country, with a normal majority of 200,000, but those whom I admire most are the brave men who, during the long night of Republican misrule, have kept the watch fires of Democracy burning brightly on the hilltops of old New England.

Gentlemen on the other side of the House make sport of the Underwood competitive tariff policy. The distinguished gentleman from Alabama, in the announcement of that policy, made a lasting and momentous contribution to the practical political philosophy of this time.

Competition will take the antiquated machinery from the woolen mills of this country and substitute therefor equipment capable of the most economic production. Competition will stop waste, conserve energy, and give permanent strength to all industries. How will we ever get for this Nation its share of the commerce of the world unless, with far less protection than we now have, we become able successfully to meet the competition of those who must bring their goods from beyond the seas?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself to the sugar schedule of this bill. I intend to vote for that schedule as it has been reported by the Ways and Means Committee.

I come from Colorado, which is the most important beet-sugar producing State in the Union. I was elected on a platform which specifically declared for the removal of the tariff on sugar, but the President of the United States has urged that the sugar manufacturers of this country be given three years in which to put their house in order, and he suggests an immediate cut of 25 per cent on the tariff with free trade at the end of three years. I believe my constituents have such faith in the judgment of Woodrow Wilson that they will accept this compromise, and, believing that, I propose to vote for the bill, and think I can do so with a clear conscience.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. KEATING. I will.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. What district did the gentleman say he represented?

Mr. KEATING. I represent the entire State of Colorado, having been elected as Congressman at Large.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the people of Colorado, particularly the farmers, had any understanding or any knowledge when they voted for Mr. Wilson that he would in a certain sense be sponsor for such a bill as is introduced at this time?

THE FARMERS AND MR. WILSON.

Mr. KEATING. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that when the farmers of Colorado voted for Woodrow Wilson they believed he was a Democrat. They had no reason to believe that he disapproved of the action of the Democratic majority of this House in the last Congress, and I believe the men and women who voted for Mr. Wilson voted for him because they believed he would insist upon a downward revision of the tariff, and that, in order to attain that end, they were perfectly willing to accept free sugar and, if necessary, free wool.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Just one other interruption.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Certainly.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Is it not a fact that President Wilson in all his speeches reassured the business interests of the country that they had absolutely nothing to fear of radical revision by the Democratic Party?

Mr. KEATING. Yes, sir; that is exactly true; and it is true that the business interests of this country have nothing to fear from this tariff bill [applause on the Democratic side]; and, so far as the beet-sugar industry of the State of Colorado is con-

cerned, it has nothing to fear from this tariff bill, because I want to tell you, sir, that in the State of Colorado we can raise sugar beets and we can make sugar in competition with the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The proposition Woodrow Wilson made to the people of this country was that he would not disturb any legitimate industry, and sugar making is a legitimate industry in the State of Colorado and will not be disturbed. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman one other question. Is that the gentleman's personal view? Is that what the gentleman desires the people of Colorado to understand—that the sugar growers of that State have absolutely nothing to fear?

Mr. KEATING. It is not necessary for me to state my views on the floor of this House for the information of the sugar growers of Colorado. Everyone at home knows where I stand on this question. I was a candidate before the people of Colorado last fall. I went into practically every county in that State, and I distributed copies of my platform, in which I specifically declared that I wanted no man to vote for me unless he was willing to have me come down here and vote to remove the tariff on sugar. After the primaries and before the election I canvassed the State, under the auspices of the Democratic State committee, sometimes speaking once and sometimes eight times a day, and in every speech I delivered—in sugar camps and out of sugar camps—I declared that if elected I would vote for free sugar, and that I did not want to be elected under any other circumstances. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I want to say to the gentleman that he was very much more candid in his statement to his constituents than many other Democratic candidates throughout the country.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman for the compliment.

EFFECT ON COLORADO.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the time allotted to me it is impossible to go into a thorough discussion of this sugar question. I expect, therefore, to make only a brief reference to the broader aspects of this problem and to confine myself largely to a consideration of the effects upon my home State of Colorado. We have heard a great deal on the sugar question in the last 12 or 15 years, especially here in Congress. And out of these debates and the library of reports which have been made upon this subject, I think one fact stands out so clearly that no intelligent man can question its accuracy, and that fact is that the sugar tariff adds from 1½ to 2 cents to the price of every pound of sugar consumed in this country. If that be true—and so far as I know no attempt has been made to controvert that proposition—then the American consumer who, according to reports, consumes something like 80 pounds of sugar per year, is taxed from $1.20 to $1.50 a year for the purpose of sustaining the Sugar Trust. As we have something like 90,000,000 consumers in this country, approximately $115,000,000 per year is added to the sugar bill of the consumers of the country. And the proposition we have before us to-day, when we get right down to bedrock, as we say out in the West, is, Shall we remove from the shoulders of the consumers in this country this burden of $115,000,000 a year, or shall we not?

THE COST OF THE SUGAR TARIFF.

The Democratic Party takes the position that we shall, and the Republican Party—or, at least, that portion of the Republican Party which is able to agree—takes the position that if you remove the tariff you will destroy a great and prosperous industry. I insist that instead of destroying the beet-sugar industry free sugar will save it. But before proceeding to that phase of the matter I want to call the attention of the House to what it costs the people of the West to maintain this sugar tariff.

The State of Colorado has a population of approximately 800,000 people, and in common with all the other citizens of this country the people of that State pay this flat tax of $1.20 per head to sustain the Sugar Trust. Every man, woman, and child pays it. But in addition to that the sugar company charges us another tax. They charge us for the privilege of living in the shadow of a sugar factory, and on every hundred pounds of sugar sold in Colorado they add 55 cents for freight. Now, as a matter of fact, the sugar is made in Colorado, but they charge us freight from the seaboard to the point of consumption. As I said, this freight rate is 55 cents a hundred, so that our per capita contribution to the sugar company is $1.75, and on the basis of a population of 800,000 that makes an annual contribution of about $1,400,000, or more money than the people of Colorado contribute to sustain their State government.

But while the situation in Colorado so far as sugar is concerned is rather bad, we are fortunate compared with the people of Idaho and Montana. They raise sugar beets in those States and they have a great number of sugar factories there. But the Sugar Trust adds an additional penalty to the cost of sugar used in those States, and they charge the Idaho and Montana consumer 45 cents per hundred more than they do the consumer in Colorado and $1 a hundred more than they do the consumer of beet sugar in New York. In other words, they will take Idaho beet sugar and carry it across the continent to the city of New York and sell it for $1 a hundred less than they will sell it at the doors of the sugar factory in Montana and Idaho, and, on the basis of Idaho's population, the consumers of that State are contributing $715,000 a year to support the Sugar Trust. The consumers of Montana—Montana having a larger population—contribute $827,200 a year.

ARIZONA THE UNFORTUNATE.

But while we may sympathize with the consumer in Colorado, and sympathize still more with the consumer in Idaho and Montana, it is only when we come to Arizona that our hearts bleed. Down in Arizona the Federal Government has expended many millions of dollars in constructing reclamation projects in order that the farmers there may grow sugar beets and other things. And they are growing sugar beets there. As a sugar-beet State Arizona is almost the equal of Colorado, but when you come to purchase sugar in Arizona from an Arizona beet-sugar factory you find that the Sugar Trust has tacked 34 cents a hundred onto the price that it charges in Idaho and 79 cents to the price it charges in Colorado and $1.34 a hundred more than it charges in the city of New York. In other words, the unfortunate sugar consumer who lives at the doors of an Arizona beet-sugar factory must pay $1.34 a hundred more for his beet sugar than the more fortunate citizen of this country who lives in New York. Arizona contributes something like $500,000 a year to the upkeep of the Sugar Trust.

Gentlemen from other States may figure out this problem for themselves. I wish my good friend from Kansas here [Mr. MURDOCK] would take the trouble to find out how much it costs his people to maintain the sugar factory at Garden City, which is capitalized for ten times the amount it cost to construct. He will find the bill is a staggering one.

Viewed in the light of the best interests of all the people of this country, there would be no question of what we should do with this measure. It should be passed through this House by a unanimous vote, the Progressives and Republicans vieing with Democrats to give the people of this country relief from this burden.

NO COMPETITION IN SUGAR.

But, my friends, the press agent of the Sugar Trust tells us that if we take this tariff off sugar we will destroy the beet-sugar industry, and that the farmers——

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. What does the gentleman mean by "the trust"?

Mr. KEATING. I mean by "the trust" the American Sugar Refining Co. and its friends in the beet-sugar business, because, I will say for the information of the gentleman, that the American Sugar Refining Co. controls every beet-sugar factory in the United States.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, pshaw!

Mr. KEATING. Absolutely; if not by stock holdings then by trade arrangements or selling arrangements—every one of them. There is not an independent beet-sugar company in the United States when it comes to selling sugar to the consumer.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What is the gentleman's evidence for that? I think the House is entitled to some proof of that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I represent in part the State of Michigan, where we have many beet-sugar factories.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. He said he would. I would like to know if that is true.

Mr. KEATING. The evidence is to be found in the conditions that prevail in the sugar trade in this country.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Is that the gentleman's answer?

Mr. KEATING. That is my answer; and if I had the time I could go into the figures with the gentleman from Michigan, and I think I could demonstrate to his satisfaction that there is a selling arrangement by which the price is fixed for consumers. I am perfectly sure of that proposition in my own State of Colorado, and it is never denied out there.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I would like to yield to the gentleman, but I have only 20 minutes in which to say all I have to say.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I want to say to the gentleman that in most of the States the people are much interested in this subject, especially so far as the farming communities are concerned, representing the great majority of the country, and if the gentleman has any figures to carry out the statement he has just made that there is a trust which fixes the price of sugar of all kinds, I would like very much to hear from him on that point. Is there genuine competition between cane-sugar refiners and beet-sugar manufacturers? I represent a district where we buy sugar and do not make it, and if the gentleman has in his possession any facts along that line to the effect that there is one trust in this country that controls all the sugar industries, both cane and beet, that is something that the people ought to know and a thing which I would like to know.

OVERWHELMING EVIDENCE OF COMBINE.

Mr. KEATING. I think the people should know it, Mr. Chairman, and that is one of the purposes I have in making this speech. So far as the State of Colorado is concerned, there is no question about that; and so far as any other Western State is concerned, there is no question about it. You read the testimony that was submitted in the suit of the United States against the American Sugar Refining Co., and you will find that you can not reach any other conclusion.

After the representatives of the trust had squirmed and sought to evade the issue as much as they could the fact was wrung from them that so far as these western factories were concerned they were controlled by Mr. Havemeyer, and there was an absolute understanding as to the price at which sugar was to be sold. And to-day, in every city in Colorado, in every city in Utah, in every city in Idaho and Montana, the price of sugar is the price at San Francisco, plus the freight from San Francisco to the city where you are selling the sugar. In the case of Denver this freight charge is 55 cents a hundred.

In this connection the case of Grand Junction, Colo., is very interesting. Until a short time ago the Sugar Trust charged the people of Grand Junction not only the freight from San Francisco to Denver but they also charged the freight from Denver back to Grand Junction, although if they had shipped the sugar from San Francisco, which they did not, they would have had to pass through Grand Junction to reach Denver. As a matter of fact they never shipped the sugar from San Francisco. The sugar is made in Grand Junction, and when a grocer wants sugar he sends his boy down to the sugar factory and the sugar is loaded on a wagon and taken to the grocery store.

In the face of this fact the trust tacked a freight charge of 80 cents on every sack of sugar sold in Grand Junction.

The local factory, while styling itself independent, was a party to the holdup. Eventually public sentiment became so strong that the trust graciously agreed to waive the freight charge from Denver to Grand Junction—25 cents—but insisted that the people must continue to pay the mythical freight charge from San Francisco to Denver.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in order to finally convince my skeptical friend from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] that there is no relation between the selling price and the cost of production of American-made sugar, and that the people of this country are paying the price fixed by the Sugar Trust, I will submit the following table, showing the price of sugar in various cities on March 15, 1913:

Prices quoted on beet and cane sugar at various western points on Mar. 15, 1913.

	Beet.	Cane.
	Cents.	*Cents.*
Guthrie, Okla.	4.56	4.76
Omaha, Nebr.	4.48	4.58
Denver, Colo.	4.80	5.00
Kansas City, Mo.	4.48	4.58
Salt Lake City, Utah	4.95	5.15
Seattle, Wash.	4.61½	4.81½
Tacoma, Wash.	4.61½	4.81½
Helena, Mont.	5.25	5.45
Boise City, Idaho.	5.25	5.45
Carson City, Nev.	5.25	5.45
Los Angeles, Cal.	4.61½	4.81½
Phoenix, Ariz.	5.59	5.79
St. Paul, Minn.	4.47½	4.57½
Chicago, Ill.	4.38½	4.48½
Milwaukee, Wis.	4.38½	4.48½
Topeka, Kans.	4.56	4.66
Atchison, Kans.	4.48	4.58
Louisville, Ky.	4.38½	4.43½
Cleveland, Ohio.	4.37½	4.42½
Bay City, Mich.	4.43½	4.48½
Saginaw, Mich.	4.43½	4.48½
Detroit, Mich.	4.37½	4.42½
Pittsburgh, Pa.	4.35	4.40
Buffalo, N. Y.	4.35	4.40
New York, N. Y.	4.25	4.30

You will notice, Mr. Chairman, that the closer you live to a sugar factory the higher the price you pay for sugar.

TOTAL COST TO COUNTRY.

Now let us consider what this robber sugar tariff has cost the consumers of this country.

It is estimated by experts that in the years from 1898 to 1911, inclusive, the consumers of this country paid in increased prices for sugar the staggering sum of $1,368,774,202.

This would be sufficient to construct three Panama canals; it would gridiron this country with asphalted roads; or it would construct a navy which would satisfy even the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON]. But the most impressive fact is that it represents three times the total value of all the beet sugar produced in this country during the period mentioned.

Such economic folly must end.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having counted the cost of a sugar tariff, suppose we consider the claims of the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber that the removal of the tariff on sugar will destroy the sugar industry in this country.

WILL STIMULATE, NOT DESTROY.

I do not presume to speak for the sugar industry of Louisiana—I am not an expert on exotics—but so far as Colorado and the other Western States are concerned, free sugar will, in my judgment, prove a tremendous stimulus to the beet-sugar industry and will lead to the establishment of extensive and most important auxiliary industries, such as packing, preserving, and so forth. Free sugar will injure just one class—the owners of the watered stock of the beet-sugar companies. Unfortunately, the men who are responsible for the water will not suffer alone. They have in many cases unloaded the watered or common stock on the gullible American investor.

One of the men most active in the sugar lobby in this city boasted to me a short time ago that he did not own a dollar of common stock. He had sold all his holdings to the widows and orphans whom he is now parading before the sympathetic eyes of Congress in an attempt to have the tariff on sugar retained.

The 76 beet-sugar factories in this country are capitalized for $141,000,000. Their real value is less than $60,000,000. Eighty millions of water must be removed, and then the patient will be able to sit up and take a little nourishment.

Can the western beet-sugar factories pay the farmers the prevailing price for beets—$5.50 for 15 per cent beets—and produce granulated sugar in competition with the world? Without a moment's hesitation, I answer "Yes."

How do I arrive at that conclusion? Let me show you.

COST OF MAKING BEET SUGAR.

Germany is the world's foremost producer of beet sugar. German sugar enters the English market and competes with the sugars of the world. We have not heard anything about the pauper labor of the Tropics driving German sugar out of England. In fact, there is some complaint that this so-called pauper labor needs "protection" against the vigorous German sugar maker.

This being the fact, it stands to reason that if we can produce sugar as cheaply as Germany we, too, can compete with the world.

That brings us to the question, What does it cost to produce 100 pounds of sugar in Germany and what should it cost in this country?

The problem is not so complicated as our friends on the other side of the Chamber would have us believe.

The principal item in the cost of producing beet sugar is the price paid the farmer for his beets.

In this country the standard price is $5.50 per ton for 15 per cent beets. The factories in Colorado pay that price, not because their owners are philanthropists, as some gentlemen would have us believe, but because our farmers will not raise beets for less. They do not have to. They can raise other crops of as great money value. I wish the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] would bear that fact in mind when he is shedding crocodile tears over the impending impoverishment of Colorado's farmers.

Thank God, the prosperity of the farmers of my State is not dependent on the generosity of the Sugar Trust.

I have been to some trouble to ascertain the price paid the German farmer for his beets. I find that many of the German factories are run on the cooperative basis. The farmer is guaranteed a certain sum for his beets and then in addition receives a share of the dividends paid by the factories.

The Sugar Trust's press agents have taken advantage of this fact to circulate many misleading statements concerning the compensation received by the German farmer. They give the guaranteed sum, but make no mention of the additional dividend.

My inquiries show that the average price received by the German farmer is $5.45 per ton for 15 per cent beets. In addition he receives free seed and from 40 to 60 per cent of the pulp.

So, on the whole, he receives a higher price than his American brother.

Thus, on the principal item of cost we find the American factory has a slight advantage over its German rival.

LABOR COST IN FACTORIES.

"But," our protectionist friends exclaim, "the German factories are run by pauper labor." Well, I never heard a workman in an American sugar factory complain that he experienced any difficulty in carrying home his week's wages on Saturday night.

The fact is that, according to the sugar men's own statement, the labor cost of producing 100 pounds of sugar is only 14 cents. The German cost may be a little less than that, but not much.

The next item in importance is fuel, and we have more coal in the State of Colorado and more water power in our mountains than you can find in the entire German Empire. Why, sir, if you will promise to establish an enterprise of importance in my town of Pueblo I will guarantee to furnish you with the cheapest power in the world.

Now, let us summarize. The German factory pays more for its beets and its fuel and a little less for its labor than the American factory. In other words, it is about an "even break." And do gentlemen contend that Yankee brains and Yankee brawn require more than that to win in any of life's contests?

Of course, in all fairness, I should admit that the German factory owner has one decided advantage over us. He is not staggering under a mountain of watered stock. He is satisfied with a reasonable return on the capital actually invested, and our sugar magnates will come to that after this bill is placed on the statute books.

The factory pays the American farmer about 1.9 cents per pound for the sugar in his beets. It costs about six-tenths of a cent per pound to extract the sugar. That makes the factory cost about 2.5 cents per pound.

The average price for sugar in London—and that is the world price, and will not be changed materially by anything we may do here—is 3.6 cents per pound.

There is an ample margin there to attract capital to beet-sugar factories efficiently managed and capitalized at their real value.

ARE OUR FACTORIES UP TO DATE?

Just a word on this question of the efficiency of American factories. I have in my hand the annual report of the American Beet Sugar Co. for 1911. I might say that, as I understand these figures, they show the company earned more than 40 per cent that year on the capital actually invested.

That is not the point I wanted to make, however. This report shows that this company owns six factories, and that at least three of them—those located at Rocky Ford and Lamar, Colo., and Grand Island, Nebr.—are equipped with machinery which is out of date and costly to operate.

The description of the Lamar factory will answer for all the others. This report says of the Lamar plant:

> Its machinery is of an old French pattern, removed from the company's abandoned Norfolk factory, and therefore far out of date and comparatively expensive to operate.

I will admit that that kind of a collection of old junk can not be expected to compete with the world, but I contend the American people should not be taxed to keep it and other antiquated plants like it in operation.

Give us new, up-to-the-minute plants and we will not require a tariff.

SELLING OUT TO THE SUGAR TRUST.

I wish I had the time, Mr. Chairman, to go into another very interesting phase of this sugar question. I should like to tell the story of how the men who are now directing the sugar lobby in this city betrayed the beet-sugar interests of the West to the Sugar Trust and became the paid agents of Havemeyer and his associates.

I have before me three bulky volumes of the evidence taken in the case of the United States against The American Sugar Refining Co. and others in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York.

One of the witnesses in that case was Chester S. Morey, president of the Great Western Sugar Co., and a leading business man of Denver.

Mr. Morey testified that he went into the beet-sugar business in 1901. At that time all the beet-sugar factories in the West were independent concerns, promoted in large part by local capital. The industry was developing by leaps and bounds. Tests had shown that vast areas in the West were adapted to the growth of the sugar beet, and scores of towns were planning to erect factories.

Mr. Morey swears that in less than a year after he secured an interest in a factory in northern Colorado he conceived the idea of selling out to the Sugar Trust. He tells in detail how he went down to New York, met Havemeyer, got a big price for his holdings, and then became the paid secret agent of the head of the Sugar Trust.

This evidence shows that it was Morey's business to hamper and harass the beet-sugar business of the West. Acting under directions from Havemeyer he first sought to prevent the erection of new factories, and failing in that endeavored to secure a controlling interest in the new enterprises.

These volumes show that the trust and its representatives did not hesitate to threaten to ruin men if they dared go into the sugar business in defiance of Havemeyer's wishes.

Morey was not alone in this work. Havemeyer had his representatives in Utah, Idaho, Montana, and California—wherever the industry promised to become established.

COMBINED TO OPPRESS FARMERS.

These agents of the trust not only discouraged the establishment of new plants, but they banded together to keep down the price paid the farmers for their beets. The farmers organized and succeeded by a series of struggles in forcing the price of beets from $4.50 to $5.50 per ton, but capital was effectually discouraged from investing in independent sugar plants.

Did the time permit I could read the testimony to prove how these agents of the trust succeeded in preventing the erection of sugar factories at Brighton and Durango, in my State, and at various points in other States.

I can not refrain from reading just one letter from Morey to his employer—Havemeyer. Some Colorado Springs capitalists planned to erect a sugar factory at Sheridan, Wyo. Morey sent his friend Boettcher to them and endeavored to discourage them. He even used the old tariff bugaboo to frighten them, but they were evidently familiar with that time-worn fake and maintained their position. Then Morey wrote the following plaintive wail to Havemeyer, and it shows just how much he was interested in developing the beet-sugar industry in the West:

THE GREAT WESTERN SUGAR CO.,
Denver, Colo., June 8, 1906.

Mr. H. O. HAVEMEYER, *New York.*

DEAR SIR: The inclosed letter from Mr. Boettcher explains itself. Would like to know if you see any way to check this kind of competition. I sometimes think it is a mistake not listing our stock and offering it for sale; if people want to buy common stock we ought to give them a chance to come in. This is simply a suggestion. We are doing everything we can to discourage the building of any more factories until the matter of tariff legislation is more settled than it is at present. We are using that as a basis of argument against the building of any more factories.

Promoters like the Garden City and the Sheridan people are claiming that trusts have made great profits out of the business, and in that way selling their stock.

Respectfully, yours, C. S. MOREY.

This letter was written six years ago when our Republican friends were in control of the Government, and there was not one chance in a thousand that there would be any "tinkering with the tariff."

EARNINGS OF THE FACTORIES.

And now, Mr. Chairman, permit me to read just one more letter from Mr. Morey. This time to demonstrate the enormous profits earned by the beet-sugar companies. This letter was written by Morey to Washington B. Thomas, president of the Sugar Trust, on March 19, 1910:

> You will notice that this year, in addition to the regular 2½ per cent depreciation which we have been deducting for the last three years, we have set up $1,000,000 in depreciation reserve. I do not want this year's earnings to appear as large as they would if we had not made this entry. Of course, this can be changed if the board of directors does not approve of it.
>
> You will note that our total surplus is shown by these statements as a little over $5,000,000. This does not include any surplus from the Billings Co., the Great Western Railway Co., and other corporations, which really add nearly $2,000,000.
>
> Our sugar is invoiced at 4 cents, and judging from present market indications there is at least $1,000,000 profit that will show up in next year's business. The value of our real estate and railroads over and above the amount at which they are carried is at least $5,000,000, so that the actual surplus is nearer $9,000,000 than $5,000,000.

The Great Western Sugar Co. had been in existence about five years; had paid yearly dividends and accumulated a surplus of $9,000,000. No wonder Mr. Morey did not want the public to know the facts.

WILL PUT INDUSTRY ON ITS FEET.

I prefaced my remarks with the statement that I believed free sugar would stimulate the sugar industry of Colorado, not destroy it.

Why? Because I believe free sugar will demonstrate that Colorado's sugar industry is a legitimate industry—that we can raise beets and make sugar in competition with the world.

Once we have proven that fact to the satisfaction of the thinking business men, capital will flow into our State for the estab-

lishment of sugar factories. It will be impossible for the trust's agents to frighten it away. They can not use the possibility of tariff legislation as a bugaboo, for the industry will be standing erect on its own legs.

That investors have already sensed this truth is shown by an advertisement which I received this morning announcing the formation of an independent sugar company in Colorado. The organizer, Ward Darley, is a man who has felt the fangs of the Sugar Trust, and he rejoices that we are about to strike the shackles from the limbs of this great industry.

WILL AID COLORADO'S FRUIT RAISERS.

But that will be only one of the many benefits which will inure to the people of Colorado from this legislation.

Under free sugar the consumers will save $1,400,000 a year, which now goes to swell the dividends of the Sugar Trust.

When I began my campaign last year the sugar consumers of Colorado were paying $1 for 14 pounds of sugar. Under this bill they will receive from 20 to 25 pounds for a dollar.

Colorado is one of the great fruit-raising States of the Union. Last year tens of thousands of dollars' worth of fruit perished in our orchards. If this industry is to be saved Colorado must be dotted with preserving and packing plants. To secure these plants we must have cheap sugar.

To-day we produce ten times the sugar we consume, and we pay 2 cents a pound more for sugar than the same sugar is sold for on the docks of New York for export to England.

If we could buy our sugar at the cost of production, plus a reasonable interest on the capital actually invested in our sugar factories, we could build up in Colorado a packing and preserving industry which would be the pride of this Nation.

Exhaustive study has convinced me of the truth of what I have said this afternoon. I would not knowingly do anything to retard the material prosperity of my State. I have lived there all my life. Every dollar I have in the world is invested there. I trust when my eyes are closing for my last long sleep they will be permitted to glimpse the snow-capped glory of her peaks. I believe I am a loving, loyal son of the Commonwealth, and I am convinced that in voting for this bill I am rendering a distinct service to my State and its people.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GARRETT of Texas). The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired. At the request of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HAIR].

Mr. MURDOCK. I was going to suggest that inasmuch as the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means was absent and I knew that he intended to recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HAIR], I would yield him the time, out of the time of the gentleman from Alabama, however. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HAIR] is recognized.

Mr. O'HAIR. Mr. Chairman, the courtesy of the distinguished Progressive leader from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] recalls very forcibly to my mind the generosity displayed by some of our friends on the minority side last fall.

I trust that during the course of my remarks there will be no disturbance by loud and tumultuous applause. [Laughter and applause.]

The tariff question during the last 50 years has presented a subject for radical dispute among the American people, and probably on no other question of public debate has there been such unanimous disagreement.

If after all these years of discussion and public education the per cent of the people who know something about the tariff were as great as the per cent who never have been able to understand it, we might then hope at some future time to arrive at a true solution of this great public problem.

After reading and listening to a great number of speeches presenting the tariff issue from an academic standpoint and after an honest attempt to try to understand the different theories of a harmonious tariff schedule as an entity, my brain feels very much as if it had been subjected to an electric buzzer or an attempt to read and understand the printed rules governing this House.

I know this, however, and there seems to be no one with any reputation for good sense who contradicts the proposition, that the tariff is a tax and that the ultimate consumer has to pay the tax. With this much clear in my mind and uncontradicted I want to say that if a protective tariff tax produces prosperity it is the first instance among men, either savage or civilized, since the beginning of time that a tax has been regarded as an evidence of prosperity and a thing altogether to be desired.

The good people of the district which I have the honor of representing do not seem to be disturbed by the prospects of the enactment of this bill into law. I have not received one letter nor one telegram of protest from any of my friends or constituents, but I have received many communications in which congratulations were extended to the Democratic Party for the faithful manner in which it was proceeding to carry out to the letter the pledges of our platform.

I am not worried nor bothered very much over the theory of tariff making, because I am a believer in freedom of all kinds under proper conditions—freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, freedom of action, and freedom of trade relations when that time shall have arrived.

I believe that the fewest laws of a restrictive nature with which it is possible to govern a civilized country are the most consistent with peace and prosperity.

Of course everyone realizes that the unnatural and artificial conditions in some business interests, founded and built up by subsidies in the form of a protective tariff, must be let down to a common level and to their natural condition gradually.

It takes about as long to walk down a hill as it did to walk to the top on the other side. It takes nearly as long to cure a chronic disease as the disease was in maturing. So it may take a considerable time to regulate these unnatural business concerns and to establish an understanding with them that they must do business without expecting the Government to protect them. To administer medicine enough at one dose to cure an aggravated disease would result in death to the patient. So to attempt to right the evils which have grown up under the protective system at once might result injuriously.

The Underwood bill, now before us for consideration, is based on a splendid theory for lowering the tariff bars, and, as I see it, its different parts are in harmony one with the other.

Of course under our present system we all recognize that funds must be raised with which to conduct the affairs of this Government. That being true, the only theory that appeals to me is the one that places the burden of taxation most heavily upon the shoulders of those most able to bear it and who are least accustomed to bearing it under the system heretofore adopted by the Republican Party.

I believe that there should be the least tariff on the necessaries of life and the highest tariff on the luxuries of life. And right here is a line not clearly marked nor defined as to what are necessaries and what are luxuries.

A luxury is something that nobody needs, but which rich people buy because poor people can not.

A necessary of life is something that everyone must have in order to live out his full allotment of time.

In reading this bill I have found a few things that I would change. Most of us would revise the Scriptures, no doubt, if we were given an opportunity. I would revise this bill by putting a tax of 100 per cent on diamonds of all kinds, as well as on pearls and jewelry. I believe that diamonds are of absolutely no use on earth to mankind. The human race would live just as long and would be just as happy and healthy without them as with them. I would rather have a crumb of bread and a drop of water with which to sustain life and enable me to live out my allotted time than a bushel of the finest diamonds and pearls in the world; and that is the reason I would put a high tax on diamonds. [Applause.]

I do not think I should be accused of entertaining a prejudice against diamonds, or people who own diamonds or who expect to own them, because I also would raise the tariff on silks; and, if I am not mistaken, we have one silk dress in our family. Silk is partly a luxury and partly a necessity. A silk dress will warm the body. Silk will serve as wearing apparel, and to that extent is possessed of the elements of a necessary of life; but a large part of its value is made up of what might be termed useless, ornamental, and luxurious qualities, and to that extent I would tax silk very high. Those who can afford silks and diamonds as luxuries would have to pay more dearly if I were making this bill than they will be compelled to pay under its provisions as it now stands.

This bill could not possibly suit all Democrats. It probably is true that it does not in its entirety suit any Democrat, but I believe that it comes nearest being the composite belief and opinion of what is right in this matter of any bill that could have been presented to this House. It possesses sufficient harmony to slide down from the top of the protective system to the common level of equal justice and the harbor of equal rights and privileges.

I will not say as, four years ago, did the man who occupied the great office of President of the United States that this is the best tariff bill that ever was written. That speech got that President into more trouble than everything else that he ever said while he was President. I would not use such an exaggerated expression about this bill, but I will say this about it, that it has the fewest faults of any bill that I have had an opportunity to read.

Mr. Chairman, this law, if enacted, may disturb some business interests; there are some business interests in this country that ought to be disturbed. Any business that has been fertilized by a protective tariff of personal favor and pampered privilege ought to be destroyed, but all of those business affairs that have been created by the brawn and brain of American industry, that are fostered and fertilized by the honest endeavor of progressive manhood, I do not believe need fear for one moment that their interests will be disturbed nor their trade relations disastrously affected by the enactment of this tariff law. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how the time stands between the two sides of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has used 8 hours and 2 minutes and the gentleman from New York 9 hours and 34 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORMAN].

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I approach the discussion of the bill now under consideration with some reluctance because of the great number of able and distinguished gentlemen on both sides of this Chamber who have eloquently and learnedly contributed of their vast store of knowledge on tariff legislation and legislative experience to the analysis of the pending bill, and the comparison of it with preceeding tariff measures, to the enlightenment of the House and the general information of the country.

I realize also that what I shall say here is uttered in the presence of master minds and of men who have devoted the best years of their lives to the service of the public, and who bring to the debate on the pending measure not only the ripe experience of many years, but also that confidence which comes alone from long-continued service and devotion to the public weal.

If I were to be guided by my personal feelings in the premises, I would content myself with simply voting as my judgment and political convictions bid me, and spare myself the labor of preparing what I am about to submit as well as spare the House the discomfort of listening to my feeble contribution to a much discussed and now thoroughly analyzed tariff measure.

But, Mr. Chairman, my own feelings and my regard for the feeling of the Members of this body can not control me. I have been chosen to represent a congressional district in the great Commonwealth of Illinois, whose population, according to the last census, was more than 250,000 souls, and whose inhabitants are engaged in every conceivable avenue of legitimate human endeavor. The farmer, the school-teacher, the banker, the laborer, the mechanic, the merchant, and the clergyman are all enumerated in the census of the third congressional district of Illinois, and the high order of that district's intelligence demands of its Representative in Congress something more than the mere announcement of his vote on a measure which is designed to levy taxes on the people of the country amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. Chairman, whether my action here be right or wrong, my guide in that regard shall be my conscience and my duty as I see it to those who have by their votes cast honor and responsibility upon me far beyond the measure of my worth, and in the discharge of that duty my first obligation is to give expression to those convictions which prompt my action, so that when my vote and act are submitted for scrutiny to those who have the right to scrutinize, they will know as well and be in a position to judge not only the act, but the motive which prompted it.

The bill now under consideration is called a tariff bill, and all bills of like character, I find, from the beginning of the Government have been called tariff bills.

I am prompted to inquire why such measures are called tariff bills. My limited knowledge of the science of legislation is my only excuse for suggesting the question, but I confess to a belief that the bill now under consideration and all other similar measures would be better entitled if they were called bills "to tax the American people for the maintenance of the Government," for such, in truth, every tariff bill is.

The legislative legerdemain practiced by the Republicans and their outcry for "protection to American industries" and "the foreigner pays the tax" have led to a false impression that a tariff bill is not a taxation measure, and I believe that a plain designation of the bill by a title that truthfully expresses its purpose would help materially to destroy the illusions as to who pays the tax and what is being "protected."

Our Republican brethren in presenting tariff measures have reveled in the high-sounding phraseology of a bill "to provide revenue, to protect American industries, and for other purposes," whereas if no disguise were resorted to such bills should have been entitled in contrast to the measure now under consideration, bills "to overtax the American people, to increase our crop of millionaires, and incidentally provide some revenue."

There was a time when the Republicans boasted in justification of their alleged protective measures that "the foreigner paid the tax," but I venture to assert that no gentleman on the other side of this Chamber will now assert that exploded and threadbare theory. They must confess that whatever revenue is derived from the pending tariff measure as well as any preceding tariff measure that was enacted into the law must be paid by the ultimate American consumer, except such revenue alone as is provided by the income-tax feature of the bill now under consideration.

Dismissing all theory for the time being and looking squarely at the facts, we are confronted with this situation:

The Government needs for its economic management for the coming year, according to the Treasury estimates, more than $800,000,000. This revenue can be derived only in the following ways: Either by a direct tax on the American people or an indirect tax levied in the first instance on commodities shipped to our shores from abroad and eventually through the sale and distribution of those commodities to the ultimate consumer, who takes the commodity charged with its proportion of the tariff tax, which is included in its price and which proportion of the tax the ultimate consumer has to pay; or this revenue may be derived by a combination of the direct and indirect tax, as is proposed by the pending measure.

The objections which have been urged against this bill by those who sit on the other side of the Chamber are that the indirect taxes provided by the bill are not sufficient to produce the requisite revenue, and therefore it is not a revenue measure; that the income-tax clause of the bill is objectionable because it is new and untried; it is inquisitorial and will prove expensive and objectionable in its enforcement. Without conceding any force or merit to these objections, they are entirely beside the issue.

Taxes are necessary to the maintenance of the Government, and the levying of taxes is the highest function which government can exercise. In the exercise of that great function the Government must be guided by a spirit of absolute and independent justice to all its people—men, women, and children.

Any system of taxation which is levied on the taxpayer without regard to his proportion or his ability to pay is wrong. The indirect system of taxation, coupled with the doctrine of extreme protection, as advocated by the Republicans, has proven vicious in its application. To determine whether protection is right or wrong as a system of taxation, its effect upon the great masses of the people, when applied to one of the great necessities of life, it strikes me is a fair way to test the question, and as the Payne-Aldrich law is the last expression by the Republican Party on the subject of protective-tariff legislation, and as Schedule K of that law, which deals with wool and woolen manufactures, is the most pronounced application of the protection principle, and as wool is a great, if not the greatest, necessity to the consuming masses of the people, I shall direct the attention of the House briefly to the famous Schedule K.

Under the provisions of the Payne-Aldrich law wool yarns used in knitting and mending socks and stockings are taxed 79.44 per cent, woolen underwear is taxed 93.29 per cent, woolen dress goods 99.70 per cent, and ready-made woolen suits are taxed 79.29 per cent. The items which I have here enumerated are absolute necessities to the farmer and workingman. I maintain that when the American workingman, whose wealth usually consists of his wife, his children, his daily wage, and his ability to earn a living, is obliged to pay 79 per cent of the price of the yarn used in knitting and mending socks and stockings, 93 per cent of the cost of the woolen underwear used by his family, 99 per cent of the price of their woolen dress goods, and 79 per cent of the price of their ready-made suits of clothes in taxes for the support of his Government he is paying far more than his just share and is being taxed far beyond his ability to pay, as the family of the average American workingman is five children, while the millionaire's family is usually less in number than that of the workingman. They buy no yarn for knitting or mending socks, their suits are not ready-made, the raiment of the millionaire's family is usually silk or satin, and it is not unusual, I am told, for them to go across the water to make such purchases as they require.

The Republican Party regards Schedule K in the Payne-Aldrich bill a necessary measure to protect American industry, and insists that it is for the benefit of the American workingman.

Tallyrand once said: "Language is used chiefly to conceal thought." Our Republican friends have developed into past

masters of the art of using language according to Tallyrand's conception of its use. But the American people have a different idea about the use of language, and they demand that all language—and especially that which is used in our statutes—shall be designed not to conceal but to express thought. The language of Schedule K, while it is said to be intended for the protection of American industry and American labor, in fact permits the plunder of the public by the Wool Trust.

It might be interesting to observe that the total number of people engaged in woolen-manufacturing industries in the United States, according to the census of 1905, was 179,976, and of this number 12,913 were children under the age of 16 years. Is it justifiable on any ground, let me ask—economic, patriotic, humanitarian, or any other conceivable ground—that 92,000,000 people should be taxed from 79 per cent to 99 per cent on all the woolen goods they buy in order that the wool-manufacturing industry in America should live?

Is such a tax necessary in order to protect the woolen industry? And from what is it to be protected? Will your answer be the "pauper labor of Europe"? If so, I must ask that you be more specific. Please designate the country from which this "pauper labor" comes. You can not mean Germany, because Germany has a tariff as prohibitive as our own, and according to your philosophy pauper labor can not exist where a protective tariff obtains. The same may be said of France and Italy and, in fact, of every country of Europe with the exception of England. But there is another reason why you can not designate the country from which this so-called "pauper labor" comes, and that is that you dare not stand upon the public platform in your congressional districts and specify the pauper labor of Germany, because every son of the fatherland knows as well as you know that there is no pauper labor in Germany that the American workingman need fear; and to designate Italy, France, or Great Britain as the country from which pauper labor emanates would be to insult the intelligence of the German, French, Italian, or British American citizen, and would doubtless result in the loss of his vote to the Republican Party. The "pauper labor" of Europe argument is becoming as hollow sounding and insincere as the timeworn argument, "the foreigner pays the tax."

But let us take another view of this tariff proposition as it applies to the woolen industry. That being the best protected industry in America, according to the Payne-Aldrich bill, it would be logical to suppose, if protection affected wages, that the wages of the woolen-mill employees would be the highest in America. But such is not the fact. The disclosures resulting from the investigation that grew out of the Lawrence strike exposed the horrible conditions under which the employees of the woolen mills live, and the fact was there established that they are among the poorest-paid employees in America. On the other hand, if we look for the best-paid employees in America, we must go to an industry that is in no way connected with tariff bills or schedules. The men employed in the building trades are among the highest-paid employees in the United States, and their wages are not due to a protective tariff, but to their intelligence, their experience, their efficiency, and the strength of the trades-unions.

Yet, under the guise of protection to American industries, the American farmer and workingman is taxed from 79 per cent to 99 per cent on all the woolen yarn, woolen underwear, woolen dress goods, and ready-made suits he buys to protect an industry that employs nearly 13,000 little boys and girls under the age of 16 years. Thirteen thousand little boys and girls are being sacrificed on the altar of corporation greed, are being exploited by woolen manufacturers, are being—

> Made to lose the freedom of the sod,
> And, like a colt, for work be shod.
> And made to tread the mills of toil
> Up and down in ceaseless moil.

And all this in order that the wool manufacturer might worship his golden calf.

I heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] say that there were many good features in the Underwood bill for which he would like very much to vote, but that there were some features to which he had objections and for which he would not vote. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that there are some features in this bill which are not exactly as they might be. There are schedules in this bill which, in my judgment, are still too high; but I want to say to my Progressive friends that when they compare the good features of the bill with what they are pleased to consider objectionable features they will find that the good points far outweigh the objectionable ones, and that is more than can be said for any Republican tariff bill that was ever passed. They were all bad, but some parts were worse than others. You gentlemen of the Progressive Party must not expect us to present a perfect bill; you exact too much of us when you ask us to correct all the wrongs of 50 years of Republican misrule in a single legislative act.

It has been frequently asserted by gentlemen on the other side of the aisle that the tariff is not the cause of our high cost of living, but that the increased cost of distribution is responsible for the high cost of living. I concede that the cost of distribution has materially increased in recent years and that it has manifested itself upon the cost of all the necessities of life, but this increased cost of distribution is directly traceable to the high protective tariff. All prices under the protective system are artificial—the price of distribution as well as the price of the commodity.

Protection is nothing more than a promise to secure for the manufacturer of a commodity a price for his product that the consumer would not otherwise pay, and every dollar added to the price of a commodity in tariff taxes causes just so much more capital to be tied up in the great work of distribution. If the price of a commodity is increased 50 per cent by reason of a tariff tax, then the amount of capital required of every wholesaler and retailer handling that commodity must be increased in proportion.

The tariff does not protect the distributor; he pays the increased price, and this increase of price enters into every transaction in which that commodity enters. Like watered stock, which adds nothing to the tangible assets of a corporation yet is required to earn dividends, that part of the price of a commodity which is artificial imposes its proportion of burden upon the ultimate consumer just as the watered stock imposes upon the public who must pay the dividends its unnecessary public burden, and the artificial proportion of the price of a commodity is passed from the wholesaler through all the processes of distribution to its last victim, the ultimate consumer. This artificial price, which requires the use of more capital, does not increase the amount of labor performed, does not increase the number of employees in a given industry, and accomplishes nothing by virtue of its increase of cost which could not be as well accomplished, and perhaps better so, if the price were determined by competition and not be arbitrarily fixed by a prohibitive tariff.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is another feature of the protective system that is worthy of our attention at this time—in connection with the wool schedule in particular. I have heard it said, and doubtless others in this House have heard it stated also, that very little, if any, of the goods now on the market labeled "wool" is, in fact, all wool. Shoddy, noils, and vegetable fibers are said to be large constituents in what now passes for pure wool and is charged for as such. This is another of the many evils of a prohibitive tariff. It enables the manufacturer to foist upon the consumer a cheap, inferior article, and the consumer must accept it and pay the price asked, since there is no competition.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries with it a feature that no patriotic citizen can well refuse to support. Under our direct system of taxation the surplus wealth of the country was escaping its just burden for the support of the Government, which lay heavily upon the great consuming masses of our people.

The income-tax clause of the pending tariff bill marks a new era in our fiscal system.

It may be true, as some on the other side of the aisle assert, that the income tax will prove obnoxious, but if it does it will be obnoxious only to those who have for years been escaping their just burden of taxation and are still unwilling to accept the new order; it may be an expensive way to collect taxes, but if it is it will be because those who ought to pay throw obstacles in the way of its collection; it may be inquisitorial, but if it is it will be because those who have for years been enjoying the sheltering shade of the protective-tariff wall are now unwilling to come out into the open and contribute their just share to the support of that Government which for years has lavished its favors upon them.

The enactment of the income tax and a reduction in tariff duties is but responsive to an awakened public sentiment and an aroused public conscience.

Never again will any political party have the hardihood to perpetrate upon the American people the outrages that were inflicted upon them by the Dingley and Payne-Aldrich tariff bills. The false theories of protection are gradually being exploded. That the foreigner pays the tax; that a protective tariff produces revenue; that protection, so called, protects the American workingman against pauper labor of Europe are gradually being thrown into the dust heap of oblivion with all the other follies and hobgoblins that progress, truth, and education have turned their searchlight upon and made to vanish.

I would not have anyone infer from what I have said here that I am an advocate of low prices, but when the cost of living increases out of all proportion to the increase in wages the system which permits such conditions to exist must be changed.

According to the bulletins of the Department of Labor, the wholesale prices of farm products had increased in 1907 over the prices of 1896, 75.01 per cent. Food had increased in price during the same period 40.06 per cent. Clothing had increased in price during that period 38.08 per cent, while wages had increased only 29.02 per cent. Farm products had increased in 1912, 118.08 per cent; food, 66.05 per cent; clothing, 32.02 per cent over the price of the same commodities in 1896.

This lack of proportion is due in large measure, if not entirely, to the evils resulting from the protective system and the extremes to which it has been carried.

In delivering his message to Congress on April 7, the President said:

> We have seen tariff legislation wander very far afield in our day—very far indeed from the field in which our prosperity might have had a normal growth and stimulation. No one who looks the facts squarely in the face or knows anything that lies beneath the surface of action can fail to perceive the principles upon which recent tariff legislation have been based. We long ago passed beyond the modest notion of "protecting" the industries of the country and moved boldly forward to the idea that they were entitled to the direct patronage of the Government.

This language has no weight with our Republican friends, I know; but I will quote to them the words of one who once had weight with them, and if his words have no weight with Republicans now it is because the Republicans of to-day have wandered far afield from the principles that actuated their great leaders of the past.

The words I am about to quote were uttered by one who graced these Halls with his presence, and many a time did these corridors ring with his eloquence and might. He lives to-day, and will forever, in the loving, patriotic memory of his countrymen. He was the second of our three martyred Presidents, James A. Garfield.

On April 1, 1870, the House being in Committee of the Whole, having under consideration a bill to provide revenue, Mr. Garfield said:

> I hold that a properly adjusted competition between home and foreign products is the best gauge by which to regulate international trade. Duties should be so high that our manufacturers can fairly compete with the foreign products, but not so high as to enable them to drive out the foreign article, enjoy a monopoly of the trade, and regulate the price as they please.
>
> This is my doctrine of protection. If Congress pursues this line of policy we shall, year by year, approach more nearly to the basis of free trade, because we shall be more nearly able to compete with other nations on equal terms. I am for a protection which leads to ultimate free trade. I am for free trade which can only be achieved through a reasonable protection.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have wandered far afield in tariff legislation in recent years, and an aroused public conscience has summoned those who are charged with the responsibility of legislation to lead the way back to the trail that was blazed by the founders of the Republic. We must make the Government be the servant of all the people; in the levying of taxes we must have regard to proportion and the ability of the taxpayer to pay; we must permit no man who enjoys the benefits of our Government to escape his just share of its responsibilities. We must assess taxes with a view to maintaining the Government and not with a view to giving any class of our population undue advantages over any other class. Class legislation must be avoided if the Republic is to endure.

I have heard much talk from the Republican side these last few days about a tariff board, and their loud protestations have prompted me to inquire as to how long our Republican friends have favored a tariff board. I find that in their national platform of 1904 they say no one but the Republican Party is competent to deal with the tariff. In 1908 they are silent on the proposition of a tariff board, and in 1912 the tariff board is mention for the first time in a Republican platform. In 1904, when they were in full power and possessed of much conceit, they would not notice a tariff board, but after they were driven out of power in the House of Representatives in 1910, and with defeat staring them in the face in 1912, in a last desperate effort to win back that public confidence which they had abused and to try to stem the tide of popularity which Mr. Roosevelt and the Progressive Party were developing they went on record in their national platform of 1912 as being in favor of a tariff board, to be appointed by the President or Congress. The American people went on record also in 1912 in favor of a tariff commission of their own choosing. That commission, chosen by the people and responsible to the people, consisting of a Democratic House of Representatives, a Democratic United States Senate, and a Democratic President of the United States, have presented their bill for the revision of the tariff downward; that bill has been received by this House and the country with approval, and the people eagerly await its enactment into law. The Democratic Party was commissioned by the people to do what the Republicans promised to do and failed of doing. We propose to redeem our pledges to the people. Under the pending bill, when enacted into law, the entire American people will prosper, American industries will thrive, and the croaking of the pessimist will be silenced by the hum of industry and the whirling wheels of commerce. We are about to enter upon the greatest period of peace, prosperity, and plenty that our country has ever known.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COPLEY].

Mr. COPLEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe that, with the exception of some question which involves the honor of this Nation and its people, no problem can come before this Congress which more vitally affects the welfare and the well-being of the people of our country than the tariff, the fiscal policy of the Government, in so far as it makes for the prosperity of all our people. I find most eminent authority for this opinion. In the last number of a prominent American magazine the distinguished President of the United States himself expresses the idea that it is absolutely essential for the general welfare of all peoples that they should be well fed, well clothed, and adequately housed. In other words, that it is the prime function of government to legislate in such manner, if possible, that the great body of citizens shall prosper.

UNSCIENTIFIC ARRANGEMENT OF DUTIES.

I will not take your time in an extended survey of the history of tariff legislation in this and other countries, nor am I going to impose upon your patience by attempting to review, item by item, House bill No. 3321. I frankly confess my inability to do this, and I marvel at the mental grasp of a committee of my colleagues who, giving but a few hours a day for a comparatively brief period, have been able to satisfy themselves that the duties levied by this measure are fixed at such a figure as promotes industry and prosperity in this country to the highest degree.

All the more I marvel when I consider that these same men have the same routine, time-consuming, nerve-devouring tasks to perform for the benefit of the people of their respective districts which my own constituents ask of me. But even this wonder vanishes and blends into a much greater one when I consider how a caucus of a great party meets and reads over this bill, item by item, probably the first time that one out of ten of you had ever seen it, and after each man has presented the needs for some modification in behalf of the particular industries of his district, you all finally agree that it was just right as it was presented to you and join unanimously in handing this bill on to the House of Representatives as your party's panacea for all the ills from which the good people of this country are suffering.

As a patriotic American I share with you in your hopes that this bill will be followed by general prosperity, although my business training and a lifetime study of industrial conditions raise in my mind a very grave and considerable doubt. I would feel more confidence, and I think this would be shared generally by the people of this country, if we knew the facts from which your conclusions are drawn. So far as I am able to see, the majority party in caucus finally expresses its confidence in the judgment of their colleagues who make up a majority of the Ways and Means Committee, and that committee, to the best of my knowledge and belief, in turn expresses its confidence in the distinguished chairman.

Now, gentlemen, I am ready for the test. If my theories of a lifetime have been wrong I shall be only too glad to acknowledge it, but believing in them, as I do, and knowing that they are shared by more than 80 per cent of the people of my district, I should feel recreant to my trust did I not register a protest against this or any other bill on a subject so vital to the welfare of all of them, which was prepared by a few men, in hearings which were practically secret, and without the aid of unprejudiced, nonpartisan experts of the highest character and ability, who had access to all the resources of this Government and had in their employ engineers, agriculturists, and accountants of ability and established reputations for fairness; in short, if the bill were based on information provided by a tariff commission, similar to the one legislated out of existence by the Democratic majority of this House last year, and for no other reason than that its findings disproved all the preconceived theories which your party has maintained practically ever since its foundation, findings that, in my judgment, will again be

reaffirmed by the effect of this tariff bill on the industrial prosperity of this country.

EFFECT OF BILL VITAL.

I am sure that each Member of Congress recognizes just as fully as I do the fact that this bill itself is vital, and on its success or failure rests the future of the political party now in power. At this point my wonder merges into admiration for your courage. You are certainly staking the future of your party on this bill. I do not know that you could really help it. You were ordered to do it by your party platform. This was indorsed by a doubtful 42 per cent of the voters of this country, while the platforms of the Progressive and Republican Parties, demanding the principle of protection on exact and scientific information, based on the findings of a tariff commission, was indorsed by over 52 per cent of all the voters of this country. Your imperative orders find their source from a political party hopelessly in the minority among the voters of the country.

REAL PROBLEM.

The problem which confronts you is a delicate one at best—to increase the purchasing power of a dollar when measured by the necessities of life and at the same time not to proportionately increase the purchasing power of that same dollar when measured by human labor and human endeavor; in other words, to reduce the cost of necessities without reducing the wages paid to labor at the same time and in the same proportion—to maintain the purchasing power of the worker.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in his opening speech, while expressing some doubt about the immediate fulfillment of this much-desired condition, seems to assume that the increased cost of living has been made up in great part by the tariff. Another distinguished member of the committee last year, who, unfortunately for the country, is not with us at this time, in a speech on the last day of the last session, cited several instances where the cost of distribution entered much more materially into the cost of these necessities to the consumer than did the tariff.

There are two great divisions of this subject—decreasing the cost of necessities, and maintaining the wages paid to the 85 per cent of our people who must rely on the returns from their labor for their ability to pay for these necessities.

I shall first address myself briefly to the influence of the tariff on the prices of necessities.

RELATION OF TARIFF TO COST OF DISTRIBUTION—ON WOOL.

The report of the Tariff Commission created in 1909 shows conclusively that on woolen clothes the increased cost due to the tariff on raw wool and the tariff on woolen cloths amounted to less than 10 per cent of the price which the ultimate consumer paid for his clothing, whereas the cost of distribution, or the handling from the time it left the manufacturer's hands, including the retailer's profit, amounted to an average of more than 35 per cent of the selling price of a finished suit of clothes. This report is open to you. It is complete, and if you study it you can arrive at no other conclusion. This bill is not going to entirely remove the tariff on a suit of clothes. In effect it will reduce the selling cost between 4 and 5 per cent, providing the entire saving is given to the ultimate consumer—a conclusion involved in very serious doubt.

I take pride in the belief that the district which I have the honor to represent is one of the best and most typical in this entire country. It contains 28 cities, towns, and villages above 1,000 population, and all but 3 of these are less than 5,000. In these 25 I am pretty well acquainted, knowing most of the merchants by name and face, and I am equally well acquainted in at least 30 more villages smaller than these. I am prepared to make this statement, that at this enormous apparent margin of profit on ready-made clothing, amounting to more than 50 per cent of the price at which they purchased it, or more than 35 per cent of the price at which they sell it, not one single merchant for the last 20 years has made anything more than fair wages over and above the interest on the investment in his stock of goods. And in the three larger cities not more than one or two firms in each has made more than a modest competence during that same period of time, and with that same apparent margin of profit. But the ready-made clothing departments of the great stores in Chicago, less than 50 miles distant from any one of these communities, have handed in hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars a year profit, and in some instances it runs into the millions.

It is clearly a problem of distribution and not a question of the tariff materially increasing the cost to the consumer.

I am unable to see any way in which this bill is going to make it possible for these small merchants in the smaller communities to handle woolen clothing on any less margin than the present, which affords them merely a living, unless this entire tariff scheme of yours is followed by a beating down of the standard of living of the small merchant and his family, as well as the artisan, in this country to a point where it more nearly corresponds to that in vogue in the principal countries of Europe.

The Tariff Commission's report on cotton shows exactly the same conditions. In the case of cotton cloth we have in this country a specially cumbersome, expensive, and, I think, unnecessary system of distribution, and yet I can not find any one item in this bill that will tend to reduce the cost of distribution under the cotton schedule, unless again the merchants handling that commodity are beaten down to the standard which satisfies men engaged in similar lines in England and in Germany. The merchants in the small towns in this country are able-bodied men. They have tried to follow the merchants in larger cities in fitting up attractive little stores. They give their entire attention to their business, whereas the same line of goods in the European countries are handled in much smaller, much less pretentious shops, kept by the wives and children—the nonwage-earning members of the family.

RELATION OF TARIFF TO COST OF DISTRIBUTION—ON MILK.

Take the item of milk. The splendid little city of Elgin is located in the district which I have the honor to represent. Elgin gives its name to the great dairy interests of the Middle West. Only the first of this month the milk producers of that territory were in a contest with the milk buyers as to the price which they should receive for milk on the farm. The buyers offered the price of last year—$1.40½ per 100 pounds. The producers demanded $1.50. The price which the buyers offered would average a fraction under 3 cents per quart; the price which the producers asked would average a little less than 3¼ cents per quart. And yet this same milk is retailing at 8 cents per quart in Chicago, less than 50 miles distant. If the buyers' price had prevailed, it meant that they would add 166 per cent to their cost on the farm to cover the costs of their distribution and their profits for the same, or 62½ per cent of the selling price would be used for that purpose, representing the cost of handling after it had been delivered from the farm. The duty on milk under the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, now prevailing, is one-half cent per quart. I doubt if any of that duty is added to the cost of milk anywhere; yet if it is all represented it would mean only 6 per cent of the ultimate cost to the consumer, while the cost of distribution amounts to 62½ per cent of that cost.

When I was a boy in all the small towns a considerable percentage of the people of the neighborhood kept one or more cows. The father of the family usually did the milking after his day's work was done, unless, perhaps, he had a boy old enough to be drafted for this purpose and not old enough to organize a successful rebellion. The neighbors sent their children for the milk. They took it home in tin pails and pitchers, which had not been previously sterilized. The milker himself did not have a cement floor in his barn, as is now demanded, and he did not take the time to have his hands manicured before sitting down to milk. The milk was not kept at a low temperature and was not put into separate bottles previously sterilized and sealed with germ-proof caps.

The manager of one of the great milk-distributing firms told me only a few weeks ago that their average breakage in bottles alone cost them more than one-fourth of a cent on each quart of milk sold.

The system of milk distribution in the great cities is also unnecessarily expensive. The general manager of the firm making the largest amount of machinery designed for the purpose of handling milk and cream told me last January that as he left the building in which his apartment was located that morning there were six milk wagons standing in front and the driver of each was scurrying through the building carrying only one or two bottles. This is manifestly a most wasteful system of distribution, but it is the legitimate working out of an economic competition—the battle of wits.

I venture the statement that 1 cent per quart could be cut from the price of milk delivered in every large city in this country if the system of distribution were arranged so that there was not an unnecessary duplication of capital and labor.

Take the question of dressed beef. The present tariff is 1½ cents per pound, and yet beef went up the equivalent of more than 3 cents per pound in the Chicago markets inside of 60 days last year. This must show conclusively that the tariff has little, if anything, to do with the cost of beef; otherwise, foreign dressed beef would have come into this country the minute the increase in price had passed the 1½ cents per pound. The reason for the high cost of beef is entirely another story and has little to do with the present discussion.

The fact is that the cost of milk, butter, eggs, poultry, beef, mutton, pork, potatoes, carrots, onions, beans, cabbages, and other vegetables are less on the farm in this country than in any civilized country with which we compete industrially; and yet when they reach our homes they cost very much more. It is a problem of distribution. No tariff commission will be doing its full duty to the country unless it follows the lines laid down by the last one, and traces every single item from its very beginning to the ultimate consumer and shows the cost at every stage.

RELATION OF TARIFF TO COST OF DISTRIBUTION—ON CHINA.

Let us take some of the articles that are not in such general use and see what per cent of difference the tariff makes in the selling price of those articles. I have in my hands two plates. I know that a dozen plates exactly like this I have here were sold by one of the principal dealers in Chicago less than three years ago for $44. I know that a dozen of exactly these same plates are sold by the American commissary in Colon to the employees of the Government there for $14.

Mr. MURDOCK. Are those the identical plates?

Mr. COPLEY. The identical plates. But there is no duty paid on them on the zone. The commissary pays $11 per dozen for these plates in England. The dealer in Chicago can buy them just as cheap. The duty of 60 per cent adds $6.60. He can lay them down in Chicago for less than $18 per dozen and yet he sells them at $44 per dozen, an apparent profit of $26, or an increase of 144 per cent over the entire cost, including the duty, or 60 per cent of the entire selling price goes to pay the cost of distribution. The duty of $6.60 is only 15 per cent of the selling cost of these plates. The cost of distribution in this instance adds four times as much to the selling price as does the tariff.

Here is another plate which cost the American commissary $12 per dozen, or $1 apiece. The duty on this grade is $7.20 per dozen. They can be laid down in Colon for the American commissary at less than 80 cents additional per dozen, or they can be laid down in New York City at less than $20 per dozen, including duty. I have a letter from a very prominent dealer in New York offering to replace these plates at $60 per dozen. He figures his cost of distribution to be $40 per dozen on these plates, or 200 per cent added to their total cost to him laid down in New York, or exactly 66⅔ per cent of the entire selling price is represented by his cost of distribution. The distribution in this instance adds five and one-half times more to the cost to the ultimate consumer than does the tariff. These articles are not produced in this country and consequently the entire duty is added to their cost. In the case of milk, as I have shown, there is probably nothing added for the tariff. In the case of clothing and cotton goods, and other things in which there is local competition in this country, some percentage of the tariff is added to the cost to the ultimate consumer, and it is worth our while to have figured out for us by a competent and disinterested board just exactly what percentage this amounts to in the various articles of common use by the masses of the people.

Fifty-two per cent of all the men who went to the polls and voted last November indorsed that principle; yet you gentlemen are overlooking that fact and are following a doubtful 42 per cent. When I call them doubtful it is for the reason that many of the Democrats of the North are protectionists at heart. In addition to this, the President undoubtedly received a very substantial number of votes from men who always want the highest kind of a tariff irrespective of the facts, because they were actuated by a fear lest a certain distinguished gentleman, whose methods have not always pleased them, might possibly be elected to the Presidency. Many of these voters are well meaning, but nearsighted. They thought that the specter over their shoulder was the evil one himself. Instead, he is actually offering them and all the rest of the people of this country industrial prosperity on the basis of a square deal for everybody. [Applause.]

Briefly, this shows the difficulty of materially increasing the purchasing power of a dollar unless you remove the duty from those articles which are not produced in this country.

EFFECT OF H. R. 3321 ON WAGES—ON STEEL.

Now, let us look at the other side of the question, the probability of maintaining wages; in other words, at the same time holding up the purchasing power of that dollar when measured by human labor.

Take the question of steel: I submit herewith a statement of the comparative wages paid in this country and in England and Germany, showing that the labor cost of the finished product in Pennsylvania and Ohio exceeds the labor cost in England by approximately 44 per cent and exceeds that in Germany by more than 60 per cent.

Let me here quote from the President's address, on page 132 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 8, 1913:

The object of the tariff duties henceforth laid must be effective competition, the whetting of American wits by contest with the wits of the rest of the world.

It must be apparent to each of you that while we are whetting our wits the rest of the world is also whetting its wits, and if the iron founders of the competing countries have the same intelligence, if they have whetted their wits against ours, if they use the same type of machinery which we have, either they must increase their labor cost to equal ours—an inconceivable hypothesis—or we must decrease our labor cost to equal theirs, not only if we are going to compete in the markets of the world, but if we are going to hold the American market itself against outside invasion. Everything else being equal, matching wits and finding equal intelligence, we must match the prices paid for labor if we are going to continue to compete in the general cost of the finished product.

ON WATCHES.

Take the item of watches: The American watchmaker receives on an average just about two and one-fourth times as much as the watchmaker of Switzerland. Now, if we match only our wits against the wits of the watchmaker in that country, and he uses the same type of machinery as we do, with the lesser wages which he would have to pay, there can be no question as to the fate of that industry in America.

ON TYPEWRITERS.

Typewriters—another industry which uses highly skilled mechanics. The Remington Typewriter Co. maintains plants in the United States, England, Germany, and France, and in the United States averages paying just about twice as much in wages. In this case it does not become a battle of executive wits. These plants are owned by the same people, managed by the same minds, and must necessarily produce the typewriters that are sold in America in whatever country that will put them down in the distributing centers of this country at the lowest figure.

REAL EFFECT ON LABOR.

I will not weary you by going into the balance of the schedules. Some men who are now making boots and shoes in America will find themselves out of employment; so will some men who are manufacturing woolen goods and cotton goods, who are manufacturing steel and watches and typewriters. These men whose occupations in this country are gone will be unable to follow the industry to the other countries. They and their families can not possibly obliterate themselves from the face of the earth. They must live, and the only avenue left is to try to get the job of some other man. The most natural thing would be to attempt to get a place in the same line of industry in which they are trained. That makes two men bidding for one job. There can be but one result. The law of supply and demand, to which the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee referred in his speech, governs labor in our present scheme of society just as relentlessly as it does any other department of trade. Prices will be reduced and will be followed by some men being driven from employment in that particular line. Then they will attempt to secure work in some other line, and again wages will be reduced and the purchasing power of all these men will be very much lessened. The farmer and the producer will find his prices reduced. You gentlemen of the majority are going to find the cost of living cut, and you are going to find the purchasing power cut to an equal and probably a very much greater degree.

EFFECT OF H. R. 3321 ON COST OF LIVING.

The cost of living is a relative expression. It makes no difference whatever to a man what he has to pay for the necessities of life when viewed from that standpoint alone, and equally it makes no difference to him what the remuneration for his labor amounts to when viewed from that standpoint alone.

The relation between these two makes all the difference in the world to him. In other words, it is his balance sheet at the end of the day, the month, or the year. Are his wages sufficient to properly nourish and clothe his family and himself? Have they been adequately sheltered, have the children been kept in school, and is some balance left over for the savings account at the end of the year? This is the true measure of success or failure of the tariff, and this is the yardstick which the people of this country are going to apply to House bill 3321.

There are approximately 7,000,000 men in this country who derive their principal income from the farm. Excluding the comparatively small percentage engaged in garden and truck farming the balance of them are producing articles which must either find a market in this country or else they must be thrown

onto the markets of the world. Each country has its own particular market place for the various kinds of commodities. For instance, Chicago is the American market for wheat. Liverpool is the world's market for the same commodity. Whenever all the wheat that is produced in this country is consumed by our own people the farmer gets the Liverpool price at Chicago, and 7,000,000 men and their families in this country, or practically 35 per cent of all our people, are made more prosperous by the difference in freight rates between Chicago and Liverpool, which has been saved to them by the home market. When they are prosperous they buy more freely of the wares fashioned by the artisan as he works at his bench, and he has in consequence more hours of work and a pay envelope bringing in every week more money and more ability to buy the products which come from the farm and which tend to keep his family and himself in the best possible condition.

H. R. 3321 FAVORS COTTON GROWERS.

May I refer to the agricultural economic condition as it affects the Democratic Party, or rather as it is affected by the Democratic Party? You represent more than a century of specializing in a certain agricultural line in which you practically have no competition with the rest of the world, and it is true it makes very little difference to you where your cotton is spun into fabrics. You practically control the world's market for raw cotton. You and your constituents may be individually benefited by the removal of all tariff duties, thus enabling you to buy all your supplies cheaper without materially reducing the value of your principal agricultural product, but the value of your product is less than one-seventh of the value of the total agricultural products of this country, and the benefits which you receive by the reduction in the cost of other necessary articles probably would not be materially offset by a reduction in value of your cotton on the farm.

But how about the Democrat who represents Ohio, Michigan, Missouri, Colorado, Illinois, and all the other States where sheep are produced when the duty is removed from wool? How about the Democratic Members of Congress from States where they grow cane sugar—Louisiana, Georgia, and Texas—and where they grow beet sugar—Colorado, California, and Michigan? Can the same thing be said with equal truth of them? Why, 40 per cent of all the cotton cloth manufactured in this world is manufactured in Great Britain, about 20 per cent in the United States, and 10 per cent in Germany. A reduction in the tariff that would affect the prosperity of 60,000,000 or 65,000,000 of the people in the Northern and Western States would, to a small degree only, curtail the buying power of cotton goods in the world, probably not more than 2 per cent, and such a trifling decrease in the value of the entire world's demand would be met by a decrease in the production of raw cotton at the points where it costs most to produce it—India and Egypt. I want to compliment the gentleman from Alabama, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. He is certainly providing for his own in this bill, and so far as it has worked its passage he has engineered it through the House with apparently the same delicate tact which overcame all obstacles in the committee of which he is the head and also in caucus. House bill 3321 clearly reestablishes not only in America but in the entire world the old kingdom of cotton. There would be no Democratic Party but for the cotton-producing States. You have more than enough sure electoral votes to furnish a majority of the number necessary to elect a President. You dominate every Democratic national convention and you dominate every caucus of the Democratic Members of Congress. You are the only reliable Democrats, and the economic value of your natural, world-wide monopoly in the growth of raw cotton has made you free traders. Why, when the great leader of the Progressive movement sought to break into your "solid South" he made only one mistake. You gentlemen are not Democrats because of sentiment; the reason is economic. Your raw cotton will bring as much and will not cost as much for labor and certainly not for jute and steel bands with which to cover and bind your bales. You will save a little something on your woolen clothes and a little something on your finished cotton cloth. You will save some more on sugar, for sure, unless the trust swallows it up. You will be able to buy your agricultural implements a little cheaper, and your mechanical cotton pickers—if they ever do come—will be made in Germany or England, and your labor will also be under much better control.

INCOME TAX.

This bill is really a freak of the intellect. It carries two ideas on the same trunk—one almost a free-trade tariff, the other a graduated-income tax. You Democratic gentlemen have been very clever in this. You are putting men who do not agree with you on the tariff, but who do agree with you on the principle of a graduated-income tax, in a serious dilemma. I have always believed in such a tax; the principle is correct. It places the burden of taxation on the shoulders of the people who are best able to bear it. All governments are established for the purpose of guaranteeing security to life and security in the enjoyment of property or an income. The graduated principle is absolutely sound, because, in addition to placing the burden on the shoulders that can best bear up such a tax, it also places it on the shoulders of the people who enjoy most that stability which our Government guarantees to property. Take the humblest workman and the richest man: The Government guarantees to each his life, and it is of equal value to the two egos. It guarantees to each the enjoyment of his property and his income, but I do not think any man in this Chamber will tell me that such a guaranty is enjoyed by both men in equal part. This bill is by no means as radical as I would wish, and I shall take the opportunity to attempt to amend it when we come to that section under the five-minute rule. However, this beginning is in the right direction, and I shall not vote against it. Like everyone else here, I have always thought it cowardly to dodge a vote; but I will not vote against that income tax, nor any other. It is the only way we can get a start. Nor will I vote for that tariff bill nor any other like it; and I am going to choose that which appears on the surface as a coward's position. I am going to refuse to vote one way or the other on that bill combining those two principles; and I will say to you that whether or not it takes courage for a man to be a coward, I am going to leave that to the individual judgment of each Member of this Congress. However you decide on this question, I myself am thoroughly resolved that if I am alive and well I will be in my seat when this bill is voted on and will vote "present," as being the only way in which I can conscientiously express my sentiments on a double-headed bill of this sort, one half of which meets with my entire approval and the other half of such a nature that I could never vote for it.

GRADUATED INCOME TAX THE REAL SOLUTION.

My own opinion is that a protective tariff is absolutely necessary for the industrial prosperity of the 85 per cent of the people of this country who work for a living, and if it could not be exactly equitable I would rather have it too high than too low. With the income-tax amendment read into the Constitution of this country you have in your hands the greatest equalizer of the inequities that have followed the tariff or any special privilege that has been put into the hands of a legislative body. I agree with you that the present tariff law brings in many inequities, but I do not believe you are curing them with this bill, for I think it is the poison of industry. But I do believe that you could cure them by a properly adjusted graduated income tax. I believe it to be a remedy that could be used in conjunction with a protective tariff, but I do not believe that it will prove an antidote to the industrial poison of free trade. It is absolutely necessary to gather in this country wealth if we are going to distribute wealth equitably among our people; and that the tariff has assisted in the gathering of wealth is perfectly evident from a study of the census decade by decade since the system of protection has been the guiding principle of our fiscal law. That it has been equitably divided I do not claim. I do not believe it has. The only civilized country that now adheres to a free-trade doctrine is England, and there is more hardship and want and suffering and pauperism in free-trade England than in any other country on the face of the globe. They have tried the income tax, but it does not remedy the trouble. The fact is no adequate remedy will ever be found that does not provide prosperity for the great mass of the people. President Wilson was right—a people must be prosperous if they are well governed—and if House bill 3321, carrying his sanction, makes for the general prosperity of the masses of our people, he ought to have the unanimous indorsement of all political parties; and if it fails, he and you know the penalty. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS].

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'HAIR). The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I shall use all of the time which the leader of the minority of the Ways and Means Committee has so generously assigned to me; but in the time that I shall speak I want to say something about some of the provisions of this bill and something about the general policies that are involved in its consideration. In the first place, I want to say that with much that my friend from Illinois [Mr. COPLEY] has said I agree. I agree with him in what he has just said in favor of a protective tariff. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the industrial history of this country has demonstrated beyond question that that system of tariff that we call the protective system is necessary for the maintenance

of the continued welfare and prosperity of the Republic, so that in that regard I am in entire accord with the gentleman from Illinois who has just spoken. I agree with him that we ought to have a protective tariff. I agree with him, secondly, that that tariff ought to have such rates as will equalize the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. I agree with him in the third proposition, that that difference in the cost of production at home and abroad should be ascertained not by the quasi investigations that may be carried on behind the locked and closed doors of a caucus room but upon the findings of a tariff board or a tariff commission. [Applause on the Republican side.] I agree with him in another thing—and I think the great majority of the American people are in agreement upon that proposition—and that is that the time has passed when successfully any political party in this country can legislate in secret caucus by dark-lantern methods. [Applause.]

I am in agreement with my friend upon that proposition. I agree with him upon another proposition. For many years I have been in favor of an income tax. I am now in favor of an income tax; but here is where I part with my friend. I would be glad to vote for a reasonable income tax; and in saying that I think I am announcing good Republican doctrine, because there could not have been and would not have been any opportunity to vote in this House for an income-tax law had it not been for the action of a Republican Congress. Therefore, I do not think I am guilty of political heresy in saying that I am in favor of an income tax; but here is where I part company with my friend. It seems to me that the tariff provisions of this bill are so unfair, so unjust, so unwarranted, so unreasonable, that I can not bring myself to the point where I think I would be serving my constituents simply by sitting quietly by and voting "present" when this bill is put upon its passage. I feel that I can not discharge that duty other than by registering, as I shall do, my vote, and, so far as I am able to do so, my voice against any such legislation as this. [Applause on the Republican side.] The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COPLEY] referred to another very important proposition which I hope to discuss a little later in my remarks, and that is the influence of local custom in the retail trade, so far as prices are concerned. We talk here and upon the hustings a great deal about the tariff. We say much about its influence upon prices—and it has an influence—but the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that there are other forces at work that perhaps have as much to do in shaping prices in this country as does the tariff. I refer to the peculiar custom of local trade.

Complaint is registered against the American farmer, and in this bill the things he produces are upon the free list, or rates greatly reduced, upon the theory that because of the fact that in the past few years he has received fairly remunerative prices that the expense of the product to the consumer is thereby increased. Complaint was made here the other day by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama because, as he said, the price that the farmer was getting for his product had increased some 93 per cent since 1897. The farmer was and is entitled to this increase. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the increase in price, the high cost of living, so-called, does not come to any considerable extent from the increase that has come in the price that the farmer gets for his product. The fact is that the big increase in price comes from the time that the products leave the hands of the farmer until they reach the hands of the consumer. Just an illustration, and I will come to that more fully a little later, but as an illustration of that proposition I live in a section of the country where we have great onion fields, perhaps the greatest in the country, 5,000 acres in a single county. I happen to know that this is true—and I got the facts from a careful investigation made by the Department of Agriculture—I happen to know that of the price the consumer of onions pays in New York or Philadelphia or Boston when he buys them by the peck, the farmer back in the eighth district in Ohio, who owns the land or rents it, who buys the seed, who hires the labor, who contributes his own efforts, who runs the risk, the farmer who plants the crop and tills the crop and finally harvests the crop, pulls the onions and sorts them and crates them and puts them on the car, the man who does all that work gets out of every dollar that is paid for onions in the markets of New York, Boston, or Philadelphia only 28 cents; somebody else between the farmer and the market gets the 72 cents. The framers of this bill, presuming to say that they are going to benefit the consumers of this country, are cutting the duty upon onions in half, i. e., from 40 cents per bushel under the present law to 20 cents per bushel under the Underwood bill.

I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that if this bill shall be enacted into law—as I very much fear it may be—if it should become the law the price that the consumer has to pay is not going to be changed materially. The price that the farmer gets for his onions will be lowered a great deal, but the change that comes about through the reduction in the tariff of one-half, as is proposed by this bill, is going to be eaten up by the middleman, not by the man who goes into the field and tills and raises the crop, but by the jobbers and the wholesalers—the people who are producing nothing. On the subject of the tariff on onions a prominent Democratic farmer of Hardin County, Ohio, comments as follows in a letter addressed to me:

> The proposed tariff bill would destroy our business, and as much soil is only adapted to onions, it would be a great hardship, owing to the cheap labor in the Bermuda Islands. We, of course, could not compete with them. Besides the freight rate from our section is 24 cents per hundred pounds, 30 cents from Indiana points, 30 cents from Michigan points, and 16 cents from the Bermuda Islands to New York, and correspondingly low to all the Atlantic points.
>
> In our product, in fact, nearly all those articles under Schedule G require large outlay for labor and to let those articles to our shores free would entirely destroy the demand for this help, as these articles would come to our shore in the form of finished product, and it would be a loss to our Nation.
>
> Counting the use of an acre of land worth $12; preparing the ground for seed bed and drilling the seed, $5; hand cultivating and hand weeding, $30; fertilizers, $10; pulling onions, $4; topping, say, 300 bushels at 3 cents a bushel, $9; screening and sacking 300 bushels at 2 cents a bushel, $6; hauling to the cars, at 3 cents per bushel, $9; use of 300 crates at 3 cents per crate, $6; moving crates from sheds to field and return, $2; 5 pounds of seed, at $1.60 per pound, $8. This gives us $101. Our annual crop report gives us 300 bushels per acre as an average yield per acre in all the onion fields. This is about what our section produces. You will notice this gives us nothing for our own labor, and as the man who superintends an onion farm can do little other than watch the detail of his business, one can not grow an acre of onions and support his own family for less than $120 per acre. The average fall price here in the last 10 years has been 40 cents per bushel. You will note that the cost of producing onions is mainly labor: Cultivating, weeding, pulling, screening, sacking is all hand labor, besides preparing seed bed and hauling away crop. At this very time we are selling onions from 20 to 30 cents per bushel. We are delivering onions in our cities, freight paid, from 30 to 40 cents per bushel. And at this time these same onions go to the city trade at $1 per bushel and 20 cents for one-half peck. The high cost of living is blamed to the farmer. The fact remains that nearly all vegetables are delivered at the cities at 25 per cent of the prices paid by the ultimate consumer.

And that leads me to inquire, Mr. Chairman, whether the policy that was laid down here by the distinguished and courteous and able gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is the correct one in this respect. The gentleman said in his opening remarks in this debate that this bill marked a new era. I think that is true if it shall become the law, a different era, anyhow, and then he went on to say, with his usual eloquence and lucidity, that the time had come when we should cease to consider producers and should consider consumers. Mr. Chairman, that is a very serious proposition. Is this country to take the position that from now on legislation in State and Nation shall be had not for the benefit of the men who toil but for the benefit simply of those who consume? Of course everybody recognizes that these classes are overlapping all the time, but I insist, Mr. Chairman, that if we shall legislate in this country that producers have work, if we shall legislate that the laboring man have a chance to earn an honest dollar by honest toil, if the farmer has a market for his products, if the miner has a chance to dispose of the product of his toil, if we shall so legislate and shape affairs in this country that all the producers are prosperous, that all producers have work, then it seems to me that the question of consumption of goods can be left very largely to take care of itself [applause on the Republican side], and, so far as I am concerned, I totally disagree with the proposition that we are to ignore the producers.

I have stood, and the party to which I belong has stood, and now stands, for a policy that says it is better to have men working here, our own men, beneath our own flag, in our own country, than to have goods produced elsewhere. [Applause on the Republican side.] It may seem high political heresy to some of my good friends on the other side that we should say such a thing as that, but, Mr. Chairman, I can not get that idea out of my mind that somehow it is the duty of the American Congress when it is levying taxes—as it was admitted in a number of eloquent addresses on that side this afternoon that we must levy—that it is wise and desirable and statesmanlike so to levy those taxes as to discriminate in favor of our own people. I believe in American industry, in the American farmer, and the American laboring man. I do not care very much about the industries of Europe. [Applause on the Republican side.] To me it is a matter of shame and regret that at this very moment the highest encomiums that are being pronounced upon this proposed legislation come from the trade journals of Europe. [Applause on the Republican side.]

They are in high glee. They say the good old times are coming back when they were supplying the American market. The trade journals of France and Germany and England are pointing with pride to the probable action of this House. But somehow, Mr. Chairman, I have an idea that it would be wiser if

we were proposing so to legislate as to secure the favorable comment of our own trade journals, of our own people, and to merit the acclaim of our own workingmen and our own farmers. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I have before me an interesting though weird political document. It is the platform that was adopted at the convention of the Democratic Party in the city of Baltimore. One plank of that platform reads as follows:

We recognize that our system of tariff taxation is intimately connected with the business of the country, and we favor the ultimate attainment of the principles we advocate by legislation—

Now, note this—

we favor the ultimate attainment of the principles we advocate by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry.

That is a very careful, conservative, comforting, and reassuring sort of a pronouncement. And then, to make the people of this country feel perfectly confident that the Democratic Party could be trusted on the tariff question, President Wilson felt called upon to say, at Pittsburgh, on October 18 last, the following:

I welcome the opportunity of stating what I believe to be the well-considered position of the Democratic Party with regard to the tariff. It is absolutely essential that we should be entirely frank with one another in the discussion of this fundamental question.

Now, note this, brethren:

The Democratic Party—

Now, this is the official announcement by the head of the party, interpreting the plank in the platform which I have just read:

The Democratic Party does not propose free trade or anything approaching free trade.

I desire to use those two interesting statements as a text for a little bit of exegesis, first, from the platform, where it says:

We favor the ultimate attainment of the principles we advocate by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry.

And then, secondly, what the President says:

The Democratic Party does not propose free trade or anything approaching free trade.

And then to make us trebly assured that it was all perfectly safe and pleasant and harmonious and happy the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] said, in his eloquent opening address, something about lowering the duty not with an ax but with a jackscrew. And while I can not quote just his language the implication was that by this bill we would be lowering the tariff carefully and slowly, not knocking the tariff all to pieces, not using the ax but letting things down gradually with a jackscrew. Was it not upon that theory that this same Democratic Party told us only 12 months ago that the last word on the subject of tariff on wool was 20 per cent ad valorem, that it was needed as a matter of revenue? That was the proposition then, and yet in view of this proposition that no legitimate industry is to be interfered with, in view of the statement that the tariff is to be gradually reduced and let down with a jackscrew, in view of those two statements a bill is brought in here, I honestly believe, contrary to the judgment of the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, providing that the woolgrowing industry of this country is to be destroyed at one fell swoop on the theory, is it not, that the raising of sheep, the growing of wool, is not a legitimate industry; or is it upon the theory that this statement in the platform and this quotation from the speech of President Wilson were intended, as a good many planks in Democratic platforms are intended, as something not to stand upon but to get in on?

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is not in compliance even with the terms of the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore. If it had complied with it, it would have been bad enough, but it is even worse than that. Without any notice, in the face of implied promises to the contrary, wool is put on the free list, and so is practically everything else that the farmer produces, on the theory that we are to have a gradual, harmless reduction of the tariff.

That leads me to discuss why it is not wise, in my humble opinion, to put wool on the free list, as is proposed in this bill, at the behest, I think, of the President of the United States, and contrary, I believe, to the judgment of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, although I am not informed as to that. Nobody is informed as to that. The country is not informed about that. The country is left in the dark. We are left to implication and rumors as to what occurred in the dim secrecy of the Democratic caucus chamber.

Here is the first reason why it is not wise to put wool on the free list: I start with the assumption that it is not desirable to wipe out sheep raising and woolgrowing in this country. I think it means much to this Nation to be able to produce a large proportion of the clothing wool which it uses, and I call attention to this important fact that every time our Democratic friends have undertaken to tinker with the tariff, or every time anybody has undertaken to tinker with the tariff by reducing the rate, the sheep industry and the woolgrowing industry have very seriously fallen off. For example, it seems that somehow, according to the laws of Nature, there is a rate, a natural rate, and if we reduce the tariff below that rate, the sheep-raising and woolgrowing industries will suffer, and unless the rate is changed those industries will probably be destroyed.

Effect upon the number of sheep of 5 experiments during the past 42 years with revision of the wool tariff.

[Whenever the duties have been below 11 cents per pound on wool of the first class, flocks have always decreased, and, on the other hand, when the duties have been as at present (11 cents per pound or higher) they have always increased.]

Year of enactment.	Term of existence.	Rate of duty per pound.	Per cent of increase (+) or decrease (−).
		Cents.	
1867	Last 4 years of it	12½	+25
1883	About 6 years	10	−16
1890	Less than 4 years	11	+10
1894	do	Free.	−21
1897	12 years	11	+46

Under the act of 1867, during the last four years of it, the tariff rate was 12½ cents a pound on wool. In those four years woolgrowing and sheep raising in this country increased 25 per cent. Then, under the law of 1883, for about six years of that law, the rate was only 10 per cent. The industry fell off in those six years 16 per cent, whereas it had increased in the preceding four years 25 per cent. Under the four years of the McKinley law of 1890, with a rate on raw wool of the first class of 11 cents per grease pound, there was an increase in the woolgrowing and sheep-raising industry of this country of 10 per cent; and then under the Wilson law, in effect only a comparatively short time, something like three years, with free wool, which you are proposing in this bill, that industry fell off 21 per cent. And yet gentlemen affect to believe, or, at any rate, to say that they believe, that the enactment of this bill into law will not injure any legitimate industry!

Well, if that is so, it simply means this: That the teachings of history amount to nothing; that when we come to make a tariff law we ought to reject our experience and consult simply our imagination and our invention. The teaching of history is exactly the reverse of the contentions of the gentlemen who are favoring free wool.

Then under the act of 1897, with the rate the same as it had been under the McKinley law, there was an increase of 46 per cent in the product.

History will repeat itself. If this law goes into effect, mark you, gentlemen, and particularly my friends on that side of the aisle who happen to come from sections particularly interested in woolgrowing, as some of you do, I warn you that the same thing will occur that occurred under the Wilson law.

The sheep-raising industry will be practically destroyed. The farmers who are now engaged in that industry will have to seek other lines of employment, and the question is whether, in the long run, this country is going to be benefited any by that proposition. And I wonder what my friends on that side of the aisle who come from States that do have some interest in the woolgrowing industry are going to say to their people when they get back home and undertake to tell their people about the vote they have cast on this tariff bill when inquiry is made as to why, contrary to every law that we have had for many years, they separated in this bill wool and goat hair. There are other jokers and funny things in this bill, quite a good many of them. I do not know whether attention has been called to this by anyone or not.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. For a brief question. I have only a short time.

Mr. SLOAN. Will it be a sufficient answer to those constituents for them to say that marvelous juicy patronage was exchanged for their votes, and that until their votes were cast attractive and desirable committeeships were held in abeyance?

Mr. WILLIS. I could not really answer that question, but the suggestion might be very apropos.

Relative to this tariff on goat hair, I wish that every Member of the House would get the tariff hearings on Schedule K, No.

20, January 28, and turn to page 4049, and read there some of the most interesting material that I have ever found anywhere:

EXTRACTS FROM HEARINGS.

The CHAIRMAN. If we separate mohair from wool, we must follow that policy all the way down the line, in the finished products as well——

Mr. ROBERTSON (interposing). That is what we want you to do, Mr. Chairman, and that is what you ought to do.

The CHAIRMAN. If we do that, we have a difficult proposition, although I understand that wool and mohair are never mixed, and that mohair in some respects is a luxury. But it is every day becoming a necessity. There is really no better summer suit in a hot country for a man to wear than a mohair suit. You recognize that?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; it is cheap.

The CHAIRMAN. It is cheap and it is cool.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is becoming more and more a necessity. I realize that, but at the present time it is a luxury and it ought to be taxed. The rich ought to be made to pay for these things, and the Government must be sustained.

* * * * * * *

Mr. KITCHIN. Most of the Angora goats are in Texas, are they not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; most of them in the United States are in Texas.

Mr. KITCHIN. Of course, I meant in the United States. How large is your flock?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We have about 3,000 goats; about two flocks.

Mr. KITCHIN. How much have you increased your flocks in the last five years?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Five years ago we had 5,000 goats; to-day we have only about 3,000 goats.

* * * * * * *

Mr. FORDNEY. You are one of the Democrats who believe in protection?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORDNEY. I agree with you.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And I believe we will get it. I believe this Ways and Means Committee will consider our cause. I believe that they will give us a specific duty of 12 cents a pound, and I believe that we can present to the Ways and Means Committee, if not just at the present time, later on, facts and figures that will demonstrate and prove to you beyond the shadow of a doubt that you have no idea and can get no idea under your present law of how much mohair is produced——

Mr. KITCHIN (interposing). Twelve cents per pound is about 40 per cent ad valorem?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. You are cognizant of the fact that the 16 Texas Representatives and the two Texas Senators voted for this reduction last year on mohair?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, sir; I am.

Mr. KITCHIN. Were they acquainted with the facts relative to your industry?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think not. Even if they were—grant that they—we people are in too small a minority; we are very small.

* * * * * * *

Mr. KITCHIN. I think you are consistent, Mr. Robertson.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I believe that the Representatives from Texas and the Senators did right, because, as I say, we are a small minority up yonder in the hills. They did not know that we were in existence. Some of them, perhaps, have never seen an Angora goat. They are among the farming class and the cotton-raising class. If I should cut off a lock of this Angora hair, some of them would think it was cotton. If I should put it in a boll they would say, "That is beautiful cotton; it must be Egyptian cotton."

Mr. FORDNEY. You are now speaking of your Texas neighbors?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am speaking of our Representatives from Texas. I realize, gentlemen, that we are a small minority out yonder in the hills, away out yonder on the bleak hills, where we can not water our stock. We do water our stock when the wind blows and the windmills are in good condition.

Mr. KITCHIN. In other words, you believe in having a protection of 12 cents a pound on your raw material, which is leaving it the same as it is in the Payne-Aldrich Act, and that the manufacturers who buy your raw material and produce goods from them ought to have some protection?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Certainly I do; they must have it.

Mr. KITCHIN. You are not like some of these men who want their stuff protected and the other fellow's stuff not protected?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No; it is necessary if they are to prosper.

Mr. FORDNEY. I think you ought to move up to Michigan.

Mr. ROBERTSON. No; if I moved up to Michigan I could not raise Angora goats.

Mr. FORDNEY. But you would be a Republican, all right.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am viewing the proposition from a Republican standpoint somewhat now, and yet I am a Democrat, and I am pleading for revenue.

Mr. KITCHIN. You are a Democrat from habit and not from principle.

Mr. ROBERTSON. No, sir.

The first thing is an admission by the distinguished chairman of the committee that mohair is not a luxury but a necessity. Then later on in the hearings, which I will not take the time to read, but which I shall place in the RECORD, this gentleman who is arguing for his industry, a gentleman from Texas, by the name of Robertson, goes on to explain how it is that his industry has not received proper consideration heretofore at the hands of the Representatives from that State. Why, he even says in one place that they are unacquainted with the location of his industry. He says here on page 4052:

They did not know that we were in existence. Some of them, perhaps, had never seen an Angora goat. They are among the farming class and cotton-raising class.

Now, listen to this:

If I should cut off a lock of this Angora hair, some of them would think it was cotton. If I should put it in a boll, they would say: "This is beautiful cotton. It must be Egyptian cotton."

That is the opinion that he expressed—I think quite unfairly and wrongfully—concerning the Representatives from his State, because they are all of them of distinguished ability, and one of them—I wish he were here now—is of special alertness and eloquence, always on the job, looking after the interests of his constituents. He is a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

In the laws that we have had heretofore wool and Angora goat hair were in the same schedule, and they ought to be now; but this distinguished, eloquent, and able Representative from the Lone Star State, Mr. GARNER, a member of the committee, always is alert in looking after the interests of his constituents.

I speak of this not by way of complaint; I compliment him for his activity. He saw to it that when this tariff bill was written wool and Angora goat hair for the first time went into separate schedules. I want to refer to that particularly just now. I have before me H. R. 3321, the pending tariff bill. For example, now, let us take the raw material first. The wool that is produced upon the farms of the North is put upon the free list, but if you will turn over to page 77 of the bill, paragraph 314, you will find this interesting item, which separates wool and Angora goat hair. Wool goes on the free list. It was not desirable that the product of the great State of Texas should be thus placed upon the free list, and consequently the gentleman, with his distinguished ability, prevailed upon the committee to make a new arrangement. Consequently on page 77 of the bill you will see this interesting item. While the wool of the sheep is on the free list, this item reads:

314. Hair of the Angora goat, alpaca, and other like animals, and all hair on the skin of such animals, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Do you see the point of that? Then we will go on a little further. Under section 295 we read:

Combed wool or tops, 15 per cent ad valorem.

That is the product of the sheep of the northern farms. But, lo and behold, tops made from the hair of the Angora goat, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Oh, I tell you there is nothing like having a Representative on the committee who takes an interest in his constituents. I do not say that offensively, now, but rather by way of compliment. It is a great thing to have somebody to look after things. The unfortunate thing about it was that the 600,000 woolgrowers of the United States from the northern farms had no one to speak for them amongst the Democratic members of that committee. If there had been a Representative as active in their behalf as was the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] in behalf of the raisers of Angora goats, no doubt there would have been a different story to tell.

And so it runs all through the schedule. It is wonderfully interesting.

296. Yarns made wholly or in chief value of wool, 20 per cent ad valorem.

But in paragraph 316 you see:

Yarns made of the hair of the Angora goat, alpaca, and other like animals, 30 per cent ad valorem.

So it runs all the way through. It is, according to the philosophy of these gentlemen, necessary and desirable that wool should be put upon the free list, but when it comes to the product of the Angora goat of the State of Texas, even though this gentleman did testify in the hearing that the gentlemen from his State did not know anything about Angora goats and could not tell Angora goat hair from cotton, could not tell a goat from a boll weevil [laughter], yet when it came down to arranging the rate it was shown that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] did know about the Angora goat, and he did look after the interests of those who raised the Angora goats. You gentlemen over there from the wool-growing States of the North and from the wool-growing States of the West and Southwest propose to vote for this bill to put wool on the free list and yet to protect the Angora goats that have the good fortune to live in the district so ably represented by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER].

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. For a brief question.

Mr. NORTON. Does it not look, from the arrangement of the schedule, as if these Democrats from Northern States and from Western States were sent here to Congress to look after the Texas goat rather than their own sheep industry at home?

Mr. WILLIS. It looks to me as if the southern Members had got the "goat" of the northern Members. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. Can not the gentleman see that this is an infant industry that needs protection?

Mr. WILLIS. That may be so; I had not thought of that phase of it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to proceed to another phase of this tariff on wool. Another matter I wish to refer to is why we can not have and ought not to have free wool in this country. The fact is, as shown by a carefully prepared report of the Tariff Board, that the wool of our greatest competitors, namely, Australia, South Africa, and South America, figuring the cost of production of that wool on exactly the same basis upon which they figure the cost of the production of wool in this country, the wool of Australia, our chief competitor, and the wool of South Africa is going to the market with no charge against it at all. If you have any doubt about that you can find it fully elucidated in volume 2 of the report of the Tariff Board.

This is, on page 350, where they use the following language:

There remains, therefore, only the simple operation of subtracting from the flock expenses the receipts from other sources than wool, to reveal the fact that as against a clearly demonstrated net charge against the western American wool of from 10 to 11 cents, there is probably not more than 4 to 5 cents per pound against the South American clip, and if the season is normal and the sheep market steady, little, if any, charge against the Australian. Indeed, well-managed stations in many parts of Australia are showing at the present time a profit before any wools are sold.

This qualification is generally applicable to the stock trade in all of the larger sheep districts of Australia. Statements similar to the above are made by two other prominent owners with regard to returns from surplus stock in Queensland and Western Australia. But both say that in good years, and on well-managed runs, the sales of sheep yield enough to pay working expenses. One of these anticipates that, in view of the increasing exports of Australian mutton and lamb, the surplus station stock will in future years give an annual return considerably in excess of the amount of the working expenses—assuming that no large addition is made to the cost of labor in the meantime.

In the light, therefore, of the best information to be obtained, the board believes that at the present time the entire Australian output of merino and crossbred wool (interest being left out of account, as in the case of the United States) is moving to market, under present receipts from sales of sheep, with a net average charge of but a few cents per pound; and this estimate apparently holds good of New Zealand and the African Cape as well.

Now, on page 514 of this same volume, it is shown that in South Africa the same condition obtains. The statement is as follows:

Sale of surplus stock and mutton: In the Cape Province fat ewes are reported as selling for $4.50 per head and fat lambs 5 months old at $4. Old ewes are readily sold for local slaughter at from $2.50 to $3 per head, according to their flesh.

At the present time the demand for mutton is so strong that there is a good profit in breeding the woolless sheep for mutton alone. Where the sheep combine both wool and mutton the profits must naturally be much greater.

Cost of production: The average shearing per head is estimated at 6 pounds, with an average price received by the growers of 13½ cents per pound.

With an average valuation on breeding sheep of $2.50 per head and an investment, excluding lands in improvements and equipment per head of not over 40 cents per year, and taking into account the low cost of wages and provisions, the moderate leasing values of their grazing lands, the mild winters which do not demand other food for the animals than that found on the ranges, the strong demand for mutton of all classes, it is evident that the African woolgrower is able to meet all his expenses from the sale of his surplus stock and mutton, leaving the wool as a clear profit on his investment.

One flock owner in Rhodesia reports he can sell his wool at 12 cents per pound and make money.

That is to say, put it this way: The sheep men of Australia or South Africa, if they chose to do so, could absolutely give their wool away, realize nothing for it, and still continue in the sheep business. That must be perfectly apparent; that where there is an average charge against wool products of this country of 9.6 cents per pound we can not compete with a country that produces wool that has no charge against it.

Now, there is another reason connected with that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. For a brief question.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. From the protection standpoint, what is the gentleman's idea as to the duty on wool, the highest duty and the lowest duty that would be just?

Mr. WILLIS. I think my friend knows that I try to be conservative about it. The fact is that you take the fine merino wools of Ohio, as shown by the report of the Tariff Board, and by the report of the committee on the wool bill of the last Congress, in order to afford full protection to these merino sheep there would have to be a duty on the scoured content of about 24 cents. But I recognize the fact that that proposition must be looked at in a reasonable way. We have got to take something like the average cost of production of wool, and therefore my opinion, based on the report of the Tariff Board, is that the duty on the basis of the scoured content should be 18 cents. Of course, although I have no personal interest in the sheep business, I come from a section that has, and I would be glad to have it 19 or 20 cents, but I am personally of the opinion that 18 cents on scoured wool would give a reasonable protection to the woolgrowers of this country. This opinion is concurred in by the National Woolgrowers' Association and by the farmers and sheepmen of the country generally.

Now, there is another reason why we can not compete successfully with the countries I have named. Of course, I recognize the fact that these men who think it does not make any difference whether we have anything in this country, whether we raise any sheep or not, or whether we build up any industry, will not agree with me, but I think the American people take a contrary view to that of gentlemen who so think, and therefore I want to call attention to these facts taken from the report of the Tariff Board.

Take the average labor cost per sheep in the United States and it is 82 cents. In South America it is 23 cents. In Australia it is 7 cents, or about one-twelfth of what it is in this country. Why, in South Africa there are instances, and many of them, where men are hired at a rate of $1.70 to $3 per month to take care of sheep—men that are clothed in a happy smile and a G string. That is the kind of labor with which we are to compete if this bill goes through. The labor cost is higher, and it ought to be, because the people that are getting the wages are American laborers that receive and ought to receive the highest wage of anybody in the world. [Applause.] Anybody that has investigated beyond the most superficial inquiry knows the wages here are two or three times what they are in foreign countries.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course I am not going to challenge the gentleman's statement about men being clothed in sunshine and a G string.

Mr. WILLIS. Oh, it was a sunny smile. I must insist upon the gentleman keeping my metaphor correct.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. A sunny smile and a G string. If the weather be such that men can dress in that fashion, does not the gentleman think that it is pretty hard on the sheep that grows the wool?

Mr. WILLIS. I do not quite catch the point of the gentleman's question.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. How is it possible for the woolgrowing sheep to live in a climate where men can dress themselves in a sunny smile and a G string?

Mr. WILLIS. I want to say to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that that is a question that is not up to me. It is a question that is up to the sheep. As a matter of fact, they do so live by the million. That is a fact. How they do it I do not pretend to know. The conditions to which I refer, in so far as habits of dress are concerned, do not apply to Australia. As the gentleman well knows, Australia is hot and dry, and yet the sheep producing that beautiful fleece of heavy wool thrive there. I do not know how it is, but it is a fact of nature, and we can not argue with that fact.

There is another thing to which I wish to refer, and that is the cost of shearing. The average cost in this country is 9½ cents per head. In Australia it is 7 cents, and in South America 6 cents, and in Africa 2 cents. The labor cost again is vastly higher here. Then, too, take the question of freight. Do gentlemen stop to think that it is cheaper to ship wool from Australia to Boston than it is to ship wool from Idaho to Boston? Here are the facts: The freight rate to the wool market of Boston from the West of the United States is 6 cents on the scoured pound. From Australia it is half of that, 3 cents; from South America, 1 cent and a fraction; and from London, two-tenths of 1 cent. In other words, the producer of Australia, of South America, and of South Africa has a large advantage on the labor cost, and he has an immense advantage in the freight cost; and the result of these things is the unquestioned fact that we can not compete with those countries in the production of wool. As I said, if gentlemen say, "Very well; destroy the sheep industry; wipe it out," then this argument has no effect; but I think the great mass of the American people do not take that view.

There is another question to which I wish to refer very briefly. Some one will ask himself, perhaps, why it is that woolgrowing has not increased in this country. It has not increased rapidly. In fact, it has decreased in some years, and that is a perfectly legitimate question. How does it come, since we have had a tariff, that woolgrowing has not increased? Let us see. In the first place, it is because the protection which the farmer has had has been continually decreasing. While the rates in the law remain the same, certain forces have been at work which I believe I can explain, which have operated to reduce the actual protection every day in the year. What are

those forces? Here is one—the development of the frozen-meat trade of Australia, giving a great impetus to the production of wool of light shrinkage. Second, the famous skirting clause in the present tariff law. On this subject the Tariff Board says (vol. 2, p. 382):

The complaint of the grower of domestic wools that he is not now and has not during all these years been receiving the amount of protection nominally extended by the 11 cent duty on the grease pound is based upon the heavy shrinkage of the domestic fleece as against the light-conditioned skirted wools selected for importation primarily for their large net yield. An examination of the existing duties will show that the schedule is constructed upon the theory that wool shrinks 66⅔ per cent in the scouring. Since, however, it is certain that the wools actually imported shrink something less than 40 per cent, it is obvious that instead of paying $11 duty for every 33⅓ pounds of actual wool brought in, the importer is really securing some 60 pounds at a rate of not to exceed 18 cents per scoured pound.

In order that this matter may be more clearly understood, the board has prepared a tabular statement in which the full effect of shrinkages upon the actual operation of the existing wool duties is shown:

Present grease-pound rates with computed scoured-pound equivalents.

Shrinkage.	Actual duty on scoured content.	
	Class I wools.—Duty per pound, 11 cents.	Class II wools.—Duty per pound, 12 cents.
75 per cent	$0.44	$0.48
70 per cent	.36⅔	.40
65 per cent	.31⅓	.34⅓
60 per cent	.27½	.30
55 per cent	.24⅔	.26⅔
50 per cent	.22	.24
45 per cent	.20	.21 9/11
40 per cent	.18⅓	.20
35 per cent	.16½	.18 6/11
30 per cent	.15⅔	.17⅐
25 per cent	.14⅔	.16
20 per cent	.13¾	.15

I have no doubt that gentlemen understand what that means. There is a provision in section 368 of the present law that I will read. I think it is only fair, however, in passing, as I criticize this section somewhat, to say that it is no reflection on the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], because he himself has fought for years to have this schedule revised. The provision that I refer to is as follows:

Provided, That skirted wools as imported in 1890 and prior thereto are hereby excepted.

What do they do under that clause? Australian wool is beautiful wool. When I spoke here in the last Congress I had samples of it. It is beautiful wool, not as strong as the Ohio wool. You can pull it apart as you can cotton batting. It is not as good as the Ohio wool in some respects; it is not so strong in fiber, but it is beautiful wool. The producers shear the wool off and spread it out, and they will cut off the legs, the dirty portions, the neck and belly, and simply leave the solid part of the wool, the best of it. Under that clause in the present law that wool comes in as if it were in its natural condition. Couple these two facts together, first the development of the frozen-meat trade, and, second, this practice of skirting, and you have the result that whereas the present law was drawn upon the theory that wool would shrink in the neighborhood of 66⅔ per cent; as a matter of fact, the wool which now comes into the country shrinks not 66⅔ per cent but it shrinks more nearly 40 per cent. That is discussed very briefly in the report of the Tariff Board, to which I simply refer in passing, in volume 2, page 382. Just to make it a clear illustration, suppose we had 100 pounds. The importer buys 100 pounds of wool, and if it shrinks 66⅔ per cent he would have 33⅓ pounds under the present law, and he would have to pay a tariff of $11, and that would make the schedule what the law intended it should be; but let us see how it actually works out.

Instead of shrinking 66⅔ per cent it shrinks only about 40 per cent, and, then, instead of having 33⅓ pounds it will be 60 pounds, and if you will divide the amount of duty he pays by 60 instead of 33⅓ it will be seen the farmer has not been getting anything like 33 per cent protection on the scoured pound. As a matter of fact, it is shown by a table which I shall place in my remarks he has been getting something like 18 per cent. That is why I said 18 cents on the scoured content in reply to the gentleman from Tennessee. That is about what the farmer is actually getting under the present law as protection. Some interesting tests were recently made. I happen to know the authenticity of these facts. A fleece of Ohio wool was cut in two and half of it was sent to Boston and the other half to London. That sent to Boston sold at 26½ cents per pound, that sent to London sold for 19½ cents per pound, a difference of 7 cents—not 11, but 7. A fleece of Oregon wool was divided, as I have stated in this case. That fleece of Oregon wool sent to Boston brought 20 cents and that sent to London brought 14½ cents, a difference of 5½ cents. The same thing happened with Wyoming wool. In other words, the protection is not what the law indicates it should be. It has been only something like probably 6 cents on the grease pound or 18 cents on the scoured pound, and that is why the production of wool has not increased more rapidly under the tariff.

Now, I want to call attention to another fact, and that is the effect the tariff on wool has on the price of clothing. It is clearly demonstrable that if all the amount of the tariff is added to the price of the article that on the ordinary suit of clothes the tariff will not increase the price more than 75 or 80 cents a suit. Does anybody believe that simply by taking this tariff off that a suit that you now buy for $20 you will then be able to get it for $19.25? Does anybody think that there will be the slightest change in the retail price?

No one gives it serious consideration, because it is such a small element in the price. Ordinarily you can not make a suit of clothes for the biggest man on earth out of a piece of cloth and put over $2.10 worth of wool in it. How can it be that the removal of tariff on wool is going to have any appreciable effect upon the price of clothing? As a matter of fact, it will have practically no effect. For illustration—and I hold no brief for the wool manufacturers and I shall consider them only incidentally, for I think the terms of the present compensatory duty on wool are unfair and ought to be revised, and I shall vote for an amendment to reduce it—as I say, I hold no brief at all for the wool manufacturer, but I believe in giving even the devil his due. What I object to is free wool for the farmer but protection for the manufacturer. If wool is made free, why not clothes? The fact is, the price of that clothing is not because of the profit the manufacturer makes, but it is because of the profit that is added somewhere else. There is no wool raised in Ohio that will bring over 60 cents per pound, cleaned, and it will not take over 3½ pounds to make 3¼ yards of goods required for a suit. The cost of that wool can not be over $2.10, and there is not any better wool in the world, and this under the present tariff. Whether a suit costs $15 or $75, it can not contain more than $2.10 worth of wool, including the duty, and the rest of the price must be paid to American labor or American profit, and not over 25 cents profit per suit gets to the mill on the average. Twenty years ago department stores paid 80 cents, less 7 per cent, for goods to retail at $1. To-day the big houses will not pay over 62½ cents for goods to retail at $1 and not over 82½ cents for goods that retal at $1.25, and practically no house will pay more than $1.05 for goods that retail at $1.50. A $25 suit for women at retail in department stores in our great cities costs the retailer not more than $15 net, and it contains about $6 worth of dress goods.

A department store selling a suit at $25 gets $10, the mill not over $6, including the tariff on wool and the cost of the wool. Here is a little item I have here taken from a New York paper, an advertisement for one of the big department stores of New York City, which one it is not necessary to say, except it goes to show that they can sell a blue serge suit, special and thoroughly dependable, at $14.75. Now, let us analyze that. The ultimate consumer pays $14.75. The department store pays not over $10. The clothing manufacturer pays for goods not over $3.25. The clothing manufacturer pays for trimming, labor, expense, and profit $6.75, making $10. The department store gets $4.75. The mill gets $3.25, which includes the tariff, cost of wool, etc. The department store makes, by simply hanging up the suit, a profit of more than the farmer gets for raising the wool, more than the manufacturer of the cloth gets for its conversion into cloth.

The single profit that is made in the one handling is more than the total cost of that piece of cloth, including the cost of the wool up to the time it leaves the mill. And then they complain about what an immense profit the farmer is getting, and about the tariff. The clothing manufacturer pays for the goods not over $3.25. He pays for trimming and labor expense and profit, $6.75, making $10. The department store gets a profit of $4.75, a profit of nearly 50 per cent. Here is the actual cost. And yet we complain because the farmer down on the hills of Ohio is getting a little tariff protection upon his product.

I shall place in the RECORD something of an elaboration of what I said at the beginning about the influence of local custom upon prices, to make it clear, if I can, as a matter of fact, that the thing which has the most to do with prices is not the tariff, but these peculiar local customs.

Commodity.	Unit of sale.	Producer's share.
		Per cent.
Milk	Quart	50
Butter	Pound	87
Poultry	do	50
Eggs	Dozen	69
Cabbage	Head	48
Do	Pound	65
Celery	Bunch	60
Apples	Bushel	56
Do	Barrel	66
Strawberries	Quart	49
Do	Crate	76
Onions	Peck	28
Do	Barrel	58
Oranges	Dozen	20
Do	Box	50
Oats	Bushel	74
Melons	Pound	50
Parsnips	Bunch	60
Potatoes	Bushel	59
String beans	Barrel	80
Sweet potatoes	do	61
Turnips	Bunch	60
Watermelons	Each	34

That is to say, the man who runs the dairy farm, furnishes the cow, cares for her, feeds her, and attends to the milking, gets but 50 per cent of what is paid for the milk by the ultimate consumer. In case of poultry, the farmer's wife who raises the chickens gets but 50 cents out of every dollar that is paid for them by the consumer. The producer of onions gets only 28 per cent of the consumer's price. The producer of oranges gets only 20 per cent. The producer of cabbage gets only 48 per cent of the price paid by the consumer. The producer of potatoes gets only $59 out of every $100 paid by the consumer. The man who raises the watermelons gets only 34 per cent of the price to the consumer. In other words, with the agricultural production increasing only slowly and in some cases absolutely decreasing, with only a small share of the consumer's price going to the producer, it is very apparent why the cost of living is high. We see clearly two of the reasons that enter into this great problem. Of course, there are other factors, which it is not our purpose here to discuss.

Mr. Chairman, I see that my time is almost gone, but before I conclude there are some things to which I should like to call attention. I should like to go through Schedule G, in which practically everything that is raised upon the farm is either put upon the free list or the rates are cut in two—the farmer suffers the most heavily of all. Did you notice the duty upon peanuts? It is as interesting as it can be. That is on page 57 of this bill. Before that they had been cutting and slicing right and left, putting cattle, and horses, and sheep, and mules, dead or alive, and swine, and all of those things at greatly reduced rates, and then the brethren, in order to save their faces and keep up appearances, slightly reduced the duty on peanuts. Peanuts unshelled now bear half a cent a pound. They made a tremendous (?) reduction from one-half a cent a pound to three-eighths of a cent a pound, in the interests of the people. And shelled peanuts that now bear a rate of 1 cent a pound—and who ever heard of such magnanimity—are reduced to three-fourths of a cent a pound. A product that is raised in a locality that has not a Member on the committee to look after it has to stand a cut, but peanuts had a friend on the committee, and so they did not suffer.

I will refer in the closing minutes which I have to this free list.

Mr. Chairman, this is a thing grand, gloomy, and peculiar.

Mr. MAPES. Where are peanuts raised?

Mr. WILLIS. In Virginia, North Carolina, and so on down. I am not complaining about that. I am simply bewailing the misfortunes of the poor fellows in Michigan and Ohio and other places who did not have a friend at court. I am not complaining.

When the farmer opens up this free list, there are things that are going to make him happy. He will find broom corn on the free list, and buckwheat is on the free list. But there is compensation. His broom corn has gone down in price, and his buckwheat is not worth enough to fill up a ravine; but what a satisfaction it will be to him when he finds that he can get cadmium free. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield three minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIS. And then if he goes on he will find corn and cornmeal, which he used to get protection on, now on the free list, but bonechar he can get free. Unfortunately, however, that is used only by the Sugar Trust, and consequently is put on the free list for its benefit. Incidentally, the Sugar Trust seems to be wonderfully favored in this bill, as is indicated by the following from the Ohio Farmer of April 26, 1913:

[From the Ohio Farmer, Apr. 21.]

FREE SUGAR.

So far every attempt in the Democratic caucus to alter any of the schedule items in the Underwood tariff measure has been thwarted by the administration forces. Practically every important item has its opponents, but the fiercest fight came, as expected, on the sugar and raw-wool items. The sugar schedule as written into the bill, reducing the duty at once from 1.9 cents to 1 cent per pound, then removing it entirely in three years, was attacked from both sides. Representative BROUSSARD, speaking for the Louisiana sugar raisers, attempted to compromise by proposing a 10 per cent reduction at first, with a progressive reduction every three years, but this was defeated 86 to 15. A free-sugar Member proposed to remove all the duty at once, but to make it effective October 15, to give wholesalers time to adjust their business to the new conditions, but the caucus also voted this down. Opponents of lowering the sugar tariff graphically pointed out that consumers are not now paying the full duty—1.9 cents per pound—on refined sugar, nor the 1.685 cents on raw sugar, nor the Cuban-sugar duty of 1.348 cents, for the reason that refiners, in competition for the domestic market, have so reduced the price that consumers are now paying only a fraction of these duties. Removing the tariff will therefore enable the refiners further to cut prices and hold them down until all the domestic beet and cane sugar producers are put out of business. Then the world's price of sugar at Hamburg would go up, on account of curtailed world's production, an illustration of which is afforded by the fact that a shortage of a million tons, which is less than our domestic production, sent sugar up 2 cents in 1911. Then, with the beet-sugar industry out of their way, the half dozen American refiners would import all their sugar, make their own prices, and grow richer than ever before. Mr. UNDERWOOD says that the only suggestions which President Wilson insisted on inserting in the tariff bill are the free-sugar and free-wool items. Also, it is reported that the President admits that "some of the domestic sugar factories must close, but he hopes that they will reopen later." What would they reopen for? Our farmers are not going to raise sugar beets at a cost of 3.54 cents per sugar pound to compete with the German cost of 2.41 cents (figures are from the Ways and Means Committee report accompanying last year's Underwood tariff bill), especially when all the margin of profit goes into the pockets of the American Refining Co. and its associates. Furthermore, Louisiana cane sugar, because it goes upon the market early in the fall, before domestic beet-sugar supplies are available, has served to keep the price of sugar more uniform the year around. Thus it is made clear that free sugar may benefit none but the half dozen powerful refining concerns, and the "dear consumers" may pay dearer than now.

But as the farmer sees that his corn and corn meal, wheat, and hogs are on the free list he can look up and thank his stars that he can still get cudbear free. [Laughter.] Think of the old farmer with his worn-out trousers and his run-over boots—for his trousers are likely to be worn-out and his boots run-over under the hard times which this bill will bring—going into the store and saying, "Mr. Storekeeper, I want a bushel of cudbear."

That is a thing that you Democrats have promised your constituents. It is a great satisfaction to know that cudbear is on the free list. It is a splendid thing for the farmer. [Laughter.]

Then if the farmer's wife has been so economical as to be able to save up a little lard and take it to market she will find the price has been cut a cent and a half a pound, but, thank God, joss sticks are on the free list, and also old junk. [Laughter.] And if that good mother should happen to want a leech she can get it, because leeches also are on the free list.

This farmer goes on and he finds his beef and veal and mutton and pork and lamb are put on the free list. The prices of the products of his farm have all gone to pieces, but he says, "I am satisfied, because I can get all the manna I want, as it is on the free list." And also meerschaum. I thought that was well put in here, "mere-sham." He finds that the prices on oats and hay have all gone to grass, but, glory be, he can get myrobolans free, and also nux vomica. That helps out. [Laughter.]

And his potatoes, on which he had 25 cents protection, are put on the free list. That is bad for him. It is bad to have the price of his rye and milk and cream reduced by taking off the tariff, but it helps out some to have the farmer know that if he wishes he can still get all the pulu he wants free of duty.

That is a great fundamental doctrine of the Democratic Party—to give the people pulu in great abundance. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

And here is another thing that helps out: Apatite and dividivi are made free. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Then, here is section 613. It will be a splendid thing for the American people, before the effects of this bill are outlived, to have spunk placed on the free list. Here it is. We shall surely need it before we get through with the effects of this bill. [Renewed laughter.] And then if you tell the farmers that the price of hogs has gone down and the price of tallow has gone down, it will comfort them to know that, even with that reduction of price in tallow and hogs, tamarinds are made free. [Laughter.] And that is the case all the way through this bill—a "mere sham." [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING].

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, with the full knowledge that any remarks I may make on the pending bill will be futile, yet, in justice to my constituents, I must register a protest against the provisions of these schedules which, if enacted into law, will disastrously affect the people of the first New Jersey district, the people of the entire State of New Jersey, and the people of the whole country. We need only the light of experience to read the handwriting on the wall.

I shall confine my remarks largely to the situation in my own district, though I believe my contention is applicable generally to all other districts and States of the Union.

Mr. Chairman, I represent some 200,000 industrious, energetic, prosperous people, and I might say that almost every article we need in our daily life is produced and made in my district and State. On our farms—though ours is not an agricultural State—we raise millions of bushels of wheat, corn, and oats, and about every known article of so-called garden truck. In our factories, mills, and yards we turn out innumerable articles, from steel pens to battleships and merchandising vessels. Thirty thousand wage earners are paid some $15,000,000 yearly, more than the amount paid by the Government to its employees here in the National Capital. Besides our profitable farming communities we have prosperous iron and steel and pottery and woolen plants, while our chemicals, candy, soups, laces, oilcloth, embroidery, stoves, corks, talking machines, and scores of other articles are known throughout not only our own country but all over the world.

And right here, Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize the fact that every one of the industries of my district is subject to the very keenest competition. We have no monopolies and we pay dividends on no watered stock. With possibly one exception, you can not connect us with any so-called trust; and, further, many of the manufacturing concerns of my district can and do pay the highest wages on earth, and make a reasonable profit by exercising the most rigid economy and efficiency in management.

Fifty million dollars have been invested in plants and machinery, and $50,000,000 worth of products are turned out annually. This could only be possible, however, with protection against the products of cheap foreign labor. Remove this protection in whole or in part, as is proposed in this most iniquitous, un-American, free-trade bill, and one of two things must happen in the factories in my district, my State, and all over the country—the mills must close or the workmen must accept foreign wages.

There is no dispute, Mr. Chairman, about this difference in wages. No one denies or will deny that the wages paid in Camden, N. J., are double and treble those paid abroad for the same work. And with the wage cost of an article amounting to from 70 to 90 per cent of its total cost of production, what is going to happen when we are driven to open competition with producers who receive but one-half or one-third of our wages?

We are told that this new tariff will reduce the cost of living. I believe it will, Mr. Chairman. It will mean living in one or two rooms instead of living in a whole house. It will mean one suit of clothes instead of three. It will mean meat occasionally instead of daily. It will mean few, if any, luxuries. It will mean the withdrawal of savings, which in the city of Camden amount to $20,000,000. It will mean a cessation in building, which will affect the workers in the various trades, whose wages will be cut in half or worse because of idle time. And then the merchant and professional man and woman will suffer, till only the pawnbroker will be doing a profitable business. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The President in his message made no allusion to wages. The report of the majority is silent on the matter. The speeches favoring this bill severely let the subject alone, and yet it is the pith of the entire question.

We are told by the astute writers on finance and economics of the country that we are to have a new national wage adjustment. We are told that this bill, if it becomes a law, will revolutionize our wage scale, will disrupt our labor unions, and level our present standard of living toward the foreign plane. Such must be the result, if not the intention, of this bill. It will positively close more than one factory in my district unless our workmen are willing to accept one-half or one-third of the wages they are now receiving. And when that result is brought about, Mr. Chairman, every man, woman, and child in the country must be adversely affected.

My people are already realizing what this bill means. They are sending me petitions bearing thousands of names, not the names of capitalists and manufacturers and bankers, but the names of the men and women of the mills, regardless of party. Some of them remember and refer to the conditions of 20 years ago and beg that we do not repeat that folly.

I have sent this bill to the industrial establishments of Camden, the principal city in my district, and elsewhere, and from many of them I have received candid replies, stating the result that must follow the enactment of its provisions.

The head of the State grange and a practical farmer says:

I haven't had time to make a thorough comparison of schedules, but am fully convinced, so far as I have gone, that the bill will be fatal to agricultural interests.

From the South Jersey Farmers' Exchange comes the following:

We are writing you on request of about 1,000 members of the South Jersey Farmers' Exchange in protest against the bill that is before Congress to take the duty entirely off of potatoes. We think at least there should be not less than 15 cents per bushel duty paid on all foreign potatoes coming into this country. We can hardly believe that you and other Members representing the farmers' interests will allow this bill to go through.

From a letter of the officials of a worsted mill I take the following extracts:

We certainly feel that its effects will be most serious and depressing, for we can not see how the manufacturers will be able to compete against foreign importations with but 20 per cent on yarns and 35 per cent on manufactured goods and clothing, even with wools being admitted free of duty.

* * * * * * *

We are wholly dependent on the weavers of the goods for our business, and what we fear most is that they will not be able to run under a 35 per cent duty at the present scale of wages, in which case they will have no use for our yarns, and we, in turn, will have no use for wool, free or otherwise.

The head of a varnish and paint concern writes:

I can assure you that its provisions will operate most disastrously, as far as our interests in Camden are concerned.

I extract the following paragraphs from a letter concerning the worsted and woolen yarn industry:

From every indication it means practically utter destruction.

* * * * * * *

It is almost certain that there will be very little American cloth made until American labor has been brought down to the level of European labor.

* * * * * * *

An analysis of the last census report shows that in the city of Camden there were about 1,200 persons employed in the manufacture of worsted yarns, receiving $355,000 annually in wages. This means that approximately 16 per cent of our entire population is dependent upon this industry for a livelihood. Strike at the root of this industry and you deprive this portion of our population of the means of support. Nothing could be more disastrous to our city and to the worsted-yarn industry than the passage of House bill 3321.

From a macaroni company comes the following:

As we said formerly, this will practically mean that many American macaroni factories will have to go out of business, as it is impossible to compete with foreign manufacturers, because macaroni is a product that is used principally by foreigners, and they prefer to buy imported goods, especially if they can buy it cheaper than the American product.

A firm in Camden dealing in wool, scoured, carbonized, and combed, writes:

We have carefully considered the portions of the bill relating to our industry, and look upon its passage with very great fear.

* * * * * * *

The proposed bill provides for free wool and 25 per cent on manufactured textiles, and in the light of past experience we can not see where the textile manufacturers have much chance to operate. We believe since the passage of the former bill the textile industry of this country has advanced considerably, possibly to such an extent that the industry might be able to live under the condition of the bill passed in President Cleveland's term, but it surely has not made such strides that it can exist under the provisions of the Underwood bill.

* * * * * * *

It is a national disgrace if this country can not clothe its people, and we thoroughly believe that a bill bearing such a low rate of protection to manufactured textiles will give the industry a severe setback. From the Democratic standpoint of tariff for revenue, the proposed bill will be a great success, in that it will permit the importation of goods in enormous quantities.

A comparatively new industry, that of phototypes, gelatine prints, commercial and art catalogues, send the following:

At its best this industry is but in a state of infancy, and it is to further develop it in this country that we protest against lowering the tariff, as we have found in the past that it is already low enough on work done by this process to make it impossible for us to compete with foreign houses on such things as illustrated post cards and art subjects. Worse still, another lowering of the tariff would mean to us to abandon the industry altogether, as we would be absolutely unable to compete with the in-rush of the printing done by foreign producers.

A petition signed by the employees of the above firm says:

Should the tariff be lowered on the goods of our employers it would be impossible for them to compete with the foreign producers, and consequently they would be compelled either to abandon the industry or reduce our wages to such an extent as to almost deprive us of a decent livelihood, to which we as American citizens are justly entitled.

One of the glaring inequalities of the bill, bearing on an industry in my district, is the fact that a duty remains on burlap, not one yard of which is made in this country. To place this on

the free list would work an injury to no citizen of this country, but, on the contrary, would be a positive and substantial advantage to the poorest man, as this commodity is the basis of his carpet—floor oilcloth.

On the other hand, the duty on floorcloth has been changed from 45 per cent to 20 per cent, and this feature, in connection with the fact that the raw material—burlap—carries a duty, makes it practically sure that the American manufacturer of floorcloths can not compete with the manufacturer abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I have quoted the comments of honest business men, of men who know what the effect of this tariff would be and who would be justified in anticipation of its enactment in closing their mills or announcing the reduced wages, which must positively be the only alternative. And in this connection, Mr. Chairman, I could pay no higher tribute to the manufacturers of my district and the State, and to the manufacturers throughout the country, than to call attention to the fact that they have made no threats, they have resorted to no recrimination, but in the face of coming adversity, and ruin for many, they have kept up courage and proceeded as best they could with constantly decreasing orders, keeping their fires lit and their men at work in the hope that in some way disaster may be averted.

I might, in justice to myself and the industries of my district, ask that the bill be amended, but I should have to present as many amendments as we have industries, and as it would only be a waste of time I shall refrain.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do protest against this bill, not alone because of the general reductions that take away the adequate protection our industries need against cheap foreign labor, but because of the vicious features of the measure which increase the duty on raw material that we do not produce and reduce the duty on the finished product. That sort of tariff making, sir, is not only un-American but inhuman and iniquitous to the last degree.

It would seem that there could be nothing worse for our labor and industries than free trade, but worse still is a tariff that taxes the raw material and lets in free, or with a low duty, the finished product. There is no reason and no excuse for such legislation, Mr. Chairman, unless it is the intent and desire to adjust American wages and the American standard of living to the European and Asiatic level.

When the wages of workmen in our mills and factories are reduced to the Democratic free-trade dollar-a-day basis, then the price of farm products must be cut in half and the wages of carpenters, painters, plumbers, masons, bricklayers, paper hangers, decorators, teachers, clerks, and so on, must also be cut in half, with idleness on every hand. There will be no strikes then for higher wages and shorter hours. Instead of a job or two for every man, there will be two or more looking for every job.

There is another point, Mr. Chairman, that should not be overlooked. While you are reducing duties upon a standard American product, other nations are increasing their duties, with the result that our manufacturers will be ground between two millstones.

We are making in my district superior goods, the best made on earth. The cheap imitations of these goods are at present kept out by an adequate tariff; take away this protection and we shall be inundated by the cheaply made foreign product. We are prohibited from selling abroad by foreign tariffs; our home market will be taken away, the domestic industry destroyed, and the inferior substitute will flood our markets. Wherein do we gain?

Again, we find that some of our industries are given slight incidental protection that may enable them to barely exist, and yet our farmers are given no protection whatever, and when the agriculturists of my district or of any other district are unable to make a profitable living, how can they buy the products of the mills and factories?

Why, Mr. Chairman, this bill instead of being called a bill to reduce tariff duties and provide revenue for the Government—which it will not provide—and for other purposes, should be called a bill for the emasculation of American wages, the dismantlement of American homes, and the debasement of American men and women.

With all the vigor of which I am possessed do I protest against such a blow to the industries of my district and against such an attempt to ruin the people I represent. I can do no more. But I warn you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that the day of reprisal will come as it came in 1824, in 1860, and in 1896—you may bring calamity and disaster and ruin and poverty and suffering, but the people will rise in their might and again restore us to protection and opportunity and prosperity.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the majority, you are taking an unfair advantage in carrying out your designs; you were not asked to frame and pass this vicious tariff measure. On the contrary, a most substantial majority of our voters protested against such legislation at the polls last fall, and a still greater majority would register their disapproval now if they could do so. You were given power by a political fluke. In the vernacular of the day you scored not by a clean base hit, but by being hit by the ball. The American people are opposed to your policy. We are a people who favor adequate protection to home labor and industries. We are in favor of high wages, a high standard of living, comfortable homes, plenty to eat and wear, and opportunity for all with consequent national progress.

This bill, if enacted into law, will bring disaster and ruin and will adversely affect every person in the country except those who profit from the adversity of others. We of the minority can only protest and hope that in some way the evils that threaten us may be in part or wholly averted. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very proud indeed to have the privilege of addressing so large and enthusiastic an audience. [Applause.] I hope my genial friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]—and I am glad that he and the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] both honor me with their presence and attention—will pardon me if I become personal to the extent of saying that, although I greatly admire the superb qualities of leadership possessed by the gentleman from Alabama and hold him in the highest personal esteem, I was, nevertheless, in favor of the nomination of my old friend CHAMP CLARK for the Presidency. [Applause.]

Millions of honest voters had been persuaded into the firm conviction that protection was unconstitutional and a robbery; that it was a handicap to capital, a burden to the masses, and beneficial only to plutocrats and other selfish enemies of the common people. I felt that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], having been the star performer in that well-staged drama, ought to have been the chief beneficiary of Democracy's ill-gotten gain. [Laughter and applause.] But the Democratic Party is sometimes ungrateful, as Republics are proverbially said to be, and my friend was "turned down." The manner of the "turning down" and the reason for it have nothing to do with the tariff question, and therefore it is not proper that I should discuss the subject here.

Mr. AUSTIN. But he will come back again, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. LANGLEY. I hope he will. I do not know whether I shall favor his nomination four years from now or not; but one thing is certain, and that is that if the popularity of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] continues to grow in this country, as a result of his authorship of this bill, as it is now growing in the countries across the sea, where they are looking with longing eyes to our rich markets which the bill will open up to them, then his political future is assured and the attainment of the goal of his ambition certain. [Applause.] Then nothing can keep him out of the White House. Even fusion between Wilson and Bryan and LA FOLLETTE and CLARK and Roosevelt, with the Socialist vote thrown in, could not stop him. [Laughter and applause.]

But will the American people like him as well "after taking" as they do "before taking"? [Laughter.] That is the momentous question. He is not exceedingly popular just now down in the district which I have the honor to represent. My constituents like him well enough, but most of them fear the effect of his bill. However, I will tell him how he can make himself a hero in the tenth district of Kentucky. We raise a good deal of cattle and hogs there, and we also consume a good deal of beef and pork and bacon. We produce a great deal of coal and lumber, but we also use a great deal of those commodities, and the same is true with reference to many other articles I could mention. If he can so shape this bill that he can maintain the price of cattle and hogs and at the same time reduce the price of beef, pork, and bacon to the consumers of those articles; if he can keep up the present price of coal and lumber to the producer and at the same time cheapen them to the consumer; in a word, if he can devise some sort of automatic process working both ways whereby the wages of labor can be maintained as well as the prices of what labor produces and at the same time these products can be cheapened to the consumer; then, indeed, I am almost willing to concede that he could come very near carrying that rock-ribbed Republican district as the nominee for the Presidency in 1916.

I earnestly hope that he can do these things, because I want to see all the people of my district get a square deal and their share of the beneficence of this bill. I confess that I entertain serious doubts as to whether all this is possible, although I really think that you Democrats are in earnest about it and

really believe that you can accomplish this devoutly wished-for result. I give you credit for the utmost good intentions, but I beg to remind you that there is a certain road which is said to be paved with that kind of material.

I will admit that I used to be quite considerably prejudiced against Democrats, and sometimes I even doubted the patriotism of some of them. When I was a boy and heard that good old camp-meeting song—

Show pity, Lord! O Lord, forgive!
Let a repenting rebel live—

I thought it was a generous plea of a righteous Republican to the good Lord to be merciful to a poor penitent Democrat. But in recent years I have developed very largely the spirit of tolerance. I think the gentleman from Alabama and his followers earnestly believe that this bill will work out great good for the country. On the other hand, I am just as firm in my belief that it will curtail home production, embarrass capital, lower the wages of labor by reducing the demand for it, driving many out of employment, lower the prices of farm products and of labor's products generally, and halt the industrial progress of the Nation. Should it turn out that I am mistaken, my disappointment will be compensated by the gratifying knowledge that more good has come to the country.

I want to say to my distinguished Democratic friend from Kentucky in front of me here [Mr. STANLEY] that I will not agree to join his party in that event, because it is wrong in too many other things; but if you Democrats make times better by this bill I will take off my hat to you and admit that for once you have guessed right.

I shall not attempt, Mr. Chairman, to point out all the defects, great and small, in this bill. Life is too short for that. I shall content myself with pointing out some of its most striking shortcomings. Everyone within the reach of my voice and millions of people throughout the country will remember how for years the Democrats, in season and out of season, have berated the Republican Party for not giving the farmer a square deal, and how they swore by high heaven that things should be different if their party ever got into power. Every Democratic platform since the close of the Cleveland administration has been ringing and reverberating with promises that the farmer and his interests should be properly cared for if the Democratic Party obtained control of the Government. This was one of the leading issues upon which that party appealed to the voters of the country for confidence and support.

Well, the party is in power now, and the very first thing it has done, in spite of those promises, has been to give the American farmer the worst slap in the face that has ever been administered to him since the foundation of this Government. It taxes the raw material and lets in free the finished product. It taxes wheat, but lets in flour free. It taxes cattle and hogs, but lets in free beef and pork and bacon, thus transferring to foreigners the employment involved in converting the raw material. If ever any class of producers in our country was discriminated against by legislation, it has been done in the case of the farmers in this bill. It was bad enough in the so-called farmers' free-list bill, which proposed reciprocal trade in agricultural products between the American farmer and the Canadian farmer, but this bill is infinitely worse, because it invites the Canadian farmer to dump all of his surplus products into the United States and gives the American farmer nothing in return. I know it is contended that Canada to-day has no agricultural products to spare, but it is well to bear in mind the fact that up in Alberta and other Provinces enormous wheat fields are being cultivated in ever-increasing numbers and that in the natural course of events that wheat will seek the American market. I opposed reciprocity with Canada, although it was favored by a Republican President, because I feared the conditions which I have just described, and with all the more vigor do I oppose the present bill, which aggravates these adverse conditions beyond compare.

Our Democratic friends declare that while it is true that the farmer's profits on his crops may be scaled down by the free entry of the products of competing agriculturists, he will be benefited by the lower prices of the things he consumes. They seem to forget, however, that it makes very little difference how cheaply an article may be bought if the would-be purchaser has not the money with which to buy it. It will make very little difference to the American farmer whether he can buy his clothing and the clothing for his family for 25 per cent less than he has been paying for it if his own income is cut down 50 per cent, or even more, as the result of this tariff legislation. It will make very little difference to him that agricultural implements can be imported free of duty if production on his acres has to be curtailed because no longer profitable.

Coal is put upon the free list in this bill. I am opposed to that. I do not believe that the price of coal will be cheapened thereby in such a degree as to make a material difference to those who use the domestic product. I do know that free coal is certain to result in the lowering of wages of the men employed in American mines. I am sure that it will affect most injuriously the coal-mining industry of Kentucky and West Virginia for the reasons already stated, and also because of the fact that a large part of the northern market now supplied from the mines in those States will hereafter be supplied by Canada and Nova Scotia by reason of the cheap water transportation from those Provinces as against the more expensive rail transportation from the States I have named. I assert, Mr. Chairman, that this is a most inequitable arrangement. We allow Canada to bring her coal into the United States; we make her a present of this great market and we ask nothing in return. In all conscience it would be bad enough to allow the free importation of coal under any circumstances, but it appears to me as extremely poor statesmanship to permit this to be done without obtaining at least some reciprocal advantage from Canada. It violates every fundamental principle of economic wisdom, and can not be excused even upon the score of expediency.

I know it is contended that putting coal on the free list will not reduce the wages of the labor employed in the coal industry in this country. I have had no practical experience in the business, and can not therefore speak from personal knowledge, but I would like to introduce a witness who has had vast experience in the business and ought to know what he is talking about. I refer to no less a personage than the Hon. Henry Gassaway Davis, of West Virginia, whom you Democrats nominated for Vice President a few years ago. Mr. Davis appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means in 1893 (Fifty-third Congress), of which Mr. Wilson, of West Virginia, was chairman, and of which the Hon. William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska, was a member. It so happened that Mr. Davis was being interrogated by the Nebraskan with regard to the effect of putting coal on the free list. In answer to one of Mr. Bryan's questions Mr. Davis made this very significant statement:

That is the district of your chairman—the second West Virginia. There are 3,000 or 4,000 people there who are depending almost entirely upon the digging of coal and getting it to market. Make coal free and you take from them their bread. (See p. 1127.)

Your arguments now contradict this distinguished witness, although you tried to elect him to the great office of Vice President after he had taken this stand. This may be Democratic consistency, but it is certainly not a jewel.

Mr. Chairman, the lumber industry is also an important one in my district, and I am opposed to free lumber for the same reasons that I am opposed to free coal. I have heretofore stated pretty fully my views on free lumber, and as I expect to debate it, as well as free coal, under the five-minute rule, I shall not go into these matters further now, except to venture the prediction that this bill will injure both industries and to protest against its enactment.

We have heard much, Mr. Chairman, about the wonderful benefits to be derived in consequence of this legislation by the "ultimate consumer." One would think that the ultimate consumer was in a class by himself. The family name of the ultimate consumer is "everybody." The tailor is the ultimate consumer of the shoemaker's product; the miller is the ultimate consumer of the man who sells him the machinery for his mill. What one man produces another consumes. Production and consumption are interlocking facts. You can not separate the one from the other. You can no more segregate the effect of the one upon the other than you can set apart cause and effect in any other operation, whether natural or artificial. We are all producers and we are all consumers. If one of us is inordinately benefited some one else is necessarily inordinately injured. It is an endless chain. In the view of economic legislation the ultimate consumer is a myth.

In order to furnish the Treasury a compensating revenue for the loss resulting from the lowering of the tariff duties the Underwood bill provides an income tax. I have always favored such a tax as a proper means for raising revenue for the support of the Government. I voted to submit the constitutional amendment to the States, and I am glad that it has been ratified so as to enable this Congress to impose the tax. It is no more than right that the wealth of the country should bear its proper share of the expense of Government. The burden of such expense ought to be placed upon those best able to bear it, and for the protection of whose interests most of that expense is incurred. The "unearned increment" ought to be made a factor in providing for the needs of the Nation. The principle of this kind of taxation has long been recognized as absolutely correct

by other nations, and has been carried into practice much more drastically than this bill proposes. I have no fault to find with the scale adopted for the imposition of this tax. I do not care how large the amount of revenue which may be derived from it. The industrial and social progress of the Nation will call for ever-increasing expenditure on the part of the Government. As the country grows its needs will grow. We are accustomed in the United States to doing things upon a liberal scale, and we shall never change in that respect. When the first billion-dollar Congress passed into history a great cry was set up over the alleged Republican extravagance of that day. Since then we have come to the billion-dollar session, and our Democratic friends have appropriated considerably more than a billion dollars in one session without turning a hair. I am not finding fault with them for that; I predict that while they are in power they will probably exceed the limit of appropriations of the last session.

Many things remain to be done in the legitimate functions and through the legitimate expenditures of the Government. Millions of dollars can be profitably expended every year in the construction of good roads. I heartily approve of the proposed creation of a committee of this House to whose care is specially to be confided the subject of providing comprehensively for a system of public highways with Federal aid in their construction and maintenance. It is one of the great needs of the American farmer, upon whom rests an unnecessary burden of hundreds of millions of dollars every year in the matter of carrying his produce to market over the worst roads of any civilized country. The American farmers, Mr. Chairman, are very much more concerned and directly interested in the improvement of roads than they are in the improvement of rivers and harbors, however necessary the latter may be. We have heard quite a good deal of late about several proposed enterprises to be undertaken by the Government looking to the construction of inland waterways that are to link the Great Lakes to the Gulf and make it possible for great steamers to pass from the Lakes to the ocean. I have no objection to the prosecution of such enterprises, but I maintain that of greater importance than these is the building of good roads, which are the primary avenues of transportation for the farmers.

It will be expensive, it is true, but it will make up the unequal distribution that has occurred heretofore in Federal appropriations and do justice to a class of our citizens—the farmers—who are most in need of this assistance; and the burden on the taxpayers will be many times compensated by the advantages that will accrue to them and to the whole country. If the country is to be so greatly benefited, as is generally supposed, by the new markets that the building of the Panama Canal is to open up to our surplus products, this public highway improvement is the only substantial way in which the farmer can get an adequate return for the share of the expense of the canal which he has borne. Mr. Chairman, I have been advocating Federal aid in the construction of public highways for many years. I have made it one of the chief issues of my campaigns for Congress. So persistent have I been in its advocacy that I was dubbed "Turnpike John" by my Democratic friends. I have always been rather proud of the name, because I regard it as a token of honor rather than of ridicule, as it was originally intended, and I am glad to see the Democrats and the country generally coming around to my views on the question.

No matter how large the revenue may be which is to be derived from this income tax, there are many other perfectly legitimate ways in which it can and will have to be expended. I need but point to one of these to make good my assertion—the Navy. It may be, Mr. Chairman, that the millennium is right at our door and that the era of everlasting peace between the nations of the earth is at hand. I permit myself, however, to entertain some gentle doubts as to this perfect consummation. At any rate, as the most reliable insurance of peace for our country and against any hostile designs on the part of any foreign nation there is no better or more obvious investment than a navy which shall be in all respects the equal of any other, excepting always, of course, the navy of Great Britain. For these reasons and many others which I do not regard as necessary to state I favor the income tax, and, to use a popular phrase, "you may go as far as you like" with it, provided always that you do not thereby destroy the protective system which enables American industrial life to hold its own against the cheaper methods of other nations and which sustains the better standard of living which differentiates the American wage earner from his fellow in any other country. Under this protective system our country has flourished for more than half a century. I believe, nay, I feel certain, that you can not subvert the principle of protection nor lessen its application without grave danger to the best interests of our people.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries joy to the heart of every importer in exact proportion to the sorrow and apprehension which it stirs in the breasts of American manufacturers and wage-workers. The importer's business will flourish exuberantly under its operation, because foreign goods of every kind, now restrained by the protective tariff, will pour in at every port. We shall see imports growing in corresponding ratio to the curtailment of domestic production. While the American manufacturer and wage earner see their profits and earnings shrinking day after day the importer will reap the rich harvest which this bill insures him. Not only the importer is rubbing his hands in glee at the prospect thus opening up before him, but foreign manufacturers are already singing pæans of joy in view of the impending breaking down of the tariff barriers which thus far have kept the American market free from the floods of cheap-labor products.

British and German trade journals and the daily press of both those countries have been fairly shouting the good tidings to their readers. And let me say right here that even those of our own newspapers which have been persistent propagandists of free trade or of a tariff for revenue only have not hesitated to say, since the provisions of this bill have become known, that it can not fail to injure many domestic industries, while some, as sugar and wool, will be practically destroyed.

There is a strong sentiment—and it is becoming stronger every day—that we shall have to enact legislation which will check the influx of immigration, especially of that class whose inevitable effect is to lower the standard of wages and the standard of living of the American workingman. This fact is recognized in nearly every State, and this feeling has found expression in many a petition to Congress asking for appropriate legislation, and numerous bills have been introduced both here and in the Senate with the view to checking the tide of undesirable immigrants. Mr. Chairman, there are more ways than one to kill a dog. Suppose that we were to enact a law to keep out the kind of immigrants that preeminently get into destructive competition with our wage earner; what will it profit those wage earners if we let down the tariff bars so far that they will have to compete against the products of that same kind of labor brought from abroad? So far as the effect upon economic conditions is concerned, the one process is almost as bad as the other; but if I had to make a choice between the two evils, I would prefer to take goods manufactured abroad by cheap labor rather than see the cheap laborer himself imported into this country and by his presence and activity lessen the opportunities of the American workingman for employment and for earning the wages he is now accustomed to receive, and at the same time lower our standard of civilization and patriotism. In its ultimate effect upon economic conditions there is very little difference between the policy of a low tariff and lax immigration laws, and I fail to see any consistency in the action of a Democratic House in passing a drastic anti-immigration law and then tear down the walls that give us protection from the ruinous competition of the cheap labor of the very same class of people.

Right here I can not forbear to express my sympathy with the action of the California Legislature and the attitude of California's governor in respect of the tenure of agricultural lands by alien Japanese in that State. I want to register my most positive dissent from the policy of the present administration on that subject. Almost from the day when Commodore Perry introduced Japan to the knowledge of the civilized world—certainly, ever since Japan has taken on the garb of western civilization—she has been a land-grabber. Japan is taking a leaf from the colonization book of her good friends, England and Germany. Like them she has adopted the motto, "Wherever you see land, grab it." She has become an industrious colonizer. Her population is increasing at such a rate that an outlet must be found for the surplus. Whether it be the forcible annexation of Korea or the joint occupation with Russia of Manchuria or the insidious acquisition of land in the States on our Pacific coast or the flooding of Hawaii with Japanese, the aim and purpose of every movement is the same—to wit, to extend Japanese influence, Japanese customs, and Japanese methods. We would be blind, indeed, if we were to shut our eyes to these facts and to the further portentous one that Japan means to extend her Empire at the cost of any nation whom she may deem weaker than herself. If Japan to-day were ready for a combat with the United States, she would not care the value of a tinker's dam whether she had a treaty of peace and amity with us or not. I do not think we ought to let Japan or any other nation bluff us, and I do not think the American people will stand for it, either. All this, of course, is incidental to the general subject of my remarks.

I do not flatter myself with the belief that anything said in criticism of this bill by anyone on this side of the House, or

on either side, for that matter, will have the slightest effect upon its status. I am perfectly well aware that I am now performing a useless function, and I should not undertake to perform it but for the fact that this bill deals a staggering blow to the industries of our country. That blow will be felt in my district and in my State as in all others.

Men of the South, no section of the country will be a greater sufferer under this bill in the long run than the Southland. We are in the transition stage from a purely agricultural to a large manufacturing community. There is hardly a State south of the Potomac that is not benefited by protection. When the people of these States realize that their onward march in industrial enterprise is checked as a result of the enactment of this bill, as I believe it will be, I shall be surprised if many of those States do not turn to the safe old captain who for so many years has guided the good ship Prosperity safely through storms and breakers. When the Republican Party returns to power, as surely it will, mark my words, it will be because the electoral votes of some of the Southern States are cast for the Republican nominee. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALLIN].

Mr. WALLIN. Mr. Chairman, it is becoming quite the fashion nowadays to brand any critic of the tariff bill here under consideration as an alarmist who seeks to trot out some sort of a bogie man to frighten the susceptible for political effect or personal gain. While this savors of assertion rather than of argument, I sincerely trust it will prove true and that nothing worse or more fatal to the business interests of the country will follow.

It is conceded here that the majority will enact into law substantially the same bill which is now before this House. The Democratic platform unquestionably declared for a tariff for revenue only. That was bad enough, but the majority of the Ways and Means Committee have gone much further. They admit that under the reduced duties they propose the revenues of the Government will fall more than $70,000,000 below the sum required to meet expenses and millions below any hope of a surplus in the Treasury, and that additional goods valued at two hundred and fifty millions will be imported to this country. So alarmed were our friends on the other side at the prospect of this result that, it is reported, the President, the Cabinet, and the radical antitariff Members of the Senate were called into consultation and an agreement was reached to let the funeral proceed and to drape the hearse with an income tax, so that any person whose income happens to reach over $4,000 a year might be doubly punished—first, by losing business, and, second, by paying for that loss out of his own pocket.

Now, our friends are "touchy" over any criticism of their pet measure and wish it understood that they are striving for an "efficient competition." With the enactment of such a measure, "efficient" competition will arrive on schedule time, so efficient that the results of 1893–1896 will be reenacted and the policy of proper protection for the farmer, the wage earner, and for our industries will be once more indorsed and demanded by the people at the first opening of the polls thereafter.

It is a matter of knowledge that foreign manufacturers are now within our midst arranging for the reception of increased imports of their goods the day the President signs such a law as is proposed by this bill. It is known here that these same foreign manufacturers are arranging facilities for doubling and tripling their output, because they are confident of making tremendous inroads on our market, which Americans, with increased cost of production, can not meet. It is a fact to-day that one of our great industries, into whose product labor is the principal factor, and whose product has been placed on the free list in this bill, is seriously considering the invitation of a foreign nation to transfer its plants across the ocean, where the labor rate will enable it to continue business, even with transportation to its American customers paid. It is known that our manufacturers are retrenching or preparing to retrench. This is a sample of the "efficient" competition we will enjoy when this bill becomes law.

However, it is simply my intention to protest, though in but a feeble way, on behalf of the industries of the district which sent me here. In this protest which I have been commanded to make that vast and important branch, agriculture, is incorporated, but those better qualified than I will speak for it. The first to feel a depressing effect on business is the farmer, and the first to resent such a condition is the man who tills the soil. However, to be specific, the district which I represent, outside the farms, is almost entirely dependent upon its manufactories. Carpets, rugs, knit goods, gloves, leather, brooms, pearl buttons, electric works, lumber, silk mills, iron and steel, oils, furniture, packing houses, and workers in wood are among the chief industries dependent upon governmental recognition for life and prosperity. I believe there is no district in the country enjoying a greater diversity in the way of manufacturing, and yet, to an extent they are all interdependent. That which seriously affects one affects all to a more or less degree. In the four small cities of my district one hundred million or more dollars are invested in manufacturing, with a wage earners' compensation roll of about twenty-five millions a year, and nearly 50,000 persons actively participating as workers on that list.

The year 1912 was the most profitable ever enjoyed by the concerns or by the people of that district. Labor was satisfied and contented with the highest wage ever paid it there. The output of the factories was the greatest ever known, and the district turned out one-sixth of all the carpets and rugs made in this country; practically all the gloves and brooms; contains the greatest electric manufactory in the United States and one of the greatest locomotive works; while our knit-goods industries ranked in product, number of workmen, and percentage of wages with any in that great center of activity.

The protest which I voice to-day comes from every branch of this interwoven and enormous fabric of business and financial construction. Some of the protests, it is true, are more emphatic than others. Those of the glove industry are perhaps the most grave and anxious. This industry is practically confined to one small county and two small cities. While about $20,000,000 is invested there only about six or seven thousand workmen are directly employed in the factories, as a great percentage of the work is done outside in the dwellings and residences of the people, so that great community is employed and sustained by that one industry. The reduction of the tariff by an average of about 15 per cent below that of last year will be a severe blow from which every manufacturer, no matter what his political affiliations may be, agrees he can not recover. Should their fears be well founded the only income-producing business of the community will be wiped out by the proposed "efficient competition" which will result.

This is but an individual instance of the feeling in a district where the businesses have dependent upon them not alone armies of wage earners, but where the welfare and comfort of every industry, every business house, and every property owner, every working, self-supporting citizen is interlocked and dependent upon the general prosperity of individual concerns. Your plan to reduce the high cost of living by closing the industries, giving the business to foreign countries, and driving our people back to the farms may accomplish that result, but where will the farmer find a market for his produce?

Before closing, however, I desire to point out what I believe is an unintentional misconception of the amount of foreign imports which we will be compelled to meet when this bill is enacted. With most of the schedules here mentioned I am more or less familiar. For instance, the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, in their handbook of information regarding tariffs and this bill, estimate that the imports of gloves to the amount of about $8,000,000 in 1912, under an average duty of 44.15 per cent, will reach only about $9,000,000 under their proposed average tariff of 31.77 per cent. I am not familiar with the grounds on which these estimates were based, but if those imports do not reach a very much higher sum it will be a matter of wonderment to those who are supposed to know whereof they speak.

In the matter of carpets and rugs the discrepancies in the committee's estimate of imports, I believe, are marked and misleading. Let me mention the fact that with a duty of 64.62 per cent last year the imports of Aubusson, Axminster, chenille, and moquette carpets was but $65,000. With the duty in this bill reduced to 35 per cent the estimate of imports is but $25,000 additional. These imports will increase, in my belief, to $500,000 a year. Take, again, the schedule for Saxony, Wilton, and Tournay carpets. Under the Payne law in 1912, with a duty of 69.38 per cent, the imports were but $23,307. The committee has reduced this duty to 30 per cent, and increased in its estimate the imports only by $7,000 in round numbers. With a decrease of more than 50 per cent in this duty I can see no reason why the imports in this line alone will not exceed $250,000 per year. The same ratio is true of the Brussels, Wilton, velvet, and tapestry and ingrain carpets.

In tapestry Brussels the estimates of the committee seem to me to reveal a most glaring inconsistency. In 1912 the tariff on these carpets was 83.53 per cent. The imports under this rate were but $225 for that year. In this bill the committee

has reduced this duty to 20 per cent, and yet, with this remarkable reduction, estimates that only $4,000 of these goods will be brought in from abroad. In my opinion the imports of tapestry Brussels under a 20 per cent duty will run up to hundreds of thousands of dollars per year, and possibly into the millions. Tapestry Brussels are the most popular in the American market and are handled by the factories and dealers in large quantities.

In the matter of rugs, more or less luxuries, the discrepancy, to my mind, is even much greater. The reduction in the tariff rate, it is true, is not so great—from 58.10 per cent in the Payne bill to 50 per cent in this bill—but these goods are high in price and the 8 per cent reduction in the duty will make a marked difference in shipments. In 1912, $3,800,000 worth of these rugs were brought in to take the place of those of American manufacture and purchased by the wealthy, and yet the committee believes, with its reduction in the duty, the importations will not exceed four millions. From what I know of conditions, I assert that if these imports are kept down to $6,000,000 per year under the proposed tariff rate we may be thankful.

However, if the estimated imports on the other schedules of this bill are as faulty as those to which I have referred, the hope of retaining a home market for home manufactures will fast disappear; the boast of the highest paid labor in the world will be a thing of the past.

That these protests will fall on unheeding ears, I am certain. That they will avail nothing in this mad rush to carry out a theory once tried and found wanting, but demanded in a platform indorsed at the polls by a minority of the voters of the country, is practically certain, but one whose home folks are so vitally interested in this matter would be derelict to his duty and to his principles did he not in some way strive to record these warnings publicly and at the fountainhead.

I thank you for your attention. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. J. M. C. SMITH].

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, it would be impossible at this time of night with such a short time allotted to me to make any extended remarks upon this important subject, but I am equally well aware that if I had a longer time anything I might say would not change this bill in any particular. We are told that no amendments will be permitted and that it is fully determined that the bill shall pass this House in the manner in which it was reported by the Ways and Means Committee. This leaves no opportunity for any Member to procure an amendment or to comply with the requests of his constituents who want it changed.

I was very much interested in what gentlemen on both sides have said during the day. Some of it I agree with and much of it I can not agree with. I favor the income tax, but no one can vote for it separately or without voting for the whole bill. I can not believe when I read the history of this country that it will prosper under free trade or tariff for revenue only, which is the same thing. I have heard gentlemen here say to-day that they do not know what effect the passage of this bill will have upon the industry or the prosperity of this country. I wondered, then, to myself why it is, when we consider the present conditions, that we should take this leap in the dark, not knowing whether it is going to preserve the splendid conditions that we have to-day and that exist throughout the country.

Abraham Lincoln was a protectionist, and if he was right at that time the principles of protection are right to-day. The great Republican leaders of this country have been protectionists, and our country has gone on in this magnificent prosperity under protection within the past decade from $115,000,000,000 to the fabulous wealth of $150,000,000,000.

Now, where is the necessity for a change in our fiscal condition? We can not hope that our condition will be better, nor is it expected that we will reap greater prosperity. We are told that it is done for the purpose of fulfilling a promise and party pledges, if you please. But the Democratic Party did not receive a majority of the popular vote at the last election. More votes were cast for the principle of protection than for free trade or a tariff for revenue only.

Now, there are many phases and features of this bill which work a great injustice. They say it will not affect any legitimate industry. I would ask any reasonable man to turn back to the times and conditions of the former bill for a tariff for revenue only and compare the times then with the prosperous times of the present.

I am not ready to admit that the making of a tariff bill is a simple matter where equity and exact justice is to be done to all classes concerned. I am willing to admit that if we adopt the rule followed in this case where we act blindfolded, or where we only compute the revenue necessary to run the Government and estimate the imports, that it is not a difficult matter. That is the basis of a tariff for revenue only, and it is not difficult if each one dollar of imports bears the same rate of duty that every other dollar of imports bears. But that is not equity. That is not justice, because some articles should pay more duty than others, and the only way to levy a duty for revenue only is upon articles we do not manufacture or produce in this country. If the duty gives incidental protection or adds to the cost of an article, it is to that extent a protective tariff and not considered in the make-up of this bill. Such a tariff as is contemplated by the proposed measure ought to be levied upon articles we do not manufacture or produce in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I can not support the pending measure, for the reason that I do not find in its provisions any encouragement for the industries of our country. It is a direct blow at our agriculture, which is the greatest of all our industries and which brings more happiness and prosperity to a larger number of people than any other industry. There is no need for the assault upon the American farmer that is made in this bill by putting nearly all of his products upon the free list or at a very low rate of duty and compelling him to compete with the agricultural products of foreign countries.

Foreigners do not defend our flag; foreigners do not build our schoolhouses and our churches; foreign nations do not build our highways nor do they seek to promote our national welfare. They would prefer to promote our national downfall. This tariff bill is unjustly discriminatory. It permits other countries to levy duty on our products, while they can import their like products without paying duty into our country. It places a duty on the raw material, while it allows the finished product to come in free. Meat and flour are imported free of duty into this country, while cattle, sheep, wheat, rye, and oats pay a duty. Live stock and grain must be manufactured into meat and flour, and it is inconsistent to charge a duty upon the raw material while permitting the manufactured product to come in free. If you wish to help the American workman and the manufacturer, put a duty upon the manufactured article.

We are engaged in the duty of enacting the economic law of our country which shall control under the Democratic administration now in power. This bill has been assailed by some of the greatest economists of our country as being drastic. No more important legislation will be considered than that relating to the tariff. It forms the dividing line between the two great political parties. It affects the manufacturer, agriculture, and commerce of the Republic to a greater extent than any other measure that will be considered. It is of vital interest to the laboring classes. Labor and agriculture are the foundation and source of all our prosperity. Thomas Jefferson gave special prominence to agriculture and commerce in his first inaugural address. For the vantage ground of national prosperity we are competing in the make-up of the world's progress with all nations of the earth, and in the conduct of affairs for national supremacy in trade and uplift I concede that all of us, of whatever political faith, have only the best interests of our country at heart, and whatever differences of opinion exist between us are based upon honest convictions.

I, for one, do not believe that the welfare of our country is best subserved by the tariff becoming or remaining a party measure or that the tariff should be made the test of party success or party reverses.

During our national existence many tariff bills have been enacted into law. We have had high protection, low protection, and so-called tariff for revenue only. Truly out of all this experience in framing tariff legislation the burden should be lighter and the pathway plainer in arriving at what is best for our country and all the people. The appointment of a nonpartisan tariff board chosen by the President and confirmed by the Senate is demanded by the people. This commission ought not to fix rates, but furnish basic information upon the relative conditions of all trade, foreign and domestic, and the relative effect upon our industries and commerce in imposing, changing, or altering the tariff rates and duties. Everyone admits that we are a happy, prosperous Nation; that as a Nation we are so far ahead of all others as regards the prosperity of all to admit of no comparison. I give due credit to our Democratic friends on the other side for their personal part in aiding that prosperity; but you must admit that we have attained this exalted national supremacy under a protective tariff, and that there is no free trade period or tariff for revenue only period known to such prosperity. The exact reverse is true. I want to give one concrete example. Under the last year of the Wilson-Gorman free trade tariff for revenue only bill in the fiscal year of 1897, and before the Dingley bill took effect, there was imported into this coun-

try more wool than during any prior year or any year since the fiscal year of 1897. The older Members of this House know of their own knowledge that good sheep sold for 75 cents a head during those times of adversity. In the fiscal year of 1897 250,000,000 pounds of wool were imported into this country under the free wool tariff, while the greatest number of pounds of wool imported in any one year prior to the passage of the Wilson-Gorman bill was 172,000,000 pounds in 1892, and the most wool imported in any one fiscal year since 1897 was 266,000,000 pounds in 1908; and this is true notwithstanding the fact that we have increased in population more than 25 per cent since 1897.

No one will dispute that where the duty is excessive or where rates are levied in excess of fair competition and reasonable rates they are too high. Rates are too high when the law will permit the manufacturer or producer to charge an unreasonable price for his product. In such cases it should be lowered. But no bill should indiscriminately make an unwarranted assault upon the industries of our country so that our manufacturer can not pay his labor American wages or compete with his foreign competitor, who pays much less for his labor than is paid in this country.

Much has been said about the efficiency of the American workman. The efficiency of the American workman is not questioned. He is the superior artisan of all the workmen of the world, but that he should be compelled to do twice the work of a foreign workman in a day's time or in the same number of hours in order that the American manufacturer can compete in the markets of the world with foreign manufacturers is exacting too great a toll on human efforts and is expecting too much from the laborer. Any economic law which has for its basis the principle that the American laborer does or ought to do as much again in a day's time or any other given time as the foreign laborer is wrong in theory and in fact. A laborer should only be required to do a day's work, and for it should be paid a reasonable wage. The wage should be one which will support himself and family, educate his children, and admit of an assured competency to provide against want in old age.

It is claimed that under this bill our imports will be increased $241,000,000. How can you claim that by increasing the importation of farm products you will benefit agriculture? How can you claim that by increasing the importation of manufactured goods you can benefit the American manufacturer? Or how can you claim by importing manufactured articles you can increase the demand for or the wages of American labor?

Why is it that wages are low in protected Italy and Germany while they are high in protected America? The proof of the pudding is in the eating. The fact exists. Wages in Italy are only one-third of what the wages are in America, while wages in Germany are about one-half in like trades and occupations. This is the result of their thick population. In Italy the population is 300 to the square mile, and in Germany it is the same. In America the population is only 30 to the square mile. In Italy and Germany there is not sufficient work for their people to do. In America there is good, profitable, dignified labor for all at good wages.

Why the demand for this drastic free-trade measure? The claim is made that it is to reduce the high cost of living. It is also claimed that it is to carry out the mandate of the people and fulfill the party pledge. One of the purposes, as stated in the bill, is to reduce tariff duties, and if enacted into law it will certainly do that. But why reduce the tariff so much that it will destroy the industries of our country or depress agriculture? No one wants that to be done, and no explanation is offered to show that the passage of this bill will not have this effect. Foreign nations are hailing the passage of this bill and its enactment into law with delight. Why, you may ask? Because it will provide a rich market for a quarter of a billion of their products of field and shop.

Buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest market is an old Democratic slogan. There is no cheap market anywhere when you have nothing with which to buy. Without money with which to buy everything is dear. The best market in the world is the American market, and it should be preserved for the American people against all comers, to lend happiness and prosperity to their eternal welfare. You say it will bring down the high cost of living? I find that the cost of agricultural products is 25 per cent cheaper this year than last. I notice by an article in one of the local papers of my district that the price of kraut does not pay for cutting the cabbage, and onions can find no market. Potatoes are 25 cents a bushel, wheat 90, hay $10, and I am constrained to inquire whether in this bill the farmer is to be made the goat? You have reduced the tariff on his products one-half or put them on the free list.

Articles.	Present rate of duty.	Proposed new tariff rate under Underwood bill.
Wheat	$0.25 per bushel	$0.10 per bushel.
Oats	$0.15 per bushel	Do.
Barley	$0.30 per bushel	$0.15 per bushel.
Beans	$0.45 per bushel	$0.25 per bushel.
Sugar beets	10 per cent ad valorem	5 per cent ad valorem.
Onions	$0.40 per bushel	$0.20 per bushel.
Apples	$0.25 per bushel	$0.10 per bushel.
Buckwheat	$0.15 per bushel	$0.08 per bushel.
Hay	$4 per ton	$2 per ton.
Straw	$1.50 per ton	$0.50 per ton.
Butter	$0.06 per pound	$0.03 per pound.
Eggs	$0.05 per dozen	$0.02 per dozen.
Cheese	$0.06 per pound	20 per cent ad valorem.
Rice	$0.02 per pound	$0.01 per pound.
Cattle	$27.50 per head	10 per cent ad valorem.
Horses	$30 worth $150	$15 worth $200.
Sheep	$1.50 per head	10 per cent ad valorem.
Wool	$0.11 per pound	Free list.
Swine	$1.50 per head	Do.
Potatoes	$0.25 per bushel	Do.
Meats	$0.015 per pound	Do.
Flour	25 per cent ad valorem	Do.
Cream	$0.05 per gallon	Do.
Cornmeal	$0.40 per hundredweight	Do.
Buckwheat flour	25 per cent ad valorem	Do.
Oatmeal	$1 per hundredweight	Do.
Rye flour	$0.25 per hundredweight	Do.

This is significant when we see by your report that in 1912 there was imported into this country of these farm products the following quantities:

Imported in the fiscal year of 1912.

Wheat	bushels	2,681,381
Oats	do	2,721,037
Barley	do	2,768,474
Beans	do	825,720
Onions	do	1,433,797
Potatoes	do	13,740,481
Hay	tons	699,213
Butter	pounds	1,005,640
Cream	gallons	1,120,240
Eggs	dozens	1,098,702
Cheese	pounds	46,017,405
Cattle	head	316,602
Wool	pounds	193,779,722
Meats	do	1,822,933

These importations will be greatly increased in quantity under this bill.

The importance of agriculture can not be overestimated. Farming is seeing the dawn of scientific treatment more clearly than heretofore. New methods of culture are being studied. The exodus to the city is being discouraged. Is all the effort to make farming more profitable and country life more desirable to be arrested by the hands of the lawmakers of our country? Is the hand of the husbandman to be stayed and the greatest of all industries retarded, the value of farm holdings diminished, and the profit of his toil swept away? We are at a loss to know of any good reason why this should be done. The Ways and Means Committee have not furnished one. When it becomes a law and the people see and feel its effects, you will abandon search for a reason and vainly seek for an excuse.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, in the five minutes yielded to me by Mr. PAYNE I can not argue the question of tariff. I can only enter my protest against the bill.

I came to this session prepared to vote on any tariff bill wherein the revision was downward and based on a scientific investigation that would give protection to the industries and laborers of this country against the invasion of cheap foreign labor and industries. This bill, in my judgment, is simply a makeshift, based solely on the judgment of a few inexperienced men and not given proper consideration *by the representatives of the people in Congress.* The Democratic Representatives in *caucus* were told what to do *and did it.* This is proven by the comparatively few changes from the original draft. I am disappointed and surprised that new Democratic Members, coming here fresh from the people, did not break the rule of "Cannonism." That rule is justified by your leaders in saying, "*Republicans did it.*" Does that make it right? You gave the bill, in *closed caucus*, about three weeks' consideration. You will force the House of Representatives to approve it in five days. Is that fair in considering a bill of this importance?

Your whole bill is class legislation, written for the *food consumers* without one thought for the *food producers.* Is it because the congested centers you represent are food consumers? Why did you not remove the duty on rice? Is it because the rice is raised in the South and you believe *just that much* in a protective tariff? Why did you not put cotton products on

the free list? Could not you raise your revenue on *agricultural products?* Have the food producers—the farmers and stockmen—of this country received more than their share of the present prosperity? You strike such a keen ax at the root of the agricultural tree, and you will see the tree wither and the leaves fall.

I do not need to pile up statistics mountain high to prove that the American producers of cereals, hay, and meats are placed at a disadvantage when brought into open competition with the wheat growers of Argentina, the herders of Brazil, and the farmers of Australia and Canada. Not because our climate is not as favorable, not because our farmer is lacking in enterprise or integrity, not because he is not favored by industrial inventions, but his handicap is the thing of which we boast—higher land values, higher wage scale, better methods of living. These factors enter into the cost of production.

In every speech I have heard from the opposite side I hear the plea for the reduction in the cost of living. What matters it to you if the price of foodstuff and clothing is cut in half *and you have not the wherewith to purchase it?* [Applause.] You could reduce the cost of living by importing "coolie labor" to this country in competition with our sturdy farmers and diligent laboring men, but would you advocate it?

Are you prepared to tell the American farm hand, who to-day has the right to hope that he will become a farmer in his own right, that his wages must be cut to the basis of the Argentinian laborer at $10 to $12 per month, or the Brazilian tiller at from $12 to $14, or the Chilean at from $8 to $10? Are you prepared to promise the farmer that the railway transportation rates from the West will be reduced to the point where he can meet the water competition of his foreign rivals? [Applause.]

I am not pleading for the protection of an "infant industry" in the nature of the small farm, but I am urging that the man on that farm be not reduced to a condition of poverty. It has been the proudest boast of this Nation since the establishment of its independence that poverty and servility are not hereditary; that because a man's father and his grandfather and countless generations before him have been dependent tenants that his lot must remain the same. It is the spirit of the freeholder that we as a Nation have tried to engender in the hearts of every native-born American and of every foreigner who has come to our shores and become a part of our national life. [Applause.] But can this spirit continue to thrive if we cripple it by unfair and unworthy competition?

Consider this bill schedule by schedule and I will vote with you on every point that I consider fair and just to the people I represent. I believe in an income tax, but not in all of the provisions incorporated in this bill. You force me by presenting this bill as a unit—as you did the sundry civil bill—to vote against provisions I favor in order that I may protect my district from the unjust provisions it contains. Is this Democratic? Is this fair?

The bill as a whole is unjust to my people. The farmer, the beet raiser, the woolgrower, have been made the "goats" in this tariff bill, and a goat is a disagreeable factor when molested. You have challenged him to combat and the future will prove to you his staying qualities. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER].

CONDEMN METHODS USED IN THE PREPARATION OF THE BILL.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, tariff legislation, and especially when it is of such a sweeping character as that proposed by House bill 3321, should be carefully considered, and ample time should be allowed for a free and open discussion before the entire House. This bill has been prepared by our Democratic friends in secret caucus and is now presented in its completed form with the distinct understanding and determination of our friends on the other side of the House that it shall pass in its present form.

DENIED A VOICE IN LEGISLATION.

Many of us are new Members, and for the first time sit in this House representing constituencies that are vitally interested and affected by the provisions of this bill; and whether we are old or new Members, unless we have been elected on the Democratic ticket, have not had and will not have a practical voice in this proposed legislation. This bill has been prepared by a mere handful of men who have either no practical knowledge of business conditions or by training and interests are impelled to look only on one side of the question.

DO NOT REPRESENT A MAJORITY OF THE PEOPLE.

These men seem to think that because they are in the majority in this House that they, and they alone, are commissioned to draft this legislation. Let me remind them, in all kindness, that they do not represent the majority of the people of this country, neither did they receive a majority of all the votes cast at the last election; therefore the "free-trade" or "tariff-for-revenue-only" policy of the Democratic Party was not approved by a majority of the electors of this country, and, even had they been, the methods adopted in the framing of this bill would not be justified. No method can be approved by the American people that does not give all the representatives of all the people a voice in legislation that affects every citizen of the United States.

DEMOCRATIC PLEDGES.

Let me call your attention to the pledge given by the Democratic Party to the American people in their platform. As to the right of the people to rule, their platform says:

> We direct the people's attention to the fact that the Democratic Party's demand for a return to the rule of the people, expressed in the national platform four years ago, has now become the accepted doctrine of a large majority of the electors. We again remind the people that only by a larger exercise of the reserve power of the people can they protect themselves from the misuse of delegated power—

and so forth.

Has the course pursued by our Democratic friends been in accordance with their platform pledge? Has not this very method been condemned by them; or do they consider their action a fulfillment of their pledge when a majority of the people are denied a voice in this all-important bill? Again let me quote from the Democratic platform. It says:

> Our pledges are made to be kept when in office, as well as relied upon during the campaign, and we invite the cooperation of all citizens, regardless of party, who believe in maintaining unimpaired the institutions and traditions of our country.

Is this a keeping of their pledge when in office? It was no doubt relied upon during the campaign by the voter.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL.

Now, as to the provisions of this bill: It is almost inconceivable that the American Congress should be asked to pass a bill drafted by Members of this House who deliberately choose to favor foreign industries and foreign workingmen rather than American. If this bill is passed as it is written then our industries can only prosper when they are located in foreign countries beyond the seas.

TARIFF AN ECONOMIC QUESTION.

It is extremely unfortunate that this whole tariff legislation can not, and is not, considered from an economic instead of a political standpoint; it is an economic question and not a political one. So long as it is considered from a political standpoint just so long will the political club be used to drive men in line and tie them body and soul by the political caucus to support the measure, regardless of its true merits or the consequences it may have upon the interests of any Member's constituents or the country as a whole. The American people will never forget the sincere effort and honesty of purpose of the Republican Party to sever this question from politics. It was a Republican President who first proposed a nonpartisan tariff commission, and at a time when all branches of the Government were in control of the Republican Party, for the express purpose of obtaining information that would enable Congress to write a tariff bill that would be just and equitable to a majority of the people of this country.

PROSPERITY.

During the last 50 years this country has had an era of internal development, of internal growth and prosperity, that no one had dreamed of, and one that has never been equaled by any country at any time anywhere. It has not only attracted the attention but commanded the respect and admiration of the entire civilized world.

MERITS OF PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

It is an undisputed fact that during this era of prosperity there was a protective tariff in force, and it has been the experience of this country that whenever that tariff was replaced by a so-called "tariff for revenue only" we paid the penalty by disastrous and ruinous panics. What we want to do is avoid a repetition of these conditions.

HAVE RIGHT TO EXPECT BETTER BILL.

I am not opposing the passage of this bill because it is a Democratic measure. I am opposed to it because of its vicious provisions. We have a perfect right to expect and even demand from our Democratic friends a bill more in harmony with the interests of the country, and especially with the interests of the farmers and workingmen. As a justification of this statement, let me call your attention again to the Democratic platform, and remember you stated that your pledges were to be kept when in office, as well as relied upon during the campaign. It says:

> We recognize that our system of tariff taxation is intimately connected with the business of the country, and we favor the ultimate attainment of the principles we advocate by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate business.

This is all we ask. We want no other. The Republican Party and the members of the Republican Party recognize and acknowledge the fact that the Payne bill was not a perfect measure, nor was any previous tariff bill perfect, neither did nor do we expect a perfect bill from our Democratic friends. We recognize the fact that the time allotted to the Ways and Means Committee and to Congress is entirely too short to properly investigate each item in each schedule in this entire bill, and especially in the absence of impartial technical knowledge, such as would and should be furnished by the tariff commission; but we have a right to expect a bill in accordance with the pledge of the Democratic platform that will not injure or destroy legitimate business, and we also have a right to have a consistent bill. This bill is not only vicious but inconsistent.

INCONSISTENCIES OF BILL.

When you present a bill that provides for a tariff of 10 cents per bushel on wheat, and then put flour and bran, the products of wheat, on the free list; put a tariff of 10 cents per bushel on rye, and then put rye flour on the free list; put a tariff of 10 per cent ad valorem on cattle and sheep, and all other live animals not especially provided for, and then put wool and beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork on the free list, it is not consistent, and the Democrats knew it was inconsistent when they presented it.

UNFAIR AND UNAMERICAN.

A bill that places manufactured articles, in which a considerable portion of their value is labor, on the free list is absolutely unfair to the American manufacturer and wage earner, and I submit to you that any legislation that does not take into consideration the interest of our wage earners is un-American and not worthy of serious consideration. Any tariff bill that does not provide a duty equal to the difference in cost of production between here and abroad can not and does not protect American labor.

COMPETITIVE BASIS.

We are told that it is the policy of our Democratic friends to put all lines of manufacture on a competitive basis with foreign countries; that is to say, that a certain proportion of the articles we use shall be imported and the duty on each article should be determined and regulated by the volume of importations of that article, and in this way maintain a competitive basis in all lines of trade. If the volume of importations increases beyond a certain point, raise the duty; if they fall below a certain point, then lower the duty, and in this way protect the American public from overcharges and monopolistic greed on all articles. This is to be their cure-all for all tariff legislation.

WILL NOT BRING RESULTS.

The intention is good—we are all emphatically opposed to overcharges and monopolies or special interests—but, Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that this proposition will not bring about the desired result, because it is fundamentally wrong and can not bring satisfactory results. It places a penalty on thrift, economy, honesty, and ability, and puts a reward or premium on waste, incompetency, and dishonesty; for instance, should there be a trust or combination manufacturing a line of goods having agreed-upon prices, selling the goods to the public at a high price, the importation would naturally be large, because the high price charged will permit importation by the foreign trade; then that line is on a competitive basis, according to the Democratic doctrine, and the duty may be retained, notwithstanding the fact that there never was free and open competition, economy in manufacture never being necessary or practiced. On the other hand, in other lines of manufacture where the most fierce, free, and open competition has prevailed for years, compelling the greatest possible economy in the minutest details of manufacture, as well as in the marketing of the goods, resulting in the placing of the goods on the American market at so low a price as to practically prohibit importation, then the duty on such lines of goods must be reduced or put on the free list, thereby penalizing the industry for not forming a combination and raising the price so as to allow a proper amount of goods to be imported.

SELLING PRICE AND COST.

The selling price on all articles is regulated by the cost, and the price of labor is just as positive an item of cost as is material. Cost of material—that is, raw material—is about the same in all countries, but there is a vast difference in labor cost in different countries; therefore the tariff duties should be based on the difference in labor cost on each manufactured article instead of volume of imports. If this is done, then and then only will we accomplish the purpose we are striving for and desire to accomplish.

I might incidentally refer to the boot and shoe industry of this country, because I am intimately acquainted with it, which is one of the largest industries in the country, having an invested capital of between $200,000,000 and $300,000,000 and employing hundreds of thousands of workers and paying millions of dollars to their help each year. According to census reports the volume of business of the boot and shoe manufacturers, including cut stock and findings, in 1909 amounted to over $512,000,000—to be exact, $512,797,642—as compared with $357,688,160 for 1904, showing an increase of over $157,000,000 in five years—over $31,000,000 each year—so that the estimated volume of business for 1912 is over $615,000,000. It is a larger industry than either the wool or sugar industry, and yet it has received practically no consideration. The shoe manufacturers appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and stated their position, and explained that in order to save the industry and protect the workmen from cheap foreign competition it was essential—and made the modest request—that the small duty of 10 per cent on boots and shoes should be retained. But they find them on the free list in this bill. This industry and the men engaged in the shoe factories must be penalized and punished because the manufacturers placed the price of shoes so low and have supplied the American people with such good footwear that even with the nominal duty of 10 per cent they have made it impossible for foreign manufacturers to gain a foothold in the American markets. They have done more; they have even invaded the foreign markets and committed the "unpardonable sin" of shipping shoes of certain grades to foreign countries, even to the extent of $16,000,000; so, of course, off goes the measly 10 per cent duty and shoes go on the free list, and the American market is invited to become the dumping grounds for all grades of shoes, the product of the pauper labor of all foreign countries, and the American workingman is put in direct and open competition with the lowest of the underpaid foreign workmen.

Here is a great and most important industry pleading for a duty that will protect the cost of labor, and labor only. The competition has been fierce, free, and open; it has caused the greatest possible economy to be practiced in the minutest detail of manufacture. The competition has forced the reduction of profits to the point where only the fittest have been able to survive, and now with unfair, unequal competition of foreign-made goods, with a labor cost that is only a fraction of the American cost, it remains for the American manufacturer to either turn over the business to his foreign competitor, reduce the wages so that he may be in a position to compete and retain his market, or remove his factory to foreign land, which no doubt many will do. They are told that because the importation of shoes is so small the trade is not on a competitive basis, and for this reason shoes are placed on the free list, plainly penalizing all connected with the industry for thrift and economy.

ARTIFICIAL VALUE.

Again we are told that the objection to a duty on any article equalizing the cost of labor between here and abroad is that it creates an artificial value, which is a direct tax on the consumer, which he should not pay. This is to say that American labor is on an artificial basis, and that we are paying an artificial price for it, directly the result of the protective tariff. There is no question but what this bill will reduce the price of labor, but where shall we find the standard or real value of labor? Shall we accept the English scale as the real or true standard, which is about one-half of the American price, or shall we go to continental Europe, where it is still less, or go to India—Calcutta, for instance—where an able-bodied man receives from 8 to 15 cents per day. Do we realize that the standard of living always follows the wage scale; in fact, the standard of living is just what the wage scale permits it to be. No one on either side of this House desires to do an injustice to labor, but this bill utterly disregards and ignores the wage earner. There are millions upon millions of wage earners in our factories, in our mills, in our mines, on our farms, everywhere, whose welfare, happiness, and earning power will be impaired. They can not and must not be ignored.

They are the all-important factor in our national life. They are the great consuming public. They are the great purchasing power of the Nation, and it is only when the wage earner has steady employment at a fair wage that this Nation can and does prosper. The moment that you interfere with their earning power you strike at the very root of national prosperity.

The distinguished gentleman from Alabama, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, very kindly referred to the labor unions in his splendid opening address, and gave credit to the unions for the present scale of wages paid in this country, but at the same time he presented a bill that entirely ignores them and will utterly destroy the wage scale now established and in force. The distinguished gentleman told us that this bill is drawn with a view of putting all lines of production and manu-

facture on a competitive basis and encourage importations to the end that the cost to the consumer may be lessened; but does not the gentleman realize that with every manufactured article imported into this country comes with it a certain amount of foreign labor? Not only that, but just that much less American labor will be needed. And does he not realize that if any considerable quantity of manufactured goods are imported there will be a surplus of American labor?

The American labor market will be glutted and result in a lowering of wages.

The wage earner has his labor to sell; it is his stock in trade, and is in no way different from any other market. If labor is scarce, as it has been for some years, it commands and sells at a good price, but if there is a surplus of labor it must be sold at what it will bring, and bear in mind that it must be sold. The family must live, and when he is compelled to sell it in free and open competition with the foreign market, can he hope to get more than the market price?

Again I shall quote from the Democratic platform. It says:

American wages are established by competitive conditions and not by the tariff.

True, the tariff does not establish the wages, but it does establish the condition, and the condition, or perhaps better, the demand, establishes the wages. The only excuse offered for refusing to protect labor by equalizing the cost of production is that it is so difficult or not possible to ascertain the labor cost. This is all a mistake. As a matter of fact, the labor cost is no more difficult to obtain than cost of material or selling cost, or any other item, and is known and readily available down to the minutest detail. If there be first a willing mind the rest is easy.

In conclusion. The purpose and object of the distinguished gentlemen who wrote this bill was no doubt to legislate in favor of the consuming public, but who is it that will really benefit if this bill is passed?

The farmers and stock raisers can not, because their products are on the free list, or nearly so.

The manufacturers can not, because their products are on the free list or protected by an insufficient duty.

The millions upon millions of wage earners can not, because their products must be sold in the open market with foreign competition.

The class that will benefit are the indolent and idle rich; their business will not be affected. "They toil not, neither do they spin," so they have nothing at stake. [Loud applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOSS].

Mr. MOSS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it may be with excusable timidity that I arise in this Hall in the presence of so many distinguished and learned men who have made the subject of tariff a lifelong study. The people, however, of West Virginia whom I represent, are so vitally interested and will be so seriously affected by the passage by the Democrats of this Congress of the tariff bill, as now framed by them, that my duty impels me at least to remonstrate and protest against the injustice which will be inflicted upon my constituents. The great State of West Virginia, with its untold resources, its vast natural wealth, its varied industries, and its intelligent people, never gave consent to a reckless attack by the Democratic Party upon the industries of this Nation; but, on the contrary, by the election of four Republican Congressmen, elected by the aid of the Progressives of West Virginia, that great State announced in no uncertain terms that it preferred to live and thrive under the peace and prosperity of protective administration. But the misfortune of a divided party in the Nation gave technical victory to the Democracy, and though the majority of our Nation's voters registered their adherence to the great doctrine of protection, as enunciated in both the Republican and Progressive platforms, yet Democracy, though indorsed by a mere minority, feels called upon once more to throw this great Nation into the uncertainty, the fear, and the demoralization resulting from tariff agitation.

I stand upon the American doctrine of protection and the creation of a tariff commission, both of which are important planks of the Republican and Progressive platforms. In one sense the tariff question is and always will be political, for the Republican Party has always stood for protection to American industry, American labor, and American homes. The Democratic Party has always opposed it. And incidental to this doctrine we have always believed it proper, speaking generally, to levy duties upon articles or products which we produce in this country rather than upon those imported from other countries which we do not produce. The Democratic doctrine, with some modifications from time to time, has been that the object of tariff is to raise revenue without any fixed policy as to the manner in which that revenue should be raised. This means that that party advocates a hit or miss tariff policy, and when in power is more prone to remove the duty from articles coming from abroad which are also produced in this country than they are upon articles not so produced here—the very doctrine which has resulted every time it was tried in bringing disaster to the people of this country.

In another sense the tariff question is not a political question. When it comes to fixing the proper amount of tariff rates, that is the work of a statistician and not a politician. We favor a nonpartisan tariff commission composed of men of the highest character, stability, and learning appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to enter upon a searching inquiry, both here and abroad, as to the comparative cost of production here and there, and other conditions surrounding the question, and then to lay this information before the Congress so it can intelligently act upon this important problem. The Democratic Party, however, have just proven by the drafting of this tariff bill that they are in favor of approaching this important question by guesswork and not by scientific methods, and the bill which has been introduced by the majority leader, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and which the Democratic President has ordered his party to pass, is a juxtaposition of inconsistent and irreconcilable tariff patchwork, and it is so presented to us that we must vote for all or none of it—we must swallow the whole dose, good and bad, mostly bad, or else reject it all. For one, I shall not partake.

In the first place, the Democratic tariff bill was not framed after a full and fair hearing. Men who represented the farmer, men who represented labor, men who represented capital employed in vast manufacturing industries of this country, were denied even the right to be heard. A tariff bill involving hundreds of articles and products was framed in a few weeks behind closed doors and backed by orders from the Executive Mansion. While Federal patronage is being withheld until Congressmen shall obey the commands of the President, this mass of heterogeneous elements, dignified by the name of a tariff bill, is introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States by the leader of the party, and will be pushed through the House after only five days of debate. Is it true that our friends on the other side are possessed of such superior intellect and so much keener perception than the average statesman ever claims to possess that they can frame tariff bills offhand and secure the peace and prosperity of this country by their passage?

It does seem superfluous, after a century of tariff experience, to argue that free trade, or any approach to free trade, is disastrous to this country. Every time it has been tried we have had desolation and distress. Every time a truly protective-tariff law has been enacted it has been followed by unexampled prosperity, and yet our friends on the other side, in order to again test the theories which they profess to love so well, are ready to turn their backs upon the light of experience and again grope in the dark night of experiment. And the American people must pay the penalty.

Perhaps it is the way of Providence. The great Republican Party has been split in twain by internal dissension. Lincoln, Blaine, McKinley, Grant, and Garfield, and all the other great and illustrious names possessed by that party that have adorned the pages of history, were forgotten, and, with open eyes, that party walked over the precipice of defeat in the year 1912. What will bring unity? What will bring back its pristine strength? What will induce the partisans of men to put principle above personality? I predict, my friends, that the great moving cause that will unify that great party and make these men forget their feuds and factions when confronted by the call of their country's good will be the dire result of the passage of the Underwood bill, which will follow as surely as the darkness of night follows the splendor of day. Back there in the hills and valleys of my own great State of West Virginia there still remains some of that bitterness and animosity which the division of our party last year engendered; but if those men could only be here now and could behold this blind and reckless band of Democracy stamping out the American doctrine of protection, opening wide the door to the competition of pauper labor, and deliberately plunging this country into financial and economic depression, all to carry out a pet theory of their own—if they could be here and see all this as we see it there would be no further division in the Republican Party. The Republican Party must be progressive. The people of this country will indorse no party that stands still. It has received the punishment and, I believe, learned its lesson. There are now strong indications that it will resume its old-time leadership in the march of progress. Those of us who love her will stay with her so long as she will live up to her historic tradi-

tions. But should she prostitute her pristine purity, become but the petty agent of privilege, and give to an expectant public but her empty name, then will we spurn her as treachery alone deserves and unite under some other name to wage battle against the destructive and devastating forces of Democracy. That hour has not yet come, and I hope to God never shall; and I believe that this present year will show that this grand old party still stands for protection, for a sound dollar, for the cause of the great common people, their active participation in the affairs of this Government, and for the maintenance of the honor and glory of our flag, whether it wave over the dome of the Capitol Building here in Washington or over the sunny islands of the distant seas.

The spokesman of the Democratic Party in this Congress is the Hon. OSCAR UNDERWOOD, of the State of Alabama. He is indeed a splendid gentleman and a most pleasing personality. We give him full credit for his great ability and his sincerity, and it was indeed a privilege which I highly prize to have heard his speech on the opening day of this debate, setting forth the views of his party on this great question. I am, however, compelled to say that, in my humble judgment, the premises upon which his argument is based are so fallacious, his theories so much at variance with the experience of the past, and his argument to establish the correctness of such theories so strained that we were impressed with the difficulty of his case and sympathized with him personally in his efforts to defend the indefensible position of his party. He speaks of the cost of living and quotes statistics to show that since the year 1897 farm products have increased 93 per cent, and attributes that to the tariff. The prosperous farmers of West Virginia can testify that in recent years, during Republican administrations, they have been able to secure a fair and decent price for the products of their farms, and I do not believe that the gentleman's complaint about the prosperity of the farmer will be received with much relish by that industrious and intelligent class throughout this Union. If a Republican tariff is responsible for justice and equity to the farmers of this country, then make the most of it, but do not advance as an argument against the great principle of protection the fact that under a protective tariff the farmer enjoys his share of prosperity, while under the tariff for revenue only, as experience has proven, he receives more than his share of common disaster.

The high cost of living is caused by surplus of gold production, increased migration from the country to the city, monopolies, and other reasons that time will not permit me to discuss, but it is not caused by a protective tariff. It is a world-wide complaint—of free-trade as well as protective countries. But if it were so caused, the concrete proposition is reduced to this: Would you rather pay reasonably high prices for the necessities of life and have the money to buy them with, or do you favor cheap prices and empty pockets? When people have money they consume without stint or restraint, and the supply, therefore, equals or surpasses the demand. When they have not money they economize, reducing themselves to bare necessities, and thus reduce the demand and thereby the price.

I lay it down as a fact which can not be challenged or contradicted that the American laboring man is paid a higher average wage than the laboring man of any other country on the face of the globe, and with that wage has come a higher standard of living. Again I assert—as statistics clearly show—that the American laborer can buy much more of the necessities of life with his eight hours' work than can the laborer of any other nation with a similar amount of work. As long as this condition exists it is idle to talk about the superiority of free trade. It seems to me axiomatic that admitting, as our Democratic brothers must do, that the American laborer is paid on an average from at least one-half to two-thirds more than the European laborer, and often twice as much, then if we are thrown into direct competition with the products made by that cheap European labor only one result can follow, and that is that the wages of the American laboring man and his standard of living must be reduced. I am one of those who think that our laboring man is entitled to live better than his brothers across the sea. I believe he is entitled to his little home, to conveniences for his family, to send his children to school, and, in truth, to stand erect in the nobility of manhood and command the respect that honest labor deserves, and I am opposed to any party that advocates the cause of the foreigner in preference to the American and seeks to advance theoretic altruism to the extent of pulling down our own standards and industries in order to build up those of the foreigner. I must say that even the statement of the gentleman from Alabama can not convince the American people that the cost of production is not to a large extent a determining factor of competition in the world's market, and therefore while we should cherish a spirit of brotherhood toward all mankind it is first our bounden duty to preserve the peace, happiness, and prosperity of our own people.

The gentleman from Alabama again asserts that the protective tariff has prevented our development as a factor in world trade, has stifled enterprise, has put a premium on inactivity. What an astounding statement, coming from the leader of a great party. If all this be true, then the greatness and prosperity of this Nation, which statistics show has surpassed all other nations in industrial and commercial development and progress, is but a passing dream and facts about which no unprejudiced mind could heretofore cherish a doubt are but fleeting clouds and a vanishing mirage. The gentleman is mistaken. Protection has made this country commercially great, and has contributed in no small degree to our prosperity and happiness. If this Nation be so hampered and oppressed by a protective tariff, why is it that the citizens of these European countries that our friends appear to envy are pouring into this country as a very gulf stream of oppressed humanity?

It is with sincere regret that I heard this leader of Democracy in that eloquent address appeal to class distinction and class prejudice. He announced that the Democratic Party, by this tariff bill, intended to tax the luxuries of the rich, not the necessities of the poor. Perhaps the gentleman, then, can explain why it is that the tariff on luxuries is not as high, on an average, in the Underwood bill as it is under our present tariff bill, framed by a Republican Congress. Why did you not increase the tariff on these luxuries and carry out your pretensions of punishment of the wealthy class? Why did you reduce the tariff on gold leaf, tinsel wire, aeroplanes, fancy cakes, preserved fruits, lace window curtains, oriental rugs, wearing apparel of silk? Are these not luxuries of the rich? How much of them does the laboring man consume? The gentleman from Alabama says he did not make the tariff high because these luxuries would not then come over. My answer is, They have been coming over under the higher tariff of our present Republican tariff bill. If the wealthy want them, they will buy them. I do not like appeals to different classes in this country. We are one people, bound together by ties of brotherhood, and with common interests to protect. You can not cripple the business of the manufacturer without injuring the laboring man who works for him. You can not crush the American business man without destroying the American farmer. We do not live to ourselves, and when you hurt one man you injure his neighbor, and when, as you propose to do by this tariff bill, you throw almost all American industries into direct competition with the cheap labor of Europe you are injuring every American citizen.

West Virginia cries aloud her protest. The tariff on her earthenware and crockery products has been reduced from 55 to 35 per cent ad valorem; on her hogs, from 13.81 per cent to nothing; on her cattle, from 27.08 per cent to 10 per cent; and by one sweep her wool, her coal, her lumber, her clay, has been thrown into the Democratic hopper of free trade.

There is no doubt in my mind that the present tariff on many articles is too high, but I want to know and not to guess which they are. It should be reduced according to the recommendation of an intelligent tariff commission after thorough investigation. I have no doubt that there are trusts and monopolies that have by their machinations increased the price of necessities to the consumer. If so, those trusts and monopolies should be demolished, their officers prosecuted and be made to obey the law of the land, and, in this connection, we are proud to say that, beginning with the administration of President Roosevelt and coming on down through that and the administration of President Taft, there have been more trusts and monopolies prosecuted and brought to the bar of justice than in all the Democratic administrations put together that this country has ever had.

When the people of this country determined last year that they would, by reason of division in the ranks of the great Republican Party, permit democracy to again assume control of this Government, they did so with the assurance on the part of its candidate for President and its political leaders that no legitimate industry of this country should be harmed. And yet, now in this spring of 1913, only a few months after the termination of that campaign, legitimate industry is threatened as it never was before by the terms of an unfair, illogical, and un-American tariff bill. Our friend, Mr. UNDERWOOD, in the course of his remarks, had much to say of the lemon, and seemed to be concerned as to its growth and production. Let me say that before another year shall roll around our people will be fully convinced that the prize for growing lemons should be awarded to the Democratic Party, because when this tariff bill is passed and signed by a Democratic President, if you will pardon a slang expression, the biggest lemon on record will be handed by this Democratic administration to the American people.

My friends on the other side, beware! There will be no excuse behind which you can hide when calamity spreads over this country as the result of this work here to-day. In 1912, when you were elected, with our bumper crops, our busy and prosperous industries, our plentiful supply of money, we were leading in the march of nations. The fear of your hostile legislation is already having its injurious effect. If you thrust this bitter nostrum down the throat of the American people, and then cast us once more into the dead sea of disaster, you will at the first opportunity be buried so deep that even the call of Gabriel's trumpet can not resurrect you. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Kansas has 4 minutes to his credit, which he reserved this morning, and I yield to the gentleman, in addition to that, 24 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 28 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RUPLEY].

Mr. RUPLEY. Mr. Chairman, 50 years in the lifetime of the ordinary man means a great deal. A half century does not mean so much to the older nations, but it marks well-defined lines of progress or retrogression in the history of our country. The last 50 years have seen the trial of the protective tariff.

I have listened to learned expositions on this question from gentlemen from all parts of our common country. We have a right to suppose that they, under our system of government, represent the best thought and intelligence of their respective communities and have at heart the greatest good of their constituency and of the Nation as well.

The system of the application of the protective principle by my Republican friends seems to have suffered little change except the tendency to run to extremes, since the days of the great war taxes forced upon the Nation by extraordinary conditions. The war has been over for many years, and yet this unnatural financial condition has been accepted as the rational and right criterion after which to follow. This child born in the throes of necessity has been nourished by all the methods known to skillful tariff doctors and clever surgeons of privilege and power. Natural laws apply to policies as to peoples. The heir of this system has proved a hybrid and a revulsion of the public mind has been the result. This fact is proven by the immense majority on the other side of the floor.

I have heard much about the prosperity due to the high protective tariff, and I am free to confess that it has produced among the favored few who are its beneficiaries an age of discovery, not of the amount invested but of the profits to be secured; and then capitalization, far beyond the investment, based on real earnings. Then we have the golden age of 1896, until when, I ask? All the while capitalizing labor, labor, labor—millions of watered stock, made good by labor. First, the counterfeit stock of the United States Steel. Holding labor to the wheel until this stock produces many fold, and then dividends; first, to holders of the stock; second, to surplus; third, to labor? No; third, a new stock dividend for labor to earn additional dividends upon. Nothing for labor, the producer of it all.

The acid test of this proposition is the amount left over and above the living expenses of the family to contribute to the comfort and the welfare of the home. No one denies it brings prosperity to the rich. I ask you, in all fairness, if you believe the benefits are equitably distributed between the rich man and the poor man?

The scholarly gentleman at the other end of the Avenue, the President of this dominant party in the Nation, upon his nomination found in the platform that old socialistic doctrine—

> It is a system of taxation which makes the rich richer and the poor poorer.

Members have grown eloquent over the high wages paid the workingman. There is no proof that this is due to the high protective tariff. The evil of the system lies in the fact that the wages are not in proportion to the living expenses. The purchasing power of a dollar is the thing most important to the workman and his success. It means that he will be able to keep the boys and girls out of the workshop and in the school. That the standard of citizenship is raised or lowered to the standard of his living.

Is there any advantage given the low-priced laborer over the one highly paid? Surely the scrubwoman is entitled to a return on her commodity—her labor—in the same proportion as the man who has his income increased many times over by means of the protective tariff.

Why does the high protective tariff always produce a surplus, and what happens to it? Labor capitalized in billions to earn dividends for the few favored rich.

The manufacturer not knowing how long this condition is going to last, and knowing the great profits to be had, asks his employees for more of their service. He exhausts American labor, he secures foreign labor, and most of our large mills are now only half American and the other half European.

We hear the gentlemen contend that the American workmen will have to compete with the low-priced laborer of Europe, and every day we see our "captains of industry" importing these low-priced laborers as rapidly as they can to compete right here at home with our workmen. [Applause.]

The high protective tariff has been before the bar of judgment of the American people and has not made out its case—it stands guilty as indicted.

Prosperity, about which we prate, has been only the crumbs from the rich man's table. All too late, this fact has taken hold of the Republican wiseacres. Blood letting will not now suffice. Plastering the sore spots will no longer control the malady. The people have diagnosed the case, and they will apply the cure.

Now, what of the gentlemen from the other side of the House? What is the record of their party and their measures? In their platform they say the Republican Party has brought about a condition where "the rich are growing richer and the poor growing poorer," and the last election seemed to show that the people agreed with them.

The answer to my query is read from the page of the history of the United States. They have been forced by circumstances since the war into the positions they have taken. A party of negation and opposition. To oppose a high tariff they propose a low tariff. Cause and effect. During their spasmodic periods of quasi power they never had a real chance to try their steel before it had to ring back into the scabbard of their endeavors. I have no thought but that it, too, would have proved abortive to real and lasting results because based on false premises. Purgatives relieve, but do not cure. Their present tariff bill is an attempt to meet the demands of an aroused public conscience. They realize that the tariff must be revised downward and that nothing else will appease the public's ultimatum.

In following their bill it is interesting to note how far they have wandered from the great apostle of free trade, Senator Walker. The Walker bill of 1846, framed to embrace the suggestions contained in the celebrated Treasury report of 1845, was considered the last word on Democratic tariff policy. They have abandoned free trade in its purity and are endeavoring to pass a bill "to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes." Walker says, "The Constitution does not confer power on Congress to lay tax for protection, but for revenue only," and that only on that principle can any degree of permanency be established.

That last word in the Democratic tariff policy was also in the platform of this scholarly gentleman who is President of the United States and who, in my judgment, is making good before the American people, and it is contained in the first paragraph of the platform framed by the Democratic convention in Baltimore:

> "We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government, under the Constitution, has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue."

I take it that there is no man to-day of reasonable mind but will grant me that there should be a tariff graduated to the needs of our people and the protection of certain industries. Why this constant harangue and political daubing should be repeated at every change of administration is hard to explain on sensible lines.

The ordinary Congressman knows as little, technically, about the tariff as I do. Why is he asked to take a position regularly without knowing what it all means?

Politics is the science of government; it has nothing to do with the art of securing office or place. Among all the great countries of the world we stand alone as being the only one that has not taken the tariff out of business and politics. Is there any good reason to continue the practice of playing policy instead of attending to the public business? Have we not learned through all these years, with our experience, our trade, our finance, our supposed intelligence, that this is a question for scientific men, specially trained; to be settled far removed from political clamor and the heat of debate?

The results of past tariff legislation have been unsatisfactory and of a patchwork variety, as is evidenced by constant and increasing demands for change. Here we are at the guessing game again. If we guess right on some schedules, we are commended; if wrong on some, we are condemned for all.

I would not impeach the integrity and sincerity of the gentlemen on either side of the House. At the present time they are doing the only thing they can do—the Democrats trying to

measure up to the situation in a manner and the Republicans watching their endeavors with the hope of breaking through and profiting by their mistakes. Mark you, the citizens of this great land are awake to conditions.

While I agree that early action should be taken in response to the expressed will of the voters in the last election, I do not agree that it should be taken at the expense of the rights or privileges of any industry or section. You will find that in the Progressive national platform we contend that the tariff question should be controlled absolutely by a nonpartisan, expert commission. This is the safe, fair way to proceed, so that the interests of the poor man may have the same protection as those of the rich man; so that industries needing help may be fostered and those to be curbed can be controlled; that a just relation be preserved between the cost of living and the wage scale; that taxation affecting the necessities of life be reduced to a minimum or removed entirely, and that men and women who work with their hands or their minds may have the same chance to have the comforts of complete living as the favored plutocrat who is living on a part of what these men and women earn and produce.

We are a high-grade Nation in science, in literature, in art, in learning, and the like, yet we fail to keep up the standard in matters political. The national Progressive platform asks for a nonpartisan, scientific tariff commission. Not in form—as was Mr. Taft's—but in fact, so that the scales may be balanced in justice between what we eat and wear and what we earn and produce. That the poor man and the producer shall have his exact share of life's benefits as well as those who are favored in worldly goods. This tariff question is not for bickering nor blustering. We are engaged in a serious business. It touches the hearthstones and their happiness in all the many homes throughout the land. The security and safety of our people to enjoy the liberties vouchsafed them under our free institutions of government means much to our Nation in her upward stride. The demand for social and economic justice has called into being the Progressive Party because too long the demon of oppression has held the reins of power and driven the heavy car of despair as it crushed out ambitions and opportunities.

"Suffering makes the whole world kin," and the suffering of the millions is being heard and answered in a movement which has for its purpose the uplift of man and the ultimate happiness of the race.

The home must be the hub upon which all else revolves, and only in its sanctity and security can a nation rise in service to its God.

This movement is going on under all suns and in all climes. It is now the yeast, and it will leaven the loaf. Its instruments are various, yet no less powerful. The statesmen moving policies as pawns, the jurist wise in law, the preacher strong in eloquence, the scientist great in discovery, the journalist virile in expression, the teacher great in thought, all working to the common end that in this age of the world man is indeed his brother's keeper.

The proposition presents different aspects in different countries. In our own great land we have many problems yet to solve. Here our dogma is the doctrine of progress and good will, and we believe that only in adhering to it we will at least be able to make the law of the land more responsive to the will of the people.

John Adams said, "The happiness of society is the end of government." Have we not reached the point in intelligence when we can say that our public servants are our representatives only so far as they are our commissioners? In this connection we hold with Macaulay, "That the cause of all revolutions is that while nations move forward constitutions stand still."

For these evils in our system there must come a remedy if our institutions are to exist in perpetuity. The answer lies with the people.

The line of cleavage is well marked between the reactionaries and the Progressives. I care not to what party they belong, whether they follow the leadership of a Roosevelt, a Beveridge, a Murdock, or under the banner of a Wilson, a Bryan, or a Palmer, they are a different type of men than the servile servant subject to the dictates of the Penroses, the Ryans, the Roots. These two elements can not fuse. They have nothing in common. Their ideas are widely divergent as to the ends of government. The principles for which Progressives stand are too important and far-reaching to neutralize. There is no middle ground to take; no twilight zone between the rights and privileges of men and the power and injustice of organized wealth; no happy medium between life and property when posterity is paid the debt in shekels of human misery.

What has been the result in both the old parties? What has been the product of the system? A condition of one-man power, boss rule, machine politics, corruption funds, high salaries with little work, indifferent citizenship, and the failure of the people to secure representation, and the attendant evils. The times demand a new party of action and of honor. You can not graft progressive policies on the old trunk of reaction. They belong to different families. They may grow for a little while, but their time will be short. A new tree having roots and tendrils planted in every inch of our glorious country has started to grow, and it will take under its protecting shade the memories of the Southland and the hopes of our western prairies and the wealth and promise of our East and North.

Years of apparent prosperity had seemingly lulled our people into sleep, and listening to the siren song they were dashing toward the rocks.

On the scroll of the Pantheon of the future will be written in letters enduring and imperishable the words of the redoubtable Jackson, "Justice for all, privilege for none." Indeed this might fittingly be the creed of each Progressive, for in this life we are of little worth save the service we render our time and posterity. This is not a party of expediency; it is a party of principle.

New times demand new measures and new men,
The world advances and in time outgrows
The laws that in our father's day were best;
And doubtless after us some purer scheme
Will be shaped out by wiser men than we,
Made wiser by the steady growth of truth.
The time is ripe and rotten, ripe for change;
Then let it come; I have no dread of what
Is called for by the instinct of mankind.
Nor think I that God's world would fall apart,
Because we tear a parchment more or less.
Truth is eternal, but her effluence
With endless change is fitted to the hour
Her mirror is turned forward to reflect
The promise of the future, not the past.

[Applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, I believe in a protective tariff, sufficient but not excessive, and it is with regret that I address this body to-day in opposition to a bill reducing the tariff. I believe that many schedules should be lowered. I came to this House of Representatives determined to assist in a proper reduction of excessive tariff rates. Time and again my vote has been cast with the majority side and contrary to the view of many of my colleagues on this side. I voted as I believed I should, voted as I promised, voted as I always will vote for any and every measure I believe right, no matter from what part of the House it comes.

If the reductions in this new tariff bill had been based upon information obtained by an expert tariff commission, or, if in answer to a general demand, moderate and justifiable reductions had been made, I would be favoring it.

But this bill calls for a radical change in our economic policy. It carries tremendous reductions that I feel sure will work out injuriously to the American laborer, the American producer, and the American employer.

This Democratic bill goes so far in its reductions as to change our tariff policy from one protecting the American laborer and producer to a policy near free trade—a tariff for revenue only. I am obliged by my conscience and by consideration for the welfare of the people of the great State of California to protest against enacting any such radical legislation.

I do not ask more consideration for industries in my own State than I am willing should be granted the industries of other States. I have been willing, and I am willing, to take reasonable reductions in schedules affecting California provided a proper reduction can be had in other schedules. I voted for a reduction in Schedule K, notwithstanding California is a great woolgrowing State, but I can not believe that justice is done that industry by placing it on the free list in this bill. [Applause.]

I know how seriously the life of the citrus and sugar industries in California is jeopardized by this bill. I know how much the prosperity and happiness of all who labor in those industries are affected by the unwarranted extent of the reduction in the lemon schedule and by the free list ahead for sugar. If this bill is unjust and unfair to industries of my State, is it not reasonable to suppose that it is also unjust and unfair to other industries in other States?

I would like to vote for an income tax and I would like to vote again for substantial reductions in most tariff schedules, even for reductions on items in which California is greatly interested, but I can not vote for reductions that seem to me to be decidedly unreasonable. I believe the American people are

demanding the regulation and improvement of industrial and business conditions, but I do not for one moment believe there is any widespread demand for the destruction of any legitimate American industry.

I am by no means a tariff expert. I know but little compared with what there is to be known. However, I have the knowledge on tariff subjects of the average citizen—perhaps of the average Congressman. I find that to be sufficient to make me sure that genuine experts are needed by Congress when building a tariff structure to serve all interests adequately and deservedly.

I feel sure now, as I did when I first came to Congress two years ago, that a proper downward revision of the tariff will benefit our whole people. I am ready now to vote for any reduction founded on information and warranted by a due consideration of producer and consumer, but I can not vote for this bill, which I believe to have been made without sufficient information and without giving due consideration to the interests of the laborer and grower, the manufacturer and consumer.

Our tariff policy and tariff schedules should be determined by Congress after a careful, adequate, and world-wide study of tariff rates and tariff effects. Beginning at once, each rate should be singly determined and established. Then every separate avenue of labor and industry would not be disturbed, as now, in a general revision. A nonpartisan expert tariff commission should investigate and report to Congress full data on every item of every schedule. It should report the cost of production at home and abroad; the prices received by the grower and manufacturer; the prices paid by the consumer, and the wages and conditions of labor. It should make recommendations. Congress could then work systematically and intelligently on expert, scientific plans, which could be adopted, rejected, amplified, lessened, or otherwise changed.

Congress has passed nearly one-third of its time in the last four years in tinkering with the tariff. Now, we are to be given three or four months of extreme suspense while our tariff boat is turned bottom side up and our respective industries permitted to sink or swim without any regard to those entirely dependent upon them.

It may be that most of our industries will survive four years of Democratic tariff upsetting; but why try such a doubtful experiment? Why not proceed along safe and sane lines to a tariff readjustment through the aid of a nonpartisan expert tariff commission, as proposed and advocated by Progressives from the first. It is through such means that our tariff troubles will be solved aright.

California is hard hit by this Democratic tariff bill. The citrus and sugar industries are perhaps most vitally affected. Two hundred millions of dollars is California's investment in oranges and lemons. Her people have twenty millions in sugar.

There have been fat years in the citrus industry, and there have been many lean ones, but an average for the past 20 years will not show more than a moderate profit. California believes she can supply the whole United States with lemons at prices fair to consumer and grower, if given reasonable time and protection. Only one-fifth of available acreage adapted to lemon-growing is planted in lemons. With protection the acreage in lemons will rapidly increase and every part of our country can be supplied.

The present rate of duty possibly may be too high; the proposed rate is much too low. Who can honestly determine until after full and complete investigation by an expert tariff commission?

The growing of lemons in California is an American industry, owned by Americans, managed by Americans, and furnishing a livelihood to 40,000 families, practically every one of which is genuinely American. Way down deep, my friends, the Democratic Party seems to care more for the mysterious influence of a handful of foreign importers in New York than it does for a home industry in California, owned and cared for by our own countrymen.

Lemons will not average less in price for the next four years because of the removal of two-thirds of the duty. When Sicily has a monopoly, America will pay whatever Sicily chooses to ask for lemons.

To-day I received a wire from California which I wish to read:

SACRAMENTO, CAL., *April 23, 1913.*

Hon. WILLIAM D. STEPHENS,
United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to the provisions of a Senate joint resolution adopted by both Houses of the Legislature of the State of California, I herewith transmit to you a copy of

Senate joint resolution 25, relative to memorializing Congress regarding the citrus-fruit industry of the State of California, and requesting our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use all honorable means to prevent a reduction in duties on citrus fruits below the point where the difference in the cost of production of the same would be equalized.

Whereas the citrus-fruit industry is one of the great and important enterprises of this State, representing an investment of $200,000,000, and materially contributes to the upbuilding thereof; and

Whereas the rates of duty on citrus fruits should equalize the difference in cost of production between the United States and foreign countries; and

Whereas the present rates of duty bring to the Government a substantial revenue that has increased in recent years; and

Whereas a material reduction of the duties on citrus fruits would hamper and retard the growth and development of the State of California: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That we respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States not to reduce the duties on citrus fruits below a point equalizing the difference in the cost of production of the same in the United States and foreign countries, and we earnestly request our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use every honorable means to prevent such reduction; be it further

Resolved, That the governor of the State of California be requested to appoint five citizens of California to present this memorial to Congress in behalf of this State; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be telegraphed to the President and to each of our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

W. N. PARRISH,
Secretary of Senate.

I can best tell you what our people think of the Democratic sugar proposals by quoting the following telegrams:

SACRAMENTO, CAL., *April 22, 1913.*

Hon. WM. D. STEPHENS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

I have the honor to hand you herewith copy of joint resolution No. 18, adopted by senate and assembly and approved by the governor April 18, 1913. Assembly joint resolution No. 18, relative to the protection of the California beet-sugar industry in the enactment by Congress of laws affecting tariffs on imports into the United States.

Whereas in the process of tariff revision by Congress the indicated tendency is toward an abolition of the duties on imported sugar; and

Whereas such a policy would be calamitous to the cane and beet sugar industry of the Nation at large, and especially to the beet-sugar business of the State of California, which produces 165,000 tons per annum, or one-quarter of the beet-sugar output of the United States; and

Whereas the annual consumption of sugar in our country is now 3,500,000 tons per annum, supplied, viz, from domestic cane grown in Porto Rico, Louisiana, and Hawaiian Islands, 1,100,000 tons; from beet sugar manufactured in 16 States, 650,000 tons; the balance, 1,750,000 tons, being purchased from foreign countries and refined by a few corporations on the Atlantic seaboard, who are clamoring for "free sugar," in order that they may check the further invasion of their markets by the constantly growing beet-sugar industry; and

Whereas our Nation's beet-sugar output has increased from 40,000 tons in 1897 to 650,000 tons in 1912, a rate of increase greater than can be shown in any country in Europe during an equal period of time, while our cane-producing districts have apparently reached the limit of their prosperity; and

Whereas this country should, and can, become self-supplying in the matter of sugar through the development of the beet-sugar industry, now involving the use of only 450,000 acres of land against 274,000,000 acres adapted to the cultivation of the sugar beet; and

Whereas the development of the industry is checked by the menace of a free sugar bill, which will subject this product to competition with cane and beet sugar produced under the low-wage conditions in the Tropics and Europe, and at prices delivered at our seaboards lower than, under the conditions, is paid to the farmers of our State for the sugar in the beet before it is manufactured: Now, therefore,

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California (a majority of all members elected to senate and assembly voting for the adoption of this resolution and concurring therein) request the Senate and House of Representatives at Washington and the President of the United States that due regard be had in the consideration of tariff revision for the claims of the beet-sugar industry, which is so full of promise to our Nation, and that the principle governing the revision of the tariff in this regard be that the tariff should equalize the difference between the cost of production of sugar at home and abroad.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to each of the Members of Congress from the State of California to be presented to the President and Congress.

L. B. MALLORY,
Chief Clerk of Assembly.

LOS ANGELES, CAL., *April 9, 1913.*

Hon. WM. D. STEPHENS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas proposed new tariff bill which was introduced into the House of Representatives April 7 by Hon. OSCAR UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, and which is now before Committee on Ways and Means of the House for consideration, reduces customs rates on great number California products to such degree that in several instances it will have inevitable result of seriously crippling, if it does not absolutely destroy, great interests upon which depend large numbers of people and the public welfare of the State; and

Whereas present reading of proposed tariff bill indicates that California has been more severely dealt with than other States of the Union, and its products more severely and unnecessarily exposed to foreign competition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, That an earnest protest is hereby made against adoption of the tariff bill in its present form with its severe discrimination against products of the State of California.

The above resolutions were adopted by board of directors at meeting held to-day.

ARTHUR W. KINNEY,
President Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

In addition to the above, I have received more than 2,000 individual letters of protest, appealing to Congress not to make the changes in the sugar duties in the way proposed.

I shall not go further into details of the citrus and sugar industries, for my colleagues, who more intimately represent the citrus and sugar sections, are better able to do so.

Gentlemen, I do not ask for more than is justly ours. I want nothing to which we are not entitled. But I do ask, and I do insist that the growing industries of the United States should be protected to a degree determined by Congress after consideration of reports and recommendations of an expert commission. [Loud applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member, I shall make my remarks very brief.

I presume it may truthfully be said that there is no Federal legislation which more generally, directly, and vitally affects the people of the country than tariff legislation. It reaches down to the very poorest of our people and up to the richest of them. It not only has its effect on the income of the average citizen, but it determines in large measure the purchasing power of that income. It not only affects the people as individuals, but as groups, families, communities, and the Nation as a whole. There can therefore be no legislation more important than that which is now before us.

The tariff is a legitimate means of raising revenue for the maintenance of the Government, but it should be much more than that. American labor properly looks to the tariff for protection from those conditions which are such a burden to foreign labor. Any tariff which does not primarily disclose its benefits in the pay envelope of the laborer is not an equitable tariff.

I believe that a tariff should extend to the point of protection—such protection as will equalize conditions of competition between the United States and foreign countries, both for the farmer and the manufacturer, and which shall maintain for labor an adequate standard of living.

Believing that there are certain schedules in the existing tariff which are unjust and excessive, I strongly favor tariff revision, and it should not be necessary to add that the revision should be downward.

I have spent much time in studying the pending bill, and have tried to determine whether it bids fair to accomplish the things which I think a tariff bill ought to accomplish. There are over 4,000 items in this bill. Is the tariff which is provided for each of these items the kind of a tariff I have said I believe in and would like to vote for? I presume some of them are, but I feel sure that some of them are not, and I am very much more certain of the fact that, with reference to most of the schedules provided for in this bill, I do not know whether they are right or not, and neither does anybody else [applause], unless he has given the question such study as qualifies him as an expert upon it. The one big fact about the tariff that has been borne home to me as I have studied this bill is the fact that it is absolutely impossible to frame a just and equitable tariff by the log-rolling, I-tickle-you-and-you-tickle-me methods that have characterized tariff making thus far in our history.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Illinois. I can not yield; I have only a few moments.

Ours is the only Nation in the world to use such methods in framing a tariff. It would have brought certain ruin to any other nation foolhardy enough to try it, and the only reason it has not brought ruin to us is to be found in the fact that because of the great extent of our territory our population is not dense as compared with other nations, and also because our resources have been and still are so vast.

It is high time we changed our methods. It takes long investigation and study—painstaking, thorough, and trained examination of exhaustive data, followed by the careful consideration of a trained, unbiased expert, to get at the real facts connected with any given business or industry, from which we may proceed to reach a correct conclusion on the question of whether or not we shall have any tariff at all on a given article, and if it is concluded we shall have, then what that tariff shall be, in order that it shall accomplish the ends which we believe a tariff should accomplish.

The present bill is not the result of such work, and it is bound, therefore, to be inaccurate, unscientific, and inequitable in many respects. It can not be otherwise unless it is a miracle, and even its own best friends do not expect that of it.

I believe the basis for tariffs and changes in tariffs should be found in the reports of a commission, a nonpartisan, scientific tariff commission, reporting both to the President and to either branch of Congress, such reports covering the costs of production, efficiency of labor, capitalization, industrial organization and efficiency, and the general competitive position in this country and abroad of industries seeking protection from Congress; as to the revenue-producing power of the tariff and its relation to the resources of government; and also as to the effect of the tariff on prices, operations of middlemen, and the purchasing power of the consumer.

I wish to say to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] who addressed himself to this subject yesterday, that he has missed entirely the idea of the tariff commission as proposed by the Progressive Party. We do believe that the Republican Party of itself can not revise the tariff accurately and scientifically. We do believe that the Democratic Party of itself can not revise the tariff accurately and scientifically. We believe, further, that the Progressive Party of itself can not revise the tariff accurately and scientifically. In advocating an expert nonpartisan tariff commission, however, we of course do not propose to delegate any legislative power to it. The commission is not to formulate or pass laws. That power must constitutionally and properly remain with the Congress. What we do propose is that the commission shall scientifically and accurately ascertain the true and unbiased facts upon which we may base our tariff legislation.

I do not feel, however, that the people of this country should be compelled to await the reports of such a commission before obtaining relief from those of the present schedules generally recognized as excessive. I had hoped that we would have an opportunity to act on such schedules singly and immediately. While the recent Tariff Board may not have proven commensurate with our ideals for such bodies, it did make more or less exhaustive investigations with reference to Schedules I and K, affecting cotton and wool, and submit reports on them, and it seems to me that those reports, such as they are and irrespective of our views with reference to the board itself, give us at least such information and light on those two schedules as, coupled with the burdens to the consumer caused by the existing cotton and woolen duties, requires us to modify those existing duties and specify new tariffs in those schedules which will be justified by the information submitted in those reports. I trust that later on in the consideration of this bill substitutes will be offered for Schedules I and K—substitutes based on the reports of the Tariff Board to which I have referred—and in that case I shall be glad to support them, irrespective of their source. [Applause.]

Of course, the pending tariff bill contains its jokers. Any tariff act framed as this one has been is bound in the very nature of things to be filled with them. Some of those that are in this bill are plain and easily discerned and others are not. One of the most patent is contained in Schedule K. It was eloquently referred to this afternoon by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS]. In the bill to revise this schedule, submitted by the Democrats in the last Congress when they knew it would be vetoed if passed, Angora wool was given an ad valorem duty of 10 per cent. In the pending bill much ado is made of the fact that wool is placed on the free list. But tucked carefully away in Schedule K is a clause, 314, in which our friends the Democrats have provided—and they know now that the bill will be signed when passed—that "hair of the Angora goat, alpaca, and other like animals, and all hair on the skins of such animals" shall have a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem. It should be added here that the center of the Angora goat industry is in the district of one of our friends on the Democratic side of this House who comes from Texas—one of the members of the Ways and Means Committee who participated in the preparation of this schedule. He apparently saw to it that the tariff bill offered by his party did not get his goat.

I favor an income-tax law, and I regret exceedingly that I am not at this time to have the opportunity of casting a vote on such a law unencumbered with this pending omnibus tariff bill. Our friends the Democrats have very adroitly coupled the two together.

Both because of and in spite of these views I hold on these questions, as a Progressive and as one who believes with whole heart in the principles laid down in the platform of that party and who means earnestly to endeavor to live up to those principles here and do whatever possible to carry them out, I must oppose this omnibus bill, for whatever of good there may be in it is completely outdone by the bad, as I am able to see and understand it. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NEELEY].

Mr. NEELEY. Mr. Chairman, when I became a candidate for Congress at the special election held in my district in January, 1912, my platform contained 12 specific promises. Two of these promises—the amendment to the Constitution

of the United States providing for the election of United States Senators by the direct vote of the people, and providing for the adoption of a decent pension law—were enacted into law during the last session of Congress, and I expect to have the pleasure of seeing two more promises—one providing immediate reduction of the tariff downward and the placing of trust-made goods on the free list, and the other providing for an equitable income tax, to equalize the burdens of government with those who are best able to bear it—enacted into law during the present session.

Mr. Chairman, I have never been a free trader. I am not a free trader now and, as long as the present condition of affairs continues, have no intention of becoming a free trader. I fully recognize that the tariff is a local issue; that the preparation of a tariff bill represents not the individual wishes or desires of any Member of this House, but is a series of compromises made between the different sections of the country and intending to strike a happy medium according to the ideas of the political party in power. Since the making of a tariff bill thus involves a series of compromises, it is impossible to completely satisfy each Member of the House, but there is so much of good in this bill and so little that is bad that it is entitled to the hearty indorsement of every Member of this body. I am exceedingly glad to know that the Democratic Party, in the preparation of this bill, has adopted its old position of a tariff for revenue tempered with such protection as is made necessary by a changed competitive condition, and that instead of an average tax of 90 per cent, as provided in the Payne law, the burden on the consumers of this country will be lowered to an average of a little less than 25 per cent.

Some of our friends, both Republican and Progressive, are prone to indulge their agricultural and laboring constituencies with fulsome cant relative to the Payne-Aldrich Act, and, lest they forget, I desire to go back and call their attention to the items contained in the free list of this act and make a brief comparison with the items contained in the free list of the pending measure.

We begin at the head of the list with aconite; acorns, raw, dried, or undried but unground; agate; albumen; amber; ambergris; ammonia; analine salts; apatite; arsenic; asbestos—and for the life of me I can not understand why a Republican should desire to place asbestos on the free list unless it was that he permitted his gaze to wander into the political future when he would have need for that particular article, and why our Progressive friends now defend that particular item and insist that it shall be retained, unless they, too, expect to have use for the self-same thing. Asafetida; balm of Gilead; beeswax; bismuth; bladders; and dried blood; Brazilian pebbles; camphor; catgut; whipgut or wormgut, and so forth, ad infinitum; chalk; civet; clay; cochineal; coffee; coir; cotton; cuttlefish bone; dandelion root; divi divi; and dragon's blood. And on down through the list there is ergot; palmleaf fans, to go with the asbestos; felt; fibrin; fishskins; and fossils—and why on earth should the Republican Party insist that fossils come in free when they have the splendid example of fossilized ideas in the preparation of this bill? Gambier; glass enamel; glass plates; grease; fat; guano; gutta-percha; hide rope; hones and whetstones; ice; india rubber; iodine; ipecac; jalap; jet; joss sticks; old junk; kindling wood; lac; lava; leeches—plenty of them after this bill was in operation; lime; litmus; loadstones; manuscripts; meerschaum; oakum; oil cakes; oleo stearin; paper stock; phosphates; plumbago; potash; pulu; quinia; radium; and old rags—not new rags, my friends; not the things that go to make clothing that living men, women, and children wear to protect them from the elements, but old rags, discarded and useless, come in under the beneficent provisions of that bill absolutely free of duty. Rennets, raw or prepared; salicin; salep; sausages; sheep dip; silkworm eggs; skeletons; soda; spunk; storax; tamarinds; tapioca; teeth; terra alba; tobacco stems—not the tobacco; they made the tariff on that from 35 cents to $2.50 per pound; but you were looking out for the best interests of the poor man whom you gentlemen talk about so touchingly, and so you made it possible for him to take his dear Jimmy pipe, go back into a corner of his home, fill it with tobacco stems, and enjoy himself to his heart's content. Turpentine; turtles; vaccine virus; wax; whalebone; wafers; and that closes the list. Made up almost entirely of druggists' sundries, there is only one item in general use that comes in free under the terms of your bill. What a confession for the man who defends it. No wonder tears come to the eyes of gentlemen who support that bill, gentlemen who have talked so eloquently and plead so earnestly for the farmer, for the laboring man, for the man who toils, and give as their sole reason for voting against this measure that it does not protect his interest; that it fails to bring to him that measure of benefit that is his by virtue of his being a citizen of this country. Not only do you tearfully plead now for your fattened industries, but "having ears you have heard not." And your next plea must be to your constituencies whom you have thus betrayed. My prediction is that your next lachrymal demonstration will compare with this, as does a thunderstorm to an October mist.

This bill places agricultural implements, including plows, harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, cotton gins, wagons, carts, and all other agricultural implements of every kind and description, including their repair parts, now taxed 15 per cent ad valorem, to go on the free list; cash registers, linotype and typesetting machines, sewing machines, typewriters, shoe machinery, cream separators, tar and oil spreading machines, used in the construction and maintenance of roads, including their repair parts, all of which are now taxed at 30 per cent ad valorem, go on the free list; gloves, made wholly or in chief value of leather, from horsehides, pigskins, and cattle hides, now taxed at from 75 cents per dozen to $4.75 per dozen, go on the free list; leatherboard or compressed leather, leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps, or other forms suitable for conversion into boots and shoes, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather, leather shoelaces, finished or unfinished, harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or parts, now taxed from 5 to 20 per cent ad valorem, go on the free list; cut nails, cut spikes of iron or steel, horseshoe nails, hobnails, and all other wrought-iron or steel nails, not specially provided for, wire staples, wire nails made of wrought iron or steel, spikes, horse, mule, or ox shoes, and tacks, brads, or sprigs, all now taxed at four-tenths of 1 cent per pound, go on the free list; barbed wire, galvanized wire not larger than No. 6 or not smaller than No. 14, commonly used for fencing purposes, galvanized wire fencing of the same size, together with baling wire, all now taxed at from three-fourths of a cent per pound to 1¼ cents per pound, together with an additional tax of 35 per cent ad valorem, go on the free list; hubs for wheels, posts, head bolts, stave bolts, last blocks, wagon blocks, and so forth, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber not further manufactured than sawed, planed, and tongued and grooved, and now taxed at from 50 cents per thousand feet for rough lumber to $2 per thousand for dressed lumber, go on the free list; clapboards, now taxed at $1.25 per thousand, go on the free list; laths, now taxed at 20 cents per thousand, go on the free list; pickets, palings, staves, and so forth, now taxed at 10 per cent ad valorem, go on the free list; and shingles, now taxed at 50 cents a thousand, to come in free of duty.

I can understand why gentlemen now representing manufacturing interests that have fattened for years at the consumers' expense would oppose this free list containing these items, but I confess I am wholly unable to see how the man who represents a farming or a laboring constituency, or a constituency that is progressive and believes in honest and fair competition, can vote against this reduction that places the trusts manufacturing these articles of daily necessity on the free list and make his peace with his people by handing them the time-honored buncombe of protecting home industries—industries that have long since grown rich and powerful through their privileges at the people's expense.

In 1902 the International Harvester Co. was organized under the laws of New Jersey by the consolidation of the following concerns: The McCormick Harvesting Machine Co., the largest of these concerns with respect to assets and volume of business, organized September 11, 1879, and having a factory at Chicago; the Deering Harvester Co., second in importance, organized in 1899, with its factory at Chicago; the Warder, Bushnell & Glessner Co., manufacturer of the "Champion" line of harvesting machinery, organized October 18, 1886, with its factory at Springfield; the Piano Manufacturing Co., organized March 3, 1881, with its factory at Piano, near Chicago, but later moved to West Pullman, Ill.; the Milwaukee Harvester Co., organized December 15, 1881, with its factory at Milwaukee.

This combination was brought into existence by J. P. Morgan & Co., and its appraised assets, amounting to $67,076,229, was immediately inflated by its incorporators until its capital stock amounted to $192,000,000, and upon this sum the combination thus formed began to base its profits, its prices, and to frame its competition. It has gradually extended its operations until at this time it controls some twenty-odd subsidiary companies, and is complete master of the American market. The net earnings, dividends, additions to surplus, capital stock, together with rate of net earnings on capital stock and surplus, and rate of

dividends on capital stock from the years 1903 to 1911, inclusive, is shown by the following table:

Year.	Net earnings.	Dividends.	Additions to surplus.
1903	$5,641,180.61	$3,600,000.00	[1]2,041,180.61
1904	5,658,534.68	4,800,000.00	858,534.68
1905	7,479,187.36	4,800,000.00	2,679,187.36
1906	7,346,947.32	4,800,000.00	2,546,947.32
1907	8,080,457.51	4,200,000.00	3,880,457.51
1908	8,885,682.13	4,200,000.00	4,685,682.13
1909	14,892,740.21	4,200,000.00	10,692,740.21
1910	16,084,819.19	[1]27,400,000.00	[2]11,315,180.81
1911	15,521,397.89	8,200,000.00	7,321,397.89
Total	89,590,946.90	66,200,000.00	23,390,946.90
Average	9,554,549.68	7,355,555.56	

Year.	Capital stock and surplus.	Rate of net earnings on capital stock and surplus at beginning of year.	Rate of dividend on capital stock.
1902	$120,000,000.00		
1903	122,041,180.61	[3]4.70	3.00
1904	122,899,715.29	4.64	4.00
1905	125,578,902.65	6.08	4.00
1906	128,125,849.97	5.85	4.00
1907	132,006,307.48	6.31	3.50
1908	136,691,989.61	6.73	3.50
1909	147,384,729.82	10.89	3.50
1910	[4]156,069,549.01	10.91	[5]21.95
1911		9.95	5.86
Average	132,310,913.83	7.62	5.91

[1] Includes stock dividend of $20,000,000 from surplus.
[2] Decrease due to stock dividend from surplus.
[3] Computed on capital stock, $120,000,000, Oct. 1, 1902.
[4] Includes $20,000,000 capital stock dividend from surplus.
[5] Rate based on cash dividend and also stock dividend of $20,000,000.

We people in the State of Kansas have had some experience with this same concern. Our attorney general brought a suit to oust them from the State because they were engaged in a conspiracy in restraint of trade, constituted a combination in violation of the Kansas law, and in the Eighty-first Kansas State Report, on page 612, the court in considering that matter found that the practical effect of the merger of these concerns that I have named into the name of the International Harvester Co., of New Jersey, had been to regulate and control the retail and wholesale prices of harvesting machines in the State of Kansas and to secure to the defendant, the International Harvester Co., approximately 85 per cent of the total business within the State. The court further found:

So strong is this monopoly that the testimony in this case discloses that its power to regulate and control the price of machinery throughout the civilized world where such machinery is used has a strong, if not controlling, force in the fixing of prices and the regulation of trade in such commodities, and that under the evidence a complete forfeiture of the defendant's charter and right to transact business within the State of Kansas would be justified.

Proceeding further, the court says:

It is prohibited from using exclusive contracts with its agents and dealers in this State, restraining or restricting them from handling or selling goods or implements of the nature sold by the defendant in this State other than those obtained from the defendant. And it is restrained and prohibited from making any unfair discrimination in the sale of its goods in this State against any section, community, or city, or between persons, for the purpose of destroying competition.

I am amazed that Members of this House, despite this report made by the Department of Commerce and Labor which I have quoted, and despite the finding of our court that this organization constitutes a trust and monopoly in restraint of trade, restraining trade throughout every section of the United States, should still insist upon gentlemen representing the State casting their votes against the users of agricultural machinery and in favor of this concern. I hope no Kansas Representative will dare vote against the bill that tends to free his constituents from the control of this merciless combine, and I am sure his constituents will rebuke him should he do so.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. NEELEY. I will.

Mr. PLATT. Do I understand the gentleman to imply that the International Harvester Co. or other manufacturers of agricultural implements of that kind are objecting to having their products on the free list? I have in my district two large manufacturers of agricultural machinery in competition with the International Harvester Co. I have not heard a word from them, but one of them told me a while ago that they did not care.

Mr. NEELEY. I have heard their sponsors on this floor protest in this House time and again and ask that these rates be maintained, and that this tariff be maintained, in behalf of the American manufacturer.

Mr. PLATT. Recently? Was it in these recent hearings?

Mr. NEELEY. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. PLATT. Has the gentleman heard that statement made recently by those manufacturers?

Mr. NEELEY. I heard the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moss] make an appeal of that kind. It has not been over 15 or 20 minutes ago. It is the same appeal that every special interest makes, to stand by the home industry.

Mr. PLATT. The manufacturers of agricultural machinery that I know do not care. They would just as soon have their products placed on the free list as not. They ship a large part of their products abroad, anyway.

Mr. NEELEY. I hope, then, that the gentleman will not vote against this bill.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEELEY. Certainly.

Mr. LOBECK. And when they ship harvesters abroad they sell to the Australian and Argentinian farmer for $80 what they charge the Kansas or Nebraska farmer $135 for, and thus put those wheat raisers abroad on a better basis and in a position of greater advantage to meet the cost of production.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman should be fair, because he is mistaken about that.

Mr. LOBECK. Well, I am not mistaken, because I have seen it from letters, and have had some statements in which the claim is made that that is true.

Mr. NEELEY. I think that is correct, and I think that is not all of it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption right there?

Mr. NEELEY. I can not yield now. I understand that a wagon that is sold in Kansas for $75 to $80 is shipped across the ocean and sold in Germany, France, or Russia for $65; that a mowing machine that retails for $45 with us is sent to Europe, Asia, or Africa and sold for $35; and that other things are exported and sold in proportion.

Mr. LOBECK. F. o. b.?

Mr. NEELEY. Yes. I am sure my farmer friends will not object to the placing on the free list of cut nails and cut spikes of iron or steel, horseshoe nails, hobnails, and all other wrought-iron or steel nails, wire staples, wire nails made of wrought iron or steel, spikes, and horse, mule, or ox shoes, and so forth. I hope my friend who attempts to justify a vote against this bill will remember, too, that these items are controlled by a trust almost as powerful as the Harvester Trust, and that they will doubtless give this bill the same support the Harvester Trust gives the plan to reduce the tariff on agricultural implements.

And in that connection it might be proper to suggest that, notwithstanding the cry to protect the Nail Trust, in 1910 the total importation of cut nails and cut spikes into the United States amounted to 37,196 pounds, of the total value of $877, while the exports amounted to $407,904, and the amount consumed in the United States amounted to $1,811,000.

Horseshoes and hobnails imported in the same year amounted to 14,829 pounds, of the value of $2,162; the total consumption being of the value of $2,209,162.

Of wire nails the import was 8,648 pounds, of the value of $209, while the export was $1,705,026.

In 1910 we imported 642 pounds of horse and mule shoes of the total value of $105. We consumed that year $8,219,000 worth of these articles. We also imported 517 pounds of tacks, brads, and sprigs of the value of $22, while the exports were $613,004, and yet our Republican friends representing consumers of agricultural implements, barbed and fencing wire, lumber, laths, shingles, nails, and the other articles placed in this free list have the temerity to flaunt in the face of their constituents in this progressive year of 1913 an argument that means a vote to maintain these monopolies. Each of these industries has not only become great and powerful as monopolies at home, but they have so extended themselves that they can go into the home of the foreigner, compete with him on his own soil and against his own labor and machinery. None of these countries into which these trusts have gone and built up their splendid trade have subsidized them by paying them any duty on their imports, thus proving that during every minute of time they have been competing with the foreigner on his own soil they have been filching and robbing the consumer at home, and when you gentlemen on that side return to your farmer constituents to tell them the story of your vote against this bill I trust that you

will then explain to them why it was you helped Andrew Carnegie and his associates in the construction of libraries and other philanthropic institutions in your districts. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, it is too late for us to discuss the issue of changing from the protective system to a revenue system in this House. Our Democratic majority in control of the House have assumed that they have that commission and that we have no authority to combat it; that the commission came from the people, and that we must obey what the people have said.

I take issue, and I say that the people did not in the election decide against the protective system, because the majority vote of over 1,000,000 in this election was upon platforms that pronounced in favor of the protective system. And if that had been an issue where the people could vote "Yea" or "Nay," there is not any doubt in my mind as to what would have been the result of the election.

Yet I am not going to contend here that the Democratic majority should not push this issue to the last limit; but I am going to take the opportunity of saying that if this Democratic measure goes into effect there certainly must be a reversal of public opinion, and that will certainly come in a very short time—just as soon as the people can register their will. My judgment is that few things will be more sought after than a chance to vote.

We are here discussing whether this country, that has constantly profited under the protective system, shall now abandon that system and go on a revenue basis, a basis under which this Government never yet has prospered. Need I refer to national conditions preceding eras of tariff legislation in contrast with those following such legislation? No thoughtful student will deny that seasons of depression called for stimulation of business which was furnished by the system of protection, which in turn were followed by seasons of great business revival. It was true in the McKinley bill of 1890, the Dingley bill of 1897, and we are now, under the present bill, with a volume of trade unequaled in history. The opposite effects are shown in the experiment of revenue tariffs, such as the Wilson bill of 1894.

If proof for these utterances are desired, consult the volume of business transacted, ask the capitalist about the demand for his goods, ask the laborer about the certainty of his employment and the amount of his wages, ask the farmer to contrast the price of his produce sold from the farm in the periods of the protective system as compared to those of the revenue system.

When our Democratic friends were looking for an issue to go to the people in 1884 they saw a full Treasury, a surplus, under a Republican administration, which they seized upon and charged the party in power with the crime of being too prosperous. They declared that they would reduce the surplus if they but had a chance. One of these strange freaks of human conduct caused the people to reject the peerless leader of Maine to accept his opponent, Grover Cleveland. Four years of experience were sufficient, when the same people rejected the Cleveland message of 1887 and its author and commissioned the party of protection to reinstate the system under the McKinley bill. Most of us remember the challenge of that rare leader when in his place in this House he challenged the Democracy upon item after item, in which he urged that the Nation be given a chance to develop her resources on the basis of American wages, and "We will not only supply our own people but we will soon help to supply the world." I heard him declare we could produce all the tin we needed if a duty, protective in character, were allowed. He even challenged the opposition by writing into law that if within a certain time under the law we did not produce one-third of what we used the law was to be invalid. What followed? Tin mills were erected, millions of our own capital were invested, thousands of our own laborers were employed at good wages, tin was placed on the market, and in time prices went down to the consumer below what they were before the duty had been levied; and now consult the Democratic handbook accompanying this Underwood bill for the amount of tin we are exporting. And yet with the tariff on wages are still up while prices of tin are down. This is the American system.

Misrepresentation as well as willful denunciation opened the way for the application of the revenue system which bears the name of Wilson. I have heard upon this floor the declaration that that law was the best tariff law ever placed upon the statute books of any nation. Again I would recommend that men would consult the movement of business, the loss of wages, the destruction of capital, the paralysis of general industry, and the foreclosure of farm mortgages, with no price for farm products with which to pay expenses of living. This may be the measure of good law by some men, but it is not a Republican measure.

If Republican theory of protection means anything, it means to encourage American enterprise by inviting capital to remunerative investment and the employment of labor at American wages, on the theory that home competition will ultimately reduce the price to the consumer below that which he was paying before the industry was established. After this the duties can be lowered. This theory has been pursued by the Republican Party. The Morrill tariff was revised, and we got the McKinley law. Then came the Dingley law, and later came the Payne law. In many items the latter law was not a satisfactory downward revision. At the same time, the free list was increased and duties much reduced. Under it abundant revenue is afforded for the expense of the Government, business has never been better, labor was never more steadily employed or at better wages and under better conditions, and our exports surpass anything known in the past. But the Democratic Party undertook to prove the Nation was hopeless, business was inequitable, the consumer was ground to earth, prices were out of sight, of course, due to the tariff, and the country at large was generally on the verge of ruin. Apropos to this we experienced an unfortunate division in our ranks, which split our party in twain, in which not all the fault was on one side. This permitted a party casting less by 1,300,000 votes than the protective parties to ride into power. Here they are, in control of this floor. Here is their proposed law, designed to go to a foreign country to buy with American money goods made by European labor, instead of investing that money here, employing our labor here, and thus keeping both capital and labor here.

The protective system looks to the employment of American labor and not to the employment of European labor. The protective system looks to a wage that is a living wage and not to a wage on the basis of Europe. When you produce a thing in this country you employ American capital; you invest American capital in the employment of American labor, and if you purchase the goods from our own manufacturers you keep the money here instead of sending it to Europe, and that is the whole situation.

I have heard here time and again, from men for whose judgment I have the greatest respect and for whose courtesy I have equal regard, that we ought to go to Europe for the purchase of our goods rather than stimulate their production at home. I say, gentlemen, that whenever we can make two blades of grass grow at home where one grew before, that is American; and where we refuse to grow the two blades but choose Europe for the second one, that is not American. The man who says, for example, that the sugar industry is not legitimate because it needs the protecting, fostering care of this Government is unscientific and against true Americanism. For if this country can produce the sugar we need by a little fostering in the beginning, it is not only our duty but it is patriotic Americanism to stimulate that industry in the investment of our own capital, in the cultivation of our own fields, and in the employment of our own labor. This will not only tend to do so, but will keep American labor and capital both at home and make this Nation industrious instead of looking to the industry of Europe built upon a European scale of wages. [Applause on the Republican side.] We can produce in this country every pound of sugar we need. We are informed by experts like Dr. Wiley, whose judgment my Democratic friends opposed to this principle will respect, that America has sufficient acreage of sugar-raising lands, if properly cultivated, to produce every pound of sugar we need in this country. A moderate estimate fixes this amount at 278,000,000 acres, enough to produce double our needs. I know of no better practical illustration for our purpose than that furnished by sugar.

The German chemist extended his knowledge to the German beet field and proved that the beet was not only a good sugar-producing plant, but a splendid soil fertilizer at the same time. Our own agricultural experts insisted and still maintain that what Germany is doing we can do. Farmers knew that they could raise beets, but they could not dispose of them. It was impossible to export them to the German beet-sugar plants, and there was no American plant. No sugar plant costing over $1,000,000 would be built until there was some assurance that its product, made by American labor at American wages, would not come into open competition with cheap European labor costing one-third as much.

The Republican leaders, satisfied that we had the ability to produce our own sugar, gave capital the protection necessary to

pay American wages. When was it done? In 1904. What is the result? More than 70 great sugar mills, many superior to anything in Germany, costing nearly $100,000,000, employing thousands of laborers on farm and in factory. What has this industry done? It produces now 600,000 tons of sugar, which sells to-day in our own markets for less price than before duty was levied. What is our contention? It is better to produce here than to go abroad. It is better to pay our producers than European producers. It is better to employ our labor than that of Europe.

Give our sugar producers assurance for a time and you will increase the acreage of beets, enrich the soil by the root plant, multiply the mills, increase the demands for labor, and you will promulgate a true Americanism. Now, my friends, I insist that it is true Americanism to stimulate the industry of sugar producing, and ultimately we will produce all we need. This is the protective policy and it is the American system.

The authors of this bill have dealt a deathblow to the sugar industry, especially that of Louisiana. When questioned "Why this course?" the reply came that sugar was not a legitimate industry. This position is based upon the theory that the same land could be employed more profitably in some other commodity.

For the same reason a similar stroke is dealt the woolgrowing industry of the country. The United States does not produce all the raw wool we need for our woolen mills. However, we do produce 65 per cent, and look to other lands for the remaining 35 per cent. The contention of this bill on this matter is, since we must purchase some wool abroad, it is wrong to levy a duty to protect that produced at home. In other words, the Democrats say it is better to seek the 35 per cent produced by cheap labor in foreign wool-producing countries, such as South America, South Africa, Australia, and Russia, than to stimulate home production by home capital and home labor. So it goes on the free list. Ohio, my State, the third woolgrowing State in the Union, with her 4,000,000 sheep producing the finest grade of wool in the world, must surrender this industry. This Nation, producing 328,000,000 pounds of wool, 65 per cent needed by our numerous mills, must surrender this industry. This bill justifies this vandalism on the basis that our people should cease the futile effort, as they style it, to raise wool and seek it in the markets of Australasia, South America, and South Africa. In other words, destroy one of the most important industries of the farm to justify a theory of tariff.

At a time when prices of meats are high and still increasing, because of the shortage of cattle raising, when common sense would urge the stimulation of sheep raising, not only for its wool product but its mutton value, thus reducing the price of meat by the increase of the supply, we have this freak bill to further embarrass the meat situation, and it is offered as a panacea for high cost of living. This is done in the face of facts produced by the Tariff Board that the sheep countries of the world outside of the United States will not greatly increase the world's product. If this be true, and it is not refuted, how long will it be after the destruction of the industry at home and we are dependent upon the outside world until the foreign monopoly will dictate prices to the American consumer? Why would it not be better to care for the home production, the 65 per cent of our needs, under which system each farmer could stock his farm with a growing flock which could live on forage much of the year at comparatively small expense, which will not only clean up the farm but would fertilize it to better production of other products. Why would it not be better than to look to the world for the 35 per cent by a policy that will ultimately increase this foreign need by 100 per cent and reduce this great Nation to a totally dependent one in the matter of wools, mutton, and lamb?

I hold such a raid upon such an established industry is unpatriotic and un-American. Here is an industry in which 600,000 producers and millions of consumers are directly interested, so individualized that no trust can be formed. It is particularly an industry of the farm, and since it is grown on land worth more than land is worth in South America, South Africa, and other countries, it must be abandoned. This is done in the interest of the consumer. What will be the consumer's chance when we must depend upon the foreign country for our needs? Who will control the price we shall pay? In the case of wool we shall fare as we will in the case of sugar when our prices are fixed by the importer, whose entire interest is in the amount of his imports, of his sales, and the profit. Wool can not be produced profitably with a less duty than 18 cents on scoured wool. This duty will not materially affect the price of clothing to the consumer, since 6 to 9 pounds will make the suit. A difference of $1 or $1.50 on a suit will be absorbed by the middleman, and the consumer will not secure the advantage. In order to save an imaginary sum the Democratic Party proceeds to destroy one of the country's best industries. I repeat that any raid upon an important industry such as the wool or sugar that will ultimately destroy it is not patriotic in this nor in any other country, and the time will inevitably come when the man who votes thus to destroy will hear a voice that is louder and more determined than any heard in this hall; and I am sure the time will not be long delayed if this measure goes into effect.

One argument oft repeated on this floor is that the protective system depletes our resources. I take issue on this statement. We ask protection for the woolgrower. One consideration is the value of sheep raising to the soil of the country. No farm was ever depleted by a flock of sheep, but invariably benefited.

For the same reason we ask for protection for the sugar beet as a root-producing crop, which as such is a great fertilizer of the soil as scientifically demonstrated in the agricultural laboratories and experiment stations of Germany and this country. A similar argument by our opponents printed in their handbook is to the effect that our system is designed to continue old, worn-out machinery that should be discarded and which must be discarded if we were on a free-trade basis. This statement was made by the distinguished floor leader of the majority, the author of this bill.

Let us examine the facts. I take it if the machinery of production is depleted and worn-out, production must either stand still or decrease. It surely would not increase. Is this true? Take my own State as an example. The last census compares the figures of 1909 with 1904. We have 15,138 manufactories in Ohio, in which are engaged 523,000 persons, representing a capitalization of $1,301,000,000. In 1909 this capital employed 446,934 wage earners, expending in wages $317,597,000. The products amounted to $1,437,936,000, to produce which materials costing $824,212,000 were utilized. The value added by manufacture was thus $613,734,000. When these figures are compared with the year 1904, the census reports the following increases: The increase in number of manufacturing plants was 9.8 per cent. The increase of wage earners was 22.7 per cent. The increase of products, which is the real test of the machinery, was 49.2 per cent. In the face of these figures, what becomes of the contention of the Democratic policy of depleted machinery? In this case, as in all others, facts and figures are your greatest enemies, but mere denouncement or loud declamation does not serve as a substitute for the census report. The increase in the iron and steel industry from 1899 to 1909 was in laborers 35.4 per cent and product 99.6 per cent. In the same period the meat business showed an increase of 144.6 per cent. In the five years from 1904 to 1909 the flour milling business showed an increase of 16.5 per cent. In the same period the clothing business, which represents $45,000,000, increased 38 per cent. The State shows similar growth in printing and publishing business; in automobiles, in which Ohio stands second; in the boot and shoe business the increase reached 22.6 per cent; in the clay products, in which the State ranks first, the increase from 1899 to 1909 was 85.2 per cent, being 18.1 per cent of the total product in the United States. Ohio also stands first in the manufacture of carriages, wagons, and so forth, this industry alone representing, in 1909, $21,949,000.

There is not a single industry of farm or factory, mine or manufactory, in my great State that is not seriously crippled by this proposed Underwood bill. What has this bill done for the farmer? In the desire to decrease the price of his produce in the belief that this price is the cause of high cost of living, his crop must be placed on the free list. In other words what he has to sell must come down in price, no matter what he must pay for what he buys. Wool, with 11 cents protection, must go on the free list—sugar receives like treatment. Corn, now protected with 15 cents per bushel, goes on the free list. Broom corn, now protected by $3 per ton, goes on the free list. Buckwheat, with 15 cents protection, also goes on the free list. Potatoes, now protected by 25 cents per bushel, go on the free list. Swine protected at $1.50 per head, also goes on free list. Like treatment is accorded lard, meats, milk, cream, rags, rye, seeds, and many other products.

What has not been robbed of all protection has been fatally reduced. Horses, protected at $30 per head, are to have $10 duty. Sheep, with a duty of $1.50 per head protection, reduced to one-third or 10 per cent ad valorem. Oats, with 15 cents protection, is reduced to 10 cents. Wheat, with 25 cents duty, is reduced to 10 cents, while flour, the finished product of wheat, goes on the free list. Butter, with 6 cents protection, is reduced to 3 cents. Beans, with protection of 45 cents per bushel, are reduced to 25 cents. Hay, with $4 per ton protec-

tion, reduced to $2 per ton. This is sufficient to show the viciousness of this measure as applied to the producers of wealth of the country.

The reasons offered for such reduction as announced by the brilliant floor leader of the majority, who has won the admiration of both friend and foe by his winning personality, was that first, protection is unconstitutional; secondly, it is the chief cause of high cost of living; and thirdly, it is the mother of trusts. If the protective system is unconstitutional surely Hamilton, Madison, and Washington, all of whom were protectionists, and each of whom was a member of the convention that framed the Constitution, would have known it. I place the judgment of the framers of that instrument against the modern Democratic free trader.

If protection is the cause of high cost of living, how does it appear that high prices are on the unprotected articles as the protected, and that high prices rule in free-trade countries the same as protected countries? If protection is the mother of trusts, what explanation have we of the existence of trusts in articles not protected, such as oil, salt, etc.? Or why do trusts thrive in free-trade England? The facts are that great combinations are the result of modern business methods for the sake of saving expense of operations. Where combination is possible, competition is impossible. This is not a subject of the tariff, but a subject of regulation and control.

High prices should be interpreted the "cost of high living" rather than the "high cost of living." It is due to many causes. First, the well-to-do situation of the average man has placed him in a position to gratify increased demands. He is becoming more extravagant. He wants more and his standards of living are gradually increasing. Secondly, the drift of population from country to city disturbs the balance between production and consumption. It increases the demand for consumption more rapidly than the supply of production. This also causes prices of products to go up. Thirdly, the multiplication and improvement of facilities for communication, making the world but one neighborhood, has a like tendency upward in prices. Fourthly, the increase in number of the middle men between the original producers and the ultimate consumer compels an upward trend of price to the consumer, though it might not change it for the producer. The farmer who sells his fat cattle at a price that steak could sell at 15 cents will see the steer go through a half dozen different hands, each of which must have a margin, so that when it reaches the hotel table it will command more than three times the original price. Fifthly, another cause of high price is the great bulk of money in circulation in our country. These causes are conditions of industry and not results of tariff duties.

This legislation is a playing of the town and city against the country. It goes upon the basis that it is in the interest of the consumer at the expense of the producer. The Democratic leaders say the consumer must always be considered before the producer. This is the sheerest demagogy. Who is the consumer, and who is the producer? How can you separate them in their interests? How can you benefit the consumer unless you also benefit the producer?

Wise legislation will look to the production in order that consumption is possible. The vast proportion of the consuming element is made up of men and women who have nothing with which to buy production except the wage they earn. Legislation that does not look to the supply of this wage is un-American. The chief thing in the mind of the consumer is not the price for which the producer sells his articles of necessity but whether he has the money with which to pay the price. The legislation that does not provide wages is bitter enmity to the consumer, no matter how loud its devotees profess that they are looking to the consumer and not to the producer.

If protection stands for anything, it is for the welfare of the consumer. It looks to building up industry here. It invests all our capital at home. It employs all our labor at home at wages on an average of double those paid in other countries.

Put this proposed tariff legislation into effect, remove the protection from the producer, seek the supply of your needs in foreign markets, then note the effect of your law upon the consumer, for whom you are now agonizing. Every dollar's worth of goods you purchase from abroad that could be produced at home you take from the labor at home and give to the labor abroad. Every dollar you send abroad for goods you could have purchased at home you reduce the business at home for the sake of the business abroad.

Put this proposed law into force by which you remove the protection of our farms, our manufactories, and industry in general, and one of two things must follow: Either the business must be seriously crippled, if not ruined, in all the various operations, or else labor here must be reduced to the basis of the labor in the countries with which you propose to compete. In either case, what becomes of the consumer? Oh, yes; we have heard it said that wages will not be lowered, that business will not be hurt; that when we remove the tariff we will invade the markets of Europe, which will increase the demand for our goods, and thus prices of both goods and labor will increase. This is placed on the basis that prices are ruled by the principle of the law of diminishing returns. That threadbare argument used by the author of this bill sounds very sophomoric, as it has the odor of the classroom of the college professor. The price of a thing is not determined by the cost of it. The price at which a thing sells does not measure the desire for it. The price of an article is always determined by the ability of the consumer to pay for it. I make an article, it costs me so much. My friend from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] makes the same article. It costs him less. Both articles are sold in the market. What I get does not depend upon the cost to me. It depends entirely upon the ability of the consumer to pay. If he can not pay, I can not sell, no matter how much or how little the thing costs. And I say here and now the man who constantly talks of the consumer, losing sight of the consumer's power to buy, which is his employment, determined wholly by the ability of the producer to pay wages with which consumption is made possible, that man is wrong. One will say, oh, it is a matter of production; the other will say, no, it is a matter of consumption. I do not care about the juggling of words. If we are out in a boat and it capsizes, we will not dispute whether we went down or the water came up. The effect is just the same. The sensible thing in legislation is to see that the producer can make it possible for the existence of a consumer. That is what the protective policy is pledged to do. Oh, but, you say, we want to open the markets of the world to our goods, as if the world's markets are not open now.

Has there ever been a period in the history of any country like ours at present? Where is the capital that can not find investment? Where is the laborer who can not find employment? Where is the man whose station is not better to-day, so far as common weal is concerned, than at any period past? If you have anything to sell, you can find a market. If you wish to buy, you have the money, or if you do not have it you do have the opportunity to work for it. The volume of trade, both domestic and foreign, is stupendous, unlike any other period. Consult statistics. Our foreign commerce is four and a quarter billion of dollars and our domestic trade is the wonder of the world. Our exports for nine months ending the month of September were as follows:

1909	$1,141,030,311
1910	1,193,333,862
1911	1,428,710,426

For the seven months ending January the exports were as follows: 1911, $1,239,615,111—more than nine months in 1909; 1912, $1,289,855,419—more than nine months in 1910; 1913, $1,506,461,628—more than nine months in 1911.

This marvelous export trade is under the protective system, which our friends, the Democrats, say closes the foreign markets to our goods. I am not averse to opening up the markets to the sale of our goods. That has been done, as the figures show. But I am averse to opening up the markets for the purchase of foreign goods which we can produce at home.

The plea of the doctrinaire that we should proceed on the broad plane of cosmopolitan philanthropy which includes in our scope the whole world has no hold upon me if it means detriment at home. Free trade means equality of conditions. Europe does not give her labor the same chance we give ours. I am ready to open the gates when Europe lifts her labor to our plane, but I will not vote to lower our labor to her plane. That is the entire contention in this proposed legislation.

In conclusion, I am opposed to this proposed bill because it seriously cripples the agricultural interests. It strikes a death blow at two most valuable products—wool and sugar. It undertakes to benefit the resident of the city at the expense of the farmer. It proposes duties that will seriously cripple every woolen and cotton manufactory in the country. Its policy toward the boot and shoe trade, toward the earthenware industry as well as the glass industry is most hurtful. Not a schedule is touched that is not in danger of serious crippling. The first party to feel the hurt will be the laborer. While all will admit that duties when unnecessarily high should be reduced, which has been the history of the Republican Party, I believe the majority of the people will reject this revenue tariff measure, which is professedly an abandonment of our protective system.

If this measure becomes a law—and I am frank to say I expect the Democrats to pass it—we will see whether history will repeat itself. It is only 16 years from a former Wilson bill, which most of us still remember.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. ADAMSON, having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

CARL L. COOPER.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read:

House resolution 79.

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, Carl L. Cooper be authorized to act as special employee of the House of Representatives and receive compensation at the rate of $1,800 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided for.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I understand this is the employee that it was understood by the House should be given to the leader of the Progressive Party on the floor?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is the recognition of the gentleman's party in his portion of the employees of the House.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. MURDOCK, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution making an appropriation for defraying the expenses of the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives authorized to attend and represent the Senate and House at the unveiling and dedication of the memorial to Thomas Jefferson at St. Louis, Mo.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD (at 9 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, April 26, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3466) granting a pension to Eugene H. Chamberlain; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4024) to correct the military record of Charles J. Lanning; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 4289) for the erection of a public building at Linton, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 4290) to provide an allowance for loss of distilled spirits deposited in internal-revenue warehouses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 4291) providing for the erection of a public building at Marion, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 4292) providing for the registry of officers, clerks, and employees in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: A bill (H. R. 4293) to establish a botanical laboratory at Reno, Nev.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 4294) providing for the erection of memorials to Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 4295) to establish the Fredericksburg and Adjacent National Battle Fields Memorial Park in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 4296) providing for the creation of a commission to be known as the Mississippi spillway belt commission, defining its power and duties, and making an appropriation for its expenses; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 4297) authorizing additional desert-land entries; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 4298) granting an increase of pension to widows of all soldiers of the Mexican War; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4299) to require all common carriers engaged in interstate and foreign commerce to collect, accept, receive, transmit, and deliver all express packages not exceeding in weight 50 pounds; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4300) to prohibit interference with commerce among States and Territories and with foreign nations, and to remove obstructions thereto, and to prohibit the transmission of certain messages by telegraph, telephone, cable, or other means of communication between States and Territories and foreign nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4301) to amend section 57, subsection n, of the act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4302) to revive the right of action under the act of March 12, 1863 (12 Stat., 820); to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 4319) granting to the city and county of San Francisco certain rights of way in, over, and through certain public lands, the Yosemite National Park and Stanislaus National Forest, and certain lands in the Yosemite National Park, the Stanislaus National Forest, and the public lands in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DALE: Resolution (H. Res. 76) to appoint John O. Snyder a special messenger to serve in and about the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution (H. Res. 77) directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to report on holding corporations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 78) authorizing and directing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions of transportation to Mount Vernon, Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLACKMON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 76) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to accept the title to 4,000 acres of land at or near Anniston, Ala., for the purpose of establishing maneuver camps, rifle and artillery ranges, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 77) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Massachusetts, relative to the sale of certain land by the United States to the city of Chelsea, Mass.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Massachusetts, relative to the price of coal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Massachusetts, relative to the sale of small fruits; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. KAHN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relating to the preservation of the natural conditions of Lake Tahoe and of establishing by judicial decree the conflicting claims to the use of the waters thereof; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to making investigations and experiments as to nature and cure of tuberculosis; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, protesting against the proposed reduction in the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, protesting against the proposed reduction in the duty on citrus fruits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to action by Congress in directing an investigation through the Department of Agriculture of measures for the

protection of fruit from frost damage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Legislature of the State of California, relative to the continuation by the United States of surveys for the construction of storage reservoirs for the impounding of flood waters in the Sierra Nevada Mountains in the State of California, and asking that an appropriation be made for forwarding the work as speedily as possible; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, in favor of the acquisition of Monticello by the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requesting that certain abandoned military reservations be set aside to be used as sanatoria for sufferers from tuberculosis; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 4304) granting an increase of pension to Herbert Thayer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4305) granting a pension to Dora Dee Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4306) granting a pension to Ernest Holmes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4307) granting an increase of pension to Lucretia Grice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 4308) granting a pension to Jane F. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 4309) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of J. Lucius Bell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: A bill (H. R. 4310) concerning certain moneys collected from Bernard Citroen as customs duties and declared by the United States Supreme Court to have been illegally exacted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 4311) to authorize the President to appoint Brig. Gen. Frank D. Baldwin to the grade of major general in the United States Army and place him on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 4312) granting a pension to Gertrude V. Ross; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 4313) for the relief of Josie Myer Reynolds; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 4314) for the relief of the trustees of the Zion Methodist Church, of York County, Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4315) for the relief of Charles E. Boltz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 4316) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4317) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: A bill (H. R. 4318) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cause patent to issue to Erik J. Aanrud upon his homestead entry for the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 15, township 159 north, range 73 west, in the Devils Lake land district, N. Dak.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 4320) granting a pension to Charles Wedeke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4321) for the relief of Warren E. Day; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the City Council of Norfolk, Va., relative to the acquisition and operation by the United States Government of the telegraph and telephone utilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), memorial of the City Council of Kansas City, Mo., favoring a Federal telegraph and telephone system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), memorial of the Daughters of the American Revolution of the State of Colorado, against the transfer of any part of the public domain of the United States, etc., to the individual States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), petition of the Guidon Club, New York, protesting against any action by Congress to amend the Constitution granting suffrage to women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of Amos R. Dewees, of Bryan; B. A. Welch, of Van Wert; Clyde Smith, of Leipsic; and sundry citizens of Paulding, Ohio, favoring exempting from income tax mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Adam Deibel and Robert A. Youngen, New Philadelphia, Ohio, and T. J. Halen, Canal Dover, Ohio, protesting against an income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of C. H. Kripendorf, sr., of Cincinnati, Ohio, against placing shoes on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Wilmanns Bros. Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., against proposed amendments and changes to Schedule M, paragraph 412, tariff act of 1909, relative to lithography; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' International Union of America, against unlimited free trade with the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Flavoring Extract Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring keeping vanilla beans and oil of lemon on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Walter Travers Daniel, of New York, and the North Western Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring exemption from income tax in tariff bill of mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Blodgett Milling Co., of Janesville, Wis., against tariff upon rye, buckwheat, and the products thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Herman Reel & Co., against the proposed duty upon raw furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of E. May Caldwell and others, favoring legislation for the suppression of the white-slave traffic; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Massachusetts Peace Society, favoring the repeal of the toll-exemption clause in the Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, favoring an amendment to the income-tax section of the tariff bill exempting from tax mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' International Union of America, against unlimited free trade with the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the C. J. Tagliabon Manufacturing Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the reduction of duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Passaic Board of Trade of the State of New Jersey, with briefs submitted by sundry Passaic manufacturers, against the reduction of tariff affecting the woolen, cotton, handkerchief, chemical, metal, and paper industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Memorial of the St. Louis Association of Credit Men, favoring prompt legislative action on banking and currency reform; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, favoring exemption of mutual life insurance companies from income tax as proposed in tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Isaac Prouty & Co., of Spencer, Mass., against placing shoes on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Atlantis Daily Greek Newspaper, against the duty on currants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, of Richmond, Va., favoring a law for the reform of banking and currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Alex. D. Shaw & Co., of New York, N. Y., favoring a reduction of the duty on wines, whiskies, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Star Expansion Bolt Co., of New York City, and D. Saunders' Sons (Inc.), of Yonkers, N. Y., against a reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Salts Textile Manufacturing Co. and the Angora Goat Raisers and Goat Breeders' Association, of Kimble County, Tex., against the 30 per cent duty on raw mohair; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Banner Milling Co. and the Thornton & Chester Milling Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., against placing flour on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Snyder & Wheeler, of New York, N. Y., against the duty on vegetable ivory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of Cigar Makers' International Union of America, against unlimited free trade in Philippine cigars and tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Petition of Tempe (Ariz.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, in favor of legislation for the closing of the Panama-Pacific Exposition on Sundays; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. HILL: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Josie Myer Reynolds, of Smith County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL: Memorial of the Rocky Mountain Ore Producers' Association, against the proposed reduction of the duty on lead; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the proposed duty on wheat, oats, and barley; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVY: Petition of the Cigar Makers' International Union of America, Chicago, Ill., protesting against the importation of Philippine tobacco and cigars free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York Credit Men's Association, New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation making an immediate reform in the present banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of North Carolina monazite miners and other citizens of Shelby, N. C., favoring an increase in the duty on monazite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. H. Lane & Co., New York, protesting against any change in the present tariff on cotton yarns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of N. L. Carpenter & Co. and sundry citizens of New York, N. Y., protesting against an income tax being placed on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of sundry Greek-American citizens of Providence, R. I., against the duty on currants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Executive Board of Trade of the Rhode Island State Federation of Women's Clubs, against the measure to place the control of forest reservations in the hands of the individual States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Rhode Island State Branch, Cigar Makers' Union, No. 94, against free trade with the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Amalgamated Lace Operatives of America, Branch No. 16, West Barrington, R. I., against the reduction of the tariff on laces and lace curtains; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Rhode Island Association Opposed to Women Suffrage, Peace Dale, R. I., protesting against the passage of legislation granting suffrage to women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of John R. Dennis and David A. Craig, Providence, R. I.; William Wheelock, Greystone, R. I.; and Lawton & Co., Pawtucket, R. I., protesting against any radical change in the present tariff on wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of James Dillingham; Maurice H. Stearns; W. S. Redfield, general agent of the New England Mutual Life Insurance Co.; George M. Parks, of the Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Providence, R. I.; Robert Brindle, superintendent of the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Woonsocket, R. I.; Alfred Green, superintendent of the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Pawtucket, R. I.; and John W. Manley, Providence, R. I., protesting against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Embusso Club, John Hutchens Cady, the Rhode Island State Federation of Women's Clubs, the Bachelor Girls' Club, the Read, Mark, and Learn Club, the Audubon Society of Rhode Island, the Thimble Club, the Rush-Light Club, the Rhode Island Field Naturalist Club, and H. L. Madison, all of Providence, R. I.; Forest P. Beck, Oliphant Club, W. M. C. Little, John P. Swan, and others, Newport, R. I., favoring the passage of legislation prohibiting the importation of feathers and plumes of wild birds for commercial use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: Petition of sundry business men of Golconda, Virginia City, and 7 other towns of Nevada, favoring the passage of legislation to compel concerns selling goods direct by mail to the consumer to contribute their portion of the funds for the development of the community, county, and State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the passage of legislation reducing the wages of the customs guards at the port of San Francisco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Elko County Cattle Association, Elko County, Nev., protesting against the placing of wool and meat on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of sundry citizens of the thirtieth district of New York, favoring an amendment to the income-tax provisions, especially with reference to life insurance companies, in the proposed tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Rev. John C. Breaker and sundry citizens of Worcester, East Douglas, Grafton, and North Uxbridge, Mass., favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls or the arbitration of the question with the British Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILDER (by request): Petitions of W. H. Whiting and sundry citizens of Barre, Charlton, Leicester, New Salem, Petersham, Princeton, and Spencer, Mass.; members of the Second Baptist Church of Palmer; and W. R. Kimbell and sundry citizens of Lancaster, Mass., favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *April 26, 1913.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father Almighty, humbly and reverently do we bow in Thy sacred presence, realizing how utterly dependent we are upon Thee for life and all its attendant blessings. Thou hast anticipated all our needs, our longings, hopes, and aspirations; yet how often in the stress of life, its cares, and temptations do we forget the mind that conceives, the heart that loves, the hand that would guide us to better thoughts, nobler living. Strengthen our minds, purify our hearts, and make us willing to be led in Thy ways, after the manner of the world's great Exemplar. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has the credentials of Hon. JOHN J. MITCHELL, of Massachusetts, properly certified to by the governor of the State and the secretary of the Commonwealth, and Mr. MITCHELL will come forward and be sworn. If there are any other gentlemen who have not been sworn they will please come forward.

Mr. JOHN J. MITCHELL appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office. [Applause.]

ASSAULT ON REPRESENTATIVE SIMS.

Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the special committee appointed under resolution 59, I desire to present a privileged report and to give notice that it will be called up as a matter of privilege immediately upon the conclusion of the tariff bill. I also desire, Mr. Speaker, to ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia, chairman of the special committee, sends up to the Clerk's desk a report and asks that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia. Excluding the testimony, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Excluding the testimony, and the gentleman gives notice that he will call it up immediately after the disposition of the tariff bill by the House.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman, does the testimony accompany the report?

Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia. The testimony accompanies the report, but it is not desired to print that in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. And that will be printed as a part of the House report?

Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia. It is to be printed as a substantive part of the report.

The SPEAKER. The report will be printed in the RECORD and the report and the accompanying evidence will be printed as a separate document.

Mr. MANN. And I take it that it will be referred to the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER. And will be referred to the House Calendar.

The report is as follows:

[House Report No. 6, Sixty-third Congress, first session.]

IN THE CASE OF CHARLES C. GLOVER FOR ASSAULT UPON REPRESENTATIVE THETUS W. SIMS.

Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia, from the select committee appointed pursuant to House resolution 59, submitted the following report:

The select committee of the House of Representatives appointed pursuant to House resolution 59, and charged with the duty of investigating the alleged assault committed on Friday, April 18, 1913, by one Charles C. Glover, a resident of the city of Washington, upon the person of Representative THETUS W. SIMS, a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Tennessee in the Sixty-third Congress, begs leave to report that it met on Monday, April 21, 1913, requested Representative SIMS to be present at a hearing on Tuesday, April 22, 1913, at 10.30 o'clock a. m., and notified Mr. Glover of the time and place of the hearing, also informing him that he could be present in person or by counsel and make any statement to the committee which seemed to him or his counsel to be proper. The committee also caused to be issued the summons of the House of Representatives to several actual witnesses of the alleged assault upon Representative SIMS by Mr. Glover.

The committee met for the hearing on Tuesday, April 22, 1913, at 10.30 a. m., and from the testimony adduced found the facts of the assault as follows:

FINDINGS OF FACTS.

"That Representative THETUS W. SIMS while on his way from his residence in the city of Washington to the Post Office Department on official business on Friday morning, April 18, 1913, was accosted in Farragut Square, in the city of Washington, by Charles C. Glover, who, after applying to him certain epithets, assaulted him by striking him in the face.

"That the said Charles C. Glover committed the assault upon Representative SIMS because of statements made by Representative SIMS in debate on the floor of the House of Representatives at several times during the session of the House in the Sixty-second Congress, in which Congress the said Representative SIMS was also a Representative from the State of Tennessee."

While Mr. Glover did not appear at the hearing either in person or by counsel, he sent a letter, which will be elsewhere set out in full in this report. In that letter is contained the following statement, admitting the assault upon Representative SIMS:

The preamble of the resolution sets forth with substantial accuracy the facts of the incident therein referred to. It is true that in a moment of passion, moved by what I deemed to be an extraordinary provocation, I, who have the most profound respect for the law, took the law into my own hands. It is needless to say that in so acting I had no intention to invade any privilege of the House of Representatives, or of any of its Members as such; nor, indeed, did I at the time understand that any claim could be made that I was so doing.

By the said House resolution 59 your committee was charged with the further duty of reporting—

a course of procedure to be followed in dealing with the said C. C. Glover, to the end that the rights and the privileges of the House of Representatives and its Members should be maintained and protected.

The performance of this duty has necessarily involved a consideration of the privileges of the House of Representatives and its Members and of the powers of the House in relation to them. After giving to these topics such consideration as the time allowed by the House for the making of this report has permitted, your committee has reached, upon reason and precedent, the following conclusions:

First. That for the purpose of this inquiry it is not necessary to consider what privileges, if any, the House of Representatives or its Members may possess other than those expressly stated in the Constitution.

By section 6 of Article I of the Constitution it is provided inter alia that:

They (the Senators and Representatives) shall in all cases, except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either House they (the Senators and Representatives) shall not be questioned in any other place.

The scope of this immunity was discussed by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Kilbourn *v.* Thompson (103 U. S., 168), to which we will later refer. The court said:

Mr. Justice Story (sec. 866 of his Commentaries on the Constitution) says:

"The next great and vital privilege is the freedom of speech and debate, without which all other privileges would be comparatively unimportant or ineffectual. This privilege also is derived from the practice of the British Parliament, and was in full exercise in our colonial legislatures and now belongs to the legislation of every State in the Union as matter of constitutional right."

It seems to us that the views expressed in the authorities we have cited are sound and are applicable to this case. It would be a narrow view of the constitutional provision to limit it to words spoken in debate. The reason of the rule is as forcible in its application to written reports presented in that body by its committees, to resolutions offered, which, though in writing, must be reproduced in speech, and to the act of voting, whether it is done vocally or by passing between the tellers. In short, to things generally done in a session of the House by one of its Members in relation to the business before it.

It may be thought by some that the constitutional immunity implied in the words "for any speech or debate in either House they shall not be questioned in any other place" relates merely to lifelong immunity from legal proceedings against the Member. The term "questioned," however, has always been construed liberally. In Kilbourn *v.* Thompson, supra, the court quotes with approval from an English case, Stockdale *v.* Hansard (36 Common Law Rep., 67):

For speeches made in Parliament by a member to the prejudice of any other person or hazardous to the public peace, that member enjoys complete immunity.

This complete immunity guarantees exemption from questioning not only within but also without the courts. Obviously, if one may not question a Member for words spoken in debate under the processes of law, he can not do so by taking the law in his own hand.

In Wilson's Lectures on Law, delivered by Mr. Justice James Wilson, of the United States Supreme Court (vol. 2, p. 156), it is said:

The Members of the National Legislature * * * shall not for any speech or debate in either House be questioned in any other place. In England the freedom of speech is, at the opening of every new Parliament, particularly demanded of the King in person by the Speaker of the House of Commons. The liberal provision which is made by our Constitution upon this subject may be justly viewed as a very considerable improvement in the science and the practice of government. In order to enable and encourage a representative of the public to discharge his public trust with firmness and success it is indispensably necessary that he should enjoy the fullest liberty of speech, and that he should be protected from the resentment of everyone, however powerful, to whom the exercise of that liberty may occasion offense.

Second. An assault upon a Member of the House of Representatives for words spoken in debate is a breach of its privileges and a contempt of the House.

This has not only been the uniform opinion of the House of Representatives from the earliest times, but is necessarily true because of the reasons which lie at the foundation of the constitutional provision. As just stated, it was conceived that absolute freedom of speech and of debate in the Legislative Assembly was essential to the public welfare, and it was intended that the voice of a Member, and of his constituents speaking through him, should not be silenced by any fear of legal or personal consequences. A Member, of course, may plead his constitutional privilege in bar of any action based upon his utterances, but unless his person is likewise immune from attack for the same cause, the purpose of the Constitution would be but half accomplished.

Nor is the House as a collective whole less concerned in preserving this freedom of debate than are the individual Member and his constituency. In order that the final action of any deliberative body may represent the joint wisdom of its members, there must be unrestrained exchange of thought and opinion, and whatever tends to silence one subtracts just so much from the efficiency of the whole. A breach of a Member's privilege of unconditional freedom of debate therefore reacts upon the House; and the House in treating it as a contempt against itself does so with no desire to magnify its office nor to vindicate its wounded dignity, but to preserve and defend its legislative integrity and power. Of this legislative integrity and power it is the sole guardian, and it may at all times protect that integrity and power by appropriate action taken for and by itself.

CONGRESSIONAL PRECEDENTS.

There are parliamentary precedents for the conclusion that an assault upon a Member of the House of Representatives for words spoken in debate is a breach of its privileges and a contempt of the House.

During the first session of the Twenty-second Congress, in 1832, an aggravated assault was made by Samuel Houston upon William Stanberry, a Member from the State of Ohio, for words spoken in debate; and after full hearing and exhaustive discussion this was held by the House of Representatives to be a viola-

tion of its rights and privileges, authorizing the arrest and reprimand of the offender at the bar of the House. (1st sess. 22d Cong., Journal, pp. 590 et seq.; 2 Hinds' Precedents, 1616 et seq.)

During the first session of the Thirty-fourth Congress (1857) there occurred the regrettable assault by Preston S. Brooks, a Member of the House from the State of South Carolina, on the person of Charles Sumner, a Senator from Massachusetts, because of language used by the latter in debate. A special committee of the Senate having been appointed to investigate the occurrence, reported the Senate powerless to proceed in the matter against a Member of the House except by making complaint to the House of the assault. In their report the committee said:

We have examined the precedents which are to found only in the proceedings of the House of Representatives, the Senate never having been called on to pronounce its judgment in a similar case. In the House of Representatives different opinions have at various times been expressed by gentlemen of great eminence and ability, among whom may be mentioned the late President of the United States, Mr. Polk, the late Judge Barbour of the Supreme Court, and Mr. Beardsley, of New York; yet the judgment of the House has always held an assault upon a Member for words spoken in debate to be a violation of the privileges of the House. (2 Hinds' Precedents, 1622.)

In the second session of the Thirty-eighth Congress (1865), one A. P. Field, in an attempt to intimidate and deter William D. Kelley from the free and fearless exercise of his rights and duties as a Member of Congress in voting and deciding upon a pending subject of legislation, made an assault upon Mr. Kelley, which the House held to be a breach of its privilege and caused the offender to be brought before the bar of the House and reprimanded. (2d sess. 38th Cong., H. Rept. 10; 2 Hinds' Precedents, 1625.)

Third. Such an assault, when committed on the person of a Member for words spoken in debate, constitutes a contempt of the House in which he is then sitting, although the words may have been spoken in a prior House.

It will be observed that the speeches made by Representative SIMS in the House of Representatives which Mr. Glover admits constituted the provocation for this assault were delivered by Representative SIMS during the Sixty-second Congress; but, while this raises a question not discussed in earlier precedents, it does not change, in our opinion, the status of the case. This becomes clear when we contrast the individual privileges of the Member and the collective privilege of the House.

It is obvious that the Constitution, in providing that Senators and Representatives shall not be questioned in any other place for any speech or debate in either House extends an immunity unlimited as to space and unrestricted in point of time. One who has been a Member of either body, whether longer so or not, can nevertheless plead this constitutional immunity against any attack which may be made upon him at any time by reason of any speech or debate which took place during his service. The shield of the Constitution, once extended, protects him so long as he may live.

The House, on the other hand, being simply the aggregate of its membership, is itself concerned with those things which affect the freedom and efficiency of its constituent Members. A Member of the Sixty-second Congress, for instance, who enters the Sixty-third Congress brings with him his constitutional immunity against question for his action in the former body; and in order that he may be free to perform, without fear or hindrance, his duties in the latter, it is both its right and duty to resent as an attack upon itself any violation of his constitutional privilege. Its attention should properly be directed, not to the time when this privilege accrued, but to the time when it was violated.

Fourth. The House of Representatives has power under the authority of the Constitution to punish as a contempt against it such a breach of its privileges as is involved in the assault upon Representative SIMS by the said C. C. Glover.

Both parliamentary precedent and high authority support this power. In addition to those precedents we have previously mentioned, there are the proceedings had by this House in 1795, in the first session of the Fourth Congress, against Robert Randall and Charles Whitney for attempted bribery; in the same Congress, against James Gunn for challenging a Member to a duel; in 1818 against John Anderson, in the first session of the Fifteenth Congress, for attempted bribery; in 1857, in the first session of the Thirty-fourth Congress, against James W. Simonton for contumacy as a witness; in 1874, in the second session of the Forty-third Congress, against Richard B. Irwin for a similar offense; and on the part of the Senate of the United States, in the first session of the Sixth Congress, against William Duane for a libel on the Senate; in 1848, in the first session of the Thirtieth Congress, against John Nugent for the publication of a secret treaty.

In the second session of the Forty-first Congress (1870) one Patrick Wood so assaulted Charles H. Porter, a Member of the House from the State of Virginia, in the city of Richmond, that the latter was delayed in returning to the House, although it did not appear that the act was done by reason of any words spoken by Porter in debate, but nevertheless it impeded the return of the Member to his place in the House and was held to be a breach of its privileges and a contempt. The offender was accordingly arrested and subjected by warrant of the House to three months' imprisonment in the jail of the District of Columbia. (2 Hinds' Precedents, 1626 et seq.)

As further illustrating not only the right but the power of the House to protect the constitutional privileges of its Members, the case of Charles V. Culver, a Representative in the Thirty-ninth Congress, should not be overlooked. The House having been advised of his arrest and detention under civil process in the hands of the sheriff of Venango County, Pa., issued a warrant to its Sergeant at Arms directing him to take Mr. Culver from the custody of the sheriff, which was accordingly done.

In the letter of Mr. C. C. Glover to this committee, in which he admits the assault upon Representative THETUS W. SIMS, but challenges the power and authority of the House to take notice of his act or punish him for it, he relies upon the case of Kilbourn *v.* Thompson (103 U. S.), already referred to in this report, as a warrant for a denial of the power of the House to deal with contempts of its privileges. It is therefore important to make a somewhat critical examination of the cases in the courts affecting the question.

JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS.

ANDERSON V. DUNN (6 WHEATON, 204).

This case grew out of an attempt upon the part of Col. Anderson to bribe Hon. Lewis Williams, of North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Claims. Upon a statement of the facts to the House, a motion was made directing the Speaker to issue a warrant for his arrest, and the identical question here involved was at once raised in the House.

Mr. Terry, of Connecticut, inquired whether, according to our forms of proceeding and to our constitutional provisions, a general warrant as proposed could be issued. Was it not opposed in itself and in its nature to the principle of civil liberty? The Speaker observed that in the practice of the House, happily, instances were extremely rare where such warrant became necessary. No such occasion had occurred within his observation. But there could be no doubt when an offense was committed against the privileges or dignity of the House it was perfectly in its power to issue a warrant to apprehend the party offending.

This question, pro and con, was debated very extensively and very ably in the House for many days, and it was contended on the one hand that Congress was given by the Constitution no power to punish for contempt, and that it especially had no power to punish for acts not committed in its presence. On the other hand, it was contended that the House had an inherent and implied power to protect the dignity, freedom, and self-respect of the House and to punish those guilty of a breach of the privileges of the House and of a high contempt of the dignity and authority of the same. After a very full consideration of this question, the House, by a very large majority, decided it had the power to punish for contempt, whether committed within the walls of the House or elsewhere, and Mr. Anderson was arrested and punished. He afterwards sued the Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Dunn, for trespass in executing this warrant, and raised the specific question that it was issued without authority and hence constituted no protection. The case was tried in the Circuit Court of the District of Columbia, which court held that the House did have the power to punish for contempt and that the possession of this warrant issued by the House constituted a complete defense to the action of the plaintiff. Mr. Anderson appealed this case to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the decision of that court is found in 6 Wheaton, page 204. There the identical questions raised in the House were again insisted upon. It was there contended that the Constitution gave no express authority to either branch of Congress to punish for contempt, and that our institutions forbade its exercise as implied authority. The court says:

It is certainly true that there is no power given by the Constitution to either House to punish for contempts, except when committed by their own Members. Nor does the judicial or criminal power given to the United States, in any part, expressly extend to the infliction of punishment for contempt of either House, or any one coordinate branch of the Government. Shall we, therefore, decide that no such power exists? * * * But if there is one maxim that necessarily rides over all others, it is that the public functionaries must be left at liberty to exercise the powers which the people have intrusted to them. The interests and dignity of those who created them require the exertion of the powers indispensable to the attainment of the ends of their creation. Nor is a casual conflict with the rights of particular individuals any reason to be urged against the exercise of such powers. * * * That "the safety of the people is the supreme law" not only comports with but is indispensable to the exercise of those powers in their public functionaries, without which that safety can not be guarded. On this

principle it is that courts of justice are universally acknowledged to be vested by their very creation with power to impose silence, respect, and decorum in their presence and submission to their lawful mandates, and, as a corollary to this proposition, to preserve themselves and their officers from the approach and insults of pollution.

It is true that the courts of justice of the United States are vested by express statute provision with power to fine and imprison for contempts; but it does not follow from this circumstance that they would not have exercised that power without the aid of the statute or not in cases, if such should occur, to which such statute provision may not extend. On the contrary, it is a legislative assertion of this right, as incidental to a grant of judicial power, and can only be considered either as an instance of abundant caution or a legislative declaration that the power of punishing for contempt shall not extend beyond its known and acknowledged limits of fine and imprisonment.

But it is contended that if this power in the House of Representatives is to be asserted on the plea of necessity, the ground is too broad and the result too indefinite; that the executive and every coordinate and even subordinate branch of the Government may resort to the same justification, and the whole assume to themselves, in the exercise of this power, the most tyrannical licentiousness.

This is unquestionably an evil to be guarded against, and if the doctrine may be pushed to that extent it must be a bad doctrine, and is justly denounced.

But what is the alternative? The argument obviously leads to the total annihilation of the power of the House of Representatives to guard itself from contempts, and leaves it exposed to every indignity and interruption that rudeness, caprice, or even conspiracy may meditate against it. This result is fraught with too much absurdity not to bring into doubt the soundness of any argument from which it is derived. That a deliberative assembly, clothed with the majesty of the people, and charged with the care of all that is dear to them; composed of the most distinguished citizens, selected and drawn together from every quarter of a great Nation whose deliberations are required by public opinion to be conducted under the eye of the public and whose decisions must be clothed with all that sanctity which unlimited confidence in their wisdom and purity can inspire; that such an assembly should not possess the power to suppress rudeness or repel insult is a supposition too wild to be suggested. And accordingly, to avoid the pressure of these considerations, it has been argued that the right of the respective Houses to exclude from their presence and their absolute control within their own walls carry with them the right to punish contempts committed in their presence, while the absolute legislative power given to Congress within this District enables them to provide by law against all other insults against which there is any necessity for providing.

It is to be observed that, so far as the issue of this cause is implicated, this argument yields all right of the plaintiff in error to a decision in his favor for non constat from the pleadings, but that this warrant issued for an offense committed in the immediate presence of the House.

Nor is it immaterial to notice what difficulties the negation of this right in the House of Representatives draws after it when it is considered that the concession of the power, if exercised within their walls, relinquishes the great grounds of the argument, to wit, the want of an express grant, and the unrestricted and undefined nature of the power here set up. For, why should the House be at liberty to exercise an ungranted, an unlimited, and undefined power within their walls any more than without them? If the analogy with individual right and power be resorted to it will reach no further than to exclusion, and it requires no exuberance of imagination to exhibit the ridiculous consequences which might result from such a restriction imposed upon the conduct of a deliberative assembly.

Nor would their situation be materially relieved by resorting to their legislative power within the district. That power may, indeed, be applied to many purposes and was intended by the Constitution to extend to many purposes indispensable to the security and dignity of the General Government; but they are purposes of a more grave and general character than the offenses which may be denominated contempts and which, from their very nature, admit of no precise definition. Judicial gravity will not admit of the illustrations which this remark would admit of. Its correctness is easily tested by pursuing, in imagination, a legislative attempt at defining the cases to which the epithet "contempt" might be reasonably applied.

This decision clearly and unequivocally sustains the doctrine that the House has the implied right to punish for contempt, whether committed in its presence or elsewhere.

NUGENT V. BEALE (SMITH'S DIGEST OF DECISIONS AND PRECEDENTS, 601).

The next time this matter came up for judicial determination was in the case of Nugent *v.* Beale in the Circuit Court of the District of Columbia. This case grew out of a breach of the rules of the Senate by Mr. Nugent. A warrant was issued and placed in the hands of Beale for service and a writ of habeas corpus was asked, bottomed on the proposition that the Senate had no power to arrest or punish for contempt. The court said:

The jurisdiction of the Senate in cases of contempt of its authority depends upon the same ground and reasons upon which the acknowledged jurisdiction of other judicial tribunals rests, to wit, the necessity of such jurisdiction to enable the Senate to exercise its high constitutional functions—a necessity at least equal to that which supports the like jurisdiction which has been exercised by all judicial tribunals and legislative assemblies in this country from its first settlement and in England from time immemorial.

IRWIN V. ORDWAY (SMITH'S DIGEST OF DECISIONS AND PRECEDENTS, 520).

In 1874 one Richard B. Irwin was held in contempt of the House for a refusal to answer certain questions before a committee of that body, and having been presented in custody of N. G. Ordway, the Sergeant at Arms, he applied to one Arthur McArthur, one of the judges of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, for a writ of habeas corpus. Upon hearing, the writ was refused, and in refusing it the court said:

There can be no doubt that either House of Congress has the right of committing for contempts all contempts which infringe upon the order, dignity, or the purity of their legislation, and for this purpose it is not denied but that they have the power of examination, of investigation, and of calling witnesses into their presence or before their committees and of administering oaths and putting inquiries, and of punishing at refusal to answer. These powers of the House are so very clearly established now that the learned counsel has not impeached them unless Congress, by the enactment of 1857, has abrogated this almost indispensable power of Congress. It is to be observed that the statute applies to only a species of contempt; that is, the witnesses who refuse to answer questions upon subjects of legislation before Congress or before its committees. * * * The power of the House to punish for a contempt extends only to confinement and terminates with the session of Congress. If a party were found guilty of a contempt 24 hours before the period of adjournment, that must be the limitation of the punishment. Now, this might be a very inadequate protection to the House and a very inadequate punishment for a party in contempt. I have no doubt that Congress intended recusant witnesses or witnesses refusing to answer pertinent inquiries upon proper subjects of investigation should be punished beyond the power of the House to reach them; and that they therefore created the offense a misdemeanor to be punished by fine and imprisonment in the courts of justice. This statute can by no means purge the contempt or abolish the power of the House to protect itself in this respect, as it is able to protect itself from every other species of contempt.

KILBOURN V. THOMPSON (103 U. S., 168).

The next time that this question was discussed was in the case of Kilbourn against Thompson. This was a case wherein one Kilbourn refused to answer certain interrogatories propounded to him by a committee of the House of Representatives. This opinion, written by Mr. Justice Miller, undoubtedly controverts some of the reasoning contained in the case of Anderson against Dunn, and by some is thought to overrule the fundamental principle involved in that case, namely, the implied power of the House to punish for contempt. But a careful reading of the case will show that that is not true. After having given expression to much dictum on this subject, it finally bases its opinion upon another and entirely different proposition. The court says:

Nor, taking what has fallen from the English judges, and especially the later cases on which we have just commented, is much aid given to the doctrine that this power exists as one necessary to enable either House of Congress to exercise successfully their function of legislation. *This latter proposition is one which we do not propose to decide in the present case, because we are able to decide it without passing upon the existence or nonexistence of such a power in aid of the legislative function.*

Then, after defining the express powers of the House to punish its own Members, the court continues:

Whether the power of punishment in either House by fine or imprisonment goes beyond this or not, we are sure that no person can be punished for contumacy as a witness before either House unless his testimony is required in a matter into which that House has jurisdiction to inquire, and we feel equally sure that neither of these bodies possesses the general power of making inquiry into the private affairs of the citizen.

It will thus be noticed that in the Kilbourn case the Supreme Court bases its decision upon the proposition that Congress has no power to punish a contumacious witness for refusing to answer questions in regard to matters about which the House has no jurisdiction to inquire—namely, the private affairs of individuals or corporations. It does not even decide that Congress has no power to punish a contumacious witness for refusing to answer questions concerning which the House did have the right to inquire. It did not overrule the case of Anderson against Dunn; at most, it only limits and defines the doctrine of that case.

IN RE CHAPMAN (166 U. S., 661).

The last time that this question was before the Supreme Court was in the case of Elverton R. Chapman. This is a case where prosecution had been had against Chapman under the statute for punishing contumacious witnesses. Application was made to the Supreme Court of the United States for a writ of habeas corpus. The contention was made in that case that Congress had undertaken to delegate its power to the courts of the District of Columbia and this statute was, therefore, unconstitutional. The court, in passing on that question, said:

While Congress can not divest itself, or either of its Houses, of the inherent power to punish for contempt, it may provide that contumacy in a witness called to testify in a matter properly under consideration by either House and deliberately refusing to answer questions pertinent thereto shall be a misdemeanor against the United States.

And further on the court says:

Nevertheless, although the power to punish for contempt still remains in each House, we must decline to decide that this law is invalid because it provides that contumacy in a witness called to testify in a matter properly under consideration by either House and deliberately refusing to answer questions pertinent thereto shall be a misdemeanor against the United States, who are interested that the authority of neither of their departments, nor of any branch thereof, shall be defied and set at naught.

This case in all of its reasoning clearly recognizes and sustains the doctrine that each House has the inherent power to punish for contempt.

As a result of this analysis of the judicial precedents it seems clear that it has been established by the highest court of the land that either branch of Congress has the implied power and authority to punish those guilty of a contempt of the authority

of either House by a breach of its privileges whether the breach is committed within or without its Chamber.

In view of the expressed desire at the time the resolution under which this committee is acting was passed, a somewhat extended examination of the matter of the privileges of the House has been made. In addition to the privileges expressly stated in the Constitution there is warrant for the claim that the House of Representatives possesses such additional and inherent privileges as are necessary for the preservation of its own integrity and the due performance of its legislative functions. Such are, for instance, the right to protect itself from the offer of bribes, to punish contumacious witnesses, and to put down tumult or riot within its walls, or so near thereto as to disturb its deliberations; but for obvious reasons it has always been deemed unwise to attempt a catalogue of these inherent privileges and powers, and so long ago as 1837 the House of Representatives expressly refused to proceed with a bill defining the offense of a contempt of the House and providing punishment therefor.

Upon the question of inability to define breaches of privilege and contempts of the House the Supreme Court itself has said:

> Nor would their situation be materially relieved by resorting to their legislative power within the District. That power may, indeed, be applied to many purposes, and was intended by the Constitution to extend to many purposes indispensable to the security and dignity of the General Government; but they are purposes of a more grave and general character than the offenses which may be denominated contempts, and which, from their very nature, admit of no precise definition. Judicial gravity will not admit of the illustrations which this remark would admit of. Its correctness is easily tested by pursuing, in imagination, a legislative attempt at defining the cases to which the epithet "contempt" might be reasonably applied. (Anderson *v.* Dunn, supra.)

The existence of the inherent power in the House of Representatives to determine and punish contempt against its privileges is most cogently stated in Rawle on the Constitution, as follows (p. 48):

> It would be inconsistent with the nature of such a body to deny it the power of protecting itself from injury or insult. If its deliberations are not perfectly free, its constituents are eventually injured. This power has never been denied in any country, and is incidental to the nature of all legislative bodies. If it possesses such a power in the case of an immediate insult or disturbance, preventing the exercise of its ordinary functions, it is impossible to deny it in the other cases which, although less immediate or violent, partake of the same character by having a tendency to impair the firm and honest discharge of public duties.

That learned jurist, Mr. Justice Story, strongly sets forth the same views thus (Story on the Constitution, vol. 1, sec. 847):

> This subject has of late undergone a great deal of discussion both in England and America, and has finally received the adjudication of the highest judicial tribunals in each country. In each country upon the fullest consideration, the result was the same, namely, that the power did exist, and that the legislative body was the proper and exclusive forum to decide when the contempt existed, and when there was a breach of its privileges; and that the power to punish followed, as a necessary incident to the power to take cognizance of the offense.

The committee also believes that in reporting on such a grave subject it ought to say that while freedom of speech and debate is a great vital privilege, and without that freedom to an unconditional extent all the other privileges of either of the Houses of Congress would be practically ineffectual, yet the very existence and extent of the privilege demands the greatest restraint in its exercise. No man, even under the cloak of public necessity and parliamentary power, ought to have the right wantonly to defame another.

As Mr. Justice Story very pertinently says (Story on the Constitution, sec. 866):

> Every citizen has as good a right to be protected by the laws from malignant scandal, false charges, and defamatory imputation as a Member of Congress has to utter them in his seat. If it were otherwise a man's character might be taken away without the possibility of redress, either by the malice or indiscretion or overweening self-conceit of a Member of Congress.

The House of Representatives is vitally concerned with the safeguarding of its privileges and the preservation of its legislative integrity and dignity. It is just as seriously concerned, however, with the maintenance of such a course of conduct on the part of each of its individual Members as will assure to every citizen in the land protection from defamation on the floor of the House. The power of the House over its Members is of the broadest character. The breach of the privileges of the House by a Member gives to the House ample power of punishment. It must become to be understood, therefore, that as the privileges of the House in so far as the public is concerned will be enforced by prompt punishment for contempt in the event of their breach, the House, in the future, as often in the past, will also fully protect all citizens from unjust assaults upon their character by censure or other punishment administered to an offending Member.

The committee calls attention to the written communication received from Mr. Glover, which will be found in full in the appendix containing the testimony accompanying this report.

This letter, it will be observed, contains a frank avowal of fault and a voluntary disclaimer of any intentional contempt toward this body. The testimony, however, establishes the fact that his act was the result of some premeditation and design extending over a period sufficiently long for him to have informed himself, if ignorant, of the privilege of the House; and his disclaimer, while full and free in form, is accompanied by a challenge, though without discourtesy, of the jurisdiction of the House in the premises. Under the circumstances, therefore, your committee recommends the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Speaker do issue his warrant directed to the Sergeant at Arms commanding him to take in custody wherever to be found the body of Charles C. Glover, of the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, and the same in custody keep, and that the said Charles C. Glover be brought to the bar of the House of Representatives on a day to be fixed in said warrant to answer the charge that he, on Friday, April 18, 1913, in the city of Washington, D. C., committed an assault upon the person of Representative THETUS W. SIMS, a Representative in the Sixty-third Congress from the State of Tennessee, because of words spoken by the said Representative SIMS in debate on the floor of the House of Representatives while the House was in regular session during the Sixty-second Congress, and that in committing said assault Charles C. Glover has been guilty of a breach of the privileges and a contempt of the House of Representatives; and that the said Charles C. Glover be furnished with a copy of this resolution and a copy of the report of the select committee of the House of Representatives appointed to investigate the charge made against him in the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That when Charles C. Glover shall be brought to the bar of the House to answer the charge of having violated the privilege of the House of Representatives by having made an assault upon Representative THETUS W. SIMS, of the State of Tennessee, for words spoken by said Representative SIMS on the floor of the House of Representatives, the Speaker shall then cause to be read to the said Charles C. Glover the findings of facts by the special committee of the House charged with the duty of investigating whether or not the said assault had in fact been committed as alleged, and whether or not the said Charles C. Glover had violated the privileges of the House of Representatives by said assault. The Speaker shall then inquire of the said Charles C. Glover if he desires to be heard, and to have counsel, on the charge of being in contempt of the House of Representatives for having violated its privileges. If the said Charles C. Glover desires to avail himself of either of these privileges, the same shall be granted him, if not the House shall thereupon proceed to take order in the matter.

JOHN W. DAVIS.
J. HARRY COVINGTON.
CHARLES R. CRISP.
S. E. PROUTY.
JOHN M. NELSON.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill—with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] such time as he desires to occupy. [Applause.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, for many years those who believe in justice in taxation have been striving to secure the adoption of a national income tax. The United States Supreme Court first blocked the way by their decision in the Pollock case. During the period that followed this decision, surprising as it was disappointing, its friends continued undismayed to advocate this wholesome doctrine and watched every opportunity to secure its enactment into law in some form. During these dark years of reverses and failure the Democratic Party was considerate enough of the rights and interests of the people to write in its quadrennial platforms a ringing declaration in favor of this doctrine. The Nation-wide sentiment to this effect, which was thus kept alive, grew until in 1909 a Republican Congress found itself confronted by the alternative of accepting a comprehensive income-tax law or a less broad provision limited to corporations. Being wedded to class taxation, they chose the latter as the lesser measure of relief which the country would receive. The friends of this tax also wrung from that unwilling Congress the submission of an amendment to the Constitution which when ratified would uproot and overturn the Pollock decision and again restore to the people and their representatives in Congress every phase of this just power of taxation.

I congratulate the American people upon the fact that they ratified that amendment, wiped out all judicial obstructions, and cleared the way for comprehensive, honest fiscal legislation. The people's representatives in Congress, no less alert, no less

mindful of the public welfare, now propose to write into law the great principle which the people forever wrote into the Constitution. The general uprising throughout the country in behalf of this tax is due to the long-standing dissatisfaction with existing tax conditions and to the belief, which long since became a conviction, that the masses were being grossly discriminated against through the agency of our tax laws. Every citizen realizes that the General Government is obliged to secure revenues to defray its necessary expenses, and that in doing so it takes annually from the property of the American people in the neighborhood of $1,000,000,000. This can only be accomplished by means of taxation of some kind and in some form. Voluntary contributions, both to the state and the church, as practiced in the early colonial days, are no longer made. No matter how imposed, taxes are never welcomed except to the extent that they displace a more undesirable method of taxation. I should say that there is one exception to this universal rule of human nature. Our manufacturing friends, who have been in a tariff partnership with the Government for more than half a century, strongly favor the high protective-tariff tax for revenue only—not Government revenue, but revenue nevertheless.

During recent years there has been a general agitation and demand in almost every State in the Union and almost every country in the world for intelligent, fair, and practical reforms and readjustments of their tax systems, to the end that every citizen may be required to contribute to the wants of the State or Government in proportion to the revenue he enjoys under its protection. To this end the doctrine of equality of sacrifice or ability to pay is being universally invoked. A glance at the fiscal history of all countries shows a constant struggle on the part of the wealthy and more powerful classes to shift the chief weight of Government taxation to the shoulders and backs of those weaker, poorer, and less able to protect themselves from the injustice and oppression inflicted by disproportionate tax burdens. This conflict has been and is to-day being waged in the United States.

All taxes in this country, whether for National or State and local purposes, fall upon the American people; however, the gross inequalities and injustices resulting from tax evasion by those most able to pay and the shifting of the tax burden to those least able to pay is seen alike in connection with both national and local taxation. This is the result of unequal and unjust tax laws. As stated, the General Government must annually take from the property of the people about $1,000,000,000, while the States and their subdivisions must annually take a still larger amount in taxes. Let us glance for a few moments at the effect and operation of our National and State tax laws. The States, as a rule, have sought to maintain the general property tax system.

A few instances will sufficiently disclose the inefficiency and unfairness arising therefrom and the consequent failure and virtual breaking down of these systems. The State Tax Commission of Massachusetts, according to its published report, recently estimated the value of personal property in Massachusetts that is subject to taxation at over $5,600,000,000, of which less than one-fifth is taxed. The commission also found that the greater part of this remainder, viz, $4,646,265,000, is intangible personalty subject to taxation, but which is not taxed, because its disclosure has never been compelled. By the United States Census inquiry of 1904, New York had $5,500,000,000 of personalty, whereas by the tax returns she had only $1,500,000,000. According to the published report of the special tax commission of that State in 1907, in which the disparity between the assessed and real value of personalty was placed at much wider figures, the following, among other, conclusions were reported:

1. That the richer a person grows the less he pays in relation to his property or income.

2. Experience has shown that under the present system personal property practically escapes taxation for either local or State purposes.

The comptroller general of South Carolina, in his recent report for 1912, indicates that the small property holders pay the bulk of the taxes of the State. One real estate firm of Columbia, according to this report, published at the close of 1912 that their real estate sales during the year in that city aggregated over $4,000,000, whereas its assessed valuation was $400,000, or 10 per cent of the price it brought, while the assessed valuation of all property, both in that city and county, was only $10,685,000, although tax assessors assumed to assess it at 50 per cent of it actual value.

According to the recent report of the Kentucky Tax Commission, the amount of deposits in the banks of the State on the 1st of January, 1912, was given in for assessment by the taxpayers at $12,847,868, whereas, according to the reports of the banks to the State commission and to the Comptroller of Currency at Washington, the amount of deposits on that day was, in fact, $133,339,871.

The mayor of Philadelphia recently stated in the press that the undervaluation of property in that city is more than $300,000,000.

To further illustrate our State and local tax systems by an individual instance, the published reports show that Mr. Andrew Carnegie for many years only paid taxes upon a personal assessment of something over $5,000,000, although it has recently been raised to ten million. It may be safely said that with a few notable exceptions, the conditions I have described exist in the State and local tax systems in relative proportion throughout the Union. The small property owner, who can not hide his property nor shift his tax burdens, constantly feels the crushing weight of taxation, while the rich investor in securities, the money lender, and the wealthy business and professional men cover up most of their taxable property, as well as much of their city realty, when the assessor comes around. Intangible personalty, including stocks, bonds, and other securities, almost entirely escape taxation everywhere. A report of the Census Office shows that in the year 1904, while the true value of all property was $107,104,192,410, the ad valorem assessment of this property was only $38,963,381,000; that the true value of personalty was $44,762,719,000, while it was only assessed at $8,873,562,000, and the assessment of realty was less than 50 per cent of its true value.

Turning to our present system of national taxes, we find a still worse condition with respect to our customhouse taxation. Our internal-revenue taxes offer no special ground for criticism. Under this system Illinois paid $51,600,000 to the Government for the year ending June 30, 1912; Kentucky, $31,177,000; Indiana, $30,000,000; Missouri, $12,000,000; New York, $43,800,000; Pennsylvania, $25,600,000; and other States likewise paid in smaller amounts. Our system of high protective-tariff taxation violates every canon of taxation and is outrageous in its operation and effects. It is conceived upon the idea that the people should be taxed, not according to their ability to pay, but according to their needs and, practically, their poverty. No civilized or humane people can longer tolerate this system of diabolical extortion. In contributing three hundred millions to the Federal Treasury the American consumer is compelled at the same time to hand over at least $1,500,000,000 as a bonus to those select individuals given special favors by the high protective-tariff tax. During recent generations our high tariff taxes have degenerated into a system of special privilege, such as has never before been revealed in the annals of our fiscal history. It is no longer justified either in law or morals. The public conscience revolts against it and modern civilization turns away from it. This doctrine of taxation, the plain and palpable effect of which requires one citizen to bestow as a gift portions of his hard earnings upon another citizen, has become insupportable here and everywhere, and whatever may be the future developments of the economic policy of the United States, the period of high protection has reached its end. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The present average protective-tariff rates appear to be in the neighborhood of 40 per cent, but in fact, when we consider the innumerable rates that are absolutely prohibitive, the average rate must be near 60 per cent.

The temptation to discuss at length the evils and unfairness of our high tariff taxes, and the splendid reductions carried in the present bill is very great, but I shall forego this for the present, in order to consider other phases of our proposed tax system. The American people have completely learned that they are not being taxed either fairly or honestly; they are demanding that the inequalities, abuses, and injustices of our present system of high tariff taxation shall be eliminated, and that a new system of taxes, fair and equitable, embracing a strictly revenue tariff and an income tax, shall be devised. The experience of all countries with respect to every form of taxation has resulted in the universal conclusion that the fairest and most just of all taxes is that which is levied upon the citizen according to ability to pay, and that this result can best be accomplished by imposing a tax on net incomes.

Fifty-two countries and States have taken this step, and wherever given a reasonable trial this form of tax has never been repealed, save in the United States.

England, the seven States of Australasia, and most of the other English colonies, Prussia, and the numerous other German States, Switzerland, Spain, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Holland, Hungary, Greece, Japan, Denmark, Austria, and numerous other important countries have this tax in operation, while France is on the verge of adopting a comprehensive income-tax law in lieu of numerous other taxes. In many or most cases other coun-

tries have adopted and maintained this tax for the twofold purpose of securing revenue and equalizing the burdens of taxation.

In no other way could the burdens be equalized and the rising tide of unrest, discontent, and socialism be so successfully met. By this method alone could every citizen see and know that taxes are being imposed equitably and according to ability to pay.

The very fact that this is a just tax means that it will meet with opposition; the beneficiaries of unjust taxation and many who have measurably escaped all taxation will always be found opposing an honest and fair tax upon selfish grounds. Under the present high tariff tax system a poor man with a large family pays more taxes than a rich man with a small family. Hence the man of weath who is too selfish and too unpatriotic to pay taxes will vigorously oppose the imposition of any just tax, as will any creature of class or privilege taxation.

The pending measure has already met with the specious suggestion that it is class legislation, and makes a distinction between citizens of large means and those without particular means. It may be replied that the very purpose of the measure is to reach for taxation those who have escaped taxes and who are most able to bear the same. Suppose the bill in chief measure exempted this class of citizens, as other laws have done and now do; the tax would continue to be paid, as heretofore, by the middle and poorer classes. The very purpose of a combination of just tax laws is to reach every citizen in fair proportion. The masses of the people are now paying most of our $312,000,000 tariff taxes and most of our State and local taxes, save in a few States. Then where is the injustice of requiring the receivers of incomes over $4,000 to equalize in some measure these tax burdens by contributing less than $100,000,000 to the Federal Treasury?

The objection is also offered, in a tone of injured innocence, that the proposed tax would be sectional in its effects. This measure certainly is not sectional in its terms, and should it be sectional in effect it would be due to the fact that wealth has first made itself sectional. It would be monstrous to say that the receivers of great incomes which are drawn from every section of the country may segregate themselves and upon the plea of segregation or sectionalism successfully exempt their entire wealth from taxation. They should invoke the plea of segregation and not sectionalism.

The very nature and purpose of the income tax is fairly to reach and successfully to cope with such conditions, for long experience everywhere has demonstrated that the only means of getting at the financial resources of the country in fair measure, and taxing classes of persons who would otherwise escape taxation or nearly so, is to levy a tax on incomes. To illustrate the importance of this tax, during the parliamentary debate of 1909, Mr. Lloyd George said:

> The income tax is in reality the center and sheet anchor of our financial system.

Mr. Gladstone characterizes it as an engine of gigantic power for great national purposes.

This tax in England now produces about two hundred millions of revenue annually, and according to universal testimony gives the taxpayer as little trouble as any form of taxation. The complaint of inquisitorialness has now almost completely disappeared.

I shall not consume the time of the committee in commenting upon the results of the operation of this tax law in the various foreign countries, except to say that the masses everywhere have a deep-seated conviction that it is fair alike to every citizen and is the only effective method of equalizing tax burdens.

This tax, in addition to being fair, is productive and responsive to changes in rates, and is cheap of collection.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. In paragraph B and paragraph C of section 2, the income-tax section, it would appear that a holder of municipal bonds or State bonds would be exempt from payment of tax.

Mr. HULL. If the gentleman will pardon me now, I will come to an anaylsis of the bill within a few moments.

Mr. MOORE. Very well. I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman, but the point is very much inquired about, and I would like to have the gentleman explain it.

Mr. HULL. No honest taxpayer has anything to fear. The fact that difficulty in administering the proposed law is sometimes experienced is due to the persistent efforts of dishonest or evasive taxpayers to shirk and evade their proper share. No law that would effectually reach this class of taxpayers can be devised and successfully enforced without more or less difficulty in some instances. The administration of the present National and State tax laws is more inquisitorial and difficult if enforced.

Every good citizen should not only be willing to contribute according to ability to the needs of the Government, but to this end should be willing to devote a brief time during some one day in the year, when necessary, to the making up of a list of his income for taxes. The Government asks this of him in return for the many blessings and benefits he receives. It is gratifying to find during recent years the large number of our wealthiest citizens who heartily favor the proposed tax and cheerfully agree honestly to abide by its provisions; those who do not subscribe to this patriotic view may realize later their shortsightedness. The intelligence of the American people has rapidly increased, until to-day the overwhelming majority of the masses in every section of the country, whether in the valleys or in the mountains, are keenly alive to existing financial, industrial, and social conditions, and realize fully the great disproportion of governmental burdens which rest upon them.

The masses leave their homes and families and imperil life and body to fight the battles of the country in time of war, and none realize better than they that by reason of discriminating laws and governmental policies they are required to support the Government in chief measure in time of peace, and in addition constantly to make unjust contributions to the favored class of their fellow citizens.

It is sometimes sought to prejudice persons against this tax by asserting that it is a tax upon thrift and industry. It may be replied that the tariff is a tax upon consumption, want, and even poverty and misery. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In any event, the proposed tax is measured by net profits or gains, and is not imposed upon gross income nor capital nor other property. If a citizen has not been successful in his efforts to accumulate profits he is not required to pay the tax, but if he has prospered he is required to contribute to his Government, not the scriptural tithe, but a small percentage of his net profits.

The proposed tax is the outgrowth of centuries of tax legislation throughout the world. Those who have been the victims of our intangible and invisible tariff taxes, with all their features of spoliation and plunder, without being able to know the extent thereof, should and will welcome the proposed tax; the receivers of large incomes and the owners of great wealth should prepare to accept it as a permanent tax, for, in my judgment, it has come to stay. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Responding to the manifest interests and desires of the American people and to the fiscal needs of the American Government, the Democrats of this House propose to incorporate, along with honest tariff revision, an income-tax provision permanently in our tax system, the effect of which will be to displace about $70,000,000 derived from the most vicious portion of custom-house taxation, to the end that this country may in the future have justice in taxation, flexibility and stability of revenue, and economy in expenditures. This provision goes hand in hand with genuine tariff reform.

I desire now to give a brief outline of the pending measure. Instead of comprising 100 or more pages, containing in detail all the methods of administration, such as European and other laws present, this measure briefly but succinctly prescribes each essential rule and method with respect to the levy, assessment, and collection of the tax, and leaves to be embraced in the regulations to be prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury the manner and details of carrying out the provisions of the law. These regulations will make clear to the taxpayer the scope and application of each feature of the law with respect to every class of taxpayers and business.

It should be borne in mind that paragraphs A to G relate exclusively to the imposition and collection of the tax of individuals or persons, whereas paragraph G embraces corporations.

Paragraph A imposes a tax of 1 per cent per annum upon the annual net income of every individual over $4,000. In addition to this normal or basic tax of 1 per cent, which applies alike to all individuals and corporations, as aforesaid, a graduated additional tax is imposed upon the total annual net income of every individual derived from all sources, including corporate dividends, exceeding $20,000. Instead of making this additional tax a flat rate, the same is graduated in its application to incomes from $20,000 to $100,000, thus leaving a flat rate of 3 per cent additional upon that portion of any income exceeding $100,000. Paragraph B and those following, down to G, relate to the assessment and collection of the normal tax of 1 per cent imposed upon persons.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, would it interrupt the gentleman at all to ask him a question in reference to the proposition that he is now discussing, for information?

Mr. HULL. I will suggest to the gentleman whether it would not be best for me to conclude my attempt to analyze the bill, then I shall be glad, as best I can, to answer any question that may be asked.

Mr. MANN. This will be a very simply question.

Mr. HULL. Very well.

Mr. MANN. Suppose during the year a man holding a piece of real estate sells it, is there any attention paid to the amount of the proceeds of the sale, so far as his income is concerned, under the provisions of the bill? My recollection is it refers to profits.

Mr. HULL. Just a little later I will make a statement on that point.

Mr. MANN. I thank you.

Mr. HULL. Each individual to whom the additional and graduated tax will apply makes a personal return in every instance of his total net income from all sources. He will compute it by taking his net income as computed for the purpose of the normal tax and substituting the exemption of $20,000 for the normal tax exemption of $4,000, and then adding, first, the amount of his net income upon which the normal tax was withheld and paid at the source by another for him; and, second, the amount of dividends or other net earnings received or receivable by him from corporate sources. No part of the additional tax imposed is collected at the source of the income. This method enables the Government to reach all large incomes exceeding $20,000 by assembling the same in the individual to whom it ultimately goes and taxing it as a whole.

The proposed law should be construed as similar laws have been construed by the courts with respect to the application of the tax, and that is that the income in question shall be the measure of the tax and not the specific fund out of which the tax is necessarily payable; the bill takes as the measure of the tax the net income of the preceding year. Paragraph B defines the net income of a taxable individual or person. Income as thus defined does not embrace capital or principal, but only such gains or profits as may be realized from rent, interest, salaries, trade, commerce, or sales of any kind of property, and so forth, or profits or gains derived from any other source.

It would be impossible here to undertake to explain the application of this provision of the bill to the innumerable transactions arising in this country. The rulings of the Treasury Department and the decisions of the courts of this country with respect to similar provisions of the old income-tax laws, and also the English rules of construction, all essential portions of which will be embraced in the Treasury regulations, will make clear the distinction between taxable profits or income on the one hand and capital or principal on the other. The proceeds of life insurance policies paid on the death of the person insured are expressly exempted; likewise the return of any part of principal invested in insurance during life, as distinguished from the earnings upon same, would not be taxable.

Bequests, devises, and so forth, are not considered as taxable income; an inheritance tax applicable to them would naturally contain rather highly graduated rates, so that this tax would properly be contained in a separate enactment. The second division of paragraph B prescribes the deductions allowed in computing net income for the purpose of the normal tax. Most of these deduction clauses have heretofore been construed both by the Treasury Department and the courts. As to losses, these provisions primarily contemplate allowance for losses growing out of the trade or business from which the taxable income is derived, and generally termed trade losses, as distinguished from losses of capital or principal or losses incurred entirely apart from business transactions from which income is derived. A similar rule governs deductions for expenses. In thus computing net income the taxpayer does not embrace any portion upon which the tax is stopped at the source; but in all cases where taxable income arises from an annual business relationship, but does not exceed $4,000, and so the tax is not withholdable at the source, the same must be embraced in a personal return, and also if such income is uncertain or irregular in the amounts or time of its accrual, and so is not derived from a business relationship extending through the year, it likewise shall be embraced in a personal return, and no tax would be withheld at the source. This latter would embrace all taxable profits or income derived from trades, professions, and other businesses embracing promiscuous transactions and the accrual of profits in uncertain amounts and at irregular times, as distinguished from business relationships running through the year and the fixed income therefrom. The amount received by the individual taxpayer from the net earnings of a corporation subject to like tax will not be embraced in his personal return of income for the purpose of the normal tax. The normal tax of 1 per cent that would otherwise accrue against the owners or stockholders of the corporation is paid for them by the corporation upon its net earnings.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman let me ask him a question?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Suppose the gentleman himself had $5,000 he wanted to invest, and did invest the $5,000 in the bonds of some corporation, and that the tax was taken by the corporation from the interest coupons on these $5,000 of bonds—suppose the gentleman had no other money in the world except the $5,000. Would the company that issued the bonds that he had his money invested in be allowed to deduct the tax from the interest due on the coupons on these bonds?

Mr. HULL. The taxpayer, if he desired his $4,000 exemption in that case——

Mr. MADDEN. But here is a case where there is only $250 income.

Mr. HULL. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I thought he said $5,000.

Mr. MADDEN. He has an investment of $5,000 with an income of $250, and that is all the investment he has in the world. How does the gentleman provide for the payment of tax on these coupons?

Mr. HULL. The corporation would withhold the tax, unless the bondholder should file his affidavit claiming his exemption, and if he should, unless the amount of interest exceeded $4,000, no tax would be withheld.

Mr. MADDEN. But suppose the gentleman did not have business knowledge that would enable him to understand all these things. Lots of poor widows and orphans already have such investments as I have described, and they do not understand the situation, and will not understand it, no matter what happens. What protection have they?

Mr. HULL. Well, I would say in reply to that that under existing conditions most of the present corporate bonds draw interest, which is represented by coupons. Those coupons are payable to bearer. They circulate promiscuously and pass currently all over the country in all kinds of trade and business. It is a question of whether the Government will adopt the only possible way to reach the income derived from the interest on these bonds by providing that the tax shall be withheld at the source of payment, or whether it will abandon any purpose effectively to tax the income derived from the $28,000,000,000 of corporate bonds on account of the fact that there may be a limited number who may not, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] suggests, understand, at least at the very beginning of the operation of this law, that they would be exempt entirely under $4,000, provided they filed notice to that effect.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Suppose, for example, that a man has coupons in the course of a year to the amount of $500 and that is his total income. At present, if he collects those coupons, payable to the bearer, he deposits them in a bank and gets credit for the amount. Now, under the scheme that is proposed, how would that operate?

Mr. HULL. It would operate this way, that the holder of corporate bonds can always have the benefit of his exemption of $4,000 and his deduction; that is, the owner of the bonds can, provided he presents them or has them presented for collection himself. But if he trades them to other people and parts with title to the coupons, then that privilege would not lodge in the other persons, because such coupons would be capital and not income in the hands of other taxable owners.

Mr. MANN. Practically, then—I ask for information—under this proposition the owner of these coupons of small amounts could no longer deposit them in banks, but would have to send them by registered mail or by express to the headquarters of the company, with an affidavit stating that that was the amount of his income or that the income was less than $4,000.

Mr. HULL. They could mail them directly to the headquarters of the company, and claim exemption, and receive full payment of the interest.

Mr. MANN. Would it be practicable under the bill to deposit them in a bank, with an affidavit as to the amount of income?

Mr. HULL. It would be practicable if the holder of the bonds retained ownership and did not part with them, as he would with any other negotiable instrument.

Mr. MANN. Of course he could not put them through the bank unless he parted with title to them.

Mr. HULL. He could for purposes of collection.

Mr. MANN. Even then he would have to assign his title to the bank, as a negotiable instrument. That was not worked out before under our law, but how does that work out under the English law?

Mr. HULL. Under the English law the corporations retain the tax on the interest and pay it to the Government, and the taxpayer presents to the Government any claim, either for deductions, abatements, or for the $800 exemption which exists over there, instead of the $4,000 exemption here.

Mr. MANN. Of course there are a large number of people either holding a small amount of bonds or a small number of shares. Of course the shares would not make so much difference. But there are a large number of people who hold a small amount of coupon bonds now. I think the universal custom is that those are collected through the banks by deposit. Is there any way of making an arrangement by which that could still continue? It is a matter of very great convenience.

Mr. HULL. I would suggest to the gentleman that coupon bonds, issued by well-established business concerns, are exchanged generally in trade, and, of course, as the gentleman well knows, they pass current like any other negotiable instruments.

Mr. MANN. Certainly; but they could not under this plan where anybody desires to have an exemption.

Mr. HULL. Well, this plan, I will say to the gentleman, gives the taxpayer two or three opportunities to claim his exemption. In the first place, if the taxpayer receives the principal part of his income from a source at which it is proper to withhold the tax, he may present his claim for exemption—he would be required to present his claim for $4,000 exemption there in order that it might accompany the bulk of his income, which would be large enough to permit the deduction of the $4,000. Otherwise he can claim his exemption in his personal return of other income than that on which the tax is withheld. But if he desires several hundred dollars of deductions, for expenses, or indebtedness, or taxes paid, and has an amount of income from other sources which is larger than the amount of his deduction, he can make return to the collector of the district in which he resides. But if his income from sources other than that at which the tax is being withheld is smaller than the amount of his deductions, then he would naturally find it necessary to consolidate both his taxable income and his deductions so that they could go through one channel up to the office of the Internal Revenue Commissioner as a whole. To that end he would file claim for deductions and return of his additional income, either with the district collector in the district in which his chief income was being returned, or, if he preferred he could file it with the person whose duty it is to make the return for him as to the bulk of his income.

Mr. MADDEN. If his income was less than $3,500 he would not have to make any return at all, would he?

Mr. HULL. He would not.

Mr. MADDEN. But if he wanted to place himself within the deduction on the interest from his coupons, he would be required to make a statement under oath to the company whose bonds he held, would he not?

Mr. HULL. He would be required to file his application for the $4,000 exemption. And I want to say to the gentleman and to the House that this is simplicity itself, compared to the English system on the same subject. They have thousands of applications for deductions and abatements and other modifications, either of the assessment or refund of the tax, that are constantly being shifted back and forth between the Government and the taxpayer. This method, in my judgment, places the collection of the tax in the most expeditious form, and one that will do no injustice either to the taxpayer or to the issuer of the bonds.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. While the bill provides that it shall apply to all citizens at home and abroad, it is true, is it not, that this bill does not apply to the President of the United States or to Federal judges?

Mr. HULL. I will reach that in a very few minutes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Before the gentleman proceeds with that, will he yield for one question?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Taking the case cited by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], where a person might own bonds to the amount of $5,000, paying 5 per cent interest, which would be $250, and suppose the interest is payable semiannually, and that is the entire income of the person holding the bonds, would he have to claim the exemption each time that he presented the coupons for payment as they matured—that is, every six months—or is there a way provided by which, so far as such a person is concerned, one exemption would be sufficient?

Mr. HULL. The $4,000 exemption would cover both payments.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman consider my question now?

Mr. HULL. If the gentleman will pardon me one moment——

Mr. MOORE. It bears on this question.

Mr. HULL. Just in that connection, first, in order to reach the income derived from our immense amount of corporate bonds, three methods might be adopted. In the first place, we could allow the corporation to pay the interest to the individual taxpayer entitled to it, and then depend upon him to make the personal returns, just as we depend upon taxpayers to make personal returns of their property in the States now under the State tax system. The result of that would be, as I have pointed out here, that they would return probably $1 out of $10, judging by the experience of the States; so that that method is as faulty as the State tax systems to which I have directed attention.

Another alternative would be to allow the corporation to withhold the interest only in cases where it exceeds $4,000—that is, withhold the amount of the tax upon it; but when we undertake to carry this rule entirely through the bill in that respect—and we do that, except in this case and that of United States bonds—we are confronted with the fact that all or most of this interest is represented by coupons payable to bearer; so that the holder of $100,000 of these coupons, when tax-paying time came around, could distribute them, if he desired, into sums of less than $4,000 and send them through 25 different channels for collection; and by distributing and scattering them he could always measurably evade the tax. So that the only method of really getting at the tax with a minimum of inconvenience both to the Government and the taxpayer is that proposed in the bill. Now, I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Under the exemptions provided for in paragraphs B and C, is it not possible for a rich holder of bonds or stocks of an industrial nature to sell out and transfer his holdings to municipal or State or Federal bonds, and thus escape the very object of the bill? I want to explain that that question has been brought up to me by some who have said this bill was easy, that it was full of loopholes, and that so far as some of the idle rich, so called, were concerned they could simply transfer their holdings from industrial stocks and bonds to municipal, State, and national bonds.

Mr. HULL. In the first place, the whole amount of State and municipal bonds is two to three billion dollars, and $750,000,000 of the municipal and State bonds are owned by small mutual savings banks. There are $28,000,000,000 of corporate bonds.

Mr. MOORE. I only called the gentleman's attention to the fact that a shrewd man might in that way evade the law, and if the test came they would simply transfer their holdings from industrials and other taxable stocks to municipal, Federal, and State bonds that would be exempt.

Mr. HULL. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. As an illustration, suppose application is made in a mutual insurance company for a prospective dividend which is paid afterwards. Suppose the applicant pays $20 and at the end of the fiscal year $12 is returned to him as a dividend. That assessment is made on the estimate as to the earnings of the company in the past years, and the company collects this $12 out of the individual. It does not belong to the company but belongs to the individual. I would like for the gentleman to explain fully if that $12 is taxed in this bill. It is claimed by the Southern Mutual Fire Insurance Co., which does business in my State, one of the most prosperous in the country, and which does that kind of business, that you tax them for the assessments they have collected out of the applicants.

Mr. HULL. There is no tax imposed on the policyholder. It is proposed to place a tax of 1 per cent on the net earnings of all insurance companies. But I will discuss that later on.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I am not claiming that there is a tax imposed on the policyholder. There is a tax imposed on the company which collects an advanced payment out of the policyholder and returns to him at the end of the fiscal year that advanced payment. It belongs to the individual and not to the company.

Mr. HULL. The amount of the dividend returned to the policyholder has been represented to come out of the surplus of the company, but in any event it would not be reduced any

more than the 1 per cent which the corporations now pay reduces the dividend to the stockholder. One ninety-ninth of the net earnings from all sources has thus far had no effect on it. This tax has never affected the policyholder heretofore.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. A great many people have asked me whether a man owning a life insurance policy will under the provisions of this bill be allowed to charge the annual premiums he is required to pay against his income.

Mr. HULL. I will deal with that in a few moments if I can proceed.

Mr. MADDEN. And I would also like the gentleman to answer another question, whether a widow will be required to pay an income tax on the money secured as the result of her husband's death, or whether that money will be considered as property?

Mr. HULL. It never was contemplated to tax the proceeds of life insurance policies.

Mr. MADDEN. It is not very clear in the bill.

Mr. HULL. The last print of the bill before it was introduced was by inadvertence a little obscure on that point.

Paragraph C exempts from the law salaries of State and local officers and interest upon State and local bonds. The Supreme Court has often held that under our form of government the States have no power to tax the instrumentalities of the Federal Government, and conversely that the Federal Government has no power under the Constitution to tax the instrumentalities of the States; not desiring to raise any constitutional question, or to arouse the antagonism of any of the States, this provision was inserted.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is a fact that in my State and in a number of other States, when this amendment was up before the legislature for adoption, many people opposed the adoption of the amendment because there was nothing specifically said in the amendment that excepted State, municipal, and other subdivisions of State bonds from taxation under the proposed amendment; but the friends of the amendment felt justified in assuring them that except in great stress, except in time of war, Congress would never think it wise to tax the bonds of the State or the subdivisions thereof.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I think the suggestion of the gentleman is entirely pertinent.

Mr. BARTLETT. In other words, the people were assured by the friends of this measure that it would be only in rare cases that Congress would ever be called upon to enact any law which would tax the instrumentalities of a State or a subdivision thereof.

Mr. HULL. I do not undertake to express an opinion either way upon the power of Congress to impose such tax by virtue of the recent constitutional amendment. It does not necessarily arise in view of the provision in the bill.

The salaries of the present President and the Federal judges now in office are exempted for another constitutional reason. As construed heretofore the constitutional provision to the effect that the salaries of these officials can not be diminished during their terms of office has been held to exempt such salaries until their successors assume office, when the tax would apply. This is a constitutional provision independent of any taxing provision in the Constitution. During and subsequent to the Civil War period it was held that salaries of these officials during their respective terms of office could not be diminished for any purpose, taxing or otherwise, and it was so held with respect to an attempt to assess them for income tax. In view of the very small amount involved, together with the fact that it was not desired to raise any constitutional argument over so small a matter, it was thought wiser to allow the successors of Federal judges and of the present President of the United States to assume this tax rather than provoke an argument by undertaking to impose it now, should we even have the power to do so.

Paragraph D provides for three kinds of return of income for taxation:

First. Return of an individual for himself.

Second. The return of a guardian, executor, and so forth, for the person for whom he acts.

Third. The return of any person or corporation for a taxable individual upon whose income such person or corporation is required to withhold and pay tax to the Government.

As I indicated a few minutes ago, while England collects about two-thirds to three-fourths of her entire $200,000,000 at the source, I think that, under the proposed measure, probably in the neighborhood of two-thirds of the tax, including, of course, that which would result indirectly from the individual, but which is paid by a corporation, as to the normal tax—at least two-thirds would be collected at the source of the income, and this would insure to that extent the collection of the full tax without trouble to the taxpayer, and without temptation to him to conceal or evade or withhold any portion of his taxable income.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman describes a case now where the corporation pays the tax, and where the stockholder who would get dividends from the company would not be required to return his dividends as part of his income.

Mr. HULL. Of the normal tax.

Mr. MADDEN. But the surtax he will be required to pay.

Mr. HULL. As to the additional tax, every individual makes personal returns of all of his income from every source, corporate or otherwise.

Mr. MADDEN. Deducting the amount of the original tax of 1 per cent paid by the corporation in which he is a stockholder.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I undertook to state a while ago the method of computing his income for the purpose of the additional tax, and I would prefer not to go over it again just now, if the gentleman will pardon me.

This paragraph also directs the exemption of $4,000 to every individual taxpayer. The exemption of $4,000 was fixed for a number of reasons. In the first place, as already stated, the people with incomes below $4,000 pay the principal part not only of our tariff taxes, but of the State and local taxes, and there is no injustice in requiring those with higher incomes to bear the amount of taxes this bill would impose; again, an exemption of this amount made it possible to omit a number of deductions which are allowed in other countries, and which would be allowed here, with a lower exemption, such as a certain amount for premiums paid on life insurance policies, allowances to a person with a large family, or to a person supporting indigent relatives, and so forth.

In other countries that have $200, and in most cases not over $800 exemption, their laws provide these special deductions, but in a law that allows $4,000 exemption it is not necessary to mention these items of expenditures specifically.

Furthermore, like any new tax law, it will be necessary for the people to become acquainted with the proposed law and for it to become adjusted to the country before extending its classifications, abatements, deductions, exemptions, and so forth, to that extent which in all respects would make it as comprehensive as it should later be made. It was therefore deemed sufficient at present that while the bill should contain the essential features of a modernized income-tax law, no attempt should be made to write into it the comprehensive system of rates such as is found in other countries, like England. With the English rates this bill would yield probably $400,000,000.

The Treasury regulations will classify the character of income and the persons or corporations in all cases where returns are required to be made for another and the tax withheld at the source. As I have indicated, the tax will only be thus stopped at the source of annual income which is fixed or determinable and is derived from yearly transactions or continuous business connections or relationships extending through the year. This will largely embrace income from interest, rent, and salaries, dividends not being included in return of income for the purpose of the normal tax. All other classes of income accruing during the year will be embraced in a personal return of the taxpayer. The work of administering the proposed law will be done by the Internal-Revenue Department. In making returns the taxpayer, or the person or corporation making return for him, will pursue very much the same course practiced with respect to the assessment of State or local taxes. The Internal-Revenue Department will send blank return to each person supposed to have net income over $4,000 and to each person or company through whose hands a like sized income is supposed to pass. Should such taxpayer be overlooked it would be his duty, as in the case of State taxes, to request a blank return and execute and file with the district collector of the district in which the taxpayer resides. A person or corporation required to withhold tax and make return for another only returns the income in his or its hands and makes no inquiry as to other income of the taxpayer, the latter being a matter between the taxpayer and the Government. All returns shall be made and filed by March 1 next and subsequent to December 31. The tax accrues to the Government after December 31, and the

machinery for its assessment and collection extending over some months is only one means of getting the tax into the Treasury.

Paragraph E prescribes the time and manner of paying the tax as computed upon each of the three returns heretofore described. Any person or corporation required to withhold and pay for a taxable person would not withhold any tax until the annual payments exceeded $4,000, except where the same is derived from interest on corporate or United States bonds; neither would the tax upon incomes from net earnings of corporations subject to like tax be withheld. No part of the tax imposed on corporations is stopped at the source. In many cases the taxable person will receive income from several sources at which the tax will be withheld, and, in order that one of the persons or corporations so withholding may understand that the taxpayer shall be allowed his $4,000 exemption thereon, the taxpayer is required to claim the same by filing affidavit to that effect within 30 days next before return is to be made for him. The other persons or corporations likewise withholding tax upon the income of the same taxpayer would understand, in the absence of such claim for exemption, that when the income exceeded $4,000 per annum they would retain the taxes due without including any exemption. In cases where tax is stopped at the source, as I have described, if the taxpayer has deductions for expenses, interest, taxes, and so forth, which he desires to have the benefit of, he may file the same with the collector of the district in which he resides if he has other income exceeding those deductions, otherwise he would be obliged to file the same either with the collector of the district in which his income is returned by another for him and the tax withheld or with the person or corporation whose duty it is thus to make return for him. This will be optional with the taxpayer. These two latter methods would bring his entire income and claim for deductions together in the hands of the district collector, so that when the same reached the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for assessment all the facts pertaining to the same would be together.

The first proviso in paragraph E requires the tax to be withheld from income derived from interest upon corporate and United States bonds and other indebtedness, even though the income does not exceed $4,000. This is the only available means of collecting taxes from this source of income. The interest on most corporate bonds is represented by coupons payable to bearer. Any holder of those coupons, no matter how large the amount, could easily divide them into amounts under the exemption of $4,000 and send them through different sources for collection or otherwise dispose of them so that when they reached the corporation owing the same no appreciable tax could probably be collected therefrom.

The latter part of the proviso I have mentioned simply contains a provision of the English law designed to intercept the tax from income of a taxable person derived from the dividends upon the stock or interest upon the bonds of foreign corporations doing business in foreign countries, the same being payable outside of the United States. This provision likewise relates to interest on bonds of foreign countries payable outside of the United States.

Paragraph G imposes a like normal tax upon the net profits, gains, or income of corporations without exemption. The provisions and administrative machinery of the present corporation-tax law are, in the main, reenacted. However, the language imposing the tax is made more comprehensive so as to embrace all corporations and joint-stock companies or associations, whether or not having capital stock. A large number of corporations that should be subject to tax have escaped under the present corporation-tax law. The dividends received by one corporation from the stock of another corporation are not exempted from the tax. This provision was based upon the policy that if a corporation desires to hold stock in another corporation, with all the corporate and business advantages arising therefrom, it should not object to paying taxes accordingly. Upon this ground no provision is made for exemptions to individual taxpayers deriving income from corporate earnings.

Labor, agricultural, charitable, and other organizations and societies exempt under the present corporation-tax law are likewise exempt from taxation under the proposed measure. Mutual savings banks not having capital stock represented by shares would also be exempt.

With respect to mutual fire insurance companies, a slight relaxation of the corporation-tax law as construed by the Treasury Department is made in the proposed bill. It is represented that factory mutual fire insurance companies require a premium deposit of from ten to twenty times as great as experience shows would be needed to pay the fire losses and all their expenses of the year. This presents a different state of facts from those relating to mutual insurance companies who seek exemption, in effect, from the operation of the proposed income tax.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that time does not permit me to go further into the details of this measure.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Suppose one has an income of $5,000 from either dividends or interest payable by corporations, and that that is his entire income, made up, say, $500 from one company, $600 from another, $700 from another, $800 from another, and on up enough to make $5,000. How does he get his exemption of $4,000 and in which company?

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will recall that where a taxpayer's income is derived in small amounts at different times from different sources he makes a personal return of it as a whole. If he receives an annual income from one source exceeding $4,000 the tax upon the excess over $4,000 is withheld at the source and paid, except as to the interest on the bonds of corporations. I want to say with respect to the difference between the amount of taxes paid by a person whose income is derived from other than corporate sources there is some little distinction.

The stockholder in the corporation who receives $100,000 income as dividends would pay $40 more than a bondholder or person whose income was derived from any other source. That is due to the fact that where individuals prefer to invest their wealth in corporations as stockholders, so far as this normal tax is concerned, with all the business and corporate advantages accruing to them, under this system of requiring the corporation to pay a tax for all its stockholders upon all the entire net earnings before dividends are declared, they are not permitted their exemption. That makes a difference of $40 in incomes up to $20,000,000, or any other amount derived, on the one hand, from dividends upon stocks, and upon the other from any other source.

Mr. MANN. Perhaps I did not make myself quite clear. Where the income from interest coupons, say, from different corporations, makes an income of $5,000, is not the person entitled to the exemption of $4,000, or only pay the income tax on $1,000?

Mr. HULL. Except where it is derived from dividends.

Mr. MANN. Well, I say interest; it is not derived from dividends; the person is then entitled to pay tax only upon $1,000 of that income?

Mr. HULL. That is true.

Mr. MANN. Yet the corporation is required to deduct the tax from the amount paid as interest. Now, how does the man get his exemption of $4,000?

Mr. HULL. He would make claim for his exemption to the district collector in the event the sources of his interest were many and were situated in different localities and no one source exceeded $4,000. He would bring it in those few instances, like they do in hundreds of thousands of instances in England, where, as a rule, he makes his application to the collector either for an abatement of the assessment or a refund of whatever amount of taxes might be paid.

Mr. MANN. If he makes the application, is there authority for him to make application for a refund and then for the Government to pay him back the income tax as to the $4,000?

Mr. HULL. All the authority of the present internal laws is given the taxpayer for remedies and relief, both as to corrections or abatement of the assessment or a refund of the tax.

Mr. MANN. It is not an abatement of an assessment, it is a question of paying back a refund to a man which has been paid by somebody and which he is entitled not to have charged to him.

Mr. HULL. The taxpayer would have all the remedies and the gentleman from Illinois, of course, is entirely familiar with the numerous remedies of the taxpayer with respect to remedying any incorrect assessment or to secure a refund of any amount of taxes that have been paid.

Mr. MANN. I am aware of this fact, that it is a very difficult thing to obtain a refund of the amount of internal-revenue taxes which have been paid in many cases, as the gentleman will readily recall by an examination of the Private Calendar of the House. However, I suppose there can be a remedy applied and in the case named that would require the Government to make an investigation as to how much had been paid in each instance by each corporation as interest to this person.

Mr. HULL. The taxpayer would simply file his claim for $4,000 exemption. He could also file his claim for a deduction, should he desire such. In any event he could file his claim for

this exemption along with verified facts as to the amount of taxable income on which the tax was withheld at the source.

Mr. MANN. Very true; but his tax has been paid by the corporation. He files a statement or claim to have that refunded to him. Certainly the Government would not admit that statement as true without investigation. Now, is the Government provided under the bill with means or ability to go to the source of the payment of the tax in each instance and ascertain whether or not the corporation has paid for this individual?

Mr. HULL. I think the fullest opportunity is given to the taxpayer in every case to secure redress and to secure whatever amount of exemption or deduction he might claim. In this instance he could have the assessment abated. As I stated in the beginning, it will be, of course, utterly impossible to take up the thousands of business conditions of this country and off hand apply the most expeditious method of dealing with them and apply this law to them, but, like any other tax law, the regulations of the Treasury Department will be prepared so as, without injustice, to meet and apply the law to the business conditions as they exist in such innumerable forms.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I will.

Mr. HARDY. In connection with the question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], I do not know as I understand the workings of the bill, and I am asking simply for information. As I understand it, if you have a number of dividends from corporations which pay 1 per cent at the source, amounting to, say, in six different dividends, to $5,000, all of which paid 1 per cent when the corporation paid taxes on their income before the dividend is turned over to the stockholder, as I understand the bill, in that case there would be no rebate. The party would receive $5,000 income.

Mr. HULL. That is true. The gentleman from Illinois was discussing interest derived from corporate bonds.

Mr. HARDY. I thought he had reference to income and dividends.

Mr. BATHRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I will.

Mr. BATHRICK. On page 139, the second proviso, line 8, it seems to exempt the incomes derived from dividends upon stocks and corporations which have paid the corporate tax. Is that true?

Mr. HULL. That relates to the 1 per cent normal tax which applies to corporations as a separate taxable entity, just as it applies to individuals; and when the tax is first paid by the corporation on its net earnings, then the stockholder who is to receive a dividend out of the earnings that have paid the tax would not duplicate the tax by paying it again.

Mr. BATHRICK. Suppose in this income tax there is a tax on incomes of over $4,000; when it arrives at $20,000 there is a higher tax, is there not?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. BATHRICK. Suppose there is an income derived by some person in excess of $20,000, which I believe is where the tax increases, is it not?

Mr. HULL. That is where the additional tax first applies.

Mr. BATHRICK. Suppose he has an income of $25,000, $30,000, $40,000, or $50,000 from dividends, does not he pay under the graduated rising tax?

Mr. HULL. Oh, yes. As I have stated, the law undertakes to assemble in the hands of every individual who receives an income exceeding $20,000 from every source, corporate or otherwise, the amount of his income, and fastens this additional graduated tax upon him.

Mr. BATHRICK. Notwithstanding the corporation has paid 1 per cent on the $4,000?

Mr. HULL. There is no relationship between the normal tax of 1 per cent and this graduated tax. It is simply added for the purpose of graduation.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that I would impose on the committee by consuming the time that it would be necessary to dispose——

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I will.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman was discussing the matter of income at the source. The gentleman will remember in the case of a bond issue of a corporation doing a commercial business, or a railroad, the bonds issued are not payable to any particular party, but payable to bearer, and the interest generally paid at the stated periods, say every six months, represented by coupons which are cut off at the interest-paying period. Now, you can not compel the railroad company or corporation to pay the income at the source of all the people who own these bonds. Now, the railroad company which issues the bonds, or the manufacturing company which issues them and puts them on the market, does not keep any list of those who own them. They pass from hand to hand like a dollar bill or a hundred dollar bill. In other words, they pass current. Now, how is the railroad or other obligators of the bond to know what person they are to take the income from? The coupon is cut off and carried by the owner of it to the bank and deposited, and these coupons are generally payable in New York, Chicago, or other places. How is the obligator in the bond or the Government to determine whether that particular man has paid the tax or is due to pay the tax under this bill?

Mr. HULL. As I stated awhile ago, unless the actual owner of the bond presented the coupons for payment himself, or it should be done for him, the company would withhold the tax for the reason that so long as these negotiable instruments are in general circulation it is utterly impossible, as I think the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] will agree, to reach them for taxation in any other manner. These coupons are not taxable income, but capital, when they pass to new owners and from the bondholder.

Mr. BARTLETT. Unless a man swears to a falsehood, you can reach him.

Mr. HULL. Well, I have pointed to the fact before that if you depended on the individual taxpayers, as we do in the States, to get returns of our concealed personality, it would amount to only about $1 in $10, as a rule.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then there may be a case arising where the tax due upon one particular security will be two or three times paid. A man may pay it and present it to the bank, and it may pass from hand to hand, and each one of the persons to whom it passes may have paid it except the last one. The obligor of the bond will hold it at the source for the man who last presents it, whereas the Government will get the honest man's return of it who makes the return and pays the tax on it; and if this last man is a dishonest man and tries to evade the tax, the Government will get it from the source once and from the honest people every time. So that it looks to me as if it will depreciate the value of these securities very much on the market—the manner the gentleman has suggested of collecting the tax at the source.

Mr. HULL. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, this method is not only feasible, but it is the only feasible method of dealing with this situation as it relates to corporate indebtedness, and it is far more simple and far more expeditious than any other method in use in other countries. The corporation owning the bonds would only retain the tax once. The coupons are taxable income in the hands of the bondholder, but no subsequent purchaser could claim any exemption or deductions with respect to them, because they then become principal.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Perhaps the gentleman explained it when I was out, but I do not know. Why were not the Hawaiian Islands included—citizens of the Hawaiian Islands? The citizens of Porto Rico and of the Philippine Islands are included, but not the citizens of the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. HULL. In the first place they have an income tax of their own, and this bill simply extends the tax to the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico for their exclusive benefit and taxation. Of course, they become the beneficiaries of the revenue derived. This was done, as I understood, at the request of officials connected with the islands. The Hawaiian Islands, already having an income-tax law of their own, would naturally not want another one embraced in the bill.

Mr. COOPER. But there are a number of States of the Union that have income-tax laws.

Mr. HULL. I know; but I understood the question applied to these insular possessions that do not occupy the category of States.

Mr. MADDEN. Would there be any difference in fact between a State and the insular possessions? If the citizens of a State pay an income tax as citizens of the State, and are then required to pay an income tax as citizens of the United States in addition, is that any different from the case of citizens of the Hawaiian Islands being obliged to pay an income tax in Hawaii and then to pay also an income tax as citizens of the United States?

Mr. HULL. I do not think that question arises in the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. It discriminates against the people of the States in favor of the people of Hawaii.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I do.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I simply wanted to state to the gentleman, in reply to the statement of the gentleman from

Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], who spoke of Hawaii as an insular possession, that Hawaii is a Territory of the United States, and I suppose it would be treated on the same basis as the States of the Union.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Tennessee will permit——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman about another matter which might have been discussed during my absence. If that is so, I do not ask the gentleman to repeat it. But there is a provision requiring a lessee to make returns of tax in all instances where the amount paid by the lessee would be in excess of $4,000, as I recall it, and the lessor is entitled to an exemption only in case he has filed with the lessee a statement showing his entire income from all sources, and that shall be made a part of the return to be made by the lessee to the Government. Now, if I am correct in my statement of what the law provides, I want to ask the gentleman what he has to say as to the disadvantage to the citizen of being thus compelled to make public, not to the Government, but through the lessee, his entire private affairs touching his income, and so forth?

Mr. HULL. I tried to explain that at a former stage. But to use figures, so that there can be no misunderstanding about it, suppose a taxpayer receives an income of $10,000 from a certain corporation. The tax is withheld by the corporation and paid to the Government, or to be paid to the Government after tax return and assessment. This taxpayer has $3,000 of income derived from other scattering sources. He has $2,500 of deductions, expenses of his business, interest on his indebtedness, and taxes paid to the State. He wants the benefit of those deductions. Now, he can do one of three things under those circumstances. He can file a return of his own with the district collector in the district where he resides, containing the $3,000 income and the $2,500 deduction, and that will be disposed of in the usual way. But if his deductions were $3,000 and his income on which the tax was not withheld at the source was only $2,500, then he would not have enough income from that source from which to subtract his deductions. So that he is obliged to consolidate them at some point between him and the internal revenue collector's office where the tax is assessed—consolidate it with his aggregate income. In that event he would send to the district collector, where the return was made for him by the corporation on the $10,000. He need not go to the corporation. It is optional with him to send to the district collector the return of the $3,000 deduction claimed and the $2,500 income. Then the $10,000 income would be returned for him to this same collector by the corporation, and they would merge in the office of the collector and go up together to the internal revenue commissioner's office, as I have said, with all the attendant facts and be assessed upon the whole facts.

Mr. SHERLEY. Let me see if I understand the gentleman. Suppose a man has an income from three pieces of property, and in each instance he gets $5,000 income. It is the duty of the lessee to hold out the tax, is it not, and send it in to the collector?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. The lessor gets his exemption of $4,000 only in the event that he gives to the lessee information touching his entire income.

Mr. HULL. I beg the gentleman's pardon. That is not at all correct.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is what I want to find out.

Mr. HULL. The taxpayer is given the fullest discretion in making claims for deductions—to file the same either with the district collector or with the person who returns his tax, as he sees fit. The $4,000 exemption alone would be claimed at the source.

Mr. SHERLEY. Let me ask you some questions. Suppose he does not give notice to the lessee at all. Is it made the duty of the lessee in each instance to hold out the tax and pay it to the Government? Is that true?

Mr. HULL. After it reaches $4,000 he would hold out the entire tax.

Mr. SHERLEY. I understand. Now, I have stated a simple case, where a man owns three pieces of property. He leases each of those three, and his income from each is $5,000. Now, he does not give notice to the lessee. Is it not the duty of the lessee to hold out the tax of 1 per cent in each instance and pay it to the Government?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. That being so, how does the lessee get his exemption? Is there a provision whereby the Government returns to him the excess tax that has been paid him by each lessee?

Mr. HULL. I will try to come to the gentleman's point.

Mr. SHERLEY. Can not the gentleman answer me directly?

Mr. HULL. I want to see whether I understand the gentleman's position. If the taxpayer receives an income from three or four sources——

Mr. SHERLEY. Let us take the case I have stated.

Mr. HULL. He receives $5,000 from each source. Each of the other gentlemen is required to withhold the tax for the taxpayer. Now, unless he notifies one of them of his claim for exemption, neither one of the three would know which one should make the request for his exemption in withholding the tax. So that the taxpayer is required, if he desires the benefit of an exemption under those circumstances, to make his claim with some one of the three.

Mr. SHERLEY. Otherwise he would not get back the excess. Is that true?

Mr. HULL. That is true so far as the tax collected entirely at the source is concerned.

Mr. SHERLEY. All right. I want to present to the gentleman the situation. Suppose, instead of taking the man who has simply three pieces of property, take the great Astor estate, which is largely an estate invested in real estate. As I understand, in order to get the exemption, it would be necessary to give to one of the lessees from whom you are to get the claim of exemption the entire private history of your income.

Mr. HULL. I beg the gentleman's pardon; you do not give a history of anything. The exemption is $4,000, and you merely file your claim for exemption, and that is all that there is involved.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think the gentleman will find that the section goes very much beyond that.

Mr. HULL. The person who is required to withhold the tax at the source——

Mr. SHERLEY. I will read the provision on page 142 of the bill.

It requires the person to—

file with the person who is required to withhold and pay tax for him a true and correct return of his annual gains, profits, and income from all other sources, and also the deductions asked for, and the showing thus made shall then become a part of the return to be made in his behalf by the person required to withhold and pay the tax——

Mr. HULL. Go on and read the balance of the sentence.

Mr. SHERLEY (continuing the reading):

or such person may likewise make application for deductions to the collector of the district in which return is made or to be made for him.

But I ask the gentleman where there is a case in which the payments are all made at the source, the man in that instance must expose to some one of the source-paying persons or corporations his entire income.

Mr. HULL. I assure the gentleman that if I know anything at all about this language he is in error. He confuses deductions with exemptions. There is one statutory $4,000 exemption that must be claimed of the person who withholds the tax at the source in cases where one's taxes are paid at the source. His deductions for expenses, losses, and so forth, which the gentleman seems to have in mind, are left to the taxpayer to be claimed to the district collector, or, if he should prefer, through the person or corporation withholding his tax at the source of his income.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is provision made for the collector to return to the person the excess of tax which has been collected at its source?

Mr. HULL. No tax has been collected up to the time the gentleman seems to refer. This is only for the purpose of assessment, and, as I stated awhile ago, both items merge in the office of that collector. They then go up to the office of the internal-revenue collector, who assesses the tax, computes the sum due, and then sends notice of amount due to those whose duty it is to pay the tax.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman does not state what I understand to be the requirements of law. The law says that the lessee or corporation shall withhold and shall pay. Now they actually pay the tax to the Government. What I want to know is whether there is any method whereby if a man does not desire to make a disclosure of his deductions he is entitled to to a private individual—is there any method by which the Government can repay to him the excess tax that has been collected at the source?

Mr. HULL. The gentleman's question assumes that the taxpayer is obliged to disclose something relating to his business to some other individual, which is entirely inaccurate. It is optional with him.

Mr. SHERLEY. All right. Suppose he does not do it to an individual, but does it to the Government; the tax has all been

paid at the source. What I want to know is what provision is there whereby the Government, getting the information directly, can return the deductions, can repay the excess collected at the source?

Mr. HULL. In the first place, the tax has not been paid at all at this stage. This results merely in an assessment of the tax, a preliminary stage occurring some time before the tax would necessarily be paid. It relates to the determination of the amount of the tax.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then, am I correct in assuming that the gentleman implies that, these deductions coming to the knowledge of the Government, it shall then be the duty of the Government to inform the lessee in the particular case cited that the man is entitled to certain deductions?

Mr. HULL. To be sure; that is, in the sense that the Government would notify him of the amount of the tax, which would show that deductions had been allowed.

Mr. SHERLEY. And that, therefore, he, the lessee, is to pay to the Government only a certain proportion of the tax?

Mr. HULL. They would send back to the lessee, to take the gentleman's case, along with the statement of his own taxes, the amount of the assessment on the return he had made for this other person.

Mr. SHERLEY. But do they give to the lessee knowledge of deductions that the lessor is entitled to, so as to enable the lessee to pay a less tax than he would ordinarily pay for the lessor; and if so, where is the provision in the law for it?

Mr. HULL. I am sorry that I can not make myself clear to the gentleman.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not want to embarrass the gentleman.

Mr. HULL. There is no embarrassment whatever.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not asking for the purpose of trying to confuse the gentleman or tricking him, but this matter has been discussed considerably in the press. It is a very important question in that unless provision is made by which the excess of tax can be refunded, or not collected at the source, an individual may have to disclose his entire private concerns to another individual.

Mr. HULL. The law, as the gentleman read it there, is as plainly in the alternative as it can be made.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; that is all right; but does not the man get penalized, in taking one alternative, by not getting his rebate.

Mr. HULL. The sole purpose of that provision is to give him his rebate or deduction. Otherwise the provision would not be there.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I was wondering if there ought not to be some means by which the individual who receives the income should be permitted to pay his own tax in the case of property rent. Why should a lessee be authorized to pay taxes for you as a lessor?

Mr. HULL. That is, in effect, a practice even now in a great many States. The tax imposed upon individuals is also paid by some other person, as in the case of the tax on shares of banks for its shareholders. I believe that is the law in the gentleman's State.

Mr. MADDEN. Let me cite this case. I own a building in which there are 50 tenants. The income from that is, say, $6,000 a year. I do not undertake to say what it is. How would the tenants in that case be authorized to pay the tax on the revenue that I was to receive from the building?

Mr. HULL. No person is to withhold the tax for another unless he owes that person exceeding $4,000 arising from an annual transaction.

Mr. MADDEN. Owes him $4,000; but the rule is that where a man leases a building or a piece of property he gets his income monthly, and it is not at all likely that any person leasing a building would owe $4,000 at the end of any fiscal year.

Mr. HULL. Then a personal return would be made if the annual rental should be less than $4,000. If the rent, based on a yearly contract, should in the aggregate amount to over $4,000, even though payable at shorter periods, the lessor would begin to withhold the tax whenever the amount paid exceeds $4,000.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I have received, and I presume every other Member has received, more or less complaints—criticisms—of the bill so far as it affects insurance companies—life insurance companies, mutual fire insurance companies, and so forth—and the criticisms are based, as I understand it, upon the provision in H. R. No. 10, and I understand that in the pending bill there have been some changes made. Will the gentleman state to what extent the bill as it is now before the House differs from the provisions in the bill No. 10?

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I will oblige the gentleman as to this entire insurance controversy as best I can, although I feel I am imposing very much on the committee.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman perhaps did not quite understand my question. I am laboring under the apprehension that the provision which the gentleman has just been discussing in the pending bill has been changed in some respect from what it is in House bill No. 10.

Mr. HULL. It proposes simply to impose a tax on the net earnings of insurance companies without permitting them to have deductions for these dividends, which they declare annually to policy holders, in computing their net income, which is the construction that has been placed on this law by the Government during the last few years.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I understand, but I will ask the gentleman again. Is the pending bill the same in this respect as the bill H. R. 10? Has there been some change?

Mr. HULL. The only change is that we have attempted to make the language a little clearer, and the language is specific enough to prevent the companies from shifting these earnings from one category to another if they should be inclined to do so, and in that way escape the tax.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Whatever criticism has been made has been on the provision in H. R. 10. Now, the pending bill having modified that to some extent, I was desirous, if possible, to ascertain whether the change had met any of this criticism, so that the criticism no longer lies. In other words, I am anxious to know in just what respect the provision in the pending bill differs from the way the provision appears in H. R. 10.

Mr. HULL. I will say to the gentleman it is simply an issue whether the company shall pay the tax on their annual net earnings without making deductions as they have claimed heretofore in this controversy.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield? In order that I may be able to write clearly, I want to see if I can write in condensed form. As I understand, the gentleman does not think this bill levies any tax on the proceeds on death payment of the policies?

Mr. HULL. That is expressly stated.

Mr. HARDY. And in no case it exempts no tax on death dividends and annuities. On that portion, the death dividends and annuities, the experts shall determine. So death receipts are placed on the same basis as other taxes?

Mr. HULL. There is no tax proposed, except on the net earnings of insurance companies——

Mr. HARDY. I understand that many insurance policies are in the nature of an investment, and if there is an earning, that earning is taxed.

Mr. HULL. That is true.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I will.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I understand the gentleman to say this amount that is paid in case of an emergency by mutual fire insurance companies is returned to the policy holder, and is not taxed in this bill?

Mr. HULL. That is taken care of——

Mr. TRIBBLE. In the present bill. That is the point I wanted to know.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, there is no distinction made between the so-called mutual companies and the profit-making insurance companies?

Mr. HULL. No. They are taxed on their net earnings.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I do not understand that the question, either by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE] or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY], disclosed fully what was sought to be brought out. My understanding was that the criticism of H. R. 10 before the caucus was that it seemed a tax was levied upon an insurance policy if paid during the life of the holder and upon the beneficiary of a policy, after death, and that in the caucus the language was straightened out so as to show clearly that no tax was levied upon the beneficiary of a policy or upon the amount paid, such as on a 20-year policy, but that the net earnings of the company or any other net earnings were continued to be taxed under the bill? That is my understanding.

Mr. HULL. That is substantially as it is. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PHELAN. Is there any provision in the case of life insurance companies whereby what is directly an overcharge shall not be taxed when it is returned to the policy holder?

Mr. HULL. I will say to the gentleman of course it is utterly impossible to write provisions in a general law that would specifically apply and govern every phase of the hundreds of thousands of different kinds of business transactions in the country. I would say, however, that companies have been paying dividends, according to their own admission, out of actual profits, in sums far greater than any kind of premium savings. If the companies persist in mixing the smaller amount of premium savings in these undisputed profits, then no distinction is made.

Mr. PHELAN. That is what I meant. There is nothing which would prevent a life insurance company from figuring what is strictly an overcharge when they make their premium, and deducting that, and not including that in their entire net earnings. There is nothing to prohibit that in this bill?

Mr. HULL. Well, to the extent that excess of premiums are collected and blended with profits, the same rule would apply as to tax.

Mr. ROGERS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. If I understand the provision of paragraph B, on page 134, correctly, it defines that income as including gains, profits, and incomes, among other things, from sales and dealings in property. Now suppose a man should buy 100 shares in one company and 100 shares in another company, and at the end of the fiscal year he should find one of that block had gone up 20 points and the other had gone down 20 points, do I understand he would have to pay on the profit he had made without receiving any benefit on the loss he had sustained?

Mr. HULL. Where he is conducting two separate businesses, or where he is conducting one business consisting of different branches, he would deduct from his aggregate profits the losses that were incident to the business out of which the profits grew.

Mr. ROGERS. Here, for example, we have a man investing in the securities of two entirely distinct companies, one of which goes up in value and the other goes down. I can not read in the law anything that takes care of the man and gives him a set-off on the securities on which he has been at a disadvantage.

Mr. HULL. I sought to explain that situation briefly a while ago. Of course it is impossible to take up all the different and countless illustrations that any gentleman might suggest and dispose of them in short order. But I undertook to say that the losses and the expenses that are ordinarily considered relate to those growing out of the particular business which secures to the individual his income, or from which his income is derived. Of course any loss foreign to that, or any expense entirely different from that, would not be considered as a part of his trading loss.

Mr. ROGERS. Does the gentleman think that in the case I have put there would be an allowance for the deficit which the individual had sustained in the less fortunate security?

Mr. HULL. The gentleman means in case of a broker who invests, or just an individual not regularly in the business?

Mr. ROGERS. No. Suppose the gentleman or myself or anybody should invest in 100 shares of one security and in 100 shares of another security and one goes up and the other goes down. Under the act, unquestionably, other things being sufficiently high, he has to pay an income tax on the fortunate security.

Mr. HULL. Yes; if he is simply making a casual investment of that kind now and then, or here and there, I think he would report his gains for taxable purposes, and probably would be allowed for his loss. It would not be a trade loss, but set off against the particular gain from the other stock transaction.

Mr. ROGERS. That might, of course, be a very important matter for a man who was doing a good deal of buying and selling in the stock market in a perfectly proper way, not as an operator or speculator, but as a man who buys when an opportunity presents and sells when he sees another opportunity.

Mr. HULL. The question would arise whether he is making that a business. There are ample adjudications as to all these kinds of transactions, which will make it easy, I think, for the Secretary of the Treasury to make the taxpayers acquainted with their exact application and relation to the tax.

Mr. MANN. Another question occurs to me right there, if the gentleman will permit. Perhaps the gentleman can answer. I do not criticize him if he can not. Suppose a man bought a piece of property some years ago for a small price and sells it during this year after this bill takes effect, or even this year before this bill takes effect. Does he have to account for the entire profits as income based upon the original cost, although the property last year may have been worth as much as he sells it for this year?

Mr. HULL. Of course that raises a very broad field of consideration. The laws have been construed heretofore to the effect that the taxpayer is expected to return the profits that accrued to him during the calendar year or the taxable year. Profits on the sales of property which was purchased in connection with the business which a man is carrying on from year to year would be reported for taxation for the year of their accrual, such as any regular trade or business, even though the property was purchased during the preceding years. As to abstract or occasional cases, such as the gentleman suggests, apart from that class that I have described, sometimes each one might depend upon its own state of facts. But at any rate the entire profits that accrue during the year in connection with trade or commerce or business regularly carried on from year to year, no matter when the property was purchased, would be reported.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can readily see that that question is certain to arise in many cases.

Mr. HULL. Yes. I may say to the gentleman that at present, as the corporation-tax laws are enforced, if a man bought some property, it may have been 10 years ago, for $10,000 and sells it for $20,000 now, he would return the average annual increase for one year, which would be $1,000, as a part of his annual profits for this year. Now, it was not attempted to get into the field of unearned increment in this measure, and if you go too far along that line you will get into it.

Mr. MANN. Are you not in it now? That is what I am getting at. Are you not in it if you have to make return on the property or increment, with no further distinction?

Mr. HULL. I will say to the gentleman frankly that it has been held, in construing all these laws that I have observed, that unless the unearned increment is expressly made income, it is not considered income in any sense of the word, but simply increase of value or capital.

Mr. MANN. Very true; but your bill specifically provides, as I recall it, that you are to treat as income profits on the sale or use of real estate.

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Well, I know; but profits on the sale arise from the differences between what it costs you and what you sell it for. That is the measure of the profit.

Mr. HULL. That would not necessarily raise the other question. It would in some cases and would not in others.

Mr. MANN. What I really wanted to get at was not that, but whether it would relate back so as to cover all profit. Suppose a man bought property many years ago which probably last year was worth as much as it is this year. He sells it this year. What are his profits? How does he arrive at what his profits are?

Mr. HULL. My judgment would be that as to an occasional purchase of real estate not by a dealer or one making the buying and selling a business this bill would only apply to profits on sales where the land was purchased and sold during the same year.

Mr. MANN. I hope that statement will remain in the RECORD.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I desire before closing to allude to the merits of the proposed tax of 1 per cent per annum upon the net profits of insurance companies. I presume that most of the Members of this House are policyholders. I may say that I, and doubtless every Member of this House, feel most kindly toward the policyholders of this country, and feel no prejudice against the insurance companies. In disposing of the merits of the proposed tax I am satisfied no Member has the slightest desire to even remotely do injustice or injury to any company or policyholder.

I recall when the income-tax law of 1894 was enacted these companies came down here and stirred up a great deal of sentiment and excited the policyholders and procured their exemption; but after the matter was fully understood by the country it was the occasion of about the most severe criticism there was to the bill. Now, some of the companies have sent out alarming circulars to the stockholders, which are calculated to impress upon them that they are about to be outraged or in some other respect seriously injured by some of the provisions to be found somewhere in the pending measure. As a matter of fact, there is no tax, as I said, upon the proceeds of life insurance policies paid at the death of another. There is no tax imposed upon any individual with respect to the return of any sum or amount invested in insurance as a business proposition during his life. Of course, if there should be actual earnings coming back to him along with a return of a portion of the investment, as in case of an

annuity, for instance, then as determined by the expert knowledge of the actuary it would constitute actual earnings such as would arise from the interest on a promissory note on a loan, and the individual would be expected to keep that in mind as a part of his taxable income, if the company had not already paid the tax. As to the third proposition, I explained that the $4,000 exemption which is granted, three times as much as that of any other country, allows for an item of expenditure such as premium payments without mentioning them separately; and, finally, the mutual insurance companies desire to have themselves entirely exempted as to their net earnings from the 1 per cent normal tax imposed upon corporations. Now, when this corporation-tax law was enacted four years ago it was drafted by a very skillful hand; its chief author was reported to have been Attorney General Wickersham, a gentleman who had intimate knowledge of the nature and character of the business of these insurance companies and of the different classes and kinds of net earnings and accumulations that arise during the year; and it was expressly provided in that law that insurance companies, mutual or otherwise, should not be permitted, in computing their net income, to make deductions for dividends paid to policyholders. The word "dividends" was expressly and definitely inserted there upon the broad ground of public policy and of justice; that when insurance companies pay dividends out of the accumulations of the character that these companies have they should pay the tax of 1 per cent imposed on all corporations; but they come in and say that that should be stricken out; that whenever they declare a dividend to the policyholder it is simply a return of the premium savings and constitutes in no sense net earnings in the way of interest savings or in the way of excess of the mortuary fund or from the other sources from which actual accumulations or profits arise.

When the corporation-tax act had gone into effect, some of the insurance companies acquiesced in this insurance clause as just, others objected to paying the full amount of the tax. Treasury decision No. 1743, which I will publish at the end of my remarks, shows that hearings were had covering a period of almost six months, during which almost all the companies affected were heard in person or by brief. After a full consideration of the facts the Commissioner of Internal Revenue reached the conclusion that these companies had made it a rule of their business during past years, through their literature, advertisements, agents, and solicitors, to represent to the public whose business they solicited, that each policyholder at stated periods shall be entitled to a dividend out of the surplus of the company; that the amount of the dividend was generally made the most prominent feature of their advertisements and solicitations for business; that their policy contracts designated such amounts paid as dividends; and that in their sworn reports to the States the word "dividend" in its ordinary commercial sense was to all intents and purposes always used. It is clear from these recited facts, as found by the department, and which have not been denied to my knowledge, that the term "dividend" as thus used by the insurance companies had long existed in the insurance world as embodying this term in its broad commercial sense. It was known that at times, at least, some companies had heretofore permitted profits to accumulate permanently to a large extent in the hands of the companies. For the first time, however, when they came to offer objections to the payment of the corporation tax, these companies, or most of them, undertook to disclaim or rather to deny the accuracy, not to say truthfulness, of all the representations they had been making to the public, as I have described. If these companies had from the beginning represented to the public whose business they solicited that they would collect excessive amounts as premiums and would return such premium overcharges to the policyholders from time to time, instead of representing that they would pay dividends out of profits, then both Congress and the country would have better understood the real nature of their business.

The companies now ask Congress to say to the country what they refused to say for themselves until recently and long after this tax was enacted in 1909, viz, that they only make returns of premium savings to their policyholders growing out of excessive charges on premiums. However, there are various sources of earnings with respect to insurance companies; they derive savings from the amount set apart for expense of conducting the business; they derive a considerable sum from excess of the mortuary fund, as I understand; gains or savings from lapses and surrenders is another source of profit; excess of interest earnings is still another. It is generally understood that the premiums assessed upon policyholders are based upon an assumption of mortality, which is about 30 per cent less than actually occurs; nevertheless the full amount is collected, so that the excess goes to profit accumulations unless returned. Again, it is assumed that the companies can only earn from 3 per cent to 3½ per cent upon the reserve, when in fact they earn far more than this amount, as is shown by interest rates in their reports to the different States. No one can question the justice of a nominal tax upon these classes of accumulated profits, which are in excess of current needs. Of course the companies can blend the earnings I have described with premium overcharges and then insist that no tax should be laid. I do not pretend, as none except an expert would pretend, to be well versed in all the intricacies of the insurance business; however, by reason of profits derived from the sources I have mentioned many companies have made surprising showings. One hundred thousand dollars of stock in the Equitable Co., of New York, has sold for $3,000,000. It has assets amounting to more than $400,000,000. One-hundred-dollar shares of stock in the Aetna Life are reported to be worth more than $10,000; $100 shares of Metropolitan Life, $15,000; $100 shares of the Prudential, $17,000. Several companies have assets amounting to $500,000,000 or $600,000,000. Several of these large concerns, with their huge aggregations of property, are among the most powerful factors in the financial world. Yet, enjoying, as they do, the protection of the Government; being permitted, as they are, to amass these enormous accumulations of property, and to hand it or its equivalent down from generation to generation under the management of a few individuals, loud complaint is offered when the General Government proposes a nominal tax of 1 per cent per annum upon their net profits.

The entire amount of tax involved is perhaps not over $1,000,000. Even if the companies could and should pass it down to the policyholder, it would amount to only 15 to 20 cents each. Hundreds of thousands of circular letters have been scattered all over the country with a view to arraying the policyholders against the proposed tax and the effect of which is to prejudice them most unjustly against the entire income tax proposed. One of these circulars complains at the "heavy burden of taxation now borne by the policyholders"; the circular then gives the amount of taxes paid by the company during the past five years, which is an average of $1,171,633. This would amount to about one-fifth of 1 per cent. But why do the companies pay this tax to the States? Why have not they procured their exemption from State taxation, as they are now proposing, with respect to this nominal Federal tax? I have yet to hear of any suggestion that the States should exempt them. My judgment is that the accumulations of these companies, which arise from savings in expenses, savings in mortality, savings from lapses and surrenders, and profits from excess interest earnings, when considered in the aggregate, are clearly of such a character as to merit the payment of the proposed tax. But when it is proposed to impose the tax, the question of premium overcharges is now brought up for discussion. It would seem that the interest of the policyholder would be better served by leaving with him substantially the amount of this sum overcharged as premiums, in view of the fact that many of the companies are able to pay dividends amounting to several millions, which amount was derived from the sources of gain I have described. If the companies would keep the question of premium assessments and overcharges strictly within a category to themselves and not mix and confuse them with the profits derived from the sources I have enumerated, I think it would then be possible for the law to deal with the one without affecting the other. It would seem that many or most of the companies are in a position to declare a dividend in the strict commercial sense, and I should say that the courts now construe the language of this bill so that if the so-called "dividends" are actual premium overcharges no tax would apply, so that the tax would only go to profits of other kinds. While the mutual companies seek entire exemption and controvert the views I offer, yet I can see no theory of fair dealing upon which the tax is unjust, or would reduce the dividend or increase the premium of any policyholder. Everybody will seek exemption if we exempt these huge corporations owning several billion dollars of assets.

Now, Mr. Chairman, apologizing to the committee for the length of time I have used, I want to say in my judgment this is simply——

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Pardon me, but I want to conclude my remarks.

Permit me to say, in conclusion, that laws similar to the income tax proposed in this bill have operated and are now operating successfully and satisfactorily in a large number of instances throughout the world. There is no reason why its administration should not be even more successful in this country.

The American people will experience a saving from tariff reductions, which the proposed income tax makes possible, immeasurably greater than the amount of the tax. The American people understand the nature of this tax, and by their recent action have shown their desire for its enactment into law.

In view of the experience of other countries, it is confidently believed that when the measure now pending becomes a law and becomes adjusted to the country and understood by the people the universal judgment will be that it equals in its satisfactory operation and excels in its justice, flexibility, and productiveness any tax law on the statute books. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

APPENDIX A.

(T. D. 1743.)

Special excise tax on corporations.

Dividends declared by insurance companies are the dividends referred to in section 38, act of August 5, 1909, as not being deductible from gross income, and when such dividends are applied to the payment of renewal premiums, to shorten the endowment or premium-paying period, to purchase paid-up additions and annuities, etc., they must be included in and accounted for as income.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, D. C., December 16, 1911.

SIR: Section 38 of the act of August 5, 1909, provides that every insurance company now or hereafter organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State or Territory of the United States, or under the acts of Congress applicable to Alaska or the District of Columbia, or now or hereafter organized under the laws of any foreign country and engaged in business in any State or Territory of the United States or in Alaska or in the District of Columbia, shall be subject to pay annually a special excise tax with respect to the carrying on or doing business by such insurance company equivalent to 1 per cent upon the entire net income over and above $5,000 received by it from all sources during such year. The act referred to provides that such net income shall be ascertained by deducting from gross income received within the year from all sources (first) all the ordinary and necessary expenses actually paid within the year out of income in the maintenance and operation of its business and properties, including all charges, such as rentals or franchise payments, required to be made as a condition to the continued use or possession of property; (second) all losses actually sustained within the year and not compensated by insurance or otherwise, including a reasonable allowance for depreciation of property, if any, and, in the case of insurance companies, the sums other than dividends paid within the year on policy and annuity contracts, etc.

In the administration of this law the questions of what was meant by the use of the word "dividend" and the status of dividends declared by insurance companies have arisen. These questions have been receiving most careful consideration in this office for the past six months. Many hearings have been had on this subject, at which have appeared officers and counsel representing nearly all of the insurance companies interested. In addition to elaborate arguments, a number of briefs have been filed and this office has on its own account made careful and painstaking investigations.

Reduced to final analysis, the contentions of the various companies are chiefly two:

First. That dividends declared by mutual and participating companies are not dividends in the commercial sense of the word, but are simply refunds to the policyholder of a portion of the overcharge collected from such policyholder at the time the annual premium of the policy contract is collected, which overcharge is merely held in trust by the company issuing the policy, and annually or at stated periods all, or a portion thereof, is returned to the person holding the policy.

A careful consideration of the language used by Congress on this subject; a consideration of the provisions in the policy contracts relating to dividends; the statements of the insurance companies to their policyholders; the statements made by the insurance companies to the public generally through their authorized advertisements, their literature, and by their agents; and the sworn reports of the insurance companies made to the various State authorities show that this contention is untenable.

The language in the various policies differs a little, but the contract itself sets out specifically that the policy shall entitle the holder annually or at stated periods to a dividend which shall be the distributive share of the policy in the surplus of the company, the amount thereof being fixed by the board of directors or in some other designated method.

In the authorized literature sent out by each of the various companies the amount of the dividend is in general made the most prominent feature, and, as is a matter of common knowledge of every person who has reached the age of maturity, each and every one of the agents of these companies presents a mass of alleged facts and figures showing the financial benefits to be derived by taking a policy in any given company on account of its large annual surplus and the dividend to be declared on the policy as a result thereof. In fact, in the current magazines, street car advertisements, etc., one is confronted with allegations set forth in attractive type of the dividends earned and declared on the policies of one or another of these companies.

In all of the policy contracts and in the literature and representations of the agents and officers of the respective companies the amounts thus paid to the policyholder are designated dividends, are treated as dividends so far as appears both by the companies and the policyholders receiving them, and an examination of the sworn reports furnished by these insurance companies to the various State officers discloses the fact that these amounts are still called dividends and treated as dividends, and in the face of these facts it becomes an impossibility for this office to rule that such dividends should be considered under any other designation or that the amounts so paid should be deductible from gross income in making the returns of annual net income.

It was vigorously contended by counsel, representing certain of these companies, that it was necessary at the outset to disregard entirely the policy contracts, the published literature, the representations of officers and agents, the sworn returns to State authorities, and to consider the proposition only after these items had been eliminated; that owing to the exigencies of business and the competition of insurance companies it was necessary, in order to secure new business, to convince the prospective policyholder of the desirability of the same, and that this commercial necessity had resulted in the companies making misrepresentations of facts as to dividends to their prospective purchasers of insurance, and that names and designations having a single specific meaning in the commercial world, and which were therefore attractive to prospective policyholders, had been adopted to represent transactions which they now hold are entirely different from what their name implies and represents and from that which the policyholder himself believed he was receiving, and that business necessities had caused a continuance of these misnomers. It was represented that, in fact, there were no dividends, but merely a refund of overcharges, which, for reasons above stated, were usually referred to as dividends.

It appears, however, from the investigations of the books themselves, that in many cases the earnings of the companies from previous investment and holdings are nearly, if not quite, as large as the amounts which are annually distributed as dividends, and while it may be true that the dividends in whole or in part might be distributed from premiums rather than from these earnings, it does not appear that a separation of sources of income is made for the purpose of ascertaining the funds available for dividends. The insured is not promised a refund, but a participation in the surplus or profits is promised, and the plea that the dividend declared is a refund of a portion of the premium heretofore paid, rather than a distribution of the actual surplus of a company derived from all sources, does not appear to be consistent.

It does not appear, therefore, that the facts warrant the contention of the counsel that dividends are refunds of premium payments, but, on the contrary, it appears that most of the companies are in a position to declare a dividend which will conform to the commercial definition of dividends urged by counsel as the correct definition.

The language of Congress relative to deductions from gross income is as follows: "And in the case of insurance companies the sums other than dividends paid within the year on policy and annuity contracts," and there is no clearer or more reasonable rule of construction than that every clause or word of a law should be presumed to have been intended to have some force and effect.

When all the facts are borne in mind and it is remembered that such facts were all before Congress at the time the specific language was adopted that an insurance company should be entitled to deduct "the sums other than dividends paid within the year on policy and annuity contracts and the net additions, if any, required by law to be made within the year to reserve funds," it is clear that by "dividends" Congress had in mind the same thing that the insurance companies themselves have been designating as dividends, and that whether such dividends are dividends in the commercial sense or not they constitute what Congress specifically prohibited from being deducted.

Second. The second contention, and the one most vigorously advanced by many of the companies, is that granting that dividends paid to policyholders in cash are dividends within the intent of the statute, when such dividends are applied to (a) the payment of renewal premiums; (b) applied to shorten the endowment or premium-paying period; (c) applied to purchase paid-up additions and annuities, they are not dividends but refunds applied as stated. The contention is that the company does not actually receive the money and that it is not therefore to be taken up in the income accounts, but that owing to provisions of local statutes over which they have no control they are forced against their will to take up these items on their ledger accounts and on their sworn statements as income.

A careful consideration would appear to show the complete fallacy of this contention. It is not disputed that when the dividends shall have been declared and the ratable distribution determined by the duly constituted authority of the company, the title to the ratable share is thereby vested in the policyholder. Such being the fact, the company is thereafter the mere custodian of the amount of dividend thus declared and agrees as agent to make disposition of such amount in accordance with the direction of the owner thereof. This is specifically set out in the policy contracts, and the disposition of the dividend is determined solely by the election of the policyholder himself.

The insurance company declares a dividend and the policy contract gives the insured, in whose favor the dividend is declared, the absolute direction of its disposal. He may direct that it be paid to him in cash or he may direct its disposal as hereinbefore stated, by the company, which acts as the agent of the policyholder in applying the dividend as he may direct. The dividend having been regularly declared, the amount belonging to each policyholder is entirely within his control in accordance with the terms of his contract, and he may and must direct its disposal as stated. For purpose of illustration, suppose a policyholder elects to direct the disposition of his dividend to the part payment of his next renewal premium.

The company contends that such an election on the part of the policy holder is a rebate on the part of the company. When we consider, however, that the title to this dividend has already vested in the policy holder, it would appear that there is no abatement of premium, but that the policy holder who pays a continuing annual premium remits to the company a certain portion of that premium in cash and directs that the company take the amount of dividend due and payable to him and add it to the amount remitted in cash in payment of the premium then due to the company. The policy contracts of the companies themselves, the receipts for premium payments, and the whole transaction appear to establish this beyond any question.

The contention that the company does not receive the amount of money belonging to the policy holder which is in the physical possession of the company, and which the policy holder directs to be taken and added to the amount which he remits and thus pay his premium liability, is, moreover, not acceptable as an accounting proposition.

Nor can this office concur in the proposition that the company can, at the direction of the owner of a sum of money in its custody, take such sum and make a part payment on an obligation therewith and then contend that out of its liberality it has abated a portion of the obligation exactly equal to the amount of money in its possession thus applied at the direction of the policy holder.

The second and third allegations as to disposition of dividends declared fall indentically within the reasons set forth, and a further detailed discussion thereof does not appear necessary. It appears clear, therefore, that under the language of the law the dividends excepted from deductions are the amounts disbursed annually by the various companies as dividends, and that after the dividends are once declared, and by the direction of the policy holder are transferred back to the company for the purpose of paying premiums, purchasing additional insurance, or shortening the term of insurance, the amount of dividends so retransferred to the company constitutes income in every sense identically as though the actual cash was paid therefor, and such

items shall be so treated and accounted for. The contention of the insurance companies that their ledger accounts and sworn statements are untrue and incorrect as to the item of dividends can not be accepted.

Certain decisions of State courts appear to lend color to the position assumed by the various companies. It should be borne in mind, however, that the various statutes construed or referred to in these decisions differ both in language and intent from the statute now under consideration, and without raising the question as to the extent to which these various State decisions are binding, it is clear from a careful consideration thereof that they do not furnish a safe guide to follow in determining the intent of Congress as evidenced by the language now under consideration.

The various agents will, therefore, continue to make up the returns from the ledger accounts of the insurance companies, recommend disallowance of any deduction claimed on account of dividends, and report as items of income all dividends declared by insurance companies and repaid to the insurance companies by direction of the owner thereof, even though the physical possession of such dividends shall have continued with the company.

The matter of amortization of bonds has already been the subject of an official ruling. The various items of depreciation claims and of certain questions relative to reserves are not sufficiently general for a ruling to be made thereon, and such questions will, for the present, be made the subject of individual consideration.

Respectfully, ROYAL E. CABELL,
Commissioner.

Mr. JOHN W. SINSEL,
Internal Revenue Agent, New York.

APPENDIX B.

Synopsis of Paragraphs A to G relating to the tax upon individuals or persons.

INCOME TAX—PERSONAL.

INCOMES COVERED.

Those of all citizens of the United States residing at home or abroad.

Those of all persons residing in the United States although not citizens thereof.

All net incomes from property owned and from every business, trade, or profession carried on in the United States by persons residing elsewhere.

NORMAL TAX.

One per cent per annum upon the amount of net income over $4,000.

ADDITIONAL TAX.

One per cent per annum upon the total amount of net income from all sources over $20,000 and not over $50,000 per annum.

Two per cent per annum upon the amount of net income over $50,000 and not over $100,000.

Three per cent per annum upon the amount of net income over $100,000.

NET INCOME INCLUDES.

All gains, profits, and income derived from salaries, wages, or compensation for personal services of any kind and however paid.

Professions or vocations.

Business, trade, or commerce.

Sales or dealings in property, real or personal, growing out of the ownership or use of, or interest in property, real or personal.

Interest, rent, dividends, or securities.

Transaction of any lawful business carried on for gain or profit.

Gains or profits or income derived from any source whatever.

Income, but not the value, of property acquired by bequest, devise, or descent.

DEDUCTIONS ALLOWED.

Necessary expenses actually incurred in carrying on any business.

All interest accrued and payable within the year on indebtedness.

All national, State, county, school, and municipal taxes.

Losses actually sustained during the year, not compensated by insurance or otherwise, arising from fire, storm, or shipwreck.

Debts actually ascertained to be worthless, and charged off during the year.

A reasonable allowance for the exhaustion or wear and tear of property arising out of its use or employment in business.

All income the tax upon which has been paid at the source.

Amounts received as dividends upon the stock of any corporation, etc., which is taxed upon its net income.

DEDUCTIONS NOT ALLOWED.

All personal, living, or family expenses.

Taxes assessed against local benefits.

All expense of restoring property or making good the exhaustion thereof, for which an allowance has been made.

Amounts paid for new buildings, permanent improvements, or betterments made to increase the value of any property or estate.

EXEMPTIONS.

Interest upon the obligations of a State or any political subdivision thereof.

Interest upon the obligations of the United States the principal and interest of which are now exempt from Federal taxation.

The compensation of the present President during the term for which he has been elected.

The compensation of the judges of the Supreme and inferior courts of the United States now in office.

The compensation of all officers and employees of a State or any political subdivision thereof.

AMOUNT OF INCOME EXEMPT.

Four thousand dollars shall be deducted from the net annual income, as above ascertained, of each person.

Only one deduction of $4,000 shall be made from the aggregate income of all members of a family.

FAMILY CONSISTS OF.

One or both parents and one or more minor children, or of husband and wife.

EXCEPTIONS.

A wife living permanently apart from her husband.

Guardians are allowed to make deductions in favor of each and every ward when same are not comprised in one family having joint property interests.

TIME OF GOING INTO EFFECT.

The tax shall be computed upon the remainder of the said net income for the year ending December 31, and for each calendar year thereafter.

RETURN OF INCOME.

A true and accurate return of all net incomes of $3,500 or more shall be made under oath or affirmation.

It must be made to the collector of internal revenue for the district in which said person resides or has his principal place of business in the United States.

FORM OF RETURN.

The form shall be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Shall set forth specifically the gross amount of income from all separate sources. From this total shall be deducted the aggregate items of expenses and allowances above authorized.

TIME OF RETURN.

The return must be made on or before March 1, 1914, and on or before March 1 of each year thereafter.

PERSONS REQUIRED TO MAKE RETURNS.

1. Each taxable person of lawful age, for himself.

2. Guardians, trustees, executors, shall make and render a return of the net income, coming into their custody or control, of the person for whom they act.

3. All persons, firms, companies, copartnerships, corporations, etc., having the control, receipt, disposal, or payment of fixed or determinable annual gains, profits, or income of another person subject to tax, arising from an annual business relationship, shall in behalf of such other person render a separate and distinct return for each person upon which the normal tax is paid at the source.

EXCEPTIONS TO RETURNS.

No return of income not exceeding $3,500 is required.

Persons liable for the normal tax only on their own or another's account shall not be required to make returns of the income derived from dividends on capital stock of corporations taxable upon their net incomes.

DUTY OF THE COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

The collector or deputy shall require each list to be verified by oath or affirmation of the party rendering it.

The collector may increase the amount of any return if he has reason to believe that the same is understated.

No such increase shall be made except after due notice to such party and upon proof of the amount understated.

In case of disagreement between the collector and the taxable person, such person may submit the case with papers and proof to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

ASSESSMENTS.

All persons shall be notified of the amount for which they are respectively liable, on or before June 1 of each year.

NEGLECTED, FRAUDULENT, OR FALSE RETURNS.

In case of neglect or refusal to make returns, or in case of fraudulent or false returns, upon the discovery within three years after said return is due, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall make such return himself.

TIME OF PAYMENT.

Said regular assessments shall be paid on or before the 30th day of June each year.

Assessments made by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue are payable upon notification.

PENALTY FOR DELAYED PAYMENTS.

On sums due and unpaid after June 30, or for 10 days after notice and demand thereof by the collector, there shall be added 5 per cent to the amount of tax unpaid and interest at the rate of 1 per cent per month from the time the same became due.

EXCEPTIONS.

Incomes from the estates of insane, deceased, or insolvent persons.

COLLECTION AT THE SOURCE.

All persons, firms, companies, etc., including lessees or mortgagors of real or personal property, trustees acting in any trust capacity, executors, etc., employers and all officers and employees of the United States having control, receipt, custody, disposal, or payment of interest, rent, salaries, wages, premiums, annuities, compensation, remuneration, emoluments, or other fixed or determinable annual gains, profits, and income of another person exceeding $4,000 for any taxable year, who are required to make and render a return in behalf of another, are hereby authorized and required to deduct and withhold such normal tax and pay it to the United States official authorized to receive the same.

EXCEPTION.

Incomes from the dividends on the capital stock or from net earnings of a corporation, etc., subject to the normal tax are not to be included in the above.

LIABILITY.

Each of the persons, firms, etc., above enumerated are hereby made personally liable for such tax.

BENEFIT OF EXEMPTION.

Where the income tax of a person is paid at the source, the benefit of the $4,000 exemption shall not be allowed unless there shall be filed, not less than 30 days prior to the day on which the return is due, with the person or concern required to make such payment of tax at the source, an affidavit claiming the benefit of such exemption.

When a taxable person's tax is paid at the source, if he desires any deduction for losses, expense of business, etc., he may either file claim, together with return of any other income upon which the tax is not withheld at the source, either with the collector, or with the person or corporation withholding his tax, as the taxpayer may choose.

INDIVIDUAL INCOMES NOT EXCEEDING $4,000 PER ANNUM TO BE TAXED AT THE SOURCE.

Incomes derived from interest on bonds, mortgages, or other indebtedness of corporations, joint-stock companies or associations, insurance companies.

Securities of the United States not now exempt from taxation.

Incomes composed of coupons, checks, or bills of exchange for or in part payment of interest or dividends upon stock or obligations of foreign corporations, etc., engaged in business in foreign countries.

Interest upon bonds of foreign countries.

Foreign mortgages or like obligations not payable in the United States.

GENERAL PROVISIONS.

No taxable person shall be released from liability for this tax.

When a return is made and his tax paid at the source, no person shall be required to make a return himself unless he has other net income.

Only one deduction of the $4,000 shall be made in case of any person.

FAILURE OR NEGLECT TO MAKE RETURN FOR PERSONAL TAX.

Any person, corporation, etc., liable to make a return for a personal tax refusing or neglecting to make such return shall be liable to a penalty of not exceeding $500.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I understood that the gentleman from New York desired to yield some time.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. With the understanding that after that hour I will have an opportunity to even up the time. Gentlemen on that side of the House are several hours ahead of this side.

Mr. MANN. I submit to the gentleman in that connection, if the Chair will pardon me, that so far this side of the House has used the time very largely from half past 4 o'clock on, which is sometimes not the most favorable part of the day in which to secure the attention of Members, especially when events are taking place such as have been taking place outside the House for several days past. While this side of the House is ahead in point of time, I think the gentleman from Alabama, with his usual fairness, will perceive that the time ought to be scattered somewhat in the division.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am proposing to accomplish just exactly what the gentleman from Illinois suggests. I am yielding to allow the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] to speak now, but propose to even up the time this afternoon at the very time that the gentleman is complaining that his side had to use it.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman uses the time during those hours, it will be very satisfactory. I do not want to say it again, but we have used all the time between 5 and 8 o'clock in the evening.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will divide the time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is it the purpose after the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] has concluded to yield an hour to gentlemen on the other side?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not yield all the time on that side. The gentlemen there are about three hours ahead of this side, with only one-third of the membership to take care of. I will simply say that when the gentleman from Minnesota has concluded I should like to endeavor to get the time evened up on this side of the House. If we do not, it will carry it into Monday with the balance in my favor, and I want to be fair with you and not put you gentlemen in that position.

Mr. MANN. I hope we will be able to remain here to-night until 10 or 11 o'clock, and that gentlemen on both sides who desire to address the House will be here. We finished last night about 9 o'clock with a very good audience in the House.

Mr. MURDOCK. And getting better all the time.

Mr. MANN. Gentlemen who desired to address the House ought to have been here last night, so that we could have continued the session until 11 o'clock.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is my desire to run right on up to 11 o'clock to-night, if the speakers are here to occupy the time. Of course, if they are not, we will have to adjourn.

Mr. MURDOCK. We have been having each day an hour and 10 minutes, and we have lived up to our contract.

Mr. PAYNE. An hour and 12 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. An hour and 12 minutes, then. We are not willing that any arrangement should be made which would crowd us out, inasmuch as we have been here right along and have occupied the time which has been given us.

Mr. PAYNE. I hope this will not be taken out of the time of the gentleman from Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is assuming that this colloquy is proceeding by unanimous consent and it is not being charged to anybody.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, before yielding to the gentleman from Minnesota I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the elections of last November and the fact that we have a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President there is no doubt in my mind but that this Democratic tariff bill will become a law. The Democratic Party can not escape its enactment if they would. They have been waging a campaign of misrepresentation for so many years as regards the tariff and have been proclaiming from every housetop that if they were given the power they would change the tariff laws and reduce the high cost of living. Of course, many of the Democrats who have been preaching this doctrine did not believe it. Others, either because they were not fully informed or on account of their long advocacy of this false doctrine, had really come to believe that if they were given the authority they could change the tariff laws so as to greatly benefit the American people. Many of the distinguished Democrats throughout the Nation have advocated tariff reform, tariff revision, or whatever they may have seen fit to term it, because of their desire to get into office. They knew that the great principle of protection to the American industries and American workmen was Republican doctrine, hence they had to advocate the opposite of that in order to get an issue.

Continual agitation of this question in and out of Congress, coupled with the split in the Republican Party at the last election, has given to the Democratic Party the opportunity and the power to revise the tariff. There is no way by which you gentlemen of that side can escape that responsibility now. You must pass such a bill as the Democratic Committee on Ways and Means has presented to the House. You have said for years and years that you could pass a better tariff law than the Payne law, which is now in force. Through the action, or rather the inaction, of the American people in the last elections you have that chance. Nothing that I can do and nothing that the Republicans in this House can do will prevent you from passing this bill. You have had it for two weeks before the Democratic caucus of the House, and they have given it their approval. You have a majority in this House of over 100, and it has been clearly indicated that you will accept no amendments presented by the Republican minority. The tariff law that you propose to change is that of 1909, known as the Payne law. You have claimed since its enactment that it was not a revision of the tariff downward; that it was too high, and so forth. President Taft submitted to the last Congress facts and figures from the Tariff Board as a result of their investigation of the woolen and the cotton schedules of the tariff, which said report showed that reductions should be made in those schedules to equalize the cost of production in foreign countries and in this country. You abolished the Tariff Board by refusing to appropriate to continue its work, and you have refused to create a new tariff board to gather information and facts upon which to write a tariff bill. I am in favor of revising the tariff downward wherever impartial facts and figures indicate that it can be done without cheapening the price of American labor. In other words, I believe that the tariff, or the amount collected at the customhouses, should be only the difference in what it costs to manufacture the articles in this country and in foreign countries, measured by the standard of the wage scale in this and foreign countries. I do not believe that the tariff should be made a political question and issue, but that it should be a purely scientific one; that a nonpartisan tariff board should be created by Congress to gather facts and information regarding the cost of production at home and abroad; and that we should only charge at the customhouse that difference. This is the Republican doctrine and it is the American doctrine. It means America for Americans and protection to our American industries and workingmen against the cheap coolie and Hindu labor of foreign lands. It is true that the Payne law is not correct in every particular at this time, and that the tariff should be lowered in some instances and raised in some to meet changed and existing conditions. The woolen schedule and the cotton schedule are too high in some particulars, and if this Congress had followed the information gathered by the Tariff Board it would be an easy matter to change these schedules with due regard to what is right and fair. I believe that it is highly improper to write a new tariff bill every time a change is had in the political complexion of Congress and the White House, but that these changes should be made in the schedules from time to time as facts warrant. You gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber have proceeded to slaughter many of our American industries, due to your ideas of writing a free-trade and tariff-for-revenue law. You have had to admit, however, that many of your arguments and statements on the political stump and otherwise as regards the Payne tariff law are untrue. On page 481 of the majority report, which is signed by all of the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, you cite the official records from the Treasury Department, which show that the Payne law is a revision downward.

Your report shows that the average ad valorem duty on all imports in 1908, the last year of the Dingley law, was 23.88 per cent, and that in 1912, under the Payne law, it was 18.58 per cent. This is a reduction of 22⅞ per cent on the Dingley ad valorem rates. In addition to these facts, from your own report submitted in connection with this bill, further proof is had in two letters read in the House three days ago by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], and which I herewith insert in my remarks as a further evidence and proof

that you have been deceiving the American people upon this tariff question during the last four years, at least, and I hope that the American people will themselves give more study to the tariff question and learn for themselves what is for their best interests and not continue to take the advice and be misled by a lot of agitators and seekers for public office. The letters referred to are as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 17, 1913.

Hon. A. P. GARDNER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to aeknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th instant, requesting information as to certain computations made by the Treasury Department in 1910, showing a comparison of the duties collected under the tariff act of 1909 with those that would have been collected on the same importations under the tariff act of 1897.

You state that ex-Congressman E. J. Hill, of Connecticut, made the assertion in a speech that the computation showed that the importations considered actually paid into the Treasury under the Payne law (a reduction of 6.4 per cent) $11,178,162.02 less than they would have paid if no change of law had been made. You request to be informed as to the following points:

First. Is the above difference correctly stated?

Second. What were the months covered by the computation?

Third. What were the aggregate importations covered by the computation?

In reply I have to state that:

First. The figures given are correctly stated, as shown by the computations made, which are believed to be correct. The amount stated represents the net decrease.

Second. The months covered by the computations were the six months from October 1, 1909, to March 31, 1910.

Third. The aggregate importations covered by the computations had a total value of $804,878,645.46, and these importations consisted of all dutiable items, Philippine goods, and items in the free list for the period mentioned, with the exception of various items having a total value of $2,983,830.97, relative to which the data at hand were insufficient to form a satisfactory basis for the computation of the duties under the act of 1897.

Respectfully,
J. F. CURTIS,
Assistant Secretary.

—

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 1, 1913.

Hon. A. P. GARDNER,
United States House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th instant, further in the matter of computations made on importations received under the tariff act of 1909 showing a comparison of the duties collected and the duties computed on the same importations under the rates of the tariff of 1897.

You state that you have been informed that such computations have been made for the period from April 1, 1910, to October 1, 1910, and you request information as to the following points:

First. Whether or not a computation has been made by the Treasury Department for an entire year showing a comparison of the duties collected under the tariff act of 1909 as compared with the duties that would have been collected on the same importations had the tariff act of 1897 still been in force?

Second. Which 12 months were covered by these importations?

Third. What results appeared—

(a) As to percentage of increase or decrease under the Payne law?

(b) As to the increase or decrease in the total amount collected under the Payne law?

In reply I have to state that the department did not make computations for the six months mentioned by you, but did for the fiscal year 1911, relative to which, in response to your questions, you are advised as follows:

First. Yes; the computation as outlined was made.

Second. The 12 months covered were those from July 1, 1910, to June 30, 1911.

Third. (a) The computations showed a decrease under the Payne law of 4.05 per cent. (b) The decrease under the Payne law shown by the computations was found to be $13,036,875.84.

As in the previous computations, the above figures represent the net decrease on the items compared, consisting of the dutiable items, Philippine goods, and items in the free list according to the importations for the period under consideration, except various items relative to which the data at hand were insufficient to form a satisfactory basis for a computation of the duties under the tariff act of 1897. The percentage of decrease is based on the duties computed under the tariff act of 1897.

With respect to the last paragraph of your letter, requesting information as to whether there is any printed publication which covers the points mentioned, I have to state that the department knows of no printed publication covering the points in question, as the computations were prepared in the form of typewritten schedules only during the years 1910 and 1911 for the use of the President.

Respectfully,
J. F. CURTIS,
Assistant Secretary.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], in referring to these two letters in his speech, said:

They show in practice the Payne law has proved to be a downward revision. When it is remembered that the greater part of the increase of duty in the Payne law was confined to wines, spirits, silks, perfumery, and other luxuries, it will be at once apparent that there was a substantial downward revision in that part of the tariff law in which the average man and woman is particularly interested.

So, Mr. Chairman, with the Democratic Party in the position that they are, on account of the results of the election, and their former claims as to being able to write a tariff bill much better than the Payne law, we have before us to-day this conglomeration of imperfections, mistakes, and inaccuracies, prepared without due regard to the facts and without a reasonable opportunity for the industries of the country to be heard. It is very difficult for one to even understand, much less intelligently discuss, this bill in a single speech. It is claimed that this bill is in the interest of the poor man and to reduce the high cost of living, and that you propose in this bill to place taxes according to a person's wealth. You claim to try to do this through the income-tax provision. I myself am heartily in favor of an income tax. The truth is that it was a Republican Congress that submitted the income-tax resolution to the States for ratification. Yet that provision in the income-tax part of this bill which taxes millions of policyholders of mutual life insurance companies is unjust and not in line with your claim of equalizing taxation. It is claimed that there are 20,000,000 persons thus affected, and that under this income-tax provision they will all be taxed, but yet very few of them have an income of as much as $4,000 per annum. Mutual life insurance companies being owned by policyholders, this tax will, of course, have to be paid by the policyholders, and most of them are citizens with little wealth, but who have taken these policies as a protection to their families. About 20,000,000 of these good, honest citizens are hit by this income tax, yet they are paying their full share of taxes to the city, State, and Nation otherwise.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] in introducing this bill called attention to the fact that it would tax only about 425,000 people out of our entire population. As a matter of fact, a tax on the net income of the insurance business in this country done on the mutual plan would become a personal tax on several millions of people, a tax levied in violation of the principle of the bill and without any regard whatever to the actual income of the people taxed. The Democratic claim in this bill of equalizing taxation does not equalize and violates the principle of income taxation.

Mr. Chairman, this bill also is inconsistent in that it puts a tax on cattle and sheep coming into this country but admits beef and mutton free. This is a discrimination against the producers of our live stock and is in favor of the producers of cattle and sheep in Canada and other foreign countries.

It is the same way with oats. You put a duty of 10 cents a bushel on oats, but oatmeal you admit free. Here is what the manufacturers of that product in my district say with regard to it:

We believe the proposed changes in the tariff as to free oatmeal, rolled oats, and oat hulls with a duty on oats is unfair for the following reasons:

A duty of 10 cents per bushel on oats with rolled oats and oatmeal free would give the Canadian miller an advantage of $1 per barrel and would force the independent mills of the United States out of business.

The largest manufacturer of rolled oats and oatmeal in the United States, and in fact in the world, has a large mill in eastern Canada and a second one in the Canadian Northwest about ready to start, and the above provision in the tariff bill would enable them to still further gain control over the oatmeal business as against smaller American manufacturers having no mills in Canada.

The Canadian Cereal Co., with headquarters in Toronto, Canada, is an oatmeal trust, being a combination of about one dozen Canadian oatmeal millers with plants located at Toronto, Tilsonburgh, Lindsay, Woodstock, London (Canada), etc., and this combination and the above-mentioned American manufacturer could positively control the oatmeal trade in the United States.

We do not ask for protection, but we do ask for equity.

We ask that oats and the manufactured products therefrom be put on a parity.

If oatmeal, rolled oats, and oat hulls are put on the free list, we ask for free oats.

In this bill there is a 10 per cent duty on wheat, but you admit flour free. This favors the millers of Canada to the injury of those of our own country.

All through the bill can be found discriminations against the American manufacturers and American producers and in favor of foreign manufacturers and foreign producers. In fact, you claim that this legislation is for the benefit of the consumer, but pray tell me how the consumer will be able to buy provisions and clothing when he is not given an opportunity to work in the production of these things? They will all be manufactured and produced abroad with foreign labor. Our people will not be able to buy the things needed for want of money. However, your bill provides that rags shall be admitted free to this country. I suppose this is in your bill for the reason that you know that our workingmen and their families will not be able to buy anything to wear except rags, and you are showing your good spirit at least in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a great manufacturing district.

Last year the freight of St. Louis handled by 26 trunk-line railroads and by river was over 51,340,000 tons.

There are approximately 150,000 people employed in the different factories in my district, and the goods manufactured there last year amounted to approximately $350,000,000.

Some of its chief products are shoes, street and railway cars, automobiles, dry goods, hardware, tobacco, drugs, chemicals, patent medicines, ammonia, soaps, perfumes, toilet articles, stoves, clothing, machinery, woodenware, and steel bridges.

Five hundred thousand stoves are manufactured there annually. The car-building industry amounts to $70,000,000 a year. Dry goods are manufactured to the extent of $75,000,000 a year. The hardware houses sell $50,000,000 worth of goods a year. We make 70,000,000 pounds of chewing tobacco in my district. The manufacture of 65,000,000 cigars in my splendid district gives employment to several thousand of our best people. They are being hard hit by this free-trade bill. The Democratic Party has declared for the independence of the Philippine Islands, and this Congress is intended to carry out their wishes by passing a law to that effect, yet our laboring men must compete with their cheap labor without any protection. Let me read to you a protest from the cigar makers' union of my city. Here is what they say:

CIGAR MAKERS' UNIONS 44 AND 281,
JOINT ADVISORY BOARD,
St. Louis, Mo., April 18, 1913.

Hon. L. C. DYER,
Twelfth Missouri Congressional District.

DEAR SIR:

Whereas the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives has reported a bill establishing absolute free trade in cigars and tobacco and other products with the Philippine Islands; and

Whereas the present law permits 150,000,000 cigars from the Philippine Islands to be admitted duty free, which in itself is equal to the annual production of 2,500 American cigar makers; and

Whereas any bill having for its purpose the open-door policy, viz, removing the duty on all cigars and tobacco manufactured in the Philippine Islands, will work considerable hardship on the men and women engaged at cigar making for a livelihood and be a decidedly disturbing factor in the industry many of us have devoted almost a lifetime to;

Therefore, we, the members of Cigar Makers' and Cigar Packers' Unions, Nos. 44 and 281, of St. Louis, Mo., comprising over 1,000 members, most of whom have large families depending solely upon the progress and development of the cigar industry in the United States, hereby enter a vigorous protest against the enactment of any law or rules which tend to destroy the cigar industry of the United States, the result of which deprives us of a livelihood; be it further

Resolved, That we certainly protest most vigorously of being pitted against oriental labor, viz, Filipinos, Chinese, Japs, etc., the cheapest labor of the world, and we insist as American citizens that our welfare be given the first and highest consideration, and in accordance with this spirit we look forward to the Congress of these United States to defeat any measure endangering the means of existence of this Nation's toilers or any portion thereof.

Trusting we may learn your disposition in the above matter.

JOINT CIGAR MAKERS' UNIONS 44 AND 281.
HY. C. PLASSMEYER.
PHIL H. MUELLER, *Secretary.*

Their plea here for a square deal will, however, avail them nothing. This bill is to pass this House without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i."

The greatest fur market in this country is located in St. Louis. There is also located the largest brewery in the world. Two of its chief products, Budweiser and Malt-Nutrine, are known and sold all over the world. The lumber industry in St. Louis is the greatest in America.

This bill strikes at practically every important industry in my district. It strikes at union labor also, and I am satisfied will work great injury to the people of that splendid city.

Practically every industry in my district, big and little, are discriminated against in this bill in favor of the foreign manufacturers. When this bill is taken up for amendments I shall endeavor to have necessary changes made that will give to these industries a fair show in competition with foreign manufacturers.

In view, however, of the well-known understanding that this bill is to pass the House as it came from the committee and from the Democratic caucus, I have little hope of accomplishing anything. I have not the time to go over all of these industries and point out wherein they will be injured if this bill becomes a law. One of the great industries in my district, the boot and shoe industry, I will, however, take as an example. That fairly applies to the other industries. There are 32 shoe factories in my district and 17 others in neighboring towns owned by the St. Louis houses. These 49 factories employ about 20,000 people. Their average sale amounts to about $60,000,000 a year. The Payne law levied an import duty of 10 per cent ad valorem on—

(SEC. 450) boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight of cattle of the bovine species, including calf skins—

and an import duty of 15 per cent on—

(SEC. 451) boots and shoes made of leather.

The duty of 10 per cent applies in general to men's shoes; the duty of 15 per cent applies to women's shoes.

This bill puts them on the free list, yet there is a duty on most of the supplies which the shoe manufacturers use, which is unfair to our own manufacturers and gives the advantage to the foreign manufacturers. Our manufacturers have to pay a tax on many of the articles used in manufacturing shoes coming here from foreign countries, and under this proposed law will have to sell in open market with the foreign manufacturers. The following comparative table shows the tariff on articles entering into the manufacture of shoes under the present law and under this bill, to wit:

	Payne Tariff Act.	Proposed Underwood bill.
	Per cent.	
Braids	60	50 per cent.
Cotton galloons	60	60 per cent.
Cotton goring	60	50 per cent.
Silk goring	60	50 per cent.
Nippers, pliers, etc	60	30 per cent.
Cotton webbings	60	25 per cent.
Buttons	57½	40 per cent.
Cotton lacings	52½	25 per cent.
Dextrine	50	¼ cent per pound.
Needles	47	25 per cent.
Hooks and eyelets	45	15 per cent.
Shoe machinery	45	Free.
Studs and rivets	45	20 per cent.
Tissue paper	41	30 per cent.
Brushes	40	35 per cent.
Wire (iron or steel)	40	20 per cent.
Gold leaf	39	35 per cent.
Oxalic acid	39	39 per cent.
Linen thread	38	25 to 30 per cent.
Cardboard for cartons	25	25 per cent.
Gelatin	35	10 to 25 per cent.
Plaster of Paris	35	25 per cent.
Cotton thread	34	5 to 25 per cent.
Cotton lining cloth	31½	25 per cent.
Coal-tar dyes	30	30 per cent.
Glue	30	10 to 25 per cent.
Box shooks	30	15 per cent.
Silk thread	25	Do.
Sal soda	23½	½ cent per pound.
Sponges	20	10 to 15 per cent.
Chamois skins	20	15 per cent.
Wood alcohol	20	Free.
Last blocks	20	15 per cent.
Borax	18½	Crude, free; refined, ½ cent per pound.
Cod-liver oil	17	Free.
Castile soap	15½	10 per cent.
Coal (bituminous)	15	Free.
Nails (iron or steel)	13½	Do.
Hobnails	10	Do.
Rough lumber	7	Do.
Tacks (small, iron or steel)	4	Do.
All leathers for boots and shoes	5 to 25	Do.

There can be no excuse for this discrimination in favor of foreign shoe manufacturers, as against our own manufacturers, because there is no one who claims that the shoe industry in this country is a trust. The wages paid shoe workers in this country is from a third to one-half more than paid in other countries. It is difficult to see how our manufacturers can compete with foreign manufacturers and maintain the present wages, when our own manufacturers have to pay duty on many of the parts that go to make up shoes, as per the above list, and which the foreign manufacturers do not.

The workmen engaged in the bagging industry in my district, and which is very hard hit by this bill, will suffer likewise from the cheap Hindu labor of India and Calcutta. I doubt if our bagging mills can keep up at all when this law goes into effect. The laborers of India work in the jute mills there for about one-fourth to one-sixth of what is paid here in our American mills.

Mr. Chairman, it is useless, as stated above, to complain. This bill will become a law substantially as it is written. Its effect upon the industries and workers in this country is apparent to all of those who have given the question study and consideration. Yet since the bill is bound to become a law, the sooner the better, that the people may know and understand the fallacies of the Democratic theory of the tariff. The sooner they realize it and understand it the quicker will we get a change and get the country back again to the splendid and prosperous protective policy of the Republican Party. The vagaries and falsity of Democratic free trade and revenue tariff doctrine will again be known, fully and completely, as it was under the administration of Grover Cleveland.

I am sincerely sorry that the American people must suffer thus, but there is no escape from it. The people of this country who believe in the policy of protection will have to come together for the good of the country. If they had not been divided in the last election, we would not to-day be facing the disaster that is sure to come from the enactment of this bill into law.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come to this country when the American farmer, the American manufacturer, the American wage earner, and all Americans who love their country and are proud of its history and progress should and must stand together. The United States is the richest country in the world;

its men and women are the most patriotic and industrious the world over. Our country stands for the best that there is in the human and industrial life of our Nation. I have no farmers in my district, but I will not be one of those to vote for a bill that will hinder and retard their progress. The success of the farming industry is closely akin to the success of the manufacturer and the wage earner. The one can not exist and prosper without the other. In my district there is published the National Farmer and Stock Grower, which goes to thousands of farmers throughout the Middle West and the Mississippi Valley. In a recent issue of that paper there appeared the following:

The National Farmer and Stock Grower is in favor of the United States customhouse collecting a reasonable range of duties upon all foreign farm products and all manufactured goods admitted into the United States from foreign countries, said duties to be applied to the support of the National Government.

By the tariff policy that we advocate fully one-half the money required for the support of the National Government should be collected at the customhouses, besides furnishing the farmer and manufacturer the very moderate amount of protection to which they are entitled. We are opposed to the admission of foreign farm products free of duty, because admission of such products duty free always leads to the advantage of the foreign merchant and speculator and causes increased burdens to be imposed on our own people.

Taking the duty off hides has been entirely in the interest of foreign countries and to the detriment of our own people; admitting coffee duty free enabled the formation of a South American combination that has raised the price three for one, and every time foreign goods are placed on the free list there is the same result. With moderate import duties received by the United States on various products as now collected the total that is covered into the United States Treasury is over $300,000,000 a year, and if not collected that way will have to be collected by direct taxes upon our own productions. The admission of foreign goods free of duty results in higher prices to the American consumer and higher taxation also upon our own products to make up the necessary revenues.

Every farmer in the United States is taxed by his county and by the State; he also pays a share of the taxes collected in various ways for the support of the Federal Government. We believe that in return for his support in tax money and in time of necessity for his personal services the American citizen is entitled to preference in his home market for his own productions from the laws of the Government he supports. We believe that the advantages of our own markets belong to the citizens of the United States, and that all foreign farm productions should pay a duty at the front door as the goods are admitted. In times of scarcity, caused by drought or other unavoidable influences, the foreign farm productions can come in under light duties on a fair basis, and in times of abundance the country thrives better without them.

We believe the farmer as a producer outranks all other people; the manufacturer is next, but without the farmer's products the manufacturer would have to shut his doors.

Legislation against the farming interest is the height of folly, and special discrimination against the farmer is a political crime. Legislation against the farmer will cause more poverty in the cities than most people imagine. The nonproducing so-called consumers in cities will be the first to find it out and be the greatest sufferers.

The above expresses my views fully. I believe, and the Republican Party believes, that the farmer, the manufacturer, and the wage earners in all parts and section of our country should be given the same fair treatment under the laws of this country; that there should not be protection for a part of the people and their products and free trade for others, to the advantage of foreign producers and manufacturers. I do not believe that there should be a duty on rice and products manufactured from rice, as there is in this bill, and meats, oatmeal, and so forth, let in free of duty. The agriculturists of the North and West are entitled to the same consideration at the hands of the Congress of the United States that the rice growers of the South are entitled to. In legislating for the people we should not legislate for the East, the North, the South, or the West, but for the great, grand, and glorious United States of America.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of a tariff bill the first inquiry is naturally directed to the policy which animates it. What is that policy? Is it such a one as will afford the wage earner increased opportunity to labor at better wages and under more advantageous conditions? Will it enhance the rewards of industry, genius, and ability and offer greater inducements for the profitable investment of capital? Will it tend to extend our foreign trade? Speed or retard us as a nation in the race for the world's commerce? Is the policy, whatever it may be, so written into the law that its burdens will be equitably adjusted and its benefits fairly distributed?

In his precedent-breaking and possibly epoch-making speech before the House of Representatives and Senate assembled in joint session on the 8th day of April, 1913, the President said:

Aside from the duties laid upon articles which we do not and probably can not produce, therefore, and the duties laid upon luxuries and merely for the sake of the revenues they yield, the object of the tariff duties henceforth laid must be effective competition, the whetting of American wits by contest with the wits of the rest of the world.

In a signed letter which appeared in the newspapers on the date of April 9, 1913, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], member of the Ways and Means Committee, in describing the effect of the bill, said:

All duty has been taken off meats, fresh and prepared. This means that meat from Argentina can be imported to compete with the product of American packers. All fish are on the free list, spelling a probable average of 20 per cent reduction in its cost to the consumer. Milk is put on the free list. Potatoes go on the free list. Cheese is cut in various grades from 35 to 42 per cent to 20 per cent. This will particularly affect the cheaper grades used in quantities by the average consumer. Leather and leather goods, with the exception of dress gloves, are put on the free list. This will force American manufacturers of shoes to compete with foreign makers. Paints have been cut enormously. The consumer will be able to purchase excellently made foreign paints at low prices. All soaps have been cut from 20 to 5 per cent. This will force American soap makers to materially lower the price of their product or increase the size of the soap cakes. The duty on all household furniture has been cut from 35 to 15 per cent. This will increase importation of excellently made foreign furniture at low prices.

Again, the report of the Democratic majority contains the following statement:

And the attempt has been made to produce in every line of industry a competitive tariff basis providing for a substantial amount of importation, to the end that no concern shall be able to feel that it has a monopoly of the home market gained other than through the fact that it is able to furnish better goods at lower prices than others.

It is apparent at once from these utterances that the prime object of the proposed legislation is to induce—to invite—importation, to place the American producer in direct competition with his foreign competitor in every line of industry carried on in this country with a view to the regulation of prices. To carry out this purpose it is proposed to transfer to foreign countries $140,000,000 annually of the industry of this country, representing not less than $50,000,000 in wages and profits. The mere statement of this proposition should be sufficient to condemn it. It is abhorrent to business sense, pride of country, and patriotism alike.

The American farmer, wage earner, and manufacturer is cheerfully invited to engage in a battle of wits for his own market. Not upon equal terms, however. Handicapped by a higher standard of living he must struggle to maintain the supremacy in the market which he himself helps to make, and to whose high standards he contributes of his time, his industry, his genius, and his patriotism. In that struggle he must meet the merciless competition of the farmers, wage earners, and manufacturers of other countries, whose statesmen have brains enough to protect their home market while they encourage them to extend their trade, by bonuses and subsidies of one kind and another, into other countries whose statesmen have not exhibited the same acumen. From the vantage ground of a protected market Russia, Germany, France, and the British possessions will contest with us for our own trade in a free market. To these unfair economic conditions the bill in detail adds many another disadvantage to the handicap of the American producer.

In his letter to the Washington Post, Mr. Hearst says Mr. Wilson is an English free trader. This is an English free-trade bill. Again, Mr. Hearst says:

Mr. Wilson's political economy is the political economy of another nation and of another age. It is the political economy of a nation that is passing and of an age that is past.

Mr. Hearst is not complimentary, but his description is accurate. The policy of this bill will place the United States in a lonely and isolated positon among the agricultural nations of the world. Germany, France, Russia—indeed, all of the civilized countries of the world making any pretense to agricultural development—maintain a protective policy. England alone has abandoned it, and with it she abandoned all pretense to agriculture. We propose to abandon the protective policy of Germany, under which ever acre of her farm lands is profitably tilled, for the free-trade policy of England, under which 28,000,000 of her 48,000,000 acres of agricultural lands lie uncultivated.

The Democratic majority of the committee contend that any degree of protection is ineffective as regards certain commodities, chiefly those produced on the farm, because the price of such commodities is controlled by the law of diminishing returns. In other words, that the price of these commodities is fixed ultimately by the cost of producing that portion of the supply which is brought into existence under the least favorable conditions, provided that all portions of the supply are necessary to satisfy a given demand.

The purpose of the argument is to demonstrate the lack of necessity for levying protective duties upon farm products and to show that the price of these commodities is controlled by a universal law. While doubtless the theory is correctly stated, it is based upon an assumed state of facts which does not exist, and overlooks the fact that the supply of farm products, or of any other commodity, under existing world conditions are not permitted to flow unrestricted to the point of greatest demand; but that, whether we maintain obstruction on our part in the form of tariff duties, other countries, in their attempt to gain

the supremacy in the world's markets, will extend to their own producers every facility for extending their foreign trade, at the same time preserving the home market to the home producer by a protective duty. In other words, the theory is based upon the false premise that the natural law invoked is applied to the world's commerce without obstruction or hindrance by either artificial barriers or inducements.

If it were true that the opening of our market to the competition of the world automatically opened the markets of the world to the competition of our manufacturers and producers, the position taken by the majority might be sound; but in the absence of such an assumption the policy of inducing importations can only result in taking away from our own producers the opportunity to produce the amount of articles imported and turning it over to the producers of foreign countries, without our enjoying any reciprocal advantage in the extension of our foreign trade. This bill gives to the foreign producer and manufacturer all that we have to give. We can offer nothing more which might induce them to open the foreign market to us. This effectually forecloses all opportunity for the making of reciprocal agreements and renders inoperative the section of the proposed bill granting to the President the power to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements.

The majority of the committee, in their report on the pending bill, say:

> The present condition of the revenue legislation of the United States is the result of many years of adherence to the protective-tariff policy. This tariff policy is the result of peculiar circumstances, and in no way represents the choice of the people.

If the latter statement can be made with propriety, it may be said with equal propriety that the policy adopted by this bill in no way represents the choice of the people at the last election. Mr. Wilson, representing the antiprotection-tariff idea, received 6,293,770 votes, while Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Taft, both running upon platforms declaring for protection, received 7,606,812 votes, indicating that there was no intention on the part of the American people to abandon the policy of a protective tariff. Had Mr. Wilson advocated free wool, free sugar, free potatoes, free rye, free buckwheat, free wheat flour, free lumber, and free leather as vigorously and as openly before the election as he has since his inauguration, he would have received less votes than either Mr. Taft or Mr. Roosevelt at the last election.

Nevertheless it can not be gainsaid that the mandate of the people in the Democratic Party both in 1910 and 1912 was to revise the tariff downward; but it does not follow with equal certainty that that mandate was to abandon the policy of protection for the theory of free trade or to open the American market to the competition of the world.

In opening the debate on the bill the majority leader, Mr. UNDERWOOD, said:

> The real question that we have to consider is that of the rights and interests of the consuming masses of the American people. The question of industry in this country is, and from our standpoint must always be, secondary to the rights and necessities of the great American consuming public.

The statement seems to assume that it is possible to establish by law a condition of prosperity among the consumers separate and apart from that of the producer; that on one side you have a consuming public and on the other a producing public, the interests of which were diametrically opposed. It ignores the fact that the great mass of people are both consumers and producers and that prosperity only marks the relation between the man's ability to produce and the cost of what he consumes.

Aside from the two extremes of society represented by the hobo and the idle rich, one of which produces nothing and consumes but little, the other of which consumes much but produces little, every man is both a producer and a consumer. His prosperity is measured by the difference between the value of what he produces and what he consumes. The ratio of difference is always higher under a high standard of prices, speaking within reasonable limits, than under a low standard. Thus a high standard of prices always accompanies prosperity and a low standard of prices depression.

Now, the protective tariff properly administered is not, as so many now seem to think, a device for enabling the producer to make a profit at the expense of the consumer. If this were the object, it could be more economically attained by paying these favored industries a bonus or subsidy as some countries now do in some lines of production.

The real purpose of a protective tariff is to enable us to maintain a standard commensurate with our resources, industry, and genius as a Nation and to maintain at the highest point the ratio of difference between the value of what we produce and what we consume both as individuals and as a Nation.

To illustrate the point I am trying to make, I desire to quote some figures from the digest of the report of the British Board of Trade on the cost of living in the principal industrial towns of the United States. The investigation which preceded this report was undoubtedly the most thorough ever undertaken.

In the United Kingdom the average weekly family income in certain specified trades, including building, engineering, printing, and common labor, is $7.74. The average weekly family expenditure for food is $4.93, or 63.6 per cent of the family income. In the United States the average weekly family wage in the same trades is $19.25, and the average weekly family expense for food is $8.03, or 41.7 per cent. The difference in favor of the American wage earner amounts to 21.9 per cent of the average American weekly wage, or $4.20 per week. I quote now from the conclusions of the report:

> Summarizing now the results of the international comparison it appears that the ratio of the weekly wages for certain occupations in the United States and England and Wales, respectively, at the dates of the two inquiries is 243 to 100 in the building trades, 213 to 100 in the engineering trades, 246 to 100 in the printing trades, and 232 to 100 in all these trades together. Allowing for a slight advance in wages in England and Wales between the dates of the two inquiries, the combined ratio would be 230 to 100.
>
> The retail prices of food obtained by weighing the ascertained predominant prices according to the consumption shown by the British budgets show, when allowance is made for the increase which took place in this country between October, 1905, and February, 1909, a ratio of 138 to 100 for the United States and England and Wales, respectively.
>
> Comparison of wages, hours of labor, rents, and prices in the areas of investigation in the two countries has been made on the assumption that an English workingman with an average family maintained under American conditions the standard of consumption as regards food to which he had been accustomed. Under such conditions the workman's wages would be higher in the United States by about 130 per cent, with slightly shorter hours, while on the other hand his expenditure for food and rent would be higher by about 52 per cent. It is evident, then, that, even when allowance has been made for the increased expenditure on food and rent, a much greater margin is available in the United States than in England and Wales.
>
> The margin over expenditure for rent and food is clearly large, making possible a command of the necessaries and conveniences and minor luxuries of life that is both nominally and really greater than that enjoyed by the corresponding class in this country, although the effective margin in itself, in practice, curtailed by a scale of expenditure to some extent necessarily and to some extent voluntarily adopted in accordance with a different and higher standard of material comfort.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Rather than the necessary cost of living?

Mr. ANDERSON. Exactly so.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to hurry along, but I will yield for a question.

Mr. STANLEY. Do I understand the gentleman to say that in the matter of clothing the difference was in favor of the United States more than in the matter of food?

Mr. ANDERSON. I said so; yes. In comparison with the wage scale.

Mr. STANLEY. Is it not true that the difference between the cost of meats and flour in England and the United States is much less than the difference between the cost of woven fabrics made of cotton or wool?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think so when you take into consideration the whole consumption of an average family in this country and England.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. From that source or any other has the gentleman any comparative statistics as to the other real necessaries of life besides food and rent—say, for instance, in the matter of clothing?

Mr. ANDERSON. About the same proportion runs all the way through, although the advantage is rather more in favor of the United States in the case of clothing than in the case of food.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I take it that the difference, wherever it operates in larger proportion to the expenditure upon the part of the American citizen as compared with the citizen of Great Britain, doubtless comes from the fact that the American citizen, the laboring man, may expend a great deal more in the line of what may be called luxuries.

Mr. ANDERSON. Exactly so.

Mr. STANLEY. It does not matter about the consumption.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes; it does. I do not want to argue with the gentleman. I yielded for a question.

Mr. STANLEY. I was asking a question. I do not think the gentleman means to assert here that the cost per yard or per garment for clothing is nearer the English price than the cost of food.

Mr. ANDERSON. The language of the report is as follows:

> The item of clothing raises wider and more difficult questions of comparison, but the report states that particulars that have been obtained go to show that, while higher prices have, as a rule, been paid in the

United States than in the United Kingdom for woolen and worsted fabrics of similar quality, a very large supply of domestic articles of wearing apparel of most descriptions is available there of standard sizes that are on sale at prices either not so much higher or not higher than in England, although often less durable.

It is impossible to avoid the lesson which these figures and these conclusions teach. While doubtless our greater natural resources would for a time sustain a higher standard of living in this country than in England under free trade, the inevitable result of the adoption of her free-trade policy in this country, especially with reference to agriculture, would be the lowering of our standard of living to something approaching that of England at least.

The Democratic theory seems to be, however, that it is possible to single out certain industries and to reduce the prices of the products of that industry to the consumer, at the same time maintaining the level of prices to the producer and the level of prosperity of the country as a whole.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I have been much interested in the attitude of the gentleman and his party. Can he tell us how you are going to compel the manufacturers to divide up profits with the workmen through the instrumentality of a tariff law?

Mr. ANDERSON. As I have tried to point out in my argument, the purpose of a protective tariff is to maintain a general standard of living. It is not, as the gentleman seems to infer, a policy of protecting the profits of manufacturers.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Does not the gentleman really think that the labor organizations are responsible for keeping up the standard of living rather than the tariff?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think so. Undoubtedly they have some effect in that direction, but I think that the evidence will show that labor has been getting a pretty fair share of the advantages of the protective tariff.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. If the labor organizations are so potent a factor in maintaining a high standard of living in the United States, why are not they equally efficacious in foreign countries, where they are vastly more efficiently organized than they are here?

Mr. HARRISON of New York rose.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CARLIN). Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I have not the floor to answer the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota declines to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The fabric of commercial industry under modern conditions is not made up of isolated units. Each industry is intricately interwoven with every other to form a symmetrical and perfect whole. It is impossible to single out a special industry and subject it to the tide of foreign competition so as to reduce the price of the products of that industry without affecting the whole industrial fabric.

I do not believe in the protective tariff as a device for the protection of profits. I do not believe in protecting profits as such. I do not believe in protecting inefficiency. I do not think it is possible to protect industry from competition in the art of the industry itself, either at home or abroad. I do believe in protecting and maintaining the higher standard of living that obtains in this country, whether that standard is represented by direct and productive labor or the indirect contributions of the farmer, the clerk, the lawyer, the doctor, or the merchant. Whenever any industry is singled out to receive the special protection of the tariff, whenever any industry is accorded a higher degree of protection than would equalize the difference in the standard of that industry at home and abroad, the tariff becomes a mere special privilege and not a policy. It can be a policy only when it is applied to all industry according to a definite measure.

On the other hand, when duties are placed at a point which subjects industry to unequal and unfair competition from abroad, it becomes merely an instrument of punishment, and immunity may constitute no less a special privilege than the giving of direct and special benefits.

Now, in order to maintain the American market for the American producer, and in order to equalize the difference in the standard under which goods are produced here and abroad, it is necessary to be fully informed as to the conditions under which the goods are produced, the relative cost of material and conversion into the finished article, the labor conditions which surround the industry, the relative efficiency of machinery and workmen, and the laws which encourage or discourage production or increase or diminish its cost.

A few days ago I received, as I suppose every Member of the House did, a statement presented by an association representing the window-glass manufacturing companies of the United States, purporting to give the costs of production of window glass here and abroad. That statement showed the advantage to be greatly in favor of the foreign manufacturer.

I have no more doubt that the figures were accurate than I have that the men who made it were human. Being human, I have no doubt they made it as favorable to their industry as the facts would permit. They would have been less than just to the industry had they done otherwise. The figures must either be accepted or rejected; but would it not be wiser and more statesmanlike if instead of disregarding these figures and possibly placing the duty at so low a point as to cripple or destroy the industry, or taking the figures at their face value and perhaps making the duty so high as to place a premium upon inefficiency, we had provided ourselves with a nonpartisan commission equipped with power and machinery to learn and report the facts upon which Congress might fix a rate intelligently?

If there is one thing more than another which marks the difference between the Democratic and Republican Parties it is their respective attitude toward facts—information. The Republican Party believes in publicity at every stage of legislative procedure. We have opened our party conferences to the public and the press. We believe the public always acts intelligently when it is well informed. Publicity is valueless unless it is based on facts. Legislation is not only valueless but frequently absolutely destructive unless based on accurate information.

The Republican Party believes in scientific government. It is in favor of a tariff based upon information, not theory. Important as is the policy which shall govern the making of a tariff bill, it is more important that we should have a tariff based upon information and that will conform to modern trade facts at home and modern world conditions abroad than that we should have a tariff either Democratic or Republican. In other words, the tariff should be made a scientific problem of equalizing the natural trade advantages of lower wage scales and standards of living and artificial stimulants and encourgements enjoyed by foreign countries rather than the football of political parties or the bone of contention of the supposedly opposing producers and consumers.

It is not my province to advise the majority; but it is possibly not too great presumption to hope that when this bill has passed, the Democratic Party will provide some adequate machinery for the determination of costs and prices here and abroad for determining trade facts and conditions and the other elements, both natural and artificial, which affect the relation of industry in this country to that of foreign countries with a view to the revision of the tariff from time to time, schedule by schedule or item by item, as the facts determined may require. Call it a tariff board, a trade commission, or whatever you will; some instrumentality must be established, equipped with power and authority, to obtain the facts necessary to the proper preservation of our own commerce and its extension beyond the seas.

The prime necessity of the manufacturer is opportunity for continuous operation under normal conditions. The prime necessity of the wage earner is continuous employment. Changes which interrupt the continuity of operation are destructive of industry. Changes which interrupt the continuity of employment of the wage earner are destructive of both his prosperity and his happiness. Radical and wholesale changes in the policy of our tariff laws must inevitably be injurious to the whole fabric of commerce and industry.

If there is one thing which the last Congress established beyond dispute, it is the efficacy and desirability of the schedule by schedule revision of the tariff. Such a revision permits of the consideration of the tariff upon allied products upon their own merits. It prevents the brutalities and incongruities which inevitably result upon the logrolling which always accompanies a general revision of the tariff, whether the general tendency of the revision is upward or downward. It affords greater opportunity for real consideration. Schedules revised in this way will not be subject to the vagaries of sectionalism which are certain to characterize general revision.

The opportunity of the Democratic Party for real service did not lie so much in the revision of the tariff as in revision of the methods under which revisions have heretofore been accomplished. It has failed miserably in this respect, but it can still redeem its failure by providing machinery which will make the adoption of similar methods impossible for the future. The

Democratic Party has ever been a party of opposition. It could earn a clear title to being a party of progress if it could lay aside for the nonce the desire for political advantage long enough to establish a really constructive method of tariff revision.

In its attempts to carry out its promise for a free market basket the Democratic Party has made the farmer the chief point of its attack against the high level of prices. The farming industry has been singled out as the shining mark for the competition of foreign countries under the mistaken theory that the price of his commodities to the consumer may be reduced without affecting his prosperity as a producer. The farmer is made the scapegoat of a weird attempt to apply an impossible theory to unknown conditions.

Nothing could better illustrate the Democratic tendency to write tariffs with absolute disregard for trade facts and conditions than this attempt. It must result in failure either at one end or the other.

If the Democratic Party succeeds in lowering the price of agricultural products to the consumer, it will at the same time lower the level of prices of wages and commodities of other industries, and ultimately the disturbances which the radical cuts proposed by the bill must inevitably produce will diminish the ratio of the difference between the value of what we produce and what we consume to the point of actual business depression and stagnation.

In the very first line of the agricultural schedule the farmer is presented with what purports to be a protective duty of 10 per cent ad valorem upon cattle. His joy upon making this discovery will be short lived, however. Upon further examination he will doubtless uncover the fact that the carcass, hide, hoofs, and horns of cattle have been placed on the free list. Doubtless he will suppose when he reads that sheep are dutiable at 10 per cent ad valorem that it was the intention of the Democratic Party to protect the sheep industry. By the same token his gratitude may be expected to be somewhat diminished when he learns that the flesh of the sheep, the skin of the sheep, and the wool of the sheep are admitted free of duty.

Wheat is theoretically protected by a duty of 10 cents a bushel, but bran and screenings are admitted free, as is flour coming from countries which impose no duty upon our flour. Oats are protected by a duty of 10 cents a bushel, but the product of oats—oatmeal and rolled oats—are placed on the free list. Potatoes come in free. Rye and rye flour free. Buckwheat and buckwheat flour free. Milk and cream free. Butter is reduced from 6 to 3 cents per pound. Cheese from 6 cents per pound, an equivalent of 32 per cent ad valorem, to 20 per cent ad valorem. The farmer is alternately lifted to the mount of hope and plunged into the slough of despair. The Democratic Moses leads him to the promised land only to leave him wandering in the wilderness, the prey of his foreign competitors.

Subsection 7 of Paragraph J of the administrative section of the bill provides:

That a discount of 5 per cent on all duties imposed by this act shall be allowed on such goods, wares, and merchandise as shall be imported in vessels admitted to registration under the laws of the United States.

Perhaps the theoretical satisfaction of the farmer over the theoretical protection of 10 cents per bushel on wheat will wane somewhat when he discovers that out of every dollar collected on wheat carried in an American registered ship from Port Arthur, Canada, to Buffalo, across the Great Lakes, 5 cents must be paid back to the importer. It is difficult to understand the mental processes that justify a policy of discouraging home industry by inducing foreign competition and encouraging foreign industries by paying them a direct bonus. It is not enough to encourage foreign competition, but we must add to the injustice of the policy by paying a bonus to the importer.

After all, it must be admitted that the price paid to the farmer has but very little to do with the cost of those articles to the consumer. For the wool in a suit of clothes selling at retail at $23 the farmer receives $1.50. For the oats in a 5-pound package of oatmeal costing 25 cents the farmer receives 7 cents. For the pound of steak for which the consumer pays 28 cents the farmer receives 6½ cents. A reduction of 6 cents a bushel in the price of wheat would mean a reduction of three-twentieths of a cent in the cost of a loaf of bread.

In the main foodstuffs to-day are sold in small packages. The size of these packages and the prices at which they are sold have been very largely standardized. Modern business conditions make it impossible that the size of these packages or the price of their contents should fluctuate with the price of the raw materials out of which they are made. Lower prices of the raw material are either absorbed in increased profits or by increased costs of selling in small quantities. On the whole it is probably better both for the consumer and producer if prices can be maintained at a fairly constant level instead of being subject to daily or periodical fluctuation. Under modern conditions of trade, clothes, hats, stockings, shoes—indeed, nearly every article of everyday use—are sold at a standard of quality and at a standard price, which admits of no opportunity to follow the fluctuations of the price of raw material. It is perfectly idle to say that the reduction of the tariff can affect this situation. If reduction in the tariff means a reduction in prices, it means a reduction effected by lowering the standard of wages, of prices, and of living all down the line. The remedy for this situation does not lie in a reduction of the tariff. That remedy consists of better and more economic methods of distribution and arrangements among consumers that will enable them to buy in larger quantities and at the same time lessen the cost of both buying and selling, as well as of delivery.

Paragraph 198 provides for a duty of 10 cents per bushel on wheat. Paragraph 439 puts bran and screenings on the free list. Paragraph 647 puts wheat flour and semolina on the free list, subject to the following proviso:

647. Wheat flour and semolina: *Provided*, That wheat flour shall be subject to a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem when imported directly or indirectly from a country, dependency, or other subdivision of government which imposes a duty on wheat flour imported from the United States.

It is carefully explained by our Democratic friends who desire to allay the well-grounded fears of their farmer constituents, that Canada will not admit our flour free and thereby obtain access to the American market.

No party and no Member of this House has the right to assume that Canada will not take advantage of a provision so evidently written for her especial benefit. If it is not intended that she should do so, the provision should be stricken from the bill. If it is intended that she should take advantage of it, we must expect the natural consequences of her doing so. No party has the right to ignore the facts and conditions to which a law is to be applied and at the same time expect to escape from the results of that disregard.

But the provision would be unfair to the milling industry of the United States even if the duty of 10 per cent on flour were absolute.

The usual computation requires 5 bushels of wheat to make 1 barrel of flour. Ten cents a bushel on $1 wheat is equal to 10 per cent, but on 60-cent wheat it is equal to 16.7 per cent ad valorem. On the other hand, 10 per cent ad valorem on a barrel of flour made from $1 wheat would be 50 cents. On flour made from 60-cent wheat, 30 cents. The duty on the wheat in the flour in both cases remains at the same level—50 cents a barrel. This would mean a disadvantage of 20 cents a barrel against the American miller. This disadvantage would be increased on the higher grades of flour requiring from 5⅝ to 5⅝ bushels of wheat to the barrel. In milling flour the by-product—bran, shorts, and so forth—amounts to 30 per cent of the wheat. As these by-products are admitted free from Canada, the duty on wheat would mean a further disadvantage of 3 cents per bushel or 15 cents per barrel of flour represented by the duty on that part of the wheat which was turned into the by-product.

An examination of the Tuesday quotations of No. 1 hard wheat at Minneapolis and Winnipeg covering the period from September 1, 1909, to August 31, 1911, shows that the average difference in price in favor of the Minneapolis market amounts to 10.4 cents per bushel. Wheat would therefore seem to be sufficiently protected by a duty equivalent to 10 cents a bushel. Wheat is used almost exclusively for making flour, and the high price of wheat is therefore dependent upon the market conditions and the trade facts which surround the marketing of flour.

In the production of wheat and manufacture of flour Canada is our nearest and biggest competitor. She will at once take advantage of the reciprocal provision in the law relative to flour in order to gain access to the tremendous market which our 90,000,000 of people affords. It is a well-known trade fact in the milling industry that in the establishment of a new mill the prime necessity is a market for the by-product of flour, bran, shorts, and so forth. The pending bill furnishes the Canadian miller with that primary market in the United States. With a free market for his by-product the Canadian miller will start out with an advantage of 10 cents a bushel on the wheat in the flour. Since it takes from 4½ to 5 bushels of wheat—in some grades as high as 5½ bushels—to make 1 barrel of flour, this would mean an advantage of from 45 to 55 cents per barrel.

No industry, no efficiency, no business acumen, can overcome this advantage. It is obvious, then, that the miller must make a reduction either in wages or the price of his raw material—probably both. The price of wheat is necessarily in a large degree dependent on the price of flour and its by-products.

Since the price of these commodities is to be fixed by direct competition with the products of other countries where the price of wheat is on a lower level than it is in the United States the price of wheat here must necessarily drop to the same level. Thus the theoretical duty on wheat will be nullified.

It is puerile to argue that the price of this commodity is governed by the law of diminishing returns or fixed at Liverpool in the face of positive evidence of an actual difference in price between this country and Canada of 10 cents per bushel and the admission of that difference evidenced by the imposition of a duty of 10 cents a bushel upon wheat. This bill gives Canada a natural market of 90,000,000 people in exchange for an economically impossible one of 8,000,000 people. No Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, Minnesota, or other United States mills could sell its product in Canada against mills buying their wheat in the lowest-priced primary wheat markets on the North American Continent, because the cost of native wheat to these United States mills would be higher. But even if prices were the same—which is inconceivable because of the greater remoteness of Canadian wheat territory from the seaboard—back-haul freight from the United States to Canadian wheat territory would absolutely prohibit.

There are nearly 12,000 flour mills in this country scattered over 48 States. It is a highly competitive industry. It employs $350,000,000 capital. At the least, it should be entitled to a square deal.

The position of the millers and farmers is by no means unique. They are but two of the many victims of the Democratic policy of ignoring facts. Their situation but emphasizes the general character of the revision. The plan seems to consist of reducing the duties at both ends. If the duty on raw material is reduced, the manufactured product is placed on the free list or, at best, the duty is so much reduced as to give the industry the merest chance of survival.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] said that the Democratic revisions of the last Congress were accomplished with blacksmith's tools; the instrument used in the present revision seems to have been an ax. Yet the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has been true to the course he laid out. The consumer has been his first consideration; the industry seems to have been an afterthought. The facts have not been considered at all.

The bill is full of inconsistencies and special benefits.

Under the present law wool, including mohair and the hair of the Angora goat, is dutiable at 11 cents a pound. Under the proposed bill wool is placed on the free list, but the hair of the Angora goat, mohair, and like products are singled out and provided with a special protective duty of 20 per cent and the manufactures of such hair by a duty of 40 and 50 per cent—the highest in the entire wool schedule. I had supposed that the donkey was the especial symbol and mascot of the Democratic Party and was at a loss to understand this sudden solicitude on the part of that party for the Angora goat. It occurred to me that the solution of the problem might be found in the location of the animal. This subsequently proved to be correct, for I found upon examination of statistics that of the 2,900,000 goats in this country 2,350,000, in round numbers, were located in 18 Southern States, and of this number more than a million are in the State in part so ably represented by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], who recently became a member of the Ways and Means Committee. Of course, it is not possible that the fact that these 18 Southern States are represented by 124 Democrats and only 10 Republicans could have had anything to do with the protection of the Angora goat.

Under the present law photogelatin printed matter is excepted from the operation of paragraph 412 and made dutiable under paragraph 415 at 3 cents per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem. The Underwood bill makes the same exception in paragraph 412, but makes no separate provision; so that photogelatin printed matter would be dutiable under that law as printed matter at 15 per cent ad valorem. The paper used in this process is dutiable at 25 per cent, as is also the gelatin. The machines used are also imported and dutiable. As a result Germany can put the finished article into this country cheaper than our own manufacturers can buy the material. A result less disastrous than the wiping out of the industry can hardly be anticipated from this provision.

Burlap cloths—bags and sacks made of burlap—are protected by differentials equivalent to 6 per cent. Under the Underwood bill burlap bags and sacks are dutiable at the same rate as burlap cloth. This puts the American producer of bags and sacks of burlap in direct competition with the burlap bag and sack manufacturers of India, where most of the burlap cloth is made, upon an equal basis, although the American sack manufacturer labors under the disadvantage of a wage scale some 300 per cent higher than that paid in India.

The duty on umbrellas in the bill is lower than that on the parts of which they are made, practically all of which are imported.

We are told that rates in the Underwood bill are competitive in every line of industry. The rates provided in the bill on cotton cloths in the gray—that is, cotton cloth not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, jacquard figured, or mercerized—run from 7½ to 27½ per cent ad valorem, depending upon the fineness of the yarn in the fabric. It is fair to assume that these duites are competitive.

Cotton cloth bleached, dyed, colored, and so forth, is subject to a duty of 2½ per cent in addition to the duties chargeable on the cloth in the gray. The Tariff Board in its investigation of the cotton schedule found there was no difference in the cost of finishing cotton cloth in this country and in England, the greatest cotton manufacturing country in the world. The board said:

> It will be seen from the table that in the case of most of the samples for which data were obtained for the two countries the American charges were lower. In a few instances the American rates are only about one-half the English; * * * the labor cost of mercerizing cotton fabrics varies from less than 0.08 of 1 cent to less than 0.11 of 1 cent per square yard, while the total cost of mercerizing varies from more than 0.53 of 1 cent to over 0.72 of 1 cent per square yard.

The additional duty of 2½ per cent on finished cotton cloths amounts to one-eighth of 1 cent per yard on cloth costing 5 cents per yard; one-fourth of 1 cent per yard on cloth costing 10 cents per yard; one-half of 1 cent on cloths costing 20 cents per yard; 1 cent on cloths costing 40 cents per yard; these amounts are, in practically every instance, more than the total labor cost per yard involved in finishing the cloths. In some instances they are nearly as much as the total cost of finishing, excluding material.

It must be apparent that if duties on cotton cloths in the gray are competitive, the addition of 2½ per cent on the same cloths finished would make these duties prohibitive in many instances. It is quite significant in this connection that the importation of cotton cloths in the gray have in the past been practically nominal while the importation of finished cotton cloths have been more substantial.

Perhaps the cotton-mill industry of the South is sufficiently protected after all.

The pending bill raises the duty on cotton yarn No. 60 over the rate in the Underwood cotton bill of last year from 15 to 20 per cent. This is one of the greatest increases in the schedule on yarns. Is it altogether a coincidence that the importations of this count of yarn in 1910 were greater than those of any other number, amounting to 1,263,000 pounds? Yarn No. 50, on which the importations in 1910 were 330,773 pounds, has been increased in duty from 10 to 17½ per cent. Duty on cotton yarn No. 40, upon which the importations for the same year were 461,017 pounds, has been increased from 10 to 15 per cent. The duties on yarn No. 68, upon which the importations in 1910 were 767,614 pounds; No. 70, upon which importations were 286,761 pounds; No. 76, upon which the importations were 248,276 pounds; and No. 78, upon which the importations were 907,388 pounds, have been raised from 15 to 20 per cent ad valorem in the proposed bill over the Underwood bill of the last Congress. The duties on yarn No. 100, of which 287,414 pounds were imported in 1910, have been raised from 15 to 25 per cent.

Singularly enough, yarns Nos. 40, 50, 60, and 100 fall into a classification taking a higher rate of duty than under the Underwood bill of the last Congress. In other words, the classification has been so changed as to make these counts of yarns, upon which the importations were quite substantial, fall into a classification taking a relatively higher rate than under the Underwood bill of last year.

Evidently the Democratic Party is not so anxious to induce importations and invite competition in the cotton industry as in the case of farming and other industries.

Yet in almost every line the bill seems to evidence a purpose to cheapen the American market while holding out to the American producer the promise that the product of his labor and genius will not be diminished in value.

It would be neither wise nor kind to indulge in predictions as to the effect of this bill; but if the Democratic Party has kept its promises to the people it will have accomplished the impossible task of reducing the cost of living to the consumer without reducing the price to the producer. It will have transferred $140,000,000 of industry to foreign lands without affecting the prosperity of the American people or reducing the wages of American workmen.

But, after all, the mandate of the American people to the Democratic Party in 1910, and again in 1912, was to revise the tariff downward. You have carried out that mandate. Whether you have done it well or ill the people must finally

judge. As Republicans we think you have done it ill, and we shall say so. But as patriotic citizens we shall bear its results and share its burdens as patiently as we may—until a majority of the people shall again decree a change. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Chairman, within a twelvemonth there passed away in France a citizen of the world, Frédéric Passy. During his 90 years of life he had seen the inception and growth of a great movement among mankind from which much was expected and little has been realized. Passy was one of the brotherhood who, with Cobden and Bright, believed and taught that free trade would destroy the antagonism between nations. He was also a great advocate of peace, and in his distinguished old age received the Nobel prize. In his lifetime he had seen the passing of the great free-trade statesmen of England; he had seen the passing of the talented professors who made the great universities of England the propaganda of free-trade principles. It was a wonderful propaganda, and carried with it not only the English people, but also many men in other lands who were charmed with the free-trade logic. Perhaps most of the Members in this Hall remember the works of Prof. Sumner, of Yale College. Looking back at those times, the American colleges seemed to be hotbeds of free trade, outvying even the English universities Practical men—men of affairs, men who knew human nature, as the professors could not—were alarmed, and great political battles arose over this subject.

One of the greatest of those battles centered around the political activities of Prof. William L. Wilson, known in political life as a Member of this House, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and author of the so-called Wilson tariff bill. We all know the history of that bill and what it did to the United States of America in the year 1894 and in subsequent years. I will not weary this House by citing testimony. I will call just one witness and rest the case on his portrayal of conditions in the country when the Wilson bill had produced its full measure of calamity. Speaking in Madison Square Garden, in 1896, William Jennings Bryan in succinct language set forth the financial condition of the people of the United States as follows:

A general fall of prices is but another definition for hard times. If the people can not buy, the retailers can not sell; if the retailers can not sell, the wholesale merchants and manufacturers must go into bankruptcy.

ONE OF THE HISTORIC MISSTEPS OF THE GENERATION.

In 1913 another professor comes to the front, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, who again presents the attractive theories of the former Prof. Wilson. Now, I do not wish to criticize personally the President of the United States. We have all been delighted with the dignity and earnestness with which he has undertaken his great task. Prof. Wilson had my sincere respect as a man. President Wilson has my support in those policies which may be well conceived for the happiness of America; but it is my duty, and the duty of every good citizen to warn him of a misstep, and oppose him when he continues in the wrong pathway. No one can doubt that he is a free trader of the old English school, and, like the Prof. Wilson of 1894, he is, for modern America, making one of the historic missteps of the generation. He is putting forward a tariff bill which exaggerates all the faults of the bill of 1894. A great leader of that epoch said of that bill on this floor:

On this side, we believe that while it pretends to be for protection, it does not afford it; and on the other side, they believe that while it looks toward free trade, it does not accomplish it.

A LONG STEP TOWARD FREE TRADE.

I will not waste time in rhetorical discussions about the desirability of the President's purpose to make a smooth pathway for free trade. I will not ask you to consider whether this bill moves "toward this end headlong, with reckless haste." It is evident that the President is moving toward free trade as fast as, in his judgment, is prudent. He is not a protectionist, he wishes to eject protection, but having the instincts of a gentleman he wishes to make the ejection in a courteous manner, because he recognizes that protection "has grown up among us by a long process, and at our own invitation."

"Grown up among us by a long process!" It has lived in our house for 50 years. Three generations have known this ancient guest. The children of our family have no conception of what its absence might mean. Sixteen years ago it was decreed that this old guest should go from under our roof, and the children of that time made their cries heard from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

"And at our own invitation!" Truly protection came at our own invitation. It came in America's darkest hour, when the great Republic of the west, the hope of the world against absolutism and tyranny, was about to be broken up so far as human eye could see. In that hour a great legislator, Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont, and a great war minister who deserves to rank with the Carnot who organized victory, cooperated to feed the armies and the people by a protective tariff, which at the same time filled the Treasury for maintaining the war. If this generation has forgotten this guest who made his abode with us in our youth, those who were in arms against us in that day were aware of his presence. One of the bravest and most talented generals of the Confederacy has left on record his conviction that the government at Washington would not have survived if the protective tariff had not been established.

And now this venerated guest is to be gotten out of our house, not by summary ejection, not "headlong," not by "reckless haste," but by a process of starvation that is more consonant with courtesy and the sensibilities of the neighbors.

THIS POLICY REACTIONARY, NOT PROGRESSIVE.

It is not worth while to debate in this Hall whether the removal of protection is consonant with the progressive aspirations of the American people. I do not know that it would do any good to demonstrate that free trade is a reactionary policy; that all the great and progressive nations except England have abandoned it; that all England's progressive self-governing colonies have abandoned it; that England herself is in the throes of indecision on this question. The President and Congress will heed little the protest of an obscure member of the minority. I will not waste the time of the House on any opinions of my own, but will simply quote the opinion of the scholarship, the wide information, of the judicious reasoning of one of the world's greatest authorities. I refer to the Encyclopedia Britannica. In a masterful article on "Free Trade" the scholars of the University of Cambridge record the following sentences:

Free trade was attractive as an ideal, because it appeared to offer the greatest production of goods to the world as a whole, and the largest share of material goods to each consumer; it is cosmopolitan, and it treats consumption and the interest of the consumer as such as the end to be considered. Hence it is open to objections which are partly political and partly economic. * * *

For Cobden and his contemporaries it was natural to regard the national administrative institutions as maintained for the benefit of the "classes" and without much advantage to the "masses." But in point of fact modern times have shown the existence in democracies of a patriotic sentiment which is both exclusive and aggressive, and the burden of armaments has steadily increased. It was by means of a Civil War that the United States attained to a consciousness of national life; * * *.

It is here that the new patriotism comes into direct conflict with the political principles of free trade as advocated by Bastiat and Cobden; for them the important point was that countries, by becoming dependent upon one another, would be prevented from engaging in hostilities. The new nations are determined that they will not allow other countries to have such control over their economic condition as to be able to exercise a powerful influence on their political life. Each is determined to be the master in his own house and each has rejected free trade because of the cosmopolitanism which it involves. * * *

Since the ninth edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica was published it has become clear that the free-trade doctrines of Bastiat and Cobden have not been gaining ground in the world at large, and at the opening of the twentieth century it could hardly be said with confidence that the question was "finally settled" so far as England was concerned. As to whether the interests of Great Britain still demanded that she should continue on the line she adopted in the exceptional conditions of the middle of the nineteenth century, expert opinion was conspicuously divided; but there remained no longer the old enthusiasm for free trade as the harbinger of a Utopia.

NATURE OF WORLD-WIDE COMPETITION.

The watchword of this new administration is competition. It is assumed that the American Nation is getting lazy; that they need an incentive to greater effort. I quote from the address of the President:

The object of the tariff duties henceforth must be effective competition, the whetting of American wits by contest with the wits of the rest of the world.

The words of the President deserve to be weighed always, but I wonder if he and the American people realize what that dire world competition is. I once knew an old soldier who served in the Civil War and for many years also in the campaigns of the West. I asked him if a white soldier was the equal of an Indian in a campaign in the Indian country. His answer was, "A white man can compete with an Indian if he is willing to live as the Indian lives." The American people can compete with the markets of the world, perhaps, if they are willing to live as the people of the competitive nations live. It can not be, however, that the Members of this House have pictured to themselves what this competition means. It can not be that they realize the sordid and merciless conditions of modern competition, which inevitably results in leaving out the labor of men and putting the burden upon the shoulders of women and children.

THE NATIONS WHICH USE WOMEN'S LABOR.

Readers of the Century Magazine for February, 1913, noticed an article on Japan's commercial crisis by Mr. James Davenport Whelpley, who has been one of the commercial agents of the Department of Commerce and Labor, and one of the most discerning observers of financial and economic conditions in the country. In this article he shows that in the industries of

Japan there are nearly twice as many women as men on the pay rolls of the country, and it is the testimony of all large employers that women are the industrial backbone of the country. The employment of women and children is the secret of the competitive power of the Japanese textile industries. Reduced to percentages, the proportion of wage-earning women in the great industrial nations is given as follows:

Japan, 50 per cent.
Great Britain, 25 per cent.
Germany, 20 per cent.
United States, 14 per cent.

THE TRAGEDY OF COTTON.

That brief table tells the story of modern competitive life. Let us examine a little further the conditions of this strife which we are invited to enter. As we examine, the cry "Cotton is king," so often heard in the Hall of this House, comes to our ears, for about the cotton industry competition rages most fiercely. It was introduced into modern commercial life by a great tragedy. The home of the industry was in India, where a large part of the men, women, and children were engaged in spinning and weaving on household looms, which produced every grade of material, from the coarsest to that of such marvelous fineness that a lady could draw a robe made from it through a finger ring. But England harnessed the steam engine to the natural labor of the women of Lancashire, denied the help of a tariff to India, and took from her the cotton industry. Deprived of their industry, the people of India had to turn to the land, there to lead a life of penury, varied by recurring famines.

England, possessed of this imperial industry, developed it almost beyond the imagination of man, and in the year 1913 she has not only the world-wide cotton market which feeds so many of her people, but also one of the most unique and distressing social problems which ever afflicted a nation. In England proper 500,000 people are cotton operatives, and 65 per cent of that great number are women and children. This great industrial army of 325,000 women and children labor in the mills of England to hold for Great Britain the cotton market of the world.

AMERICA IN THE WORLD COMPETITION.

To-day the greatest competitor of England is the United States. To-morrow it will be Japan. The cotton operatives of America number 370,000 in round numbers, 50 per cent of whom are men, the other 50 per cent women and children. It is manifest, then, that the cotton industry has forced America to put burdens upon the women and children, but not to the same extent as in England. Yet America still holds out in this fierce competition for the ideal of our race, which has always been manly men who make their way in the competitions of the world and womanly women who make the homes of the Nation. It is not necessary to review the cotton industry of Germany and Japan. It is worthy of note, however, that among the operatives of the cotton mills of Japan there are five women for every man, showing that this industry which is commercially most promising is being built up almost entirely by the labor of women. Not only this, in the recent report of the American minister we are informed that the new Japanese factory law provides that no children under 10 years are to be employed, and no children under 15 or women are to be employed more than 12 hours a day. But the provision in regard to children applies only to new help, and children of 10 years may be continued if they are already in the factory. But the Government may extend the working time of women and children to 14 hours for a period of not more than 15 years after this law goes into effect. In the cotton industry, then, it seems that the pleasant prospect of world competition which the President holds out, the prospect of "the whetting of American wits by contest with the wits of the rest of the world," means that the women of Japan are to carry on the great competition which she hopes will make her great and powerful. Not only this, but the statesmen of Japan suspend their limitation of the hours of labor for 15 years, in which time those patient drudges are expected to conquer the cotton trade of the Orient for Japan.

THE WOMEN WHO PARTICIPATE IN THIS COMPETITION.

If the statesmen of America have not been awakened, the statesmen of Germany are awake and do know what this modern competition involves. In addition to other textile industries, Germany has a promising cotton industry in Saxony, which is the foremost industrial State in Germany. The recent business crisis has shown the tendency to use female labor in place of male labor wherever possible. Our consul at Dresden reports as follows:

From the statistics of sick funds, it is learned that the employment of female labor is increasing much more rapidly than male, and also much more rapidly, comparatively, than the female population. From 1906 to September, 1910, the number of female workers increased by 24.5 per cent. The great accession of able-bodied female workers in the last few years is remarkable, and is to be attributed to the rise in the cost of living, which causes women to leave household duties for more remunerative work.

The hausfrau of Germany has even anticipated the progressive thought of our President, leader of the Democratic Party, and proposes to abandon her pots and pans and start out to sharpen her wits "by contests with the wits of the rest of the world."

WISDOM OF THE REPUBLICAN ERA.

America has hitherto been protected by the wisdom of the Republican statesmen of the last 50 years. But on Wednesday, when the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Alabama, opened the debate on this bill, he warned this House and the country that that 50-year era is ended, and that we are about to return to the piping times "before the war," when the United States Government borrowed money at 12 per cent interest and all the people dwelt in democratic simplicity. The gentleman from Alabama thinks that this changing of eras is going to be attended by no greater disturbance than the singing of a grasshopper in a deserted field on a midsummer day. The President thinks there may be a little disturbance, some people being so unreasonable as to remain awake during the performance, for the President says in his address:

To some not accustomed to the excitements and responsibilities of greater freedom, our methods may in some respects and at some points seem heroic, but remedies may be heroic and yet be remedies. It is our business to see that they are genuine remedies.

THE SOCIAL REVOLT IN ENGLAND.

I do not know that I ought to obtrude advice when the President and the Democratic Party have decided to change the current era and resuscitate the old era "before the war." But I think, if the President has read faithfully his London Times, he will notice that there are some things which can not be solved on the formulas of "before the war." We have all been amazed at the agitation which is going on among the women of England for political power. It is perhaps the most significant and startling agitation of modern times. That woman, considered, and rightly, the gentler sex, should leave the peace of home and go out to smash windows, burn castles, and mob the dignified cabinet ministers of the most dignified Government in the world demands a serious explanation.

The modern movement for woman suffrage in England dates from 1906, when Christabel Pankhurst and Miss Annie Kenney were fined in Manchester for disturbing a political meeting. This was the first of the suffragette disturbances. I think it will surprise most Members of this House, as it surprised me, to learn that this remarkable movement is to a large extent the product of the world-old cotton industry and the theory of free trade. Annie Kenney was a cotton-mill operative, having begun as a wage earner at 10 years of age, continuing until, with Mrs. Pankhurst in 1906, she started an agitation which is attracting the attention of the world. Annie Kenney gives this account of why she became a suffragette:

I grew up in the midst of women and girls in the works, and I saw the hard lives of the women and children about me. I noticed the great difference made in the treatment of men and women in the factory, differences in conditions, differences in wages, and differences in status. I realized this difference not in the factory alone but in the home. We saw men, women, boys, and girls all working hard during the day in the same hot, stifling factories. Then when work was over I noticed it was the mothers who hurried home, who fetched the children that had been put out to nurse, prepared tea for the husband, did the cleaning, baking, washing, sewing, and nursing. I noticed that when the husband came home his day's work was over; he took his tea and then went to join his friends in the club or in the public house or on the cricket or football field, and I used to ask myself why this was so. Why was the mother the drudge of the family and not the father's companion and equal?

INTOLERABLE ECONOMIC CONDITIONS.

Any man who reads Annie Kenney's justification must be moved by a profound sympathy, whatever his judgment may be of the practicability of this movement to help the hard conditions of women cotton operatives. It must be remembered that the discouraging condition of women's labor in England is not confined to the cotton industry. Indeed, as cotton manufacture might be called the premier industry of Great Britain so it is as well paid if not better than any other industry where either men or women are employed. The average earnings of women in English cotton mills amount, according to a recent Parliamentary inquiry, to $4.32 a week. The women employed in English woolen mills get an average of $3.32 a week. In the shoe factories, according to the latest Parliamentary statistics that I could find, women received $2.78 a week. It may be that in the recent agitation the wages of women in this industry have been somewhat increased.

Whether or not the agitation which Annie Kenney leads is calculated to get more wages for the working women of England

is not pertinent to this discussion, for this discussion concerns the immediate effect of this bill and not a social agitation, which must mature, if at all, after many years. The broad question of the condition of the working class in England was portrayed a few months ago by a distinguished churchman, the Dean of St. Paul's in London, Dr. Inge. In an address which dealt in part with the industrial situation, he said:

> They had amassed a population of 46,000,000 on two small islands, while Englishmen were making England the workshop of the world. Great Britain had enjoyed certain accidental advantages of which they had made full use. * * *
>
> Our coal supply was being exhausted with criminal recklessness, and our labor was no longer very good and was becoming extremely dear. As surely as water found its own level, so surely would the transfer of industries and of wealth to eastern Asia be the necessary sequel to the European labor movement, when they remembered that a Japanese or a Chinaman was content with one-third of the European's wages and did considerable more work in the time. * * *
>
> In England the conditions were ideally unfavorable for those who hoped to see a dense population with high wages and short hours. Our soil would not support them. When we ceased to outwork and undersell other nations the working classes must emigrate or starve.

The working people of England must compete, emigrate, or starve. The people of other countries take refuge on the land and, by protective laws, ameliorate the grinding competition. The cotton operatives of England must meet all comers, because their product must be sold in every land under the sun. They must sell in China, where the women cotton operatives of Japan are trying to take the Chinese market by working more than 12 hours a day and running the factories day and night.

SHALL AMERICA ENTER UPON THIS DIREFUL COMPETITION?

The establishment of Christianity in the Roman Empire marked a revolution in the status of women in the then known world. The interests of working women were protected by the enactment of regulations concerning the industries of spinning and dyeing. But in the world competition upon which free trade has embarked England, probably irrevocably, that old, humane Roman usage is observed only in favored countries. The new age which is dawning upon us has many advantages over other ages, and we sometimes look back with contempt upon the rude virtues of other times. In the days of chivalry, however, woman was given a high place in the admiration of men, and feats of arms were performed in her presence and for her favor. In Ivanhoe Sir Walter Scott thus describes a memorable tournament in which the gentle knights of that time contended in order that they might receive distinction at her hands:

> Thus ended the memorable field of Ashby de la Zouche, one of the most gallantly contested tournaments of that age; for although only 4 knights, including one who was smothered in the heat of his armor, had died upon the field, yet upward of 30 were desperately wounded, 4 or 5 of whom never recovered. Several more were disabled for life, and those who escaped best carried the marks of the conflict to the grave with them. Hence, it is always mentioned in the old records as "the gentle and joyous passage of arms of Ashby."

We may not think that "gentle and joyous" is an accurate description of the competition in which Ivanhoe figured, but what are we to think of that world tournament competition which the President and the Democratic Party invite the American people to enter, in which woman is not to be a spectator of the feats of man but a sharer in the conflict, in order that Americans may "whet their wits by contest with the wits of the rest of the world"?

ANTIQUE THEORIES IN A MODERN WORLD.

When the world-wide competition in the cotton industry is so tragically evident, it seems impossible for a thoughtful man to take the view of the Democratic Party. Democratic orators reproach this industry in America because the operatives are not so well paid as those in other American industries. They seem to forget the frightful world competition and the low freight rates which make the world to its uttermost parts one great market. Since the doctrine of free trade was upheld by Cobden in England and Robert J. Walker in America, ocean transportation has been revolutionized.

In 1850, four years after Robert J. Walker enunciated his theory of tariff for revenue, the fine steamer *Persia* carried a cargo across the Atlantic at an expenditure of 14,500 pounds of coal to a ton of freight. Thirty years ago, when the great fall of ocean rates took place, a cube of coal small enough to pass through a ring the size of a quarter of a dollar would drive a ton of cargo 2 miles. To say that improvements in ocean transportation, supplemented by the electric telegraph, have made the world one-half smaller, so far as the economics of tariff are concerned, is to make a conservative statement.

DEMOCRATIC LOGIC.

In a light commodity, like woven cotton, ocean freight rates are a negligible quantity, and therefore the cotton workers of America stand on the industrial frontier. They have a little line of protection, created by a protective tariff, and the Democratic orators reproached them for that, forsooth, and said in a great campaign that their wages are much lower than the wages of the masons who build brick houses. Of course the builders of brick houses need no protection, because brick houses are not subject to ocean transportation. But the bricklayers are nevertheless interested in this question, because if the textile industries of America are crippled all will suffer from the consequent congestion of the labor market.

Do you know how many textile workers there are in the United States belonging to the three branches of the industry? There are about 650,000, 380,000 of whom are in the cotton industry. The woolen industry employs about 170,000 and the silk industry about 100,000. It may surprise you perhaps to know that America leads in the silk industry. The number of women and children in the cotton industry is 190,000, in wool 82,000, and in silk 66,000. Because of the world-wide competition and the cheapness of ocean transportation the cotton workers are the frontiersmen of the industrial situation. They receive the first shock of foreign competition. They must work as hard and live on less than their fellow citizens, and the Democratic orators make this their reproach.

PROTECTION'S FRONTIER.

Was this the sort of treatment accorded by our forefathers to those frontiersmen who extended the line of civilization and protected the older society? Did they not rather consider the hardships of those who stood between them and the savage? Perhaps they were laborious and rough men, perhaps the women engaged in men's work, sometimes even to the extent of cooperating with the men in war against the Indians, as many women of Maine did in the early days. Was this made a matter of reproach? Everyone knew that they were dealing with an inferior civilization, and the more peaceful communities extended a helping hand. They sent rangers to help menaced communities, thereby establishing a system of public protection, and the peaceful communities gladly taxed themselves to succor their fellow citizens, well knowing that this was not really a tax because it would return tenfold in security and civilization.

Is it worth while for us to continue the textile industries, the industrial frontiers of our civilization? Other great progressive nations think it is worth while. They think that they should supply their own cotton, woolen, and silk clothing, and every nation but England has, by protective tariffs, helped out against competition, and England would do it in a moment if she could.

To show how far England is willing to go, even under its present free-trade government, to foster and protect its great cotton industry, I will call your attention to the resolution introduced into Parliament within a few days by Mr. Lloyd-George, the chancellor of the exchequer, which asked for the appropriation of $15,000,000 to develop the cultivation of cotton along the banks of the Nile in order that the English manufacturers might be independent of America for their supply of cotton.

HOW PROTECTION MAINTAINS CIVILIZATION.

At this point there are some very interesting facts relating to the textile industries in the United States as compared to competing nations. As has been noted above, the cotton workers of England are relatively well paid. The woolen weavers receive less, the shoe workers still less; but turning to the United States we find that the cotton worker, because of the inordinate competition of the world, is probably the least paid of American laborers, while the woolen worker, the silk worker, and the shoe worker, especially among female operatives, is far better paid than anywhere else in the world.

The evidence that this is due to protection is overwhelming. It is due to the tariff on wool and on silks, and when this bill gives free trade in shoes and opens the American market to the underpaid labor of Europe and to the shoe manufacturers of other lands, who have been building up the industry until now it is in a condition to enter into competition with the industry here, it will be found that the high wages of shoe workers have also been due to protection. So it is demonstrated beyond question that protection helps even the hard-pressed cotton operative appreciably, the woolen operative more substantially, silk and shoe operatives still more.

MALE AND FEMALE WORKERS IN AMERICA.

America is a new country; it is absolved from any of the European conditions, especially that of the employment of women in the industries. We wish to preserve that condition as much as lies within our power. The recent census shows that the use of female labor in the manufacturing industries of America has been decreasing during the last 10 years. This

table is so illuminating from the standpoint of advancing civilization that I venture to summarize it here:

Per cent of average number of wage earners.

Division and State.	16 years of age and over.						Under 16 years of age.		
	Male.			Female.					
	1909	1904	1899	1909	1904	1899	1909	1904	1899
United States	78.0	77.6	77.1	19.5	19.5	19.5	2.5	2.9	3.4
Geographic divisions:									
New England	69.0	69.1	68.4	27.9	28.0	28.7	3.1	2.9	2.9
Middle Atlantic	73.3	73.9	73.3	24.7	23.5	23.4	2.0	2.7	3.3
East North Central	84.0	83.8	84.4	14.5	14.5	13.2	1.5	1.7	2.4
West North Central	83.1	83.6	83.4	15.4	14.2	13.6	1.5	2.3	3.0
South Atlantic	78.0	75.4	74.7	15.6	17.0	17.4	6.3	7.6	7.9
East South Central	87.4	85.9	86.2	9.5	9.7	9.0	3.1	4.3	4.8
West South Central	93.6	92.6	91.3	4.7	5.5	6.4	1.7	1.9	2.4
Mountain	94.3	93.6	94.4	5.1	5.2	4.2	0.6	1.3	1.3
Pacific	90.4	88.6	85.5	8.9	10.3	12.6	0.7	1.2	1.9

While the employment of women has not increased in the United States in the last decade, it is probably increasing very rapidly in England, at least in the cotton industry. From 1835 to 1901 the increase of females over 13 years of age has been from 47.9 per cent to 61.1 per cent. There is relatively the same percentage of male operatives through those years. The great advance in England has been through legislation eliminating child labor. Females over 13 years old have taken the place of younger children. But in American industries generally the increase of men is noticeable.

I know a silk mill in this country which competes with the silk mills of Japan, where the women weavers receive the same wage as the men when they do the same work. This new tariff will be a serious blow to that industry, and if it survives after this bill becomes a law its activities will be seriously crippled. How long will this American condition of equality last when that mill must compete with weavers in Japan who receive wages on an oriental basis?

DEMOCRATIC POLICY FOUNDED ON MISCONCEPTION.

The other day I read in a popular magazine an article on the prevailing social unrest, by a western writer, evidently a well-meaning man. I was attracted by a phrase in which he spoke of the New England manufacturers as among the most selfish of mankind. It reminded me of a speech made in the United States Senate by the late Senator Frye, of Maine, in which he spoke of a certain school of political thought which had "a holy horror" of "New England capitalists," of "thieving manufacturers." This was on February 10, 1882, 31 years ago. Consider also that within this 31 years the period of 1894 had intervened, and in that period the circumambient air had been vexed by denunciations, not of the mill owners of New England alone, but also an equal denunciation of the mill owners of the industrial part of America which have followed the example of New England. Thus it is proved by history that from the recent article of the western editor for over 31 years back the manufacturer has had a bad reputation among some people. Now if that is so, why has this enlightened America tolerated these men? Is not that a phenomenon worthy of examination? If such respectable men as magazine writers set their faces against the manufacturers, many other people may be prejudiced. No rank in life will be free from a share in this prejudice. All manufacturers, in and out of New England, will be discredited. It may be that some high officials participate in this prejudice and unwittingly do great injustice to the manufacturers, and to those earnest, hard-working people who are dependent upon the manufacturers for their livelihood.

IMPORTERS AGAINST MANUFACTURERS.

Now, when any man or class of men is ill-spoken of by a number of people, that ill-speaking creates what we term a prejudice. Whole communities are sometimes prejudiced, rightly or wrongly. The young man starting out in life and encountering these prejudices either believes them or becomes mystified by the apparent contradiction between the bad reputation and the attractive personality of the victim of the prejudice. The older man, especially if he has had some experience in business or politics, knows that all men are not fair-minded, that sometimes they assist in raising prejudices against other men simply because those other men have, or are trying to get, some good thing which the circulator of prejudices wishes for himself.

Have you ever thought that it may be that in this tariff situation there is a great good thing which two rival bodies of men are trying to get, viz, the supplying of certain commodities to the American people. One of these bodies of men goes to foreign lands, brings the commodities of those lands to America, and sells them to her people in the great department stores and importing houses of large cities. Those merchants evidently wish the importation of foreign goods to be as large as possible. Their business is legitimate, and I make no complaint of them as individuals.

The other body is the American manufacturers, who desire to sell as much as possible of the commodities produced by the American people in New England and elsewhere and want to discourage as much as possible the domestic use of the manufactures of foreigners.

THE QUESTION NOT TO BE SETTLED ON BASIS OF PREJUDICE.

Why should the individuals of the second body of men be hounded in the public prints and on this floor with every sort of insinuation and charge? Is the manufacturer the most oppressive of mankind and the merchant who sells manufactures a philanthropist? Do not merchants obtain large profits? Do not merchants employ thousands of clerks in the great cities who receive a wage that is as beggarly as that received by some operatives? Why should the manufacturer bear the entire burden of the hardships of the age, when no individual can remove it entirely? A great party in this Hall are putting through a bill which will cause the manufacturing of the American people to be turned over to the women textile workers of England, Germany, and Japan. No wonder that those who are responsible for this legislation wish to distract attention from what they propose to do by denunciation of some one. In this debate this Hall has resounded with denunciations of the high dividends made by manufacturers—dividends which upon analysis are usually found to be grossly overstated, as were the fabulous dividends of the cotton industry two years ago.

Why is so much stress put upon this? Does not conspicuous success advance one man or corporation beyond its fellows? Have there not been wonderful successes in commercial business? But the rank and file of business contents itself with moderate returns. The opponents of protection know this very well. Then, why do they vex the atmosphere of this Hall with stock denunciation worn out by 50 years of service? Perhaps their motive may be suggested by a story which Plutarch records:

> Alcibiades had a dog which cost him 70 minas and was a very large one and very handsome. His tail, which was his principal ornament, he caused to be cut off, and his acquaintances exclaiming at him for it, and telling him that all Athens was sorry for the dog and cried out upon him for this action, he laughed and said, "Just what I wished has happened, then. I wished the Athenians to talk about this that they might not say something worse of me."

TWO GREAT CAMPS.

Those two bodies of men, the importers and the manufacturers, have diametrically opposite interests, and where that is the case, human nature being as it is, prejudices arise, and the contestants not only become imbued with those prejudices, but they imbue other people—their neighbors and business associates. In this rivalry between the importer and the manufacturer it is manifest that both sides will have their own partisans, seek publicity for their ideas, and try to mold public sentiment.

And public sentiment is a tremendous element in such a rivalry. Long ago, when the earth was younger than it is to-day, there was an enterprising man named Philip of Macedon. He was King of a little country known as Macedonia, and a few years later, through the genius of his son, Macedonia conquered the world. But in Philip's time Macedonia had many enemies, one especially redoubtable, Athens, the center of culture in that Old World. And Philip of Macedon in the rivalries of that time felt that he was constantly at a disadvantage, because in his poor, rude country there was no one to celebrate his deeds of valor, and he expressed the wish that he might possess Athens in order that he might have her classic poets and orators to make illustrious his virtues and his victories.

Probably Philip did not mean that these orators and poets should make him illustrious corruptly or by duress, but rather he hoped to get their esteem and friendship through association and mutual understanding—through acquaintanceship at the club, at the church, and in society.

Now, in this great conflict between the importer and the manufacturer the manufacturer is somewhat in the position of Philip of Macedon. He is confined to his manufactory in small villages or mill towns, as is the case in my own State. He goes to the great cities at infrequent periods. He does not become acquainted with the great life of the metropolis. He does not know the men who mold public opinion, especially the editors and business managers of the great metropolitan newspapers and magazines.

On this point the importer has a distinct advantage. He mingles constantly in the life of the metropolis, he impresses his views at the clubs, and undoubtedly in the newspapers, not corruptly, but through identity of interests. It is strange, then, that any metropolitan journal should take any other than the importer's side, and the fact that some great metropolitan journals do take the side of the manufacturers is a tribute either to their open-mindedness or is due to the fact that their particular city has enough manufacturing to counterbalance the influence of the importing classes.

Do not these considerations, then, explain the prejudice which has arisen against manufacturers? It is quite generally supposed that the millionaires of America are largely manufacturers who have grown inordinately wealthy through tariff favors. I do not deny that manufacturing is a profitable form of occupation. It is an axiom in the world that manufacturing nations grow wealthy faster than other nations. This was evident more than a hundred and fifty years ago, when Lord Chesterfield, in writing to his son at Berlin, impressed upon the youth the fact that Prussia was too poor to make an effective English ally; that while she possessed many brave men, she had not the wealth proceeding from manufactures which was needed to equip armies. But while manufacturers create wealth for others, they do not necessarily amass great wealth individually. I was greatly surprised not long ago to run across in the New York World Almanac a table of American multimillionaire families. I supposed that they were manufacturing families, the products of the tariff, particularly of Schedule K.

It appears that multimillionaires of America are largely bankers, railroad men, real estate owners, and those who have handled and distributed the products of manufacture, farm products, and the spoils of our natural resources. But there is not a single cotton, woolen, or silk manufacturer among them. It has been found that the surpassing wealth of the few manufacturers has come, not by the manufacture alone, but by the financing of bankers. It is noticeable that two of these multimillionaire families of America come from a single firm which has had wonderful success in Chicago—I mean the Marshall Field Co.; they were not manufacturers, but distributors and importers of manufactures.

FREE TRADE IN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

This world-wide competition to which the President and the Democratic Party wish to commit this country makes no exception of classes except in some favored cases. The wheat farmer of the Northwest has protection, but the potato farmer must exist under absolute free trade. Consider for a moment the condition of a potato farmer who has for years raised his crop for the New York market. Year in and year out he probably does not realize 30 or 35 cents a bushel, for the freight rates on a bushel of potatoes sometimes amount to 15 or 20 cents if the farmer is as far away from New York as Maine or Ohio.

Now, to what sort of competition does this bill subject the potato farmer? To the competition of all the world, including the great potato-raising regions of Germany. The freight on a bushel of potatoes from Hamburg, Germany, to New York City is 9 cents, so that Germany as a market is nearer than the greater part of the eastern country which is tributary to New York City. European wages for day labor are very small for both men and women. It is probable that 50 cents for a man and 30 cents for a woman would be a fair compensation for work in the potato fields. I can not give the exact figures, because the work on which I was obliged to rely, German Life in Town and Country, was published in 1901, when wages were lower, men getting 36 cents and women 24. But under the protective policy of Germany wages have increased. Moreover, the treatment of the female farm laborers has probably greatly improved. The authority which I have already cited records this incident, which, in 1901, was said to have occurred "several years ago":

> Upon a manorial estate in West Prussia some 40 Polish women are employed. These people could no longer bear their terrible ill usage, for they were treated like cattle, and they resolved to seek release in flight, which they did by taking the night train to Berlin. No sooner, however, was their flight discovered on the estate than word of it was sent to the police there, with the result that two police wagons were in waiting for the party at the station on their arrival, and in these they were placed and conveyed to prison.

Yet there is no doubt that the competition of the underpaid men and women in the potato fields of Germany will at once become a serious factor in the farm life of America, when we remember that the American farmer has been forced to pay a wage which in Europe would be considered princely.

SCIENTIFIC PROTECTION.

I do not believe that many Members of this House wish inordinate protection. I for one cooperated gladly with my Republican associates in proposing a tariff commission. When this fateful bill shall have run its brief course, another House of Representatives will frame a bill on scientific and humane principles, which will be indorsed by the American people for years to come.

The great question which is before us in this Hall to-day is how best to conserve the old ideals of America. Tariff contentions are supposed to be largely devoted to questions of wealth, and that is necessary in this age, when wealth properly distributed uplifts mankind. But before it is possible to distribute wealth, conditions must be right for the production of wealth. After all, however, the great question has not to do with wealth but the well-being and advancement of the men, women, and children who live in this America to-day. On this side we uphold the principles of the glorious era which has done so much in the last 50 years, and with confidence await the outcome.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am not entitled to yield to anybody just now. I understand the gentleman from Alabama was to yield to some one at this time.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Alabama was to yield to me after the gentleman from Minnesota concluded.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CARLIN). The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, with the exception of a brief period during the last 50 years the Republican Party has been in charge of the Federal Government. The American people having become dissatisfied with the manner in which that party conducted the business of the Government, have retired Republicanism, and turned over the administration of governmental affairs to the Democratic Party.

The exorbitant and prohibitory rates of tariff taxation, the increased cost of living, the willful and well-nigh criminal extravagance in the expenditure of the public funds, the granting of subsidies and privileges to favorites, and the utter incompetency and general mismanagement of the Republican administration were the determining factors in the struggle for political supremacy at the polls last year.

The Democratic Party promised to reform this abuse of governmental authority and to reduce the outrageous and prohibitive rates of a protective tariff, which had increased the cost of living, destroyed all legitimate competition, and permitted the development and growth of gigantic trusts and commercial combines.

For nearly half a century the protective system of taxation has been forced upon the country. Through the operation of law the commercial, industrial, and agricultural interests of the United States have been made to suffer from the baneful effects of Republican protection. The resources of the country have been shamefully exploited. The taxing power has been used to develop private business and to increase private profit. It has been freely bartered and exchanged for campaign contributions. It has been used to stifle competition and to strangle legitimate industry. Efficiency in equipment and skill in labor are no longer the tests by which the success of a great commercial enterprise is determined.

The Democratic Party promised to reform these abuses, to divorce that partnership existing under Republican control between the Government on the one hand and a few tariff-swollen manufacturing industries on the other—a partnership sanctioned by law, which, as Carlyle once said, "compels all the people to furnish the capital and allows its favorites to receive the profits."

We promised to give relief from the shameful system of spoliation by taxation which marked the conduct of the Republican administration. The American people took us at our word and placed us in control of every branch of the Federal Government.

Thus commissioned, we have assembled in extra session to carry out our pledges and to redeem our promises.

It is no easy task which confronts the Democratic Congress to-day. The commercial interests which for years have been so subsidized by tariff benefits that they now look upon these privileges and favors as vested rights in resentful and indignant crowds have besieged the Committee on Ways and Means. All the beneficiaries of protection were present. The steel interests, the lumber interests, the coal interests, the cotton manufacturer, the manufacturer of woolen goods, of glass and earthenware, hatters, makers of boots and shoes, accompanied by skilled lobbyists, represented by able lawyers, all were there. The great interests and the small interests presented their side of the case to the Committee on Ways and Means, who gave them a long and patient hearing in every instance. Every beneficiary of this tax was represented. But the consumer upon whose shoulders the burden of these taxes fall was not there. There was no one present to represent him before the committee. Protec-

tion giving benefits and bounties and subsidies to its favorites has always had powerful friends to champion its cause, parade its virtues, extol its worth, magnify its merits, cover up its imperfections, defend its iniquities, and protect its injustices, as all systems have powerful friends when those friends themselves are directly benefited.

While on the other hand, any policy or system like a tariff for revenue only, which protects no special interest, appeals to no one man's individual gain, though benefiting the economic situation of the country as an entirety, is lacking in the militant championship and enthusiastic support personal interest lends and private profit actuates.

The policy of the Republican Party has been to permit the friends of protection to write into law the tariff rates for the benefit of themselves, and though the American consumer was not present at these hearings before the committee, begging for relief from outrageous, unjust, and prohibitive taxation, yet the committee and the Democratic Party looked after his interests. We have presented to the American people a tariff bill which is the redemption of our pledge, being an honest and careful revision downward of the outrageous, exorbitant, confiscating, and prohibitive rates now in operation in the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, we have treated our friends on the other side of this Chamber with the utmost fairness. During the passage of the Payne law we were permitted to offer only seven amendments. At the end of this discussion those opposed to this bill will have ample opportunity to amend by substitution or otherwise every schedule in this bill. We are going to and we have given them ample time to debate the different items in the measure, but we are going to pass this bill without any Republican protective amendments attached thereto.

Before discussing the bill itself, I ask your indulgence for a few moments while I briefly discuss a proposition I have in recent years heard stated so often—that is that the tariff question is a local issue.

The tariff is not a local issue. There is perhaps no greater line of demarcation, no clearer distinction between the diverging lines of thought of the two great political parties than their respective views upon this very question.

Those who really regard the tariff question as merely a local issue have been deceived by observing that, as a rule, those receiving the benefits of this artificial stimulant are generally the most enthusiastic in their advocacy of the system, and as these benefits often apply to the entire protected interests of a community, the questions of locality and sectionalism are suggested.

Local influences can change men's ideas, transform their beliefs, and mold their opinions, but principles themselves are unchangeable, fixed, immovable, and eternal.

A proper understanding of these diverging views leads to no perplexity and frees the question absolutely from all suggestion of localism.

The issue between the two great political parties on the tariff is distinct and well defined. Each of these parties represents ideas which are inherently and fundamentally antagonistic, opposing, and hostile. Both parties declare for certain duties to be levied upon the importation of certain articles which are produced or manufactured in foreign countries. The distinction lies not in the way these duties are collected, nor in the purpose for which they are to be used after collection, but in the purpose, the object, and the intent which governs the levying of these duties. The purpose, the object, and the intent of a Republican in levying a tariff rate is to secure protection to home industry.

The purpose, the object, and the intent of a Democrat in levying a tariff rate is to secure revenue to carry on the expense of the Government.

To the one revenue is merely an incident; to the other protection is merely an incident.

A protective tariff rate is levied for the purpose of keeping out importations, of stifling competition, of building up home industries, and benefiting private enterprise, while a revenue tariff rate, to be effective, depends upon the encouragement of competition so that importations may be brought into the country in order that the duties upon these importations may be collected and turned into the Public Treasury.

The Democratic theory of a tariff being that no dollar shall be collected by taxation for purposes other than revenue, there are only two problems confronting the framer of a Democratic tariff bill: First, how much money is needed to meet the necessary expenses of the Government economically administered, and, second, how can we best raise this money by levying duties in such a manner that it will prove least burdensome to the American people.

That is the true theory of a Democratic tariff, and if the present bill in any instance should fail to measure to that standard it is because the Baltimore platform declared for a gradual reduction in these duties.

Some may ask, Why was it necessary for the Democratic platform to declare for a gradual reduction in these duties? The answer is plain. During the forty-odd years of Republican misrule and Republican mismanagement protection has run mad.

The protective theory has been so fostered, the business of the country has been so artificially stimulated, this unhealthy and unnatural system of taxation has grown to such an enormous extent, its ramifications have so affected the commercial life of so many of our citizens, that evil as it is, harmful as it has been, this unwholesome and artificial stimulant can not all be withdrawn at one time without causing perhaps serious business disturbances.

But though we have felled the tree of protection, trunk and branches, let no protectionist gather hope because we may have left a few of the roots in the ground. I say to you on the other side of this Chamber, they will never sprout again. They are as dead and as lifeless as the prospects and the hopes of the Republican Party.

Protection has been given a fair trial by the American people, and after years of experience it has been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

In absolute control of every department of the Government, flushed with the intoxication of victory after victory, drunk with the exercise of an almost despotic power, enriched by the spoils of over 40 years of Federal patronage, strengthened by the enormous subsidies and bounties given to its favorites, with plausible tongue and seductive arguments, the advocates of protection after nearly half a century of trial have vainly attempted to justify its guilty existence. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Based upon love of personal gain, founded upon selfishness and opportunity, dependent upon favoritism and expediency, this hateful system of privilege, with its subsidies, its benefits, its advantages, and its favorites, has left behind the lasting memory of a corrupted and coerced ballot and an endless chain of perpetual lobbyists. Its insiduous and indirect method of taxation is responsible for the wildest form of governmental extravagance. It has developed the trust, which, stretching its hungry tentacles far and near, has annihilated, crushed, and destroyed all who dared to cross its noxious path.

It has led to an aristocracy of wealth and power, and in the mad scramble for favoritism and preferment has leveled national legislation to the dignity of a bargain counter.

It has become hateful to the American people, and on last November, long to be remembered by all lovers of just and equal taxation, this harbinger of woe and want and misery and dissatisfaction was buried beneath an avalanche of ballots, never more to be resurrected. [Applause of the Democratic side.]

In briefly discussing the present tariff bill I shall to a large extent confine my remarks to Schedule K. Perhaps no schedule in any tariff bill has created more discussion and aroused more controversy than the one pertaining to wool and the manufactures of wool.

It was the storm center of interest in the Wilson bill. It occupied the chief place in controversial discussion in the Payne-Aldrich bill. In the present measure, not even excepting the schedule on sugar nor the provision relating to the income tax, wool still occupies the stage, playing the chief part in the drama of tariff legislation.

There is sound reason why the schedule relating to wool should arouse so much controversy. The tariff on raw wool has well been called the arch of protection. It has long been the connecting link which binds together the manufacturing and agricultural interests of the United States to the doctrine of protection.

Those favoring and those opposing protection know that when this link has been severed there will be no further excuse for the agricultural interests to cling to a protective-tariff system. The manufacturing interests well know this, and knowing this, they are more than willing to see a tax go on their raw material and take their chances in securing a proper compensatory duty, because they can not afford to lose the political support of the great agricultural interests, which in many instances has been accorded them through a mistaken idea that the tax on raw wool compensates the farmer for the millions of dollars wrung from his pockets every year by the plundering hand of a tariff.

Removing raw wool from the dutiable list has long been a Democratic principle. As far back as 1857 all wool valued at less than 20 cents a pound came in free. The Morrison bill, the Springer bill, the Mills bill, and the Wilson bill all placed wool on the free list, and following Democratic precedent and Demo-

cratic principle, we have placed raw wool upon the free list in the present bill.

Removing the duty from raw wool means that the price of necessary articles of woolen clothing will be reduced, because we can then remove from the manufactured article the compensatory duty which has been given the American manufacturer to place him on equal terms with his foreign competitors in the purchase of his raw materials.

As long as there is a tax on raw wool, while other countries allow wool to enter free, this tax is a distinct handicap to American manufacturers, and it is manifest that without a compensatory duty our manufacturers, hampered to the extent of this tax, can not compete with foreign manufacturers in the purchase of the raw material to be used in the making of the finished article.

To place American manufacturers upon an equality with foreign manufacturers in the purchase of their materials it has been the settled policy of all political parties in the interest of fairness to give our manufacturers a compensatory tax equal to the amount of the tax on the raw material.

If we impose a tax of 11 cents a pound on raw wool and England permits wool to enter free, then the English manufacturer, other conditions being equal, can buy his wool 11 cents a pound cheaper than the American manufacturer. Therefore it has been the practice that when raw wool is taxed our manufacturers have been given a compensatory duty equal to the amount of this tax, so that both the home and foreign manufacturers will be on equal terms in the purchase of their raw materials.

The compensatory tax must then be added to the cost of the finished article, which goes into the price paid by the consumer.

Under the present system of taxation not only the compensatory tax is given the American manufacturer, but in addition thereto outrageous and enormous prohibitive duties are given the woolen manufacturers, all of which is added to the price paid by the consumer, except perhaps in some instances where the tariff rate is so ridiculously high that it amounts to more than the value of the article itself.

We have placed raw wool upon the free list Now, in order for the consumer to receive the benefit of the removal of this tax on raw wool, the compensatory tax given the American manufacturer to place him on equal terms with his foreign competitors must also be removed.

After placing the American manufacturer in a position where he can buy his raw material under similar conditions with his foreign competitors and removing the compensatory duty given him, the question now confronts us as to how high a rate should be levied upon the finished product.

We would like to remove the tax from all articles of necessity and in common use, but unfortunately it is only on those articles that the people want that revenue can be collected, because if the people do not want them there will be no demand for their importation and no duties to collect. We need revenue to carry on the expenses of this Government. Wool is a good revenue producer. The manufactures of wool bring in over $16,000,000 annually. Now, how shall we raise revenue for the Government and give the people cheaper clothing at the same time? What rate shall we place upon this woolen clothing? We place this tax at what we believe to be the lowest competitive rate, so that foreign clothing may be imported and competition created. By placing this tax at the lowest competitive rate great importations of clothing, blankets, underwear, dress goods, and other woolen articles will be brought into this country to engage in active and healthy competition with the clothing from American mills. Millions of dollars will go into the Public Treasury, and through the competition created by these importations the American people will receive the benefit of cheaper clothing, for if the American manufacturer does not reduce the price of his woolen articles to that of his foreign competitor the consumer will buy from the foreigner.

Not only will the removal of this tax on raw wool result in cheaper clothing to the consumer, but it will result in better clothing; and more durable articles of woolen manufacture will be offered to the American people. We now tax raw wool 11 cents a pound. This tax of 11 cents a pound on raw wool has resulted in keeping from the American market much of the finest wool. The wool from Odessa, from Morocco, from Australia, and other places differs in quality, in value, and in weight. There are any number of grades of wool. The greater part of foreign fine shrinkage wool never finds its way into the United States by reason of a tax of 11 cents a pound on the raw wool. The removal of this tax, however, will bring it in, and our manufacturers can have the benefit of the selection of these finer grades, and better and more durable clothing will be offered to the American people.

As the removal of this tax will cause greatly increased importations of wool, then the output of our factories would also correspondingly be increased. The increased output would mean an additional demand for labor, and by reason of this demand employment would be given to hundreds who, under a prohibitive tariff rate, were idle and vainly seeking work.

"But," says the protectionist, "are you going to destroy the great sheep industry of the United States?" No, my friends; we are not here to destroy the sheep industry or any other industry; but, on the other hand, we are not here to build up the sheep industry or any other industry by taxing the American people for their benefit. The removal of this tax from raw wool will not destroy the sheep industry of the United States; on the contrary, it will prove a benefit to this industry, and before I am through I will demonstrate that this is so.

But before I proceed to demonstrate this I assert that under the Democratic theory of taxation no industry—the sheep industry or any other industry—is entitled to a share of the taxes paid by the American people. I have heard many wax eloquent when they tell us that it is not fair to the owner of the sheep to take the tax off of wool and leave a tax on clothing made from wool. Why is it not fair? Why is the man who owns sheep any more entitled to the tax money than the man who owns hogs? I deny that the woolgrower by matter of right is entitled to the benefit of a tax. Why he more than any other citizen of the United States?

According to the Republican idea of a tax, that it is a blessing to be given some favored individual—a cheap way of giving subsidies in return for campaign contributions and support during election time—then the argument that because there is a tax on clothing made from wool there should also be a tax given the man who raises the wool is consistent.

But the Democrats do not believe in that kind of taxation. They believe that taxes are not a blessing, but a burden. They believe that it is wrong to levy taxes for the purpose of paying campaign debts. They do not believe in levying taxes so that certain industries may be insured a profit in their private business. They do not believe because one article is taxed that that is a reason why some other article should be taxed. The Democratic theory of taxation is that taxes should be levied solely and alone for the purpose of raising revenue to meet the necessary expenses of the Government.

The taxing for revenue of a suit of clothes composed, as many of them now are, partly of wool and partly of cotton, is no more the concern of the man who raises the wool than it is of the man who raises the cotton. This tax is levied for the purpose of raising revenue and not for the benefit of the man who raised the wool nor the man who raised the cotton nor the man who made the clothes. The manufacturer is no more entitled to this tax than those who contributed the materials which went into the article he produced. If any protection results and the manufacturer happens to be benefited, why the protection that he receives is incidental, because the purpose of levying this tax is to raise money to carry on the expense of the Government.

What peculiar right has been given to the sheep barons, with their thousands of acres and millions of sheep, that all the people should be taxed to increase the value of their flocks? Why is the man who owns a large ranch with countless sheep roaming all over it any more entitled to a benefit and a privilege from the Government than the man behind the plow, the clerk in the store, the blacksmith at his forge, and thousands of others who toil but who never dream of asking the Government to insure their business a profit by the donation of tax money?

The aggrieved attitude and the indignant protests of those who for years have been receiving these governmental favors, when they see that these favors are to be removed from them, marks one of the glaring evils of the protective-tariff system. Looking for favors destroys self-reliance and does away with commercial independence.

I would rather, Mr. Chairman, that the American people should have warmer clothing to protect them from the chilling blasts of winter.

I would rather that the children of the toiling masses should have woolen underwear to keep sickness and cold from their little bodies than to place these necessary articles above their reach in order to insure, through the operation of law, an added profit to a few woolgrowers, who graze their flocks in the wild and undeveloped lands of the great and golden West.

But the removal of this tax will not destroy the sheep industry in the United States. It is the tax that is more harmful to practical sheep husbandry than perhaps any other one cause.

It is well known that the owners of small flocks of sheep get little or no increase in the price of their wool by reason of the

tax of 11 cents a pound, because the price of wool is controlled by the great packers and wool merchants, and the owners of the small flocks have to sell to them at a price fixed by these packers. The trust controls the wool industry, as it does so many industries in the United States. Now, the wool owners of the West, with their millions of sheep, do perhaps get an increased price for their wool by reason of the tax, but there are only a few of these wool barons, as they have frequently been called, and the reason that they get the increased price is because of the agreement that exists between them and the manufacturing interests, and they are also closely related to the wool-buying packers, and for the further reason that because of the great amount of wool they have on hand they can afford to hold it and put it upon the market in such a way and at such a time as to secure this advanced price. But it is ridiculous to contend that the farmer with a flock of from 50 to 100 sheep gets any material part of this tax levied on raw wool.

To those who have given little study to this question it would appear, from the great number of protests against reducing the rate on raw wool, and especially against putting it on the free list, that wool is the foremost of our agricultural products. The amount of space the subject of wool occupies in the bibliographies on manufacturing textiles and on agriculture gives further color to this belief. But such is far from being true.

The total value of the raw wool produced in the United States in 1911 amounted to $66,591,017, while the corn crop amounted to $1,565,258,000. The hay crop amounted to $694,570,000. The wheat crop amounted to $543,063,000. The oat crop amounted to $414,663,000, and the cotton crop, based on the year 1910, amounted to $820,320,000; making a total of $4,037,874,000.10 in cotton, corn, wheat, hay, and oats as against only $65,591,017 in wool. As compared with other agricultural products wool is not one-tenth so much in value as cotton; not one twenty-third so much in value as corn; not one-fifth so much as oats; not one-eighth so much as wheat; not one-tenth so much as hay; not one-third so much as potatoes; not one-half so much as barley.

Why is it, then, that the bibliographies of agriculture and manufacturing textiles devote so much space to this subject? It is because there is an agreement I mentioned a few moments ago—an understanding between the woolgrowers on the one hand and the manufacturers on the other. The sheep barons will stand for the tax on the finished article if the wool manufacturer will stand for the tax on raw wool, and they have combined their interests and their strength. Why should the manufacturer want a tax on the material he needs to finish his product? There is not a manufacturer in the United States who would not prefer having his raw material free. There is hardly a woolen manufacturer in this country who is not vexed and hampered by this 11 cents tax on the material he needs to make his cloth and his clothing. Then why is this agreement? Why is the manufacturer willing to pay more for his material and to take his chances on getting the proper compensatory duty on the raw product?

Because the manufacturer knows that when wool is placed upon the free list the last connecting link between a tax on agricultural products and a tax on manufactured articles has been destroyed. Destroying this link means an abandonment of the protective system by the agricultural interests of the United States. If you deny the woolgrowing interests a tax of 11 cents a pound on raw wool, these same interests are going to use their best endeavors to prevent the manufacturer from receiving a prohibitive rate on the clothing they themselves have to buy; but as long as the sheep-raising barons are receiving a protective tariff of 11 cents per pound on raw wool they are more than willing for the manufacturer to receive all the protection he can secure upon the finished article.

So the manufacturing interests know that if the sheep industry is removed from politics the protective system will then have to depend solely for support upon the manufacturing industries which are receiving these benefits. When the agricultural interests find that they are no longer connected with protection through the medium of a tax on wool, those interests, those farmers who in 1911 raised $4,037,874,000 worth of cotton, corn, wheat, oats, hay, barley, and potatoes; who were taxed and forced to pay exorbitant and unreasonable prices for all woolen clothing that they had to buy, in order to insure an added profit, which in many instances never reached the producer of wool, the value of which was not one-sixtieth of the amount of the value of the seven products I have just referred to, the protective system will become hateful to them. The farmer will of all others be more opposed to a theory of governmental taxation which permits him to sell his products in the open markets of the world, but yet compels him to pay a tax on everything he buys for the comfort of his family and for the carrying on of his business.

The highest protective tariff on wool in the history of the Republic, during the last 10 years, has not prevented a decline and falling off of over 11,000,000 sheep.

Yet during the same period, with the exception of cattle, there has been an increase in all other farm animals. We have a tax of only about 10 per cent on hogs, and since 1903 the number of hogs in the United States has increased from 46,922,624 to 65,620,000. The tax on horses and mules is nothing like so high an ad valorem equivalent as the rate on wool, yet notwithstanding the great number of automobiles and horseless vehicles, now so much in use in social and commercial life, since 1903 horses increased from 16,557,373 to 20,508,000 in 1912, and mules have increased during the same time from 2,728,088 to 4,362,000.

Yet when we come to the sheep industry, we find that with a tax of over 15 per cent on the animal itself and a tax of 11 cents per pound on wool in the grease and 33 cents per pound on scoured wool, that notwithstanding all this enormous protection the number of sheep in the United States has decreased from 63,964,876 in 1903 to 52,362,000 in 1912, a decrease of over eleven and a half million sheep. In less than 10 years, under the highest protective tariff in the world, the sheep industry of the United States shows a falling off of nearly 12,000,000 sheep, while during the same period of time, with less than one-fifth and in many instances less than one-tenth the amount of protection given the sheep and its wool combined, the value of all farm animals shows an increase from $3,102,515,540 to $5,276,438,000, a total increase in the value of farm animals of over $2,000,000,000. And yet we are told that if we take the tax off of wool that the sheep industry in the United States will be destroyed.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that one of the greatest handicaps to the proper development and growth of the sheep industry in the United States is the political influences which surround that industry. We do not raise cattle for their hides; we raise them for their beef. The hides are a by-product. We ought to raise sheep for the mutton that is in them and let wool be the by-product. There is always a demand at high price for mutton and lamb chops. We ought to raise sheep for their mutton, but instead of that we have been raising sheep for their wool and mutton has been the by-product. The sheep industry in this country is not upon a proper basis.

Instead of improving the breed, like is done in the raising of hogs and other farm animals, instead of improving the breed, slaughtering the young males, and supplying at high price the ever-increasing demand for roast lamb and mutton chops, the sheep growers, devoting all their attention to the production of wool, have not made progress in the sheep industry.

As long as wool is the prime object in sheep raising the industry in the United States will languish, because sheep can not profitably be raised for wool by reason of enhanced values of real estate, except in certain lands of the West.

The merino sheep produces a large amount of wool, but is not a mutton sheep. Yet by reason of the fact that merinos are the only breed of sheep which will closely herd together the woolgrower of the West, paying absolutely no attention to the mutton value of the animal, persists in raising only those breeds which have one-half or more mixture of merino blood in them because of the increased amount of wool, and also because of the expense in herding and loss by strays which characterize breeds of sheep other than the merino.

This tax on wool keeps the sheep industry in politics all the time. It prevents the selection and improvement of the breeds of sheep necessary to make that industry a success.

But remove this industry from the unnatural political atmosphere which surrounds it and sheep, like hogs and other animals, can be profitably raised in the United States without all the people contributing a subsidy to keep up an industry the tax has helped to destroy.

The enhanced value of our lands can be put to more profitable use in other directions than in raising large flocks of sheep for their wool. The proof of this is strikingly shown in New England, where land values are high, and conclusively proves that woolgrowing is a frontier proposition. From 1840 to 1910 the number of sheep in New England have decreased from 3,820,000 to 300,000. In the Middle Atlantic States, where land values also are high, during the same period the number of sheep has decreased from 7,106,000 to 1,263,000 in 1910, while, on the other hand, Wyoming, Montana, Utah, Idaho, and other Western States, where land values are low, and in which the country is practically unsettled, the territory of the sheep industry has shifted, for in those States the number of sheep has increased from 380,000 in 1850 to 18,338,000 in 1910.

In the State of Texas, where a number of ranches have been divided up in farms since the passage of the Dingley Act, there has been a decrease in the number of sheep from 2,520,068

to 1,400,000. A falling off of nearly 1,200,000 sheep since the passage of the Dingley law. At an average value of $5 per head this would appear to be a loss to the State of Texas of about $7,000,000, but the value of the cotton crop in that time has increased from 1,471,242 bales in 1899 to 3,072,932 bales in 1910, an increase of 1,601,690 bales of cotton, valued, including the seed, at $50 per bale, which has added to the wealth of the State of Texas in the value of its cotton about $80,000,000. Texas may have lost $7,000,000 in the falling off in the number of sheep since the passage of the Dingley bill, but since 1899, corn, some of which was grown on lands formerly used to graze sheep, has increased from 81,151,398 bushels in 1899 to 140,080,000 bushels in 1910, which at the low rate of 30 cents a bushel would add over $15,000,000 in wealth to the State.

While sheep showed a falling off of about 50 per cent since 1898, when the Wilson bill was repealed, removing wool from the free list and placing a high protective tariff on this product, yet the value of the live stock in Texas increased from $240,576,955 in 1900 to $318,646,509 in 1910, an increase of nearly $80,000,000. Texas may have lost $7,000,000 in the sheep industry in the last 10 or 12 years, but the value of farm property has increased in that State since 1910 from $962,476,273 to $2,218,645,164, an increase in that one item of over 178 times the amount lost in sheep. What are you going to do with this tremendously increased value in farm property? Turn some of it back into sheep and cattle pastures? Are you going to lose a part of the benefit of all these values, amounting to considerably over a billion dollars, to make up for $7,000,000 lost in sheep? I simply mentioned the State of Texas because it is typical of all other sections of the United States, where the value of farm property has so increased that it is impossible to raise sheep profitably for their wool, with mutton as the by-product.

Mr. Chairman, with the aid of hothouses and artificial heat we could raise coffee in New England and tea in Pennsylvania, but it would be the sheerest folly for us to attempt to compete with Brazil or with Japan and China in raising these commodities. Such industries could never be fostered in the United States if we were to erect around those hothouses a tariff wall mountain high. So, like sensible people, we turn our attention to those things that we can profitably raise at home, and with some of the money realized we buy our coffee from Brazil and our tea from China and Japan. As long as the American farmer is realizing $20 or $30 an acre on cabbages or corn or cotton or wheat or strawberries or in any other product, he is not going to abandon that field of productiveness and turn his fertile acres into a sheep pasture, if you were to give him a tariff rate on wool as high as the gallows upon which Haman was hanged.

Certain lands in Australia and elsewhere are by nature adapted to the raising of sheep and are not suitable for other agriculture. We can not compete with them in raising wool, but in many parts of our country sheep can be profitably raised for mutton. The merino is not a good mutton sheep but a good wool sheep, and the wool barons of the West for this reason and also because of the gregarious qualities of that breed have continued to direct their attention to these kind of sheep, paying no attention to the selection of their flocks, for the purpose of raising mutton, which will always command a high price in the market because of an ever-increasing demand.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that placing raw wool on the free list benefits every class and condition of our people, even including the woolgrower.

It will result in giving clothing and blankets and underwear and other woolen articles at a greatly decreased price to the American people.

It removes the discrimination against the American manufacturer in the purchase of his raw materials.

It relieves us of the necessity of giving the American manufacturer a compensatory duty equal to the tax on his raw material.

It prevents this compensatory tax from being added to the price of necessary articles of woolen clothing.

It permits us to cut down the rates on the finished product equal to the duty on the raw material.

It furnishes better grades of wool to American manufacturers, and the people can buy more durable clothing.

It increases the output of our mills, so that more employment will be given to American labor.

It takes away from the rank of the protectionists the last link which connects them with the agricultural interests.

It will direct the attention of the American farmer to a profitable industry, the raising of sheep for mutton, with wool as a by-product.

Under the Payne-Aldrich bill not only was the compensatory tax added to the price of the finished product in woolens, but an outrageous, and in many instances a prohibitive, duty was placed upon these articles.

Take, for instance, blankets, flannels, and underwear. Under the Payne-Aldrich bill blankets came in bearing a duty of from 72½ per cent to nearly 75 per cent, while flannels for underwear bore a tax of from 93 per cent to over 100 per cent. We have reduced the rates on these highly necessary articles down to 25 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, when we find that the tax on flannels for underwear was over 100 per cent, we should not have been surprised when it was discovered that in the examination of the 120 children who were among the thousands working in the woolen mills at Lawrence that only 7 of these children were able to secure underwear at all. And yet, by a strange irony of circumstances, they were working on the manufacture of those very articles they themselves were unable to buy.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption there?

Mr. COLLIER. Certainly.

Mr. STANLEY. The gentleman might add, speaking a babel of 16 different tongues and dialects, and not 10 per cent of them were Americans and the sons and daughters of Americans.

Mr. COLLIER. Still, they were suffering for the want of those articles which by reason of a prohibitive tax they were unable to buy. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, there is a peculiar pathos connected with those who want in the midst of plenty. There is nothing more pathetic than the hungry watching others eat. This sorrowful condition was emphasized in the lives of those children in the factories at Lawrence who helped to make woolen clothing for others, but yet, by reason of a protective and prohibitive tax, were unable to own even one of the little garments they were making.

Cinderella clad in rags, sitting in the kitchen, forced to work upon the gorgeous and resplendent costumes of her older sisters, caused our youthful breasts to throb with indignation and resentment. That beautiful story has touched the heart of childhood whenever it has been told.

But there has been no fairy godmother with magic wand to assist those tired, shivering, hungry, half-clad children working in the woolen mills at Lawrence.

Shut out from God's sunshine, behind the dark, damp, moldy walls of a huge factory, those children, who never had the time to learn how to play, who had forgotten how to laugh, with cavernous eyes and solemn, pallid faces, breathing dust and ashes, choking on the foul odors of wool and grease and new-made cloth mixed with chemical compounds, dying by inches from neglect and exposure, these children of our poor dedicated their puny little bodies to the spindle and the loom. [Applause.]

In that severe New England winter, forced by stern necessity to wear their young lives away, making warm, comfortable woolens for others, which they themselves were unable to buy, the prohibitive rate of 100 per cent in Schedule K hangs like a millstone around the necks of those, who enriching themselves by the operation of law, placed the price of these articles above the reach of those children whose labor and sweat and blood and toil had helped them to amass their wealth. [Applause.]

We have tried to lessen these burdens. We have tried to lighten the load bearing down on the shoulders of the poor, the weak, and the oppressed. We have reduced these prohibitive rates to a healthy competitive basis, so that these articles may be placed within the reach of all.

We have reduced the rates on ready-made clothing from 80 per cent to 35 per cent. It is upon this class of clothing that the consumer will be especially benefited. The reducing of this rate will cause millions of dollars of importations to be brought into the United States. The price of this clothing will be materially reduced to the American people. There will be a keen and healthy competition established between our manufacturers and foreign makers of this clothing, and the American manufacturers in order to meet this competition must reduce the price of their clothing to that of the foreign manufacturers. If not, the consumer will purchase from the foreigner, for he will have an opportunity to buy clothing where he can get it the cheapest.

Mr. Chairman, we have presented in this bill an honest revision of Schedule K, a schedule which in the Payne-Aldrich bill was practically without defense and with but few defenders, even among the ranks of the protectionists. With prohibitive rates in most of its classifications the schedule relating to wool became a law, only to be denounced by a Republican President as indefensible.

We have taken care, Mr. Chairman, of the great agricultural interests of our people. Despite the attempt of those on the other side to make it appear that we have discriminated against

the farmer, this tariff bill will give him more relief from the exorbitant and confiscating system of taxation now in operation in the United States than perhaps any other class of our people. For years the American farmer has been selling the fruits of his labor and his toil in the open markets of the world without any protective tax to insure his business a profit, and at the same time everything he buys for himself and his family has paid a heavy tribute to the tariff.

This bill removes the tax from agricultural implements. We have given the farmer free plows, free harrows, free harvesters, free reapers, free planters, free mowers, free cultivators, free thrashing machines, free gin stands, free wagons, free carts, free harness, free saddles, free trace chains, free bagging and ties, free binding twine, free nails, free barbed-wire fencing, free sewing machines, free needles, and free fertilizers of all kinds.

We have given to the toiling masses free meat, free bread, free coffee, free salt, free flour, free meal, and free boots, and free shoes.

We have reduced the rate on knives from 53.77 per cent down to 30 per cent. We have reduced the rates on all tinware from 45 per cent to 25 per cent. We have taken the rate of 35 per cent off of furniture and reduced it to 15 per cent. On india rubber manufactures we have reduced the rate from 35 per cent down to 10 per cent. We have reduced the rate from 35 cents a gallon on castor oil down to 15 cents a gallon. We have taken the tax of over 45 per cent off of window glass and reduced it to 28.20 per cent. We have reduced the rate on shirts and collars from 64.03 per cent down to 25 per cent.

We have reduced the rates on plates and dishes and cups and saucers and all kinds of earthenware in common use from 25 per cent down to 15 per cent. We have reduced the rate on cotton clothing from over 50 per cent to 30 per cent. On the cheapest stocking hose and half hose from 50 per cent down to 20 per cent.

On cotton underwear, so necessary during the summer months, we have reduced the Payne rate from 60 per cent to 30 per cent. On all oilcloths we have reduced the protective rate of over 45 per cent down to 15 per cent.

We have put mechanical ground wood pulp on the free list. Our cheap paper used for book and periodicals is composed chiefly of mechanical ground wood pulp. Over 80 per cent of the ingredients in this kind of paper is composed of this pulp. We, therefore, gave it free, so that newspapers and periodicals and magazines and schoolbooks will be placed in the reach of all.

We have carried out in this bill the Democratic theory of taxation—that the luxuries shall bear the highest rates of duty, and all articles of necessity and common use are either placed upon the free list or else the rates are materially reduced.

We have placed the great basic materials, such as coal, lumber, and iron ore, upon the free list. Coal is a commodity which is not given to us by the ingenuity of man, but by the goodness of God. It lies in the bosom of Mother Earth, placed for us by the beneficent hand of the Creator, waiting to be carried to the furnaces of the factories and to the homes of thousands. It is an article in common use; it should never be taxed for the profit of those who have succeeded in corralling all the coal lands in the United States. It is so connected with the commercial and private life of so many of our citizens that an unnatural increase in its price would cause the wheels of industry to be stopped and create suffering and distress throughout the land.

Lumber is another commodity that comes to us not through man's skill, but also by and through the goodness of God. It is needed by every class and condition of our people. The man in the city needs it to build his home. The farmer needs it to build his barns, his fences, and his stables. We need it to build schoolhouses and churches. The Democrats have always stood for free lumber. Our party does not believe that the taxgatherer should ever stand between an American citizen and the building of a home for his family, a schoolhouse for his children, or a church for his God. [Applause.]

The Steel Trust owns nearly all the iron ore in the United States. We put this ore upon the free list, so that the independent manufactories could buy their ore to be put into finished articles on equal terms with the trust. The increased importations of iron ore mean that the American people can secure cheaper articles made of steel. It enabled us to give the farmer his agricultural implements free of duty. By reason of the increased importations there will be greater output from American mills, which necessarily means increased employment to American labor.

We have given the American people an income tax. After listening to the splendid address upon the subject of this tax by my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], this morning, I shall not go into the details of this provision other than to say that for years the American people have been longing for a tax where the wealth of the country will pay its proportionate share of the burdens of government. [Applause.] Under our protective tariff the taxes are collected upon what we eat and upon what we wear, irrespective either of ability to pay or protection received from the Government. The poor man with a large family pays more Federal taxes than the rich man with a small family. Under the present system colossal fortunes have been built up and gigantic trusts have been created, which do not in many instances pay one cent of the revenue necessary to meet the expenses of a Government under whose laws these fortunes were amassed and these trusts established.

Under existing law the man in the factory working for scarcely living wages, the farmer toiling all day, the miner who goes down into the earth to drag therefrom the precious metals to be used in commerce and in trade, the clerk behind the counter, the blacksmith at his forge, the artisan at his bench, the shop girl in the store, each and every one paying a tax upon the food that they eat and the clothes that they wear, often contribute more to the expenses of the Government than the man worth millions, and who is constantly calling upon the Government to protect his property and to insure his business against loss.

We have placed the nominal rate of 1 per cent per annum upon all incomes over $4,000. When this income exceeds $20,000 and does not exceed $50,000 an additional tax of 1 per cent shall be levied, and where the total net income exceeds $50,000, but does not exceed $100,000, 2 per cent additional shall be levied, and when the net income exceeds $100,000, 3 per cent additional shall be added.

This income includes all gains, profits, and incomes derived from salaries, wages, or compensation for personal services of every kind, or from sales of property, or for rents, interest, and dividends. There shall be allowed as deductions the actual expenses of the business, all interest paid on indebtedness, all county, State, and municipal taxes, losses actually sustained, incurred in trade, or caused by the act of God and are not compensated by insurance, and a reasonable allowance for the wear and tear of property, but no deductions shall be made for personal living or family expenses, or for any improvements intended to increase the value of an estate.

But as I stated before, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] has this morning gone into this matter with such detail that I shall not detain you further upon this subject.

We have redeemed our promise and given the American people an honest tariff bill with an honest revision downward.

The dismal prophecies of ruin and disaster coming with tiresome monotony from the other side for over two years are now falling upon deaf ears. The Democratic Party was never stronger in the history of the Republic than it is to-day. Like a sentinel upon a watch tower the Democratic Party, founded upon principles of truth as eternal and as everlasting as the hills of our native land, has witnessed the wreck and decay of many political parties whose glittering generalities captured for a while the popular fancy of the people of the United States. But whenever the country was in trouble, whenever panics and financial disaster fell upon the land, whenever the burdens grew heavy upon the tired shoulders of the toiling masses, the sober judgment and good common sense of the American people would return, and, going back to the faith of the fathers, they would repudiate the false doctrines and relegate their promoters to the background of political oblivion and cling to Democracy as the only safe and sure anchor in time of trouble.

For over 100 years Democracy has been either in control of the affairs of our Government or else the dominant minority party, warning the American people against false idols and false gods, and the history of the Republic shows that, without a single exception, sooner or later, the sound sense of our people heeds the warning.

Founded upon the eternal principles of constitutional government, honest and fair taxation, and equal rights for all and special privileges to none, Democracy has stood the test of time, and will endure as long as love of liberty finds lodgment in the human breast.

When these principles of Democracy shall perish, then, but not till then, will popular government be destroyed and our country be known no more among the nations of the earth. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, the Dingley law had been in operation but a brief period before the American people began to make demand for its revision and relief from its exorbitant exactions. So persistent and universal did this demand become that both the political parties in the campaign of 1908 made response, and the people felt assured of some relief from the exces-

sive burdens of tariff taxes. There was no dispute as to the position of the Democratic Party. It was a straightforward declaration for a downward revision of the tariff, and the Republican platform simply promised revision, leaving to the members of that party an interpretation as to whether that revision was to be upward or downward. The people demanded an explanation of that platform, and the Republican candidate for President was compelled to give his party platform official interpretation. As the temporary leader of his party, he declared that if his party was given the mandate of power it would perform its promises in good faith, and that that promise was a substantial revision downward. Upon that interpretation of the platform and the promise of its candidate for President, the people intrusted the revision of the tariff to the Republican Party; and, faithful to its established custom of forgetting the pledges made to the people before an election, the representatives of that party returned to their seats of power, and the friends of the tariff again revised it in the interests of its beneficiaries. To the promises of revision downward of the Dingley law, the answer was the Payne law; to the demand for relief, the answer was additional burdens; to the cry for lower taxes, the reply was higher contributions; to the appeal for the reduction of the cost of the necessities of life was the assurance that higher prices would bring added prosperity and happiness; to the appeal that the poor were unable to stand greater burdens was the reply that our Nation would continue to prosper and that this prosperity in some way would diffuse itself among all the people, with its blessings of happiness and contentment.

The Payne law, taken item by item upon the same importations, showed an increase of the average rates of 1.071 per cent. A statement showing the facts in detail was prepared under the direction of Mr. PAYNE's committee and was never disputed.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman to figure that out in some way. I challenge him to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DIXON. Yes. I will say that statement was shown by the report that was filed by the Ways and Means Committee, of which the honorable gentleman was chairman. It was in the hands of all the Members of Congress, showing that upon the same importations the average rate was 1.71 per cent larger.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that a member of the Committee on Ways and Means is inexcusable for making such a statement as that to-day.

Mr. DIXON. May I ask the gentleman a question? Did not his committee file a report showing the importations of that year under that rate and under the new rate?

Mr. PAYNE. It did.

Mr. DIXON. And those added together showed that the average rate upon the same importations was in excess of 1 per cent and a fraction over——

Mr. PAYNE. It did not, and the statistics the gentleman's committee present to-day show that the statement is utterly unfounded and false.

Mr. DIXON. I will bring to the gentleman a statement prepared by the gentleman's own committee and the clerks of his own committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. And I will bring those prepared by your committee within two weeks.

Mr. DIXON. I am not asking the gentleman to take the report of the Democratic committee. I am only asking him to take the report of his own committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. And I am asking him to take what he has solemnly admitted, showing that his statement is entirely without foundation to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DIXON. The papers—the documents—are public property and can be verified by anyone who will investigate.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know; there are some gentlemen who do not understand them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call attention—the gentleman from New York, of course, knows the rule——

Mr. DIXON. I am sorry I did not have those statements with me, made up by the gentleman's own committee.

Mr. PAYNE. So am I.

Mr. DIXON. To the protests of the people of the repudiation of its promises, the Republicans claimed that it was a substantial compliance with the promises and the proof consisted of the alleged fact that of the 2,024 items in the Dingley Act nearly 220 were increased, 1,150 were unchanged, and 654 were reduced. These figures constitute the argument and proof, yet they disclosed the fact that of over two-thirds of the items, as counted by the President, there was no reduction downward. An investigation and analysis of the items increased and lowered disclosed that the reductions were so small as to make it hardly perceptible; in fact, the total reduction in 4 of the 14 schedules taken together were less than 1 per cent. As an instance we find sugar was reduced four one-thousandths of 1 per cent, and it was necessary to buy 100 pounds of sugar to get the benefit of a nickel, while, as a matter of fact, the ordinary purchases are for a smaller amount, and this reduction could not be handed out to the consumers. The ordinary consumption was 80 pounds a year for each individual, and the result that it would require a year and a quarter of consumption of sugar to secure the benefit of the 5-cents reduction, if secured at all. Our reduction is substantial, and it would require several thousand years to secure the total reduction under the Payne law that we have given in one year.

The duty on lard was reduced one-half of a cent a pound; in 1912 we collected $66.45, and this is a reduction of $22.15—and if this was distributed among our total population, who can say that it would have contributed largely to the reduction of the cost of living?

They reduced the tariff on corn meal 5 per cent, and last year we collected $24.91 upon the importations, thereby saving the whole American people together a couple of dollars, and these are parts of the substantial reductions; but these tariff duties were absurd, the importations trivial. We export corn and corn meal and lard, and their values exported runs into the millions of dollars, and we have placed them on the free list.

They reduced the duty on agriculture implements from 20 to 15 per cent, but the manufacturers of agriculture implements have not only been able to supply our home market but to sell abroad nearly one-fourth of the amount manufactured, and we placed them on the free list. These instances could be cited in large numbers, but the ones here mentioned are indicative of the character of the large class of other reductions.

At the first opportunity the people had to resent the conduct of their Representatives in the passage of the Payne bill there was a change in the House from a Republican majority to a Democratic majority and at their next opportunity they transferred the control of the Government into the hands of the Democratic Party. In the last Congress the Democrats sought by a number of tariff bills to redeem their promises made to the people, but these bills were either unacted upon by the Republican Senate or vetoed by the Republican President.

In less than two months after our return to power the Underwood bill has been submitted to the House of Representatives for its consideration and action. Trace Republican legislation from its beginning and there has been no measure of relief to the people ever enacted by that party that covers so large a benefit as the pending Underwood bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The effect of the protective tariff is to distribute unfairly the rewards of labor, prevent its natural diffusion, and concentrate it in the hands of a few people. It is a tax levied by the Government on all the people for the benefit of the favored few. The Government, deriving so much of its revenue by means of the tariff, will give in a measure protection on the articles thus selected and to this extent these advantages will ever be given to the American manufacturers. The tariff originally adopted was for the purpose of encouraging infant industries; it was never intended to make the people forever contribute toward their support. It was not originally established or justified in order to shield the American manufacturer from the world's entire competition in trade and to deprive the American consumers forever of the benefits of the world's market, but it was intended to encourage the American manufacturer to embark in competition with the world in trade and production, and to give him the advantage of a moderate tariff, so he could equip himself to compete with the world. The idea of partitioning off the American people as forever excluded from the benefits of the world's market and doomed to be victims by legal compulsion of protection prices and protected trade only is a modern curse that looks to the Republican Party for perpetuation and fellowship. In obtaining foreign trade the United States manufacturer must always meet the world's competition, as well as legislative barriers beyond this jurisdiction, and could expect but a reasonable profit. His chief aim and richest harvest is the market of the United States, the widest and largest of the world, and the only one over which he could obtain dominion by law. It is this market that is the object of his chief concern.

The domestic consumption and interstate commerce of the United States is twenty times as great in volume and value as our foreign trade has ever been. Our home market is twenty times as profitable to the manufacturers of the United States as our foreign trade, at its utmost figures. Competition and legislative barriers must ever be met by the American manufacturer in his foreign trade; his home market will forever

remain in great excess of the foreign trade and if he can only remain the master by law of the American markets, free from the foreign competition and at liberty to fix his own price for his wares, he can levy his extortions on the people as he wills, and swell his fortunes as he chooses. We are told that our policy will reduce the wages of our workingmen, and force them out of employment. Our tariff shields the manufacturer from foreign competition, but it does not lessen competition among those whom he employes to make his goods. Its object has been, "not the protection of the seller of labor, but the protection of the buyer of labor; not the maintaining of wages, but the maintaining of profits." Men ask protection for labor in public, but in their business buy the cheapest that can be secured. Investigations that have been made at different times into the industrial condition of the country shows that the people for whom we have taxed the American people for the protection of their industries employ the very foreign labor against whose products they seek protection. Wages in the protected industries are as a rule lower than in the unprotected industries, yet they tell us that if the tariff rates are reduced the wages of their employees must be reduced also. Labor wants competition that reduces the cost of living. "He has competition in his labor in what he has to sell, he has a right to ask that there may be competition in what he has to buy."

It is true our laborers receive larger wages per day, and they ought to; they are the most efficient laborers in the world. The actual price of labor is the amount of the necessities of life you can buy with those wages. The laborer does not work for the sole sake of employment, but to supply the needs and comforts of his home. What he wants is the highest return for this labor. His prosperity is measured by what is left after the necessary supplies for his home is purchased. If his wages are increased but the necessities of life are increased more rapidly, then he is poorer, though, in fact, his wages may be larger. Wages have increased in the last 10 years about 20 per cent; the cost of the necessities of life have increased over 50 per cent. The Underwood bill will not reduce the wages of labor, but it will lessen to him the cost of the necessities of life. Upon no class of our people does the present fiscal burden bear as heavily as it does on our farmers. We boast of the great wealth of our country; the farmers created that wealth. They are the basis of the prosperity of our country. Agriculture is the oldest and most important of all industries, and our progress is measured by its development and advancement. In the prosperity of the farmer is involved and dependent the happiness and prosperity of all classes. Bountiful harvest to the farmers brings prosperity to all classes and diffuses its blessings among all the people. Failure to him brings want and misery to all. The Nation prospers when the farmers prosper, and the results are felt throughout the world. He asks no special favors from the Government and has received none. The favors shown to the special interests by high-protective laws have been to the detriment of the farmer, and upon his back have rested most heavily those unjust burdens of tariff taxation. He asks for a fair deal, and from Republicans he has asked in vain. We propose to do justice to this large class of citizens who have made this country the envy and pride of the world. Upon the farmer rests the burden of feeding and clothing the world, and the Republican policy has taken from him by tariff taxation a very large part of the profits of his labor. We are told of the great increase in our national wealth under protection. This country is so situated and has such immense resources that its development and increase of wealth would be wonderful under any kind of tariff laws. We have fertile soil, inexhaustible mines of hidden wealth, and the most intelligent people on the globe. Prosperity is not produced by law. Prosperity comes through natural processes; it is not handed out by Congress. It comes by industry, fertility of the soil, and the intelligence of our people combined. Our country, with its broad and fertile plains, vast mines of mineral wealth, and enormous resources will be prosperous and progressive.

We have immense wealth, and last year it amounted to nearly $178,000,000,000, yet 70 per cent of it was owned by 200,000 people, and the other 30 per cent was owned by the remaining 95,211,000 people of the country. Five thousand men in this country actually own one-sixth of our entire national wealth, leaving the balance to be divided among the remaining 95,406,000 people. The tariff has contributed more than all other things combined to produce this unequal distribution of wealth—stimulating, supporting, and producing trusts. These advantages are given by law. It is the duty of our party to change the system by which the money is taken by law from the man who earns it and given to the man who has not earned it. Greed, avarice, and selfishness should not be the basis upon which men should ask some special benefit from the Government. Our policy of government should be to encourage the individual to his best effort, not a policy that stifles competition and destroys peaceful rivalry. We are opposed to a policy that will guarantee profits to some individuals at the expense of others. No individual can be given a right that does not belong to him, except by taking from some man a right that does belong to him. The system that allows these wrongs we will change.

The Statistical Abstract, published by the Government, shows that the value of the finished product of all the manufacturing industries of the United States for 1910 is $20,672,051,870. The amount paid in wages in said year in the production of said manufactured articles was $3,427,037,884, which gives the total labor cost for all of the said articles as 16 per cent, while the tariff rates are from 30 to 100 per cent on said articles. In other words, the tariff rates cover the entire labor cost. It not only covers whatever alleged difference exists between the labor cost in this country and in foreign countries, but it also covers the entire labor cost and then gives a profit many times the cost of labor.

The first schedule is that of chemicals. The average rate under the existing law is 25.91 per cent. We reduced it to 19.64 per cent, a reduction of $6.27 upon each $100 worth imported. Who will be injured by this reduction? They will tell us the laboring man. The protection left of 19.64 per cent is more than the entire labor cost; it not only covers an alleged difference in cost at home and abroad, but it covers the entire labor cost.

The next schedule is earths, earthenware, and glassware. The average duty under the present law is 50.92 per cent, and the pending bill reduces this to 33.17 per cent, a total reduction of 17.75 per cent. This estimate is based upon the estimated importations, but based upon the same importations of 1912 the average rate would be about 37.97 per cent, a reduction of 12.95 per cent.

The items in this schedule that are used by the manufacturer in his business are reduced 50 per cent in order to allow him to purchase his raw material cheaper, where we have reduced the duties upon his finished products. The high-priced and necessary fire bricks used in the construction of the furnaces in the iron and steel and glass industries have been greatly reduced and to the injury of no one but to the benefit of all. The clays and earths used in the paper, pottery, and tile industries have been reduced 50 per cent, as their finished products have been reduced. Earthenware and china have been separated, in order that the wares used by the many could be purchased cheaper and those regarded as luxuries carried at much higher rates. Window glass has been reduced, as some of the rates were over 100 per cent, and practically no glazing glass has been imported for years. The rates have been in the past so adjusted as to allow no competition. Plate glass has been greatly reduced. There has never been any competition in this glass used for glazing purposes.

The manufacturers of iron and steel produced in 1910 $1,277,151,817 worth of finished products and paid in wages for the manufactures $187,807,288, or 13.63 per cent of the value of the finished product. In 1905 the wages represented 15 per cent of the value of the finished product. These articles were given by the Payne bill protection of more than twice the entire labor cost. In 1912 the average for this schedule was 34.42 per cent. The pending bill will average a rate of 20.19 per cent and will cover the labor cost, and any attempt to convince the laboring men that their wages must be reduced on account of the passage of the Underwood bill will be unfounded and only made in order to arouse prejudice against the measure.

We have not changed the liquor schedule and but slightly the tobacco schedule, because we believe that the people who use the articles mentioned in these schedules could afford to pay the duties levied on them. They were both good revenue producers and should be classed as luxuries rather than necessities. The people are compelled to buy the necessities of life, and for this reason we have sought to reduce the duties upon them in order to make them cheaper.

The cotton manufacturers turned out in 1910 $628,391,813 worth of manufactured goods and paid in wages $133,859,145, or 21 per cent of the value of the finished product. The Payne bill gave these manufacturers in 1912 protection of 55.59 per cent. No possible justification could be given for the extravagant protection offered this industry. The Underwood bill reduces these exorbitant rates to 30.48 per cent.

The manufacturers of wool products produced in 1910 goods to the value of $507,166,710 and paid in wages $87,962,669, or 17 per cent. The protection given this industry by the Payne bill is more than the entire cost of labor in the manufacture thereof. We reduced the average rate from 55.98 per cent to 35 per cent.

Manufactures of silk products in 1910 amounted to $196,911,677, the value of wages $38,570,085, or 19 per cent. In 1912 the average duty was 52.03 per cent. We reduced these rates to an average of 43.98 per cent, but these goods are luxuries, are good revenue producers, and the reduction was small.

We have transferred from the dutiable list under the Payne law to the free list articles that were imported last year of the value of $102,402,579 and paid duties amounting to $24,698,226. The largest single item is raw wool, value at $33,141,408, and paid duty of $14,454,234. Wool was free in all the tariff laws until 1824. We intend to reduce the price of woolen goods by taking the tax off of wool in order to allow our people to buy woolen goods for winter. If there is one schedule more than another that has received the condemnation of the American people it is the woolen schedule. Its rates are now, and have been for years, exorbitant and unwarranted and its burdens fall upon all, but most heavily upon the people who are least able to pay. Our climate requires and our health demands comfortable and warm clothing, and the existing law practically forbids a large number of people from securing these needed articles. Woolen clothing and blankets should never have been luxuries. Nature demands and our climate requires that their use should be general and not restricted. We have reduced woolen blankets from 104 per cent to 25 per cent, ready-made clothing and articles of wearing apparel from 75.76 per cent to 35 per cent, shawls from 101.35 per cent to 35 per cent, woolen hats from 82.44 per cent to 35 per cent, carpets from 88.53 per cent to 20 per cent and 35 per cent—reversing the Republican plan of placing the highest duties upon the cheapest articles.

We have put lumber on the free list in order to allow our people to shelter themselves from the cold. The Democrats are in sympathy with the poor. In fact, our party is known as the poor man's party, and it is the highest encomium that can be given to a party that it guards and protects those who are unable to protect and defend themselves. Of the 16,000,000 families in this country less than 5,000,000 of their houses are unencumbered by mortgages, and the remaining 11,000,000 either have no homes or have mortgaged ones. We propose to make it easier for our people to own their homes. The price of lumber has increased so much that it is almost impossible for the man with moderate means or a fair salary to manage to build a house; it is impossible for the men with small wages to do so. The easier for our people to own their own property the better for our country, since it will result in better citizens and a better citizenship.

We have given the farmers free agricultural implements—plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, drills, planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, threshing machines, and wagons—binding twine, cream separators, horseshoes, nails, barbed wire, and fencing. [Applause on the Democratic side.] As Democrats we have no political debts due to the special interests, and we rejoice at the opportunity to relieve the people of their exactions. This bill, with its inestimable benefits, will be soon presented for passage. Its support by the Democrats is assured. We hear the cry and protest against this bill. The industries affected loudly protest and object, and we must disregard the protest or continue to tax the people forever on their special productions. If we wait to gain the consent or receive the approval of the people who make money from the present rates, there will be no revision now or hereafter. No tariff rate can be lowered if we consult the judgment of the beneficiaries of the rates. Our party promised to reduce the tariff, and there was no proviso to the promise that we would reduce it only after having received the approval of its beneficiaries. That was the course of the Republican Party. Its first consideration was to the beneficiaries, and the interests of the people were forgotten, and as they neglected the people in their legislation they were neglected by the people at the ballot box. The contest is one between the interests of the people and the beneficiaries of special legislation, who believe the people should be taxed for their enrichment. In this contest we have not hesitated to choose. We will stand with the people and against the special interests and upon the pledges of our party platform.

We give the farmers free barbed wire and wire fencing. These articles are a necessity to the farmer. He is no longer able to maintain rail and board fences, as the price of timber is too high to be used for this purpose. He must of necessity resort to the wire fencing, and it is an item of considerable expense in his yearly accounts. He should be able to purchase it at the lowest possible price, and for that reason we have placed it on the free list. The tariff rates on these articles have compelled our people to depend upon the great steel industry for their supply. The Steel Trust is the greatest combination of wealth in the country, and this wealth has accumulated by means of tariff legislation. With absolute control of our markets and with power to fix their prices at will, they have drawn from the American farmer a constant flow of gold to their own treasury.

Not satisfied with the control of this market, they have annually exported immense quantities of their goods. We export several million dollars worth of barbed wire each year. In 1911 we exported $4,643,391 worth. We export about as much barbed wire as all other wire combined and sell it in all parts of the world. By this bill we give to the housewife her sewing machine with the duty free. This article is no longer a luxury but a necessity, and is found in almost all the homes of the people. Our machines are used in almost every country of the world, and an American traveler sees them for sale in every European port. We exported in 1911 $9,039,840 worth of sewing machines.

We have greatly reduced the duties on chemicals, glassware, and pottery, cotton and woolen goods, hosiery, gloves, underwear, clothing, oilcloths, carpets, blankets, flannels, furniture, and household furnishings, in fact, upon every necessity of life. We have sought in every way to lighten the burdens of the people and reduce as far as possible, by the tariff, the cost of living, and this bill is presented as an answer to the people who have asked for help and relief. [Applause.]

I submit below the statement of the clerk of the Ways and Means Committee of the estimated revenues under the law of 1897 and the Payne bill, as reported by the Ways and Means Committee and referred to by me in the above speech:

Tables showing the rates and duties collected under the law of 1897, for the year ending June 30, 1906, also the rates and estimated revenues under proposed bill (H. R. 1438) as reported from the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Mar. 18, 1909, Sixty-first Congress, first session.

[Prepared under direction of Committee on Ways and Means by William W. Evans, assistant clerk. The ad valorems are based on dutiable values.]

Schedules.	Value of merchandise (dutiable and free).	Revenue under—				Equivalent ad valorems.	
		Present law (act of 1897).	Proposed bill (H. R. 1438).	Increase.	Decrease.	Present.	Proposed.
	Dollars.	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
A. Chemicals, oils, and paints	37,125,351.05	9,743,468.44	10,029,339.54	285,871.10		28.82	28.48
B. Earths, earthenware, and glassware	26,539,272.92	13,748,947.51	13,834,352.03	85,404.52		51.81	52.13
C. Metals, and manufactures of	51,405,153.57	18,702,890.19	17,597,278.47		1,105,611.72	36.96	36.15
D. Wood, and manufactures of	28,086,569.24	3,650,054.89	2,926,252.13		723,802.76	16.03	10.42
E. Sugar, molasses, and manufactures of	86,132,918.06	52,648,866.44	52,139,668.71		509,197.73	61.13	61.39
F. Tobacco, and manufactures of	22,916,119.01	23,927,700.96	23,918,459.68		9,241.28	104.41	104.31
G. Agricultural products and provisions	82,376,479.86	18,161,265.68	32,171,658.01	14,010,392.33		33.81	39.08
H. Spirits, wines, and other beverages	19,684,467.21	14,011,560.22	14,747,776.50	736,216.28		71.18	74.92
I. Cotton manufactures	26,543,211.53	12,286,499.08	13,343,346.15	1,056,847.07		46.29	50.27
J. Flax, hemp, and jute, and manufactures of	92,658,402.01	41,778,299.48	41,592,247.67		186,051.81	45.38	45.98
K. Wool, and manufactures of	63,273,497.04	37,973,891.34	37,586,491.96		387,399.38	60.02	59.40
L. Silks and silk goods	32,591,910.12	17,351,095.14	17,653,160.03	302,064.89		53.24	54.17
M. Pulp, papers, and books	14,154,482.00	3,020,980.92	3,274,865.19	253,884.27		21.34	25.35
N. Sundries	118,208,710.77	26,325,474.36	24,156,304.63		2,169,169.73	22.27	26.26
Sec. 9. Unenumerated articles	1,501,402.00	226,989.49	253,531.69	26,542.20			
Total from customs	702,597,946.45	293,557,984.14	305,224,732.39	16,757,222.66	5,090,474.41	44.16	45.72
Net increase from customs				11,666,748.25			
Internal revenue on legacies, etc			20,000,000.00				
Internal revenue on cigarettes, additional			1,500,000.00				
Total revenue by proposed bill			326,724,732.39				

I also submit the statement of the Finance Committee of the Senate showing estimated revenues under the act of 1897 and the Payne bill as reported from conference.

Tables showing the rates and duties collected under the law of 1897 for the year ending June 30, 1907, also the rates under H. R. 1438 as it passed the House of Representatives, rates and estimated revenues under proposed bill as it passed the Senate, July 8, 1909, and as reported from conference, with tables of imports, production, and consumption.

[Estimated revenues—Comparison of H. R. 1438 with the present tariff law (act of July 24, 1897), prepared under direction of Finance Committee, 61st Cong., 1st sess. The ad valorems are based on the dutiable values.]

Schedules.	Value of merchandise (dutiable and free).	Revenue under—			Equivalent ad valorems.		
		Present law (act of 1897).	Senate bill.	Conference bill.	Present law.	Senate bill.	Conference bill.
	Dollars.	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
A. Chemicals, oils and paints	41,329,675.85	11,124,088.61	11,028,532.48	10,619,095.21	27.64	29.35	28.26
B. Earths, earthenware, and glassware	31,326,109.47	15,350,019.67	15,283,832.50	15,283,206.15	49.63	48.79	48.79
C. Metals, and manufactures of	68,194,136.11	21,882,145.87	21,905,574.67	21,365,073.03	32.59	32.13	31.55
D. Wood, and manufactures of	24,818,753.90	3,701,201.76	3,338,391.25	3,170,917.53	15.12	13.63	12.79
E. Sugar, molasses, and manufactures of	92,784,081.69	60,338,223.31	59,635,940.54	59,635,886.65	65.03	65.30	65.30
F. Tobacco, and manufactures of	29,959,081.79	26,125,037.41	26,113,185.29	26,113,185.29	87.20	87.18	87.18
G. Agricultural products and provisions	64,917,221.87	19,203,886.36	21,213,538.41	20,432,014.39	30.14	32.82	32.20
H. Spirits, wines, and other beverages	23,063,420.63	16,318,120.14	20,518,162.77	20,575,894.52	70.69	88.89	89.13
I. Cotton manufactures	31,857,017.07	14,284,628.15	15,128,762.11	16,126,096.98	44.84	47.49	50.62
J. Flax, hemp, and jute, and manufactures of	123,075,272.44	49,890,953.69	53,569,946.86	50,295,043.55	43.72	43.96	44.07
K. Wool, and manufactures of	62,831,601.31	36,561,217.64	36,561,193.15	36,560,651.38	58.19	58.19	58.19
L. Silks and silk goods	38,816,839.20	20,313,706.39	20,503,890.23	20,445,130.77	52.33	52.83	52.67
M. Pulp, papers, and books	20,005,625.62	4,136,629.42	4,264,664.70	4,328,812.57	20.67	21.08	23.43
N. Sundries	147,284,417.06	29,887,883.19	33,275,218.90	27,799,680.60	22.51	22.60	24.29
Total from customs	860,282,653.41	329,117,441.61	342,340,833.86	332,750,688.62			
Net increase			13,223,392.25	3,633,247.01			
Total luxuries, articles of voluntary use, dutiable and free	329,912,352.35	162,493,497.23	173,018,117.82	170,637,370.10	49.25	52.44	51.72

I also submit the statement prepared by Mr. Shinn, an employee of the minority party, as to revenues under the Dingley and Payne laws:

Comparative revenues.

Schedule.	Dingley duties.	Aldrich-Payne duties.	Percentage of increase or decrease.
A. Chemicals	$11,136,886	$11,816,214	[1] 5.63
B. Earthenware, etc	15,349,939	15,290,932	[2] .32
C. Metals, etc	21,821,184	20,370,396	[2] 6.65
D. Wood, etc	3,705,022	3,128,553	[2] 15.53
E. Sugar, etc	60,338,523	60,333,866	[2] .001
F. Tobacco, etc	26,125,037	26,125,027	[3]
G. Agricultural products	19,181,888	20,454,646	[1] 6.63
H. Spirits, etc	16,318,220	20,705,369	[1] 26.88
I. Cotton, etc	14,291,026	15,835,112	[1] 10.80
J. Flax, etc	49,909,580	49,776,276	[2] .24
K. Wool, etc	36,554,816	26,426,214	[2] .35
L. Silk, etc	20,313,706	23,458,747	[1] 15.48
M. Pulp, paper, etc	4,136,629	4,550,492	[1] 10.62
N. Sundries	29,896,500	26,484,490	[2] 11.41
Total	329,109,342	334,758,344	

[1] Increase. [2] Decrease. [3] No change.

Increase over Dingley duties, $5,649,002, or 1.71 per cent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield——

Mr. PAYNE. I want to ask the gentleman if he thinks the minority have any rights which he is bound to respect?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] that the minority has exercised more rights recently than anybody on the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, having the floor, I desire to ask how the division of time stands.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman wants to find out whether I have used more time than he has, I will admit it now.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to find out just exactly how the time balances.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has used 12 hours and 9 minutes, and the gentleman from New York 13 hours and 8 minutes, the latter including the time yielded by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. PAYNE. That is the way I supposed it was, Mr. Chairman. That is not what I am complaining of. I told the gentleman on the start, when he was asking me to take time in the evening, because I was ready and he was not, that he must be fair and equitable about it, and he said that he would be fair and equitable about that. I said that I wanted to occupy some time in the daytime. Now, we have commenced at 11 o'clock, and I have had 45 minutes, and it is now half past 3. When is the gentleman going to get equitable on this subject?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] that I will be more than equitable. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I do not propose to have him reflect on this proposition, and I will enforce an equitable condition from now on if he is not satisfied. I will say this, that the gentleman from New York was yielded time yesterday when he was ready. To-day his leader complained to me that we had not occupied time in the afternoon, and that we were taking the morning time, and that the night time was better to speak in, and I made the agreement with the leader of the gentleman from New York to-day that I should occupy the time this afternoon and even up to this time, and now I am proceeding to do it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN.]

Mr. PAYNE. I will get my time some day.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this is a fortunate time for the American people. For the first time in many long years a tariff bill has really been written in the interest of the people. No trust magnate, no tariff baron, dictated to the great leader of the Ways and Means Committee what should go into this bill, and those associated with him on that committee have joined in giving extensive tariff hearings upon all matters touching this legislation. That could not be said of the Ways and Means Committee that framed the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill. The American people have repudiated the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, and they have repudiated the party that enacted it, and once more they have called into power the great party of the Constitution—the Democratic Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The divided and discordant remnants of the old Republican Party are trying to deceive the people and befog the issue by discussing and denouncing the Democratic caucus. The few stand-pat Republicans remaining in the House have lifted up their voices in solemn protest against the secret caucus of the Democratic Members of this House, and the insurgents, Progres-

sives, or whatever they call themselves at present, have also condemned the secret Democratic caucus. Both of these minority parties have gone through the ridiculous and farcical performance of holding what they call an open caucus. Pray tell me what they have to caucus about. [Laughter.] They take their orders from trust magnates and tariff barons. Their program is prepared by the bosses of special privilege, and they must do the bidding of the tariff masters. Then why try to fool the people by sitting in an open caucus with cold feet killing time. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, we are the representatives of the people and we discuss in secret caucus ways and means to secure wise and just legislation for the people. We do not take orders from the privileged few who have grown rich through favors granted by the Republican Party. We have full and fair discussion in the secret caucus by Democratic Representatives from every section of the country. There we discuss our differences and settle them, if we can. There we prepare the measures that we will present to the House and be responsible for to the country, and no Republican agent of a subsidized newspaper has any business in a Democratic caucus. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The measures that are submitted to the caucus and the measures that we agree upon are given to the public, and the vote by which the agreement is reached is also given to the public. Why should the enemies of the Democratic Party be allowed to sit in its council chamber when it is suggesting and discussing party procedure regarding measures that we must stand responsible for to the country? If we bring out of the Democratic caucus just and meritorious measures the people will applaud and indorse the action of the caucus. Gentlemen of the opposition who think they are deceiving the people are fooling themselves. The people do not care so much about what is said in reaching a conclusion as they do about the conclusion reached by the Democratic caucus. The caucus will be judged by its fruits, and so far the Demoratic caucus has borne good fruit.

Mr. Chairman, the American people indorsed the work of the Democratic caucus of the Sixty-second Congress, and they will indorse the work of the Democratic caucus of the Sixty-third Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You stand-pat Republicans can not deceive the people by trying to take their thoughts off of you and your miserable subserviency to special interests by howling about a secret Democratic caucus. Face the issue squarely and join us in our efforts to grant relief to the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let me say to you gentlemen, the people do not care how many secret caucuses we have so long as the caucus seeks to bring about the greatest good to the greatest number. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, some of these Insurgents or Progressives insurged and progressed a good deal at home during the last campaign, and when they came into this House I watched and waited to see what stand they would take when the battle line was marked between the people and those who oppress them. In a little while I heard the tariff gong sound on the race track of privilege and a trust magnate's voice saying "they are off"; and lo, in the dust and noise of the race, I could not distinguish stand-pat horse from insurgent steed, and when they passed betwixt the flag of monopoly and the wire of high protection, they were neck and neck, and stand-pat horse only won by an eyelash, but the insurgent steed performed so admirably and pleased the tariff judges so well that they gave him a prize also. So side by side you go, and you will sleep together in the protective-tariff stall, John Anderson and Joe. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Insurgents who insurge at home and Progressives who progress in their talk at home, but are nonprogressive in their action here, will have to explain their conduct to those who sent them here. You can not be Progressives or Insurgents at home and then stand here and aid in keeping on the statute book an iniquitous tariff measure like that which now benefits the manufacturers of Lawrence, Mass., where human beings are working for small wages. Half clad and half fed, they are eking out a miserable existence.

Children are working there, and the hearings had regarding a strike in the mills at Lawrence not long ago disclosed the fact that these children get meat to eat only once a week; that some of these children had their fingers chopped off by running machinery, as they were compelled to clean the machinery while it was in motion. When a little fellow was asked if he sued for damages when his finger was mashed off, he said: "No, sir; I was afraid I would lose my job." I remember a little girl who had half of her scalp torn off by the machinery in a mill at Lawrence, Mass. She, too, was cleaning the machinery while it was in motion. When asked if they paid her damages for the injury done her she answered "No." She, too, was afraid she would lose her job if she tried to get damages.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I plead this afternoon for the underpaid, overworked, illtreated children who work in these tariff-protected industries. I want the Progressives and insurgents to join us in our efforts to strike the shackles from the limbs of America's industrial slaves. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But what are you doing, Progressive and standpatter, under one and the same flag, when it comes to doing the bidding of the tariff masters? You Progressives said, we are a separate and distinct party, nothing in common between us and the standpatters. Get together; no, sir; nevermore. [Laughter.] But you are together on this question. You remind me of the old fellow who was sitting in front of a little shanty in a certain southern city. He was gazing into space and fanning himself furiously, for the weather was warm, and he was noticeably under the influence of fermented millet juice. [Laughter.] A friend approached him and said: "John, what in the world made you do this—get in this condition?" John said: "Well, I was just sittin' here and not a'bothering nobody at all, and a durn ballon went up, went right straight up, and I can't stand everything." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Some of these insurgents who said nevermore will we have anything to do with the standpatters, were found sitting right in the camp of privilege, right under the protective-tariff flag, side by side with the bellwethers of protection. [Laughter.] What made you do it, old fellow? "Well, I was just sittin' here looking for something to happen, and a durn tariff balloon went up, went right straight up, and I can't stand everything." [Applause and laughter.] So here you are.

Now, then, what is the chief difference between you Progressives and standpatters? The fact is nearly all of you are really and truly hide-bound protectionists, and the chief difference between you now is one of you wants to revise the tariff by a tariff commission, so you say. The others say, "No, no; we want to revise the tariff by a tariff board." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] The commission would be composed of five men and the board would be composed of five men. This is a serious matter, and there is a broad chasm between these two propositions. [Laughter.] It looks as though you will never be able to bridge it and get a revision of the tariff, and both of you are hoping that you never may. [Laughter.]

What is the Democratic proposition? We propose to revise the tariff by the people's Representatives, coming fresh from the people every two years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why, gentlemen, in the early days the Senate sought this power, but so jealous were the fathers as to where this power to levy taxes should be lodged that they said, "No, we will not even intrust it to a Senate composed of ambassadors from the sovereign States of this Union. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This power must remain as near the people as possible, and we will keep it in the hands of our Representatives in Congress, who go up fresh from the people every two years." [Applause on the Democratic side.] It will be a sad day when a commission or a board composed of a few men shall have the right to exercise the taxing power in this Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In all the tariff bills that you have written when you were increasing the tariff taxes of the people you did not ask for a commission then; you did not want a tariff board; but now, when we seek to reduce the tariff tax, you clamor for a board or a commission, and they mean one and the same thing. What is your commission for? You know as well as I know that it is for the postponement of tariff revision. [Applause on the Democratic side.] What is your Tariff Board for? You know and the people know what it is for. It is for the postponement of tariff revision. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Gentlemen of the committee, do you recall the story of the mother bird and her young in the wheat field? One day the farmer came, surveyed the situation, made a few observations, and returned to his home. That night the mother bird said to her young, "Who has been here to-day?" They said, "The farmer." "And what did he say?" "He said, 'This wheat is getting ripe.'" "What else?" "He said, 'It ought to be cut.'" Then the next night the mother bird said, "Who has been here to-day?" "The farmer." "What did he say?" "He said, 'This wheat is ripe and needs cutting, and I will get my neighbors to cut it.'" The mother bird said, "Do not be alarmed, my children, you will not have to move yet." But again the farmer came, and that night the mother bird said, "What report have you now, my children?" They said, "The farmer has been here again, and he said, 'This wheat is ripe and falling

down. It must be cut, and I will come myself to-morrow and cut it.'" Whereupon the mother bird said, "It is time to move, my children; he is going to do it himself." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What are you gentlemen of the opposition asking for—tariff board and a tariff commission? The tariff baron smiles, and he inquires, "What did the standpatters say?" They said they wanted to revise the tariff, but that they would get a tariff board to do it. "Ah, ha," said the tariff baron, "Do not be alarmed, my brethren, we will not have to move yet" [applause on the Democratic side], and then he said with a merry twinkle in his eye, "What do the Progressives say?" They said, "We want to revise it, too, but we will get a tariff commission to do it." "Ah, ha," said the tariff baron, "Do not be disturbed, my brethren, we will not have to move yet." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] But, Mr. Chairman, what did the Democrats, coming up from the various sections of the Union, marshaled behind OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, say? They said, "The tariff needs revising. It must be revised downward, and we will do it ourselves." [Applause on the Democratic side.] And then the tariff baron said, "My brethren, it looks like we will have to move." [Laughter and applause.]

And, Mr. Chairman, in the name of all that is just and right, I declare to you and to the country that they are going to have to move. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The cost of living is so high that it presents a serious problem to the average man, and he is hard pressed to secure the bare necessities of life.

A teacher in a Sunday school said to a little boy, "Jimmy, do they ask the blessing at meal times at your house?" The little boy made no reply. The teacher turned to the other members of the class and said, "What is the first thing your father says when he goes to the breakfast table in the morning?" For a moment no one replied. Finally a little red-headed fellow looked up and said, "I can tell you what my daddy says." He says, "Go slow on that butter, kid; it costs 40 cents a pound." [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

The Payne-Aldrich tariff law carries the highest tariff tax rate ever enacted by the Congress of the United States, and the people are afflicted with tariff burdens as they never have been before, and yet Mr. Taft said that it was the best tariff law ever written, and when I heard the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] talking about a speedy return of the Republican Party to power I was greatly amused, and I thought of the conundrum propounded by a little boy to his father when he said, "Papa, what is the difference between Taft and Moses?" "I don't know, son," said the father. "What is the difference?" The boy said, "The Lord buried Moses where the people could not find him and the people buried Taft where the Lord could not find him." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, for fear that these insurgents may take themselves and their leader at Oyster Bay a little too seriously and that a few of these standpatters may fool themselves into hoping for the return of the Republican Party to power, let me dispose of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Taft in passing. A Western poet in a certain town who had been dealing for quite a while with the firm of Hart & Leonora was slow to pay his debts, and one of the partners, Leonora, instructed Hart not to sell him any more on credit, but one day the poet came in and persuaded Hart to sell him a $5 derby hat. When Leonora discovered his name on the book opposite the amount charged for the hat, he had many unkind things to say about the poet and quarreled with his partner Hart. Hart wrote the poet the following touching note: "Leonora has quarreled with me for selling you the hat and he abused you terribly. Please remit for the hat at once. Remember that I trusted you, trusted you implicitly." The poet turned the note and wrote on the back, "Trust on, fond Hart. Leonora, fare thee well." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, when the battle line was drawn across the Republic on the 5th day of November last, old men, middle-aged men, and young men stood with their ballots in their hands ready to perform a patriotic service, aye, to save their country from the dangers that threatened it. The big, fat man from the Philippines and the wild man from Africa [laughter and applause] came charging down the line, and the American people in one united chorus said, "Move on, sweet William; Theodora, fare thee well." [Prolonged laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, now having answered all of the arguments of Republican standpatters and insurgent Progressives [laughter and applause on the Democratic side], I shall proceed to speak in behalf of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The spirit that covets unduly
Holds sin that 'tis hard to forgive,
For religion never preaches more truly
Than when she says, live and let live.

From the earliest glimmerings of history men have manifested serious concern about the use of the taxing power. If the dead republics could tell the story of their dissolution and downfall, it would be about the use and abuse of the taxing power. The taxing power in the United States has been used for the benefit of a few men to the detriment and great injury of the masses of the people. A protective-tariff tax in a republic a hundred years old is unjust, inexcusable, and indefensible. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The tariff tax, increasing under the long reign of the Republican Party, has become a burden to the average man. Henry Clay, who pleaded for protection in the early days, never advocated a tariff tax above 20 per cent. He justified that rate upon the ground that our industries were young and needed protection until they were older grown. He and others said to the fathers, we must have industries. We want factories here to manufacture what we need in the way of wearing apparel, cooking utensils, agricultural implements, and so on. The consumer said, "What do you mean?" Well, to illustrate, they said that we must have a man to manufacture hats. The hat you have on cost $1.50. It came here from Europe. We will manufacture the same hat here and levy a tax of, say, 50 cents on it. That will make the hat cost you $2. That tax will enable the American hat man to build a hat factory and manufacture hats here.

The consumer said, "Then I am to be taxed for his benefit." The fathers said, "We know that it is wrong, but it is the only way that we can build up industries in the United States, and we must have industries. Submit to it only for a little while and we will reduce the tariff tax to the revenue basis." The consumer said, "You are taxing me to build a hat factory here. Who will own that factory? Will I have any interest in it?" And the fathers said, "The hat manufacturer will own the factory and you will have no interest in it, except you can point with pride to it and say that you were taxed to help build it." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

That is what was done in the early days in order that industries might be established in the United States. So it was clearly the purpose of the fathers to reduce the tariff tax and to wean these industries just as soon as the industries of America passed the period of their infancy and got a foothold in the commercial and industrial world. The Democratic Party believes that these hoary-headed infants are old enough to be weaned. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Bryan has said that you can wean anything in the world, even a mule colt, but that it is hard to wean a tariff baron. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, these tariff barons remind me of the Kentucky boy. He was 15 years old, barefooted, with trousers rolled up to his knees, shirt open in front, and one suspender hanging down, perspiration trickling over his dust-covered face as he ran up the road, with his hat in one hand and a rock in the other. He met some gentlemen, and said, "Gentlemen, have you seen anything of airy woman, kind of sandy haired and trottin' like?" They said, "Yes; about a quarter of a mile up the road." He said, "That's ma, durn her; she thinks she's going to wean me, but she ain't." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the American consumer has been demanding for a long time that the tariff tax be reduced. The tariff tax would have been reduced four years ago but for the betrayal of the American people by the Republican Party. At last the people are triumphant and the consumer has a friend in court. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let me say a word in behalf of the American consumer. But for him the various industries of the world would perish from the earth. These industries are dependent upon the consumer for the sale and consumption of their products, and yet so unjust have been the exactions in tariff taxes and trust profits that the consumer's ability to provide for himself and family has been seriously impaired. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Time was when the industry and enterprise in the individual stood for something in every community in the land. These were the mighty forces that wrought for American progress and prosperity. Then competition was the life of trade, and hope and opportunity called to the enterprise and industry in the American youth and bade him go forth to labor and achieve. Then the fields of opportunity were broad and inviting and the average man's efforts were fairly rewarded. He had intelligence, industry, and enterprise and opportunity. Opportunity was calling to him and he asked no more. He could go out and match his skill and energy against the skill and energy of others in the broad field of industrial endeavor, where competition was the life of trade. Then more men had money in the

banks, more men owned their homes, and more men were prosperous and happy, according to population, than ever before or since in the history of our country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That time was when we had a Democratic tariff law—the Walker law. Then we had a tariff for revenue only and competition was the life of trade. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Competition was the mighty force that called out the best that men had in them, but, Mr. Chairman, in an evil hour the enemies of the people conceived the idea that by raising the tariff tax high enough they could shut out foreign goods, establish a monopoly, crush out the independent concerns of the country, and destroy competition in the United States. The protective tariff has been the hotbed of wicked combinations and monopolies, and Havemeyer, the sugar king, spoke truly when he said "the tariff is the mother of the trust." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This cruel offspring of the Republican Party began its operations in the United States. It went into politics, made barter of the ballot, and cut the wage of the laboring man and denied that he was worthy of his hire. It did not stop there, Mr. Chairman; it suspended the operation of the law of supply and demand and fixed the price of all that it had to buy and of all that it had to sell. What is a trust, you ask me? A trust is a combination of men with capital, and has for its purpose the control of the output and price of a certain article of commerce. It kills off competition by reducing the number of men engaged in the manufacture of that article; that reduces the number of buyers of the raw material and decreases the number of sellers of the finished product; so this offspring of the protective-tariff system, this law-guarded monopoly, deprives us of a competitive market—holds up the producer with one hand and robs the consumer with the other. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the Scripture tells us that when the servant returned from the field where he had been to inspect the young wheat, he said, "Master, there are tares in the wheat," and the master said, "An enemy hath done this." The servant said, "Shall I go out and pull up the tares?" "Not now," said the master, "the tares and the wheat are green and look something alike, and the wheat stalks are tender and easily broken down." What else did the master say? He said, "Wait until the harvest time, so that you can distinguish the tares from the wheat; then go and pluck up the tares, bind them, and burn them." The Democratic Party says that in the wheat field of fair competition, of individual enterprise and effort, where equal opportunity called to the skill and energy of men, an enemy hath sown the tares of monopoly and the trust is flourishing there. The harvest time is here. You can clearly distinguish the trust tare from the wheat stalk of fairplay and honest competition, and the Democratic Party bids us go and pluck up these trust tares and bind them and burn them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the American manufacturers now sell abroad cheaper than they sell to us at home. Is the tariff system beneficial to the American citizen when it forces him to pay a higher price for what he buys in the United States than the foreigner has to pay for the same article shipped to him in a foreign country? Can a tariff system be defended that enables a man to sell cheaper in foreign countries than he sells at home? The money now taken from the American people by the raising of a protective tariff tax does not benefit the Government but enriches a few men at the expense and to the great injury of the masses of the people. If the money now wrung annually from our people by the protective tariff system of the Republican Party could be left with them for a few years we would have the happiest and most prosperous people in the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The trouble is, Mr. Chairman, the average man does not get acquainted with his earnings before they are taken from him through this oppressive tariff system. The average man is industrious and enterprising, and if he could be allowed to enjoy what he makes there would be less unrest and more contentment and happiness in the country, but when the tariff tax amounts to one-third, and in many instances more, of the price that he must pay for the real necessities of life, he is embarrassed to meet his obligations and hard pressed to supply those who are dependent upon him with the bare necessities of life. Now, then, when you realize that the tariff tax paid by the average man is so high that it seriously embarrasses him and denies him many of the necessaries of life, and that this tax does not go to the Government but into the pockets of a few men, who have grown rich at the expense of the many, you are indignant, and no wonder you are crying out against the cruelties of a system that takes from the weak and gives to the strong, that taxes one class to enrich another. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Government that uses the taxing power to enrich the few at the expense of the many has entered upon a dangerous road. The welfare of the citizen is of the greatest concern to our country.

It is the highest end and aim of constitutional government, and I deny that the Republican Party has the right to sell the taxing power to a band of tariff marauders who employ it to pillage and plunder the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why, Mr. Chairman, through this system a few men are coming more and more to own and control the fields of American opportunity and industrial endeavor. The people are anxiously awaiting our action. What are we going to do? What would the fathers think if they could come back and find that by the improper exercise of the taxing power one class had become enormously rich and another and a larger class had been denied the common necessities of life? That one, a very small class, by the unjust operation of tariff laws, had come to own four-fifths of the wealth of the United States, and that another class, composed of more than 50,000,000 American people, did not own their homes? Where are those who believe with Lincoln that the man should be placed above the dollar? Where are the representatives of the sturdy stock who followed Jackson in his war against plutocracy when he said, "The people shall rule"? Where are the descendants of the men who gloried in the doctrine of Jefferson of equal rights to all and special privileges to none? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

My friends, the battle is on between justice and injustice, right and wrong, the people and their oppressors, God and mammon. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Your country is calling you. On which side are you battling? Will you battle in behalf of the American home and the family at the fireside or will you be found on the side of those who oppress them? Will you vote to remove the obstacles from the path of the American boy that he may have a fair chance in the struggle for existence or will you aid those who are shutting the door of opportunity in his face and denying him the blessings and benefits that should come to him? We owe it to him and we owe it to the country to look to the health and happiness of the American boy. So much depends upon this little fellow's future. He is more important than your tariff-protected monopolies, and I demand for him a fair chance in the struggle of life. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Democratic Party is determined that you shall not crush out the spirit of usefulness that God has planted in the breast of this American boy. You shall not deny to his little bright eyes the blessed light of hope. You shall not crucify him upon the altar of monopolistic greed or barter his birthright to the enemies of the Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Upon the treatment and encouragement of this American boy depends the future strength and glory of the Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Then I appeal for protection to the American home. There this boy gets his first glimpse of human government and there he hears for the first time the story of our country's goodness or the tale of its injustice and oppression. Then how important it is that his surroundings should be such that he may have wholesome food and comfortable clothing and the opportunity to become healthy and strong and tutored in the blessings and benefits of constitutional government. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He has it in his power to preserve the Republic. The perpetuity of this Government will rest upon his shoulders; aye, the course of liberty in this western world will be marked and bounded by his chart and compass and in the years to come he will be the guardian of constitutional liberty in this Republic of the West. [Applause on the Democratic side.] What are we doing to inspire in him love of country? What are we doing to strengthen his faith in the justice of our laws and in the integrity of those who make them?

Mr. Chairman, the strength of the Republic is in the homes of the people. Then the most important institution in our country is the American home; and the Democratic Party has registered a vow that it will go out and drive this band of tariff marauders from the door of the American home. [Applause on the Democratic side.] These cruel tariff marauders are sowing pestilence and want in the path of the American boy. They are spreading the poison of distrust and bitterness along his way, and by their pillage and plunder of the American home they are making an anarchist or a socialist of the American boy before he reaches the age of accountability. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, if the Republic is to live this condition of things must change; but every time the effort is made to reduce the tariff tax so that the American consumer can live more decently and comfortably and obtain the necessaries of life at a reasonable price those who profit by the tariff tax put into operation

every force that they can employ to frighten the American people into the belief that if we dare to reduce that tax business will be disturbed and industries will be destroyed. These mighty interests spend vast sums of money and do all in their power to safeguard their privilege to pillage and plunder. This is the business that they do not want disturbed. [Applause on the Democratic side.] What are you doing to prevent them from destroying the American consumers' business—that of providing a decent living for himself and family?

Then, again, Mr. Chairman, they tell us that the tariff is a local issue. It is a local issue in one sense, for it haunts the housewife throughout the day, and when she retires at night she is surrounded on every hand by tariff-taxed household utensils. It confronts the father at all times, and is forever clawing at his purse strings. It follows the children to play, for their little toys are taxed. It follows them to school, for their wearing apparel, books, and the building itself are taxed. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, it is also a national issue, because it affects everybody everywhere in the Republic. There is no escape from the remorseless taxgatherers of the Republican Party. They pursue the American citizen from the cradle to the grave, for the swaddling clothes of the infant, the wearing apparel of the adult, and the winding sheet of the dead are all taxed, and heavily taxed, by the Republican tariff law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, we will not despair of the Republic so long as against the ills of evil we hold the remedy of right. We will reduce the tariff tax, dissolve the trusts, restore competition, open the door of opportunity to the American boy, and give the average man a fair chance in the struggle for existence. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want to see the time come when every man who wants to work will find work to do and will be well paid for that work and not have to indulge in strikes, boycotts, and demoralization of trade in order to obtain it. Mr. Chairman, I want to see a prosperity felt by the common man, heard in his cheerful voice and seen in his happy home. Not the kind of prosperity produced by the Republican Party as expressed in a few money kings, who tower above the mass of the people like peaks above the plain, but a prosperity that will permit every farmer to garner in his own barn and every citizen to enjoy at his own fireside the full and fair fruits of his labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.] A prosperity that spreads peace and plenty o'er a smiling land and is reflected in a happy nation's eyes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Four years ago the Republican Party came into power under false pretenses, broke its promises, and to-day stands convicted of deceit and unfaithfulness to the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The mask of hypocrisy has been torn from the face of that party, the veil has been rent in the temple of high protection, and trust magnates and tariff barons have been located in the temple of the people, and Woodrow Wilson is calling them to judgment. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This oppressive tariff-tax system of the Republican Party is the deadly upas tree in the political life of America. Its roots are planted in the ruins of American competition, its branches are uplifted to a sky black with special privileges, its poisonous odors choke and stifle individual enterprise and effort, and its deadly fruits are socialism, anarchy, distress, and want. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In this hour of sore trial and oppression amongst the people God has raised up a man who, like Aaron of old, will stretch forth the healing rod to give the land deliverance. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Once more he will wave the flag of the people's rule and once more proclaim the doctrine of Jefferson, "equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

Back on her native mountains where the flag waved long ago
We will plant again that standard white as the driven snow.
It's the flag that Jefferson loved dearly—
It's the banner that Jackson bore
In his battle for the people's rights in the happy days of yore.
I can hear the Army marching;
I can see the flag unfurled;
And Woodrow Wilson now waves it to the world.

[Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think——

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] go on now?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from New York that there is an hour and 50 minutes still due to this side, and I had an understanding with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that if I yielded this morning to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] I could go on and endeavor to make up my time this evening, the time which it was complained we were not occupying.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] hardly states the understanding with me.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I stated to the gentleman, when he asked me to yield—notwithstanding that we were about three or four hours behind time, so that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] could come in at that time—that I would do so with the understanding that I would have an opportunity this afternoon to make up my time. But I will say this, that I have two gentlemen here who are anxious to get away to-night, and consequently very anxious to get in this evening. Each one of them wants 20 minutes of time, and if the gentleman will allow me to yield to those gentlemen, although I am nearly two hours behind that side, I will yield to that side, and he will have an opportunity to go on to-night, because I do not want to carry the time into to-night.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Alabama that he has used 13 hours and 2 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has used 14 hours and 8 minutes. The gentleman from Alabama has 1 hour and 6 minutes remaining in order to equalize the time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thought it was more than that.

Mr. MANN. I protested to the gentleman from Alabama at the beginning of the debate against this side of the House being obliged to use time from half past 4 until practically the adjournment as being unfair to this side of the House. To-day the gentleman stated that he expected to proceed until he had made up his allotment of time. I went to the gentleman and said to him that I thought that was not fair to this side of the House, when he or his side had been unprepared to use time in the evening and we had used it then, that he should endeavor to make it up in the afternoon or during the day. The gentleman stated that he would consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] should come in, and that he would then proceed to make up his time. To that I again protested that is was not fair to this side of the House.

That statement was afterwards made by the gentleman from Alabama on the floor, and my statement was made by me on the floor again. It is not fair to the minority, in my opinion. I think we are entitled to stand upon that. If we proceed with the debate between 5 and 7 or between half past 7 and 8 o'clock, when the gentleman from Alabama has no one who is willing to proceed, it is not fair that the gentleman shall then take the time in the afternoon to make up for the time which he did not occupy, and I think the gentleman himself will concede that much.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I desire to have everybody satisfied. I did not desire the gentleman to go on yesterday evening. As a matter of fact, yesterday evening is about the only time when we ran late. We ran until after half past 8, and the last speaker was a gentleman on this side of the House.

Mr. MANN. He was the next to the last speaker.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That was the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NEELEY].

Mr. MANN. He was the next to the last speaker. The last speaker was the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If gentlemen do not want to speak at this time of the evening, then when I have made up the little over an hour that is due me I am willing to move to take a recess and come back here at half past 7, so that the gentlemen on that side may have a full audience, and then I will divide the time equally.

Mr. MANN. But I think the gentleman ought to proceed and take some of the time between 5 and 7 o'clock.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I expect a little later on to move to take a recess for dinner. The only reason why I desire these two gentlemen to come in now is that they want to go away, although they would have a better audience this evening.

Mr. MANN. Everybody wants to get in early. We have a great many applications for time on this side. I think that as for myself I may be cut out of the privilege of addressing the House, although I would like to address it, because of lack of time. Now, the gentleman proposes not to use any of the time between 5 or half past 5 and 7 o'clock, which he ought to use; yet if we use it he wants to charge us with all that time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman is attributing to this side of the House something that it ought not to be charged with. It is true that at one time there were more speakers at a later hour. The gentleman complained that we did not put anybody in yesterday until half past 3 or 4. Now, we have given the gentlemen on that side of the House one-half of the time and they have only one-third of the membership. The gentleman complains that he can not take care of his men. I have two-thirds of the House to take care of and the gentleman has only one-third. I do not insist on the gentleman making his friends speak here between 5 and 6, and I shall not do so.

Mr. MANN. But there is no way of getting 10 or 12 hours a day, as the gentleman suggested in the first place.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to even up, and I do not want to put the gentleman's friends in the position of speaking here at a time when they do not want to speak. We can adjourn until half past 7 and continue then until 11 o'clock, and they will have a better audience then than now. I think I am entitled at this stage of the proceedings to even this time up when I have two-thirds of the House to take care of.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman has a majority of the House, and he can do what he pleases, but I do not think that is fair to this side of the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I repudiate that proposition. I have been fair, and more than fair.

Mr. MANN. I do not think so.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will even up the time, and then we will divide it as it comes. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KENT] is recognized.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, the American people have been chasing after strange gods. They have set up brazen images in the wilderness and have fallen down and worshiped them.

Get rich quick without work is the motto of this pantheon. Among the lesser gods were fiat money, depreciated currency, trusts, stock watering and stock and produce gambling, lotteries, bucket shops, patent medicines, and fakes in general, but the great boss god Baal is the protective tariff. Baal has not always been so great or so greedy as in his latter and his last days. He was once an infantile, honest-appearing mendicant that asked for food in order that he might grow and acquire strength enough to work for self-support. But the beggar's life was easy and demoralizing, so that while Baal grew big as per schedule and heavy in the belly, which was unexpected, and weak in the legs, which was a natural sequence, he refrained from cultivating an appetite for work and more and more hated the thought of supporting himself while becoming ever hungrier and more insistent. And then Baal proceeded to claim that he dropped the rain on the thirsty soil, that he daily turned on the sun, and caused the waters to run to the sea. He made us fear that he would withdraw the coal and oil and iron beyond our reach if we ceased to pay him tribute. And ever he got bigger in the belly and weaker in the legs and ever hungrier and more blatant.

Then people agreed that Baal should bant and exercise himself and eventually eat less and do something, as became a grown person, but when Baal got through arguing with his priests he persuaded them to feed him more, and after they increased his rations they allowed that he was the best fed god that ever reigned and therefore would be the best acting one. Then the people tired of Baal and ran off his priests and sentenced him for his crimes. There were many who urged that he ought to be starved down to moderate proportions before being knocked in the head, for, said they, the remains will make an awful mess before we can bury them. Others were in favor of immediate execution regardless of results, while a very few of his old priests continued to chant calamity, the failure of yield of field and factory, the drying of the watercourses, and the darkening of the sun if Baal and his maw and his craw were disturbed.

The protective tariff, like any other tariff, be it understood, is a tax. A tax is the process of abstracting money from the individual pocket for the ostensible benefit of some of us or all of us. The protective tariff having duly abstracted the coin from the pocket of the man who is supposed to have earned it, then turns and pretends to place it in the pocket of some individual who needs it because the product of his labor is not an adequate wage.

If this Robin Hood system of distribution were a taking from the rich and a giving to the poor, its false economy might in a measure be condoned as emanating from a kind heart, albeit connected with a weak head, but it has proven a taking from the poor and a giving to the rich, so that neither head nor heart are to be trusted.

If we were organizing a new system of taxation and distribution, with no traditions, no muddling precedents, we would first of all lay down the dictum that the burden of proof lies heavy on him who would take from any man any portion of the product of his toil. The protective-tariff doctrine, on the contrary, takes much from everybody, and then gives what portion is not otherwise absorbed by the taker to somebody who happens to be unprofitably employed and unable to pay himself out of his product.

Through many years we have gone along under this absurd reversal of premises. We have been laboriously taught that this form of taxation has been enriching us. It has been a noxious disease that we have suffered, akin to one that stimulates the heart to undue exertion. In our Nation, suffering this disease, we have done what the human body does under such conditions—we have adapted ourselves to it, and have lived in spite of it. It would be dangerous to stop the poisoning all at once, and now the burden of proof measurably rests on him who would suddenly withdraw the stimulant. [Applause.]

There are in the world a number of persons who believe, and who have the temerity to assert, certain economic premises. They hold to the thought, already expressed, that men must be, and are, paid for their work out of product; that they are not, and can not be, paid in the aggregate out of any other fund, because there is no other fund; that the primal need of society is production, and that production should be as cheap as possible, always taking into account human and social elements. Next we may remark that product out of place is of no value; so that unhampered commerce, cheapening of transportation, is as important as the act of production itself. Again, cheapness of distribution is as important as cheapness of production and celerity and cheapness of transportation.

The man who eats the food, who wears the clothes, must pay the producer's cost, must pay the transportation charge, must pay the middleman in the system of distribution. The protective tariff theory declares that all of us shall be taxed to pay some of us more than we should be paid out of our production. Also that natural and cheap trade routes should be cut by national boundaries; that physical geography should be defined as un-American; that production and distribution should be regulated, stimulated, asphyxiated, subsidized, taxed, and generally tinkered until we have the fearful and wonderful result which has apparently become displeasing to the majority of our fellow citizens. I had great hope of the Progressive Party as an organization, which, to use the eloquent phrase of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CHANDLER], would not only set its collective face, like flint, against us when we are engaged in wrongdoing, but which, now and forever, stands for social and industrial justice, "with hearts of steel," by the way. This party, that proposes to invoke the wrath of the American people upon the heads of us reactionaries on both sides of this House—this party ought to know its sworn enemy, a special privilege, when it happens to meet one; but it shakes hands most amicably with the first one it meets, the protective tariff, and hopes for political success as a result of the compromise.

It is as if a knight of Arthur's table went out to rescue damsels and, as per schedule, met a dragon, and as though he turned aside from the road, remarking that he did not see anything but a benevolent angleworm which he would later take fishing with him. One may have respect for the infant-industry theory out of which has grown the high protective tariff; one may countenance the plain, unvarnished greed of some of the old schedules, but in Heaven's name what is this chastened, this holy, this pale-blue purified essence in which, unless we believe, we shall most assuredly be damned, if we are to believe the gentleman from New York, who is about to call down the wrath of the American people upon us. What is the "protective principle"? Has it not been defined? It surely has, and the definition is worse than the disorder. The protective tariff "should equal the difference in cost of production at home and abroad," with or without a profit to the producer. What could be fairer than that? Coconuts in Maine, mahogany in hot beds, vanilla beans in Potomac Park, and our husky mechanics making ancient tapestry, the bricklayers' union whittling out German dolls, and every laborer drawing down good pay while trying to raise something that ought to be raised somewhere else or to do something that some one else can do better. [Applause.]

My little daughter is collecting elephants. Alas, what fiends she and I are, to encourage Japanese and Chinese to carve them of ivory and teak, Dutchmen to mold them in pottery, and Hindus to cast them in bronze. These elephants are, of course, utterly and entirely useless, but we could pay more for them if we took some of our people from raising corn and wheat and hogs and put them at the task of making elephants. [Laughter.]

The protective tariff is one of the brood of special privileges. The protective principle, as progressively enunciated, is but an attenuated form of a fundamental fallacy.

What is a special privilege? It is a scheme whereby part of one man's product can be taken from him for the benefit of another. There may be times when this performance is justifiable, but at least the burden of proof should be on him who would put his hand in the pocket of another. When the community, the State or Nation, does this it is called taxation, and when done for purposes of safeguarding the Nation and of caring for the individual, it is obviously justifiable. Without such cooperative expenditure, without such common levy of funds, no nation could endure. But when this power of taxation is invoked for the purpose of redistributing product, those favor-

ing it land in an interminable morass and in their flounderings get entangled with "differences in the cost of production," which are to be squared by taxing our people, and then they proceed to call this thing, which closely resembles piracy, a "principle."

I fully sympathize with our really truly Progressives—although I believe I am now classed as an assistant reactionary—in their attempt to push forward a splendid program of humanitarian legislation. I join with them in a desire to see every man well paid, to have no children engaged in life-destroying occupations. I wish to see society take the risk from the shoulders of the sick and the aged. I shall work and vote for measures to bring these results, but I shall do it with the full knowledge that there is more than one side to the ledger and that all of us must pay the bills we incur and pay them in the only way they can be paid, by giving up privilege, by increasing product, by freeing commerce.

I believe in a tariff commission, expert and nonpartisan, to report to us, who are the framers of financial legislation. The last commission mined for facts and published facts to which all men should have access.

It is a delightful millennial hope that some day, somehow, we may get the tariff out of politics, but I can not foresee that desirable consummation while there are two or more parties professing belief in enrichment through taxation—two schools of "boot-strap" aviation. [Applause.]

Gentlemen of the majority, you are doing a brave deed in carrying out your campaign pledges to reduce the tariff. It is not going to be a pleasant experience for the American people to lead a more sober existence after the long course of stimulants in which they have indulged. They will experience what Daudet, in his great novel "Sappho," alluded to as the "gray sadness of the morning," and some of you, perhaps many of you, will fall by the wayside. But, at any rate, you will have done your duty. "The way to resume is to resume," and not unlike the hardships that came after the resumption of specie payments will be the effect of your action.

You are already hedging on your promises to reduce the cost of living, and you are wise in so doing. It is not the direct tariff charge that counts most in the articles for which we pay extravagantly. It is the burden of the distributing cost, the toll levied by the land-owning privilege, the toll paid to watered securities, the unnecessary extravagance and burden of those people that look for an unearned livelihood in the overloaded distributive avocations, and last of all, the waste and misuse and the destruction of the capital needed for production.

It is not so much the burden of the few drones in our national hive that makes our country far less productive than it should be. Rather is it the vast amounts of unprofitable toil, the fearful toll of wasted, unproductive effort, and the charges levied by privilege, of which the protective tariff is but one.

This ought to be said: That a man who can not see the burdensome, anticommercial character of such a tariff as we have had can hardly be expected to recognize other forms of abuse. A knight who would mistake a dragon for an angleworm would probably mistake a one-eyed giant for a prairie dog, and go on crusading with the new crusaders without picking trouble where he ought to have had trouble.

The gentleman from Alabama, in charge of this bill, and other gentlemen on the majority side, are guilty of serious error when they talk of a "consumers'" tariff. It has been often pointed out that in any well-ordered community the consumer is also the producer. The tramp and the idle rich are the only nonproductive consumers.

The sort of tariff we need is a tariff for the benefit of the unprivileged, for the men who have no means of shifting the burden of taxation on the man below him, and we all know what that shifting is. Does the landowner pay the tax? Not if he can make the tenant do it for him; and the tenant, if he keeps a store, makes the man who deals with him pay his rent and his tax, and eventually the tax drops on and stays on the back of the man who can not shift it onto the back of some one else.

We need a system that will lead toward productive endeavor, not one that will encourage misplaced effort. The call for labor, capital, and brains is heard wherever our resources lie.

Some of our wise men are talking about a "competitive tariff." That is a loose phrase, but there is back of it definite meaning. Privilege is always wasteful. A railroad that is permitted to overcharge for freight or passengers cares little for economy. It takes pressure to force improvement. In many lines we may hope for remedy from the pressure of competition; from others, essentially noncompetitive, as our public utilities, we must look to regulation. It is our hope that this tariff will wake up our backward people; that it will cause our merchants to cut across lots to the elimination of unnecessary costs, and that when our economic thinking gets on a straight track it will stay there and go on down the line and not again get off on a blind stub siding.

But this is no time or place for a lecture on political economy. Whole books would be required to follow through the argument against malemployment, waste, and that form of private taxation known as privilege. I should like, before I close, to consider a few matters that are of interest to the unprivileged, leaving them with you as facts to be met, without pretending to offer any definite remedy at the present time.

First, as to our costs of distribution. The findings of the Tariff Commission show that in the case of three typical articles of cotton manufacture in England there was a margin of from 40 to 70 per cent between the factory price and the consumer's price. The same articles showed a margin of from 90 to 150 per cent in this country. Here is something outside of the difference in the cost of labor at home and abroad. It is obvious that our distribution is preyed upon by parasites to a greater extent than that of England.

Col. Wilson, of the commissary service in the Isthmus, is selling the best quality of American corn-fed porterhouse steaks at 20 cents a pound, with bone and fat trimmed off. This is just about half of what such steaks would cost in Washington. He buys them of the iniquitous packers at prices thoroughly satisfactory to them. He has a monopolized market. He has no waste, he is not conducting the business for profit. He pays no rent. One man on a fair salary runs a business supplying 20,000 people with their daily meat at one-half the costs of competitive marketing here. Must democracy forever be wasteful and inefficient? Must we call ourselves socialists before we can fight against waste and unproductive employment?

In 1887 I sold land in Nebraska at less than $20 an acre. The men who bought it could pay for it with six crops of 20-cent corn. That land is now worth $100 an acre, and six crops of 50-cent corn will not pay for it.

The mechanic who has no land wherewith to tax some one else pays twice as much for his ham and his bacon as he used to do. The land value is an item, and a most important item, in the present cost of food. The community creates the land value. The individual owner gets the value and the community over and over and over again and forever pays for the value it has created in interest or in rent.

The cities are too big. They represent two legitimate functions—manufacturing and distributing. It is in the cities that we realize the tremendously overloaded condition of the distributing business—too many banks, too many brokers, too many wholesalers, jobbers, and retailers, with all their employees, and all eating. The limit of the city's usefulness as a manufacturing center is reached and overreached by extravagant land values. There is a continuing exodus of productive enterprises from the city into the suburbs, yet the city apparently eats just as much as it did before the removal. Who pays for the extravagance of the big buildings for the transportation systems in the overgrown city? Who pays interest on $100 to $500 per square foot of land value? It all is loaded on the distributing and manufacturing costs of the country.

The Panama Canal represents the opening of great commerce, a great world service, but the building costs of underground and overhead railways in the city of New York represent a greater fixed capital than used in the great canal.

If we grant that New York is too big, if we are willing to admit that a city a quarter of its size could perform its functions just as well, then we must realize the terrible waste of capital found not only in the great buildings, but in providing these means of transportation for a surplus and an unproductive population.

We know how scarce is capital when called upon to develop productive rural industry. It must be scarce somewhere to make up for the extravagant misuse of funds in great cities. The great insurance companies have continuously taken from the country communities, where capital is needed, and with one or two honorable exceptions have used their funds almost entirely toward increasing the burdensome development of the overgrown cities.

There is no panacea, there is no patent serum, that can cure our economic ills, but it is time that we at least have a diagnosis, that we faced the situation, and know what is the trouble with us. All the numberless forms of waste are destroying our substance. The liquor traffic, military expenditures, our luxuries, these are some of the visible items in our course of extravagance, but after all there is nothing to compare with the vast destruction caused by the great army of people who are honestly, patiently, and laboriously doing useless things, or useful things in the wrong way and the wrong place, an army that must be supported by those productively and profitably em-

ployed. It is for this malemployment that the protective tariff is largely to blame.

I shall vote for the Democratic bill because it represents a lowering of the tariff. It is a blow at one form of privilege. It represents an attempt to secure direct taxation, which is better than a cowardly system of indirect taxation. [Applause.] I wish some of the schedules were treated differently. I wish cattle were on the free list, so that we can secure our young stock from Mexico, where it can be raised cheaper. [Applause.] I believe there may be a mistake in totally eliminating the tariff from wool, for though wool is now practically on a free-trade basis, despite the 11-cent specific duty, the psychology of the situation may discourage the woolgrower and thereby cut down an important part of our meat supply. It would have been better, in my opinion, to have levied one-half the duty proposed in the Republican bill, or 9 cents on clean content, for a short term of years.

I wish that more time were given to considering the condition of the citrus-fruit industry, where a crop only comes at the end of eight years of cultivation and where reduction should be more gradual than in the case of annual crops.

There is no sense whatever, as I see it, in protecting rice or wheat or other annual crops from the appetites of our hungry people.

There are doubtless many clauses in the bill that are open to criticism, but as the average of it is good I shall not stand by and make faces at it, not even the sort of flint faces promised us by the gentleman from New York, but shall take the medicine, which I believe to be wholesome and in general terms for the public welfare. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I print as a part of my remarks the following articles from the Valve World, by R. T. Crane:

Mr. R. T. Crane, at the time of his death in 1912, was one of the greatest manufacturers in the world. Aside from combinations of railroads, his company, the Crane Co., was the greatest consumer of American steel. After having paid tribute to the Steel Trust on all their watered stock and tariff privileges, the goods manufactured by his organization went throughout the world on a competitive basis.

Mr. Crane preached and proved the doctrine that well-paid, intelligent, efficient labor is the cheapest labor. His firm not only paid the maximum wages but annually shared their profits, to the extent of an aggregate of millions of dollars, with their employees. While they practiced and taught the theory of efficiency, the theory and practice were always carried out with the utmost regard for the well-being of the employees. Theirs, one of the greatest manufacturing businesses in the United States, has been just to labor, has provided promotion through merit, and, while burdened with the protective tariff exacted by the producers of steel and iron, has never asked for even compensating privilege from the Nation.

The views of such a man, with such a record of honorable success, on the subject of tariff are certainly worthy of public consideration.

[From the Valve World, January, 1911.]

WHAT CONSTITUTES A SCIENTIFIC TARIFF.

Much is heard nowadays about a scientific revision of the tariff. I have been endeavoring to find out just what a scientific tariff really means, and have reached the conclusion that it means the application of common sense and honesty, not only in the revision of the tariff but in the levying of the tariff itself.

The relative merits of free trade and protection I do not care to discuss. Each has its plausible arguments. The free trader insists that there should be nothing that will interfere with a man selling his product or making his purchases in the best possible market, and that the same freedom of trade should exist between nations as now exists between the individual States of the Union.

On the other hand, the protectionist claims that all countries are natural trade enemies and that a tariff is but one form of expressing the instinct of self-preservation; that it enables new industries to get started, which in turn furnish employment to labor; that the laborer in a protected industry is doubly benefited by the tariff, personally, because it has given him employment and generally, because anything that gives employment benefits all; hence everyone is benefited either directly or indirectly. Undoubtedly this has been true in hundreds of cases in this country, but that does not prove that a tariff is necessarily a good thing when it is applied to every infant industry just because it is an infant industry.

My idea of a scientific or common-sense tariff is one that is based upon these principles: First of all, can this industry be profitably developed under all the circumstances? Second, does it need help or protection to get started? And, third, if protected in getting a start, will it, when started, be able to take care of itself or must it be forever bolstered up by the tariff? Unless these can all be answered in the affirmative a tariff is not only unscientific but nonsensical, not to use a harsher term. There is no sense nor justice in requiring all to pay a higher price so that a very few may be temporarily or permanently benefited.

There should be not only a possible profitable development of the industry, but a very strong probability that the industry when once started will be able to take care of itself and show a profit without the help of the tariff in order to justify its imposition in the beginning.

Another instance for the application of a scientific tariff, although at first thought it may not seem that a tariff should be levied at all, is in the case of a country whose agricultural wealth has been greatly depleted and which produces goods that we require, but which, because of lack of skill and training, we can not advantageously produce, while we in turn are exporting food products to that country. A common-sense method of handling this situation would be to induce these people to emigrate to this country where their skill and training would find a ready market, while at the same time they could secure their foodstuffs to better advantage. This would obviate the present expensive method. In advocating this I do it on the theory that these people would make a desirable class of citizens. One of the indirect benefits of such an emigration would be that these people would help to populate and develop the country.

Having pointed out the general principles which underlie a scientific or common-sense tariff, with illustrations thereof, let me now cite a few instances in which a tariff would not only be unscientific and nonsensical but positively harmful to the community at large. Such would be the imposition of a tariff to protect and develop an industry in which we are at a decided disadvantage; for example, the tin industry in California or the raising of pineapples or bananas in this country.

An equally palpable blunder would be to attempt to force the development of any line of business in which we are at a disadvantage, when by so doing we would bring in an undesirable class of people. Our experience in attempting to develop the silk industry is an illustration of my point. Before the introduction of a high duty on silk we were buying our silks abroad from countries where the workmen did not receive in excess of $1 per day. These wages formed the basis of the price which we were compelled to pay for the silk we consumed. But when the high tariff was levied we brought these men over here, paid them $3 a day, and since then we have purchased our silks at a price fixed on that basis. In many cases these people turned out to be undesirable citizens. Thus the tariff failed to produce any good at all.

Another illustration of our extremely unscientific tariff is a tariff that has for its object the protection of an agricultural product. If it can not be raised to advantage in our soil—that is, in successful competition with any other country—it would be better to buy it elsewhere and devote our soil and energy to the things that we can produce advantageously and profitably.

Practically all of the land of this country has either been given away by the Government or sold by it to the farmer at $1.25 an acre. The amount of money that has been made from the products of these farms and through the increased value of the land is something stupendous. It represents probably 75 per cent of the entire wealth of the country. I can imagine nothing more absurd or ungrateful than for the owners of this land to ask for protection for any of their products. When they do so they become greater hogs than the hogs they raise.

What is true of the agricultural products is equally true of the lumber and mineral products. They are parallel cases. Immense fortunes have come from what was essentially a gift in the first instance. Then for the owners of the land, after all that has been given them, to ask for protection for its products is very selfish, to say the least.

The Americans have always boasted of their great mechanical ability and of the agricultural and mineral richness of their country. There is not the slightest doubt but that the American mechanic is the most able and productive mechanic in the world and that we have a greater wealth of natural resources than any other country. Either the above statements are not true or a protective tariff is not necessary. For surely a combination of the greatest natural resources and greatest mechanical ability should be able to compete with the world. In view of these facts it is entirely inconsistent for this country to perpetually maintain a protective tariff on anything.

Undoubtedly the general idea of protection is that given at the beginning, namely, the protection of those lines in which we can come very near competing with foreign countries without any tariff assistance, but that these infants should not be protected after they are on their feet. It is one thing to help a child to his feet and quite another to act as a crutch for him to lean on the rest of his life. The public has been taxed enough in helping them to get established and should be relieved from furnishing any further assistance. Any further help is mulcting the general public.

When an industry has been established a great many years, there has been an abundant opportunity to determine whether its goods can be produced in this country to advantage or not. Then if the people engaged in it continue to ask for protection it would seem to be conclusive evidence that it never should have been protected.

To continue this protection to any considerable extent after they are on their feet is nothing short of highway robbery, and when these people become bold and arrogant and form large combinations for the purpose of robbing the public it is time that the American people sat up and took notice.

But this abuse of the tariff, despicable as it is, is not its worst feature. The worst feature of a high or unjust tariff is that it corrupts the public service, demoralizes the public, and offers an incentive for smuggling, undervaluation, etc. It leads to the bribing of Congressmen, revenue officers, and everyone who is in any way connected with the administration of the tariff law. Evidence that this demoralization permeates every corner and class of the country is too recent to need mention. Exposures in New York, where large quantities of foreign goods are being received continually, are so numerous that except in rare cases they cause no comment.

Undervaluation and fraud have been reduced to a science. Every possible scheme has been diligently studied that the Government may be defrauded with ease and dispatch. Some time ago a gentleman engaged in the manufacture of crockery informed me that a German firm had taken a man out of the internal-revenue department at New York City and was paying him $100,000 a year to look after its interest in defrauding the Government.

This country is full of men who apparently stand pretty well in society and business, but who defraud the Government whenever they have any possible opportunity to do so, and they have abundant opportunity. Let me illustrate just how far this has gone. Some years ago a highly respectable firm in New York City wanted to get spelter into this country without paying a duty, so they had it made in the form of statuary, which was not subject to duty. After getting the statuary safely deposited here, they proceeded to have it melted and put back in the form of spelter slabs.

But decidedly the worst feature of this demoralization is the smuggling of jewelry, which is carried on to an unlimited extent and by those who are called our very best people, and particularly by the women. In fact, persons who would not think of stealing $5 will defraud the Government out of thousands of dollars in this way, and instead of considering it disgraceful they will frequently boast of it. The same may be said of opium, which demoralizes in more ways than one. What is true of jewelry and opium applies equally to many lines of expensive fabrics which are easily concealed.

I think this is another argument in favor of a scientific, honest tariff. In other words, I believe that a scientific tariff would not tend to make thieves and liars of people to such an extent as our present tariff does. It is my opinion that it would be much better to have no tariff at all on such articles and raise the revenue in some other way than to use a method which has such demoralizing effects.

Nine-tenths of the people who defraud the Government justify it on the ground of the unreasonableness of the tariff, but that is no excuse in morals. Of course a man is unfortunate when his fellow men feel justified in defrauding him, but a Government is doubly unfortunate when its people feel that way toward it, and especially so when they can point out glaring inconsistencies, absurd classifications and distinctions, and excessive duties, where, according to the true principle of the protective tariff, there should be no tariff at all.

This is not said in extenuation of those who defraud the Government—far from it; but character is not particularly abundant to-day, and if the Government can do nothing to build up character in its people it certainly can ill afford to make laws whose tendency is to destroy what little character the people now have and whose effect is altogether reprehensible.

—

[From the Valve World, July, 1911.]

OUR PRESENT UNSCIENTIFIC TARIFF.

In the Valve World, January, 1911, we published an article giving our ideas of what constitutes a scientific tariff. We wish at this time to consider the question of an unscientific tariff, or one which is not constructed in a business-like way, but consists principally in giving everybody what they ask for as a payment for campaign contributions.

In the previous article we laid down the following principles as the basis of a scientific tariff. First, can the industry be profitably developed under all the circumstances; second, does it need help or protection to get started; third, if given protection to get started, will it, when started, be able to take care of itself, or must it be forever protected? Our contention is that unless the above questions can be answered in the affirmative a protective tariff should not be levied.

Judged by the above principles, or by any other principle, our present tariff is highly unscientific. It is founded on no scientific principle; it makes no effort to discover whether the industry can ever be practically developed or not. It pays even less attention to whether an industry really needs any help in getting started. Third, and most reprehensible of all, it assumes that the industry once protected must be forever protected; that the infant industry which has become an industrial giant shall be most liberally protected. The whole thing is a crazy-quilt, hodgepodge affair. The tariffs are largely returns for campaign "fat," tariff favors being promised and awarded in proportion to the liberality of the campaign contributions of the interested parties. It was framed with the deliberate intention of aiding the few at the expense of the many.

HOW TARIFFS ARE MADE.

Mr. H. E. Miles, chairman of the tariff committee of the National Association of Manufacturers, gives the best explanation of the method pursued that we have noticed. He says, "The people instruct and trust Congress to grant just, equitable, and ample protection; Congress trusts the Ways and Means Committee; this committee trusts such persons as Dalzell, PAYNE, Aldrich, etc., and they trust the trusts." The method is very simple, very convenient, and very satisfactory indeed to the protected interests who write their own tariff schedules.

He relates an instance of where a representative of the Government was asked for relief from a tariff schedule. He referred the party to a New England manufacturer, agreeing to act in accordance with this protected manufacturer's wishes. Said the manufacturer, "I wrote that schedule myself, and I will not consent to a modification of it." The present unscientific, not to say dishonest and tricky manner of making a tariff, is so patent to any observer that it is not worth while to discuss it.

The tariff is highly unscientific because it is not needed. The last thing that this country needs is a protective tariff. A protective tariff, practically considered, has for its object the supplementing of nature and man to this extent, that the conditions of production shall be as nearly equalized as possible, and to that extent only. Therefore if a country is extremely rich in natural resources, especially favored in climate, and blessed with an inventive people, the whole combination making for a greater per capita production and hence a decreased unit cost of production, it follows that that country does not need and should not have a protective tariff, except possibly as a makeshift for raising revenue. The advisability of using the tariff as a revenue producer is not within the scope of this article.

CONDITIONS FAVORABLE TO CHEAP UNIT COST OF PRODUCTION.

Conditions in America are, on the whole, more favorable to a cheaper unit cost of production than in any other country. Climate and blood under the fostering care of Democracy have produced the American laborer, who, because of his intelligence, his ingenuity, his inventiveness, and his efficiency is at once the wonder and the admiration of the world.

Add to these our wonderful natural resources, the juxtaposition in which they are often found, and our wonderful growth of capital, and together they form a combination which should enable us to meet and vanquish the world. We not only should, but we can and are doing it to-day. The boast of America has always been that she has the greatest agricultural and mineral resources, the greatest mechanical ability, and the most productive laborers. These boasts are every one true.

No argument is necessary to prove the truth of the above statement in regard to the richness of America's natural resources. A catalogue of the ingenious and useful inventions is but a roll call of American inventors. To anyone who has considered the question the efficiency of the American workman, as compared with any other, is equally apparent. Why, then, is a protective tariff needed to equalize conditions of production when every advantage is in favor of this country?

To-day America stands head and shoulders above the world in manufacturing, and consequently the manufacturing interests no longer need a protective tariff. The world's working power is estimated to have doubled in the last half century, due largely to the use of steam. During the same period America's efficiency has increased tenfold, while that of her nearest competitor has increased only fourfold.

Just what this means in the volume of output and in decreased cost of production is certainly not appreciated, even if understood, and least of all by Americans. It is claimed that 50,000 people, with the aid of machinery, now do what it required 16,000,000 persons to do a few years ago. Man for man the American laborer produces 50 per cent more by hand labor and 100 per cent more by machine labor than any of his competitors. The following furnishes a good illustration: In Lancastershire a man who can tend two looms is counted a very fair workman; in New England a man who can not tend eight looms is rated as an apprentice, and paid accordingly. As a result we have risen from fourth to a close second in textiles, eclipsed Sheffield in cutlery, and now produce one-third of the hardware of the world, while consuming but one-seventh.

High-priced labor produces a cheaper article than low-priced labor. Manufacturers say that they can profitably export hardware which contains a great deal of labor and a small amount of raw material, but that they can not export hardware in which the raw material constitutes a large proportion of the value.

WHY ARGUE? WE ARE EXPORTERS.

After all, what is the use of arguing this question? Why not take the facts? The fact that we are exporting all the great staples in manufacturing lines in successful competition with the world is absolutely conclusive evidence that no protection is needed. We can not afford to take our time nor that of our readers to go exhaustively into what articles we are exporting, but will mention only a few.

Everyone, of course, knows that we are exporting enormous quantities of steel; agricultural implements by the shipload; locomotives, sewing machines, typewriters, electrical machinery, and shiploads of machinists' tools, and it follows that if we can profitably export these lines we can also do the same on all collateral lines.

The steam engine is the product of skilled labor, and yet we defy competition. We commenced exporting locomotives very soon after they were invented. Our people took large contracts for them in Russia, and have been exporting them in large quantities ever since.

In the last three years they have been supplied to Great Britain, France, and southern Germany, and remember, they were formerly our competitors in South America. Skilled labor constructs our electrical machinery, and yet we fear no foreign competition, even in the markets of the world. Our agricultural machinery is made by skilled labor, and yet we export it to all countries. Our sewing machines are manufactured by skilled labor, yet scarce a country could be named where they can not be found.

The list could be extended to include practically every item in the nine groups of articles of domestic manufacture which form the principal manufactured articles exported from the United States. These nine groups, which form about 80 per cent of the total value of manufactures exported, are iron and steel manufactures, $179,133,186; copper manufactures, $88,004,397; agricultural implements, $28,124,033; wood manufactures, $14,570,064; mineral oils, refined, $93,813,031; chemicals, drugs, dyes, etc., $21,415,935; leather and manufactures of leather, $52,646,755; cotton manufactures, $33,397,097; paper and manufactures of paper, $16,083,271.

AMERICA CAN MANUFACTURE CHEAPER.

Our preeminence abroad is directly due to the products of our factories and workshops. In discussing the cause of our rapid rise and domination of the industrial world the Hamburger Fremdenblatt says: "The steel manufactories of the United States, which two decades ago were in their infancy, to-day control the markets and the prices of the world and have attained not only a position that enables them to compete with the older iron and steel producing countries, but even to profitably export their products to England"—and why not? Mr. Dalzell, who represents Pittsburgh in Congress, and who should be competent to speak of conditions in the iron and steel industry, was asked:

"Can the gentleman from Pennsylvania name me any steel mill in the world that can make steel rails cheaper than they are made at Pittsburgh? Can the gentleman from Pennsylvania name me any iron furnace in the world that can make pig iron cheaper than at Birmingham?"

Mr. Dalzell answered: "I think not; I am coming to that question." That question was never answered by Mr. Dalzell; to answer it truthfully would at once break down the whole theory of the protectionists, because if steel can be manufactured at Pittsburgh cheaper than anywhere else, and iron in Birmingham cheaper than elsewhere, there can be no excuse for a protective tariff on such products either to protect the manufacturers or the laboring men employed in those industries, for no one can successfully compete with them.

For 25 years the American workingman has been told that he receives higher wages than the English workman solely because of protection, but he now knows this can not be true, because the English workman receives higher wages than the German workman, although the German tariff is higher than the tariff of Great Britain. Protection does not make good wages. The American workman receives higher wages because of his greater intelligence and skill and because of the greater hope which free institutions give; because of improved machinery, because of the better conditions that surround him. In a word, because he produces more; that is, earns more.

Down to 1890 the imports of iron and steel were far in excess of our exports. It is now calculated by the Bureau of Statistics that during the 10 years ending June 30, 1910, the value of iron and steel manufactures exported was more than four times the value of the imports of iron and steel for the last decade. At the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1910, manufactures formed 45 per cent of our total exports as compared with 35 per cent in 1900 and 21 per cent in 1890. For 1910 automobiles and parts of automobiles exported was to the value of $11,190,220; manufactures of india rubber, $10,175,634; scientific instruments, $12,535,643.

To-day every manufacturing country in the world looks upon America as her greatest rival. From the above facts several conclusions appear. America has secured her position in the markets of the world on her merits. She has had no encouragement from foreign countries in entering their markets, but has entered them, in many cases, in the face of great prejudice. Patriotism has tended to make the entry extremely difficult. Consequently America has won her supremacy strictly on the merits of her products or on her prices, or on both.

Therefore, if the American manufacturer can successfully compete abroad when paying a high price for raw material caused by the tariff, he certainly could more successfully compete if he had cheaper raw material. Especially would this be true of the large number of manufacturers whose completed product is not protected, but whose raw material is. The success of the American manufacturer under the present adverse conditions demonstrates conclusively our contention that the American manufacturer neither needs nor deserves a protective tariff. It merely serves to enrich the favored class at the expense of the whole people. It is as wrong in theory as it is reprehensible in practice.

AMERICAN LABORER IN SUCCESSFUL COMPETITION WITH THE WORLD.

Advocates of protection insist that it would be manifestly unfair to put the American laborer in competition with the cheaper labor of other countries. As a matter of fact, he is in successful competition with that very labor in its home countries to-day, as we have shown above. It might

be added that as a rule the workers in the most highly protected industries in America labor under the worst conditions, as the investigations at Homestead and elsewhere have shown.

This plea is a fraud. Consider for a moment the number of laborers affected by foreign competition. If the proportion of other censuses govern, there is not to exceed 1,500,000 laborers, those in gainful occupations, who could possibly be affected by foreign competition, while there are about 28,000,000 in gainful occupations who would not be affected. Since when does 1,500,000 deserve more consideration than the 28,000,000? No effort is made to protect the American laborer from the foreign laborer who comes to this country, brings his standard of living and wages with him, and who is employed in some highly protected industry.

This talk that protection is wanted in order to protect the laborer is simply one of the means used by the protectionists to pull the wool over the eyes of the public, and is on a par with the claim that the big manufacturers demand a tariff in order to protect the small manufacturer.

Were the tariff to disappear, the American manufacturer could more easily continue his conquest of foreign markets. This would give an added impetus to manufacturing which would in turn furnish more employment for labor and tend to give employment for the large amounts of capital that are being exported. We are exporting not only the products of our factories and workshops, but money, skilled laborers, and brains. Within the last few years a number of our large concerns have established plants in Europe, Mexico, and Canada and elsewhere for the manufacture of goods for which there is an active demand. We have established plants for the manufacture of electrical supplies in Canada, England, and France; air brakes in Russia, England, and Germany; shoe machinery at Frankfort on the Main; and tanners' machinery at Frankfort, Vienna, Liecester; radiators in Germany, England, and Italy; and so on. Thus the Government is deprived of the duty which this raw material would bring; the foreign laborers receive the wages that should go to American laborers, while America's exports fall off to just that extent.

Therefore the real object of a protective tariff—the employment of both capital and labor at home—are both being defeated by our present tariff. Hence a protective tariff under such conditions is an inconsistency, a fraud, and a worker of injustice.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, even the distinguished chairman of the committee which drew the measure now under consideration does not claim it to be a perfect one. It falls far short even of his ideal. It is in large part a compromise of conflicting elements, and in certain details it is sadly disappointing, especially to those who had hoped that in a Democratic tariff no vestige of privilege or favoritism would be found.

But faulty as the measure may be in particular items, far as it falls short of perfection, sadly as it may lack in consistency, it is still a long step in the right direction. It has merits so surpassing that its shortcomings are almost negligible; it goes so long a way toward the redemption of Democratic promises and the fulfillment of popular expectation that even the free trader like myself may applaud it with sincerity and vote for it without stultification.

Had I been writing it items which now find a place in the dutiable list would certainly have been dropped therefrom. In a score, or perhaps a hundred, instances duties which seem to me excessive and indefensible upon any revenue ground would have been brought lower, if not eliminated. But in a matter of this sort it is a question of give and take. Something must be yielded here and something yielded there; but if the main purpose shall be kept in sight these concessions can not greatly detract from the final result.

And so in this Underwood tariff we find an achievement along Democratic lines which may well appeal to Democrats of all shades and all persuasions. It so splendidly enlarges the free list that we may forgive its errors in the direction of accorded privileges to special interests. It so generously answers the prayer of the masses for cheaper food, cheaper clothing, cheaper farm implements, cheaper lumber, cheaper manufactures of all sorts that it is possible to disregard the lapses from grace which here and there obtrude in certain of the schedules.

Not since the Walker tariff of 1846 have we had one drawn so nearly in harmony with the revenue idea. It goes further toward the unshackling of trade and industry than any other tariff which this generation has known. And we may well anticipate that its results will be equally salutary, for, like the Walker tariff, it is bound to stimulate industry of every sort. It can not fail to lift burdens from the masses and make it possible for the man of toil to stand more erect and free. The Walker tariff inaugurated an era of prosperity the like of which had not been known before and which has not since been surpassed. This is not my testimony alone; it is the testimony of the late James G. Blaine. As a historian he was compelled to tell the truth about the tremendous awakening which followed the so-called free-trade enactment. It was not a free-trade measure any more than this one is, but it was a measure insuring freer trade; it was one which conceded the least to favor and the most to desert; it was one which held out the fewest premiums to the classes and the fullest inducements to the masses.

But it is said that a lowering of tariff rates will react unfavorably upon wages. This might be true if there were any relation direct or remote between tariff rates and wage rates. No such relation now exists or ever did exist. Wages no more depend upon tariff schedules than they do on the tides. In the last analysis they depend upon what labor can produce on the best free land in use. And so it was urged in the argument supporting the Walker tariff that what labor needed was not protection but opportunity; it needed access to the land; this denied, wages were bound to decline, no matter how high tariff rates might be lifted.

We have had 50 years of protection, yet in relation to the product labor is receiving less to-day than it was half a century ago. Even nominal wages are scarcely higher in 1913 than they were in 1860. Measured in the product they are actually lower. That is to say, while labor is producing on the average a much greater volume of wealth, it is retaining a relatively smaller proportion in wages. It is therefore not so well paid relatively as it was before protection set up shop as the dispenser of alleged benefits to the worker.

When one begins to look into the real effects of a tariff it is found that they are different from those usually advertised. Not only does it fail to keep faith with labor, it equally fails to keep faith with capital as capital, for it robs both, it discourages both, it impairs the development of both. It does this by diverting both from the normal and the natural into the abnormal and the unnatural; it draws them away from the naturally productive employments into employments which can succeed only at the expense of other employments; and in the long run every tariff benefit is absorbed by the owners of natural resources. Thus a tariff on lumber slips through the hands of lumber workers and lumber manufacturers into those of the owners of stumpage. A tariff on sugar does not benefit the cane grower as a cane grower or the labor employed in sugar making; it is reaped by the owner of sugar lands. And so all along the line. It is true of iron; it is true of coal; it is true of citrus fruits; it has been true of every single industry for which tariffs have been laid on the theory that those employed in them or who had money invested in them were to reap benefits in higher wages or augmented interest. The benefits, in fact, have always accrued at last to the owners of the sources of supply.

If this could be once understood in all its real and vital significance by the masses of the people, the end of all tariffs would soon be reached. [Applause.] But the world has so fuddled itself regarding wages and tariffs and the relation of the one to the other and there has been such hopeless confusion of counsel with respect to the ultimate effects of protection upon business in general that it is almost impossible to get the average man to study the questions at issue in the light of reason or even in the light of actual experience. There might something be said for the tariff proposition if under protection we had always and everywhere enjoyed prosperity, with high wages, satisfactory profits, and a diffused social comfort. But under the very highest protection ever known we have undergone some of our very worst depressions, with wages sinking to the minimum, with employment precarious, with credit unsettled, with all industry in a state of paralysis, and with general conditions so distressing that the very foundations of society seemed to be crumbling. Nor has this been peculiar to our own land. The very same phenomena have been witnessed repeatedly in other lands where protection was supposed to spread its beneficence over all. It has been the same delusion there as we have found it here. It has never in any country or at any time kept its promises to those who accorded it a place in their scheme of things.

It is the failing of our Republican friends that they are somewhat like the African, with his crooked stick. To it he ascribed all the good things which happened to him. All the bad things he ascribed to something else. And is not this precisely what our protectionist friends are doing and have always done? Do they not ascribe all our prosperity, our growth, our expansion, our progress, and our development to the blessed tariff, while ascribing to something else the panics and depressions which have come upon us under that tariff? As a matter of fact, the tariff has neither bred nor prevented these panics and depressions. They have come in spite of tariffs, and they would recur were tariffs to be wiped out root and branch. But tariffs have undoubtedly played some part in them, though generally but a small part, the real cause of them lying in the monopoly of opportunity and in the evils springing therefrom. If one will but take the trouble to study the history of industrial depressions in this and other countries he will discover that they have always and everywhere been preceded by a speculative rise in land values.

That Robert J. Walker, away back in the first half of the last century, saw the wage question in its true relations, and

that he most effectually disposed of the protectionist claim that wages depend upon tariff schedules, is shown by the report he submitted to Congress as Secretary of the Treasury. In that reoprt he said, among other things:

It is an argument urged in favor of the tariff that we ought to protect our labor against what is called the pauper labor of Europe. But while the tariff does not enhance the wages of labor, the sales of public lands at low prices and in limited quantities to settlers and cultivators would accomplish this object. If those who live by the wages of labor could purchase 320 acres for $80, 160 acres for $40, 80 acres for $20, or a 40-acre lot for $10 the power of the manufacturing capitalist in reducing the wages of labor would be greatly diminished, because when these lands were thus reduced in price those who live by the wages of labor could purchase farms at low rates and cultivate the soil for themselves and families instead of working for others 12 hours a day in the manufactories.

The logic of Walker's position is as true to-day as it was in 1845, and that logic is a complete refutation of the protectionist argument; it is a complete answer to every question raised in support of the Republican proposition that the tariff raises and maintains wages. The tariff never did anything of the sort. The lowest wages ever paid in the steel mills of my town were paid under the highest kind of protection, and the salient fact should never be lost sight of that the highest wages obtaining in this country are commanded by labor in industries where so-called protection is impossible.

We have heard a good deal in the course of the discussion on this bill of the decline of agriculture in the United States, and alarmist pictures have been drawn in this connection, some going so far as to predict that we should soon cease to be an exporting country, so far as foodstuffs are concerned, and that we must look forward to the time when we must go abroad for these. But why has agriculture declined in the United States relatively, if not actually? Is not the answer obvious? Has it not relatively declined simply because of the stupendous premiums we have been holding out to labor and capital to engage in manufacturing? How could it be expected that, with lures of 40, 50, 75, 100, and even 250 per cent premiums dangled before them in the shape of tariff duties, labor and capital could be kept on the farm?

If there has been anything in the last 50 years of Republican legislation which has not been actually discouraging to agriculture, the fact has been overlooked by most observers, for not only has enterprise been tempted away from the soil by the special rewards offered to it in making steel and weaving cloth and blowing glass and producing a thousand and one things in mills and factories, but we have gone further than this in driving capital and labor from the primitive pursuit by compelling the tiller of the soil to pay tribute to sugar, to steel, to copper, to lumber, to woolens, to chemicals, to leather, and to 500 other protected interests.

Mr. Chairman, I come from the seat of one of the largest steel plants in America. It is, in fact, the mother of all the other steel plants on American soil. It has grown great and it is growing steadily greater, less by reason of the protection it has been accorded by Republican legislation than because for many long years it has enjoyed exemption from local and State taxation on its products. For in Pennsylvania we have been enlightened at least to this extent—that for a generation or more we have ceased fining men for manufacturing. We still fine them for building houses and for having certain kinds of property in their possession, but we no longer fine them for producing iron and steel and textiles and all the myriad things coming from our mills and factories. This is the one advantage which Pennsylvania has enjoyed over her sister manufacturing States, and she has surpassed them all in many lines simply because this advantage was like that of a discriminating freight rate in her favor. Pennsylvania has been called the royal palace of King Steel, and surely he has luxuriated there if any where. But Pennsylvania has been his royal palace much more because our great State has refused to punish him for operating his furnaces and transforming ore into the finished product than because Congress has built a tariff wall at our coasts to protect him from his foreign rivals. And I have not the least fear that the great steel mills in my town will cease operations, or even relax operations, because of the changes we have made in the steel schedule. Those mills are now running to capacity; they are meeting competition in the open markets of the world; they are growing steadily in capacity and in the volume of output; and I feel that the time has gone by when the 25,000 men employed in them can be frightened by the old bogie which was once so effective.

I shall be greatly disappointed should this tariff fail enormously to stimulate both imports and exports. As freer trade relations with the Philippines and Porto Rico have stimulated trade between those islands and the United States, and as both the islands and the United States have been tremendous gainers through this growth of commerce, it is fair to assume that freer trade relations with the world in general will produce similar results. Freedom in trade has never failed to bring an answer in better social conditions, higher wages, and a fairer distribution of wealth. And it seems to me that if our protectionist friends would but look around them and consider the tremendous fact that the United States comprises the largest free-trade area in all the world, they would look to this rather than to their fetish of protection as the true explanation of the progress and prosperity which have been ours in such generous and unrivaled measure. [Loud applause.]

Mr. Speaker, in the course of a short address in the House yesterday the Hon. SAMUEL W. SMITH, of Michigan, declared that the Democrats could not point to any free trade or tariff for revenue legislation which did not injuriously affect all our industries. He said:

It is not possible for one of you gentlemen to point to any free trade or tariff for revenue legislation in this country under which we have not had results like we had in 1837, in 1857, between 1893 and 1897, and I am frank to say to-day that I would like to have somebody give to the country some consolation and comfort that we can hope that this bill will be an exception to every other tariff for revenue or free-trade piece of legislation written on the statute books.

Were we to produce the testimony of Democratic authorities or even the testimony of disinterested and impartial observers to prove that the Walker tariff law (under which the lowest tariff duties were levied) produced the greatest period of prosperity this country has ever known, our Republican friends would say that we were attempting to falsify history for political effect.

Therefore I will produce the testimony of a man who for a generation was the acknowledged and undisputed national leader of the Republican Party; he was Speaker of this House, a Member of the Senate, the Republican candidate for the Presidency in 1884, and Secretary of State under two Republican administrations. I have reference to your great popular idol, James G. Blaine. As a philosophical historian he was obliged to confine himself to the facts and tell the whole truth in his admirable work "Twenty Years in Congress." In that great work he said:

TWENTY YEARS OF CONGRESS.

[By James G. Blaine.]

The Whig victory of 1848 was not sufficiently decisive to warrant any attempt, even had there been a desire, to change the tariff. Gen. Taylor had been elected without subscribing to a platform or pledging himself to a specific measure; and he was therefore in a position to resist and reject appeals of the ordinary partisan character. *Moreover, the tariff of 1846 was yielding abundant revenue; and the business of the country was in a flourishing condition at the time his administration was organized. Money became very abundant after the year 1849; large enterprises were undertaken, speculation was prevalent; and for a considerable period the prosperity of the country was general and apparently genuine. After 1852 the Democrats had almost undisputed control of the Government and had gradually become a free-trade party. The principles embodied in the tariff of 1846 seemed for a time to be so entirely vindicated and approved that resistance to it ceased, not only among the people, but among the protective economists and even among the manufacturers to a large extent. So general was this acquiescence that in 1856 a protective tariff was not suggested or even hinted by any one of the three parties which presented presidential candidates.*

It was not surprising, therefore, that with a plethoric condition of the National Treasury for two or three consecutive years the Democratic Congress in the closing sessions of Pierce's administration enacted what has since been known as the tariff of 1857. By this law the duties were placed lower than they had been at any time since the War of 1812. The act was well received by the people and was indeed concurred in by a considerable proportion of the Republican Party. * * *

(Page 202.)

The free traders consider the tariff of 1846 to be conclusive proof of the beneficial effect of low duties. They challenge a comparison of the years of its operation, between 1846 and 1857, with any other period of the history of the country. Manufacturing, they say, was not forced by a hothouse process to produce high-priced goods for popular consumption, but was gradually encouraged and developed on a healthful and self-sustaining basis not to be shaken as a reed in the wind by every change in the financial world. *Commerce, as they point out, made great advances; and our carrying trade grew so rapidly that in 10 years from the day the tariff of 1846 was passed our tonnage exceeded the tonnage of England. The free traders refer with special emphasis to what they term the symmetrical development of all the great interests of the country under this liberal tariff. Manufactures were not stimulated at the expense of the commercial interest. Both were developed in harmony, while agriculture, the indispensable basis of all, was never more flourishing. The farmers and planters at no other period of our history were in receipt of such good prices, steadily paid to them in gold coin, for their surplus product, which they could send to the domestic market over our own railways and to the foreign market in our own ships.*

Now, I admit that the low duties under the tariff law of 1833 were a factor in producing the industrial depression of 1837, and that the low duties under the tariff law of 1846 produced the industrial depression of 1857; but they were not produced in the way the Republicans imagine. The fact is that low duties have always and everywhere produced periods of marvelous material prosperity; that this prosperity has naturally and necessarily increased the demand for land; the increased demand for land has increased its economic value, and this in turn has led to land speculation. The speculative advance of

land values tends to force capital and labor to less productive fields, thus reducing their proportionate shares in the aggregate wealth produced by their combined efforts. It is evident that speculative rent can only advance at the expense of labor and capital, and that the only way that they can counteract the forcing down of wages and interest is by the cessation of production.

Take any industrial community in which population is increasing and the consequent cooperation of individual powers is developing old industries and creating new ones, and land must increase in value, constantly and continuously. This assured increase of land values naturally leads to speculation, in which future increase is confidently expected, and speculative values are forced beyond the point at which, under the normal conditions of production, their usual earnings would be received by labor and capital. Their failure to receive their just returns disposes them to stop production. This cessation of production at some parts of the industrial system must necessarily show itself at others in a lessening of effective demand, which retards production there, and thus the depression communicates itself through the whole industrial system, resulting ultimately in widespread industrial depression. This is how seasons of marvelous material prosperity and progress have produced industrial depressions and financial panics.

The taxation of land value, irrespective of improvements, would remedy this by destroying the incentive to land speculation.

During this debate much has been heard from the other side of the Chamber regarding the low labor cost of production abroad in comparison with labor cost in the United States. I deny that we are at any such disadvantage, and I reassert the proposition that ours is actually the cheapest labor on earth. And in this connection I want to call attention to the testimony of Mr. Frank A. Vanderlip, a Republican of high standing, formerly a Secretary of the Treasury, and to-day regarded as one of the foremost business men of the country. He went abroad soon after his retirement from the Treasury Department to study the commercial and economic conditions of Europe, and on his return he wrote a series of articles for an American magazine, not included in the "yellow" or muckraking class, on "The American commercial invasion of Europe." Let me quote from Mr. Vanderlip to show the idleness of the talk on the other side of our inability to cope with European competitors on account of our so-called higher wages and higher standard of living. Here is what that eminent Republican authority says:

THE AMERICAN "COMMERCIAL INVASION" OF EUROPE.

(By Frank A. Vanderlip, in Scribner's Magazine, January, 1902, p. 10.)

American locomotives, running on American rails, now whistle past the Pyramids and across the long Siberian steppes. They carry the Hindoo pilgrims from all parts of their Empire to the sacred waters of the Ganges. Three years ago there was but one American locomotive in the United Kingdom; to-day there is not a road of importance there on which trains are not being pulled by American locomotives. The American locomotive has successfully invaded France. The Manchurian Railway, which is the real beginning of oriental railway building, bought all its rails and rolling stock in the United States. American bridges span rivers on every continent. American cranes are swinging over many foreign moles. Wherever there are extensive harvests there may be found American machinery to gather the grain. In every great market of the world tools can have no better recommendation than the mark "Made in America."

We have long held supremacy as a producer of cotton. We are now gaining supremacy as makers of cloths. American cottons are finding their way into the markets of every country. They can be found in Manchester, as well as on the shores of Africa and in the native shops of the Orient. Bread is baked in Palestine from flour made in Minneapolis. American windmills are working east of the Jordan and in the land of Bashan. Phonographs are making a conquest of all tongues. The chrysanthemum banner of Japan floats from the palace of the Mikado on a flagstaff cut from a Washington forest, as does the banner of St. George from Windsor Castle. The American typesetting machines are used by foreign newspapers, and our cash registers keep accounts for scores of nations. America makes sewing machines for the world. Our bicycles are standards of excellence everywhere. Our typewriters are winning their way wherever a written language is used. In all kinds of electrical appliances we have become the foremost producer. In many European cities American dynamos light streets and operate railways. Much of the machinery that is to electrify London tram lines is now being built in Pittsburgh. The American shoe has captured the favor of all Europe, and the foreign makers are hastening to import our machinery, that they may compete with our makers. In the Far East, in the capital of Korea, the Hermit Nation, there was recently inaugurated, with noisy music and flying banners, an electric railway, built of American material by a San Francisco engineer, and now it is operated by American motormen.

Also, in Scribner's Magazine of February, 1902, page 202:

In Vienna I met an American who is at the head of one of the large boiler works in this country. He has been interested in making comparisons of the cost of labor and of the methods of work in the Viennese factories, and I found him amazed at the wasteful methods and the high labor cost that resulted from the Austrian manufacturers failing to use modern machinery.

"I was informed in one shop," he told me, "that a boiler of about 150 horsepower cost for labor alone $750." That boiler would have been built in an up-to-date shop in America for a labor cost of $150. In the United States three workmen with modern tools would accomplish as much in one day as would be done by four workmen in a Vienna shop working one week. The cost of labor in the United States would be about $5, the men receiving for this class of rough work a little more than $1.50 a day. Of the four men in the Vienna shop, two would receive 80 cents a day, one 60 cents, and one 40 cents; but even at those low wages the total labor cost there would be $15.60 against about $5 with us. I found an almost total absence of labor-saving machinery in some of the largest shops in Vienna; plates were being handled by hand; there were no riveting machines, no traveling cranes, no modern hoists.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask now how the time is balanced?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). The gentleman from Alabama has used 13 hours and 47 minutes and the gentleman from New York has used 14 hours and 8 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. About 20 minutes in my favor.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty-one minutes difference.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] that I do not desire to force the Members on his side of the House to speak at this time in the evening, and if it is agreeable to him I will move that the committee rise, and will then move that the House take a recess until 7.30 o'clock, so that they may have a full audience.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] has just been asking me for time. I do not know whether he wants it now or when he wants it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let me say, if the gentleman from Alabama will yield, that I asked the gentleman from New York for time and he refused to grant me any time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the House that we have had 45 minutes to-day.

Mr. MURDOCK. And we have had none.

Mr. PAYNE. You are not entitled to any yet. I have told the gentleman from Kansas that I would yield to him the next time I got time, and, to say the least, it is unfair for him to make any such statement as he has made to the House.

Mr. MURDOCK. I asked the gentleman if he would yield to me, and he refused to answer.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, if other gentlemen desire to go on, I am willing to stay here now. If not, in fairness to the minority, so that gentlemen on that side of the House may have a reasonable audience, if it is agreeable, I will move that the committee rise and to take a recess and come back at half past 7.

Mr. MURDOCK. I will ask the gentleman from Alabama, if we take a recess, can we have a chance to accommodate those who want to speak after half past 7?

Mr. PAYNE. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman from Kansas shall have time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman endeavor to accommodate us between that time and 11 o'clock?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will endeavor to run as late as we can to accommodate everybody, but I have no control of the time on that side of the House.

Mr. PAYNE. I am willing that the gentleman from Kansas shall have 30 minutes now, if he wants it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Why did not the gentleman from New York say that a few minutes ago when I went and asked him?

Mr. PAYNE. I told him the next time I got time I would yield to him for 30 minutes. I said that very distinctly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to go on now?

Mr. MURDOCK. I would prefer to take a recess.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise. The gentleman from Kansas says he prefers to go on after supper.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course, you gentlemen both prefer to go on when there is a crowd here.

Mr. MURDOCK. Suppose the gentleman from New York takes 30 minutes now.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman from New York wants to keep things pretty nearly on an even keel, as he can not get any understanding with reference to an equitable division for Monday. I do not care to take 30 minutes now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

APRIL 26, 1913.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as member of the committee appointed to attend the unveiling of the Jefferson statue at St. Louis.

Very truly, yours, FRANK P. WOODS.

The SPEAKER appointed Mr. PROUTY in the place of Mr. WOODS.

RECESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House take a recess until half past 7 this evening.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 7.30 o'clock this evening. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts to act as Speaker pro tempore for the evening.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until 7.30 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 7.30 o'clock p. m. by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill—with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE].

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, it has been but a few days since this tariff bill was presented to the House, and therefore there has not been sufficient time for the Members to give careful consideration to the 660 paragraphs of the various schedules and the free list, which, taken together, comprise more than 4,000 separate items.

Each of these items raises a distinct tariff question. A Member may have made a careful and extensive study of one or more schedules without thereby learning anything valuable about another. He may, for example, have acquired wide and accurate knowledge of the conditions under which wool is grown and the cost of its production in Argentina, Australia, and South Africa, in Ohio, Michigan, Montana, and Wyoming; he may know manufactures of wool, from carpets to cloths of the most delicate weave; he may be familiar with rates of wages, with capitalization of the industries and with the quantities and prices of the products of factories at home and abroad, but the great labor by which he acquired this information has given him no special knowledge that will enable him to vote intelligently on the fixing of rates on glassware and earthenware, or chemicals, or other goods imported. If there is to be an intelligent vote to fix the various duties, special knowledge of each schedule is necessary, and in some cases special knowledge of each item.

Yet this bill, with its more than 4,000 items, is to be pushed to a final vote in less than three weeks after it has been put into the hands of the Members. There has been and there can be no opportunity for the Members of this House to become familiar with the data on which the rates are based, much less to learn the probable effect of the law upon American industries, upon the wages of workingmen, upon the farmers, or even on the prices to the consumer.

With all respect to the able and distinguished gentlemen who constitute the Democratic majority on the Ways and Means Committee, and who adhere to the majority report of that committee, it may be doubted whether even they have mastered the intricacies of the bill, whether they are able to tell us what its effect will be on prices to the consumer, on the wages of the workingman, or on the prosperity of the manufacturer or the farmer.

To raise such a doubt is not to question either the ability or the diligence of these gentlemen. According to the tariff doctrine which they have adopted, they do not need to know very much about these things. The report of the Ways and Means Committee, presented by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], repudiates any desire to compare the costs of production at home and abroad or, at any rate, to use the knowledge gained by such comparison in tariff making. I quote from that report:

> The so-called theory of the cost of production as a regulator of rates was fully discussed at the time tariff revision bills were introduced by the Ways and Means Committee during the Sixty-second Congress. It will be recalled that much was said by protection advocates in support of the view that it was incumbent upon the United States to maintain a system of tariff rates that would cover differences in cost of production between the United States and foreign countries in addition to a reasonable margin of profit. That doctrine became the basis of the work of the Tariff Board which furnished reports to the President, later transmitted by the Executive to Congress, concerning wool and woolens, cottons, pulp, and paper. Many manufacturers have presented arguments based on the doctrine of comparative costs. The statement is therefore made that no part of the committee's work has been founded upon a belief in the cost-of-production theory, and the theory is absolutely rejected as a guide to tariff making.

Now, this theory, rejected by the framers of the bill, is one about which the protectionist does and must concern himself. The Progressive Party is pledged to a protective tariff which shall equalize conditions of competition between the United States and foreign countries, both for the farmer and for the manufacturer, and which shall maintain for labor an adequate standard of living. In order to frame such a tariff we desire the creation of a tariff commission for the investigation of facts and conditions which this committee deems so unimportant that the study of them as a guide to tariff making, we are informed, has been no part of the committee's work.

With its peculiar view of the tariff question it follows, of course, that the Democratic Party will have no use for a tariff commission organized to study the costs of production and the general competitive position in this country and abroad of industries seeking protection from Congress. There is a vital difference, therefore, in this respect between the tariff policy embodied in this bill and that to which the Progressive Party is committed.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration, as explained with great frankness by the men who made it, is intended to destroy the economic policy of protection. Let me quote again from the report of the Ways and Means Committee, presented by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. After reciting the tariff plank from the Democratic platform of 1912, the report says:

> We believe that this pledge contains two essential ideas, both of which have been applied in the formulation of H. R. 3321, as follows:
> 1. The establishment of duties designed primarily to produce revenue for the Government and without thought of protection.
> 2. The attainment of this end by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry.

For many years we have been told that the Democratic Party believed in a tariff for revenue, with incidental protection, but now we are to have a new and radical policy—a tariff for revenue without thought of protection. However radical this may be, it does not go beyond the Democratic platform of 1912. The tariff plank adopted at Baltimore declares that it is—

> A fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government under the Constitution has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue.

This may be now a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party, but it was not always so. James Madison, the father of the Constitution and one of the founders of the Democratic Party, believed that the Federal Government had authority to levy import duties for the purpose of protecting manufactures. On April 9, 1789, in the course of the debate on the first proposition made in the House to levy duties on goods imported into the United States, he said:

> There is another consideration. The States that are most advanced in population and ripe for manufactures ought to have their particular interests attended to in some degree. While these States retained the power of making regulations of trade they had the power to protect and cherish such institutions; by adopting the present Constitution they have thrown the exercise of this power into other hands. They must have done this with an expectation that those interests would not be neglected here.

Later in the same speech Mr. Madison laid down a general rule that commerce ought to be free and labor and industry left at large to find their proper objects, but to this general rule he admitted certain exceptions. In particular he said that where the trade regulations of a State had succeeded in building up an establishment the National Government ought not to allow the industry to perish, for, he said:

> It is not possible for the hand of man to shift from one employment to another without being injured by the change.

This Democratic statesman, and father of the Constitution, could not then have held opinions which would harmonize with the declaration of the Democratic platform of 1912.

Let me call attention again to the statement already quoted from the report of the Ways and Means Committee. The two essential ideas which have been applied in the formulation of the bill now under consideration are hostile to each other and can not permanently abide together. A tariff law which levies duties without thought of protection can not but injure or even destroy some legitimate industries. If it were intended to convey the impression that both of these "essential ideas" have been applied to the bill at once, and with equal thoroughness, then the only escape from the charge of inconsistency would be for the committee to maintain that no industry which needs protection can be a legitimate industry.

But if this is not what is meant—if an effort has been made not to injure or destroy legitimate industries which need protection—then it can not be maintained that the first essential idea of the pledge has been consistently applied to the bill; the tariff duties have not yet been fixed "with no thought of protection." That is to be done with greater thoroughness in the future. Three years from now, when sugar is to be placed on the free list, what other rates are then to be adjusted to this new tariff policy? We are fairly warned that whatever slight trace of protection the present bill may leave in the tariff system will be done away with as soon as the industries of the country have adjusted themselves to the new rates. It is the pledge of a tariff for revenue "and with no thought of protection" that is the permanent element, the abiding, essential idea of the Democratic policy.

It is said that the Democratic Party comes into power with a mandate of the people to abandon the protective system and inaugurate a new era. The Democratic Party has no such mandate from the people. The Republican Party reaffirmed its belief in a protective tariff, and its candidate received 3,484,980 votes. The Progressive Party condemned the Payne-Aldrich tariff as unjust to the people and demanded immediate downward revision of those schedules wherein duties are shown to be unjust or excessive; but the platform which was adopted as a contract with the people declared unequivocally for a protective tariff which would equalize conditions of competition between the United States and foreign countries. The candidate of the Progressive Party received 4,119,538 votes. The two large parties pledged to the protective system together polled 7,605,518 votes.

The Democratic voters, who presumably approved the platform which pronounced a protective tariff unconstitutional, numbered 6,293,454. Therefore, taking into consideration only the three large parties, the voters who approved the policy of protection outnumbered their opponents by 1,312,064. The tariff bill now under consideration will therefore incur the disapproval of a large majority of the voters of the Nation. Nevertheless it will pass the House, and perhaps the Senate, without material change, because by a stroke of luck, dependent upon a division among their opponents, a minority of the people happen to be represented by a majority in both Houses of Congress.

Your bill will pass, and you, of course, will be responsible for it. If it should lead, as you believe it will, to increased prosperity; if it should lower the cost of living without materially diminishing the incomes of the consumers, then I shall rejoice with you and be glad; but if it should lead to business depression, decreased wages, or unemployment, then your party will never be in a position to carry into effect your promise of further legislation three years from the present time.

I am a Progressive and heartily concur in the party's condemnation of the present tariff known as the Payne-Aldrich law. It is unjust to the people. In at least one of its schedules, judging from the report of the Tariff Board on manufactures of wool, the rates are so high that the manufacturer need fear no foreign competition in prices. Under no necessity, therefore, to compete in the quality of his goods he no longer needs to pay the wages necessary to secure skilled workmen. He crowds wages down far below what is necessary to maintain a decent standard of living and puts in his own pocket profits protected by an extortionate tariff. In this case, and in others like it, if you will give me the opportunity, I shall vote for a large reduction in the duties; but the bill as a whole is a dangerous experiment for which the Democratic Party alone must be responsible. There is undoubtedly a demand on the part of a great majority of the people for immediate downward revision of such schedules as have been shown to be excessive; but it is a minority of the people, and a decreasing minority, that will support a tariff framed "without thought of protection." [Applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman from Pennsylvania use all of his time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one minute remaining.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Progressive Party I am not a free trader; at the same time I have never smote upon my breast and declared "I am a high protectionist" with the pride that the Apostle Paul once proclaimed "I am a Roman citizen." I am willing to take my protection in broken doses. I believe the country has suffered under high-protection policies, and I am for the immediate downward revision of the tariff.

I also favor an income tax. Almost any kind of a tax on incomes above $4,000 is an improvement on our present method of collecting taxes. I introduced in the State Senate of the State of Washington a resolution ratifying the income-tax amendment, and when the reactionary sentiment among both the Republicans and the Democrats refused to adopt the resolution and sidetracked it into a temporary desuetude, I waited another term and helped mold sentiment in its favor. When I reintroduced the resolution at the next session the Republican and Democratic leaders had been forced into a progressive attitude on the subject and the resolution passed.

The decision of the United States Supreme Court that national income tax could not be enacted under the Federal Constitution—a decision by a majority of only 1, the minority of the court dissenting—has cost this country about a billion dollars. That sum at least has been taken from the pockets of the consumer since that decision was rendered by unconscionable tariff levies and by subtle indirect taxation that should have come from the incomes of the rich.

Would it not have been the part of common sense and good judgment to have submitted to the people this decision, with all the arguments pro and con, and permitted the people to recall the decision and tax incomes at once if they so desired rather than to have required all these years of fighting and struggling to compel the reactionary representatives in Congress and in the several legislatures to submit and approve the amendment to the Constitution? The Progressive says "Yes," and it stands with the people for authority in their hands to rule not only Congress and the President but the courts of this land.

The reactionary forces have a fit every time the recall of judges or the recall of decisions is mentioned, but I should like to suggest the connection between the recall of the decision of a jury in the State of Washington by the pardon of C. D. Hillman by President Taft, and the theft of the Washington vote in the Chicago convention for the Republican Party, and I would like to cite the fact that the two Oregon delegates who, in violation of instructions, voted against Roosevelt, obtained the long-cherished desire of their hearts after the convention adjourned in the presidential pardon of Frank P. Mays and Hamilton Hendricks.

There are industries, I believe, that ought to be protected against cheap foreign labor. There are instances where this protection can be afforded without even violating the Democratic ideal and standard as enunciated by the distinguished and able leader of their party on the floor of this House.

I now refer especially to the shingle industry of the State of Washington, which employs about 15,000 men. There are 400 mills, many of these very small mills, located on small streams and on the shores of Puget Sound. The men employed live and work close to their homes, and, of course, have their families dependent upon them. There is about $9,000,000 invested in the industry, and the pay roll of the shingle mills makes prosperity and activity of every kind in almost every community on Puget Sound.

The free list is supposed to contain, largely, raw materials, but the value of the red cedar shingle placed on board the cars in western Washington is largely labor. Stumpage is valued at from $1 to $2.50 per thousand for cedar, according to its accessibility. This means the raw material in 1,000 shingles is worth from 10 cents to 30 cents, the balance is labor—labor in the woods, labor in bringing the logs to the mills, labor in the mills manufacturing the shingles. There are few industries where the selling value is so largely labor. Why then should this industry be one singled out for the free list? Can wool or cotton or steel show so large a percentage of labor? I think not.

I hope that the disaster that is prophesied as a natural consequence upon the enactment of the proposed tariff law will fail to materialize, and I believe it will; but I submit to the consideration of the majority in this House that if men are unnecessarily thrown out of employment in one such industry as this,

the balance or equilibrium of industry will be disturbed, and thus the fiscal condition of an entire State imperiled.

There is no question of the ability of our mills to supply the demand for shingles in the United States. Never in the history of the industry have the mills been able to operate at full capacity on account of the fact that the supply would then exceed the demand. There is intense competition in the industry.

There are a number of reasons for the retention of the present duty on red cedar shingles. In British Columbia, just north of the State of Washington, and working in the same belt of timber between the Cascade Mountains and the coast, there are a number of mills, and the timber is there to furnish material for a large number of mills. About 80 per cent of the labor employed in these mills is oriental—the Chinese, the skilled workman, and the Hindu, the common laborer—whose scale of living is far below our standard.

I am reliably informed that the British Columbia manufacturers have for the past two years had an ironclad combination. The consumption of shingles in Canada is divided up among the different manufacturers, according to the number of machines which they have, and they are allowed to cut only their apportionment.

Our laws will not permit of this. They have, however, been able to run about half their capacity and are looking anxiously to the American market to permit them to run full time, holding up their market on their own shingles in Canada and using our country as a dumping ground for their surplus.

I accordingly appeal for consideration of the shingle industry, and the men employed in it, most of whom reside in the State of Washington.

In the campaign that has been waged the tariff has been a tremendous issue. It has been a potent means in the hands of so-called "captains of industry" and representatives of great wealth to gain for themselves privileges and to take away from the people their fundamental rights. The people do not know anything about a scientific tariff law nor the principles of political economy and fiscal legislation which underlie the tariff. Neither does Congress nor the Members of Congress know these things.

I have no doubt, in fact I know, that the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has the ability, if it should become his duty, to devote himself to a nonpartisan investigation of the tariff, and I have no doubt that he would make a splendid commissioner for that purpose, if he could lay aside his party obligations and accept the burdens of such an office; but I say that it is impossible for any man to make or prepare a scientific tariff or to levy its schedules with that degree of impartiality that is required while he is a great party leader and his great purpose and object is party success. Howsoever competent he may be, whatsoever his ability, he is necessarily hampered by partisan ties and his conclusions are necessarily distorted by party platform and party theories.

The Members of Congress who are members of the Ways and Means Committee are some of them expert in these lines and others are not. Those who are expert are necessarily hampered and limited by the same restrictions of party and the same prejudices of sectional representation as is the distinguished and able leader, the chairman of that committee. There are doubtless some who are Members of Congress and are on that committeee who are experts and have expert knowledge as to the tariff, but all of them are likewise circumscribed by party connection and the particular wants of the section which they represent.

But the vast majority of the representatives in Congress are in no sense qualified as experts on tariff and tariff legislation and do not claim to be. If I were to ask for a show of hands, requesting every Member of Congress here present who considers himself expert in these matters to raise his hand, I am sure but very few in honesty would respond and acknowledge that they consider themselves entitled to any such classification. I know I could not so classify myself.

The plan of the Progressive Party platform for the appointment of a nonpartisan scientific tariff board, with ample powers and sufficient compensation to enable them to devote their whole time to securing the necessary data to inform Congress as to tariff schedules and the multitude of fiscal and economical features involved in the tariff legislation so the tariff can be revised without logrolling, schedule by schedule, is the only proper plan for intelligent and scientific tariff revision. But, as I have already stated, I do not claim that any form of tariff legislation, howsoever accurate and scientific, can satisfy the people or restore to the confidence of the people the late Republican Party.

What the people want is that the power of government usurped and taken out of their hands by corrupt politicians be restored to them, so they can compel tariff revision after the best method. The people demand equal opportunity. Human welfare is being placed above the right of a few to pile up colossal fortunes. The people want to know how the Members of Congress stand on these fundamentals. They know how the delegates to the last Republican national convention stand. They know how they were elected. They know how in many cases they were rewarded and how in all cases they expected to be rewarded. They also know how William J. Bryan declared the majority of the delegates to the Democratic convention at Baltimore stood for a time at least.

In Gary, Ind., a few weeks ago 15,000 people gathered from all walks of life to pay homage to a dead newsboy. The rich jostled elbows with the poor; the doctors of law with the collectors of garbage; the lawyers with the lawbreakers; the society leader with the hired girl. Such a crowd assembled that traffic was blocked.

A crippled newsboy in a city hospital had voluntarily lain down his life to save the life of another. By his self-effacement and his humanity he had touched a chord whose notes are sweeter to the ear than the strain of an Aeolian harp played by the angel fingers of the mythical gods. We are a Nation of people prone to listen to the cry of humanity.

> When earth's high councils meet in splendid halls,
> To higher build the structure of their laws,
> Each statute framed in truth and righteousness,
> Has Sinai's code for deep foundation stone,
> And bears upon its crest the Golden Rule.

The mighty, but peaceable, revolution that is now being felt over this country was brought on when the people realized that these fundamental sentiments and principles were not observed by those who had control. In utter disregard of every humanitarian impulse, unrestrained by the authority or dignity of the law, unashamed by the exposures of criminal aggressions and fraudulent exactions, unawed by the people's demands and the people's want, criminal wealth with its organized power became superior to the Constitution and the law. They forced upon the people legislation for their own special interest.

The people's representatives were led to violate their pledges, and they foisted upon the people a "best ever" tariff that forced higher the cost of living and closed tighter the door of hope. Through child labor, overworked women, impure foods, and every form of injustice they continued to pile up their ill-gotten gains.

In gleeful rivalry corporations raced to beat each other to the remaining coal deposits, the timber, the minerals, and other resources that belonged to the public. In the spirit of pillage and by the power of the "beast" they sought to rend asunder any man in public life who would attempt to stay their hand in the name of justice and on behalf of the people. By illegal combinations the special interests increased their power until they were able to defy Congress and control the decisions of the highest tribunals. Legislatures were debauched and officers of the law made to do the bidding of their moneyed masters.

It was perfectly natural that the people should not always permit this condition to exist. Finally all over this land they became awakened and showed their determination to solve the problems that were presented by the unusual conditions, and to take part in politics as they had never done before.

Forgetting party men they sought principled men. Tired of the sounding brass and tinkling cymbal of party name and catchword, they sought for leaders in their several communities who would recognize the principle of humanity in government, and would strive to eliminate selfishness and greed to the end that the children of the poor should no longer be sacrificed to industrialism; that the virtue of their girls and the lives and bodies of their men should be conserved and their necessary wants supplied.

With this purpose in their hearts they went forward willing to sacrifice to win. They had listened to false prophets long enough. They were prepared to go the limit. By patient, earnest work they had already secured the Australian ballot, which gave to them the right to vote without being supervised or checked up by the mill foreman, the mortgagee, or the political boss.

They had gotten the direct primary, by which they were guaranteed the right to make their own nominations to public office and to take from the party howler and the political ward heeler his old-time prerogative to control conventions and put up candidates. Not content, ever progressing, in many communities they acquired the right to initiate legislation and to recall legislative acts, as well as to recall their officers who proved recreant to duty.

At each step in this record of progress certain men in each State were invariably found objecting and attempting to block the way. In some instances they were Democrats and in others

they were Republicans. But it was the same old gang moved by the same impulses, acting in the same way, accepting instructions from the same forces, and receiving and appropriating to themselves the same kind of rewards. They stood in each State of this Union, interfering with all their might with the movement on the part of the people. These men, when they came to Congress, voted with dogged determination and unremitting zeal for the highest protection that could be suggested and for many unconscionable enactments.

They were the "high-protection men"; they were the "government-by-law men"; they were the "sacredness-of-the-Constitution men." After the party said in its platform that the tariff must be revised, they were ready to fake and trick the people by the silly suggestion that the word "downward" was not included in the platform.

When the people demanded popular rule these high-protection men declared that the right to initiate statutes and laws was "un-American," and that this was not a government of men but was a government of laws.

When the people endeavored to adopt pure-food laws and legislate into law the plainest fundamentals of justice, these same men (as many of them as were demanded) came to the front to defend the Constitution—the "sacred Constitution," as the ark of the covenant which it were a sin to touch.

Finally, the people determined to overturn election machinery, and despite the protests of these high-protection interest-controlled men they fairly and squarely won in their struggle to nominate to the Presidency a man of their own selection, a man whose deeds were to their liking.

I shall not recount the happenings which led up to the scene at Chicago, but I desire to remind the disorganized and defeated remnants of the Republican Party that the people played the game according to the rotten rules that existed. They rightfully won, despite southern-delegate iniquity and the abominable rules that permitted the islands of the sea to vote at the convention. Then it was that these same high-tariff men, these lovers of law, these adorers of the Constitution, these same men who had fought the fight of the special interests in every State of the Union, deliberately, infamously, and outrageously, in the name of the Republican Party, stole from the people the victory they had gained.

Then came the election of Woodrow Wilson, but I insist that the election returns do not show that the people of this country flocked to the Democratic Party on the issues presented by the party, for the popular Democratic vote was not increased at the election.

One result of the election, however, was to forever eliminate from leadership and successful political activity a great percentage of the men who had theretofore conducted these fights for special privilege and managed the campaigns. The Republican Party was disgracefully and shamefully condemned and kicked out of power, their candidate receiving only seven presidential electoral votes.

It is now claimed, however, that the Republican Party will atone for its blunders by calling its delegates together from all the States of this Union and having them voluntarily reorganize and eliminate themselves so far as they constitute objectionable features.

And I want to say that in my opinion it ill becomes the Republican Party here in its death throes, speaking through one of its most distinguished and able members [Mr. MONDELL], the gentleman from Wyoming, to hurl at the Democratic Party, as he did the other day, any suggestion that the Democrats continually shout "Nigger, nigger!" in the South.

It was your Republican Party that, after the death of your great, kind, pure-purposed founder, Abraham Lincoln, gave to the ignorant black man in the South the suffrage. They were not ready for suffrage, and it was a crime to the black man for you to grant it to him then.

A black spot on your escutcheon. But you did not let it stop there; you sent into the South a band of corrupt spoilsmen and carpetbaggers to despoil and rob the people, and they did rob and steal, and your party backed them up. In order to perpetuate your system in power you stole the electoral vote of my native State of Louisiana and foully inaugurated a President who had no right to sit in the White House; that was a blacker spot on your escutcheon.

As the Southern States labored valiantly one by one to free themselves from the scourge of ignorance and superstition your party had wrongfully placed upon them, you mocked them and hindered them and threatened to take from them their congressional representation, but all the while you used the votes of your carpetbaggers, your negro delegates, your pie-counter serviles to vote down and out the decent men of the North, the old soldiers who had fought your battles, and the better element in every State in the Union who felt that allegiance to your party was necessary because of the recollections of the war and the noble impulses that its memories awakened in their breasts.

You took presidential nominations in that way, and finally, after the better element in your party had risen up in the spirit of reform with the greatest living American as their leader and had won the game and whipped you under even those old rotten rules, you refused to accept the verdict, and your Rosewater and Crane and ROOT and Barnes and PENROSE deliberately ordered that the delegates of the people so elected should not be seated and that imposters, suppliant tools, should have their places. Then, after trying half-venal tactics on the good-looking man with the posey in the buttonhole of his coat—the man who wanted his picture like T. R.—your party, persisting in its madness and contemptuous disregard of every principle of honor and Americanism, proceeded to nominate for the Presidency the man who in a pitiable and humiliating burlesque of the Revolutionary patriot had exclaimed "Give me the nomination, or give me death."

In thus overturning the will of the people, even after they had met you and whipped you according to the partial and rotten rules of the game you had devised, you added the blackest spot on your escutcheon; and so I say to the Republican Party that you will get no sympathy in your death throes by your railings of "Nigger, nigger, nigger." The American people are done with sectionalism, and the Progressive Party alone is free from its taint. It alone can invite support on the issues of the present day and the rightful purposes of the future.

It is now proposed to render nugatory the plans of the rank and file as expressed in the formation of the Progressive Party through the patriotic, but, I believe, misdirected efforts of certain well-meaning men who are too progressive to be Republicans, but yet too Republican to be progressive.

I would like you to think a moment of the prospective proceedings of the coming national rebirth convention of the G. O. P. Chairman Hilles, we will say, has been forced to call a national convention of the representatives of the 3,000,000 minority. Let it be remembered that the 4,000,000 members of the Progressive Party will have nothing to do with this rebirth movement. The delegates gather at Chicago, we will say. Of course President Taft, the leader of the party, will be there, and BOIES PENROSE will sit on the rostrum. William Barnes will journey back and forth among those in attendance, occasionally conferring with the "culled delegates" from the Southern States—all of them will be there. The islands of the sea will give up their quota, and Rosewater will lend his sweetness and fragrance to the occasion. Who will call the thing to order? Why Senator ROOT, of course, with a railroad brief against free canal tolls in his hands.

There will be another contingent of men present for whom the Nation at this time has profound respect, and no doubt the distinguished chairman will call upon Senator CUMMINS to explain the purpose of the convention. He will arise and frankly state to the convention that the reorganization is necessary, and as President Taft pricks up his ears he will say that the people were outraged by the last national convention. At this juncture Mr. Barnes will rise to a question of personal privilege and the "culled delegates" will engage in a free-for-all fight. You remember the chap who tried to lift himself over the fence by his own boot straps. The situation of the Republican Party will be as pitiable. There is no use to go further to show the utter impossibility of such a rebirth. It requires saving grace for regeneration, and the Republican Party has sinned away its day of grace.

These good men who hold on to the old party may as well know that the Progressive Party has come to stay. There is nothing in common between us and the old organization. There can be no amalgamation between the quick and the dead.

It may, in the course of this debate, be alleged by the opposition that I have used improper language or applied terms that should not be used in debate. But the meanest words that have been used by any of the Progressive leaders, either in the last campaign or in Congress, do not measure up to the bitterness and vituperation of an article published in the RECORD with the indorsement and at the request of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] on the 22d of this month, referring to the cause of conservation, to which the Progressive Party is particularly pledged and which the article itself admits is a cause dear to the hearts of the American people, and one so strong in their sympathies that in its name they have been able to accomplish things unheard of in governmental administration. I take emphatic exception to a portion of the article and declare its sentiment is unworthy of the indorsement of so distinguished a Member of this House as the gentleman from Wyoming. The portion

of this article—which is a newspaper editorial under the heading "Bureaucracy hit hard"—to which I refer is as follows:

This monopoly of defiance and oppression in restraint of human rights and national development has been kept in office by pressure of misdirected public sentiment and Executive tolerance. Thus fortified these promoters of bureaucracy have made and unmade Cabinets, written party platforms, packed juries, suborned witnesses; falsified the records—all in the name of conservation.

I assert here that there is no national character whose name is identified with the cause of conservation more loved and respected by the masses of the people in the State of Washington than is Gifford Pinchot, and it did not diminish the popularity of the Progressive Party, which defeated the Republicans by a majority of 50,000 in the State of Washington, that Theodore Roosevelt had subjected himself, while President, to these "monopolies of defiance and oppression in restraint of human rights" to which the article refers as "men who have packed juries, suborned witnesses, and falsified the records."

Every conservationist admits irregularities of administration and stands for certain changes. A great portion of the Taft administration was especially given over to such irregularities. But it is useless for anyone to assail conservation on its fundamental principles when lawfully enforced in this country.

In the appendix to my remarks I shall extend in the RECORD an article written by Gifford Pinchot, entitled "Conservation as practiced," that appears in Pearson's Magazine for the current month, and I ask the Members of Congress to compare the statements contained in this article with the vituperative assault contained in the newspaper publication.

You ask what has all this to do with the tariff? The Republican Party used the tariff as a means of extortion and of favoring the few—the different interests were always correlated. The people demanded its immediate downward revision, and I shall stand for that very kind of revision at this very time. I sincerely hope some amendments may be made to this bill, and particularly that of the shingle schedule, and I hope the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the Democratic Party will make this one concession to the people of my State, a concession that will help American labor almost exclusively and will save many a family from the pinch of poverty in the Puget Sound country in the State of Washington. We are so near the British Columbia (Hindu-Japanese) oriental labor.

I make the plea in the name of humanity, and in doing it I only seek that meed of fairness which I believe is warranted by the golden rule. [Applause.]

The article above referred to is as follows:

CONSERVATION AS PRACTICED—FORMER CHIEF FORESTER REPLIES TO WIDELY CIRCULATED REACTIONARY ARTICLE BY EDITOR THOMAS, OF THE POST-INTELLIGENCER—SHOWS NUMEROUS IMPORTANT DISCREPANCIES.

[By Gifford Pinchot.]

APRIL 2, 1913.

Hon. J. W. BRYAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BRYAN: Knowing your interest in the conservation question, which is of such importance to your constituents, both as a Representative and as an editor, and also knowing of the good work your newspaper has done in former campaigns for Progressive principles and Progressive men, I venture to send you the inclosed proof of an article which will appear in Pearson's Magazine for May. It answers an article by Ed. H. Thomas, of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, which has had wide circulation in Washington, and which can be and ought to be answered. If you can find space for my answer I shall very greatly appreciate your courtesy.

Very sincerely, yours, GIFFORD PINCHOT.

The editor of Pearsons has courteously given me access to his columns to answer an article by Ed. H. Thomas, entitled "Conservation as practiced," which appeared in the January number of the magazine. I am particularly glad to avail myself of the opportunity thus afforded, because attacks on conservation usually contain few specific statements and are therefore difficult to answer specifically. This is not true of Mr. Thomas's article.

It will, I think, be most convenient to the reader if I take up certain statements in "Conservation as practiced" in the order in which they are made. Generalities which are more or less matters of opinion may well be omitted from the present discussion.

Mr. Thomas says, "The West * * * has no voice in administration, as the Forestry Bureau at Washington is made up of eastern theorists."

WESTERN MANAGEMENT.

The office of the Forest Service at Washington is managed by four men. The first of them was born west of the Alleghanies in a public-land State, and began his practical acquaintance with western forests 17 years ago, when he became, as I can testify from personal experience, a first-class mountain man. The second, born west of the Rockies, was for 10 years a small cattleman in Arizona, then went into sheep raising, and was secretary of the Arizona Woolgrowers' Association when he entered the Government service. He had never been East in his life until he was 34 years old. The third went to California when he was 10 years old, worked his way through the University of California, and had been for seven years in charge of practical forest work in California, Montana, and Idaho before he was called to Washington. The fourth, born east of the Rockies, like Mr. Thomas himself, moved West in 1892, and went into business in the same city, Seattle, where Mr. Thomas is an editor of one of the principal anticonservation journals of the West. He enlisted in the Spanish War, and afterwards entered the Forest Service. In all he has been in constant touch with the West and its problems for about 20 years.

Furthermore, of the 147 men in actual charge of the national forests, all had had extensive western experience before they were given their present responsible work, and about 80 per cent were western men before they entered the service at all. Of the 1,393 forest rangers on the rolls June 30, 1912, a little over 99 per cent were actual residents of the West when they were appointed. The practical work of forest administration in the West is now in the hands of western men.

Mr. Thomas repeats in substance the statement made in the annual report of the Forester that the national forests do not yield each year as much as they cost. He mentions an excess of expenditures over receipts of $3,582,615.19 for the year 1911, and adds, "What would be thought of a private business that would show such a balance sheet?"

BUSINESS METHODS GOOD.

The sum of $3,582,615.19 includes, although Mr. Thomas does not mention it, an extraordinary expense of $1,086,590.89 for meeting the exceptional outburst of forest fires which followed the driest season ever known in the West.

That, however, is by the way. The real answer is that a private business, conducted under the limitations imposed by law upon the Forest Service and with the same conditions to meet, would present a balance sheet of precisely the same kind. The object for which the service must be conducted is not to make money for the Government, but to make the forests useful to the largest possible number of people. In doing that work the business methods of the service need fear nothing in comparison with the best managed of the great private corporations, as was determined by the report of Gunn, Richards & Co., a distinguished firm of business organizers, made June 30, 1908.

The money spent on the national forests is an insurance against the damage or destruction by fire of some two billion dollars' worth of public property, and against monopoly and extortion when the private lands which now supply the bulk of our yearly consumption of timber are nearly exhausted. The timber of the national forests is increasing in value at the rate of at least $50,000,000 a year. It would be poor economy not to be willing to spend two or three millions annually to insure that immense return.

Ultimately the national forests will be self-supporting. But in the meantime there is little more reason in complaining that they cost more than they bring in than there would be in complaining that the premiums paid for fire insurance, or the cost of a city fire department, failed to bring in an annual cash return.

SMALL CUT EXPLAINED.

Mr. Thomas says the annual cut from the national forests is "but 8½ per cent of the annual crop."

The whole annual crop or growth is not, and can not be, harvested at present on the national forests, and the reason is not far to seek. When the national forests were created the best and most accessible of the timber had already been appropriated. The Government took what was left. Three-fourths of the national-forest timber is even yet inaccessible by reason of the lack of transportation. Where it is accessible and salable the annual crop is being harvested. Much of the more remote timber could not yet be cut even if it were given away.

The suggestion is constantly made that the national-forest timber should be sold below its value, to which suggestion the conclusive answer is contained in the report of a legislative investigation filed with the governor of the State of Washington, April 1, 1910, which report contains and comments on more than a hundred cases of sales of State timberland for less than it was worth. There is no safe and practicable way to dispose of Government timber except for what it will bring in the open market.

Speaking of the Mount Olympus National Monument, which lies within the Olympic National Forest, Mr. Thomas says: "On this reserve no one can cut a stick of firewood, prospect a ledge of mineral, catch a fish, or shoot a bird. Instead of restricting its boundaries to the base of Mount Olympus, the monument covers 608,640 acres of the heart of a known mineral region."

THOMAS MISINFORMED.

Mr. Thomas has evidently been misinformed. If he will go and camp in the Olympic National Monument he will find by practical experience that he can cut all the sticks of firewood he needs, that the only limit on the fish he can catch will be his personal skill and sense of sportsmanship, and that he can hunt buck deer from September 1 to November 1 and shoot grouse from October 1 to January 1, and shore birds and water fowl from October 1 to February 1. There are no restrictions whatever on fishing and hunting within this monument except those imposed by the game laws of the State of Washington.

The Olympic National Monument was created with its present area at the request of a Congressman from the State of Washington, who presumably represented the wishes and best interests of his State.

If there is mineral within this national monument it will, of course, be opened to development. At the time the monument was created it was not known to include a mineral region, and there are said to be strong doubts whether it does so now, although a vigorous attempt is being made on that ground to have the land restored to the public domain.

Whether there is mineral or not this area does contain valuable timber. In that connection it may be well to recall what happened when over 700,000 acres of heavily timbered land in the Olympic National Forest was restored to the public domain and opened to entry in 1891, on the plea that it was chiefly valuable for agriculture. Within 10 years 524,000 acres of it had passed into the hands of men who held it exclusively for its timber. One man had acquired 81,530 acres, and five had 178,000. And of this whole vast timbered area after 10 years less than one acre in a thousand was actually under cultivation.

Mr. Thomas also says: "Water-power sites on the public domain were withdrawn without provision for their future utilization. The city of Bellingham, in the State of Washington, is served with power right now generated in British Columbia, because progress on water-power development in the Mount Baker region has been halted by the Government.

"The pretext for these withdrawals is that they are intended to prevent monopoly, and this in a region where monopoly is impossible in the very nature of things."

WATER-POWER INTERESTS BUSY.

The water-power sites were withdrawn to give Congress an opportunity to regulate their use. They are still withdrawn, solely because of the persistent refusal of the water-power interests to allow the passage of a law, such as the Lever bill, now before Congress, that would insure the use of the public power sites without monopoly. These power interests often work anonymously, but the list of their spokesmen includes such names as Frank Short, of California; Francis Lynde Stetson, of New York; William P. Lay, of Alabama; and T. R.

McKee, of the General Electric Co. If there has been failure to develop, the responsibility lies directly upon the men who have blocked the unremitting attempts of the conservationists to get a reasonable law that would open these sites to development, and hardly less upon newspaper men, like Mr. Thomas, who make it easy for Congressmen to defeat the true interests of their constituents by misrepresenting the facts and throwing the blame on the wrong people.

In this they are not always successful. For example, MILES POINDEXTER, of Mr. Thomas's own State of Washington, was elected to the United States Senate mainly on the conservative issue, standing against Mr. Thomas and with me, and on that issue carried Mr. Thomas's own city of Seattle.

POWER SITES NOW OPEN.

To return to our argument, in the national forests the power sites are now and have for years been open to development under the act of February 15, 1901, under which 274 permits have been issued by the Forest Service and 139 water-power plants built, in addition to 28 which are now in process of construction. I do not know why Bellingham gets its power from British Columbia, but I do know that the Mount Baker region is in a national forest and that it is open to power development under the same conditions which permitted the construction of power plants in other forests.

Is water-power monopoly in the State of Washington impossible, as Mr. Thomas declares? A report of the Commissioner of Corporations published in March, 1912, shows that the General Electric group of power companies controls 40 per cent of the commercial water power developed and under construction in the United States, while the officers and directors of the General Electric Co. and its three subsidiaries control 24 corporations, which operate hydroelectric plants, over 50 public-service corporations, and a number of railroads and factories, and over 50 banks and financial houses. This same powerful group controls 72 per cent of the water power in Colorado, 58 per cent in Oregon, and 55 per cent in Mr. Thomas's State of Washington, in which two corporations have already succeeded in securing nearly three-quarters (70 per cent) of all the water power yet developed. Comment is unnecessary.

Mr. Thomas: "Several years ago a large coal-land withdrawal was made in Whatcom County, Wash., and, through department ignorance of geographical conditions, Bellingham, a city of 30,000, was included in the withdrawal."

BELLINGHAM NOT AFFECTED.

This withdrawal, like all withdrawals for similar purposes, affected only certain kinds of land. It had no more effect on land within the city limits of Bellingham than it had on land within the city limits of New York. It respected all existing claims and property rights of every kind, and had to do only with coal, oil, gas, and phosphate rock. All other minerals may be freely located and developed within the area withdrawn, and land may be taken up under the homestead laws, with a reservation of the underlying coal to the United States. So little does the withdrawal restrict the development of the region that, although Mr. Thomas evidently does not know it, it is still (February 25, 1913) in effect. Such a withdrawal might be made to include the land beneath Mr. Thomas's office in Seattle, without in the least interfering with his rights or his business.

Referring to coal claims in Mount Baker, Mr. Thomas complains of delay in granting patents when the coal is needed, as it is, and adds: "This is one case of department stupidity and neglect, but it is not an isolated case. It is typical of the manner in which all matters pertaining to the public domain have been handled."

Sixteen coal entries were made in this field. Half have already been patented, five of them within six months after entry. Several of the claims are now under investigation. This seems to be one more case of holding the Government responsible, when in reality there is no valid basis for complaint of delay.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

"Bureau ignorance of forest conditions in the Far West," says Mr. Thomas, "is dense beyond belief," and cites in support the case of a forest ranger who, in 1899, was instructed to blaze out the lines of his reserves, which covered an area about half as large as the State of Connecticut, and patrol its boundaries every day.

This anecdote of 14 years ago dates from a time long before the present national-forest policy was in existence and six years before the care of the national forests was transferred from the General Land Office to the Forest Service, upon whose efficiency it can therefore have no bearing. This was the period, unless I am mistaken, when not a single man in the division which had charge of the national forests at Washington had ever seen or set foot in one of them. I could myself give Mr. Thomas other cases from that almost forgotten time which are even more striking. Take, for example, that of two men, also in the State of Washington, who were instructed to buy rakes and rake up and burn the down timber on more than a thousand square miles of heavy forest. Neither of these stories, however, has anything to do with the present subject of discussion.

ERRONEOUS FIGURES.

Mr. Thomas: "Sales on the 11,684,360 acres of forest reserve in the State of Washington have aggregated 95,204,000 board feet in 14 years, or less than 7,000,000 annually. Decay is destroying nearly a billion feet of timber annually, so that cutting has not reached 7 per cent of the decay loss."

The facts are that in the eight years—1905 to 1912, inclusive—during which the Forest Service has had charge of the national forests 415,512,900 feet of timber has been sold from the national forests of the State of Washington. The average cut during that period was not 7,000,000 but 17,500,000 feet annually. For the last three years the cut has averaged a little over 30,000,000 feet, and during the last year it reached 37,000,000 feet.

The total stand of merchantable timber in the national forests of Washington is estimated at about 90,000,000,000 feet. This includes all classes of timber, the thrifty and growing as well as the overmature. There is undoubtedly some loss from decay. It is, however, but gradual, and Mr. Thomas's figure of 1,000,000,000 feet a year is preposterous. While it seems to be well within Mr. Thomas's average limit of error, it is an overstatement by more than four to one.

DO STATES LOSE?

Again, Mr. Thomas refers to an alleged loss to the States, "which have had taken from them areas to be held in perpetuity as undeveloped wilderness, on which there is no taxable or revenue-producing property."

Let us see. Apart from the fact that more than 600,000 persons every year engage in the use or development of national forests, the Western States now receive for their schools and roads, in lieu of taxes, 25 per cent of the gross revenue from the national forests. Up to January 30, 1912, they have thus received $2,606,400, of which $115,205 went to the State of Washington. The present Congress has set aside an additional 10 per cent for building roads, and over $200,000 has already been made available. In some places the proceeds from this 35 per cent of the gross revenue already exceeds what would be produced by taxation under private ownership. In others it still falls short. In the end it will surely exceed it everywhere.

In most of the Western States, in the areas locked up, are lands belonging to the Commonwealth. Washington, for instance, has nearly 600,000 acres of school lands worth from $12,000,000 to $15,000,000 within the 11 reserves plastered over its area. Idaho and Montana fare similarly. Thus Mr. Thomas.

STATE CLAIMS RECOGNIZED.

This statement probably refers to a decision of the Secretary of the Interior that the creation of a national forest before public surveys have been made defeats the claims of certain States to school lands in the national forests, while giving them the right to make indemnity selections elsewhere. This decision of another department is controlling on the Forest Service, which nevertheless has steadily recognized the moral right of the States to these lands, has refrained from cutting timber on them, except in agreement with the States, and has vigorously insisted that the equities of the States must be allowed and satisfied by exchange. On February 15, 1912, a final exchange of this kind was made with South Dakota. On June 4 last, a similar exchange of certain lands was made with Idaho, and an exchange that will satisfy all of Idaho's claims is now nearly complete. As soon as legislative authority can be secured the same arrangement will be made with Montana and other States.

While I was Forester I made a similar proposition personally and repeatedly to the land commission of the State of Washington, but Mr. Ross evidently preferred a cause of quarrel to the satisfaction of the State's claims, and my suggestion was always rejected.

ANOTHER ERROR.

Mr. Thomas: "One-third of Washington's total area is reserved. On these reservations there is no industry, no settlement, no development, though 20 per cent of the lands within them are arable and capable of settlement, and another 20 per cent mineral on which the forest growth is inferior and practically valueless."

If it were true, this would be by far the most important paragraph in the whole article. There are agricultural and mineral lands within the national forests, about 2 (not 20) per cent of the former and an unknown and for the present an unknowable amount of the latter. Are they tied up?

Within a year after it took charge, the Forest Service itself proposed and on June 11, 1906, secured the passage of an act to open to settlement any lands in national forests which were more valuable for agriculture than for forest purposes. Under this law, 1,213,000 acres have already been opened to settlement for the benefit of over 12,000 settlers. The work is proceeding so rapidly that within three years, in spite of the huge area of the national forests, it will have been completed.

Most of the agricultural land still owned by the Government in the national forests is heavily timbered, and worth from 2 to 20 times as much for the timber as for the land. To give the timber with the land would merely invite speculation instead of promoting settlement. So the Forest Service first sells the timber, and then the land is opened to settlement, by which arrangement the imitation homesteader is eliminated. The effect of giving the timber with the land is well illustrated by the Olympic forest elimination cited above.

MINERAL LANDS OPEN.

How, then, as to the mineral lands? Are they open to development? Every season there are 45,000 miners and prospectors in the national forests. The prospector is welcome. He may and does search the forests at will. He cuts without charge the timber he needs for his claim. He is often aided by the roads, bridges, trails, and telephone lines built by the Forest Service. Of all the false charges made against the Forest Service there is none more perfectly false than the charge that the national forests are closed against mineral development. If the well-established policy of the Forest Service were not proof enough, there is the law of June 4, 1897, which specifically provides that the national forests shall be open to prospecting and mining.

IMPORTANT IF TRUE.

Mr. Thomas: "Mr. Graves maintains that it is profitable to continue forestry on lands adaptable to agriculture. But is it a wise national policy which seeks to perpetuate forest growth at 33⅓ cents per acre per year on land which properly cultivated will produce from $50 to $500 per acre per annum? If it is, then production has ceased to be a fundamental element of economics."

This statement would be important if it were true. The simple but conclusive answer is that Mr. Graves holds no such opinion, and that already a million and a quarter acres of agricultural land in the national forests have been opened to entry by 12,000 settlers under a policy initiated by the Forest Service in 1906 and in vigorous effect to this day.

2,660 PER CENT OFF.

Mr. Thomas says: "The entire 11,684,000 acres of national forests of the State of Washington, more than a fourth of the State's total area, contains exactly 34 miles of wagon road."

This statement is but 2,660 per cent out of the way. The fact is that the national forests of the State of Washington contain 938 miles of road and 1,491 miles of trails, of which the Forest Service itself has actually built more miles of road than Mr. Thomas allows altogether, and, in addition, more than a thousand miles of trails.

"As matters stand," says Mr. Thomas, "only the very wealthy can bid at such sales"—the sales of timber by the Forest Service.

WRONG AGAIN.

Again important if it were true. The fact is that 99 per cent of all the timber sales made during the last fiscal year were for amounts under $5,000 and 97 per cent for amounts under $1,000. Not only so, but over 3,000 small operators cut 63 per cent of the timber cut during the year, while more than 38,000 permits for free timber were issued to settlers and prospectors. With the growing monopoly of western timber, it will soon be the national forests alone that give the small lumberman a chance.

Mr. Thomas: "In the Philippine Islands, with 116,000 square miles, there are many fine forests, but up to last October no national forests had been created there."

FORTY MILLION ACRES FROM TRUTH.

This statement of Mr. Thomas's is within about 40,000,000 acres of being correct. Over 99 per cent of the forests of the Philippine Islands, or 59,500 square miles, are forest reserves controlled and managed by the United States Government through the bureau of forestry of the Philippines, precisely as the national forests in the United States (likewise called forest reserves until 1905) are controlled and managed by the United States Government through the Forest Service. The names used to be the same, the purposes are the same, the general lines of policy are the same; and of this I speak with some confidence because policy and purposes were embodied in a report made by me to Mr. Taft while he was governor of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. Thomas: "Alaska to-day consists of a few towns and mining camps governed by United States marshals and surrounded by alien territory on which Alaskans can venture as trespassers only. It is rich in every natural resource, but these resources are as worthless as the minerals in the moon. They can not be touched by the people who require them."

ALASKA LARGELY OPEN.

This statement is fully as accurate as that just quoted about the Philippine Islands. First, any Alaskan can go freely upon any public land or national forest in Alaska without committing trespass of any sort. Every foot of it is open to the freest access. Second, the resources of Alaska "can not be touched by the people who require them" to the following extent:

In 1912 there were sold from the national forests of Alaska, 45,000,000 feet of timber in 355 sales.

Every kind of mineral except coal is freely open to development. During the past year the mineral resources of Alaska which "can not be touched by the people who require them" produced copper to the value of $4,904,715 and gold and silver to the value of $16,031,705, while the furs which "can not be touched," yet were touched to the value of $728,554.

Although it is doubtful whether Mr. Thomas had fish in mind as one of the natural resources he was describing, it is worth while noting that the untouchable salmon resources of Alaska yielded during the past year $16,459,036.

"The law," says Mr. Thomas, "as the department interprets it, is that no man can acquire a coal claim unless he acquires it 'for his own individual use and benefit.' And 'own individual use and benefit' is capable of no elasticity. Nowhere in our statutes is there another phrase so rigid."

STATEMENT NOT TRUE.

There is little fault to be found with this statement except that it is not so. Such provisions are common in our public-land laws. For example, the Homestead Act (R. S. 2290) says: "The entry shall be made in good faith for the purpose of actual settlement and cultivation and not for the benefit of any other person, persons, or corporations."

The timber and stone act (act of June 3, 1878, sec. 2) says: "The applicant to purchase must state under oath that he does not apply to purchase land for speculation but in good faith to appropriate it to his own exclusive use and benefit, and that he has not directly or indirectly made any agreement or contract in any way or manner with any person or persons whatsoever by which the title which he may acquire from the Government may inure, in whole or in part, to the benefit of any person except himself."

Mr. Thomas assumes to take issue with the conservation policy yet says: "A coal land leasing law in 1907 would have accomplished all that could have been done under private ownership."

GUGGENHEIMS ACTIVE.

Mr. Thomas is evidently not aware that immediately upon the withdrawal of the coal lands in 1906 the Roosevelt administration made every effort to secure the passage of a coal land leasing bill for opening them to development without waste and without monopoly. Every year since an effort has been made by the friends of conservation to pass similar legislation. That we have not succeeded was directly and solely due to the attitude of the men (Guggenheim and others) who preferred to see no legislation enacted rather than legislation which would prevent speculation and monopoly in coal and who were supported by Mr. Thomas's paper, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, in their successful effort to prevent the passage of a coal land leasing law.

It does not become the men who opposed this legislation at the time to express regret now that it did not pass, without at least acknowledging their share in defeating it. If they had allowed it to pass, the just complaint that Alaska is not allowed to use her own fuel could not now be made. It is a curious fact that the men who were directly responsible for locking up the coal of Alaska—first, by their unsuccessful attempt to have it monopolized, and, second, by their successful effort to prevent its development under conditions that would effectually prevent monopoly—are now the loudest in lamenting a condition which but for them would never have taken place.

ALMOST CORRECT.

Mr. Thomas: "The remedy for our conservation bungle is simple. * * * Classify the public lands. These four words contain the cure."

For once Mr. Thomas is almost right. The classification of the public lands is not the whole cure, but it is a part of it, and the United States Forest Service has done its full share toward that end. Both before and since I left it it has given its best attention to segregating agricultural lands from lands more valuable for forestry. It has opened a million and a quarter acres of the true agricultural lands to entry and is protecting the lands more valuable for timber against the land-grabbers. It has eliminated from the forest boundaries more than 10,000,000 acres of land more suitable for other uses. It ascertains the mineral character of lands claimed under the mineral-land laws and in many ways gives practical effect to the fundamental principle of any wise public land classification policy, the principle that each parcel of land must be put to that use in which it will contribute most to the Commonwealth.

It is one of the commonest charges against the Forest Service, because it is so easy to make, that it "nullifies the acts of Congress, indulges in bureaucratic government," to quote again Mr. Thomas's language, and generally does as it pleases without regard to the law or to certain kinds of prophets.

SERVICE LAW-ABIDING.

The Forest Service does disregard prophets of Mr. Thomas's kind for reasons which I hope have already appeared to the reader; but if it had disregarded the law, that fact would long ago have been judicially established. The truth is that the Forest Service is law-abiding with such completeness that in no single case has any court of last resort declared any action by the Forest Service to have exceeded its legal powers, and this includes two decisions by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Forest Service has frequently applied the law in ways that were distasteful to certain special interests, but when the final test of judicial decision has been made, it has been proved without exception that the service has respected the law and acted within its legal powers.

Like so many others who attack it, Mr. Thomas does not understand what conservation means. "Conservation," he says, "has been intrusted to a bureau of the Agricultural Department." It is doubtless the Forest Service which Mr. Thomas had in mind.

A portion of the work in conservation is indeed intrusted to the Forest Service, but the statement might be accepted as more accurate if Mr. Thomas had not omitted to mention that other portions are intrusted to five other bureaus in the Department of Agriculture, such as the Bureau of Soils and the Bureau of Plant Industry; to five bureaus in the Department of the Interior, such as the General Land Office and the Bureau of Mines; one in the Department of Justice, charged with the enforcement of the public-land laws; and three in the War Department, which deal with the control and development of navigable streams, including water power, and with the conservation of the natural resources of military reservations and the Philippine Islands. In other respects the statement that conservation is intrusted to a single bureau appears to be beyond criticism.

RICHES EMBARRASSING.

Mr. Thomas's article presents an embarrassment of riches to the man who will look up the facts. Richer digging is seldom found, but the foregoing samples will suffice. I should have been glad to touch, among other things, on the question of the Chugach National Forest, which was not "created under a false pretense" and which does not "exclude the only timber worth while in southern and southeastern Alaska," and upon the whole question of coal and other monopolies attempted or achieved by the Guggenheim syndicate. But perhaps enough has been said to raise a reasonable doubt whether, after all, the grabbers have had all the right on their side.

SOURCES OF OPPOSITION.

There are three principal sources of opposition to conservation in the West. First, the men who came out as pioneers, and who can not realize that the time when everything was free could not last and has gone by. Second, the men who have been checked by conservation in their efforts to grab more than their share of the public wealth. Third, men interested in development, and rightly so, who have been deceived by the stream of lies on the subject of conservation put in circulation by its enemies.

These men are opponents only until they learn the facts, but until they do their discontent with conservation is no better based than the hostility of the Romans of Nero's time to the Christians, which rested on the current fable that the Christians were enemies of humanity, habitually murdered little children, and worshiped an ass's head.

WORK NECESSARY.

I do not say that the Forest Service is free from the common human faults, but I do assert that its work is peculiarly necessary, unusually hard to do, and remarkably well done.

The pity of it is that reckless perversion should turn against it some men who are naturally its friends, and so should make still more difficult the enormous task of wisely opening to public use the natural resources of an area as large as all the States from Maine to Virginia, and doing it with the least practicable restraint to the individual, with the largest benefits to the people generally, and without monopoly or unnecessary waste.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN].

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I must confess astonishment at the observation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] that the permanence of this bill will depend probably upon the solidarity of the Democratic Party. He argues that the law will endure because his party is united; that party discipline will keep this bill on the books; that Democrats are good soldiers and as such will sink individual opinions for the good of their party; therefore he concludes his party will have a long enjoyment of power.

I can not concur in this view. This bill, if it lives, must live upon its own merits. If it is dependent upon the Democratic Party and the power of that party's organization to control perpetually the Democrats in this House, and to control the House itself, and not upon its merits as a law, then we will keep going unwisely, as we have unfortunately too much in the past, and continue making tariff laws partisan matters and not matters of patriotism. [Applause.]

It seems to me that in the making of a great fiscal law affecting all of the industries and the general welfare of the country that every step should be taken with the idea of doing justice to all of the people and not serving the partisan purpose of any political organization. Partisanship and patriotism will never pull well together. [Applause.] The close cooperation of men enlisted together in a common cause may be a good thing. A self-perpetuating political machine working its will in legislation is always a bad thing. The old Republican machine was a bad thing. This new and modern Democratic machine will prove likewise. For years before insurgency scored upon this floor the Republican Party acted as a unit. It had a masterful control—such a control as your leader now exercises over this body. In fact, the Republican Party's dominion was so absolute not only over this House but in every other department of our Government as to invite that abuse of power and selfishness that always comes to concentrated sovereignty.

The servility of this Democratic majority, surrendering, as they have, their judgment and discretion to Mr. UNDERWOOD, are doing the same thing and inviting the same disaster that came under the rule of Cannon. No man is good enough to be king. No man, not even the statesman from Alabama, can wisely be intrusted with the tax-levying power of this Nation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Day after day since the opening of this Congress we have seen the mighty majority of this House herded "like dumb, driven cattle" into the Democratic corral caucus for training and subjugation. In due time they were permitted to come upon this floor to act as if they were legislators, but their consciences were in the keeping of the Ways and Means Committee. Some of this committee have visibly suffered from the realization of their own importance during the course of this debate. Day after day they have assumed a "holier-than-thou" expression and have taken on not only the responsibility of speaking for their subjugated colleagues, but also the responsibility of this whole Nation, not only presently but for the long future. Do not take yourselves too seriously, gentlemen. From the murmurings coming up from the people right now I fancy that the burden of this Government presently is about all the undeveloped shoulders of Democracy can bear. [Applause on the Republican side.]

However, in all fairness we must concede that the responsibility of this Government is heavy and the course of true statesmanship not easy to follow. I am sure that Democracy is trying hard to move forward, and I would be the last to find fault or appear unreasonably captious about mistakes in judgment on the part of men who are honestly striving to serve the common good, as I know many men are with zeal and sincerity on both sides of this Chamber. It is the assumption of superior statecraft while displaying such a limited understanding of the facts that invites the criticism I offer of this all-powerful Ways and Means Committee. The gentleman from Alabama asserts that the whole responsibility now rests on him and the committee. Let this be conceded and it does not follow that it was wise or necessary for him to assume infallibility in statesmanship by pledging his followers in advance to refuse every amendment or change that would be suggested as the result of debate and thorough consideration on this floor. It is already apparent that it is the clear purpose of this Underwood omnibus train to carry this legislation through as per schedule regardless of the condition of its freight or the comfort of its passengers. Let trespassers who venture to pass the Democratic highway beware, for this is the first through train run by this clever and cocksure, if not cautious, crew. [Applause on the Republican side.] Mr. Chairman, the making of this law in secret by the Democrats of this committee, the passing and pledging of every paragraph behind closed doors of the caucus, the mockery of this moot-court trial in which we are now strenuously engaged is wrong—wrong as a method of legislation and, I believe, must prove wrong when measured by results. But, of course, that is the real test. Is the bill itself bad or good? That is the real question.

With many of the provisions of this bill I find myself in sympathy. In a general way this measure obeys the mandate of the people for a general reduction of tariff taxes. It is a revision downward, decidedly and substantially downward, and as such it has my hearty support. The customs duties it applies to many articles very accurately measure the difference in cost of production in this country and abroad and are such as will stimulate real and reasonable competition. If we were permitted to act on every paragraph separately, I would gladly vote for many of them. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the schedule making provision for an income tax is correct in principle, and I heartily favor it. In a resourceful country like this, where, unfortunately, there is such a spread between wealth and poverty, such a big difference in the size of large and average incomes, justice demands a fairer distribution of the burdens of Government than is possible by any tax that can be levied on consumption. The simplest and fairest way of equalizing the burden of taxation where wealth is so unequally distributed is by such a scheme as this—by a direct and graduated tax on incomes. It will never work real hardship to compel a $4,000-a-year income to pay a substantial sum in support of the Government for the protection of that income and its enjoyment. I would, however, amend this law so as to increase the rate on the excessive incomes of the overrich. Such an increase, if maintained, would in time bring about a fairer distribution of wealth. This is important. It is time that Congress realized the menace that lies in the great concentration of wealth in a few hands. Our one great national peril is concentration of wealth. If wise legislation fails to guard against this peril and by degrees remove it, there will come a time when socialism will assimilate both the peril and the poverty and do some pie cutting of its own, either by due process of law or otherwise. It is high time for such regulating devices as a scientific and graduated income tax, and the Democratic Party deserves credit for this schedule, as well as for the reductions made in many of the necessities of life. [Applause.]

There is one feature, however, Mr. Chairman, of this income-tax schedule which is clearly unjust. I refer to the tax on the net income of a strictly mutual insurance company. Such a tax falls directly on the policy holder, who in countless instances is a poor man or woman already overtaxed on consumption, with an income far less than the $4,000 limit in the bill. The dividends which a policy holder in a mutual company receives back from the company from time to time is in no true sense of the word a business profit. It is a return of a part of his own capital which the mutual company has been conserving and holding for him. What the holder of a mutual certificate of insurance pays in to the company from year to year is in no sense of the word a part of the income of that company. It is an investment of capital. What he gets back from time to time is not a dividend in the real meaning, but a return of his own capital. If this amendment is not made to the income-tax schedule the law will discriminate directly against many millions of small policy holders in mutual insurance companies whose incomes are less than $4,000 a year. Other defects in this schedule may develop under full discussion, but its fundamental idea is sustained by sound public policy.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I can not vote for this bill as a whole, forced upon us as it is, as an omnibus measure. True, it has many commendable features, but with them and underlying them all it has one fatal and fundamental fault that damns it with an unforgivable original sin. It is an unfair law; a sectional cotton-bred law; a selfish, sectional, cotton-country law. It is frankly rankly unfair to the Nation as a whole and cruelly oppressive to the great State for which I speak. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Northern agriculture is hard hit. It is thrown off guard by duty on wheat and cattle and then struck below the belt with free flour and free meat. Our farmers are stripped of protection, so far as the selling price of what they produce is concerned, while at the same time they are compelled to pay a duty on the raw furs which they need in our inclement winters and which were heretofore free. The free admission of farm machinery will help the Harvester Trust, but not the farmer, for the trust operates and controls prices on both sides of the water. Free raw wool will hurt the wool producer without helping the wool consumer, and there is still a protective tax on woolen goods in this bill which will enable the Wool Trust to maintain its prices Free raw cotton will not help the cotton consumer for the same reason. Free sugar in time will help, and free lumber will make building less burdensome, but foreign competition in the production of flour and meat will depress the farmer's market more than he can stand under excessive transportation rates and high cost of living conditions. This bill is artfully drawn to throw the whole burden of the reduction of cost of living of the Nation upon the producing farmers of the North and West, sparing the agriculturists of the South, with friends at court, and the toilers in the eastern cities, whose suffrage is sought to maintain the present administration. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. MANAHAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], in his opening argument on this bill, said that it was built upon the principle of competition. That sounds good in theory, but I submit there can be no intelligent competition unless the rates are based upon the principle of making good the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. If the rates are so high as to be prohibitive there can be no competition. It is equally true that if the rates are so low as to destroy home production there will be no competition. Fair competition can never be secured and maintained without legislation enacted with intelligent regard for the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. [Applause on the Republican side.] The gentleman from Alabama is simply indulging in sophistry. He recognizes the lameness of the tariff-for-revenue theory if applied without regard to its effect upon industries. He therefore approaches the Republican doctrine of protection based upon the actual difference between the cost of production, and he flirts with this theory, calling it the competitive theory, as though it could be competitive and not protective. A nonpartisan tariff commission to ascertain and report to Congress all the facts regarding production at home and abroad is the only way competition and protection can be secured and maintained.

But on what strange new theory has the committee hit when it puts a duty of 10 cents a bushel on wheat and admits flour free; when it taxes cattle and admits meat free? This alarming and extraordinary principle of taxing the raw material of the manufacturer and admitting free of duty the finished article of his foreign competitor is competition with a vengeance. It is bum business, sham statesmanship. What chance has a miller of Minnesota to pay a full price to the Minnesota farmer for cash wheat at the terminal markets? Under this law what chance has the miller to compete with flour from England and South America if he pays the northwestern farmer the price apparently secured to him by the 10-cent tariff on wheat?

The gentleman from Alabama speaks of sane competition; then he puts hobble skirts around the legs of the millers and blinders on the farmers while entering them in the food-supplying contest of the world. This is not fair. All the smiles and suavity of the artful leader of the majority can never make it fair. It is not fair to the millers and it is not fair to the farmers, who never can get more for their wheat than the millers can afford to pay and compete with foreign flour. We have in this country over 10,000 flour mills, and they represent a capitalization of approximately $350,000,000; it is a stupendous industry. It gives employment to many thousands of high-class men, who can not afford to have their wages lowered to meet the competition of England nor to be thrown out of employment, because the market for their output will be restricted. It is thought that when the Senate gets this bill that protection will be given the milling industry by placing wheat on the free list and thus enable the mills to obtain enormous quantities of wheat from Canada at a low price. This would put the millers on equal terms with foreign millers but it would be at the expense of the farmers of this country. Free wheat would hit Minnesota and Dakota especially hard, because of the vast fields that lie to the north, which raise wheat in greater abundance and at less cost. Does anyone think that hitting the farmer will help the men in town or make the lot of the laborer any easier? Is anyone so dull as to fail to see that the general welfare of the laboring man as well as of the business man in the cities must always and constantly depend upon the prosperity and productiveness of the farms? There can be no conflict of interest between the farmers and the toilers in town. Their interests are identical. If you make farm life hard and unattractive, the young men and women of the country will congest the cities and make more fierce the competition of the city toilers. Furthermore, it will make the farms less productive; therefore farm supplies less plentiful; therefore higher prices will be charged for food to eat. You never can make the food of the earth cheap to city dwellers except by making farms pleasant and productive, so that bounteous crops will be raised. The cities of the Northwest are especially dependent on the prosperity of the farms of the Northwest. A fiscal law like this, designed to supply the great cities on the seashore with cheap meat from South America and cheap bread from the mills and bakeries of England, that can easily be delivered on the docks of New York on cheap ocean rates, may make the cost of living less in that great city, but it will drain much money from America as well as narrow the market of the Northwest producer and knock off his prices. What effect will this have upon our cities? What keeps our cities going but our mills, our commerce, our transportation; generally speaking, the business of supplying the farmers with their needs and carrying the farmers' crops to the markets of the world? Destroy the farmers' crops and you cut commerce coming and going. Cut commerce in two and you destroy one-half of the city's business and make the other half still and stagnant. You injure labor also. When traffic falls off, the railroads and factories let out their surplus men. When farms are unproductive, surplus help, and discontented farmers' boys also, congregate in the cities, swelling the ranks of the unemployed. Men out of work stop buying from merchants. Merchants with diminishing sales dismiss their clerks. Clerks and factory hands and railroad men and discontented farmers glut the labor market, lowering wages, compelling strikes and disorder, and breeding widespread discontent. All caused by a selfish law. Our agriculture is stricken down and, going down, carries with it the country's commerce and the city's life. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Alabama also says that his party is legislating in the interest of the consumer. Does he not know that in this country consumers and producers are identical? In every well-ordered community the consumer is also a producer. No man has a right to do nothing if he consumes. The idle overrich and the tramp consume without producing, but, generally speaking, you can not legislate adversely to the producer without injury to the consumer, for they are identical.

Mr. Chairman, the majority claim they are redeeming their promise to reduce the cost of living, and in so far as they are helping consumers without at the same time inflicting injury upon the same consumers in their capacity as producers their efforts are commendable. It is well to make necessities cheaper, but what good are cheap things if you have nothing to buy them with? It is good to lower the cost of living if at the same time and to a greater degree you do not lower the means of livelihood. This bill is not wisely drawn, for in too many paragraphs our saving as consumers will not equal our loss as producers, leaving the balance of trade against us as a Nation and making us constantly poorer as a people. Sending millions of our money annually to South America for meat and flour will never make us as a Nation more able to buy food and clothing generally.

The cost of living should be reduced, of course, but do not begin at the wrong end and cripple the producer; tariff rates are too high and should be lowered, but not to the extent of draining our country of its cash and putting our producers out of business. Hit the trusts as hard as you like, for the trusts are largely responsible for the high cost of living. The rake-off by middle men, inluding the freight rates and unnecessary machinery of distribution caused by the overcongestion of the cities; the watered stock of corporations, big and little; and the waste and destruction of capital in needless pursuits is responsible quite as much as the direct tariff for the excessive prices paid by consumers in this country, and the gentlemen on the other side are dreaming vainly if they think that this bill will solve the problem.

Mr. Chairman, if this revision were fairly and wisely made it would aim to help and not hamper the farmers of our country. The cities are too big now and contain to many nonproductive men, like lawyers and doctors and bankers and brokers, jobbers and journalists; too many clerks in too many offices, all occasioned by the artificial, abnormal, extravagant, unhealthy, and unwholesome life of the great congested cities. It would be infinitely better for the race if the pure and invigorating life of the farms was made so attractive, prosperous, and easy that men and women would live there by choice. Congestion is disease either in national or physical life; it induces pain and decay in the nation as it does in the body; it always means ultimate destruction if not checked and controlled. This bill encouraging cheap low living on foreign products in our seaboard cities is unscientific and utterly lacking in comprehensive statesmanship. So far as its agriculture schedules are concerned it is tax from any angle and it is hostile to the farmer. True it gives him free lumber, but with free meat, free flour, and free potatoes putting him in competition with the plains of South America and other foreign fields he will have no occasion to enlarge his barns and granaries and have no money with which to build new houses.

But, says the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], we have lowered the rate on cheap rugs and mats from China and Japan and we have put cash registers, lifeboats, and stones and sand on the free list. The farmers of the Northwest care little for Japanese art at any price. Their cash requires no registers in counting; they have all the stones and sand they need in their business. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the people of our cold country are entitled to have woolen blankets and woolen clothing at a more reasonable price than they have been compelled to pay, but it is not a square deal to put raw wool on the free list while still giving a protection to woolen manufacturers of 25 per cent on blankets, 35 per cent on dress goods, and 50 per cent on carpets. The Woolen Trust, with its lawyers and lobbyists, and not the farmer with his flocks of sheep, has always been responsible for the excessive cost of woolen goods. This bill continues to protect the Wool Trust. It will wipe out the sheep raisers of this country, and our money will go away for mutton as well as wool and help the farmers in foreign lands. The theory of this bill seems to rest on the principle of giving everything to the foreigner and getting nothing in return. It would be better to encourage the production of mutton and wool in this country. You discourage it in the face of the record since 1867, which shows that whenever the duties were below 11 cents per pound our flocks have decreased, while on the other hand they have always increased during periods when the rate was 11 cents per pound or higher. During the last four years of the time the 12½ cents per pound rates of 1867 were in force flocks increased about 25 per cent. During the six years of the time when the 1883 law of 10 cents per pound was in force they decreased 16 per cent. During something less than four years of the 11-cent rate of 1890 flocks showed an increase of 10 per cent. Under the law of 1894 for a like period, while wool was free, there was a decrease of 21 per cent in the flocks. Under the law of 1897 of 11 cents per pound there has been an increase of 46 per cent.

In the face of this record we may be able to eat cheap mutton while we idly sit and watch the passing of this Nation's dimin-

ishing herds of sheep, but if our herds are destroyed and the Packing Trust controls the carcasses that come from Argentina and Australia, will our mutton be either cheap or wholesome? Furthermore, it is absurd to argue that free raw wool will substantially affect the price of woolen clothing. Under the present rate the amount of the tariff tax actually paid on all of the raw wool that is used in the making of an ordinary suit of clothes is about 75 cents. It is the excessive rate on woolen clothing under the present law, and not the rate on raw wool, and the domination of the woolen trade by the trust that compels the consumer to pay from $5 to $15 per suit more than he should pay.

Mr. Chairman, permit me time in conclusion to say that this Underwood bill should not be recommended for passage in its present form. It is wrong and inconsistent to tax woolen clothing while admitting raw wool free; to tax wheat while admitting flour free; to tax cattle while admitting beef free. It is wrong to legislate our sheep raisers out of business; to make the hazardous business of raising potatoes on a large scale more hazardous by the free admission of that important product. It is wrong to put white men and women in Minnesota working at fair wages making clean and wholesome mats and rugs out of wire grass in competition with the cheap, low toilers of China and Japan, making similar rugs out of like material. It is wrong to cut the rate of hay in two, subjecting our farms to the vast prairies of Canada and preventing our farmers from properly conserving their land by rotating their crops unless they do so at a loss. It is wrong, selfish, and discriminating to tax the cheap furs needed in the North while admitting free the things required by the cotton growers of the South. It is wrong and unwise to legislate against agriculture as this bill does. It injures the farmer and laborer as well, for in our civilization they must stand or fall together. This measure is wise in many respects, but it is fundamentally unfair to the North, and especially the Northwest. It is a partial, partisan law. This bill will help the cotton belt and the congested seaboard cities; it will help consumers with fixed incomes here and there temporarily, but in the long result it can not serve this Nation well, because it will drain too much money to foreign lands, lower the standards of our toiling millions in their futile effort to compete with lower types, and set back and retard the growth of agriculture, which is and must always be the heart of this Nation's national life, the support of this Nation's strength, and the source of all our real and enduring greatness. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to take up the time of the House unnecessarily in a long discussion of the merits of the tariff bill, for the reason that I feel and know that every item in this bill has received most cautious and painstaking consideration not only at the hands of the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee but also by every Member of the Democratic Party on this side of the House. We have studied it, worked on it, and talked on it for days and weeks, even months, and the embodiment of our efforts is now contained in this bill before us. It is, of course, true that certain items of the bill like—for myself—farm products, for one instance, would be treated differently if we were each writing the bill for ourselves. I was opposed to the Canadian reciprocity bill because the duties on what the farmer consumed were not sufficiently lowered and, as I looked at it, he was discriminated against. But taking this tariff bill as a whole it will accomplish, in my humble opinion, what it is desired it should do, and that which we promised the American people we would do—that is, reduce the high cost of living and restore competition in the business world which for so long a time has been stifled by monopoly fostered by a prohibitive tariff.

I desire for a moment to express my full satisfaction and accord with the income-tax feature of this bill, and especially do I want to express my complete approval of its provisions. Other countries for many years have enjoyed the benefits of an income tax and have raised the major portion of their revenue from this tax on incomes. Through the good efforts and successes of a sufficient number of the States having ratified the amendment for an income tax we are now enabled to pass a bill which includes this income tax, and from its application and workings the Government will derive millions of dollars annually from the rich, which has heretofore been levied on the poor in the guise and nature of revenue duties on the necessities of everyday livelihood.

The income tax will oblige the man or corporation with a net annual income in excess of $4,000, as our bill now stands, to pay a percentage on the excess over that amount to the Government. This is fair and equitable from every standpoint, and can not justly be complained of by the persons and corporations who will be obliged to pay this tax. The men or company of affairs and large income, with their property, require the attention and protection of the officers and agents of our Government in the protection of themselves and their vast property rights. The more their property the more of that kind of protection they require, and it is nothing more than plain fairness that they should pay more toward the support of this Government than those who are less fortunate in their financial income and who therefore require less of the kind of protection mentioned. As a whole the tariff bill, with its income-tax features, will reduce, as is its aim, the abnormal high cost of living, and will speedily restore to the people of our country a more nearly equal footing between the men of wealth and the everyday men, like you and me.

I am not yet content, however, gentlemen, that we should stop here in our earnest efforts to provide a permanent relief to the people of this country, and before the expiration of this session of Congress I shall introduce in this House, for your consideration and ultimate approval, a measure that I have had under consideration for many months past. As it is in direct accord with our ideas to help the great mass of the people at large, it is not out of the way for me to mention it at this time. While we are complaining about the excessive tariffs on some of the items of daily consumption which go to make up the high cost of living, we should remember that in this vast country of ours, and especially in the Middle Western States and in that great and noble State of Kansas, a portion of which I have the honor to represent in this House, great numbers of people and, as a matter of fact, the great majority of the people are borrowers of money, and must borrow in order to carry on their business, whether they be merchants or farmers. The interest rates which they are required to pay are, in my opinion, exorbitant, and this great and powerful Government and the Democratic Party should be the first to give the people this relief and aid in the matter of lower interest rates also. At this time the statistics show the average rate of interest for the year 1912 paid by the borrowers of this country was 7.75 per cent. In the North Atlantic States the rate was 5.96; the South Atlantic States, 7.36; Northern Central States east of the Mississippi, 6.38; the Northern Central States west of the Mississippi, 8.5; the Eastern Central States, 9.51; and the far Western States, 8.55. This rate of interest makes a decided advance in the already high cost of living, and, as I have said before, it is time that our Government should come to the aid and assistance of these overburdened borrowers and provide for them a system whereby the Government will furnish to them money on approved security at 3.5 or 4 per cent. The bill I shall introduce in this Congress will provide for the establishment of a farm-loan department in the Government, under which plan a man with land for security—and the reason that I say land is because it is the basis of all wealth and has a fixed value and can not be destroyed—may apply to this Government for a loan for an amount not exceeding 50 per cent of the actual value of his land, and the Government, through its duly appointed agencies provided for in the bill for the purpose, will furnish the money on long time, and allow its repayment in reasonable options by the borrower. With the enactment into law of this bill in addition to our tariff bill we shall then not only have filled our full obligation to the American people, but we shall have brought unto them a benefaction that will bless them, and make it possible for even greater improvement in our rural districts, the establishment and maintenance of better homes, and a more genuine contentment among our people. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY].

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, within the past 50 years the United States has increased in population three times and in general wealth eight times. This period is coincident with the development and application of the theory of protection. The only times of general public distress in that period have been those when the protective policy has been set aside or seriously threatened adversely. Our material development has grown to great dimensions during this period when American opportunities were kept for the American farmer, the American laborer, the American manufacturer, and the American man of business generally. It is now proposed forcibly by law to open these opportunities to the world for the benefit of foreign peoples under such conditions as to give the Americans the worst of the situation, and this is to be done at once without providing opportunity for a gradual readjustment, which grace it seems to me should have been allowed to soften the blow at least. Our material prosperity is a great construction. It is

marvelous that any party calling itself an American party should think so little of this as to propose and support a measure whose purpose, effect, and intent is to forcibly alter the course of our development and to open to foreign manufacturers, laborers, and producers, in the name of compulsory competition, on terms unfair to Americans, the greatest market in the world freely and without securing to us any advantage in return. Our industries, our standards of living, our productions have reached their present high state of development under the protective system. Even if it might be conceded that the protective system was economically wrong, yet our American people, having made their greatest development under it, have a right to expect that if it is to be replaced by another and untried system that it be done in the least harmful way.

The raising of a revenue sufficient for the growing needs of a nation as great as ours is a serious problem. As the little girl said, whose mother found her soaking wet in the bathtub and asking what she was doing, "Mamma, I am trying to walk on the water, and I tell you its no fool's job, either." Yet the raising of a sufficient revenue is not necessarily a process antagonistic to production, labor, or industry. Under Republican administrations it has been made to foster every proper business and labor and production, and the Republican program of making the tariff equal the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad is an American plan to foster American industry.

Under the pending bill the raising of revenue appears to be the matter of first importance; even the title of the bill discards any claim of intention or purpose to foster or promote American industry. What answer will it be to the American producer when he asks for a place to sell his products, made by high-priced, intelligent labor, to say "See how our markets are filled with the products of the underpaid foreign laborer; or to the American laborer, when he asks for employment to secure the necessaries of life, to say "You might buy some things cheaper now if you had the money to do so." Some 20 years ago this was tried with the most disastrous results. And the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, that the policy now proposed has not produced injury rather than benefits. Is it wise to hazard our prosperity again?

The production of wool is of importance to not only those who make it their principal business to run sheep on land that can not profitably be used for other purposes, but also to the great majority of the farmers of the United States. The great flocks of sheep furnish a ready and steady market for crops of hay and other farm products that would have difficulty in finding a profitable market otherwise. They furnish a market close at hand, avoiding the losses incident to high cost of transportation elsewhere, even if a distant market could be found. The farmers use sheep as a profitable means of keeping their lands clean and of enriching them, and the returns from them, under the protective policy, furnish the farmer with a steady source of income. There is no justification for placing raw wool on the free list. There is no reason to believe that free wool will cause a reduction in the price of any yard of cloth used by the American consumer. Even if by putting wool on the free list any reduction in the price per yard were possible, it would not result to the benefit of the consumer, but would be absorbed by the manufacturer and the seller. And even if we should concede that the price of cloth per yard would be slightly reduced if raw wool were admitted free, it would not justify the great economic loss to the country as a whole in crippling and probably destroying one of our most important industries. With the present condition of production of meat foods, it is unwise to injure the production of mutton, one of the most wholesome and nutritious of all meat foods, the use of which will be sure of a large increase under conditions favorable to the growing of sheep. I recall very vividly that sheep were regarded as unprofitable animals in the early nineties, which both before and since have been a source of a steady income and profit to the growers. Most Oregon growers of sheep suffered severe losses in the period named, and they view the present policy of free wool with lively and well-founded distrust, and are wondering why an industry that befriends everybody should be again subject to conditions that have formerly wrought great injury.

Oregon ranks sixth among the sheep-producing States, which in the order of their importance are as follows: Montana, Wyoming, Ohio, New Mexico, Idaho, Oregon. And in wool production Oregon ranks sixth also.

From the 1913 report of the Oregon Board of Sheep Commissioners I quote as follows:

Assuming that in eastern Oregon there are 2,225,000 sheep and one man is employed for each 400 sheep, this would increase the number of citizens of our State intimately connected with the sheep industry to 45,562; and estimating that one in each six of these laborers is married and has a family of four, then we have 49,278 people in Oregon having a "bread and butter" interest in our sheep industry. This is a large per cent of the rural population of our State and should indicate to people that the sheep industry of Oregon is one of the greatest assets to our prosperous Commonwealth. The collection of data for the Tariff Board and our report shows that the Oregon flockmaster pays on an average of $1 per head to labor for all sheep he owns. We must bear in mind that the laborer on the sheep ranch is the best paid agricultural laborer in the State. These herders and camp tenders receive from $40 to $60 a month and their board. If we have 2,225,000 sheep in eastern Oregon, then the sheep industry of this State pays to eastern Oregon labor $1 for each sheep in this district, or $2,225,000. Western Oregon possibly runs sheep at an even greater expense in so far as labor is concerned, as it is generally conceded that large enterprises are in a position to get larger returns from its labor. We might conservatively estimate that western Oregon pays to labor for the care of her 300,000 sheep something like $400,000. This amount added to the money paid to eastern Oregon labor swells the total to the sum of $2,625,000. This amount relates solely to the labor caring for sheep and does not in any way include the clerk in the store, the banker, the employee of the railroad, and a score of other employees more or less dependent on the sheep industry. It is difficult to determine the exact amount of money that the sheep industry brings to the State, as the amounts vary from year to year. It might be reasonably estimated as great as $8,000,000 during the banner years. This is a large sum of money, but its importance is more appreciated when we remember that it is profit or income that is returned from the waste places of the State. It represents an amount of money that has been gleaned from the uninhabitable desert and the thickets of our mountains and, if not made use of by sheep grazing, would probably gradually undergo decay or form tinder for our forest fires. The valuation of the sheep and the equipment necessary to run the same in the State of Oregon may be conservatively placed at $32,000,000.

The protest I have made in behalf of the sheep grower can justly be made in behalf of the grower of grain, fruit, and other agricultural products, and in behalf of the producer of lumber and other products from trees in whose cost of production the labor cost is by far the largest item. All the industries in Oregon are legitimate, and criticisms upon their conduct are rare; and there are few which, it seems to me, will not be adversely affected by this bill if it becomes a law in its present form.

Placing meats upon the free list will tighten the grip of the Beef Trust upon the throat of the American raiser of cattle, sheep, and hogs and upon the purse of the American consumer. I submit the following quotation from the Daily Consular and Trade Reports of April 26, 1913. The flood of meat products to come in will not, I fear, prove of any material or permanent benefit to our people under the manipulations of the trust, but will work great injury to all engaged in growing meats in the United States. The trusts have not complained of the proposed schedules of this bill:

AUSTRALIAN BEEF FOR UNITED STATES.

[London Financial Times, Apr. 11, 1913.]

Australian Government commissioners at San Francisco confirm the statement that Australian beef, mutton, pork, and butter will in a few weeks flood the markets of San Francisco and other American cities.

LARGE TRADE PLANNED—BUTTER SUPPLY.

Expecting at least a lowering of the present tariff on meats admitted into America, the Swift and Armour interests are now preparing for the construction of a huge slaughterhouse and freezing plant at Brisbane, Queensland, from which they will ship to the States thousands of frozen sheep, hogs, and cattle weekly. The American companies will also handle Australian butter, which at the present has been debarred from the American market through the presence of boric acid as a preservative. Apparently the acid will be omitted in future, and freezing alone depended on for preserving.

According to Mr. D. E. Quinn, now New South Wales commissioner for the United States, hundreds of cattle breeders of Texas and other Southern and Western States have signified their intention of going to northern Australia and going into the cattle business upon a bigger scale than ever before attempted. Already concessions have been arranged for the taking over of vast portions of more than 1,000,000 square miles of virgin territory, which is adapted to the raising of millions of sheep and cattle annually.

LARGE PACKING PLANT.

The largest killing, freezing, and packing plant in the world will soon be in course of construction at one of the seaports of northern Australia, in which sheep, hogs, and cattle will be handled for the markets of the world.

The tariff as a revenue-collecting measure is economic and financial legislation. It involves the accurate and scientific study of world-wide production, distribution, and consumption. It includes costs of various kinds, such as the cost of raw materials, labor, plant and equipment, overhead charges, transportation, finding markets, and others. These several items vary both as to time and place. To collect all the facts, to interpret the information truly and fairly, and to express this interpretation properly in the form of legislation will require long, patient, and scientific study. For this reason I am in favor of a tariff board or commission which shall take up the tariff schedules one by one, investigate and report upon them to Congress and to the country that the people may be fully informed, and that thereupon Congress, with such impartial and scientific information to guide it, should pass tariff laws, schedule by schedule, on a basis that will equalize the cost of production at home and abroad and that will provide an adequate proportion of the revenue.

I favor and have favored a scientific reduction in many of the duties in the existing law. I believe the duties should be so distributed as to bear fairly upon all, according to their ability to pay where payment may be required, and in such a manner as to give no man or body of men an advantage over their fellow men; that is, so that none may be advantaged at the expense of others. I believe this is not true of the pending bill. Great combinations, with foreign connections, or plants now in existence or in process of construction or planned to be constructed, are its immediate beneficiaries.

There are a few features in the bill that are commendable. It is to be regretted that for the good of our people there are not many more. Its demerits are many. I approve a properly distributed and administered income tax, but find in the plan of collecting such a tax under the proposed measure many things to disapprove and which should be changed before the bill becomes a law. In its present form it will prove a burden and an annoyance, especially to the honest farmer and business man, and will discourage industrial investments and enterprises employing labor.

It is evident that, bound by the decisions of a secret caucus on this bill, our friends across the aisle, the Democratic Party, will pass this bill through the House without amendment, excepting such minor ones as the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means may offer. No vital amendment will be allowed; no plea that we may make, no evidence we may submit, and no argument we may advance, however sound, will receive consideration. Under such conditions consideration under the five-minute rule is a pretense, and no amendment offered from the floor of the House, no matter how sound or necessary for the country's good it may be, will be allowed to pass. Here, upon the floor of the House, where all can participate, and not in secret caucus, is the place to consider a great revenue measure that vitally affects all our people, and amendments offered from the floor ought to be voted up or voted down upon their intrinsic merits, and not by reason of action taken beforehand in secret caucus, binding a majority to vote against amendments no matter how important or valuable they may be.

There is a very general prosperity throughout the country, or was until the threat of free trade caused a slowing up. The farmer, the laborer, the manufacturer, the business man generally, and the professional man were doing well. It has been characteristic of Republican administrations that under them honest and legitimate industry has been fairly rewarded. The protective policy has justified itself. It is now proposed to disregard all this and to enter upon a policy little tried in recent years in this country, and when tried has caused distress and left painful memories.

The National Farmer and Stock Grower, St. Louis, Mo., says editorially in its issue for April, 1913, in part:

FARMERS AND THE TARIFF—WHAT CONGRESS IS LIKELY TO DO AND WHAT CONGRESS WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR IF THE PROTECTIVE SYSTEM IS LEGISLATED OUT OF BUSINESS.

The National Farmer and Stock Grower is not a political paper.

We venture the assertion that if the people of the United States were permitted to vote on the tariff question alone, and not have it mixed up with all other subjects that divide people into parties, the vote on the tariff would be overwhelmingly in favor of the protection to American industries of all kinds through the imposition of customs duties that would shut nothing out entirely, but would collect some money for the support of the Government on all raw materials and manufactured goods admitted from foreign countries.

* * * * * * *

People in the United States are not going to prosper on the money that goes to Australia for wool, or on the money that goes to Canada for wheat, or on the money that goes to Argentine for beef. We prosper on the money that is paid to our own people. It goes out and it comes back again. It gets into circulation. But the money that is sent abroad remains there, and our exports are not any larger from that source of revenue.

The farm productions of this country are ample for all purposes. One-half of the time our grain productions sell at prices that barely return the cost of production. There has never yet been a time when there was a bonanza in grain growing. Through years of low prices and sacrifice, cattle have for once reached what may be called high prices, but only because of the changes that on the one hand have destroyed cattle ranges, but the cattle ranges cut up into farms have not yet produced the maximum of beef. Year in and year out farm productions bring moderate prices, and the burdens of the consumer are not caused by the wholesale cost of anything the farmer raises.

We have no hesitancy in saying as our editorial opinion that the admission of farm products free of duty from other countries will gradually undermine the productive industries of this country. The change will not take place in a day, but we will soon be in the position of a family when the head of it gambles his earnings away instead of taking the money home to his wife. Industrial enterprises will be in difficulties, for the reason that trade will be dull and wages high. Less people will be employed and many industries will be at a standstill. The farmer will be able to feed himself, but he will find himself short of money; he will practice economy and produce crops that cost the least for seed and the least cost for labor.

In another column will be found an article entitled "Our industrial policy."

The article referred to is as follows:

OUR INDUSTRIAL POLICY—WE ARE IN FAVOR OF ALL FOREIGN FARM PRODUCTIONS PAYING A DUTY FOR THE SUPPORT OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT, AND TO PAY IT AT THE FRONT DOOR.

The National Farmer and Stockgrower is in favor of the United States customhouse collecting a reasonable range of duties upon all foreign farm products and all manufactured goods admitted into the United States from foreign countries, said duties to be applied to the support of the National Government.

By the tariff policy that we advocate fully one-half the money required for the support of the National Government should be collected at the customhouses, besides furnishing the farmer and manufacturer the very moderate amount of protection to which they are entitled. We are opposed to the admission of foreign farm products free of duty, because admission of such products duty free always leads to the advantage of the foreign merchant and speculator and causing increased burdens to be imposed on our own people.

The admission of foreign goods free of duty results in higher prices to the American consumer and higher taxation also upon our own products to make up the necessary revenues.

Every farmer in the United States is taxed by his county and by the State; he also pays a share of the taxes collected in various ways for the support of the Federal Government. We believe that in return for his support in tax money and in time of necessity for his personal services the American citizen is entitled to preference in his home market for his own productions from the laws of the Government he supports. We believe that the advantages of our own markets belong to the citizens of the United States, and that all foreign farm productions should pay a duty at the front door as the goods are admitted. In times of scarcity, caused by drought or other unavoidable influences, the foreign farm productions can come in under light duties on a fair basis, and in times of abundance the country thrives better without them.

We believe the farmer as a producer outranks all other people; the manufacturer is next; but without the farmer's products the manufacturer would have to shut his doors.

Legislation against the farming interest is the height of folly, and special discrimination against the farmer is a political crime. Legislation against the farmer will cause more poverty in the cities than most people imagine. The nonproducing so-called consumers in cities will be the first to find it out and be the greatest sufferers.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE].

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative from the great manufacturing State of Pennsylvania, I would be remiss in my duty to my fellow citizens if I did not enter a protest against the tariff bill now under consideration.

The Democratic Party told us during the campaign that it was not their intention to disturb or injure any legitimate business, but what has been the result of this proposed legislation? The measure no sooner emerges from the Democratic caucus, where it has been considered in secret and behind closed doors, than the farmer, the mechanic, the merchant, and the manufacturer alike are alarmed over the situation.

It is admitted as an economic principle that the prime essential of business prosperity is public confidence in the good sense of the Government and its ability to deal intelligently with the various problems of legislation that confront it. That confidence the Democratic Party has not had for many years, and now just in the beginning of its career its party pledges are being broken, and its tariff measure is admitted as inadequate and not in harmony with the conditions in our country.

The Republican doctrine of sound tariff requires that the duties shall be fixed neither too high nor too low.

In the Sixty-first Congress a Tariff Board was created, which considered carefully Schedules K and I, the woolen and cotton schedules, but the Democratic Party has ignored the labors of that board, and has not given the kind of tariff the country needs but proceeds in the old way of tariff tinkering. All Republicans and many Democrats deplore the measure.

The Republican Party to-day stands unequivocally for a tariff board and has introduced into the Sixty-third Congress a bill creating a permanent nonpartisan tariff commission.

The manufacturer tells us if the Underwood bill becomes a law he will have to reduce wages or close down his works.

The farmer, penetrating the delusion of free agricultural implements, when there is nothing made abroad that competes with the American products, sees nothing in the bill to induce his boy to remain on the farm.

The mechanic and laborer know full well that if we are to compete with the markets of the world their products which come from the sweat of the brow must share their burden of tariff reduction.

Some of our citizens still remember the last time the Democratic Party revised the tariff and the awful consequences that followed. Business was stagnated, industry paralyzed, and the Nation's credit impaired. The country's capital had disappeared and its labor was unemployed and distressed.

The Republican Party promised to restore prosperity by means of a protective tariff. The people by a great majority commissioned the Republican Party to enact such laws and almost instantly all branches of industry revived. The mills and shops became busy. Unemployed labor was put to work.

The farmer had a market for his crops and the merchant for his wares. Every section of the country rejoiced and was glad.

Under wise laws enacted by the Republican Party and the honest administration of them prosperity continued almost continually for 16 years and all classes prospered as never before, and each individual by his own thrift and industry, energy and capacity profited to the fullest extent.

It now rests upon the Democratic Party, entering upon its new career, whether we shall march on to nobler triumphs and achievements or whether we shall compel the masses to compete with the low wages of Europe; whether the Nation shall take a step forward or backward; whether, when Democratic theories and beliefs are enacted into laws, prosperity will be continued; whether the price of that which labor produces can be lowered without interference with that labor itself.

If our country prospers under the conditions created by the Underwood bill, then the Democratic Party will probably continue in power, but if the consequences of this tariff legislation shall be of such character as to bring disaster to our country, then we may confidently expect that the Republican Party will write the next tariff bill.

The protective policy has set up a different social, educational, and ethical standard for the wage earner than that of Europe.

In the twenty-fifth congressional district of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor to represent, the wage earner is a home owner and a happy, contented, and prosperous individual. His children have the advantage of a high-school education. His wife and family dress becomingly, and, taken as a class, they are among our best citizens, and I apprehend there is practically no difference between my district and a large majority of the congressional districts of the United States.

Our highest duty to our country is not to seek world-wide commercial supremacy but rather to maintain our high standard of citizenship, not "the whetting of American wits by contest with the rest of the world," but rather we should strive to promote the highest class of citizenship by giving equal opportunity to all to attain the higher enjoyments of life.

This should be America's highest purpose, inspiring, unifying, and fundamental. [Loud applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Does the gentleman from Alabama desire to yield some time now?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRINGER].

Mr. STRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this allotment of time in the midst of this discussion, not that I am presumptuous enough to believe that I can impart to the membership of this House any information of which it is not already possessed, but primarily to place in the RECORD my emphatic protest against what to my mind has been a profanation of the fair name and reputation of one of the most distinguished Americans who ever graced the presidential chair.

From my boyhood days, Mr. Chairman, I have ever been a worshiper at the shrine of the Sage of Monticello. In my humble way I have sat at his feet in historic memory and sought to govern my own thoughts on national affairs by those eternal precepts which he enunciated at the day dawn of our history and which have ever since been the guiding tenets of our national faith.

I have always been taught and believed that Jefferson ever stood the enemy of monopoly, the foe to oppression, the friend of labor, and the inspiration of youth.

I have ever been taught and believed that Jefferson stood at all times for purity in public life, economy in the public service, the abolition of special privileges to the few, for taxes no greater than government needs, and for a trade unfettered and free.

Yet despite all this, you and I have been seriously invited, in this present session of this Congress, now convened, by a gentleman on the other side of the aisle, to consider the great Jefferson, the Nation's first commoner, in the light of an apostle and high priest of prohibitive protection and his shades monstrously invoked to bolster up an iniquitous system of unrighteous taxation, now crumbling to its fall, which in its operations has harbored unhallowed combinations of greed, stifled competition, controlled the ebb and flow of trade, fixed the price of daily life, debauched the franchise, and built its fortifications upon the bones of the poor.

In the blaze and light of our boasted latter-day civilization, in the capital of the most enlightened people on the face of the earth, in a Chamber set apart for the deliberations of the greatest legislative body in the world, we are presented with the monstrous doctrine that the Sage of Monticello, friend of the people that he was, was an advocate of that competition-destroying policy in governmental affairs which robs the many for the benefit of the privileged few.

Substantially, that statement has as yet gone unchallenged in the record, but I propose to and do challenge it now and here.

JEFFERSON'S VIEWS.

The gentleman from Ohio has stated that Thomas Jefferson favored a protective tariff and cites as authority statements made by Jefferson in his Foreign Commerce Report of 1793, where he advocates discriminative duties as against nations discriminating against us.

Jefferson favored discriminating duties, it is true. But why and when? I submit, as a matter of history, proved by the records as they now exist, that the discriminating tariffs which Jefferson favored early in his career, but which he greatly modified in his latter years, were advocated by him not as a fixed and settled policy for this Government to pursue, not as a principle to be followed at all times, but as a makeshift policy of temporary design, to be used as a measure of retaliation, and reprisal as well, in situations imminent and extreme, in order that nations which discriminated against us might thereby be compelled to remove those barriers to mutual trade and that free commerce might again prevail.

Had the gentleman from Ohio been more candid he would have read further from that same Foreign Commerce Report the conclusion Jefferson reached in the whole matter when he added these words:

> Could each country be free to exchange with others mutual surpluses for mutual wants, the greatest mass possible would then be produced of those things which contribute to human life and human happiness, the numbers of mankind would be increased and their condition bettered. (Foreign Commerce Report, Ford's edition, VI, 479, Dec., 1793.)

And what sort of a duty was it to which Jefferson referred in his Foreign Commerce Report? The highest duty known to the schedules at that time amounted to about 10 per cent and its general average was about 5. To cite Thomas Jefferson, who always favored free exchange as a permanent policy to be pursued, but advocated a tariff of 5 per cent as a temporary measure to retaliate against those who discriminated against us—to cite the great Jefferson as an apostle of a high protection which reaches the altitude of the present law—is a proposition too monstrous and too unthinkable to go unchallenged.

JEFFERSON NOT A PROTECTIONIST.

Jefferson a protectionist? Let us see. To Elbridge Gerry, in 1799 (Ford's edition, VII, 328), he wrote:

> I am for a government rigorously frugal and simple, applying all possible savings of the public revenue to the discharge of the national debt. I am for free commerce with all nations and political connection with none.

To William Short, United States chargé d'affaires, he wrote, on July 28, 1791 (Ford's edition, V, 364):

> An exchange of surpluses and wants between neighbor nations is both a right and a duty under the moral law, and measures against right should be mollified in their exercise, if it be wished to lengthen them to the greatest term possible.

To John Adams, in July of 1785 (Ford's edition, IV, 81), he wrote:

> I think all the world would gain by setting commerce at perfect liberty. I take it for granted that the commercial system wished for by Congress was such a one as should leave commerce on the freest footing possible.

And again, in his Notes on Virginia, written in 1782 (Ford's edition, III, 279), he says:

> Our interest will be to throw open the doors of commerce and to knock off all its shackles, giving perfect freedom to all persons for the vent of whatever they may choose to bring into our ports and asking the same in theirs.

In 1823, when the question was agitated of raising the duties to an average of about 20 per cent, to Thomas Cooper, who had written and forwarded to Jefferson a pamphlet protesting against the proposed raise, Jefferson, in acknowledging the receipt of the same and noting its publication in Ritchie's Enquirer, said:

> I was only sorry he did not postpone it to the meeting of Congress, when it would have gotten into the hands of all the Members and could not fail to have a great effect, perhaps a decisive one. It is really an extraordinary proposition that the agricultural, mercantile, and navigating classes should be taxed to maintain that of manufactures. (Ford's edition, X, 285).

Referring to the same subject, on May 3, 1825, he wrote to Samuel Smith:

> Taxes on consumption, like those on capital or income, to be just, must be uniform. I do not mean to say that it may not be for the general interest to foster for a while certain infant manufactures until they are strong enough to stand against foreign rivals; but when evident that they will never be so, it is against right to make the other branches of industry support them. When it was found that France could not make sugar under 6 h. a pound, was it not tyranny to restrain here citizens from importing at 1 h.? Or would it not have been so to have laid a duty of 5 h. on the imported? The permitting an exchange of industries with other nations is a direct encouragement of your own, which without that would bring you nothing for your comfort and would, of course, cease to be produced. (Ford's edition, X, 252).

And when, despite his advice to the contrary, Congress passed the act raising the tariff to the said 20 per cent, Jefferson wrote his friend, Richard Rush:

> Congress has just risen, having done nothing remarkable, except the passing of a tariff bill by squeezing majorities, very revolting to a great portion of the people of the States, among whom it is believed it would not have received a vote but of the manufacturers themselves. It is considered as a levy on the labor and efforts of the other classes of industry to support that of manufacture, and I wish it may not draw on our surplus and produce retaliating imposition from other nations. (Ford's edition, X, 304).

Mr. Chairman, I deny that Thomas Jefferson was a protectionist in the modern acceptation of that term. I deny that the moderate duties favored by him are even comparable, in principle or intent, to the duties now levied under existing laws. On the contrary, I affirm that he always stood for the freest of trade interchange between all nations of the earth, and his acts, declarations, and writings unquestionably prove it.

THE PEOPLE VOTED FOR TARIFF REVISION.

Mr. Chairman, the pending tariff measure, known as the Underwood bill, in my humble judgment, is not only a Jeffersonian reform but is in strict accordance with the instructions of the people as registered by them at the polls.

The tariff question is hoary with age, and has occupied the attention, more or less, of the American Congress since the days of the Nation's birth. But the present revival of public interest in this question dates back to the campaign of four years ago.

In that campaign the tariff was the leading, important, and paramount issue. It was then substantially conceded on all sides that the Dingley bill, by reason of its excessive rates, had lessened production, stifled competition, harbored monopoly, and needed immediate revision.

So strong was the public sentiment in that regard that the Republican platform of that year, upon which Mr. Taft was elected, pledged itself in unequivocal terms to a special session of Congress, to be called immediately after the inauguration, to revise the tariff.

During the ensuing campaign, as we all remember, Mr. Taft, on the rear of railroad trains and in great auditoriums throughout the land, repeatedly and specifically declared that that pledge of the Republican platform meant "a substantial revision downward."

To a great Milwaukee audience he said:

> It is my judgment that a revision of the tariff in accordance with the pledge of the Republican platform will be, on the whole, a substantial revision downward, though there probably will be a few exceptions in this regard.

Without these declarations Mr. Taft could never have been elected. The people took him at his word, believed his pledges, trusted in his promises, and made him their Executive to carry out the same.

PLEDGES UNFULFILLED.

How did he fulfill them? His first message to Congress, 40 pages in extent, dealt with conditions in the District of Columbia, pleaded for a ship-subsidy law, but was as silent on the all-absorbing question of tariff revision as the deep-mouthed grave.

The final answer which the people received for their demands for tariff revision was the passage of the Payne-Aldrich law, which in its general effect really increased the burdens of tariff taxation and left the people more at the mercy of the trusts than they had ever been before—a law which the late Republican Senator, Jonathan P. Dolliver, of Iowa, described by saying "that the two greatest fakes perpetrated upon the American people" in that year "were Dr. Cook's discovery of the North Pole and the Payne-Aldrich revision of the tariff."

That bill was passed by a Republican Congress, signed and approved by President Taft, and in his subsequent well-known Winona speech he declared it to be the best tariff bill ever enacted by Congress.

THE REBUKE OF 1910.

I need not at this time go into the details of the campaign of 1910 which followed. It resulted in a political revolution. The people rose in their might and relegated to the rear over 100 Congressmen who perpetrated this act, and changed a Republican Congress of 47 majority, with Joseph Cannon as Speaker, into a Democratic Congress of 66 majority, with CHAMP CLARK as Speaker. And to-day in this Congress we behold that Democratic majority increased to 157, with Joseph Cannon succeeded in this body by a Democrat and CHAMP CLARK, by the grace of God and the American people, still the Speaker of the House.

I do not claim that these victories were Democratic partisan victories. They were nonpartisan victories for the people against the special interests. They were triumphs of justice against conscienceless greed. It was an uprising of progressives of all parties alike to place the seal of condemnation on those who had trifled with the liberties of the people. It was a rebuke to President Taft and the party in power for their failure to keep their pledges.

THE REBUKE UNAVAILING.

Yet this rebuke, positive though it was, somehow or other, failed to impress the mind of President Taft or the minds of the Republicans Members of Congress.

For years the Wool Trust had been growing powerful and strong. It had secured protection under the Payne-Aldrich law that was approximately prohibitive. It had increased the price of woolen goods to such an extent that they were beyond the reach of most of our citizens. It was paying enormous dividends to holders of stock. At the same time, as shown in the strike investigation of the Lawrence mills, it was paying starvation wages to its employees, even charging the children who worked in these mills for the very water they drank during their hours of arduous toil. Even President Taft admitted that the wool schedule was indefensible.

Yet despite that admission, despite the rebuke administered to him in the campaign of 1910 by the people at the polls, when the new Democratic Congress, true to its pledges to the people, passed a bill reducing the wool schedule, when enough progressive Republican votes were secured to pass the bill through the Senate, this measure of relief to the American people was struck down by President Taft by the interposition of his veto.

When a Democratic Congress, true to its pledges, passed the farmers' free list bill, when that bill, with progressive Republican assistance, also passed the Senate, President Taft again interposed his veto and again destroyed a wholesome measure of relief.

That bill gave free farming implements to the tillers of the soil. It gave free sewing machines to seamstresses who burn out their eyes making a livelihood. It gave free boots and shoes to those who will go unshod through the wintry snows. It gave free lumber to those who would build schoolhouses and churches and homes for their families. But this measure was also vetoed by the occupant of the White House.

THE ISSUE IN 1912.

Upon this issue President Taft and the Republicans in Congress went before the people in the campaign of 1912 and this issue raised by them was again the leading, dominant, and paramount issue of the campaign.

The Republican Party in its platform indorsed the position of President Taft, renominated him for the Presidency, declared again for a high-protective tariff, and condemned "the Democratic tariff bills passed by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second Congress as sectional, as injurious to the public credit, and as destructive of business enterprise," just as the same party by its Representatives in this Congress are condemning the pending bill to-day.

In the election which followed over 15,000,000 voters registered their views at the polls. Of that number barely three and a half millions indorsed the tariff policy of President Taft and the Republican Members of the Sixty-second Congress. In other words, that policy was repudiated by a majority of over 11,000,000.

THE PROGRESSIVE PARTY.

I have listened in this Hall during the present session of this Congress to slighting references from both sides of the aisle to the fact that the Progressive Party has small representation in this body. But I call your attention to the fact that, small as that representation may be, the few Progressive Members here represent over 4,000,000 voters in this land, and from the tabulated returns have the right to claim that their party is the second great party in this Nation.

While Woodrow Wilson received 435 electoral votes, Theodore Roosevelt received 88 to William H. Taft's quota of 8. While Woodrow Wilson carried 40 States in this Union, Theodore Roosevelt carried 6 as against Mr. Taft's 2.

PLEDGED TO IMMEDIATE REVISION.

But do you tell me that the Progressive Party is a protection party? If you mean by that that the Progressive Party is pledged to the tariff policy outlined by Mr. Taft and the Republican Members of Congress in the Sixty-first and Sixty-second Congress, I emphatically deny it.

I go further and say, and I call the attention of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], the Progressive leader upon the floor of this House, to the statement that if he and the Progressive Members of this body whom he leads desire to carry out the declarations of their own platform—and I believe they do—they will be compelled by the logic of those declarations to join with us in the passage of the pending measure.

In their platform adopted in Chicago they declare—

We demand tariff revision because the present tariff is unjust to the people of the United States. Fair dealing toward the people requires an immediate downward revision of those schedules wherein duties are shown to be unjust or excessive.

Do you tell me that the Progressive Party favors a nonpartisan tariff commission? That is true, but in the plank in the Progressive platform declaring for such commission their party concludes by saying:

The work of the commission should not prevent the immediate adoption of acts reducing those schedules generally recognized as excessive.

The Progressive Party, therefore, stands pledged to immediate downward revision of the tariff, irrespective of the question of a nonpartisan tariff commission. It so specifically declares in its platform. It denounces the Payne-Aldrich law as "unjust to the people." It declares for an income tax. And I say to the gentleman from Kansas, as his conferees have already said to us, that if they fail to keep faith with the people and fail to carry out the pledges which they have made they will likewise meet the condemnation which they will deserve.

PROPHETS OF ILL.

But we are told that the passage of the pending measure will bring untold disaster upon the Nation at large. Gentlemen upon this floor predict all sorts of terrible evils that will follow. They predict fireless furnaces, smokeless chimneys, unemployed labor, and ruined industries. They even intimate that innocent children will cry, fair women lament, and strong men despair.

The very same men who a few decades ago denominated the Populists of Kansas as being composed of "calamity howlers" and discontents are to-day outhowling the most vociferous Populist who predicted general ruin in those historic days.

So voluble and clamorous are they in prophesying evil things that a suspicion lurks about their utterances that "the wish is father to the thought," that they will be disappointed if this disaster does not come, and are perfectly willing that the country should be plunged into the misery they describe if by reason thereof their political prospects will be improved and the cohorts of special privileges again returned to power.

It is freely conceded that panics are largely the result of conditions of the public mind. The strongest financial institution may be wrecked in a day by a distrustful condition brought about by the malevolence or thoughtlessness of a few who circulate rumors calculated to disturb. If disaster follows the passage of this bill, this now brood of "calamity howlers" can give themselves credit for having done their part to precipitate the same.

This is the established method used by all oppressors of the people in the history of the world. These prophecies of dire disaster were freely used in the last campaign. But for once they failed to deceive. The only hope now is to bring on these disasters by the various methods so well known, in order that these prophets of ill may point back to their preelection predictions and claim that they have been fulfilled.

FAIR TRIAL REQUIRED.

Every new law requires the requisite time for the proper working out of its provisions. Immediate beneficial results can not be expected in the very nature of things. Time is necessary for the readjustment of business conditions to any new state of affairs.

The people won a signal victory over special privilege last fall. The pending bill crystallizes that victory into law. The friends of special privilege, who oppose this law, regard the public as fickle and hope to discredit the law before it is given a fair trial and an opportunity to prove its real worth. If the public reverses its verdict before that fair trial is had, the hands on the dial of reform will be turned back. All that the people have gained will be lost and the next victory in their behalf will be more difficult to secure and will be very long delayed.

EFFECTS OF HIGH-TARIFF POLICY.

Under the operations of a high-protective schedule competition has been destroyed, individual opportunity lost, society stratified into classes, and financial power aggregated in a few hands. The prosperity we have apparently enjoyed has been a prosperity limited to the privileged few, but has not been generally diffused among the whole people.

Reports of strikes, lockouts, and labor troubles in the great industries of the land meet the eye on every page of the daily press. The terrible conditions in the sweatshops and tenement districts of our large cities alternate with stories of child labor and starvation wages paid employees in the mills, as the investigation of the strike in the woolen mills of Lawrence, Mass., so conclusively shows.

In a recent article published in the current number of the American Federationist the great labor leader, John Mitchell, says:

From public and private institutions of charity comes the ominous warning that the means at hand are insufficient to relieve the cry of distress; the bread line proclaims that something is radically wrong. Trades-unions have given out millions of dollars to buy bread for those of their number who can find no work to do. And all this time, during which able-bodied men, anxious and willing to work, are tramping the streets and highways in idleness, hundreds of thousands of immigrants are pouring in upon us.

I quote this statement to call attention to the fact that under a high-protective tariff such conditions exist. I quote it for another reason and that is to base a prophecy thereupon. Upon and for some time after the passage of this bill, these conditions, in a measure, are likely to continue to exist, for it will require time to remove them. But from the moment of the passage of this bill these very conditions, now existing under the present tariff law, will be charged by protection advocates as conditions arising as a result of the passage of the Underwood bill. Every strike, every labor trouble, every industrial depression that shall occur after this bill becomes a law, even though a direct result of the years of tariff legislation which have preceded them, will produce a new chorus of protection howls, with a view to prejudice and confound the people.

THE "CLEVELAND PANIC" FALSEHOOD.

Is this prophecy unwarranted and unsound? I appeal to history. I first assert that there has not been a protective-tariff speech made in this country since the year 1893 that has not been tuned upon what has been called the "Cleveland panic" of that year. I assert next that the so-called "Cleveland panic of 1893" was not a "Cleveland panic" at all, but was the Harrison high-protective tariff panic of 1891 and 1892, which was projected into the Cleveland administration, beginning in 1893.

Yet, despite this fact, the charges have been rung on this Cleveland panic falsehood for nearly 20 years. It has been thundered from the public rostrum, printed in the daily and weekly press, and promulgated in every section of the Nation. It has been echoed by political spellbinders, great and small, in every campaign, and there is not a hamlet in the width and breadth of the land where the street-corner protection advocate, driven to cover by his adversary in every argument presented, has not sneeringly rejoined that "you want to return to the Cleveland hard times of 1893."

Grover Cleveland was first inaugurated President in 1885, Benjamin Harrison was inaugurated President in 1889, and Grover Cleveland was inaugurated the second time in 1893. Benjamin Harrison's administration was thus sandwiched in between Cleveland's first and second terms.

It will be conceded that during Cleveland's first administration the country enjoyed prosperity to a noteworthy degree. Business conditions were good, trade was active, labor was employed, industrial troubles were substantially unknown, the public debt was reduced by nearly half a million, and when Cleveland retired, in 1889, there was turned over to Mr Harrison, his successor, a Treasury surplus aggregating three hundred millions This surplus furnished the political issue for the campaign of 1888, and on every stump the question of the day was, "What shall we do with the surplus now in the Treasury?" And this was the situation of things when Benjamin Harrison was inducted into office as Grover Cleveland's successor, in 1889.

EFFECT OF THE M'KINLEY LAW.

But, from the year 1889, when Mr. Harrison assumed the reins of power, business conditions took on a more somber hue. In 1890, during Harrison's second year, the McKinley tariff bill was passed, raising tariff rates all along the line. It was passed by a high-tariff Congress, signed by the President in due course of time, and enacted into a law.

On October 9, 1890, the McKinley tariff law went into effect. One month and two days after, the New York Clearing House Association voted its certificates to its allied banks, admitted to be in dire distress, and six days later the Boston Clearing House did the same. On the same day the banking house of Barker Bros., of Philadelphia, failed for five millions. Two days later there was a run on the Citizens' Saving Bank of the same city, and a receiver appointed for the North River Bank. Five days later, the Union Rolling Stock Co., of Chicago, assigned for seven millions. Six days later, Jamison & Co., of Philadelphia, failed for two millions; and on December 6, the Oliver Iron & Steel Mills, of Pittsburgh, closed down, throwing 2,000 workmen out of employment; and Myer & Co., of New Orleans, failed with liabilities of two millions. This was

the record of the first year of the McKinley high-tariff law and the second year of Mr. Harrison's administration.

The year 1891 opened up with continuing business disasters. On January 3, the Scottsdale Rolling Mills and the Charlotte Furnace Co., of Philadelphia, went to the wall, throwing out 10,000 workmen. On January 18, the American National Bank, of Kansas City, shut its doors, with liabilities of nearly three millions. On May 8, the Spring Garden National Bank and the Pennsylvania Trust Co. closed their doors. Business failures, which had increased to 10,000 in 1890, the first year of the McKinley law, increased to over 12,000 in 1891, and in the fall of 1892, just before Cleveland was reelected for his second term, there occurred the bloody Homestead strike at Carnegie's Mills, which wrote the most awful chapter in our Nation's industrial history.

I pause here to advert that all this occurred under the operations of the high-tariff McKinley law and close upon the heels of its enactment, and I pause further to muse for a moment as to what a mighty volume of clamorous sound would arise from the cohorts of protection if the Underwood bill should face conditions at any time after its passage one-hundredth part as disastrous as those which faced the McKinley bill within 12 months after its enactment. It is safe to say that the sunset chorus of the wild jackasses on mid-Pacific isles would be like the murmur of gentle breezes in comparison to it.

In 1892, following the general run on the banks of the country, already described, gold began to disappear and go to Europe and the National Treasury was soon drained of its supply of gold. It was then charged and has never been successfully denied that this disappearance of gold was part and parcel of a general conspiracy, framed and carried into effect by sinister interests in the land, to force the hands of Congress to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman law.

CLEVELAND'S SECOND TERM.

Such were the conditions existing when Cleveland became President a second time in 1893, and such were the conditions which really caused his election in 1892. When he retired from power in 1889 he left prosperity general and diffused; when he returned to power in 1893, after four years of Harrison's rule, he found distress and disaster. He left the times good and found them bad; he left business flourishing and found it prostrated; he left conditions satisfactory and found breaking banks, closed factories, labor out of employment, and gold disappearing as if under a magician's wand. He left a surplus of three hundred millions in the Treasury vaults, but returned to find that surplus dissipated and gone and a deficit of fifty millions, which had to be met and met without delay.

To replenish the Treasury and meet the deficit which had been willed to him by a high-tariff administration preceding, he was forced to issue bonds. And these bonds issued by him were printed on plates that had been manufactured and engraved by order of Harrison's Secretary of the Treasury before Harrison went out of office, to be used by the Harrison administration itself had it been returned to power.

And yet despite these facts, proven by reference to history, either known or accessible to all, this falsehood of a "Cleveland panic of 1893," hoary with age, is brought out in every campaign to mislead the unwary, frighten the ignorant, and perpetuate a system of high taxation which aggrandizes the very rich at the expense of the very poor.

WHY NOT BE FAIR?

Why not be fair? Has not the time for cheap demagoguery passed by? The less informed may be pardoned for their omissions to state the facts, for they but echo the utterances of those higher in the party's councils. But those higher up know that the so-called "Cleveland free-trade hard times" were not Cleveland times at all.

The "Cleveland panic of 1893" did not exist; it was the Harrison panic of 1892. It occurred under high-tariff rule, with a high-tariff President and Congress in full control in every branch of Government and with the McKinley high-tariff law upon the statute books of the Nation. The hard times of Cleveland's first year in 1893 was a legacy bequeathed to him by a high-tariff administration just relinquishing power. It was a cancer which former modes of living had produced upon the body politic of the Nation, and which required the surgeon's knife to bring about a cure. It was a foundling left upon the doorstep of the new administration, its natural parents having refused to father their own child.

Equally absurd is the claim that the Wilson tariff bill brought about these ills. The panic began in 1890 and 1891, reached its height in 1892 and 1893, and the Wilson tariff bill did not go into effect until the fall of 1894.

It is difficult to explain—

Said Senator Dolliver, Republican Senator from Iowa, in discussing the tariff in the Senate of the United States—

how a panic which came in 1893 could have been caused by a tariff law which was not enacted until the latter part of 1894.

Neither can it be well said that the fear of lower tariff duties caused these hard times, for the panic was at its height before Mr. Cleveland was elected, and his election was due to the fact that times were so hard that the people desired and welcomed a change, and they voted the Democratic ticket to bring about the change of policies on the tariff question which Mr. Cleveland had advocated at all times.

SOME PANIC HISTORY.

Going one step further in this argument, the history of tariff legislation conclusively proves that the panics of the country have not occurred in low-tariff times but, on the contrary, every panic through which the country has passed occurred under high-tariff administrations and under the full operation of high-tariff laws.

The great panic of 1869, which gave "Black Friday" to our history, occurred under the administration of President Grant, both Houses Republican and the war-tariff taxes in operation to their full extent.

The panic of 1873, marked by the failure of Jay Cooke & Co., likewise occurred under the administration of President Grant, a Republican Congress, and high-tariff laws.

The panic of 1893 occurred with Benjamin Harrison as President, a Republican Congress, and the McKinley bill in full force and effect.

The money panic of 1907 occurred with Theodore Roosevelt in the saddle, a Republican Senate and House, and the Dingley bill doing business every day at the same old stand.

That a panic existed in 1907, I offer in evidence the declarations published in magazines and newspapers, at advertising rates, in the campaign just past, placarded throughout the Nation on billboards and walls in letters so broad and long that all could read, and which declarations were duly signed by the chairman and secretary of the national Republican committee in their official capacity. I note a few of these choice extracts:

Only four years ago (1907), just before President Taft was elected, there was panic and misery. Capital was tied up in safe-deposit boxes; mills and factories were closed, because manufacturers could not sell the goods they made; empty freight cars filled the railroad sidings; farms were mortgaged; labor was hungry and desperate.

And again:

When President Taft took over the Government the country was prostrate; industry was paralyzed; business was chaotic, uncertain, suspicious; millions were out of employment; investors, wherever possible, had withdrawn their capital; enterprise was dead. All this was the result of the panic of 1907. The rich man's panic, it was called, but do you remember any poor man who was not hurt?

Mr. Chairman, I have listened in this debate to the terrible prophecies of dire disaster that are to befall the Nation in the event the pending bill becomes a law. I desire to say in passing that if all these calamitous prophesies should come true the conditions would not be one-half as bad as those officially declared by the Republican national committee to have been in existence in 1907, when a Republican President was in the White House, a Republican Congress in the Capitol, and the Dingley high-tariff bill in full force and effect.

WHO WILL BRING ON THE PANIC?

I do not know, neither do you, what is in store for the American people in the years yet to come. Times may be good or bad, as the conditions may occur. But this I know and know full well, that if times be bad the new tariff law passed here will be charged with every ill that befalls the country, no matter what the cause of those ills may be.

But I undertake to say that no low-tariff law has ever yet brought industrial disaster. And if disaster comes, following the passage of this law, it will be the result not of the provisions in this bill contained, but the failure of crops, the disarrangement of the normal conditions in supply and demand by the thousand occurrences which may bring it about, or, what is more likely, the machinations of those who manipulate, juggle, and control the credit which is the lifeblood of the Nation.

The Pujo Money Trust investigation committee, in its report, describes a startling condition which exists in this Nation of ours. They tell us that two great banks in the metropolis of New York hold interlocking directorships in substantially all of the great financial, industrial, transportational, and commercial institutions of the land. They substantially tell us in that report that less than 100 men control the volume of production, the highways of trade, and the commercial and industrial life of the Nation. Such being the case, this less than a hundred

men can precipitate a panic at any time, bringing disaster and devastation on ninety-five millions of people.

If disaster comes after the passage of this bill, who will bring it about? The farmer, the laborer, the business, or professional man will certainly not do it. If this less than a hundred men produce it, what will their object be? Will it not be to serve notice on the American people that the rule of special privilege must not be disturbed? Will it not be to serve notice that a disturbance of that rule is to invite this disaster? Will it not be a threat, a coercion, and an enslavement?

If that is the condition that confronts us as a people and we abjectly surrender to this intimidation, is not our boasted liberty really destroyed, and do not the people become slaves and chattels to a moneyed oligarchy, despotic and exacting?

THE WALKER TARIFF.

Standing boldly out in contradistinction to the array of panics which mark the Nation's history in high-tariff times is the prosperity which fell like a benediction on all during the low-tariff period following the enactment of the Walker law in 1846. Especially appropriate is this comparison now, for the reason that the Underwood bill in its general provisions and average rates is in a measure a reenactment of the Walker tariff law.

The average rates in the Walker law was about 24 per cent; the average rates in the pending bill are substantially the same. The Walker law was not framed with a view to protection, neither was the bill being considered now. The Walker law was a revenue act with protection incidental, and so is the Underwood law. The Walker law placed all schedules on a competitive basis, and the pending measure does the same.

What, then, was the effect on the country of the Walker tariff law, enacted in 1846 and, except for a further reduction in 1857, remaining on the statute books until 1860 substantially unchanged? As testimony I ask leave to cite the statements of James G. Blaine, an authority whom no Republican and no protectionist will likely question or dispute. In his Twenty Years in Congress, volume 1, page 196, he says:

The tariff of 1846 was yielding abundant revenue and the business of the country was in a flourishing condition at the time his administration—

Gen. Taylor's—

was organized. Money became very abundant after the year 1849. Large enterprises were undertaken, speculation was prevalent, and for a considerable period the prosperity of the country was general and apparently genuine. The principles embodied in the tariff of 1846 seemed for a time to be so entirely vindicated and approved that resistance to it ceased not only among the people, but among protective economists, and even among manufacturers to a large extent. So general was this acquiescence that in 1856 a protective tariff was not suggested or even hinted by any one of the three parties which presented presidential candidates.

On March 24, 1870, when a Member of the House, Senator Allison, Republican, of Iowa, said:

The tariff of 1846, although confessedly and professedly a tariff for revenue, was, so far as regards all the great interests of the country, as perfect as any we have ever had.

The pending measure nearer approximates the Walker tariff law of 1846 than any tariff act that has been framed since the Civil War. It was the Walker law which Senator Allison described as being "as perfect as any we have ever had." It was the Walker law which James G. Blaine said was so generally acquiesced in that 10 years after its passage no party even suggested a change. It was the Walker law which was in force from 1850 to 1860, which period, James A. Garfield said, was "one of peace and general prosperity." Give the Underwood bill a decade of fair trial, such as the Walker law received, and the principles governing the same will be so generally recognized as equitable, fair, and just that they will become established as permanent principles in revenue legislation for all time to come.

THE QUESTION OF RATES.

Mr. Chairman, I do not contend that the pending tariff bill is a perfect measure in every respect. No perfect tariff bill has ever yet been framed by man and, in the very nature of things, perfection in tariff legislation can never be attained.

I am free to confess that were the proposition left solely to me I would change the tariff rates in many of the schedules in this bill. I would lower some and increase others. I would put upon the free list many articles on which a duty has here been placed and I would place on the dutiable list many articles that are here free.

But I would be signally fortunate indeed if, at the end of my labors, my efforts would not reflect very greatly the personal interest which I have in the industries of my own State, and, more fortunate still, if my completed bill, viewed from the standpoint of the Nation as a whole, was not a network of inequalities.

With more than 4,000 articles in the various schedules in this bill no two citizens, however well informed, could agree upon the same rates in any given schedule. And no living being exists to-day whose information is so extensive and great that he absolutely understands the trade conditions in all of the 4,000 articles in the schedules contained.

If every Member of this House had prepared and offered his own tariff measure and had sought its crystallization into law, what a medley of divergent ideas would we have viewed? There would never have been an end to the debate and the discussions would have been interminable. The business interests of the country would have been thrown into ferment, industrial depression would have ensued, not as a result of what was being done with the tariff, but from the terrible uncertainty arising from the fact that nothing was being done at all. The next election would have found us still wrangling over the rates of the schedules.

If by chance, from all this chaos and confusion, a bill had finally been evolved, how would such an evolution have been brought about? It is evident that the result would have been a compromise measure pure and simple. It would have been the product of trades between representatives of sections and varied interests. It would not have been framed for the benefit of the whole people, and its inconsistencies would have been so glaring and monstrous that it would have been doomed to failure from its very birth.

THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE.

This has all been obviated by the tireless efforts of the present Ways and Means Committee of this House, who have sounded the depths and breadths of every proposition involved in the multifarious schedules. For more than two years, night and day, they worked incessantly and arduously upon the provisions of this bill. They employed experts, who have been gathering evidence and compiling statistics during this entire period of two years. For an entire month the committee listened to the representations of manufacturers and those interested, and gave all ample opportunity to be heard. They granted informal hearings to hundreds of others in various branches of industry. After having gathered information from all available sources they occupied nearly three months in drafting the bill. When it was drafted they published it to the world in ample time for investigation before the special session was called. It was presented to the Democratic caucus, where every paragraph was read and considered, the freest opportunity was given to criticize or amend, and a divisional vote taken whenever demanded. And the pending bill is the result of that painstaking care and consideration.

BETTER THAN A TARIFF COMMISSION.

No tariff commission, by whomsoever appointed, could have done more. What better tariff commission could any reasonable individual desire? If President Taft two years ago had appointed a commission to revise the tariff, he could not have found in the length and breadth of this land men better equipped or better informed upon all the details of the question at hand than the men who comprised this Committee on Ways and Means.

They are, in the main, men who have made tariff duties a study for the last 10 or 20 years. They have helped frame former bills and know the effect of the same on the country at large. They are better experts than those usually so known, for their opinions and deductions are the result of study and observation along lines of practical effect rather than those of academic theory. What does any expert know which they could not find out, for they had the authority and they called in experts in every line? Listening to these experts, they applied to their deductions the rule of fair dealing between man and man and framed a bill not for special privilege but in the interests of the great consuming masses of the Nation.

PRINCIPLES, NOT PERCENTAGES.

After all has been said, the dutiable rate fixed on this article or that is not the real question that is involved in this legislation. It is not in the rates or percentages or ad valorems that the people are so much concerned, but they are concerned as to the great underlying principle which governs and controls the proposed legislation, and insist on their demands, registered at the polls, that import duties, excessively high, should be downwardly revised.

Both the Baltimore and Chicago progressive platforms declared for immediate revision downward. Both platforms denounced the Payne-Aldrich law as unjust. Both platforms declared for an income tax. Out of the 15,000,000 votes cast at the election the presidential candidate on the former platform polled over 6,000,000 votes, the candidate on the latter platform

over 4,000,000 votes, an aggregate of over 10,000,000, and a majority of 5,000,000 and more over all other votes cast.

In supporting this bill I am supporting the underlying principles which it contains. It is a tariff revision "unhesitatingly downward." It is a revision with an eye to public needs, regardless of private benefits and schemes. It regards the interests of the many rather than the few, and considers the consumer as well as the producer. It introduces in every line of industry a competitive tariff basis fair to one and fair to all. It eliminates the bonus where no equivalent is rendered in return. It provides for honest competition and encourages the development of industries along the best and most economical lines. It destroys monopoly and places industry on so firm a basis that in controlling its own home markets it is practically developing itself so it can control the markets of the world.

NOT FREE TRADE.

In the matter of the levying of customs duties I am not nor never was a subscriber to the doctrine of free trade. I believe, with Thomas Jefferson, that in certain exigencies tariff duties may be properly laid. I believe, with Jefferson, that it may be well to foster industries in their genesis where necessary to impart to them temporary strength to withstand rivals in a foreign land.

But I also believe, with Jefferson, that when those industries have attained their growth, when they are able, as substantially all of our great industries are to-day, to compete with foreign rivals and undersell them at their own factory doors, that such industries should no longer be allowed to burden the people with taxation to make more profitable a trade which is able to stand alone.

I believe it is fundamentally wrong to compel the American consumer to pay higher prices for American-made goods in order that the American manufacturer of these goods may sell his products to the consumer in foreign lands cheaper than he sells the same products to the consumer at home.

I believe further, with Jefferson, that where it is evident that certain industries, by reason of natural or climatic limitations, can never reach a point where they can thrive and flourish without protective aid—in other words, where it is evident that such industries will require protection, persistent and perpetual, in order that they may exist—I believe, to use Jefferson's own words, quoted above, that "it is against right to make the other branches of industry support them."

I would willingly support a tariff which is honestly laid for the purpose of maintaining a high standard in American wage, but I want to be convinced that the profits created by that tariff actually finds its way into the pockets of the laborer and is not used to increase dividends upon watered stock. Coupled with such a tariff I would require a law which would compel industries thus protected to give to the men employed their just modicum of the profits thus obtained.

But when I see industries wax lusty and strong under the workings of a tariff system whose burdens are borne by all; when I see their promoters grow powerful and rich beyond the dreams of avarice; when I find them forming gigantic combinations of greed which destroy competition, blast opportunity, and interlock the commercial and industrial diversities of the Nation; when I see, on the other hand, these same industries pay to labor only what they are compelled to give, I have reached the conclusion that either they must divide with labor that which they have secured under the pretense that it is obtained for that purpose alone, or else that this sort of so-called protection shall cease and the people be relieved of burdens which they unrighteously bear. Being convinced that the former is not likely soon to come to pass, I am ready to act upon the latter alternative.

The cry of free trade has always been raised to prevent reductions in tariff taxation. It has been the slogan of protective privilege in every campaign. It is used to cast opprobrium on worthy measures offered in the people's behalf. It is intended to befog and deceive.

A measure such as this, which levies average duties of 24 per cent, is a long way from free trade. It places articles on the free list, as has every other tariff bill, high or low, that has been offered or enacted in the Nation's history. The McKinley bill had its free list and practically provided for sugar free, but no one would have the hardihood to claim that the McKinley bill, by reason thereof, provided for free trade.

The issue raised by this bill is not one of protection and free trade. The real issue is between the Payne law and the Underwood measure, between excessive protection and competitive rates, between the perpetuation of the present competition-destroying policy of exaggerated duties on the one hand, and on the other a fair and just revision of the tariff schedules in the interest of the consumer and public at large. The real issue is, Shall the people or the special interests prevail?

THE FARMER AND THE TARIFF.

But they tell us that their system of protection has protected and prospered the farmer and showered him with the blessings he now enjoys. The gentleman from Massachusetts, who hails from the environs of classic Boston, where the truck raiser on a little patch of impoverished soil is the only farmer they know, has said, "The countryman is said to have accepted many a gold brick in his time." If that be so, the greatest gold brick they ever accepted and received is the gold-brick proposition that they have been protected in the operation of tariff laws.

Listening to the remarks of gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, one would be led to believe that the protective tariff had fructified the soil, showered the rain, let down the sunshine, and produced the bounteous crops that grow upon America's 6,000,000 farms.

For one I do not believe that the protective tariff is responsible for the bounteous crops or the market price of the same. I was taught from infancy to believe that a benign Providence sent the sunshine and the rain, created and fertilized the soil, and covered the fields with harvests of golden grain. And I am not yet ready to admit that the Lord has turned over this job to the protective-tariff smiths of the land.

I am mighty glad such a transfer has not been made, for if it had they in turn would have turned it over to the syndicates and trusts for their control, who would have long since run a corner on nature's beneficent gifts and made the farmers pay for every ray of the golden sunshine they receive and for every drop of the precious rain.

PROTECTION TO THE FARMER A SHAM.

The farmers of the United States sell abroad and feed the world. Their exports girdle the globe. They market their crops in the free-trade markets abroad and purchase all they buy in protected markets at home. Their surplus grain goes to Liverpool and is placed in bins to compete, side by side, with the grain raised by Russian serfs, Indian fellahs, and the cheapest farm labor of the world. There the price of their commodity is fixed by the world-wide free-trade law of supply and demand. The ticker at Liverpool records the price they are to receive, the tickers at New York, Chicago, and St. Louis record the same, with added cost of transportation, and the price he receives for his surplus abroad fixes the price of his commodity at home.

Every pretense of protection to him by tariff duties laid is a delusion and a sham. It is the building of a dam to keep the water from running uphill. It is a pretended favor given to lull the farmer to sleep, in order that in his dreams he may be deceived into a belief that some benefit of protection is coming his way, and thus render him unmindful of the fact that he is fleeced on everything which he has to buy. It is an effort to captivate him by the cry of a home market, as if protected monopolists eat more than other men.

In return for a protection that does not protect the farmer has been paying tariff-enhanced prices for all that he needs. On all his medicines, paints and oils, and the entire chemical schedule; on all the dishes, glassware, earthenware, ironware, furniture, and kitchen utensils in his home; on all his tools, agricultural implements, and hardware on his farm; on the lumber, stone, plaster, brick, and nails that go into his house and barns; on the barbed wire in his fences; on all the hats, clothes, shoes, and gloves he and his family wear; on the casks, barrels, boxes, and cabinets on the place; on the sugar and molasses he consumes; on the binder twine that binds his grain; on the books he reads; on the harness on his horses and the carts and wagons the horses draw; on the bed in which he sleeps; on the coffin that enshrouds his remains at the final call and the tombstone which marks his last resting place—on all these and thousands of articles more the farmer pays the tariff toll and receives naught but empty deception in return.

Neither does the cry of Canadian wheat furnish a justification for this deception. Canadian wheat, like our own, must find its markets abroad, and its price is likewise governed in foreign ports by the same world-wide law of supply and demand. If local prices at certain Canadian points be at times lower than our own, the variance is but sporadic and for a time, and is caused by greater transportation rates, which are deducted from the world price in the end.

Likewise the farmer receives no benefit from a tariff on meats, for the packer absorbs it all. Meats are controlled by a trust, which regulates its price day by day and the farmer is helpless in its hands. It arbitrarily fixes this price at its own sweet will, and sells its beef cheaper in Europe than it does at home. It is reaching out to control the meat industry of the world, and tariffs on meats are ineffective to regulate or control.

A greater fallacy was never framed than the claim that the present high prices of the products of the farm are due to the tariff. A greater untruth was never circulated than the one that the low prices of farm products in Cleveland's second administration was a result of the tariff bill in operation at that time. The prices of agricultural products and the rates of tariff duties on the same are no more related than are the peaks of the Rocky Mountains to the ebb and flow of the ocean tide.

High agricultural prices exist to-day, not by reason of the protective tariff levied on the same at our ports of entry, but they exist in spite of and in the very teeth of this alleged protection. Present high agricultural prices exist by reason of decreased production and increased population—decrease in the supply and increase in the demand. Statistics show that in the last 10 years corn has decreased in production over 20 per cent, wheat 15 per cent, and the production of other cereals, as well as cattle and hogs, have suffered a corresponding reduction. The law of supply and demand is king in the realm of agriculture, and all other aspirants to the throne are pretenders and charlatans.

RELIEF TO THE FARMERS.

The pending measure is the first tariff bill to give substantial relief to the farmer since the days of the Civil War. He is accorded special relief in the provisions of this bill. He gets the benefit of a radical reduction in every schedule in the law. He is given a reduction of the tariff rates on everything he has to buy. Among hundreds of other articles he gets the benefit of the placing absolutely on the free list of the following commodities, which he uses every day: Lumber, plows, harrows, harvesters, reapers, mowers, cultivators, thrashing machines, agricultural implements, harness, saddles, trace chains, binding twine, nails, barbed wire, needles, fertilizers, sewing machines, salt, boots and shoes, coffee, coal, and sugar after three years.

He gets freer drugs and chemicals, paints, cutlery, tinware, dishes, furniture, hats, clothes, shirts, collars, hose, underwear, gloves, bedspreads, blankets, cotton and woolen goods of every kind, glass and glassware, hardware, books and stationery, and so on through the various schedules. This is a protection that protects, for it relieves him of tariff taxes that he has been paying for many years.

THE LABORER AND THE TARIFF.

Unfounded as is the claim that the tariff has been protecting the farmer, equally erroneous is the claim that the laborer is the chief beneficiary of the present tariff laws. This fallacy is based upon the theory that the protective tariff enables the employer to make larger profits and in turn enables him to pay higher wages to the laborers in his employ.

In theory this might seem plausible, but in practice it fails to work out. In practice the employer takes full advantage of the tariff, makes all the profits possible, and then goes out into the labor markets of the world and secures his labor as cheaply as he can. There is no protective tariff on labor, for it comes into our ports of entry absolutely free.

Adam Smith long ago laid down the rule that where there were two laborers to draw from and only one job labor would be cheap, but where there were two jobs and only a single laborer labor would be dear. The tariff has no more to do with labor than it has with the phases of the moon. It is governed absolutely by the law of supply and demand.

The very class of people who show such anxiety to protect American labor by keeping down competition in the articles they manufacture and sell are often the ones who not only buy labor as cheaply as they can but fiercely oppose any combination of workmen to keep up a standard wage.

If the American wage is now at a standard above that of employees across the sea, it is not due to a protective tariff, which assists the employer in the profits he makes in the industry he controls, but it is due to the fact that labor has organized itself into unions of strength and power and by the force of their combined might has compelled the employer to pay a living wage.

The protective tariff has not upheld the standard of wage. The labor union has upheld it, and the tariff has taken from the laborer a large portion of what he receives in wage by compelling him to pay enhanced prices for everything he has to buy.

If an effort had been made 16 years ago to reduce the wages of every laboring man 50 per cent, it would have worked nothing short of a revolution. But admitting that the standard of wage was not so reduced, still the fact remains that, by the increase of prices of the articles that the laborer has to buy by at least twofold in the last 16 years, his wages in effect have been cut in two.

It is a notorious fact that wages in protected industries are generally lower than in those unprotected and that while the unprotected laborer outnumbers the protected by a ratio of 4 to 1, there has occurred in those protected industries more strikes, more lockouts, and more labor troubles than in all the other industries of the land.

The pending tariff bill protects the laborer in every industry of whatever kind, because it protects the wage which he receives by preventing tariff-enhanced prices on what he has to buy. It gives him relief from the high cost of the necessaries of life and protects him in the possession of all that he has rightfully earned.

THE INCOME TAX.

But perhaps the most satisfactory provision of this entire bill is the levying of a direct tax, to support the Government, upon the incomes of those who receive the greater protection of its laws by reason of their greater possessions.

The revenue received from our tariffs is a revenue derived from consumption. It is ofttimes really a tax upon poverty and privation. It is the heaviest on those whose consumption is the largest in proportion to their means. It passes over property, over accumulated wealth, over what a man has gathered and put behind him, but throws its greatest burdens upon those who are battling against hunger, cold, and disease for the necessities and decencies of life. The tax upon incomes is levied according to ability to pay and upon a man's wealth and his accumulations.

The tax is now in force and effect in 52 foreign nations and States, and has never yet been repealed when given a fair trial. It is the outgrowth of centuries of experiments in taxation throughout the world, and has been proven to be most equitable, the most elastic, and the most satisfactory.

It has been demanded by the people, its enactment was declared for in the platforms of two great political parties of the Nation, and the sentiment for it was so strong that the people overturned a decision of the Supreme Court by writing into the Constitution a provision making it possible—the first constitutional amendment the country had adopted in a period of 40 years.

CONCLUSION.

In pressing the passage of this bill the Democratic Party is again carrying out its pledges to the people. No member of this House who stood upon the Democratic platform last fall can fail to support it without being recreant to his trust and false to the obligations which his nomination and election devolved upon him.

Gentlemen on the other side tell us that in supporting this measure we are digging our own political graves. I do not know what others may think about it, but as for me, I propose to stand by the pledges I made to the people and I propose to obey their instructions as registered at the polls.

If the people are as fickle as gentlemen on the other side seem to believe them to be, if they will refuse vindication of those who have faithfully fulfilled their stewardship, then well and good. But I would rather a thousand times face defeat at the polls, conscious that I have kept faith with the people and performed my duty, than be returned to this Congress a score of times knowing that such return was the price of betrayal.

The Democratic Party has already achieved many and mighty reforms for the people. It has given them the right to vote direct for those who represent their States in the United States Senate. It has changed the Constitution of the land so that it is now possible to compel wealth to bear its proportion of national expense by the levying of a tax on incomes. It has given the old soldier, who fought for the flag, the most liberal pension law in our history. It has enacted a score or more of laws in the interests of labor. Now it proposes to free the people from the burdens of an iniquitous system of war taxation and to unloose the bonds which have fettered competition and give the individual an opportunity in the great commercial and industrial contests of the Nation.

The Democratic Party stands in this fight where it has always stood, championing the rights of the people. It stands for duty as against the dollar, for manhood as against money, for human liberty as against inhuman greed, for that individual opportunity which has built up our institutions, dignified them with achievements, ennobled them with triumphs, and consecrated them in the fires of heroic devotion.

It stands for a prosperity that will come to the many and not the few—a prosperity that will come to the laborer, the artisan, and the wage earner—a prosperity that will come to those dust-covered thousands whose sun-browned hands have never touched a polluted dollar and who labor in the field from early at morn to late at eve—a prosperity that will cause the proudest

boast of American citizenship to come not from the pampered sons of wealth but from those hardy freeman who, returning with the evening sun from places of honored toil, find in the climbing vine and blossoming rose the fragrance of happy homes.

It stands where Jefferson stood at the day dawn of the Nation, where Jackson stood in his fight against corporate might, where the good and true have ever stood in every crisis of our Nation's history, and there by the grace of God it will ever stand until the foes of liberty have been everlastingly driven from the field, the grasp of greed has been removed from the flag, and the principles which it has taught for over a hundred years shall become the principles which shall guide and govern the Nation as long as it shall endure.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I simply desire to present for printing in the RECORD a memorial address delivered by the owner of Monticello, the Hon. JEFFERSON M. LEVY, of New York, on the 13th day of the present month, in memory of Thomas Jefferson, that being the one hundred and seventy-first anniversary of his birth.

Following are the remarks of Mr. LEVY referred to:

"To my friends, ladies and gentlemen: The inspiration of this day is patriotism. It is not to mourn dead clay, but to crown the enduring memory and the advent of a mighty man that the people of a grateful country pause and in person and in spirit present their floral tributes to this historic spot on "mountain top between the forest trees," the home in life, the resting place in death, of the beloved nation builder, Thomas Jefferson.

"To you, my friends and fellow citizens, I express upon this occasion the cordial welcome which at all times has been extended to the American people desirous of visiting the home of the author of the Declaration of Independence, and I assure you of my appreciation of this privilege which you have accorded me to unite with you in these ceremonial observances of this natal day.

"It is in keeping with the scope of his private and public life that there should be entwined the offerings of the great and small. Here side by side now rest the votive garlands from the Chief Executive and from the humble citizens. Now partisanship plays no halting part, but all unite with common mind to pay their tribute to the memory of this great American.

"That your pilgrimage and your purpose bring you to the open door of Monticello is most fitting. In other places Jefferson was the statesman and the diplomat, in other walks he was the President, the ambassador, and preserver of the Nation, but here on this spot which he loved so well and whose very name rang rhythm to his ear he was also the plain American citizen.

"The atmosphere which here surrounded him was that of home; such were its pleasures, such its relaxation when he sought relief from the exactions of his public life. Here he dispensed his generous hospitality. The maintenance of that same atmosphere of home has been, in a sense, the life work for four score years of the succeeding generations of my family, so that now, interwoven with my interest in Monticello, are the events of these weighted years during which we have with zealous care united again these acres and gathered from two continents the scattered and priceless relics of his bygone days and preserved them for your devotion as you see them to-day.

"It is not the mere possession which gives pleasure, but a possession mingled with long personal association from which flows the opportunity for expression of a deep and abiding reverence for the life work of Thomas Jefferson which makes my stewardship of this property so dear to me and which has caused me and mine to lavish means and time upon his home. Our eyes did not droop in sleepy forgetfulness nor our steps grow laggard on the way during all these years when those who have now exhibited their newly awakened interest in Monticello long slumbered in indifference or inattention.

"Generations of my family have consecrated time and money to its restoration and preservation. Will not now the great American people see and understand that this stewardship has become a part of the heart and life of the present owner?

"Will a man fix a price upon wife or child? To repeat my utterance of a former day, "I can not commercialize the sentiment of years by putting a price upon this noble property."

"My friends and fellow citizens, I appeal to you, has there been recreancy to the trust which this ownership imposes? Is there an untrimmed blade of grass or straying briar which has escaped the eye and which your scrutiny suggests should lead to greater vigilance?

"It speaks to-day of home and hospitality. Would not Jefferson himself have had it so? In every nook and cranny, in every leaf and flower, in spring and running brook it tells of Thomas Jefferson the living.

"Here has been maintained the open door; here have come in recent years Cleveland, Blaine, Reed, Hoar, Bryan, and Hill, with uncounted others, and caught the spirit. It has been preserved not as the house, the farm, but as the home of Thomas Jefferson.

"What man listening to the echo of his own footsteps, as he tramps upon the bared floor of Mount Vernon or Arlington, is not conscious of the lack? It is with some hesitancy that even upon this occasion I intrude upon the great-hearted but busy American people an admission of the pain which I have been caused by much misinformation, covertly framed innuendoes and untrue statements, which by letter from the platform and in the public print have been circulated concerning my ownership and care of Monticello.

"I can not enter the arena of public disputation nor involve myself in a ceaseless controversy by even justifiable denials, for these statements made against me are as unsubstantial as the mist, as variable as the flight of butterflies, as changeable as the shadows, and as recurrent and persistent as the tides.

"Lest there be a misunderstanding, however, let me in general terms express myself. During my ownership of nearly 30 years Monticello has never been and is not now for sale. I have never directly or indirectly placed a value or fixed a price upon it nor entered into negotiations of any kind looking to that end. Until the time shall come when men will no longer follow in the footsteps of Thomas Jefferson, when the right of men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness shall be ruthlessly swept away, when women and children shall be torn apart and man despoiled of his most cherished possession, I shall continue my stewardship of Monticello, preserving it with all the care and lavishment of former years, appealing to the people of the United States to weigh my ownership and stewardship and compare Monticello of to-day with Mount Vernon, the home of Washington.

"It has been intimated that I have connived at offers made to purchase or acquire this property; that even a telegram sent me by the great governor of this State was with my prior knowledge, if not of my procurement. To this and all similar statements I enter an unqualified denial, and assure you that my unbending purpose is to give during the remainder of my life, with utmost faithfulness, my best endeavors to the care of Monticello.

"View these broad fields, the house upon the mountain top filled with the treasures connected with his name; behold the shrine itself, the grave of Jefferson, and tell the American people that these have been preserved and kept not for selfish or sordid purposes but by an unceasing flow of the fountain a heart filled with love for Thomas Jefferson."

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS AND THE TARIFF.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, it might seem presumptuous for a Member at the beginning of his term of service to enter into a discussion of the general principles of a question which has been the study of the best minds of men in and out of Congress since the beginning of our Nation and on which the political economy of our country has from the earliest days been based. I therefore will not occupy the time which has been accorded me to consider the bill in its broad features, either upon the underlying principles separating protection, revenue only, or free trade, or the merits or demerits of the bill now before us, known as the Underwood bill, or what will, perhaps, be better known in the future as the bill proposed by Mr. UNDERWOOD against some of his own best beliefs under the dictation of President Wilson.

I feel, however, sufficiently conversant with the varied industries of the section of Massachusetts I have the honor to represent to call to the attention of this House certain salient facts regarding the effect the adoption of the so-called Underwood bill will, in my opinion, have upon western Massachusetts. It is not for me to single out in a selfish manner the welfare of that section as against the country as a whole, but I do maintain that, as typical of conditions there, results will come alike to us and to other sections.

TARIFF BELIEFS AND PROGRESSIVE COMPARISONS.

During the campaign of last year I made every effort to acquaint the people of my district with my views on the subject of the tariff, and am prepared to repeat in brief what I then said: First, I believe in a nonpartisan tariff board or commis-

sion, authorized to scientifically study the great problem of tariff making, and, under the authority of Congress, to advise and assist this body in the perfection of rates fair alike to producer and consumer. If no other reason were to be given against the Underwood bill, I should be recorded in opposition to the measure from the fact that this bill absolutely ignores that just principle and method of tariff making. It was with pleasure that on Thursday I listened to the able address of one of our former political colleagues, the Progressive Member from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH], wherein he voiced this same view, and I would say now that unless he intended to confer upon the tariff commission the power of making rates without congressional enactment I could qualify as a Progressive under his tariff definition; or, better, I should hope that he and his colleagues might soon be willing to again qualify under our title of Republican. The two minorities to which he referred are practically in accord on the most vital question before our people, namely, the tariff.

May I be allowed to add that various other great problems, which he probably had in mind when he referred to "social and industrial questions affecting the vital interests of the people," and which I should define as healthful conditions for working men and women—factory inspection, child labor, and other matters of public welfare which our Progressive friends are assuming to be their own cause—are to-day under suitable laws in the State which I have the honor in part to represent in this body, absolutely through the wise judgment of Republican legislators? An analysis of the Progressive Party platform adopted at Chicago shows 56 propositions, of which 19 are purely State questions, 19 purely national questions, and 18 questions susceptible of either State or National legislation, or both. Of the 37 within the scope of State legislative activity, 21 have already been satisfactorily enacted in Massachusetts. Eleven of the remaining 16 are already in process of accomplishment there or likely to be accomplished speedily. [Applause.]

A second statement which I freely made in the first congressional district of Massachusetts was a belief in reductions in certain schedules of the Payne-Aldrich law.

Both of these beliefs have been corroborated by my Republican colleagues in unanimous agreement to offer an amendment to the pending bill calling for a tariff commission and a further vote by a very large majority favorable to the submission of an amendment, based on the findings of the Tariff Board, which would reduce many items in Schedule K.

A DISTRICT OF DIVERSIFIED INTERESTS.

Possibly no Member of this body represents a district more diversified in its interests than the first district of Massachusetts. Blessed by nature with beautiful hills, adorned by wooded slopes, a fertile soil capable of a high degree of cultivation, mountain streams delighting the hearts of the followers of Walton, flowing rivers ready to be harnessed for man's use, there has grown up within its limits a community alike dependent upon the cultivation of the soil and upon employment in the great textile and other manufacturing establishments. There is an almost even division between the simple hamlets of the country and the population of busy, bustling cities. The district is therefore interested in schedules affecting the producer or farmer, the manufacturer, and the laborer. We have broad acres in farms; we have great mills manufacturing the highest grades of paper, cotton mills, woolen mills, silk mills, shoe factories, foundries, and machine shops—and it is to these lines in particular I wish to call the attention of the committee.

Let me further say that these varied industries are in no way described by the brilliant leader of the majority when in his opening speech he refers to some industries as being maintained with "worn-out, ineffective, and decadent machinery." The industries of Massachusetts are, to use an expression of the day, "up to the minute," and we ask no sympathy or assistance for their support, in that they are in any way behind the times in equipment or decadent in machinery.

THE COTTON INDUSTRY OF WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS.

The cotton industry of western Massachusetts embraces up to this time the highest products of that art, being favored by climate, pure water from the mountain streams, nearness to markets, and the skill of the pioneer manufacturers and their successors of the present day. It includes not only the making and weaving of the finer grades of cotton cloth for wearing apparel, but a great number of processes of printing and dyeing and other forms of finishing to give distinctive character to the fabrics after they have left the looms. In addition, there have grown up certain specialized lines of manufacture, such as quilts and spreads of fancy figured patterns.

To maintain the higher standard of American living, the cotton industry has had to pay a considerably increased wage over wages in the countries which would naturally be its competitors abroad. I am reliably informed that the English rate of wages is practically 60 per cent of those in Massachusetts; France and Germany, 50 per cent; and Italy, 33 per cent of our State. When we come to the skilled trades in the print works the disproportion is even greater and immensely to the advantage of the men in those trades on this side of the water.

The opinion of observers, whose views are not colored by political bias or anything but understanding and experience of the facts, is to the effect that the rates reported in this bill are not protective of the lower grades of cotton goods. As far as they apply to the finer lines of cotton goods the proposed rates are even less so. In the coarse grades the labor cost, compared to the total value of the finished product, is a small part, perhaps 10 per cent of the whole, the value of the cotton being greater, but in the fine goods the part represented by labor is 50 per cent and more, even to 70 per cent of the manufactured product. With insufficient duties our markets will certainly be flooded with goods of higher grade. In that event our manufacturers, if they are to keep their mills running, will be compelled to resort to the coarser fabrics, where they can compete and on which the prices paid labor are naturally less than on those fine weaves in which greater skill is required of the operatives. The Underwood bill, instead of promoting the development of the finer arts in this country, thrusts our industries back to a lower level, and will cause our mills to turn from the higher to the lower grades of manufacture, in which the rates of wages are less and with a resulting loss alike to the owner, the operative, and the community.

The people engaged in the cotton business in western Massachusetts are in no sense any part of trusts, combinations, or political organizations. They are interested in the continuance of their business for their own sake, for a proper return on the money invested, and for the sake of the thousands of employees and their families dependent on them. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I am informed, and I think correctly, that in no line of business is the element of efficiency so largely developed as in the cotton-manufacturing industry, for the reason that the business is highly competitive; for instance, the largest combination in cotton manufacturing is said to cover not more than 1⅓ per cent of the total value invested in the industry.

AN INJUSTICE TO HOME PRODUCTION.

The Democratic leader said in his opening address that the Underwood bill is for revenue only, with emphasis on "only." He also said that the committee had played no favorites. I wish to call attention to one item wherein both of these statements are refuted at one time. In the Panama Canal act of last year a clause was inserted whereby free entry is provided for shipbuilding material and equipment. On page 207, paragraph J, subsection 5, of House bill 3321, we find affirmation of this same clause in the words:

That all materials of foreign production which may be necessary for the construction of vessels built in the United States for foreign account and ownership, or for the purpose of being employed in the foreign or domestic trade, and all such materials necessary for the building of their machinery, and all articles necessary for their outfits and equipment may be imported in bond * * * and no duties shall be paid thereon.

I therefore affirm that this bill does play as favorites the foreign manufacturer desiring to equip any vessel in the United States, whether for foreign or domestic purposes, and that there is absolutely no revenue derived therefrom. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I know of a specific illustration of the working out of this principle in the case of some constituents of mine with reference to a contract which they attempted to secure for the equipment of the Hudson River steamers with quilts of their manufacture. They were advised that their bid was low and it seemed that they would secure the contract for this large order of quilts, when their agents were notified that the contract would be placed for foreign-made quilts, as it was found that such quilts would be admitted to the country free of duty under the Panama Canal act. While this injustice to our manufacturers first appeared under the Panama act, the framers of this tariff bill seem to have especially delighted in inserting the clause, using the word "domestic," so that any boat, wherever it is to be used, whether on lake or inland rivers, physically unable to reach salt water, can be equipped throughout with foreign-made goods, paying no revenue to our Treasury or protection to our industries. I submit for one that if I was boasting about not playing favorites, I would at least deal justly with home productions.

THE WOOLEN INDUSTRY IN WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS.

In the other branches of textiles, woolen, and silk, also largely represented in the industrial life of western Massachusetts, the

bill is equally severe on the home product. The woolen industry is on a competitive basis, there being in our part of the country a series of individual mills under independent ownership. Here again the American workingman has the advantage of his brother abroad in the matter of wages, the excess of earnings in the United States over Great Britain ranging, according to the reports of the Tariff Board, from 70 to 180 per cent more in the various operations of the mill. The other costs in this country are proportionally greater, so that the total cost of conversion from yarn to the finished cloth in nearly every instance investigated by the Tariff Board (p. 691, Tariff Board's report on Schedule K) is at least twice as great as in England, our chief foreign competitor. The 35 per cent rate on the finished woolen and worsted cloths proposed by the Underwood bill is accordingly far from putting our manufacturers on a basis of equality with their competitors, which we have been given to understand was the intent of the framers of this bill. It puts them in fact at a tremendous disadvantage.

One of the letters I have received on this subject says:

The President, whose education has been along theoretical lines and who has probably never earned a dollar in his life through competitive methods, says the bill will sharpen the wits of American manufacturers so that they may compete with the foreigners. Let me say in reply to this that, given the same labor costs, we ask no favors of any country on earth; but with our high plane of wages in this country it becomes needful for us to do one of three things in order to compete with foreigners who pay less. We must either raise the wages of the operatives in foreign mills, which I think will be conceded an impossibility, or we must reduce the wages of our own labor by one-half, equally impossible if we wish to see them maintain the American standard of living, or we must place an artificial governmental barrier to protect the wages of our working people. I should be glad if the President would suggest which of these methods he would recommend in order to place ourselves upon a competitive basis.

THE SILK INDUSTRY IN WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS.

In the silk industry our supremacy has been due so far, I understand, to the superior style and attractiveness of the silk goods which we make in this country; but we must realize that with the awakening in the Far East we will be approaching a condition shortly of strenuous competition with the intelligence of the Chinese and Japanese. All the raw silk comes from those countries, and with their raw material at hand the process of converting it into the finished product for the rest of the civilized world is taking on surprising life and vigor. They are using power looms and machinery equal to our own, although their highest average wages are 15 cents a day to a worker and the Massachusetts average is more than ten times that. They may not be as effective now as the silk-mill operatives in this country, but it appears to be only a question of time when they will equal us. The 50 per cent rate is conceded to be a fair rate to American manufacturers against competition with the European centers of silk production, but their greatest future competition, especially with the removal of specific duties and the retaining only of an uncertain ad valorem with the liability of undervaluations, will come from Japan.

PAPER MANUFACTURING.

The rates in the bill for fine writing papers are not protective, as the wages in this country are more than twice those which prevail abroad. There is also the objectionable feature of ad valorem duties being substituted for the former specific duties, which are open to the defect of admitting foreign papers by clever and unscrupulous undervaluations, there being no practicable way to standardize paper. Men of judgment in the business state that it is impossible for any man, however expert, to tell from examination of a piece of paper the value of the paper without knowing what peculiar processes it has had to go through, and that if the same sample were to be submitted to three different paper manufacturers they would probably estimate the value from 10 to 50 per cent apart. The one good point which the committee retained from the previous law was the classification of the different kinds of paper, which has some tendency, I understand, to conserve the interests of the industry.

THE SHOE INDUSTRY.

Although of less extent than in other parts of New England, the shoe-manufacturing industry in western Massachusetts has similar interests to the industry in other shoe-manufacturing centers, and this bill by removing all protection from shoes strikes a direct blow. I am glad that my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS], for whose opinion I have such a high regard, considers that this tariff bill will be beneficial to the shoe industry, but I noticed that he was very particular not to make direct answer to the question whether he considered the removal of the duty on shoes would benefit the industry in Massachusetts.

MISCELLANEOUS INDUSTRIES.

Some of the other leading lines of production which might be mentioned in western Massachusetts are those of machine tools, in which it gives me pleasure to say we appear to have the lead at present on the rest of the world, as there is some export trade in them on account of their being so much better in principle and doing so much better work that they are sold at higher prices in Europe than the same kind of tools made in the countries abroad. In some other lines of machinery, however, such as the paper-making machinery for paper mills, there is keen competition with German, English, and French manufacturers on foreign business and in Canada, as the foreign prices are far below those which are received for the machines made in this country, and where it is only a question of price I am informed that our manufacturers lose every time. The sales which they make are based on the quality of their machines. With the lowering of the duty from 45 to 25 per cent, there will certainly be strong competition from abroad.

Two factories in my district manufacture Fourdrinier wires, which are extensively used in paper mills. Only yesterday I was waited upon by several representatives of this industry objecting to the basket clause in Schedule C of the Underwood bill, whereby their line of manufacture is reduced from 45 to 25 per cent. Let me remind our friends on the other side of the aisle that these men were not the representatives of the great profit-making employer we have heard them describe, but of actual workmen at the looms. In a square foot of wire, costing 25 cents to produce, the material is 8 cents, the labor 17 cents—more than 2 to 1. The wages paid here are three times the wages paid in Germany and two and a half times the amount paid in England for similar work. Are these men not justified in asking their Representative to enter a protest in their behalf, and should not their protest be heeded rather than have a deaf ear turned to it?

We have a line of industry also that gives us a strong bond of sympathy for our good Democratic friends who are contesting the Wilson-Underwood item of free sugar. A large concern in my district manufactures machinery, especially pumps, used in the manufacture of sugar. These constituents strongly protest against the injury that will be done to the sugar industry, thereby removing a large market for their production, and likewise they protest against the very marked lowering in tariff duty on their own product from 45 to 25 per cent under the new bill.

One of the most interesting features to one who surveys the industrial make-up of such a Commonwealth as Massachusetts is the interlocking of various related industries. Among some of those which are thus interdependent are the separate preparation of cotton warps for the cotton mills, the making of cotton cloths, which later go to the print works or converters, and the special manufacture in one mill of a very heavy wrapping paper, which goes to the other mills and is used to pack their product for the market. One large company does not make a pound of the actual paper, but has built up a large separate industry in boxing and preparing fine stationery from other mills for distribution to the retail trade. Instances might be multiplied, but it is enough to say that the whole structure is so bound together that if you attack it in any of its parts the whole must suffer.

When the Democratic tariff makers boast of reductions in nearly every schedule, they are making just such an attack on the whole structure, and we need not in detail illustrate by specific examples.

FARMING.

Included in this mutual relationship of varied industry is the farmer of western Massachusetts, who, as I may have shown, has a market at his doors for the products of the farm. Canada is not so far off, however, as to be out of the field of competition, and since this bill was reported, with the reduced duties on dairy products and milk on the free list, I have been in receipt of prompt and vigorous protest, of which the following telegram from a prominent and well-informed dairyman is a fair example:

Dairy interests in New England are on the decline and need all protection possible. Fight any reduction of tariff on milk, cream, or butter to last ditch.

ADVICE FROM A DEMOCRAT.

It would have been a source of much satisfaction to me to have witnessed early in April, 1910, the great ovation given by the Democratic Members of this House to a newly elected Congressman from Massachusetts, Mr. Foss. The event was heralded from the shores of Massachusetts Bay to the Berkshire Hills as marking a great epoch in the history of our State. The opinions of the gentleman in question were received as the advice of a sage, and for three years since he has been the successful Democratic standard bearer for governor of Massachusetts.

My friends in Massachusetts would hardly be disposed to accuse me of having frequently agreed with the political views of the governor. Perhaps for one other act I may have compli-

mented him, namely, the very high standard he has set for himself in the selection of judges in Massachusetts. But I do wish to compliment him to-day and commend to the careful consideration of his Democratic colleagues, who are now condemning his opinions, a few utterances he has recently made in a special message to the Massachusetts Legislature. I ask your indulgence while I read:

The two platforms which indorsed the principle of protection received in the votes of the candidates who stood upon them a greater indorsement by the American people at the last election than the platform which repudiated the principle of a protective tariff.

The policy demanded by the American people during the past three years was a reduction of the tariff for the benefit of all the people. No considerable part of the voters were willing to support the doctrine of free trade advocated in the Democratic platform or the policy of deliberative and postponed reduction promised by the two wings of the Republican Party. But the great body of the people, without reference to political allegiance, desired the immediate adoption of a policy of tariff reduction which should benefit American industry and American trade, advance American production of every kind, and relieve the people from unjust tariff burdens.

In all tariff legislation three purposes must be kept in mind—the raising of revenue for the Government, the encouragement of domestic production, and the maintenance of the conditions necessary for private profit to domestic producers. No one of these purposes should be favored to the exclusion of the others. The combined consideration of the three purposes tends to the advancement of each.

The Democratic policy announced by one of the leaders March 10, 1912, "clearly excludes the idea of protecting manufacturers' profits." This policy is more pernicious than that of the Republican Party. It excludes not only the idea of guaranteeing profits but all consideration of the conditions under which manufacturers may earn them. It not only defeats the purposes of encouraging domestic production and assuring private profit to domestic producers, but also, through the curtailment of importations of the materials of manufacture, defeats the very purpose itself of raising revenue.

The Democratic Congress is undoubtedly resolved upon a tariff policy that will punish the monopolies for their exactions from the people. But such a policy will surely result in two years or four years of depression under ill-considered tariff legislation, to be followed by a popular rebuke to the Democrats for giving their attention to a rebuke to the monopolies instead of to the interests of the people, and the tariff will be made a political football for years to come.

But you also know that precisely the reverse of this plan is to be put into effect by the Democratic Congress—a nonprotective, tariff for revenue only, unreciprocal, destructive upward, and equally destructive downward revision. It is your right, it is your privilege, it is your duty to memorialize Congress in behalf of this Commonwealth against such a peril to the interests of Massachusetts.

MASSACHUSETTS COMMISSION ON THE COST OF LIVING.

It so happens that at the time the governor was receiving this cordial welcome at your hands and your predecessor's three years ago I was assisting in my humble way to pass the act, to which my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS] has referred, establishing the Massachusetts commission on the cost of living. The act carried my signature as president of the senate, and I should like to quote a part of it:

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of said commission to inquire into the causes of the increased prices of the necessaries of life, as compared with wages and income, and to inquire into the direct and indirect effect of our present tariff laws upon wages, income, and cost of living.

SEC. 3. The members of the said commission shall be chosen with a view to their special knowledge of law, trade, labor, and political economy, and shall consist of five persons, to be appointed by the governor with the consent of the council.

Part of the conclusions arrived at by the commission may be stated in the following excerpts from its report:

The increasing urban concentration of population has been an influential factor in the increase of prices of the commodities of common consumption. The significance of the cityward drift of the population on the side of supply in reducing the volume of agricultural production has been pointed out elsewhere in this report. Not less potent is its influence in increasing the demand. City growth has unquestionably played a part in the advance of the cost of living.

The general advance of the standard of living throughout all the ranks of the population, from the highest to the lowest, is manifestly one of the most potent causes of the increase of the demand for commodities, and consequently of the advance of prices. On every side the wants of the people have been multiplied and diversified. They demand more and better things. Their requirements are larger, more varied, and more exacting.

In all ages of the world social standards have been set from above, and so long as those whose wealth or social prominence forces the newspapers to make them objects of public notice continue to wallow in their wealth salaried persons, from the highest to the lowest, down to wage earners, follow the bad example. Extravagance is, after all, comparative. The business man with an income of $10,000 a year can safely set a standard of living that would be ruinous to a shopkeeper at $2,000 a year, and imitation of the tradesman with $2,000 a year by the shoemaker at $15 a week would be equally ruinous. If increased brains, energy, and enterprise did not result in enabling persons to indulge in reasonable luxuries, there would be no incentive to progress. The danger comes when the general tendency is toward spending beyond one's income, which is apparent to-day.

The fundamental reason for the world-wide increase of prices is, in our belief, the increased production of gold. We share this belief with nearly all the economists.

With regard to the tariffs, the trusts, and the unions, which have been declared to be either primary or contributory causes of the high cost of living, the commission finds that none of these factors can be regarded as a direct and active cause of the recent increase of prices. With regard to the tariff the facts that prices have fallen and risen during long periods without relation to changes in duties, that prices have been rising in Great Britain under free trade, and that large increases have taken place in the prices of commodities not appreciably affected by the tariff show conclusively that the tariff is not a factor in the recent upward movement of prices in this country.

In connection with the inquiry into the cost of living an unofficial board of impartial experts selected by the fruit and produce exchange and the grocers' associations, with one Republican and one Democratic member of the Massachusetts commission, visited Canada to determine the truth of the charge that food costs less there than here by reason of the tariff. Comparisons were made on articles of the same quality at the same time in Windsor and Detroit, Montreal and Boston, St. John and Bangor. Meats and provisions were 1.8 per cent higher in Detroit than in Windsor, groceries 7.5 per cent higher in Windsor, meats and provisions 10 per cent higher in Boston than Montreal, groceries 4 per cent higher in Montreal, meats and provisions 13 per cent higher in Bangor than St. John, groceries 8 per cent higher in St. John, so that, viewing the whole matter by and large, the differences in the total food cost were inconsiderable. The price lists published in great detail by the Canadian department of labor since the publication of the Massachusetts commission's report shows a wider range of food prices in different parts of Canada than are the differences between the Canadian Provinces and New England. The investigation showed that the tariff apparently had nothing to do with food prices.

I beg further to quote from a message received by me yesterday from the efficient chairman of this commission, Robert Luce, the distinguished publicist of Massachusetts, as follows:

There is to-day in this country no important body of opinion hostile to the protective principle. Both the great political parties are committed to it. The only questions are those of detail. The purpose of a protective tariff is the maintenance of a system of manufacturing industries which shall keep us independent, shall diversify our occupations, and shall make adequate use of our natural resources, at the same time providing revenue for our national needs. Manufacturing plants are built slowly, must be kept in operation, and can not be readily shifted to other uses than those for which they were designed. It would be both improvident and cruel to destroy the value of our textile mills by the repeal of a statute. It has been the American practice to revise the tariff at intervals of several years. The result has been a periodical disturbance of business, with adjustment more or less affected by political considerations. The leading commercial organizations of the country are of the belief that a wiser course would be to make the adjustments a commercial rather than a political affair; to take the tariff out of politics, as is the practice in Germany. We share in this view. Our general conclusion as to the tariff is that it is not a cause of the recent increase in the cost of living.

GENERAL CONDITIONS IN WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried briefly to describe the conditions as I see them in my own section. It may be truthfully said I have referred more in detail to the producer, both employer and employee, than to the consumer of the products, natural and manufactured, of western Massachusetts. I take it, however, that he is really one and the same person in that in mutual relationship between man and man the producer in one instance is the consumer in the other, and the benefits accruing to the one or the opportunity for his livelihood makes him more truly the consumer of his brother's product. The interdependence, therefore, the one on the other, or both upon each other, makes their interests identical, and the contents of the pay envelope of the employee is the standard of his happiness as well as of the livelihood of his producing brother.

On this beautiful spring day I confess to a feeling of longing for a sight of the hills of Berkshire, Hampden, Hampshire, or Franklin Counties of Massachusetts.

I would enjoy a visit to the neighbors at home—and I call all western Massachusetts my home. My farmer friend would be found busy with his plow or planting in anticipation of the bountiful crop of the golden autumn; the artisan is working at a good wage, with two days' work offered for one he can accept; the mill hand hears the sweet refrain of the busy shuttle, and the employer, were it not for this tariff agitation, would appear contented with a full order book. Happiness and contentment pervade the air, for each one in his individual way realizes that the wife, mother, or sister can take to market a large-sized basket, and that he can provide her with the means of filling it to the brim. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, our section is prosperous, and times are good, as they have been throughout the land in recent years. Woe to the Democratic tariff makers who change this condition. At present our people are not so much troubled about the price of the contents of their market basket as they are at the prospect of having it emptied. They ask for the continuance of an opportunity to pay for its contents. Better a full basket at fair prices than an empty one at cut rates. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID].

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I was very glad indeed when I learned that the Democratic caucus had finished its consideration of the pending bill. I had been anxious and am yet anxious, inasmuch as it has been decreed that we must have an extraordinary session for the express purpose, at least

the principal purpose, of tariff revision, that the consideration of the bill should commence at the earliest practicable time. I do regard it as unfortunate for the business interests of the country that frequent general tariff revisions should occur, but another general revision has been decreed, and the sooner it can be made the more acceptable it will be to those who think it will be a benefit and the less objectionable, the less disagreeable, to those who expect that the changes made will be injurious to the welfare of the country. I therefore congratulate the majority side on getting through with the ordeal of their caucus on so long a bill and on reaching an agreement which they were obliged to reach before they could adjourn, however diverse their respective interests and opinions might be; and I should not overlook to congratulate the very able and popular leader of the majority upon his excellent generalship in bringing the different elements in his party together with the prospects, I should say certainty, of securing their united support, at least enough of them to afford a large majority over the minority side on the pending measure. I heartily congratulate the gentleman from Alabama upon the proof of his diplomacy in this respect. But, sir, I had hoped that after the Tariff Board was provided by a previous Congress, that thereafter revisions by separate schedules whenever found necessary would do away almost entirely with the necessity for a general revision, with the advantage that the revision of a single schedule at intervals would not materially disturb business; at any rate, in a general way, also that such revisions would be made promptly when justified.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly very freely accord to the majority side collectively and severally that they have acted in good faith in the make-up of the bill and had in mind as an end the general welfare of our country. I do not pretend to deny what they claim to be the case, that the bill is the best, from the Democratic viewpoint, which they could frame and upon which they could all unite. I do not hesitate to agree with them on the proposition that it is impossible to so frame a general tariff-revision bill that it will meet with the unqualified approval of every Member who must give it his support in order that a majority therefor may be secured upon its final passage. Experience proves this is impractical and impossible in the nature of things. I grant that in order to be practical in legislation and to reach results at all mutual concessions must be made and the minority of a party yield more or less to the consensus of judgment of the majority of the same party, otherwise a result will not be reached. Any party must work in this way if results—I mean in an affirmative way—shall be attained.

Mr. Chairman, while yielding to the majority's laudable purposes with reference to the revision, from their viewpoint, as a protectionist I find very decided objections to its provisions. But, Mr. Chairman, I do not condemn it in toto. Covering 4,000 items, it would be very singular if some of them, or many of them, did not possess merit. I could point out many items out of the great number to which I should find no objection, and which if standing alone would receive my hearty support, my voice, and vote. For instance, take logs and lumber of all kinds; why, four years ago—more than four years ago, for it was during the session previous to the Republican tariff revision—I introduced a bill placing lumber on the free list, and it was unqualified in this respect, but as at the time I introduced the bill the promise of our party had already been made for a general tariff revision at the commencement of the new administration, the Taft administration, I could not secure consideration of my bill; but when lumber was reached in the Payne revision bill I voted for an amendment offered that lumber be placed upon the free list, without any restrictions as to any country or in any respect.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I should think it was about five years ago when I introduced in the House a bill providing for the placing of barbed wire, which is mostly used in fencing, upon the free list, and in the general revision bill, the Payne bill, I voted for placing barbed wire upon the free list.

Mr. Chairman, more important yet than either of these items I have just named is the income-tax provision in the pending bill. Let me mention, this provision would not have been tenable from the constitutional standpoint, or standpoint of constitutionality, except for the amendment recently made to the Constitution expressly authorizing such legislation. We do not forget that our Supreme Court years ago declared just such a provision as this income-tax clause to be unconstitutional, and while this conclusion was reached by the court as a result of a rehearing, and even then by a majority of only one, the decision and judgment was yet as binding as though it had been the unanimous judgment of the membership of the court. But this constitutional amendment is of Republican origin; the joint resolution for the amendment was introduced by Republicans in the two Houses, and was passed in each body under Republican majorities, and was approved by a Republican President.

To be specific, the joint resolution was introduced in the Senate by Senator Brown, of Nebraska, and it was introduced in the House by myself. As a result of the faithful efforts of Senator Brown a favorable report was secured from the Senate Judiciary Committee, and soon thereafter it was passed in the Senate and soon thereafter passed the House and immediately received the approval of Mr. Taft. For the last 20 years I have been an advocate of the policy of a graduated income-tax law, and I am in accord with the principle involved, in a general way, in the provision contained in this bill. Without pretending to sanction all its details, it would receive my vote if standing alone. I could mention other items in the pending bill that I should like to give my support, but objections of a very serious character which I find to many others greatly outweigh what I regard as meritorious in the bill, and it is without the least hesitation that I find myself impelled to earnestly oppose its enactment. But, sir, I concede that the die is cast, and that all the opposition can possibly do can not prevent its passage.

Mr. Chairman, time will tell who is right and who wrong of the supporters and opposers of this measure. The operation of the bill, the fruits it will bear, must determine that.

But, Mr. Chairman, I was about to overlook one feature, which is an omission in the provisions in the bill, as I regard it, which as a Republican I should consider myself derelict by failing to direct attention to it. It is the omission to perpetuate the Tariff Board or a tariff commission or to provide for either in any way whatever. This bill does not provide even for expert assistance in the preparation of a tariff-revision bill in any way whatever. Mr. Chairman, let me inquire wherein the danger of Congressmen becoming too well informed upon the subject of legislation which so vitally affects the business interests of our country? Why avoid information, why avoid being made intelligent in the premises and thus becoming qualified, highly qualified if possible, to discharge the duties of the important trust?

Mr. Chairman, are not the mistakes that have been made due to a lack of being fortified with the knowledge properly bearing upon the items contained and the rates adopted in the various schedules? The Tariff Board was of Republican origin, what we have had, but the Democratic Party, at the time in the minority, was glad to join with the Republican majority for its adoption. It was well enough this policy should be adopted and that intelligent, fair, and scientific tariff revision should be made under Republican rule. But the Democratic minority, now changed into a majority, repudiates a tariff board or tariff commission. But, Mr. Chairman, what is the use of scientific revision in the hands of a party antagonistic to the policy of protection? With free trade palpably in view as the ultimate of this revision, supplemented by one or two more revisions to finish it up, I must grant that scientific revision may not be logical under such circumstances. If there is to be no protection, and if free trade is to be adopted, certainly a tariff board would become a superfluity. Mr. Chairman, I am expecting Republicans will offer as an amendment a tariff board or tariff commission provision, and yet all who are opposed to the Democratic bill can do will be powerless to secure its adoption. But we shall have done our duty if we shall have done our utmost for the cause. For years I have earnestly advocated the policy of a tariff commission, nonpartisan in politics, composed of the best experts for the economic task or undertaking to be found among the best equipped of the Nation. The business interests of the country ought not to be tied up, involved with the political fortunes or misfortunes of any party. The business interests of the country ought not to be disturbed, injured, and imperiled by the result of constantly recurring congressional and presidential elections. This business question of the Nation, its revenues, which must sustain it, bear its expenses, make its great internal improvements, pay the salaries of public servants, defend it in wars with other countries, and pay the pensions of its patriotic defenders—this business question of our country, together with the business interests of every business man and of every citizen, should not be interrupted and made dependent upon the result of a congressional or presidential campaign.

I regard it as incontestable that anyone who is willing to have the question of tariff or revenue legislation impartially and fairly disposed of should agree to submit it to a purely nonpartisan tariff board or commission, made up, as I have just said, of the best-equipped experts for the undertaking. For a trial in courts of justice the desideratum is a fair jury, and the analogy ought to obtain here for the determination of our business and economic interests and concerns.

Mr. Chairman, allow me to add to the support of my proposition to take tariff out of politics by means of the use of a tariff commission, as I have suggested, that the result would be that our whole country, North and South as well as East

and West, would unite in vouching for its beneficence. One unfortunate feature for many years has been that political party interests were involved with the issue. I grant that at the start and for years such was not the case; at any rate, if at all, only in a small degree. There was a period when the South, on account of its production of cotton, entertained the belief that as they did with but little manufacturing, and that their main industry was the production of cotton, that the policy of protection for which New England, where the manufacturing centers then were, earnestly contended was a disadvantage to the South. But I am sure there has been an increasing disposition growing up with the people in the Southern States in favor of a protective policy, and that if congressional and presidential elections were to be decided upon that issue, not hindered or hampered by questions which appeal more strongly to them, the strength of the protective policy in the Southern States would constantly increase. Certainly there can be no question at this time that a very close community of interest, industrially and commercially, exists between the North and South as well as the East and West, and these interests, I feel very confident, will be best promoted, expanded, and conserved by the protection of home industries and the conservation of the home market to the citizens and taxpayers of this country.

Mr. Chairman, with the highest deference for our very learned and highly accomplished Chief Executive, I respectfully take issue on some propositions contained in his tariff message orally delivered to the Congress in joint session April 8. I think, too, some of these expressions may help to interpret or determine the ultimate purpose of the framers of the pending bill, the form and contents, and, I may add, the variety of phases and conditions of which no one can successfully contend mark it with a distinctive character. What I mean is that its substance and legal effect when enacted into law will not enable anyone to place it, or base it, upon any economic principle. It is very plain to be seen that it is riding horses in opposite directions at the same time, and even when racing in the same direction it goes a much greater distance on one item, or with one item, than another, even when they are of the same kind or class. Distinctions made between rates on raw material and the products thereof are wholly incompatible in principle and illogical in results. The bill left standing alone would constitute a very unreliable guide to the tariff ideas of the party proposing it if that were the only criterion or information to go by. But, taking the tariff message, the bill, and party traditions with them, into consideration, one is strongly impelled to the conclusion that free trade is the Democratic goal. Take, for instance, the message of the President. He, after speaking of the tariff reform to be made, continued with the further statement:

> The sooner that is done the sooner we shall escape from suffering from the facts and the sooner our men of business will be free to thrive by the law of nature (the nature of free business) instead of by the law of legislation and artificial arrangement.

Again, further along, it was stated that "the object of the tariff duty henceforth laid must be effective competition, the whetting of American wits by contest with the wits of the rest of the world." And, again, "We must build up trade, especially foreign trade." Some difference of opinion may arise as to precisely what is meant by these expressions. I do not want to prejudice the message in any way whatever by taking excerpts from it, and it is perfectly plain I could not do so if I were to try.

The message is credibly brief, which renders it so much more the likely that it has been read by most every citizen of the United States. It is probable a copy may be found in every household; certainly, every daily and every weekly newspaper has published it one or more issues, and who is it who reads English that does not read the President's message, especially when so brief as not to cover three ordinary pages set in good large type?

Mr. Chairman, it is essential, in order that we compete for the sale of our products in the markets of the world, that we do so, or succeed in doing so, without any artificial help which legislation might render. Sir, we have no jurisdiction to carry the effect of our legislation beyond our national territorial boundary lines. Our congressional acts are supreme within the United States, and that is the limit. But when we are discussing tariff laws it is necessarily understood that duties imposed, tolls to be paid, are intended to refer to our home market or markets. No other meaning or understanding is permissible. I am unqualifiedly opposed, Mr. Chairman, to the policy of permitting other countries, regardless of labor conditions, regardless of the low standard of living and the low standard of wages, to ship their products of whatever kind or character into the United States to come in competition in our home markets with the products of our own country in "free competition" or free trade. I would except from this things our country does not produce and make other exceptions, but I would make this the rule. Sir, where is the reward for good citizenship, for the payment of taxes for the support of the Government, for loyalty to the flag when our country is imperiled if the producers in foreign countries are to enjoy the benefits of our home markets, the greatest and best markets in the world, especially for our own people, upon equal terms with those who have made and are yet making this country the greatest country on earth?

Sir, to add to the injury, duties have been lowered and removed even in cases where some of the foreign countries impose duties for the admission of the same products into their country. The bill disregards the rule or principle of reciprocity or reciprocal trade relations made by mutual agreement. It does not require mutuality; it prodigally throws away advantages secured to our own country in face of and in defiance of the fact that other countries, sure to take advantage of the unwisdom, have barred us, our country, of the same privilege by their tariff enactments. Mr. Chairman, I am unqualifiedly opposed to requiring laborers and producers of our country to be driven to such limits of competition as to render necessary the "whetting of wits with the laborers and producers of other countries" for our own home market. I also submit that there is no law of nature which entitles the people of foreign countries to trade without price or the payment of toll in our home market. On the contrary, the law of nature secures to the citizens of our own country the exclusive right to control their own market and it is only the comity of nations, only by comity, in their progress of civilization, that they permit the trading with each other. Very frequently nations exemplify this positive right by passing and enforcing embargo acts against trade with other countries. Sir, I contend that free trade is more nearly an affirmative artificial arrangement than the doctrine of protection, considering how countries and nations started, in their low estate, and have builded up to their present civilizations. We remember at the start they all regarded each other as enemies and thus laid no claim by natural law to sell or buy in their respective markets. The fixing of duties, in my judgment, is merely a regulation or license charged for the privilege granted of trading in the home market and is merely a condition imposed upon the privilege yielded or granted by the particular government. The predilection "for especially foreign trade," or the idea that we should seek more for foreign trade than the home trade, I regard as fallacious. But I very well remember that this is in accordance with the views of those who have espoused free trade.

Why, when he was a free trader, which he at first was, Daniel Webster himself opposed the inauguration of the policy of protection for our home industries, even if he did live in New England, on the ground that it would conflict with or impair the interests of transportation upon the high seas. But ere long the great statesman perceived his error, and becoming fully converted to the doctrine of the protection of home industries, became one of its ablest advocates. With the marvelous development, industrially and commercially, which has taken place in this country since Mr. Webster became a protectionist, it is plain to be seen that the policy of protection includes, with its other virtues, great benefits with respect to what has become one of the greatest problems of our age, that of transportation. Mr. Chairman, history proves that the adoption of the policy of protection by our forefathers, which I may add, having referred to the first impressions of Daniel Webster, received the support of both the sage of Monticello and Old Hickory, the most distinguished of Democrats, was the richest and happiest solution of the problem of transportation for the American people which at that time it was possible for the most enlightened to achieve. It did not merely lower rates of transportation; the result was to abolish distance; distance to where? To markets for American produce; and where, sir, were those markets? They were in Europe, principally in England, for nearly all the manufacturing was then done in England, nearly all of the manufactures which our people purchased. And lest we forget, the mother country prohibited by law any manufacturing by our colonies. It was decreed America should be a country of farmers to feed the labor of England, especially that employed in manufacturing, and in turn that we should be dependent upon English manufactories for manufactured goods. So long as this condition existed all of our surplus farm products were to be transported across the Atlantic and the merchandise and manufactures purchased to be shipped to America in return. Thus the cost of transportation was a millstone around the necks of the American people; but they might not have found this out for a much longer time than it did take had it not been for the provocation which culminated finally in

the War of the Revolution and the political emancipation of our country.

Next in importance to our political independence was our industrial independence, and this we did achieve by the adoption of the policy of protection. This beneficent policy solved very largely, as I have said, the problem of transportation to the American people; it transferred our market, then principally in England, into our own country; it resulted in the removal of millions of people from the industrial centers of Europe to our own country. Our manufacturing industries, which were developed as a result of the policy, furnished labor for the thousands and the development of our agricultural resources were stimulated and our country took on a growth in general that it never would have known without the enactment of protective-tariff laws. Without going into details as to the ups and downs of the policy of protection, caused by legislative enactments for and against, I regard it as very reasonable to conclude that had our country never enjoyed its advantages our population and wealth would not be four-tenths of what it is to-day. I feel very confident that the greatness of our country, the achievements of our people in everything that is desirable, and our relative strength and standing with the world are due principally to the fruits of the policy of protection.

Mr. Chairman, as I view it, the pending bill in its operation would afford some benefits to agriculture if it were not for its tendency to put the industry out of commission in some particularly important respects. The serious question is whether it will leave agriculture capable of enjoying any benefits. If agriculture is rendered unprofitable, free lumber and barbed wire will not be in demand; neither will agricultural implements. If agriculture can not be permitted to remain profitable farmers must get along with the improvements and machinery they now have. I must say that the potato raisers, sugar-beet raisers, prairie-hay farmers, alfalfa-hay raisers, and live-stock breeders and raisers in the district I have the honor to represent feel they will be hit pretty hard. These products surely should not fall under the Democratic ban of not being "legitimate industries."

I have reference to the new propaganda of the majority party that industries are not legitimate which need to be protected or which will not be profitable without the aid of protection. Mr. Chairman, it ought to seem conclusive that agriculture in the United States is one of the indigenous industries, and that it can not be rendered "illegitimate" by any "artificial arrangement," such as legislation, while it may be greatly injured by legislation which is adverse. But the majority party, while advancing this new proposition of "legitimate industries" and illegitimate industries, have said nothing about the qualities of competition, the kind of competition. The party does insist upon free competition between our people and the people of other countries. But, sir, I desire to right here file a counterclaim to the proposition of "legitimate business," that the competition American laborers and American producers are to contend with must be legitimate competition. In other words, to be consistent, if industries must be classed as legitimate and illegitimate, then our country's competitors or the competitors of our people must likewise be classed as legitimate and illegitimate. And right here, Mr. Chairman, is the crux of the tariff question. All Republicans ask is that sufficient protection be afforded to Americans—to our home people—to equalize the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, it being understood that the cost of production at home, on account of the higher prices of labor as compared with European and Asiatic countries, is higher or the highest of any. All protectionists ask is that duties be imposed such as will put the home producer upon an equal footing in the home market, the expenses of production considered, with the foreigner offering his goods in our home market. Such protection as this secured to home producers and home labor will preserve and maintain the higher prices paid labor and the higher standards of living in this country than in European and Asiatic countries, and, I may add, in the American countries south of us. Sir, I make no apology for my advocacy that these conditions and standards should be maintained.

Mr. Chairman, I very respectfully submit for the consideration of the membership of this House, having in mind the proposition of the majority side, that industries must be classed as legitimate and illegitimate, and my own counterclaim proposition, that it necessarily follows that competition likewise should be so classed—I submit the proposition whether the competition of the raisers of cattle in the Republic of Mexico, with cheap peon labor and low-priced land, whether the shipping of the fresh meat of the butchered animals into United States markets free of duty is legitimate competition. Just now we will not forget that the United States is obliged to keep a large part of our standing Army interspersed along the Mexican boundary line to prevent the contending armies of the Republic from shooting American citizens within our own territory or on our side of the line. Can it be that this constitutes an additional reason why Mexican meats should reach our markets free of toll paid when crossing the boundary line? While the pending bill does provide for a small duty to be paid for the admission of live cattle from other countries, it permits all of the products and by-products of cattle to be shipped into the United States free of duty. Of the cow, it permits the milk and butter to be shipped free into our market. It has already been pointed out by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] that the only portion remaining not to be shipped free into the United States is the bovine soul; all the material part, when cut into pieces, is to be admitted free. The bill would level cattle raising in the United States down to the Mexican basis, if the product from Mexico, with that from other countries added, were adequate in quantity to produce such a result, and it will be no fault of the bill if such a dire result shall not occur; rather that of existing providential conditions. Let me add we are placed in the same way at a disadvantage with Canada, but will be affected in a smaller degree, due to a smaller disparity in conditions with regard to labor and land.

Mr. Chairman, the bill is exciting much apprehension on the part of sugar-beet growers in the Nebraska sixth district. One new sugar factory, costing about $1,200,000, has been in operation two or three years with very small, if any, profit to the factory, but with very satisfactory results to the farmers in that locality. It has added very greatly to the prosperity of the farmers tributary to the factory. It has been a direct benefit to all of these and an indirect benefit to neighboring farmers not producing sugar beets, but producing other crops, especially alfalfa, the demand for which has been greatly increased on account of the production of sugar beets in the same vicinity. To explain, thousands of cattle and sheep are brought to the factory for fattening upon the pulp of the ground beet after the sugar has been extracted, and alfalfa hay is required as a good food balance with the pulp for the fattening of the stock. Land values where beets are raised have been very greatly increased by this acquisition to agriculture, and the general prosperity of the beet-sugar locality, of every branch of business, has been very much increased by the production of beet sugar. I will here read a letter written me by a sugar-beet raiser, Mr. Thomas Hall, of Scottsbluff, Nebr., or as it is rather lengthy, I shall read only a portion of it:

SCOTTSBLUFF, NEBR., *March 3, 1913.*

Hon. MOSES P. KINKAID,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I write you in regard to the sugar tariff. I am a sugar-beet raiser; have raised beets for four years. The sugar-beet industry has been the making of this country, which is especially adapted for sugar beets. Up until the time we began to raise sugar beets it was hard to make a living here. But for the last four years we have all prospered, and we would be greatly disappointed if the tariff should be taken off of sugar to such an extent that we would have to quit rasing beets. * * * There are a great many people under the Government ditch in our locality that can not pay their water right at the present time. I myself have heard a good many homesteaders say, "If I can only get my farm seeded down to alfalfa for two or three years and then begin to raise sugar beets I can pay my water right and save my home." I sincerely believe if the tariff is taken off of sugar it will ruin this country, as this country is only adapted for some root crop such as beets, potatoes, and cabbage, which grows in a short time. Corn does not do well here, as the seasons are too short for it to mature. I will close, asking you to protect us along this line.

Respectfully,
THOMAS HALL.

Let me read a brief letter written me by Ehrman Bros., of Gering, Nebr., which is in the beet-raising locality:

GERING, NEBR., *March 11, 1913.*

M. P. KINKAID,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are a couple of young farmers. We started out to farm on our own hook seven years ago, with absolutely nothing, and now to-day we own a nice 160-acre farm—$100 an acre—and the sugar-beet industry is the cause for our owning a farm. Now, I don't see why the tariff should be taken off sugar, for it would kill this community. Why not take it off steel? Then, too, if the sugar is taken on the free list it will cripple us.

Thanking you for the favors for the future,
Yours, truly,
EHRMAN BROS.

Here I have a letter written by Mr. W. H. Stahraker, of Scottsbluff, Nebr., which is right to the point:

SCOTTSBLUFF, NEBR., *March 1, 1913.*

Hon. MOSES P. KINKAID,
House of Representatives, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As I live in the part of the United States where the sugar beet grows, and the sugar industry cuts quite an item in these parts, I am going to write you a few lines, to have you do all in your power, if you will, to prevent any reduction in the tariff on sugar.

If the beet industry is killed out here, I do not see how these people who have taken homesteads will ever be able to pay for them. As I am a grower myself, I think I know what it pays to raise. Cut out the raising of beets and you had as well take corn away from the corn-raising countries. It will have the same effect.

Thanking you for whatever you may do,

Respectfully, W. H. STAHBAKER.

You noted that the letter I first read states the homesteaders did not see how they could pay for their lands, meaning their homesteads, if the duty should be taken off of sugar. That was the writer's way of stating his view, but to many of the membership here an explanation is necessary. The writer is one among many homesteaders who made entries under the North Platte irrigation project; the land itself costs nothing; a compliance with the homestead law is all that is required to secure patent to the land itself, but the perpetual water right secured from the Government, in the patent it issues, has to be paid for in money under all these irrigation projects, and under this project the perpetual water right costs $55 for each acre of land watered. The writer of the letter means that the homesteaders can not pay for their water rights if sugar beets can not be grown profitably or if the business must be terminated. The Government has already invested in the development of these irrigation projects over seventy-five millions of dollars, and there is yet owed the Government approximately seventy-one millions of dollars. Under many of the projects it is contemplated that sugar beets will be raised, and that this will best enable entrymen of any crop to realize ready cash with which to make their annual water-right payments. Thus, the Government itself would be much better insured that water-right payments would be made when due if sugar-beet raising may be permitted to remain profitable to the farmer.

Mr. Chairman, it is pertinent to add that homestead entries were made under these irrigation projects with the mutual understanding by the officials of the Government and the entrymen that beet-sugar factories would be established to manufacture into sugar the sugar beets raised on the farms, and that this would furnish the surest means whereby entrymen could pay the water-right charges to the Government, varying from $20 to $25 to $100 or more per acre. We may fairly say the Government was party to the understanding with the entrymen that they would thus be enabled to make their water-right payments; but now the Government, under the management of a different political party, is proceeding to make this impossible, and the question arises, How is the money going to be raised to make the payments? Should not the present administration preserve faith with these entrymen and at the same time insure the repayment as early as practicable of over $70,000,000 into the reclamation fund? Is not this a business proposition for the Government?

Mr. Chairman, let me now read a brief letter written me by J. W. Gilbert, of Minatare, Nebr., upon the same subject:

MINATARE, NEBR., *March 28, 1913.*

Hon. M. P. KINKAID,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You are fully aware of our state of affairs—how we are laboring under a new system of irrigation.

Our taxes are high, and we are depending largely on our sugar-beet industry. We believe you will do what you can to protect our interests along this line.

I am a farmer, and anything you can do for us will be appreciated.

Respectfully, yours,

J. W. GILBERT.

I will read next excerpts from a letter written me by S. K. Warrick, of Scottsbluff, Nebr., a prominent banker at that place. Mr. Warrick says:

DEAR MR. KINKAID: I am anxious to know what the Ways and Means Committee has done on our sugar-tariff schedule. * * *

It is my judgment that this State has 500,000 to 800,000 acres of land that will grow sugar beets successfully. Colorado probably has 2,000,000 acres. The territory tributary to Billings has about 1,300,000 acres. We produced a million dollars' worth of sugar beets last year on 16,000 acres of land. We can not afford to destroy this industry. If we reduce the cost of living in the United States we must make 1 acre of land produce the amount that 2 acres are producing now. I believe that the sugar beet will bring about this result quicker than any crop known. This has been proven in Germany and many other European countries. Our brief statistics in this country confirm the European statistics.

I will now read extracts from a letter from A. N. Mathers, president of a national bank in Gering, Nebr., in Scotts Bluff County:

I am writing you in behalf of the sugar-beet industry. This industry is, if nothing is done to injure it, to become the great industry of the West. This North Platte Valley, from one end to another through Nebraska and for its entire width, is practically all good sugar-beet ground. Only the land close in is being put to sugar beets at present. In four years the acreage has grown from 3,000 to 22,000 for the ensuing year.

* * * * * * *

Long ago the farmer hesitated to contract for water at the cost of $12 per acre. Now, knowing the possibilities of beet growing, farmers will readily contract for water at $35 or $42.50, and are willing to sign up on the south side Government project at possibly $65 per acre. Under the present Government project the homesteader is attempting to meet his water payment and develop his home and farm by means of raising beets. I personally know of many that are hauling beets 7 miles. * * *

S. S. Stark, of Scottsbluff, Nebr., writes me substantially upon the same lines as do several others in this same county, so I shall not take the time to read their letters.

I was about to read the lengthy and very illuminating letter upon this subject of Mr. A. T. Officer, manager of the Scottsbluff sugar-beet factory, but I now recall that this gentleman filed an exhaustive brief with the Ways and Means Committee near the close of the last session, and this has been printed in the reports of the hearings had before the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I have here this short newspaper clipping headed "An appeal to the farmers of America," which was sent me by a sugar-beet farmer in the North Platte Valley, which states the case very fully from the viewpoint of sugar-beet farmers. It reads:

AN APPEAL TO THE FARMERS OF AMERICA.

The farmers who grow sugar beets and the manufacturers who make beet sugar publish the following facts about this industry in order to enlist the public's support in favor of retaining the present tariff on sugar. Read every word of this message. It is important to you and your children and to the millions of Americans who are interested in agriculture and its dependent industries. This is a fight between the *trusts* and the people. *We are with the people* and we want the people to be with us; we want *your* cooperation and support. Read the rest of this message *now;* then *act promptly.*

The Sugar Trust, in combination with a few other big importers, seeks to have the tariff on sugar *removed* with a view to crushing the beet-sugar industry of America, their only competition. The sugar importers send millions of American money abroad every year for sugar; the beet-sugar industry keeps the money at home, benefiting thousands of American farmers, coal miners, machinists, and workingmen in many different lines. Removing the tariff will only *benefit the trust and the big importers;* it *will not permanently* lower the price of sugar, no more than did the removal of the tariff on coffee reduce the price of coffee. It will cut the Government's revenue enormously and crush a great and rapidly growing American industry that gives employment and support to thousands of American farmers, workingmen, and business men.

Here are the facts, tersely told in eight short paragraphs. Read them carefully and thoughtfully, then fill out and mail the coupon below—to-day—*now.*

1. All agitation for a lower tariff on sugar originated with the importers of foreign sugar. There are only three large importing interests in the United States, of which the Sugar Trust dominates. They handle $300,000,000 worth of sugar annually and fear that the further development of the home beet-sugar industry will destroy their monopoly.

2. These importers wish to prevent further development of the home beet-sugar industry because home-produced beet sugar is their only competition and the only sugar which does not pass through their hands and from which they can not exact toll from the American consumer.

3. The present tariff on sugar is a large revenue producer for the Government, and therefore decreases direct taxes. Its net effect on the consumer amounts to only 14 cents a year per capita. To reduce this tariff means perpetuating the monopoly of the importing sugar refiners. To retain the present tariff means the further development of the home beet-sugar industry and, ultimately, cheaper sugar.

4. The tariff is no burden to the consumer, because the price of sugar is lower in the United States than in most other countries, and because 40 per cent of the sugar consumed is used in the manufacture of candy, confections, chewing gum, condensed milk, etc., the retail price of which would not be affected by any decline in the price of sugar. Reducing the tariff would reduce the Government revenue without any gain to the consumer.

5. Beet-sugar production can be developed to supply the entire demand of this country. It increased 1,500 per cent since the present tariff was enacted in 1897. There are now 72 beet-sugar factories in the United States, located in 16 States, extending from Ohio to California, and owned by 30 independent concerns. These factories represent an investment of $80,000,000 and produce over 1,200,000,000 pounds of sugar, or about one-sixth of the total consumption in the United States. The production of beet sugar benefits the farmers, the workingmen, the coal miners, the machine shops, and the railroads.

6. The price of sugar has steadily decreased since the advent of beet sugar. Further development will reduce the cost of manufacture and further reduce the price of sugar to the consumer and will retain in this country immense sums of money that are now sent abroad for the purchase of foreign sugar.

7. Beet sugar is the same substance as cane sugar. It has the same amount of sweetness as cane sugar and can be used for all purposes. Dr. Wiley, while chief of the United States Bureau of Chemistry, declared that there is no distinguishable difference of any kind between refined beet sugar and refined cane sugar.

Mr. Chairman, it can not be successfully gainsaid that the price of sugar to consumers in the United States has constantly declined since sugar-beet raising and the manufacture of sugar therefrom commenced. It is perfectly well settled that during the three months' time it takes to market the sugar manufactured from sugar beets in our own country that the whole of this time, these three months, the price of sugar is lower to consumers than during the other nine months of the year, so that it seems perfectly clear that if enough beet sugar were produced in the United States to entertain the home market for the other nine months that the price to consumers would be reduced the year around, and that the very benefit to consumers professed by the framers of this bill, which is lower-priced sugar, would eventually be realized by the competition resulting from the increased home production. But, Mr. Chairman, the effect of this bill will be to let in the competition of foreign

countries—I should say the production of foreign countries, the result of cheap labor, very low-priced labor, and thereby destroy the beet-sugar industry in this country in its infancy. It is not enough, it would seem, that foreign sugar controls our home market nine months in the year; it must be made supreme all the year. The result must be that instead of permitting competition to fully develop by the growth of the sugar-beet industry here at home, that competition will be made impossible and foreign sugar will have a monopoly in our home market in proportion as our home sugar-beet industry is driven to the wall, with the result of an increased price to the consumers of sugar.

Mr. Chairman, I again call attention to my counterclaim that competition should be legitimate in order that it be eligible to the freedom of our home markets; of course, I mean the competition of foreigners for the advantages of our home markets. I need not cite statistics to show the prices of labor in sugar-producing countries outside the jurisdiction of the United States. Every Congressman and most of our constituents are well versed upon the subject. We know, and our constituents know, that wages paid labor in these sugar-producing countries outside of the United States are insignificant and trifling as compared with the prices paid in the United States, but I will just instance what is going on south of us, specifically, in British Guiana and Trinidad. This is going to be a wonderful sugar-producing locality in the hands of the British. Large English capital, with the backing given by the British Government, which it customarily gives in behalf of a monopoly in such a case as this, is now being directed to the development of extensive cane-sugar plantations in these British possessions, and the prospects of the enactment of this bill is giving this very British enterprise accelerated impetus. But, of course, it is not Englishmen who will perform the manual labor, the raising and gathering and manufacturing of the cane into sugar. The fact is, as I have just been informed from the most authentic source, they contract for coolie labor in job lots of a thousand or more in a single contract, the same to be transported from Ceylon and vicinity to the plantations and to remain for five years, usually; and they are to be paid, just the head of the family is to be paid, the liberal price of 24 cents per day.

Mr. Chairman, let me ask, is this "legitimate" competition? Is it fair, reasonable, I should say humane, or decent that American labor should be degraded from its present high standing to the low level of wages paid to the unfortunate coolies, whose condition is thus rendered equivalent to human slavery? Mr. Chairman, if American labor must be reduced to so low a level, Americans must cease to take pride in the belief that our country is to realize a great destiny, that it is to keep in the van of human progress.

Mr. Chairman, how about the effect of the bill as to the north of us—with Canada, I mean? Reciprocity with that country, while enacted by our Congress, became very unpopular with the people; certainly those engaged in agriculture were overwhelmingly opposed to it. The fact that Canada rejected it does not argue, when the facts are known, that it would have been a good bargain for the United States. But, sir, had reciprocity been consummated it would have possessed merit not contained in this bill. Just a little bit of compensation might have been realized, or imagined, for the large amount of sacrifice made by agriculture in the United States had the proposition been consummated. But there is no pretense of reciprocity, no demand for reciprocity, in this bill. The provision relative to wheat and flour is an anomaly. It is a joker for the American farmer; it makes a showing of affording him protection upon the wheat he grows; but we all expect that Canada will at once adapt itself to the situation by removing the duty imposed by the Dominion laws on flour shipped from the United States, and thereby entitle itself to ship its flour free of duty into the United States, which the bill will permit. Thus Canadian flour will come in in free competition in our American markets with our American flour and the American farmer will be left without any real protection, with nothing but a pretense of protection upon his wheat.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to inquire for an explanation of the grudge against American millers betrayed by this provision of the pending bill. Hitherto we have understood that the theory of free trade would in its application merely put American industries on a common level in every respect with those of foreign countries; therefore we did not expect that the administration side would present a bill which, in its effect, discriminates in favor of Canadian millers over the millers of the United States. But that is just what this bill does. As the bill is written, wheat shall pay 10 cents per bushel with flour and the other products of wheat free, provided that if the importing country imposes a duty upon the admission of flour to its markets that a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem shall be paid by that country for shipping into our markets. Therefore, say, that Canada imposes no duty upon the admission of our flour into its markets, for we may reasonably assume that the duty it does now impose will be removed for the benefit of Canadian millers, and I shall assume that it will be removed and predicate my further observations about it upon that assumption. Thus it will result from the status that Canadian wheat, as wheat in the natural state, will not be imported into the United States, and this is intended to cajole the American wheat raiser. But it is very plain that the product of the wheat ground, consisting of flour, bran, and so forth, can be as easily shipped into the United States as wheat, and that it will be shipped just as extensively into our home markets as would the wheat if no duty were imposed upon the admission of wheat. Consequently wheat will not be receiving any protection, the apparent protection being ineffectual. Besides this while Canadian flour and bran will be competing in our home market with the flour and bran of American wheat, our home millers will be precluded the advantage of grinding Canadian wheat because of the discrimination made between the importation of flour and wheat.

Mr. Chairman, I will read a brief excerpt from a statement in behalf of the American millers, which was filed with the chairman of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate April 17 of this year:

> We beg further to submit that should the proposal carry to place a duty on wheat and admit its products free, the American miller will stand absolutely alone in being thus discriminated against. There is not another wheat and flour producing country on the face of the globe that does not give the miller at least an equality of opportunity; in many countries he is given an advantage.
>
> For instance, in Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, France, Germany, Italy, Norway, Roumania, Sweden, Canada, Egypt, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand there is a duty upon both wheat and flour.
>
> In Belgium, Russia, and British India there is a duty on flour while wheat is free.
>
> In the United Kingdom, Denmark, Netherlands, and China both wheat and flour are free.
>
> Surely the Congress will not willingly and knowingly place the American miller at a great disadvantage with his fellows in other countries and, thus handicapped, expect him to compete.
>
> We assume that the duty of 10 cents a bushel on wheat was imposed as a measure of protection for the American wheat raiser. If so, we contend that a duty upon the raw material without an equalizing duty on the products of that raw material will be futile and unavailing. Otherwise the principle of tariff making used since the beginning of this Government by all parties is wrong and the practice of all the wheat and flour producing countries of the world is in error.
>
> We maintain that you can not possibly discriminate against the farmer's best, nearest, and most profitable customer, the miller, without at the same time discriminating against the farmer himself; in short, that the basis on which this tariff is proposed, that of placing a duty upon wheat and admitting its products free, is both unheard of and obviously unjust.
>
> The welfare of the farmer and the miller must go hand in hand; one can not be damaged without hurt to the other. In this connection is it frequently asserted that as long as there is an exportable surplus of wheat raised in the United States it must inevitably find its basic value in the world's wheat price.

Mr. Chairman, this is another example of unscientific tariff legislation. But as a tariff or revenue bill this very provision as to wheat and flour vindicates a tariff board or tariff commission for expert help in the framing of tariff or revenue bills, to the end that the legislation may be scientific. Had the framers of this bill availed themselves of the assistance of such expert help and relied upon it they would have escaped making this bull.

Mr. Chairman, the opponents of the policy of protection, specifically the Democratic Party, are constantly looking for cheap markets where to make purchases. They would seek to build up trade, "especially foreign trade," hence would buy in foreign markets, and they would buy the products of foreign cheap labor. Thus they would bring these foreign products, and consequently foreign cheap labor, in direct competition with the producers of the same goods and the labor that produced them in our home country. Certainly, this could not result otherwise than to level the standard of living and of wages in the United States down to the standard of foreign countries. It conclusively follows that if the products of labor are to be cheap, the price of labor, or its wages, must be correspondingly cheap.

Mr. Chairman, I am a firm believer in the beneficence of the policy of protection, but this does not signify that I favor high protection. I believe in sufficient protection, and that is all; rates that will equalize the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad. I am very frank to say that if any mistakes are to be made in the fixing of rates I should prefer that the error be in favor of our home producer and of our home market. I claim it to be to the advantage of our whole country, a public advantage to all our people, that our own home producers enjoy a preference by at least a slight

margin, if not by condition or circumstance, then by "artificial arrangement," such as the imposition of a duty by legislation, that such advantage be enjoyed over foreign labor and foreign products.

Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend that the policy, the advantages of protection to home labor and home industries, has not been abused, perverted in many instances from general public benefits to mere private and selfish ends. It is true that this has occurred, but this is no disparagement of the principle honestly and scientifically applied.

Mr. Chairman, the majority side and the administration advocate as a substitute for the Republican policy of protection competition; they would remove all "artificial" trade restrictions in the nature of protection for the panacea of competition. Sir, I regret the very palpable oversight of the administration side in that they have not perceived that competition is the ultimate result of protection. Competition is the purpose sought by protection afforded in the first instance. It ought to be perfectly plain to everyone giving any serious consideration to the question that foreign manufacturers would have met with but little, if any, competition in the United States, even by this time, had it not been for the policy of protection inaugurated in our country's infancy. Our country would have yet been at the mercy of the manufacturing monopolies of Europe had it not been for the competition produced as the direct result of the policy of protection by the development of manufactories in our own country. It is the fruits of the policy of protection that have made our Nation one of the strongest competitors in the markets of the world. At the same time it is perfectly plain that this same policy has resulted in a healthy and wholesome competition in the different industries in our own country—as to many things keen competition—so that our own citizens, surrounded by the same environments with the same standards of living and wages, standing thus on an equal footing and thus made "legitimate" competitors, are being obliged to "whet their wits" to the end that they may be able to cope with each other for our home markets besides for foreign markets. When protection was first inaugurated in our young Republic certain European countries tried to stifle it by the "dumping" of all their surplus manufactures, and even more than that, upon our markets, selling at prices lower than the cost of the manufacture in order to paralyze the infant industries of the United States. But, sir, protection brought development of these industries, with the result of competition both with foreign manufacturers and between our manufacturers at home.

The Democratic Party assails the policy of protection, relying partially upon mistakes and inaccuracies or inequalities in rates of duties which have occurred in some instances. But the pending bill, as has already been pointed out, ought to make them most charitably disposed as to such mistakes. In any event, mere inaccuracies constitute only a misapplication of the policy and do not therefore disparage the principle; in many instances they vindicate the principle or its virtues when properly applied. Mr. Chairman, admitting that such mistakes have been made by our side, we find great consolation in the fact that the unfair results thereby produced are small indeed as placed beside the disasters which have resulted from Democratic revision. We remember, too, that such mistakes as we have made have generally inured to citizens of our own country, while, on the other hand, the injurious effects of Democratic tariff tinkering have contributed directly to the prosperity of foreign countries at the sacrifice of our home people. I greatly prefer that, if errors must occur, the result shall be in favor of our home people rather than of foreign countries.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Party has charged up against the policy of protection the high cost of living and made solemn promises that this revision would lower the cost of living to a reasonable level; but, sir, I greatly fear that the only way in which the cost of living will be reduced by the operation of this bill is that by its blighting effect upon business it will necessitate a low standard of or poor living.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Party is constantly charging up to the operation of the policy of protection the responsibility for the existence of trusts, but they overlook the fact that though no duty is imposed upon the admission of tea and coffee, the business in these two household necessities constitute two of the greatest trusts, and the prices are about the highest to consumers, in proportion to the actual cost, of any articles of food they buy.

Again, the business of Great Britain, the greatest free-trade country, is honeycombed with gigantic trusts.

Mr. Chairman, the bill contains many phases and varieties of economic incompatibilities. It rides two or more horses in as many different directions at the same time. It is based upon free trade, tariff for revenue, special privilege for foreign producers—instance manufacture of flour in Canada for our home market—and upon conflicting campaign promises. It will be hailed as a friend by our foreign competitors, while it is sure to be deplored as a legislative plague by producers and consumers in the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to address myself at great length to the pending measure. The subject has been discussed by distinguished gentlemen with such clearness, force, and ability that further explanation or further debate seems useless. While most of us have long realized the importance and necessity of a downward revision of the tariff, yet if any doubt had existed in our minds it would have been removed after listening to the masterly arguments of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER]. Probably never before in the history of the country has a committee engaged in the preparation of tariff legislation labored so zealously to present to the American people an equitable readjustment of tariff duties as has the majority membership of the present Committee on Ways and Means. For days and for weeks, with strict fidelity to duty and following the mandate of the American people, they have been absorbed in the building of a law for the relief of the people of the United States. And to-day we have before us the magnificent fruits of their labors.

And just here let me say that I was somewhat amazed to hear from one source and another that the notion existed that the citrus-fruit States, Florida being one of them, were willing to traffic in the principles of the Democratic Party for the benefit of their particular industries. If such an idea is prevalent in this Congress, speaking for the rank and file of the Democrats of Florida, or at least of my district, I unhesitatingly say that our people will not sacrifice, and do not desire to sacrifice, a fundamental principle of democracy, however great the reward might be. In the making of a tariff bill there must be yielding here and yielding there that the finished product may be consistent and equitable, and the people that I represent are willing to stand by a measure, without selfish contention, which offers relief to millions of the American people.

The American people are an intelligent people. It is a happy situation for our country that those who serve the Nation in the making and in the execution of her laws are directly responsible to the people themselves. It is a happier situation that that responsibility is not due to one class of the people but to all the people, from the humblest citizen who may live in a hut to the greatest and richest who may dwell in a castle. So, in the course of time, the people, whose country this is, saw the deception of the Republican Party and learned that that party had heedlessly ignored solemn pledges and failed in the performance of plain duties. And in their might they registered their protest in the ballot box and drove from power the party that had plundered them by excessive tariff taxation. As a result of the people's wrath to-day at both ends of the Capitol and at the White House Democrats sit in the seats of the mighty to legislate for the real good of the whole people. We shall not deceive them, but, on the contrary, we shall heed their call and ere the passing of many more days a blighting tariff law will be clipped from our statutes and in its stead will be found the equitable measure which we here espouse.

I cherish the hope that the time will come in this country when there shall be no duty levied on a single article necessary to human existence. The levying of a tax for the protection of any business or industry is wholly indefensible and manifestly wrong. A business that can not thrive without having the arm of the Government to support it by tariff duties should perish. Why do I say this? Because the levying of tariff duties to support an industry is the forcing of the consumer—the farmer, the laboring man, who are not protected—to buy the necessaries of life in the market of the highest price instead of the market of the lowest price.

This is unnatural, unjust, and wholly wrong. The Republican Party since its inception has laid the heavy hand of taxation upon millions of the American people for the benefit of the great manufacturers and big business interests, and the result has been the fleecing of the poor man's pocket from early morning to night. Every cent exacted by the exorbitant rates of the Republican Payne tariff bill has been wrung from the purse of those who are least able to bear it.

Let us hope that we are at the dawn of a better day. To the American people we say have patience. The iniquitous legislation of the Republican Party can not be swept away in a day, because it has been in the building for many years. As a sick

man can not be cured in a day, so also the ills of a Nation can not be vanquished as by magic. The course of treatment the Democratic Party has prescribed will ere long bring us back to happiness and vigor. The passage of the pending measure means the awakening and quickening of competition and thrift in our commercial life and equality of opportunity for the struggling men and women of the Nation.

And in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me lift the veil that clouds the future and, penetrating into the to-morrow, predict that when this bill becomes the law of the land it will be the beginning of a better day of prosperity and happiness, which will endure for many years to come; and, too, that it will make the name of the distinguished and talented gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] immortal in American history.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LEWIS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized.

Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, without fear of successful contradiction I make the statement that the progressive movement, which swept the old Keystone State in the primaries of 1912 and at the general election in November of that year, was a wonderful feat, made possible of accomplishment by reason of the disgust of the public with old abuses and the tyranny of political bosses. It was a rebuke not to the Republican Party but to the bosses and representatives of special interests.

Year after year, as conventions were held in Pennsylvania, we as delegates were sent to the State capital, sat there, at times were wined and dined, and at times were asking ourselves the question: "Why don't we vote? Who are we going to vote for?" Invariably we were told: "The slate has not been made. Our leader, our peerless leader, will tell you in good time whom you are to vote for." And then we voted for our peerless leader's selections, and went back to our homes again.

We got tired of that in Pennsylvania, and the people of Pennsylvania repudiated those tactics. So tyrannous did the political machines become in our State that the bosses in both parties worked in harmony, so that the voter had no voice in the nomination or election of candidates for public office. The "machine," composed of Republican and Democratic leaders, controlled the conventions of both parties and named the tickets.

This condition was a powerful factor in the dissatisfaction that led to the revolt and political revolution in our State, and the Progressives, known as the Washington Party, early and late voiced the fundamental aspirations of all good and earnest men and women of all parties for a higher tone in public life, for public servants more truly representative of the higher aims of the people, for honesty in public life, for efficiency, and for freedom from the trammels of "interests" seeking unjust privileges, for a government and administration that shall be instinct with the conscience and genuine patriotism of the best in America. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I come as a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania as a Progressive, not only because I am a believer in better government, in social betterment, in government by the people and not by machines and bosses, but also because the sturdy sons of the old Keystone State, by a vote of 608,000 and a plurality of more than 250,000, have sent me here to assist in so revising the machinery of the Government that the will of the majority may surely find expression in law, believing that the rights and liberties of every individual citizen are safer in the hands of the majority of the people than in the hands of any interested minority.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in revising the machinery of the Government, I believe Representatives of all political parties will agree with me that the rights and interests of the industrial workers should be adequately protected in addition to the protection and encouragement in every possible way of business, whether it be big business or small business, honestly conducted.

I come from a section of the State that is remarkable. Lehigh County, at Summit Hill, on its northern border, is the beginning of the anthracite coal district. In its northern portion, at Slatington, it has the slate industry. A few miles below, at Egypt, is the largest cement district of the world. Two miles below that, at City Line, is the limestone formation. Then comes the city of Allentown, with all its diversified industries. To the west and north of the city of Allentown lie the hematite ore mines, and 5 miles south of the city of Allentown are the mines of the Bethlehem Zinc Co.

There is not anywhere a county that is richer in its mineral products, and our agricultural products are the pride of our State. Our industries in the city of Allentown are principally the manufacture of iron, steel, shoes, silk, furniture, cigars, wire and nails, automobiles, knitting mills, and so on. Our people there are generally employed, contented, happy, and prosperous; and I want to say to you, gentlemen, that if this tariff bill is passed, I invite you all in a year from its passage to that beautiful valley, and you will find the desolation it has caused. [Applause on the Republican side.]

From the brief description I have given of only a very small county in the State of Pennsylvania, you can infer we are vitally interested in the outcome of this tariff legislation. You have heard how the Democratic Party intends to better conditions by passing a bill in the preparation of which there has been absolutely no difference of method from that followed by the Republicans in the preparation of their tariff measures. No public information has been obtainable outside of the reports of the perfunctory hearings of the Ways and Means Committee. The real information upon which the bill has been written has been obtained by correspondence and by private conferences, not known to the House nor is it obtainable by Members of the House.

The same old methods have been employed in the same old way. Your leader, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], is indeed a general. He reminds me of an old friend of my boyhood days. We were raised, we boys, in an Irish district. There was a man there by the name of Capt. O'Donnell. He was a little more advanced in his ideas and had perhaps the benefits of a better education than the other old Irishmen of that section. An annual St. Patrick's Day parade was held there, and invariably, as the years rolled on, Capt. O'Donnell sent out his annual message calling a meeting in the basement of Campbell's store. The old Irishmen met there, and Capt. O'Donnell walked in in all his glory and he would say: "Gintlemen, this mating is called for the purpose of ilicting a chairman of this mating. It is moved and seconded, gintlemen, that Capt. O'Donnell act as chairman of this mating. I thank yez for the honor, and the motion is carried." [Laughter.] Then he would add: "It is in order now, gintlemen, for some one to act as marshal of the St. Patrick's Day parade and to make all the arrangemints. It is moved and seconded that Capt. O'Donnell act as marshal of the parade and make all the arrangemints. The motion is carried, gintlemen, and I thank yez for the honor, and the mating is now adjourned." [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, we in Pennsylvania are largely protectionists; and why? Because we claim that a protective tariff which permits of goods being manufactured in this country, while it may temporarily raise the price of the goods, will ultimately tend to reduce prices by reason of the fact that competition will bring profits to a normal condition, so that if profits are excessive capital and labor will gravitate toward the industry which yields an excessive profit, and competition will therefore bring prices to the average of profit enjoyed in any industry. This should be the outcome of a protective tariff; but if a manufacturer, by reason of the ownership of a patent or other artificial advantages, is enabled to prevent competition his profits will be excessive.

An analysis of the protected industries which have proved exceptionally profitable will disclose the fact that the use of patented machinery, appliances, or methods, or the ownership of coal or mineral lands are the chief assets of the manufacturer receiving an excessive profit, because they give him a monopoly.

The protectionists' strength in the United States has been due largely to the fact that access to land has been easy, hence labor and capital have been high priced, and a protective tariff has been necessary to enable wages to be paid and capital to be reimbursed in sufficient degree to attract labor and capital to the manufacturing pursuits. In older communities, where labor is cheap and capital plenty—and consequently cheap—the production of articles in which labor and capital are the larger elements can be carried on much more economically than in the United States or any new country, and in order to build up manufacturing industries a protective tariff is essential in order that capital and labor may be induced to engage in the manufacturing pursuits.

Now, what is the best means to adopt to obtain the fullest information, to prevent logrolling, and to eliminate politics in dealing with the tariff questions?

This year's experience points more clearly than any that has gone before the necessity for a tariff commission—a great, permanent, authoritative, confidence-commanding, power-wielding establishment which shall be at all times in touch with trade and industry, which shall have the power, preferably, actually to fix rates of duty, just as the Interstate Commerce Commission has power to establish and to change railroad rates.

I am firmly convinced that the Progressive Party is right in favoring the creation of a permanent, independent, nonpartisan, expert tariff commission, and I believe that the sensible men of this country will sooner or later place their stamp of approval upon this, the only fair and honest solution of the tariff problem which offers a means toward an admirable end, without disrupting our form of government or imperiling our most sacred traditions. [Applause.]

And now, in conclusion, a word to my Republican friends. You may sneer and jeer, but you will get rid of the Progressive Party the day you abandon the automobile and return to the ox cart. It is as much a part of the age as the flying machine, the telephone, or wireless telegraphy. The new alignment, long on the way, is here at last. Recognition of this fact will prevent you from making serious mistakes, especially if you happen to be a politician. A party that can poll in its first contest more votes than the party that has been dominant in the Nation for 50 years has surely come to stay.

Recognize this fact and adjust yourself to the new order or the procession will leave you far behind. Take your position for or against the new party, but as a Republican you belong to the "third party." The Progressive Party is not the result of a split, but a birth. Get this idea fixed firmly in your minds.

We have come to stay, and in a single year the principles of right, of equity, and of justice, which are the fundamental doctrines of the Progressive Party, have made a greater advance in the United States than in all the other years of its history combined.

Our faces are indeed turned to the morning, and the sun of success is sure to rise.

[Loud applause.]

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, for the reason that some of the leading industries of the State which I have the honor to represent are vitally affected by this bill I desire briefly to be heard. I feel that on account of the peculiar and unique relations of my State to the Democratic Party that its interests and welfare are entitled to more than a perfunctory hearing by that party.

There are promises and promises; there are pledges and pledges. There is the pledge of the Republican members of the Oregon Legislature to vote for the popular choice for United States Senator; that pledge has never been violated. Then there is the trustless Carthagenian pledge, which has made the term "Punic faith" a byword, an expression of reproach and infamy a synonym for all which is false, faithless, and unreliable. Then there is the pledge of the Democratic platform for "legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry." If this bill passes in its present form, "Punic faith" in my State will become a sweet phrase, a euphemism, in comparison with this manifestation of Democratic faith, pledges, and performance.

The State of Oregon is an overwhelmingly Republican State. Among its various industries and activities it is especially noted for two valued crops, both of which may be disastrously affected by the passage of this bill in its present form through the Sixty-third Congress. One of these great crops, which we Republicans are proud of and desirous of preserving for the State and Nation and which the promises and pledges of both your platform and your President gave us assurance would not be injured by the proposed Democratic tariff changes, is the wool crop. The other crop to which I have reference and which may also be disastrously affected by the final passage of this bill, and which crop for its continuance needs and has every right to expect the utmost concern, encouragement, and fostering care from the majority in this body, instead of the blight and mildew you seem determined to visit upon it through the passage of this bill, is the quadrennial crop of Oregon's Democratic Senators.

I stated awhile ago that there are promises and promises, pledges and pledges—so there are. I stated that Oregon was an overwhelmingly Republican State—so it is, and has been for two decades past, and so have been its legislatures. And it is because the Republican Party of the State of Oregon and the Republican members of its State legislature have been true to their promises and have spurned with scorn and righteous indignation the faintest hint or suggestion of disloyalty or repudiation of those pledges given to the people, pledges no more solemn or binding, Mr. Chairman, than the pledges of your platform and your President "that no legitimate industry would be injured by your tariff policy." I say on account of this unshaken fidelity of the Republican Party of my State this quadrennial crop of Democratic Senators has sprung up, has bloomed, and has been harvested, and by virtue of this harvest you now have a safe working majority on the other side of the Capitol in the persons of the two Oregon Senators, who, I am pleased to attest, grace their positions in that distinguished body. They were elected by Republican legislators who refused to repudiate their pledges, who refused to be recreant to their pledges, and, in the case of the senior Senator, their loyalty to their pledges was encouraged by a Republican President. I know, and I say it without egotism or desire for self-exploitation, for I had the honor at that time of being a member of the Oregon Senate.

Then and there, Mr. Chairman, as now and here, the political neologist found or suggested new meanings and definitions for words, sophistry as now furnished plausible reasons concerning what was "legitimate" and what was not; cupidity and avarice were appealed to; office, preferments, and committee appointments also failed to seduce. But these blandishments were of no avail. All terrors were then invoked to induce members to betray platform and pledges, save and except that terror which here seems most effectual—the fiat of King Caucus. But the honor of those Republican legislators of Oregon was threat proof as well as bribe proof. Each one voted for the Democratic candidate for United States Senator because he had pledged his word that he would vote for the candidate receiving the largest popular vote. Their pledge was not legally binding; it was argued that it was not "legitimate," but they considered it morally binding. It was no more morally binding than your pledges to injure no "legitimate" industry.

Do you dare follow the "Oregon trail"?

On your platform and presidential candidate's pledge, that no "legitimate" industry should be injured by your tariff legislation, your senatorial candidate, now a Member of the other Chamber and also Oregon's senior Senator, canvassed the great sheep-raising districts of eastern Oregon, quieting the apprehension of the woolgrower with iterations and reiterations of that then plain and unambiguous Democratic pledge—that pledge now grown so technical, abstruse, and recondite, a veritable Delphic oracle of hidden meaning when now interpreted, unraveled, and expounded in the light of the "Punic faith" of the philologists of the Ways and Means Committee.

If you desire to preserve that quadrennial crop, I advise you not to handicap your candidates for reelection with such a subterfuge, such chicanery, such a puerile plea for your "Punic faith" as "that the wool and sheep industry of Oregon is not a legitimate industry," such as you promised not to injure. If I mistake not the character of the gentlemen—and I feel from my individual association with them that I do not—they will not stultify themselves by carrying back such a pusillanimous excuse or message to Oregon. A dispensation to violate party pledges, coming from the casuists of the caucus, will absolve no one under the "Oregon system."

The sheepmen of my district are at a loss to know why their great industry is classed among illegitimate industries, why bastardy proceedings are visited upon it, why it deserves the appellation of filius nullius. It may be because he who has been called putative father of Democracy thought so much of the sheep industry and was so anxious to foster and encourage woolgrowing that in 1809, in violation of the laws of Spain, he smuggled a few Merino sheep out of Spain, two of which he later owned. And it is this Merino brand which is the essential and predominant strain of sheep in the great wool-raising States. The sheep industry is one of the great and legitimate industries of the Nation.

S. W. McClure, secretary of the National Woolgrowers' Association, shows that at the last census the sheep of the Nation were worth $231,000,000; that the land and equipment needed to maintain these flocks represent an investment of $350,000,000, representing a total investment of $581,000,000. The census shows sheep on 610,000 farms. The industry pays for labor $47,580,000 each year. It pays yearly for forage $23,400,000; taxes on sheep alone, $2,600,000 per annum; freight on wool is annually $4,000,000. The actual cost of maintaining the 52,000,000 sheep in this country is $137,000,000. Surely such an industry can not be the subject of the radical treatment you propose to administer without the most disastrous and radical consequences.

The Tariff Board in its report shows that it costs 11 cents a pound to raise wool in the western part of the United States and 9¼ cents in the entire country. That in the great wool-producing sections of South America the cost is only 4 or 5 cents. That in Australia, our future competitor if this bill passes, the cost is only a few cents a pound on wool. The labor cost in the United States per sheep is 82 cents, against 7 cents in Australia. The average forage cost here is 45 cents, in Australia 8 cents. Our western interest rates range from 8 to 10 per cent, in Australia it is 5 per cent. All of which demonstrates that we can not compete with Australia in the production of wool on a free-trade basis, and the consequence will be

that our wool raisers in a large measure will have to abandon the industry and liquidate their indebtedness the best they can.

What are we offered to compensate us for the prospective destruction of this industry? Cheaper clothing? During the campaign last fall some of the free-trade orators talked glibly about the great reduction in the price of clothing that would follow free wool, but on Wednesday the majority leader, whose name dignifies this bill, informed us that no great reduction need be expected by the passage of this bill. Let us see just what great boon we need expect in the way of cheaper clothing to compensate us for the destruction of the sheep industry by free wool.

Dr. S. W. McClure, on behalf of the woolgrower, argues that it requires 3½ yards of cloth to make the average man's suit; that to make this 3½ yards of cloth it takes 3¼ pounds of scoured wool; for all the wool in this suit the wool raiser only receives $1.72; the tariff has advanced this suit 48 cents, according to the woolgrower's estimate. And he asks, would your storekeeper who retails this suit for $25 or $30 sell it to you for 48 cents less with wool on the free list?

Let us examine the testimony of the free-trade expert concerning the question of the reduced price of clothing under free-trade wool. Last Wednesday a gentleman on the Democratic side of the aisle asked to have printed as a public document an article in the April number of the North American Review, written by Thomas W. Page, the Democratic member of the Tariff Board. The article in question advocates free wool, and the gentleman certainly has no motive to give the wool raiser any of the best of it, for his article abounds with adverse comments on the industry. He states that it requires 9½ pounds of raw wool—meaning in the grease—to produce a $25 suit of clothes, and he adds:

> The most ardent advocate of tariff reduction could not expect the removal of the duty to reduce the sum by more than the whole amount of the duty—that is, $1.05.

So we have the protectionist telling us that free wool can only reduce the price 48 cents and the free trader telling us that the price can only be reduced $1.05 under free trade. Whichever figure you take it is evident that the prospective reduction in clothing due to free wool is a slight compensation for the financial ruin of the sheepman. Furthermore, this alleged duty of $1.05 is based on the assumption that this is the real protective duty which the wool raiser receives and that consequently the 9½ pounds of unscoured wool is increased in price to the wool raiser by that sum. But this is actually not the case, and I shall tell you why it is only the apparent duty, not the real duty. The actual duty or protection which the woolgrower receives is not measured by the duty on wool in the grease, but by the duty on the scoured pound, which is 33 cents, based on the assumption that wool shrinks 66⅔ per cent. If all wool shrank 66⅔ per cent, then in every 100 pounds of wool in the grease on which the duty is 11 cents per pound, or $11 for the 100 pounds, the purchaser of imported wools would get for his $11 only 33⅓ pounds net, or scoured wool increased in price to him by the cost of the duty of 33 cents per scoured pound. But the assumption that all wools shrink 66⅔ per cent is no longer true and has not been true for more than 20 years. The average shrinkage of the Australian and South American wools which reach our markets is 48 per cent; therefore for every 100 pounds of such wool on which the duty at 11 cents per pound is $11 the purchaser gets 52 pounds of scoured wool instead of 33⅓ pounds, which the law contemplated he should get. And this he gets at the rate of 21 cents per pound instead of 33 cents, and by the difference between 21 and 33 cents is the woolgrower's apparent duty lessened upon the scoured pound. On some light-shrinking wools the grower's protection is lowered considerably more than in the example which I have given. It is this variance in the shrinkage of different wools which has led the woolgrower to advocate a specific duty based on the scoured content of wool—fair and just to all woolgrowers and all manufacturers.

To demonstrate that the apprehensions of the woolgrowers are not groundless we need not refer to the condition of the industry following the Wilson bill, but let us refer to page 330 of the Tariff Board's report.

In Oregon the board investigated the receipts and expenditures on 229,713 sheep, and ascertained that the receipts from wool at 14 cents per pound on the 1,678,993 pounds of wool sheared were $237,000.35; from other sources, such as mutton, etc., the receipts were $272,476.51; that the total receipts were $509,476.86; that the total expense of running the sheep was $456,320.05—leaving a profit of $53,156.81. Bear in mind that this profit was with wool at 14 cents per pound, which amounted to $237,000.35. Where would these profits be under free wool with wool selling at 10 cents per pound, which is certainly a modest estimate for the price of wool on a free basis, for following the Wilson bill it sold as low as 7 cents?

Then, instead of $237,000.35 for the wool, we would have $167,899.30, a difference of $69,101.15, and instead of a profit of $53,156 we would find a loss on the 229,713 sheep of $15,944.34. This may be taken as a fair example of the effect to be expected in other States from the enactment of this bill into a law.

For this ruin and destruction of the wool industry how are we to be compensated? With a doubtful reduction of between 48 cents and $1.05 on our clothing. Mr. Page, in that article in the April number of the North American Review, adds another compensation. He tells us:

> The saving would loom large in the political addresses of those who save the country, but so widely distributed that the share of the individual consumer would hardly arouse much enthusiasm and the real benefit forgotten in the disappointment that it was less than expected.

So for thunder for that political address Democratic brethren from woolgrowing States are willing to bow to the orders of the caucus.

The sheep and wool industry in my State is an important one. It is one of the legitimate industries which the Democratic platform assured us would not be injured by their tariff legislation. It is not an industry controlled by a trust or monopoly.

It is an industry built up by honored and industrious men, many of whom in their early life suffered untold privations and hardships to get a start in the business. The importance of the industry in Oregon is shown by the following report issued by the Oregon board of sheep commissioners for the twenty-seventh legislative assembly of the State:

I quote from the report the following:

> The importance of the sheep industry in this State is best comprehended when it is called to your attention that sheep are reported to be raised on 6,318 farms, or 14 per cent of all the farms in the State are devoted to the propagation of sheep. While the census shows 6,318 farms as connected with the raising of sheep, it is unfair to presume that there are not more than that number of men engaged in the sheep industry. On many of these farms and ranches several owners are in partnership, and it would be only just to approximate that there were 10,000 sheep owners in Oregon. These 10,000 owners may be estimated to have on the average families of 4 members each, and gives us 40,000 people within the State who are more or less dependent on the sheep industry. This is a most creditable showing for the industry, but it is not all, for in gathering statistics the Tariff Board found that in this State the range flockmaster employs for the entire year an average of 1 laborer for each 400 sheep owned. Assuming that in eastern Oregon there are 2,225,000 sheep and 1 man is employed for each 400 sheep, this would increase the number of citizens of our State intimately connected with the sheep industry to 45,562, and estimating that 1 in each 6 of these laborers is married and has a family of 4, then we have 49,278 people in Oregon having a "bread-and-butter" interest in our sheep industry. This is a large per cent of the rural population of our State and should indicate to people that the sheep industry of Oregon is one of the greatest assets to our prosperous Commonwealth. The collection of data for the Tariff Board and our report shows that the Oregn flockmaster pays on an average of $1 per head to labor for all sheep he owns. He must bear in mind that the laborer on the sheep ranch is the best paid agricultural laborer in the State. These herders and camp tenders receive from $40 to $60 a month and their board. If we have 2,225,000 sheep in eastern Oregon, then the sheep industry of this State pays to eastern Oregon labor $1 for each sheep in this district, or $2,225,000. Western Oregon possibly runs sheep at an even greater expense, in so far as labor is concerned, as it is generally conceded that large enterprises are in a position to get larger returns from its labor. We might conservatively estimate that western Oregon pays to labor for the care of her 300,000 sheep something like $400,000. This amount added to the money paid to eastern Oregon labor swells the total to the sum of $2,625,000. This amount relates solely to the labor caring for sheep and does not in any way include the clerk in the store, the banker, the employee of the railroad, and a score of other employees more or less dependent on the sheep industry. It is difficult to determine the exact amount of money that the sheep industry brings to the State, as the amounts vary from year to year. It might be reasonably estimated as great as $8,000,000 during the banner years. This is a large sum of money, but its importance is more appreciated when we remember that it is profit or income that is returned from the waste places of the State. It represents an amount of money that has been gleaned from the uninhabitable desert and the thickets of our mountains, and if not made use of by sheep grazing would probably gradually undergo decay or form tinder for our forest fires. The valuation of the sheep and the equipment necessary to run the same in the State of Oregon may be conservatively placed at $32,000,000, divided as follows: Our 2,196,560 sheep of eastern Oregon on December 1 will be worth $3.75 per head, making a total of $8,236,100. The 255,354 sheep of western Oregon are worth $5 per head, making a sum of $1,276,770. The property holdings necessary to run 2,000 sheep in eastern Oregon are estimated at $8,000 per band of sheep, making a sum of estimated property holdings for the running of sheep in eastern Oregon of $16,784,000. The sheep of western Oregon require on the average property holdings to the value of $20 per head, thus aggregating $7,660,620 in this section of the State. The grand total covering the valuation of sheep in the State and the equipment necessary to run them reaches the enormous sum of $32,580,720.

I am not willing to vote for a bill which will certainly cripple and injure this important industry of my district and State, for a bill which grants a certain measure of protection to the sugar industry and the woolen manufacturer, but discriminates against the wool raiser of my State and Nation. My Democratic friends of this House, do not delude yourselves with the idea that you

can return and justify yourselves before an indignant constituency with the excuse or the pretense that you have battled for your State's interests with blank cartridges and tin swords in the sham battles of the secret caucus. The real firing line is here on this floor—the real blows are given and taken here. Emulate the Senator from Louisiana. If the sand in your craw is lacking, fill it with that Louisiana sugar; it has nerved the Senators from Louisiana in their fight and got for their sugar-growing constituents a respite or stay of execution at least long enough to enable them to write a last will and testament and decently settle earthly affairs before entire dissolution shall take place. A little backbone might secure for the sheepman a like reprieve.

In this secret caucus you find yourselves like the Horatii of old separately disembowled; or, as the gentleman from Wyoming put it, "slain in detachment." We invite you to stand shoulder to shoulder on this floor with both Progressive and Republican Parties for a reasonable tariff reduction that shall not entirely annihilate the industries of our respective States.

We all know the committee appointments have been withheld awaiting the passage of this bill. Of course, this was not to whip insurgent Members of the majority into line. Oh, no. No one in his own opinion is ever coerced. Even gallant Jack Falstaff would deny such an impeachment. But a few days ago we heard—echoing through the inspired caucus leak—your tom-toms and war songs in defense of legitimate industries. But the echoes of those songs and tom-toms were only meant to tickle the ears at home. Those echoes have died away. Now you are singing another song. It is the song of Sir Joseph in Pinafore, especially arranged by the gentleman from Alabama—Director UNDERWOOD—for the benefit of wavering Members:

"I always voted at the caucus call
And never thought of thinking for myself at all;"
I thought so little they rewarded me—
How?
By making me ruler of the queen's navee?
No;
By giving me a place on the committee.

[Loud applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I would not have presumed upon the patience of this body to listen to me even for this limited time, inasmuch as I am a new Member on this floor, were it not for the fact that I feel most emphatically that the interests of 200,000 people in my State, which have been intrusted to my protection in this body so far as I am able to protect them, are endangered.

This pending tariff bill is a deliberate blow at the agricultural sections of this country in a studied political appeal to the laboring classes in the cities. In the report of the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee on this bill it is said: "In the effort to relieve the consumer and to mitigate the high and rising cost of living Schedule G, which deals with agricultural products, has been thoroughly revised and important reductions have been made." By "consumers," I understand, are not meant those who consume without producing anything, because if there be any such class it is not entitled to any consideration at our hands. But I understand that gentlemen on the other side mean by "consumers" the laboring men in the cities of this country. This is an attempt to array the voters of the cities against the farming communities and to build up prosperous cities out of the impoverishment of the farmers. That is a very uncertain foundation upon which to build the prosperity of any country. The laboring men in the cities can not afford any program of that kind. In my judgment the prosperity of one class of our people contributes to and helps the prosperity of every other class. When prosperity exists it must necessarily be passed around, and it has been passed around. During the past few years the farmers have prospered as they never prospered before in the history of our country. At the same time the consuming classes in the cities have prospered as never before, notwithstanding the high cost of living. Labor has been in active demand, wages have improved, the hours of labor have been shortened, and the conditions surrounding the laborer have constantly been bettered. The laborer, as a rule, has had a better living and has had more of his wages left for the proverbial rainy day. The savings-bank deposits come largely from the wage earners. Following the depression of 1907 these deposits fell to $3,660,553,945. Then note the constant advance, notwithstanding living costs:

1909	$3,713,405,709
1910	4,070,486,246
1911	4,212,583,598
1912	4,451,818,523

As the farmers find an improved market for their products and secure better prices therefor they improve their standard of living, buy more farm tools, buggies, pianos, automobiles, clothing, and all the manufactured products. Thereby is the demand for these products improved, and the manufacturer shares in the farmer's prosperity. The demand for manufactured products increasing, the demand for labor increases and wages rise. As labor finds steady employment at improved wages, its standard of living is raised, and it buys more of the products of the farm and the factory. The farmer, the laborer, the manufacturer, these constitute a trio who share together their common prosperity. Any economic plan which seeks to shut out the farmer from his fair share of this prosperity will bring disaster rather than profit to the others.

In this bill the products of the farm are thrown into a free-trade market to meet the unrestrained competition of the world. Where this is not done in fact it is done in effect. If the duty is not entirely removed it is greatly reduced. This is to redeem your pledge to reduce the cost of living for the city laborer. But everyone of you know that the bulk of the increase of the cost of living is not caused by the increase in the prices the farmer receives, but by a multitude of other causes.

Before election last fall the continuous contention of the Democratic Party and its candidate for President was that the tariff is responsible for the high cost of living. No other reason was assigned by them; but the Republicans contended that the tariff had little to do with it—that there was a scarcity of farm produce and especially of meats. But no; the Democrats insisted that the tariff was the sole cause; but now that the election is over, the Democratic Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Redfield, in a report made recently, shows conclusively that the production of meats in the United States has fallen off 30 per cent in the last six years, while the population has increased 11 per cent in the same time.

It is your plan to reduce the price of farm products to the extent of the reductions you make in the tariffs on these articles. This reduction alone will bring no substantial relief to the city dweller, but for the farmer it spells ruin. The reductions you propose in the values of the chief farm products of my district would cost the farmers of my district above $6,000,000, without including sugar beets, as is shown by the following comparisons between the Payne and Underwood bills:

Comparisons, Payne and Underwood bills.

MACOMB COUNTY.

	Census, 1910.	Payne bill.	Underwood bill.	Loss.	Decrease of values.
Cattle, value	$909,406	27½ per cent ad valorem [1]	10 per cent ad valorem	17½ per cent	$159,146.05
Horses, do	$1,361,316	20 per cent ad valorem [1]	7½ per cent ad valorem [1]	12½ per cent	170,164.50
Swine, number	26,125	$1.50 per head	Free	$1.50 per head	41,187.50
Sheep, value	$144,451	33⅓ per cent ad valorem	10 per cent ad valorem	23⅓ per cent	33,323.73
Wool, pounds	186,960	11 cents	Free	11 cents	20,565.60
Milk, gallons	6,779,879	2 cents	do	2 cents	135,597.58
Butter, pounds	1,085,243	6 cents	3 cents	3 cents	32,557.29
Poultry, value	$136,369	25 per cent ad valorem [1]	11 per cent ad valorem [1]	14 per cent	19,091.66
Eggs, dozen	1,298,960	5 cents	2½ cents	2½ cents	32,474.00
Corn, bushels	1,074,601	15 cents per bushel	Free	15 cents per bushel	161,190.15
Oats, do	1,081,150	do	10 cents per bushel	5 cents per bushel	54,057.50
Wheat, do	436,590	25 cents per bushel	do	15 cents per bushel	65,488.50
Barley, do	13,082	30 cents per bushel	15 cents per bushel	do	1,962.30
Beans, do	103,497	45 cents per bushel	25 cents per bushel	20 cents per bushel	20,691.40
Hay, tons	65,852	$4 per ton	$2 per ton	$2 per ton	131,704.00
Total					1,079,101.76

[1] Estimated.

Comparisons, Payne and Underwood bills—Continued.

ST. CLAIR COUNTY.

	Census, 1910.	Payne bill.	Underwood bill.	Loss.	Decrease of values.
Cattle.....value..	$893,521	27½ per cent ad valorem [1]....	10 per cent ad valorem.....	17½ per cent.....	$156,366.17
Horses.....do....	$1,637,804	20 per cent ad valorem [1].....	7½ per cent ad valorem [1].....	12½ per cent.....	204,725.50
Swine.....number..	16,530	$1.50 per head.....	Free.....	$1.50 per head.....	24,795.00
Sheep.....value..	$143,810	33⅓ per cent ad valorem [1]....	10 per cent ad valorem.....	23⅓ per cent.....	33,676.30
Wool.....pounds..	48,920	11 cents.....	Free.....	11 cents per pound.....	5,381.20
Milk.....gallons..	8,158,404	2 cents.....	.....do.....	2 cents.....	163,168.08
Butter.....pounds..	1,201,671	6 cents.....	3 cents.....	3 cents.....	36,050.13
Poultry.....value..	$120,568	25 per cent ad valorem [1].....	11 per cent ad valorem [1].....	14 per cent	16,879.52
Eggs.....dozen..	1,243,732	5 cents.....	2½ cents.....	2½ cents.....	31,093.30
Corn.....bushels..	722,208	15 cents per bushel.....	Free.....	15 cents per bushel.....	108,330.45
Oats.....do....	1,326,132	.....do.....	10 cents per bushel.....	5 cents per bushel.....	66,306.60
Wheat.....do....	268,246	25 cents per bushel.....	.....do.....	15 cents per bushel.....	40,236.90
Barley.....do....	40,936	30 cents per bushel.....	15 cents per bushel.....	.....do.....	6,140.40
Beans.....do....	98,343	45 cents per bushel.....	25 cents per bushel.....	20 cents per bushel.....	19,668.60
Hay.....tons..	113,544	$4 per ton.....	$2 per ton.....	$2 per ton.....	227,088.00
Total.....					1,139,346.15

LAPEER COUNTY.

Cattle.....value..	$886,333	27½ per cent ad valorem [1]....	10 per cent ad valorem.....	17½ per cent.....	$155,000.27
Horses.....do....	$1,580,250	20 per cent ad valorem [1].....	7½ per cent ad valorem [1].....	12½ per cent.....	198,781.25
Swine.....number..	25,221	$1.50 per head.....	Free.....	$1.50 per head.....	37,831.50
Sheep.....value..	$302,722	33⅓ per cent ad valorem [1]....	10 per cent.....	23⅓ per cent.....	20,426.99
Wool.....pounds..	558,400	11 cents.....	Free.....	11 cents per pound.....	61,424.00
Milk.....gallons..	5,740,930	2 cents.....	.....do.....	2 cents.....	114,818.60
Butter.....pounds..	1,380,131	6 cents.....	3 cents.....	3 cents.....	41,403.93
Poultry.....value..	$106,223	25 per cent ad valorem [1].....	11 per cent ad valorem [1].....	14 per cent	14,871.22
Eggs.....dozen..	1,189,111	5 cents.....	2½ cents.....	2½ cents.....	29,727.77
Corn.....bushels..	863,284	15 cents per bushel.....	Free.....	15 cents per bushel.....	129,492.60
Oats.....do....	1,102,573	.....do.....	10 cents per bushel.....	5 cents per bushel.....	55,128.65
Wheat.....do....	226,446	25 cents per bushel.....	.....do.....	15 cents per bushel.....	33,966.90
Barley.....do....	80,751	30 cents per bushel.....	15 cents per bushel.....	.....do.....	12,112.65
Beans.....do....	188,677	45 cents per bushel.....	25 cents per bushel.....	20 cents per bushel.....	37,735.40
Hay.....tons..	85,405	$4 per ton.....	$2 per ton.....	$2 per ton.....	170,810.00
Total.....					1,113,537.73

HURON COUNTY.

Cattle.....value..	$1,198,162	27½ per cent ad valorem [1]....	10 per cent ad valorem.....	17½ per cent.....	$209,678.35
Horses.....do....	$2,218,707	20 per cent ad valorem [1].....	7½ per cent ad valorem [1].....	12½ per cent.....	277,338.75
Swine.....number..	28,113	$1.50 per head.....	Free.....	$1.50 per head.....	34,669.50
Sheep.....value..	$186,473	33⅓ per cent ad valorem [1]....	10 per cent ad valorem.....	23⅓ per cent.....	42,948.79
Wool.....pounds..	208,546	11 cents.....	Free.....	11 cents per pound.....	22,940.06
Milk.....gallons..	6,767,918	2 cents.....	.....do.....	2 cents.....	135,358.36
Butter.....pounds..	777,728	6 cents.....	3 cents.....	3 cents.....	23,331.84
Poultry.....value..	$93,363	25 per cent ad valorem [1].....	11 per cent ad valorem [1].....	14 per cent.....	13,070.82
Eggs.....dozen..	1,608,903	5 cents.....	2½ cents.....	2½ cents.....	40,322.57
Corn.....bushels..	591,158	15 cents per bushel.....	Free.....	15 cents per bushel.....	86,692.90
Oats.....do....	1,446,800	.....do.....	10 cents per bushel.....	5 cents per bushel.....	72,340.00
Wheat.....do....	541,158	25 cents per bushel.....	.....do.....	15 cents per bushel.....	81,173.70
Barley.....do....	207,980	30 cents per bushel.....	15 cents per bushel.....	.....do.....	31,197.00
Beans.....do....	265,828	45 cents per bushel.....	25 cents per bushel.....	20 cents per bushel.....	33,165.00
Hay.....tons..	87,965	$4 per ton.....	$2 per ton.....	$2 per ton.....	175,930.00
Total.....					1,280,057.64

SANILAC COUNTY.

Cattle.....value..	$1,348,102	27½ per cent ad valorem [1]....	10 per cent ad valorem [1]....	17½ per cent.....	$101,107.65
Horses.....do....	$2,403,800	20 per cent ad valorem [1].....	7½ per cent ad valorem.....	12½ per cent.....	300,475.00
Swine.....number..	18,494	$1.50 per head.....	Free.....	$1.50 per head.....	27,741.00
Sheep.....value..	$249,747	33⅓ per cent ad valorem [1]....	10 per cent ad valorem.....	23⅓ per cent.....	57,441.81
Wool.....pounds..	75,742	11 cents.....	Free.....	11 cents.....	8,331.62
Milk.....gallons..	8,190,838	2 cents.....	.....do.....	2 cents.....	162,816.76
Butter.....pounds..	1,225,047	6 cents.....	3 cents.....	3 cents.....	37,751.41
Poultry.....value..	$147,694	25 per cent ad valorem [1].....	11 per cent ad valorem [1].....	14 per cent.....	16,987.16
Eggs.....dozen..	1,545,478	5 cents.....	2½ cents.....	2½ cents.....	38,635.00
Corn.....bushels..	615,141	15 cents per bushel.....	Free.....	15 cents per bushel.....	92,271.15
Oats.....do....	2,070,000	.....do.....	10 cents per bushel.....	5 cents per bushel.....	103,500.00
Wheat.....do....	410,630	25 cents per bushel.....	.....do.....	15 cents per bushel.....	61,594.50
Barley.....do....	224,185	30 cents per bushel.....	15 cents per bushel.....	.....do.....	33,627.03
Beans.....do....	343,244	45 cents per bushel.....	25 cents per bushel.....	20 cents per bushel.....	68,648.80
Hay.....tons..	158,631	$4 per ton.....	$2 per ton.....	$2 per ton.....	317,262.00
Total.....					1,428,190.86

Total decrease for the district, $6,040,238.14.

[1] Estimated.

And, as I have said, city and country are interdependent for prosperity. Take, for example, the protection on automobiles, which has not been seriously disturbed in this bill. In many cities where the labor market has been made strong and healthy and active by reason of the manufacture of automobiles, this bill will strike at their prosperity because, while it does not vitally affect the protection given to the manufacture of automobiles, it does affect the market for them. In my country farmers are able to buy automobiles to use them in their business and to enjoy the recreation they afford.

But if you pass this bill and cripple their buying powers, as you will, the market for automobiles will be affected, and the prosperity of the laboring men in the cities where automobiles are manufactured will be seriously injured. That illustration could be duplicated in many other cases. The man in the city who works for a day's wages can not afford this kind of a program.

You say you are not going to disturb any "legitimate industry," and still you expressly deny protection to industries which are producing things we need, which save us from monopolistic robbery, which are making multitudes happy and great sections of this country prosperous. For example, you propose free sugar. Free sugar means the end of the sugar-beet industry in this country.

And the sugar industry is a legitimate industry. The total production of sugar beets in my district, including five counties, as shown in the census of 1900, was only 18,925 tons per annum, but in 10 years under the protective tariff policy we increased that production to 157,000 tons per annum, and I believe the limit would not yet be reached were it not for the action of this Democratic majority.

Production of sugar beets.

	Huron.	Lapeer.	Macomb.	Sanilac.	St. Clair.	Total.
	Tons.	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*
1910	96,330	11,300	7,677	22,287	19,630	157,224
1900	6,237	2,947	6,311	242	3,188	18,925
Increase	90,093	8,353	1,366	22,045	16,442	138,299

Increase in 10 years, 138,299 tons, worth $898,843.50.
Total production 1910, 157,224 tons, worth $1,021,516.20.

Has this been for the general advantage of consumers? Dr. Wiley, Democrat, but impartial, said in the Hardwick hearings that our beet-sugar industry protects American consumers from the greed of the refiners. Have the farmers profited from this industry? Huron County produced 6,237 tons of beets in 1899 and 96,330 tons in 1909. The farm lands of Huron County in the same period increased in value from $7,462,000 to $14,338,000.

Value of farm lands.

Years.	Huron.	Lapeer.	Macomb.	Sanilac.	St. Clair.
1910	$14,338,153	$10,215,824	$12,849,494	$15,224,746	$12,899,649
1900	7,462,440	8,017,410	11,626,700	8,269,680	10,140,790
Increase	6,875,713	2,208,414	1,222,794	6,955,066	2,758,859

Increase of farm values in 10 years, $20,021,846.

Value of domestic animals in above 5 counties, 1910	$17,182,974
Value of domestic animals in above 5 counties, 1900	9,806,003
Increase	7,376,971
Value of farm buildings, same counties, 1910	31,984,805
Value of farm buildings, same counties, 1900	16,808,230
Increase	15,176,575

In the past 10 years of Republican prosperity farm values in my district have increased over $22,000,000, the value of their domestic animals has nearly doubled, the value of their farm buildings has nearly doubled, their purchases of the products of the cities have more than doubled. Hence the products of the factories have found ready market, and as a result the laboring men in the cities have received a constantly increasing wage and shorter hours. The city which derives its prosperity from the country will suffer when the farmer suffers. The city laborer will suffer with his country cousin.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP].

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, the people at the election last fall commissioned the Democratic Party to administer the affairs of this great Nation, and in pursuance of that mandate both the executive and legislative departments of this Government passed into control of our party on the 4th day of last March. One of the first duties named under this new responsibility is the revision of the tariff downward. This great economic question demands the most serious consideration doubtless of any proposition with which we are required to deal. The bill now under consideration fairly presents the Democratic theory of a tariff for revenue, and hence meets practically our pledges to the American people and such a revision as they indorsed at the ballot box. [Applause.] We are meeting the question without equivocation and in the spirit required by the condition of the times.

Four years ago the Republican Party was empowered by the people to revise the tariff downward and was unfaithful to its pledges made before the election. When it took up the execution of its work it disregarded its promises, violated its instructions, yielded to the wishes of the beneficiaries, and revised it upward. For this breach of plighted faith, for this failure of the redemption of its public promises, the people deceived thereby administered their rebuke and turned it out of power. The passage of the Payne bill four years ago was the crowning effort of legislative greed and legislative favoritism. It was protection run mad. The Republican Party, intoxicated by its long lease of power, assumed it could ignore any and all demands of the people and survive all opposition, and therefore enacted the Payne bill as a reward to the tariff barons for their liberal contributions to their campaign fund. It was a monstrosity, and in all the four years which have passed since its enactment scarcely a man can be found who has the courage to defend it before a public audience anywhere in the United States. From its sponsors it provoked silence and from the public universal disgust. [Applause.]

We are presenting to the country a bill that recognizes the rights of all classes of our people, and one which will not cripple nor destroy the business of any, but will foster the prosperity of our country, founded upon a legitimate basis and conducted upon fairness and justice. The Democratic Party is a constructive party, desirous of promoting all legitimate business and the advancement of the best interests of the great majority of the people, but it is unwilling now and ever has been hostile to any public policy which gives one class a privilege, of advantage to a favored few, which constitutes an unnecessary burden to be borne by the many and which is detrimental to them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This bill proposes to equalize burdens and assist the ultimate consumers as well as the manufacturers of the country. Its object is not to confine prosperity to a favored few, but to pass it around, make it the common heritage of all. It recognizes the wants of the consumers and regards their consideration of just as much importance as the producers. In short, its object is the establishment of a just regard for the welfare of both the producer and consumer.

Too long, Mr. Chairman, much too long, has the welfare of the consumers of this country been ignored in the enactment of tariff legislation. Far too long, also, has it been the custom in the preparation of tariff measures to permit the beneficiaries of tariff legislation to write the schedules and fix the amount of duties. In this measure that right has been absolutely denied. It has been assailed on the floor of this House by the advocates of the high protective system as a destructive measure, one that will shut down factories, reduce wages, and turn labor out of employment. If this prophecy be true, then it is indefensible and ought not to become a law, but for all who make the prediction of such results it is safe to say they would make the same predictions if any reductions at all were made of existing duties. They always sound the old alarm, the "calamity howl." It is a stereotyped expression with them, coined for the express purpose, and in the last few years it has been made to do overtime.

The business men of the country do not so regard it, because legitimate business indorses it; the independent press of the country does not so consider it, because the independent press of the country approves it; the ultimate consumers all over the country are urging its immediate passage because it assures them relief; hence this assault upon it is only made by the standpat Republicans, the high priests of protection, who desire to uphold and maintain special privileges in this country.

Legitimate industry will thrive under it, but predatory wealth we concede will suffer, as it should do. Its purpose is to dispense with much of the legislative profit in these great protected industries and place them upon a competitive basis for profit earning, a most wholesome purpose, where the use of wits shall be installed for business success and not legislative guaranty. Could any fair-minded person object to this, and if he did what support could he hope to receive? What sympathy could he arouse? It is a common plea for the owners of protected industry to make that they can not operate if duties are reduced, and they will be forced to shut down and abandon business. This complaint has long since become chronic, and is now only a matter of form. Four years ago the great shoe industry told the public that if they were given free hides they could shoe the world and needed no protection, but as soon as Congress decided to place hides on the free list, they demanded a duty of 10 per cent on their products and got it. It was bad faith on their part, an act of perfidy, yet these great captains of industry perpetrated this shameful bunko game on the public in order to secure an increase of their special privilege. Did they need this protection to encourage infant industry? We can shoe the world, and are doing it. We not only supply the consumption at home but in addition we make annually, pay the freight to foreign countries, and sell $12,000,000 worth of boots and shoes. We shut out all competition at home, and after paying transportation charges to foreign countries sell there cheaper than to our own people at home and undersell the foreign manufacturers in their own countries. Does any fair-minded, reasonable person believe this great industry needs protection, that it should be empowered by legislation to plunder the American consumer longer? If so, upon what hypothesis does he predicate his belief? It has been the object of governmental bounty long enough, and is now, we confidently submit, fully strong enough to support itself in the open markets of the world.

It is contended by the great woolen industry that its enormously high rates of duty should not be reduced, in face of the fact that they are so outrageously high, so unjustifiable, that no man in all the broad land can be found who will come out in the open and defend them. Even President Taft, when he made his swing around the circle in 1909, attempting to appease the wrath of the American people poured out upon his party for the

passage of the Payne bill, declared the woolen schedule was indefensible. This declaration has always been taken as true by common consent. What has this schedule done for this industry? The American Woolen Co. was formed about 1900 by the purchase of 34 plants over the country and formed into one company, enough to dominate the price and production of the entire commodity in the United States. It could have had no other object. The value of the entire combination was $25,000,000. It added no outside capital to the business, it paid dividends of 7 per cent each year after its organization, and after 10 years its property, at a liberal valuation, was $419,000,000. This is the value fixed by the company in its reports to the public departments. It prospered, we all admit, reasonably well. It proved a most valuable investment to those fortunate enough to hold some of its stock. Protection was a good thing for it. The privilege granted it by the extravagant tariff schedules we all say fully protected it. The combination composed by it dictated the price in this country of all woolen and worsted productions. Now, does not the most ardent protectionist on this floor feel that he owes a duty to the 93,000,000 of people in this country of reducing the duties on woolen products as low as provided for in this bill? Does not every man with the milk of human kindness in his heart feel that the ultimate consumers of this country in the consideration of this schedule are entitled to recognition and should be regarded with as much favor as the owners of this great industry, who have thrived magnificently because of the special privilege granted them by the generosity of the Republican Party? By what standard of public regard is one to be protected, avarice appeased, that should not be the right of the other? It is asserted here that free wool will blight the sheep industry of this country. Sheep are protected, but wool is on the free list by the provisions of this measure. What has been blighting the wool industry under the highest tariff laws the country has ever known, the Dingley and Payne laws? Will some one answer?

Silence alone is the only response to this question. The Government statistics show that in 1903 while the Dingley law was in force we had in this country 63,964,876 sheep and in 1905, 45,170,423. The tariff was not changed; it was the highest ever known. What caused this great depreciation in number. Again, in 1912, last year we had only 52,362,000 sheep, nearly 12,000,000 less than in 1903. How can this decrease in number be accounted for if the high tariff fosters and encourages this industry? Why this great decrease under the high tariff laws? The tariff does not sustain this industry, as the facts clearly disclose; neither does it regulate the price of wool; but the Woolen Trust, the consumer of raw wool, dictates the price on it and has been doing so for years, tariff or no tariff. This measure protects the sheep but not raw wool. If the tariff is an incubator of prosperity, why has it not kept the price high and regular on wool? For 16 years, during all of which time the duty on raw wool has been enormously high, the price on this commodity has had a wider range of fluctuation than almost any other commodity in our markets. If time would permit I would like to take up these schedules one by one and discuss each of them. The law of supply and demand is a better regulator of markets than tariff schedules and furnishes a much better barometer for what may be expected of them. The advocates of high protection will not learn by experience or profit by example. They represent but one class—the manufacturer. In all discussion, in all action, he alone is their sole and only consideration. This measure recognizes that other and much larger class, the consumers of the country, who are entitled to just as much consideration in all legislation of this character. The consumer supports the Government, pays the taxes, and defends the flag when in peril, and he as much as the producer is entitled to recognition in legislation. We are giving it to him. For this the measure is to be commended. The spirit of justice and fairness is running all through it.

Our Republican friends from Massachusetts who have been so vigorously attacking this bill, declaring it would injure their great woolen and boot and shoe industries—drive them out of business if it passes—are unduly alarmed. Their solicitude for the laboring man is pathetic. Allow me to say to them they appear to be worse scared than hurt. About a week ago in the thirteenth Massachusetts congressional district an election was held to elect a successor to Senator WEEKS, recently elected to the Senate. It is a large manufacturing district. The Democratic candidate, bold and courageous, a fearless exponent of the Democratic faith, went before the voters of that district with the Underwood bill in his hand, pledging the people if elected he would support it. He indorsed it, and the people of that district indorsed him. In a district which went 3,000 Republican last November, gave him less than a week ago 2,500 majority. The Republican majority of 3,000 was wiped out and a Democratic majority of 2,500 substituted. The laboring men of Massachusetts are not alarmed over Democratic legislation, but the tariff barons alone are; the ultimate consumers of that great State have no fears of Democratic legislation, but the beneficiaries of special privilege have. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULLOP. Certainly.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. We Democrats in Massachusetts have been presenting the facts to the people about protection and wages. We have impressed the fact upon the people of that State that labor in the boot and shoe factories, the products of which are protected by low duties, only 10 per cent, is better paid, receives higher wages, than the labor in the great woolen industries, the highest protected of all under the Republican tariff legislation. They realize the effect in this regard and know it to be true.

Mr. CULLOP. I appreciate the force of the suggestion of the able gentleman from Massachusetts, and congratulate him upon the success he and his Democratic colleagues are making among the people of that State in disseminating Democratic doctrine and inspiring Democratic activity. I regard him as an able champion of the cause and a most worthy representative of the people. The voters of Massachusetts have had a valuable object lesson in these two great industries, as he clearly shows, the industry with a low protective duty paying labor higher wages than those paid by the highly protective tariff. The argument of the protectionist in defense of the system changes with as much ease as "the shifting sands of the seas." They used to tell us that it was needed to keep the price up in order to prevent competition with the foreign manufacturer, and by this plea secured prohibitive duties. Now, lo and behold, they deny with vehemence that it has anything to do with the price. If it does not increase the price, why not abandon it; if it is not to increase the price, why want it levied; if it has nothing to do with the price, how could it prevent competition?

They used to deny it was a tax; then they shifted that position and admitted it was a tax; but the foreigner paid the tax, and for this reason it was not a burden upon the American consumers. And now they have unmasked and admit the American consumer pays it, admit it increases the price upon everything upon which it is levied, and justify it by saying that it is necessary to encourage industry and should be high enough to cover all difference in the cost of production and also guarantee a reasonable profit—that people should be taxed on their consumption to make a private enterprise profitable. This is their position. A more radical paternalistic doctrine was never advanced or a more radical socialistic tenet proclaimed.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. CULLOP. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. FORDNEY. Does the gentleman from Indiana assert that the wages in the protected woolen industries in Massachusetts are lower than in other industries?

Mr. CULLOP. I most certainly do, as a rule.

Mr. FORDNEY. They are much lower in foreign countries in the woolen industries than in Massachusetts. I have examined to see.

Mr. CULLOP. Ah, the gentleman refers to the per diem wage, and in that he is correct; but I refer to the wage per unit of production. The wages per unit in the Massachusetts woolen mills are much less than in the European mills. That is the assertion I am making, and I fear no successful contradiction. The facts sustain it. The American wage earner does more for what he is paid than any other wage earner in the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman has singled out the wage earner in the woolen mills of Massachusetts as poorly paid. Does he not know in the Southern States in the cotton mills wages are lower than in the same kind of mills in New England?

Mr. CULLOP. I do. It is true, and the Southern mills have the same protection duties that the New England mills have. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan, his illustration is most unfortunate for his position. It proves beyond cavil or doubt that a high tariff does not regulate wages, as he and his party claim; but the law of supply and demand does. In New England labor is scarce and in the South it is more abundant. If the tariff regulated the wages of the workingman, they would be in the same kind of labor the same everywhere. [Applause.] His assertion of the difference in wages completely refutes the position of his party as to the effect of the tariff on the wage question. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The wage earner has been a theme upon which the protectionist has discoursed with eloquence upon all occasions, and

no tariff discussion would be complete unless he received much attention. The laborer is his especial object of solicitude. The tariff is for the laborer, and him alone, and yet every time it is proposed to provide the tariff levied on the articles labor produces shall be paid him, make the law so labor can get it, the advocates of protection protest and denounce it as demagoguery. Why this objection if it is all levied for his especial benefit? The truth is the tariff is not for the benefit of the laboring man, but to his detriment.

Laborers have not made colossal fortunes out of it, but the owners of the industries have. Ninety per cent of those employed in labor in this country are not employed in the protected industries, but in labor producing articles on which there are no protective duties and must compete in the markets of the world, and invariably the labor employed in the production of these articles is paid higher wages than those paid in the protected industries. The paper hanger, the carpenter, the painter, the plasterer, the bricklayer, the typesetter, and many other callings all nearly without exception receive higher wages than workmen in the highest protected industries, and yet their productions enter the markets free of all duty and must compete with the entire world. No combines control the prices of their products; competition alone regulates them. If protection is for labor, why, then, does it not furnish higher wages to the men who make the protected products than are paid to the men who make the unprotected products?

We are admonished by the standpatters, the advocates of high protection, that business stagnation, panic, and ruin will follow the enactment of this measure; that it will inaugurate soup houses, shutdowns, and industrial chaos. There are no precedents for such a fear. Every panic this country has experienced in the last half century has occurred under high protection laws. What made them? Surely not low tariff. The panic of 1873 occurred under a high protective tariff, under Republican rule. It was widespread and most disastrous to all branches of industry. Prior to it a tramp was unknown in this country. The name was coined then. It is the legacy from that dark period which has been in constant use ever since. The panic of 1893 occurred when the McKinley law was in force, providing the highest duties ever known up to that time. When it occurred no Democratic legislation had been enacted and none attempted. What caused it, then? The Republican policies governing the economic affairs of the country were in force during that great disaster which paralyzed every energy in operation all over the country, wasted fortunes, and locked the wheels of progress. Distress was common, and prosperity vanished from the land.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULLOP. Oh, certainly.

Mr. FARR. We had panics under Democratic policies.

Mr. CULLOP. When? In 1893?

Mr. FARR. Yes; and I can prove it by one who suffered during that time if given time to do so?

Mr. CULLOP. Suffered under Democratic policies in force in 1893? If the gentleman was given until the day of the millennium he could not prove that, because it is not true. No Democratic policies were in force then; the McKinley law was in force. The Wilson bill was not passed until August 24, 1894, and did not take effect until late in 1894 and early in 1895. Yet he says his friend suffered because of it at least a year before it was even passed, and before anyone knew what its provisions would be. If you, sir, could prove your proposition it would be the eighth wonder of the world. As a splendid example of the calamity howler undoubtedly the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a howling success. Panics are the production of Republican policies; they germinate them, and they flourish too luxuriantly under them for the good of the country, as the history of these great public misfortunes abundantly establishes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Again, the panic of 1907, when Roosevelt was President, occurred while the Dingley law was in force, when there was no tariff agitation, and the distress which ensued wrecked fortunes, paralyzed industries, locked the wheels of transportation, established free soup houses in every metropolitan city of the land, and lined every public highway with tramps begging for food and work. Sir, this is the correct history of the panics in this country in the last half a century. Not one occurred under Democratic policies, nor on account of them, but all occurred under the highest tariff ever known up to the time and when Republican policies were in full force in every department of the Government. Let no one mistake this fact. All history corroborates it. If, therefore, high protection breeds prosperity, it likewise breeds adversity, business stagnation, and financial distress. One seems to have followed the other at regular intervals.

Do we need a high protective tariff? If so, for what purpose? Twenty-five years ago the great leaders of the Republican Party insisted it was needed for the purpose of sustaining our infant industries, but as soon as they were well established they assured the country the policy should be abandoned. The position has shifted and that doctrine is abandoned and another substituted. The infant industry has grown to a giant, and now the modern-day protectionist demands it for profit, a guarantee against loss, against bad location, against bad business management. They demand the people shall be taxed on their consumption to make private industry profitable. Cost of production is never the same in any two factories or in any two years. Conditions, locations, and business management differ at all times and in all places. The proposition is absurd, the contention unreasonable, but the desperation of the cause supported by the greed and avarice of the men who are the fawning courtiers of the public favor are not controlled by justice or fairness, but alone by unbounded selfishness. We can and do produce the leading manufactures cheaper than any people in the world. Last year our manufacturers produced enough to supply our wants at home and exported to leading foreign countries of the world nearly a billion and a half dollars worth of products and sold them to their people cheaper than they could produce and sell them. We were not only able to compete with foreign manufacturers here, we have driven them from our markets, but we can and are producing here, paying the freight abroad, and underselling them in their own countries at the very doors of their factories and to their own people. We can compete. We are doing it not only at home but abroad as well.

If they can produce cheaper, how can we do this? At this time the leading manufacturers have in their employ the best trade salesmen that money can hire scouring every country of the world soliciting orders for articles to be delivered a year hence, for the manufacture of which they have not yet purchased the raw materials. We need no tariff, no bounty, or subvention to enable us to compete with the world Our cost of production is less and our labor per unit cheaper than anywhere else on the civilized globe. We lead the world in everything. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Last year our exports exceeded our imports by the enormous sum of more than $500,000,000. This conclusively shows that we are not only able to compete at home, but abroad as well. American products are selling in every foreign market in competition with home productions. If we can not produce cheaper, we could not sell in their markets. We do this after we pay the freight to foreign countries. If we are able to pay the freight abroad and compete in foreign markets with foreign-made goods, we are able to do it at home. We need no protection for that purpose.

One of the chief objects of this measure is to establish competition. Its duties are low enough to admit competition, and it therefore makes a bold strike at monopoly. If the domestic producer attempts to combine and maintain high prices, foreign products can be imported and thereby prevent this imposition heretofore inflicted on the American consumers, who have been powerless to obtain relief from the remorseless greed of the unconscionable manipulator of markets, who employs it for the purposes of plundering the public and swelling the coffers of his unearned wealth. The ultimate consumers will hail it with delight, because in it they see an opportunity for relief.

For years the great tariff barons, the beneficiaries of an unjust policy, have been able by intimidation, coercion, and threats to sustain the protective system, which has looted the pockets of the consumers and swell their predatory fortunes beyond the wildest dreams of avarice. They have been able to dictate tariff schedules for selfish purposes, to combine, because of this system, and control the quantity of production and fix the price, destroy smaller or independent industries, and defy the Government. Intoxicated with power and encouraged by loot and gain, they now attempt to tyrannize over 93,000,000 people and dictate the policies of a Government founded on the principles of justice and mercy, worked out by patriots amid the thunder of hostile cannon and the rattle of unfriendly musketry, drenched in the blood of patriots spilled in the name of liberty. It has for years extorted from the toiling masses, patient, God-fearing people, the substance of their labor, the fruits of their toil, until now a change of conditions is demanded, the system eliminated, and another substituted, which will enable every man to have an equal opportunity and an even chance in the race of life. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH].

THE FOUR YEARS AFTER THE PASSAGE OF THIS BILL WILL BE KNOWN IN THIS COUNTRY AS THE SIXTH FREE-TRADE PERIOD.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, it matters little what we may say here concerning the pending legislation, for it will be judged by the results which follow.

Right now, even before the bill is enacted into law, grave fear and doubt is expressed as to the outcome.

The bill will be known in history as the Wilson-Underwood-Simmons tariff law.

Many feel that it will in a large degree be followed by results similar to those after the passage of the Wilson-Gorman tariff law.

During the presidential election of 1912 the following was circulated in portions of the district which honors me with a place here:

WHY TAKE A CHANCE! WHY EXPERIMENT!

"Unless you sincerely believe you can improve conditions for yourself, family, and country, why not 'let well enough alone' at this time and vote for Taft. The Democratic Party in its tariff plank this year promise exactly the same change which they gave the country in 1893, doing away with protection entirely. Their tariff law, carried into effect, then ruined our industries, put thousands of workingmen out of work, and so destroyed the market for what the farmer had to sell.

"Prof. Woodrow Wilson in his 'History of the American people,' on pages 235 and 236 of volume 5, says of the dark Democratic days of 1893 to 1897:

"A great poverty and depression had come upon the western mining regions and upon the agricultural region of the West and South. Prices had fallen. * * * Men of the poorer sort were idle everywhere, and filled with a sort of despair. All of the larger cities and manufacturing towns teemed with unemployed workingmen, who were with the utmost difficulty kept from starvation by the systematic efforts of organized charity.

"And then Prof. Wilson adds:

"Not until the year 1897, when the Republican administration came in, did the crisis seem to be past.

"No better witness can be brought forward in this campaign than Woodrow Wilson, then the historian, now the Democratic candidate for President. A vote for the Republican ticket, headed by William Howard Taft, is a vote to continue the present prosperity and present good times.

"A vote for Wilson may bring back the dark days he described, and a vote for Roosevelt only can assist toward Wilson's election.

"*Remember, voter, 'it is better to be safe than sorry.'*"

Who is there that lived during the last Democratic administration, from 1893 to 1897, that can not verify all and even more that Prof. Wilson said respecting conditions at that time?

How can we who believe in a protective tariff expect a continuation of the prosperous times which we have enjoyed for so many years under the Republican administrations of McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft, when a free-trade party is in control of both branches of Congress and we have a free-trade President, as is clearly shown by his utterances?

WILSON A FREE TRADER—WOULD REPEAL ALL PROTECTIVE-TARIFF LAWS.

The following is taken from an address delivered by Prof. Woodrow Wilson before the Tariff Board in 1882, showing his view then on the question of the tariff and the distinct announcement of his position as a free trader, opposed to all tariffs except merely for the purpose of raising revenue:

"But the danger of imposing protective duties is that when the policy is once embarked upon it can not be easily receded from. Protection is nothing more than a bounty, and when we offer bounties to manufacturers they will enter into industries and build up interests, and when at a later day we seek to overthrow this protective tariff we must hurt somebody, and of course there is objection. They will say, 'Thousands of men will be thrown out of employment and hundreds of people will lose their capital.' This seems very plausible; but I maintain that manufacturers are made better manufacturers whenever they are thrown upon their own resources and left to the natural competition of trade."

* * * * * * *

"Protection also hinders commerce immensely. The English people do not send as many goods to this country as they would if the duties were not so much, and in that way there is a restriction of commerce, and we are building up manufactories here at the expense of commerce. We are holding ourselves aloof from foreign countries in effect and saying, 'We are sufficient to ourselves; we wish to trade, not with England, but with each other.' I maintain that it is not only a pernicious system, but a corrupt system.

"By Commissioner Garland:

"Q. Are you advocating the repeal of all tariff laws?

"A. Of all protective tariff laws; of establishing a tariff for revenue merely. It seems to me very absurd to maintain that we shall have free trade between different portions of this country and at the same time shut ourselves out from free communication with other producing countries of the world. If it is necessary to impose restrictive duties on goods brought from abroad, it would seem to me, as a matter of logic, necessary to impose similar restrictions on goods taken from one State of this Union to another. That follows as a necessary consequence; there is no escape from it."

Compare the utterances of this Democratic President with those of Thomas Jefferson, our third President, often referred to as the founder of the Democratic Party, who said:

JEFFERSON A PROTECTIONIST.

"The general inquiry now is, Shall we make our own comforts or go without them at the will of a foreign nation? He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufacturers must be for reducing us either to a dependence upon that nation or to be clothed in skins and live like beasts in caves and dens. I am proud to say I am not one of these. Experience has taught me that manufacturers are now as necessary to our independence as to our comforts.

"The prohibiting duties we lay on all articles of foreign manufacture, which prudence requires us to establish at home, with the patriotic determination of every good citizen to use no foreign article which can be made within ourselves, without regard to difference of price, secures us against a relapse into foreign dependency."

In his letter to Humphrey, 1809, he wrote:

"My own idea is that we should encourage home manufacturers to the extent of our own consumption of everything of which we raise the raw material."

In 1817, after the close of the second war with Great Britain, in accepting an election to membership in a "Society for the Encouragement of Domestic Manufacturers," Jefferson wrote:

"The history of the last 20 years has been a significant lesson for us all to depend for necessaries on ourselves alone, and I hope 20 years more will place the American hemisphere under a system of its own, essentially peaceable and industrious, and not needing to extract its comforts out of the eternal fires raging in the Old World."

Who can read these utterances of Jefferson and say that he was not a protectionist?

Let me remind you that, beginning with 1783, under the Confederacy, we have had five free-trade periods in this country, and every one of them has been disastrous.

At the close of one of these periods, Mr. Benton, Democratic Senator from Missouri for 30 years, narrated conditions as follows:

"No price for property; no sales except those of the sheriff and marshal; no purchasers at execution sales except the creditor or some hoarder of money; no employment for industry; no demand for labor; no sale for the products of the farm; no sound of the hammer except that of the auctioneer knocking down property. Distress was the universal cry of the people; relief, the universal demand, was thundered at the doors of all legislatures, State and Federal."

THE MEXICAN WAR.

Some of you on the other side have pointed with some degree of pride to the Walker Tariff Act of 1846 and its results. Let us fervently hope that we will not have another war with Mexico as we had at that time which, owing to our scanty supply of arms and the numerous munitions of war and new supplies which had to be created and paid for, occasioned the putting in circulation in this Nation of more than $100,000,000.

FAMINE IN IRELAND.

Close upon the payment to our people of this great sum followed that well-known and terrible famine in Ireland, when so many thousands suffered and perished from starvation. This demand called for and obtained our entire surplus of flour, grain, potatoes, and many other things, and left heavy payments of money therefor, which went largely to our agricultural population.

CALIFORNIA GOLD.

Eighteen hundred and forty-nine brought to our people the discovery of those amazingly rich deposits of gold in California, the output of gold averaging for 10 years, from 1849, not less than $55,000,000 per year. Many ships were required to transport great numbers of men as well as large supplies of food for the gold hunters, and for a time the California business increased the demand for labor and for our agricultural products.

EUROPEAN REVOLUTIONS.

About the same time—1848–1851—those violent revolutions broke out in many European countries which most severely tested the regular authorities of those nations in putting down

the revolutions and almost completely paralyzed their agricultural and manufacturing industries.

These events caused an immense demand upon our country, particularly for our agricultural products, gave us increased prices for them, and brought large sums of money from those countries to pay for them, and of course this money was widely distributed, and tended to make the times apparently prosperous.

THE CRIMEAN WAR.

Then right upon the heels of these revolutions followed the Crimean War between England, France, and Italy on one side and Russia on the other. This contest was long, fierce, bloody, and exhausting. Europe was utterly unable to supply her own people and those great armies besides, and a tremendous demand was again made upon us for our agricultural surplus at advanced prices, which demand continued for several years and continued our apparent prosperity.

Another series of events like these has never been known in the world's history. So far as the Nation and the tariff of 1846 were concerned, they were pure accidents, and are never likely to occur again. But 1854 saw the close of these events and of our apparent prosperity as well. As soon as these extrinsic and unusual demands ceased we learned our true economic condition. Under the low tariff we could not compete successfully with foreign manufacturers and our own factories were closed, general business was prostrated, the foreign demand for our products fell off heavily, and our own home market was insufficient and constantly diminishing as our manufacturing industries were suspended or were closed.

LOWER TARIFF AND GREATER DEPRESSION.

In 1857 the Democrats again reduced the duties, already too low, to the lowest rates we have ever had since the adoption of the Constitution; and again financial revolution, appalling in its widespread severity and distress, involved the Nation, and for more than four years tortured and impoverished our people and exhausted our resources.

Both of these latter tariffs—1846 and 1857—were intended as tariffs for revenue only. Let us see if they were successful as revenue producers.

From 1847 to 1857 the expenditures of the Government exceeded its revenues by $21,790,909, and the public debt increased in the same period $13,149,629. Yet, notwithstanding these facts, the act of 1857 kept in force the principles of that of 1846 and reduced the duties upon all articles that involved the doctrine of protection.

From this time to 1861, when a protective tariff was enacted by the Republicans, the public debt increased nearly $46,000,000 and the expenditures exceeded the receipts by $77,234,116 in the same time. So much for tariff for revenue only.

After these and similar experiences would you not suppose that our Democratic friends would profit by their mistakes and stop insisting upon a tariff for revenue only? The misery, want, and loss under these last two tariff acts for revenue only can not be set forth in clearer, more convincing, and unmistakable language than was used by another Democratic President, James Buchanan, in his official message. Speaking of that distressing period he said:

"With unsurpassed plenty in all the productions and all the elements of natural wealth our manufacturers have suspended, our public works are retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds are abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers are thrown out of employment and reduced to want. We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet notwithstanding all these advantages our country in its monetary interests is in a deplorable condition."

Is this not an awful indictment, coming from a Democratic President, against the Democratic Party?

You will recall that the revenues were so small under the tariff of 1857 that it became necessary to obtain loans to meet the current expenses of the Government, and this Government did pay interest at the exorbitant rates of from 8 to 12 per cent so low was our national credit and resources. The Republican Party has had no trouble under a protective tariff in borrowing money as low as 2 per cent.

I sometimes wonder why the Democratic Party did not profit by its mistakes, for in 1860 in the Democratic national convention it reaffirmed the platform of 1856 in favor of "progressive free trade throughout the world."

On May 2, 1911, I said in this House that a Democratic House may mean in 1912 the beginning of the sixth free-trade period in this country. Gentlemen, in my opinion, it is just ahead of us.

You may be spared a bond issue like unto the one of 20 years ago, but only because you expect to get more than $70,000,000 from an income tax and enough more to make up $100,000,000 from the corporation tax.

I observe that apatite and asafetida are on the free list, but rice, a food product, is on the dutiable list. I wonder why this is?

Some of you speak lightly of the marvelous growth of this country under a half century of protection. Compare for a moment conditions:

Comparison.

	In 1893, under a Democratic administration and a free-trade tariff.	In 1900, under a Republican administration and a protective tariff.
Bank clearings	$50,000,000,000	$105,000,000,000.
Foreign commerce	$1,539,508,130	$2,244,193,543.
Exports of merchandise	$793,392,599	$1,394,479,214.
Customs receipts	$152,158,617	$233,857,958.
Treasury balance	Deficit, $42,805,223	Surplus, $81,229,771.
Balance of trade	$75,568,200	$544,764,885.
Failures	$226,096,834 (1896)	$90,879,889 (1899).
Wages paid	$2,291,016,000	$3,056,635,000.
Sheep (number)	38,298,783	67,121,881.
Sheep (value)	$65,167,735	$246,175,325.
Pig-iron production (tons)	6,657,388 (1894)	13,620,703 (1899).
Miles railroad built	1,650	5,100.
Farm products	Loss in value, $4,283,000,000 (1893–1897)	Increase in value, $6,355,000,000 (1897–1900).
Uncle Sam	In 1894–1896 had to borrow $262,000,000	In 1900 had $300,000,000 in bank.

And the growth under a protective tariff has even been greater since 1900.

On the 3d of March, this year, we turned the country over to you with factories running full time, labor never better paid, the farmer and merchant prospering, with a working balance in the Treasury offices of $80,581,398.85 and a total balance in general fund of $149,335,711.78, quite a marked change in all these conditions as compared with those when you turned the country over to us after four years of rule and ruin, during which time you issued bonds bearing 4 and 5 per cent interest to the amount of $262,315,404, and at the end of the fiscal year 1897 there was a deficit of $18,052,454.

I want to say to our friends on the other side of the aisle that you have no idle task before you if you turn the country back to us at the end of four years, as you will, with all our people as prosperous as they are to-day.

It is idle and almost a waste of time for us as Republicans to offer any objections or amendments, because of a Democratic majority in this House of more than 140, pledged in caucus to pass this bill without any amendments; but in the name of the people of my State—Michigan—and in behalf of the farmer, laborer—skilled and unskilled—the merchant and manufacturer, and all our people, and in behalf of the sugar-beet industry of my State, I protest against the passage of this bill.

You are going to put sugar on the free list in three years as you have wool. If free sugar is a good thing for the people in three years from now, why is it not a good thing at this time, and why have you not the courage of your convictions and place it there at once? It is an undeniable fact that placing sugar on the free list will not benefit the consumer; that the country will annually lose more than fifty millions in revenue, and that this legislation is in the interests of the foreigner and the sugar refiners.

Since I was 10 years of age I have listened to Democratic orators and read Democratic speeches telling of the glorious results which would follow the enactment of tariff for revenue only legislation, with the emphasis on the word "only," as Mr. UNDERWOOD says.

You have the machinery of government to work out your will; the President and both branches of Congress are yours. I hope,

without unnecessary delay, you will write into law a tariff just as you want it. If it proves a success raising sufficient revenue, does not close our factories, giving the laboring man the good wages which he has been receiving, and the farmer splendid prices for his products, we will give you just praise, for we are all Americans before we are partisans; but if you fail, as I believe you will, I bid you forever hold your peace about a tariff for revenue only, frankly admit your mistake, and join us as Republicans in again giving to the country a fair measure of protection that this may continue to be the greatest and most prosperous of all Republics. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER].

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, the pending measure places shoes upon the free list because some one makes the charge that the shoe manufacturers of this country sell a small part of their surplus product in the markets of the world at a less price than they sell it at home.

The same bill levies a duty of 10 cents a bushel upon wheat, not for the purpose of raising revenue, but for the sole purpose of leading the wheat grower of this country to believe that his industry is being protected. The census reports of this country show that for the past decades the farmers of this country have yearly raised millions of bushels more of wheat than we have consumed and that they have been selling it in the markets of the world. Your last census abstract, on page 380, states that the wheat imports into this country are insignificant and may be wholly disregarded, while our exports of wheat and flour, its equivalent, amount to 87,360,000 bushels.

As far back as I can recollect—and that is a good way—the farmers of this country have raised more wheat than we have consumed, and they have sold their surplus products in the markets of the world in competition with foreign wheat, and frequently at a less price in the foreign market than at home. Yet the 10 per cent ad valorem is to be taken off of shoes and 10 cents a bushel levied on wheat. If the shoe manufacturer of this country does not sell his surplus shoes in the markets of world, pray tell me where shall he sell them? Must he cease to manufacture shoes just as soon as it is ascertained that the domestic demand has been fairly supplied? Do you require the wheat grower to do so? Do you penalize his industry by placing his product upon the free list because he raises every year more wheat than we consume and frequently sells his wheat and flour in the markets abroad at a less price than at home? I do not understand the logic of these gentlemen. Has there ever been any combination among the shoe manufacturers of this country tending to artificially raise the price of shoes? Have not "corners" in the Chicago wheat market been of frequent occurrence? Have not prices soared skyward with lightning rapidity, to the enrichment of the cold, unscrupulous speculator, and to the impoverishment of the shorn lamb, and working in the final result a great hardship upon the consumer of breadstuffs? As I say, I can not understand the reasoning of these gentlemen. The Democratic majority on the Ways and Means Committee are certainly cognizant of these facts. They are a matter of public knowledge, and the gentlemen can not now say that they are putting products on the free list because they are controlled here by large combinations of capital, or that they are sometimes sold in the markets of the world at a less price than at home.

When was it that the American wool grower has ever been guilty of the unpardonable sin of selling any portion of his product in the markets of the world? When, at any time since the enactment of the Dingley law in 1897, has raw wool sold too high or at an exorbitant price? Yet you place raw wool upon the free list. Why do you remove the protection from the shoe manufacturer of my district and retain protection for the cotton manufacturer of North Carolina? Why do you remove the protection from the wool grower of my district and retain it for the rice grower of the South? Why do you take protection off the manufactured products of wheat, barley, oats, and rye, products of the North, and retain that protection upon the manufactured products of rice, a product of the South? [Applause on the Republican side.] You answer that you are levying duties to raise revenue only, and that, necessarily, there will be some incidental or accidental protection in any tariff bill you can possibly offer.

But the framers of tariff for revenue measures always have the happy faculty of figuring out in advance just where this incidental protection is going to strike. In framing the pending bill they had no trouble, apparently, in finding out in what part of the United States rice is grown; and by means of graduated or shifting rates of duty, or by a proper classification, or by all these means, there is not much trouble in protecting the cotton manufacturer of North Carolina against his northern competitor.

At the second session of the Sixty-second Congress we were solemnly told by the Democratic leader of this body, the gentleman from Alabama, that the enactment into law of his free-sugar bill would remove from the shoulders of the American people an enormous annual burden of $115,000,000.

The gentleman vividly portrayed in doleful tones the woeful condition of the people of the country, groaning under this burdensome taxation.

According to the gentleman from Alabama none but the most heartless could longer sit idly by and witness this wholesale robbery of the people and refuse to grant the immediate relief proffered by his measure.

But believing that this great Democratic leader was not properly informed and unduly alarmed, and well knowing that our domestic cane and beet suger industries could not exist without adequate protection, I cast my vote against his proposition.

And now a year later and after our Democratic friends have gone before the American people and promised that if returned to full power they would give them sugar without money and without price, to my utter amazement we are to-day confronted by a bill providing for a complete revision of our tariff laws not carrying in any of its schedules free sugar, but on the contrary retaining the larger portion of the alleged outrageous robbery of which our Democratic friends so bitterly complained and so vehemently denounced one year ago.

True the pending measure provides a definite date for the execution of the domestic sugar producer and impliedly invites arrangement and preparation for his impending demise. This lease of life, we are told, is not given for the purpose of fostering and developing our domestic sugar industry, but solely for the purpose of allowing this unconstitutional, tax-sustained producer time to wind up his industrial existence.

And incidentally free sugar is to be given by this bill three years hence and on the eve of a presidential campaign, and evidently it is to be used again as the Democratic slogan for reelection.

Our Democratic friends seem to look upon the sugar schedule of our tariff law as a political football. One year ago they declared for free sugar immediately by passing the Underwood sugar bill; now they say that some consideration must be given to the domestic producers. If the domestic producer is entitled to some consideration at this time, why should he not have been given some consideration one year ago? Has anything occurred in the business or economic conditions during the past year that will warrant this change about of front? The Democratic proposition before us concedes that the domestic sugar producer is entitled to some consideration, which vindicates the position taken by those who cast their votes against the measure one year ago, in so far as the action of the Democratic Party is capable of bringing about vindication. But how is it possible for the Democratic leader of this House to sit passively by during the next three years and raise no protest against the high-handed robbery he once so roundly and loudly denounced?

The real leader of Democracy, our President, is of the opinion that the immediate destruction of this great industry would be exceedingly distressful to the sugar-producing territory of the Nation, and he no doubt fears that its disastrous consequences might be inimical to business throughout the length and breadth of the land. In this I fully agree with him.

But how about the radical reduction of the textile duties of the woolen schedule and placing raw wool on the free list? Will not this, too, prove disastrous to thousands and thousands of woolgrowers throughout the country and result in thousands and thousands of laborers being thrown out of employment?

Democrat after Democrat during the last Congress gave testimony in lengthy speeches that the placing of wool on the free list of our tariff law would destroy the raw-wool industry of the Nation; and this belief is fortified by not only an abundance of facts and sound reasoning, but such has been the result of the tried-out experience of the past. Why could not this real Democratic leader accord to the woolgrowers of the country the same generosity he proposes to extend to the producers of sugar? Why make fish of one and fowl of the other?

Why should the farmer who grows the wool for the clothing that goes upon our backs be so summarily dealt with and the farmer who grows the cane and beets out of which is made the sugar which goes down our throats be given not only three days of grace, but three years? Why this class discrimination?

Is not the labor which cares for the flock and shears the sheep entitled to the same consideration as the labor of the sugar factory and the labor of the woolen factory? Are the wool-

growers of the Nation growing rich too fast? Is there any combination among the woolgrowers tending to arbitrarily enhance the price of wool?

The cost of all the wool in the average suit of clothes to-day is hardly $2.

Our Democratic friends during the last Congress passed and repassed the Underwood wool bills, levying 20 per cent ad valorem duty on raw wool, and many of its supporters took the position that if a duty is levied on the manufactured product of a raw material produced in this country to such an extent as to be a great industry, that in all fairness there should be a duty levied on the raw material. Raw material is the finished product of the woolgrower as much as cloth is the finished product of the weaver. Each industry requires capital, labor, skill, and close attention in order that it may be fairly successful.

It is a well-known fact that free raw material affords protection to the industry using same, and the woolen textile industries under the pending bill are not only given free wool but they are further protected by duties levied on woolen goods. Why this double protection of the woolen textile industries as against the woolgrowers?

Again, why the free listing of many items and the radical reduction of duties on those items remaining in the metal schedule of our tariff law?

This heavy cut in the end must be borne by labor. And in this connection, I desire to submit an excerpt from the opinion of Mr. Andrew Glass, one of the owners of a large steel mill in my district employing 1,600 men at good wages, as to how the reduction of duties on two items of the metal schedule will affect the earnings of labor in the industries now protected thereunder. He says, that "Under 15 per cent tariff on black and 20 per cent on galvanized sheets, home mills would be at a disadvantage that labor would have to make good. That would be the end, and no other end is possible; but it would not be reached without long strikes, bringing lots of misery and trouble to the workers, and plenty of expense and sleepless nights to those charged with the duty of meeting the new conditions."

As to its effect upon the small manufacturers, especially of iron and steel, I desire to give at this point an excerpt from a letter of Hon. H. A. Marting, of Ironton, Ohio, president of the Marting Iron & Steel Co., of that city, as follows:

> It certainly looks to us as though it is the desire of the Democratic Party now in power to drive all of the smaller manufacturers out of business. The so-called trusts may be able to compete with foreign-made products, made by cheap labor, as they have an advantage over the smaller industries by owning and controlling raw material, etc., but the smaller independent manufacturers will, I fear, be compelled to close their shops and go begging for a livelihood if Congress makes into law the tariff bill as at present outlined, but it looks as though it is needless to protest.

Such is the judgment of two men who have had years of experience in the iron and steel industries, but it will have no weight with those who, now drunken with power, are bent on smashing American industries.

Yesterday I inquired of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] why the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee changed the specific duty of $2.50 per ton on ferromanganese, a product which he says is not made for sale in this country, to a 15 per cent ad valorem duty, resulting in an increase of duty at this time of more than 300 per cent. The gentleman, in a somewhat labored answer, among other things stated that "our purpose in making the rate on ferromanganese was entirely as a revenue-producing proposition." Upon an investigation of the report on the pending tariff bill, prepared with great care, no doubt, by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the chairman of that great committee [Mr. UNDERWOOD], representing an iron district in the State of Alabama, on page 112 of the report we find that they propose to reduce the revenue of $190,203 received by the Government on ferromanganese this year to $82,500 next year. It may be of some interest to the Members of this House to be informed just how these gentlemen propose to accomplish the remarkable feat of reducing the revenue now received on ferromanganese to less than one-half of the amount now being derived therefrom by increasing the duty 300 per cent. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated, the United States Steel Corporation is the only producer of ferromanganese in this country, and they use practically their entire product. It is, therefore, incumbent upon our independent steel concerns to purchase this article abroad, and the duty is thereby necessarily a tax added to the cost of their raw material. So if the output of our independent steel mills would be as large next year as in 1912, at the present price paid for ferromanganese they would have to pay a revenue of $750,000, instead of $82,500 as estimated in the report on the pending tariff bill. This would be over $650,000 more than they paid on this item in 1912. And as the pending measure takes the 15 per cent ad valorem duty off of manganiferous ore the independent steel producer is not only handicapped by the largely increased duty on a part of his raw material, but his chief competitor in this country, the United States Steel Corporation, who already enjoys a great advantage over him by reason of owning practically all of its raw material and large transportation facilities, and being able to make its ferromanganese, is relieved from paying any duty on about all of the raw material it consumes.

I have no doubt but that the gentleman from Pennsylvania would deny that the United States Steel Corporation requested that this unfair discrimination in their favor over the independent steel companies be made; but why should the gentleman voluntarily be a party to such an outrageous discrimination in favor of a trust which Members on that side of the House daily denounce is beyond my comprehension. Still, I have no doubt but that the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Alabama gave much care and consideration to this item, and that the object it will accomplish will be just as they purposed.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania intimates that it is not a matter of much consequence; but, be that as it may, they thought it important to remove the small duty of 15 per cent ad valorem on manganiferous ore, a raw material used solely by the United States Steel Corporation, and to increase the duty 300 per cent on ferromanganese, a raw material used by the independent steel companies.

And while the gentleman thinks it is not a matter of much importance, the Portsmouth Steel Co., of my district, state that they use approximately 1,500 tons of ferromanganese yearly, and that this increased duty means an increased yearly cost to them for this raw material of from ten to fifteen thousand dollars, and that they are not only handicapped by reason of this increased cost, but on account of the frequent fluctuations in the price of ferromanganese, and the duty thereon being an ad valorem one, and by reason of changing from a specific to an ad valorem duty and cutting in two the protection on their product, it is nearly impossible for them to calculate with any certainty the cost of products they make and prices of which they must quote to consumers.

While this may not be a concrete illustration of President Wilson's idea of whetting the wits of our people in a contest with the rest of the world, it is an apt illustration as to how the proposed revision of the metal schedule is whetting the wits of the United States Steel Corporation in a contest with our independent steel companies. The scythe of the Steel Corporation is being well sharpened, for the harvest looks promising, and the gentlemen from Pennsylvania and Alabama are the experts engaged in this sharpening process. But the Portsmouth Steel Co., of my district, seriously objects to be used as the whetstone.

But to return to the wonderful feat of reducing the revenue to be received by the Government on ferromanganese from $190,000 to $82,500 by increasing the duty thereon more than 300 per cent. If you will inspect carefully page 112 of the report on the pending measure you will observe that while the import value of ferromanganese was $2,821,935 in 1912, the gentleman from Pennsylvania estimates that the value of ferromanganese to be imported for the first year under the pending measure will be only $550,000. As it is absolutely necessary to use ferromanganese in the manufacture of steel, and as he states the independent steel concerns must obtain all of it abroad, undoubtedly the gentleman anticipates a shrinkage of the business of the independent steel companies under the first year's operation of the Underwood bill to less than one-fifth of what it is now, because if they use less than one-fifth of the amount of ferromanganese in 1913 that they used in 1912 they can produce only one-fifth as much steel as they produced in 1912. Necessarily, if there is a great shrinkage of the amount of ferromanganese imported, an alloy used in the manufacture of steel, there must be a great shrinkage in the output of our independent steel concerns. The estimate of the gentlemen from Pennsylvania and Alabama conclusively shows that they expect the independent steel companies to lose more than four-fifths of their business under the operation of the Underwood bill for the first year or they have provided the 300 per cent increase of duty for the purpose of compelling the independent steel companies to purchase ferromanganese from the United States Steel Corporation, which they protect in the manufacture of this product from $8 to $9 per ton.

I do not believe that it will result in lowering the price of steel to the consumer for the independent steel companies to be driven to purchase this part of their raw material from the United States Steel Corporation, a company which Mr. Car-

negie under oath states needs no protection and which has for a number of years stifled all competition in many of the products of iron and steel and which is greatly interested in getting rid of the independent steel manufacturers.

If there are other jokers in the metal schedule by reason of shifting from a specific to an ad valorem duty so favorable to the United States Steel Corporation as the one to which I have just referred it is very easy to predict as to what will become of the independent steel companies.

You put shoes on the free list and compel the American manufacturers of shoes to compete with the foreigner who not only enjoys the use of free raw materials but whose labor cost is not over half of what it is here.

This means a reduction of the wage of 200,000 shoe workers in our country.

The employees of the iron and steel and shoe industries to a great extent make many of the local markets for the agricultural products of my congressional district, as well as the great Pittsburgh market, which consumes a large part of the garden, dairy, poultry, butter, and live stock products of northern and southeastern Ohio. Why should the existing protection be removed from the products of these industries and retained on wheat, the raw material of bread, the staff of life? If protection is right, why not be consistent?

But a careful consideration of the proposed bill will disclose that the 10 cents a bushel duty on wheat, barley, oats, and rye is nothing but a delusion and a snare—a hypocritical effort to deceive the farmers of the country, for the reason that wheat and rye flour, bran and screenings, oatmeal and rolled oats, and other products of these alleged raw materials are admitted duty free. So, while the foreigner can not import wheat, barley, oats, and rye without paying an import duty of 10 cents a bushel, yet he can easily evade this payment by transforming them into some manufactured product. The northern and western farmer will note in this connection that the manufactured products of rice are protected as well as rice, the raw material.

The levying of duties on wheat, barley, oats, and rye and leaving their manufactured products unprotected will stimulate the building of more foreign flour mills and cereal-food factories. Why this great discrimination against the American flour mills and cereal factories? On the other hand, raw wool is placed on the free list and a duty is levied on manufactures of wool. All done, it is claimed, for the purpose of producing revenue only. But more revenue was derived last year upon raw wool than upon its manufactured products under our existing tariff law. This proposed change is certainly not in the interest of the user of woolen goods, for under the existing tariff law the wearer of a suit of clothes is taxed not to exceed 75 cents upon the raw wool therein. Under the proposed law he is to be given the raw wool free, but he is taxed upon the manufactured product of the wool in his suit from $1.20 to $1.50.

Imported cattle and sheep are taxed 10 per cent ad valorem, and there is an apparent attempt to protect the farmers and live-stock growers constituting these great industries throughout the country. But when it is found that beef, pork, mutton, and all meats come in duty free the whole performance turns out to be an arrangement to encourage and protect the foreign butchers and meat packers. In the place of the foreign fattened hogs, sheep, and cattle being shipped in and butchered and packed at some American plant, upon paying the duty of 10 per cent, they will be slaughtered at some foreign plant by foreign labor, employed by foreign capital, and the slaughtered product will be shipped in duty free and sold in free competition with the meat product of our American meat-packing establishments. So the farmers and stock raisers of this country occupy about the same position that is accorded the victim of a successfully worked "shell game"—now you see it, and now you do not see it. But after he has passed through the ordeal he will be well aware that he has been fleeced.

It seems that our Democratic friends, in their mad desire to reduce the high cost of living, have come to the conclusion that the agriculture class shall hereafter be made the "hewers of wood and drawers of water."

I can not support a tariff bill that gives to the foreigner the magnificent raw-wool market of this country; that contemplates handing over to the foreigner our great sugar market; that proposes to give away the markets of our mills and factories and of our great agricultural industry amounting to $30,000,000,000 a year, without receiving or without the hope of receiving anything whatever in return.

Only during short and at few intervals have those engaged in agricultural pursuits enjoyed any considerable prosperity since the Civil War up to the time of the enactment of the Dingley tariff law of 1897. Since then the Nation's prosperity has gone forward by leaps and bounds. But, while the combined wealth of the Nation has more than doubled in value within the last 20 years, farm property in all its forms has more than doubled in value within the past 10 years, disclosing that in the race for wealth during the past 10 years the agriculturist has been twice as fleet as the average man engaged in the other pursuits of our country. In other words, "the farmer has come into his own."

The general condition of the farmer as well as of the whole country, after 16 years of Republican protection, presents a most striking contrast to the condition existing at the end of three years of operation under the last Democratic free-trade tariff law. No better description can be given of the distressful and deplorable condition of the country at that time than that set out in the Democratic national platform of 1896, which declared "that the products of the people's toil are depressed in price till they no longer repay the cost of production."

This was the deliberate judgment of all the representatives of the Democratic Party composing that memorable convention at the city of Chicago in 1896.

I have never heard the truth of this declaration questioned from that time to this.

Do you know what it means when the products of labor's toil no longer repay the cost of production? I do. I have seen 15 and 20 cent corn. Just imagine a man getting rich off of a hillside corn field at such prices. I have seen railway ties hewed and hauled 4 and 5 miles at 25 to 28 cents per tie, and by the time the railway inspector got through throwing out the culls the ties would average the owner about 20 cents apiece. Now, you can imagine how rapidly this timberman accumulated wealth while engaged in furnishing and hauling these ties from 4 to 5 miles when the hewing per tie cost him 10 cents. I have passed through a similar experience at producing below cost the products of the farm and of timber grown in my district.

I have worked at the job from sunup to sundown, year after year, and I have no desire to tackle the proposition again or see some one else compelled to do so. Once in a lifetime is enough. When the products of labor's toil no longer repay the cost of production it means that the compensation received by the laboring man for a day's work is wholly insufficient to buy enough bread and meat to sustain the bone and muscle which is necessary for the performance of his day's work. And I fully agree with the Democratic nominee of that great Chicago convention of 1896 when he said:

> Is it a fair measure of value that in our great producing Nation 10 bushels of potatoes must be paid for a dollar, 10 bushels of oats for a dollar, 6 bushels of corn for a dollar, 3 bushels of wheat, and of the other products of the soil and mines and the labor of all wage earners at the same ratio? Does any fair mind say that this is honest money that forces such an exchange? And if it is not fair exchange, is it honest? Is it less than robbery?

Such, gentlemen, was the utterance of Mr. Sewall, of Maine, in his letter accepting the Democratic nomination for the Vice Presidency in 1896. It was a concrete illustration of the declaration in his party's platform to the effect "that the products of the people's toil are depressed in price till they no longer repay the cost of production." And it was the description by a great Democrat of the deplorable condition of the country at the close of the last Democratic free-trade administration. He was talking at a time when all the facts were fresh and exceedingly vivid to his mind. This philosophical Democrat also asked another significant question in his letter of acceptance, and that was this:

> How else can you increase labor's producing power but by increasing the price of all of labor's products?

Remember, my Democratic friends, he said "all."

At the time the Democratic national convention of 1896 and its nominee for the Vice Presidency were passing through their sporadic gyrations in behalf of the American laborer and producer that great commoner of the time, Mr. Bryan, in his letter of acceptance seemed to be as equally concerned about the welfare of the producers of our country.

And he contributed to the political history of our country the following illuminating dissertation:

> Labor creates capital. Until wealth is produced by the application of brain and muscle to the resources of the country there is nothing to divide among the nonproducing classes of society. Since the producers of wealth create the Nation's prosperity in times of peace and defend the Nation's flag in times of peril, their interest ought at all times to be considered by those who stand in official positions.

Mark you, he said "at all times," and I now respectfully commend his utterance to the consideration of those who occupy official places in this great representative body. How much consideration have our Democratic friends on the Ways and Means Committee given to the producers of raw wool, of

sugar, of shoes, of wheat and rye flours and oatmeal, of the products of iron and steel, and of the products of the farm?

In 1896 Mr. Bryan held himself out as the special friend of the producer. His party's complaint was that the products of labor were entirely too cheap. Now it is contended that everything is too high, and they blandly tell us that they propose to cheapen the price of everything we have to buy without lowering the price of anything we produce or have to sell.

And some of them believe it can be done!

I know but little about the science of political economy as taught at some of our leading universities. In fact, I have read and pondered over but very little of the recorded effusions of those theoretical free-trade minds which have been constantly dreaming for more than a quarter of a century.

But there are some things that I know as much about, I believe, as any college professor.

I know when you reduce the price of the products of the people's toil that you are going to reduce the price of labor. I know that when you place raw wool and sugar and many other agricultural as well as manufactured products upon the free list of our tariff law, and practically cut in two the existing import duty on those articles remaining on the dutiable list, I am certain that you will vastly increase importations, especially if you raise anything like the revenue upon such dutiable articles which would be the equivalent of that produced under our existing tariff; and when you do this you are going to displace a large amount of American-made goods and American labor, even if American labor consents to work for the pauper wages paid abroad.

Naturally, since it is proposed to place on the free list articles bearing a heavy import duty and which are produced in large quantities in foreign countries, or to materially lower the import duty, the importers of such articles cease importation or greatly reduce it until the time arrives when they can bring it into the country without paying any duty or by paying the reduced duty, thereby resulting in the collection of little revenue during this period of time. The man who has contracted to take the product of the factory, entered into on the supposition that the goods he is to receive are protected to some extent from foreign competition, at once begins to ascertain if there is not some way of becoming released from his contract. When confronted with the fact that he must sell his product, made under protected and high-priced labor, in competition with the same product made by cheap and unprotected labor, he can see nothing but loss, and if his contract is a large one ruination stares him in the face. And although he does not want to repudiate his contract his fast diminishing resources decree otherwise, and bankruptcy and humiliation are his fate.

The factory owner turning out goods made by high-priced and protected labor at once becomes aguish as he contemplates the disposal of his product in free competition with similar goods made by cheap and unprotected labor.

His sole recourse, unless his labor will consent to work for the prices of labor paid by his foreign free-trade competitor, is to speedily close his establishment. This procedure on his part stops the consumption of raw material and thereby the employment of those engaged in that industry ceases, and so on down the line until discord, chaos, and disaster permeates the whole industrial and commercial realm of the entire country.

I am one of those who believe that William McKinley was right when he advocated that it would be better to open our mills to the workingmen of our country than to open our mints to the free silver of the world.

I believe that the people of this country were right when they commissioned President McKinley and a Republican Congress to enact a protective tariff law as a remedy for the industrial ills from which we were suffering in 1896.

I believe the Republican Congress was right when it enacted the Dingley tariff law, and that the immortal McKinley was right when he appended his signature to that measure, which quickened the dead mills and factories and the inactive industries of our country and brought them again to life and caused the wheels of commerce again to move, resulting in an era of prosperity without a parallel in our history and outrivaling any era known to the world.

And as we have prospered so greatly under the protective policy, I can see no reason why its principles should not still be adhered to and equitably maintained in any revision of our tariff law made necessary by the ever-changing conditions of our country.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY].

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Chairman, I have given considerable thought in years past and recently to the question now before the House. It must be conceded that there is legitimate argument that can be advanced both in favor of free trade and protection, but it seems to me that the weight of the argument is in favor of a reasonable protective tariff. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the first tariff act passed by the United States, July 4, 1789, recited in its first sentence:

> Whereas it is necessary for the support of the Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported.

The Democratic Party does not now agree, has never agreed, and probably never will agree with the declaration made by the first Congress of the United States that a tariff is necessary for the "encouragement and protection" of American markets. The leaders of the Democratic Party have always contended, and its leaders in this House now, as well as its last national platform, boldly assert that there should be no tariff for protection, but only such a tariff as may be absolutely necessary to make up an amount of revenue, which, when added to our internal revenues, will pay the running expenses of the Government. By the logic of this argument, the Democratic Party is bound to say that we should not have any tariff at all if the internal revenues alone shall ever furnish a sufficient amount of money to pay the running expenses of the Government, and this contingency may be upon us before we know it, since our internal revenues last year amounted to two-thirds of our total revenues, and since we are to add to those revenues in the future by an income tax.

Therefore the issue is squarely drawn between the Democratic Party, which is opposed to any tariff whatever for protection, and the Progressives and Progressive Republicans, who are in favor of a tariff for protection. The Democratic Party can not escape from the inevitable position of absolute free trade, into which it is precipitated by the cold logic of this issue, by pointing out to the farmers and manufacturers of this country that it is involuntarily giving to them in some instances a slight incidental protection by levying duties to make up a deficit in our national revenues. For, as stated, this deficit may be wiped out in a short time by an increase of our internal revenues, and then if the Democratic Party is in power we shall have absolute free trade. The Democratic Party from its infancy has persistently held to the doctrine of free trade, and it is holding to and practicing that doctrine now as far as it is possible for it to do so in presenting to the country the Underwood-Woodrow bill. Probably it should be called the Woodrow-Underwood bill. [Laughter.] It was written, I understand, by UNDERWOOD and underwritten by Woodrow. [Laughter and applause.]

On page 14 of the report filed with the present bill, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] gives the country an insight into the true scope and nature of the measure when he says that in framing it the sole object had in mind was—

> The establishment of duties designed to produce revenue for the Government, and without thought of protection.

From the doctrine asserted in the paragraph just quoted, the Progressives and the Progressive Republicans of this House enter their vigorous protest and dissent. And from that doctrine I believe that at least three-fourths of the citizens of this country will dissent.

Our distinguished President agrees fully with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and in so doing the President is in keeping with the free-trade principles of the Democratic Party. On April 8 the Chief Executive honored this body and the Senate, sitting in joint session, with a personal visit. The only specific statement in the speech read to us by the President on that occasion was the following declaration touching the proposed tariff revision, concerning which the President said:

> We must abolish everything that bears even the semblance of privilege or of any kind of artificial advantage, and put our business men and producers under the stimulation of a constant necessity to be efficient, economical, and enterprising, masters of competitive supremacy, better workers and merchants than any in the world.

I cite these declarations of the leaders of the Democratic Party to show that they are opposed to a tariff for protection. It is true that some Democratic Congressmen and many Democratic voters favor a tariff for protection, but their party does not. They are in the wrong party, and they ought to join the Progressive Party or the Progressive Republicans. The present leaders of the Democratic Party are entitled to credit for one thing, and that is for sticking religiously to the free-trade doctrines of their party.

The President says that our producers must compete with the world without "any kind of artificial advantage" such as a protective tariff affords, and intimates with beautiful rhetoric that when our producers are reduced to the necessity of competing with foreign countries absolutely without protection they will become "masters of competitive supremacy"

and will be "better workers and merchants than any in the world."

The free-trade declarations of the President sounded very well. But every hard-headed, practical American citizen will realize that we must protect and foster our home markets by a reasonable protective tariff or we will be reduced to the level of foreign countries in the matter of wages and in our manner of living.

But the President only followed the Baltimore platform in declaring for free trade. That platform says:

> We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government under the Constitution has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue * * *.

That the Democratic Party is plunging the country headlong toward absolute free trade there can be no question, when we consider the assertions of its leaders, its platform declarations, and its legislative actions. That the Democratic Party unqualifiedly asserts that we have no excuse for levying any tariff at all on imports, except to make up the deficit in our national revenues, no Member of this House will dare to deny. Last year the total revenues of the United States from all sources was $938,522,481. Only one-third of this sum was realized from import duties, while one-third came from our internal-revenue taxes, and nearly one-third was realized from our postal revenues. Therefore it is plainly to be seen that the Democratic Party may in a short time, if continued in power, have an opportunity to place our country upon an absolute free-trade basis. Those who desire that this result be accomplished should support the Democratic Party. Those who are opposed to making our markets free to foreign countries should hereafter support the Progressive Party or the Progressive Republicans.

The present bill takes a long step toward the ultimate absolute free trade to which the Democratic Party boasts that it is drifting. By this bill American markets are made practically free to all the world, so far as agricultural products are concerned. The farmers are the first class that are to be subject to Democratic free trade.

On page 24 of the Underwood report appears the following statement relating to agricultural products:

> In the effort to relieve the consumer and to mitigate the high cost of living Schedule G, which deals with agricultural products, has been thoroughly revised and important reductions have been made.

No doubt that statement, coming from the leader of the Democratic Party in this House [Mr. UNDERWOOD], will fill the farmers of this country with hilarity and greatly increase their admiration for the unterrified Democracy.

But if the farmer is not filled with exuberance by the statement just quoted, he may turn over to the next page of the report, where his eyes will meet with this most friendly and encouraging declaration:

> Schedule K, dealing with wools and woolen manufactures, has been the center of criticism for many years, and the committee has given it careful study. The result has been to make raw wool free of duty. * * *

After giving the matter "careful study," the Democratic Ways and Means Committee decided to aid the farmers of this country by putting raw wool on the free list, while retaining a duty of 25 per cent on blankets, 35 per cent on dress goods and clothing, and 50 per cent on carpets. The farmer was only asking for an 18 per cent ad valorem duty on raw wool, which would only amount to about 3 cents a pound, but he was refused even that.

Neither the Progressive Party nor the progressive Republicans are in favor of a tariff which, like the existing Republican tariff, amounts to more than protection in many cases; nor do they believe in taking all the tariff off of any article grown or manufactured in this country by honest competitive producers. The tariff bill now presented does take all the tariff off many articles grown in this country by honest, bona fide, competitive producers, notably the products of the farmer, and for that reason it becomes pertinent to inquire whether the present bill, if passed, would not do more harm than good.

The farmers are the bone and sinew of any country. They certainly have as high a claim upon the Nation for a reasonable protective tariff for their products as have the manufacturers. Foodstuffs are too high I admit, but it is because of high transportation rates and combinations of packers and middlemen. The farmer deserves all he gets. When the Union Station in this city, which was built partly by the Government, was completed, the committee in charge cast about for suitable legends to have carved upon the face of that magnificent marble structure. Three legends appear there, but the one which appeals most to me reads as follows:

> The farm—Best home of the family—Main source of national wealth—Foundation of civilized society—The natural providence.

Even the so-called Peerless Leader, in his first famous speech at the Chicago Democratic national convention in 1896, in a burst of eloquence declared:

> You may destroy the cities and towns of this country and they will be rebuilt, but destroy the farms and the grass will grow in your streets.

But we now find Mr. Bryan, as the premier of the present Democratic administration, sanctioning a tariff bill which practically places upon the free list nearly every article grown on the farm, while liberal protection is retained for the big business man and manufacturer in the city. If Mr. Bryan does not favor this bill at heart, he is at least giving to it his implied approval by remaining silent, for it is well known that Mr. Bryan does not remain silent when he has anything to say.

It is safe to assert that no tariff bill ever offered to the country discriminated against the farmer as this bill does. The placing of barbed wire and agricultural implements on the free list as an offering of compensation to the farmer for taking all the protection off of nearly everything he raises is a palpable attempt at deception and is an insult to the intelligence of the farmers. Everyone knows that the manufacture and output of these articles is already controlled internationally by American manufacturers and that the placing of them on the free list will not reduce their cost to American farmers one penny.

While the Democratic Party declared at Baltimore in favor of only such a tariff as might be absolutely necessary to make up the deficit in our national revenues, and therefore warned us that they would take all protection off of everything whenever the internal revenues of the country shall equal the running expenses of the Government, still the declarations of that platform, under any fair interpretation that could be given to it, warranted the farmers in believing that they would be the last to be touched by Democratic tariff revision. As proof of this I cite the following plank of the Baltimore platform, which was written by Col. Bryan himself:

> The high Republican tariff is the principal cause of the unequal distribution of wealth; it is a system of taxation which makes the rich richer and the poor poorer; under its operations the American farmer and laboring man are the chief sufferers; it raises the cost of the necessaries of life to them, but does not protect their product or wages. The farmer sells largely in free markets and buys almost entirely in protected markets.

Col. Bryan, as the Moses of the Democratic Party at Baltimore, was then complaining because the Republicans had left the farmer to sell nearly all of his products in free markets.

Mr. GORDON. Is that true or false?

Mr. LAFFERTY. It will be absolutely true if the Underwood bill becomes a law, but it is not true under existing law. [Applause.]

The following is a partial list of agricultural products which are amply protected under existing law, but which will come into the United States absolutely free of duty under the Democratic tariff law now about to be enacted:

> Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, bacon, cured meats, milk and cream, condensed milk, potatoes, wool, rye and rye flour, swine, tallow, corn and corn meal, bran and wheat screenings, broom corn, lard, flax straw, buckwheat and buckwheat flour.

The Canadian farmers can and will compete with our farmers as to all of these products, but Canada places a heavy duty upon all of the articles mentioned, which will prevent our farmers from participating in the Canadian trade. Canada levies a duty of 3 cents per pound on fresh meats from the United States, whereas fresh meats from Canada are to come into this country free under the Democratic tariff bill. Canada levies a duty of 3 cents per pound on wool, whereas Canadian wool will come into the United States free of duty under the pending bill. Canada charges a duty of 1½ cents per pound on swine imported from the United States, whereas the Canadians may import swine into this country under the Democratic bill free of duty. Canada charges a duty of 1½ cents per pound on lard, 3½ cents per pound on milk products, 20 cents per bushel on potatoes, 10 cents per bushel on rye, 50 cents per barrel on rye flour, 25 cents per barrel on corn meal, and 20 per cent ad valorem on tallow, whereas all of these products will come into the United States free of duty from Canada and all other countries under the pending Democratic bill.

Under the Canadian law cattle and sheep on the hoof going into that Dominion from the United States must pay a duty of 25 per cent, whereas under the pending Democratic bill Canadian cattle and sheep on the hoof may come into this country on paying a duty of only 10 per cent. Butter going into Canada from this country must pay a duty of 4 cents per pound, while Canadian butter may come into this country under the pending bill on paying only 3 cents per pound. Under the Canadian law eggs imported from the United States are charged a duty of 3 cents per dozen, while under the proposed Democratic law Canadian eggs will only have to pay a duty of 2 cents per dozen.

Under the Canadian tariff law poultry going from the United States into Canada must pay a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem, while the proposed Democratic law will admit Canadian live poultry into the United States upon the payment of a duty of only 1 cent a pound and dressed poultry on the payment of a duty of only 2 cents a pound.

It remains to be seen what excuse the Democratic Party will have to offer for giving to the Canadian farmers better trading terms in this country than Canada will give to our farmers across the line. Many farmers were opposed to Canadian reciprocity because that bill admitted the exchange of many American and Canadian products upon terms of equality. The Underwood bill is bound to be far more injurious to the American farmer than the Canadian reciprocity pact could possibly have been.

The manner in which the Progressives and progressive Republicans would revise the tariff is stated in detail in the very admirable minority report to the pending bill made for the Progressives and progressive Republicans in this House by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK]. Whenever the Progressives and progressive Republicans shall be commissioned by the American people to revise the tariff, which important event will possibly take place at the fall elections next year and, in any event, not later than November, 1916, the plan outlined by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] will be followed in good faith and to the letter. [Applause.] That plan contemplates a permanent, nonpolitical, scientific tariff commission and a complete revision of our tariff schedules downward to the actual difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, but provided always that we shall never give to any other country more advantageous trading terms than such country is willing to give to us, which principle of reciprocity is being flagrantly violated by the Democratic Party, to the injury of American farmers in favor of Canadian farmers, in the passage of the present bill.

Mr. GORDON. Is not that in direct violation of the Progressive platform adopted last fall?

Mr. LAFFERTY. No; it is in direct accord with the Progressive platform.

Mr. GORDON. Did not you promise to reduce the tariff?

Mr. LAFFERTY. Certainly.

Mr. GORDON. But you say unless they give us the same advantages.

Mr. LAFFERTY. That is always understood.

Mr. GORDON. Was that in your platform?

Mr. LAFFERTY. It was implied; as much so as that no man will permit another to assault him without hitting back.

Mr. GORDON. Why did you not put it in the platform?

Mr. MURDOCK. It is in the platform.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], but I repeat that it is not necessary to put into a platform that which is necessarily implied. I might say that I would not go out on the street and assault a man, but it would be implied in the statement that if he hit me first I would hit him back. No party with one eye and a grain of sense will ever give trade conditions to a neighboring country which are better than they are willing to give to us. [Applause.]

Mr. GORDON. The promise you made was contingent.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Not at all; I have fully answered that question.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the rule is that when a Member desires to interrupt another he must first address the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. RUBEY). The gentleman from Kansas is correct, and gentlemen who wish to interrupt must first address the Chair.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Party, however, can not be charged with being inconsistent in making a wholesale revision of the tariff without regard to exact information on the subject or in placing many agricultural products on the free list. The Democratic Party has expressly disclaimed that it has given a thought to the principle of protection in the preparation of the present bill. On the other hand, it affirmatively avers that it does not believe in protection, and that the only reason why it proposes to retain any import duties at all is to make up the deficit in our national revenues. The Democratic Party is unquestionably joined to its idol—free trade—and the issue having been now clearly drawn, the American people as a whole must either affirm or repudiate that doctrine at the election next year and at the general election in 1916. The experiences of the past leave little doubt that the verdict will be in favor of protection.

The Democratic Party is the very opposite of the Progressive Party and progressive Republicans. The Democratic leaders stand now where they have always stood, for free trade and bourbonism, while the Progressives and progressive Republicans stand for the protection of our home markets and for modern laws to control industrial combinations. [Applause.]

The continuation of the Democratic Party in power and the crystallization of its central idea of free trade into permanent law would be a stumbling block, if not a complete bar, to every measure for the uplift and advancement of America that the progressives of all parties favor. The Progressive Party and the progressive Republicans favor the placing of certain obligations upon the industries of this country in the interests of labor and in the interests of the consuming public which are not placed upon similar industries in foreign countries. Therefore, if we reserve to ourselves the right to regulate our industries by placing upon them obligations not borne by their competitors in the foreign commerce, it goes without saying that we should protect our home industries in a reasonable degree against foreign competition. The Democratic idea of free trade would mean the abandonment of the progressive measures that intelligent men and women of this country of all parties are demanding.

The Progressives and progressive Republicans propose to pass a law providing that no manufacturer in this country who employs child labor shall be permitted to engage in our interstate trade. They propose to pass a law providing that no American manufacturer engaged in our interstate trade shall employ females for less than a specified minimum wage, which shall be a living wage. They propose to exclude from our interstate commerce any corporation refusing to establish an eight-hour day for its employees. It must be clear to everyone that if these laws are to be enacted and enforced in the United States, thereby making this the best country in which to live of any in the world, that we must have a reasonable protective tariff and not free trade.

The Progressives and progressive Republicans favor the passage of a law creating an interstate trade commission, with power to regulate and control, in the interests of the consumer and in the interests of labor, all industrial corporations engaged in our interstate trade. By this law they propose to make it unlawful for any corporation engaged in interstate commerce to exact a price for any commodity which shall be unreasonable, or to resort to any practice, scheme, or device that shall be against public policy or dangerous to the public welfare or unfair to any competitor or employee, and they propose to give to the interstate trade commission full and plenary powers to carry this law into effect. They propose identically the same kind of control over industrial corporations, through an interstate trade commission, that is now had over carrier corporations through the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Dickering with the tariff question is but scratching the bark on the outside of the tree as compared with going to the heart of the question of the high cost of living as proposed by the Progressives and progressive Republicans through the law that I have here outlined. That there is need for such a statute is amply proved by the fact that all political parties profess to be in favor of a law which will "control big business."

Controlling monopolies or near-monopolies does not mean to make them be good and go to Sunday school. It means for the Government, through some duly constituted tribunal, to have something to say about the prices they shall exact from the public. Big business resists with all the power that it can command any effort put forth by the people, through their Government, to bring it under just control. For example, it was nearly 30 years ago that the Interstate Commerce Commission was created with a view to having it exercise some control over the rates of common carriers.

The bill creating the commission provided that it should be unlawful for any interstate carrier to charge an unreasonable rate. And the commission was given power to decide when a rate was unreasonable, but the commission was given no power to substitute a reasonable rate for the one declared to be unreasonable, but the new rate was left to the carrier itself. Not until 1909 was the original interstate commerce act amended, giving to the commission the power to initiate rates, and even then the commission found itself unable to fix rates which would be fair to the public, because it had no means of ascertaining the physical valuations of the carriers.

The commission thereupon made three annual reports to Congress, praying that it be given the power to make a physical appraisement of the common carriers of this country, and only during the last session of the last Congress was such power conferred upon the commission, together with the necessary appropriation to make the appraisement. We may now expect that in the course of a year or two the Interstate Commerce

Commission, after 30 years of effort, will have gotten to the point where it can really protect the public from extortionate rates.

What the Progressive Party and the progressive Republicans propose to do is to give to an interstate trade commission the same powers over industrial corporations that the Interstate Commerce Commission is just now about to begin to exercise in fact over interstate carrier corporations. There is nothing radical about that.

The people of this country know what they want and they are overwhelmingly in favor of the interstate trade commission. They are overwhelmingly in favor of all of the other laws for the benefit of the average citizen proposed by the Progressive Party and the progressive Republicans. [Applause.] The people have already found that they can not expect relief from the old standpat leaders of the Republican Party. They are just now beginning to realize that the difference between the standpat Republican leaders, who have just gone out of power, and the standpat Democratic leaders, who have just come into power, is the difference between two peas in the same pod. The party representing the principles now advocated by the Progressive Party and the progressive Republicans is the party that I shall support in the future, no matter by what name it may be called.

Big business and the money power has been able for 50 years to defeat practically every effort that has been made by the American people to bring them under control of law. In so doing they have controlled the channels of news and actively participated in political conventions, and they have influenced legislatures and Congresses.

The tentacles of big business and the money power extend into every American city and State. The presidents, vice presidents, directors, and attorneys of their local street railroad, electric light, and telephone companies are among the influential men of every congressional district. These men, prior to the days of the direct primary, cut an important figure in congressional and legislative nominations. But few men have served in the American Congress who have not been flattered at home by the class of men to whom I have referred, if they were conservative and made no effort to secure legislation for the common people, or who have not been ridiculed and treated with contempt at home by the class of men to whom I have referred, and their newspapers, if they advocated legislation that would bring under control of law the money power and big business. How many times have we been told that any proposed law in the interest of the people will "hurt business"? That is he stock expression of those who are reaping extortionate profits in the absence of laws to protect the public.

I have not made the case of the people against big business and the money power as strong as the facts will fully justify. It would be impossible for any man of ordinary ability to do so. Let anyone who doubts this statement consider for a moment the present conditions in this country. The total wealth of the United States is $125,000,000,000. Fifty men own 40 per cent of this wealth. Two hundred thousand men own 70 per cent of this wealth, leaving only 30 per cent for the remaining 91,800,000 of our people, figuring that we have 92,000,000 people all told.

Such an astounding unequal distribution of wealth could not possibly have occurred under just laws. It is easy to see how the national wealth has all drifted into the hands of the money power when we look about us and observe conditions.

In every city is to be found the Bell telephone system, a street car system, an electric light system, a gas system, several express companies, and several trunk lines of railroad. But one may look about in vain to find any citizen of the average city who owns a dollar's worth of stock in any of these public-utility corporations. The stock is owned by the money power of New York, London, and a few other financial centers in this country and Europe. In nine cases out of ten these public-utility corporations are charging extortionate rates. At the end of the year the average laborer or small-salaried man has contributed about one-third of his earnings to these monopolies alone. The rest of his earnings have gone for food and clothing for himself and family and for the general necessities of his household. In purchasing the latter he has also come in contact in many instances with big business and the money power. He has paid tribute during the year to the American Sugar Refining Co., the United States Steel Corporation, the Standard Oil Co., and other industrial combinations controlling household necessities.

As an illustration of the astounding profits that big business is exacting from a gullible public let me give just one instance. A few years ago I went into the telegraph office in Portland to send a telegram of 97 words to Washington. The agent said it would be $6.50. I told him that I wanted to send it Government rate. He then said the charge would be $1.10, a difference of $5.40 on one little 97-word telegram, and it is certain the company was not handling the Government business at a loss.

The various State public-service commissions should at once make appraisements of local public-utility corporations and fix rates accordingly. As a result they would reduce telephone rentals at least one-half; electric-light, gas, and water charges about the same, where owned by private corporations; and street car charges would be reduced to 3 cents, and the companies would be compelled to furnish seats. Right here in Washington the two street car systems each charge 5-cent fares, refuse to give interchangeable transfers, and herd the population in the cars like sheep. As many as 50 people are frequently crowded in the aisles of the large cars and stand the entire distance of their ride. The officers of the companies have instructed the motorman and conductor, when the seats are full, to begin the herding process. They carry these orders out by driving the people forward in the car, men and women being indiscriminately crowded together, until the car will not hold another passenger. This sort of outrage would not be tolerated in any city in the United States outside of Washington, but as the people here can not vote they are not to be censured. The fare is too high everywhere. To make it convenient in all the cities of the United States to adopt the 3-cent fare, I have introduced the Bulkely bill to coin 3-cent pieces.

Unless our public-service commissions shall fix reasonable rates, then I shall favor Government ownership of public-utility monopolies; and I favor such ownership anyway in the case of telephones and telegraphs. The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. now owns every Bell telephone system in the United States, and it owns the Western Union Telegraph Co. It also owns the Western Electric Co., of Chicago, which manufactures all the switchboards and instruments, and in that way even controls and receives all the profits of the farmers' lines. If these facts that I am here stating can be disproved, I will resign from Congress. The American Telephone & Telegraph Co., in its own advertisements in financial journals in New York, boasts of owning all the Bell telephone systems in every city of the United States and the Western Union Telegraph Co. and the Western Electric Co. They charge for business phones about $8 a month, and I will warrant that no investigation into their cost and upkeep of plants would justify them in charging over $4 a month for business phones, and it would more probably be less than the latter figure. Residence phone rentals should likewise be cut in half at least.

I also favor a Government parcel express. This means of transportation at cost would form a conduit between the kitchen in the city and the farm in the country. A genuine parcel express would do more than any other one thing to reduce the high cost of living.

Mr. Chairman, we who favor progressive laws are frequently taunted with the question as to why the multimillionaire, George W. Perkins, is for the progressive laws if they would really control the money power. It is easy to answer that question. Every man of wealth ought to favor these progressive laws. In that way alone can prosperity, happiness, and peace for all be secured. In my speech in this House on August 21, 1911, I made this statement:

> If those who now enjoy the profits from large blocks of industrial and public-service corporation stocks want their children and their grandchildren to enjoy that same opportunity they will see the wisdom and the necessity of placing all industrial and public-service corporations upon a basis that is fair to the public. Otherwise Government ownership will come as surely as one day follows another. For that reason I stated in my campaign speeches that those who advocated Government control, as I do, were in reality the best friends of the owners of such stocks.

On August 17, 1912, in a speech on Boston Common, Col. Roosevelt was questioned by a man in the crowd who called out, "How about Perkins?"

"I am delighted to tell you about Mr. Perkins," the Colonel replied.

"Mr. Perkins is a rich man," he said. "He came into this movement not at my request but of his own initiative. I felt just the same curiosity that a man in the crowd who asked me about him felt. I said to him, 'Mr. Perkins, why are you supporting me?' Mr. Perkins flushed and said he did not know but that he ought to be offended; but I told him he should not be, and that I was both surprised and pleased to have his support.

"'The prime reason why I am with you,' he told me, 'is because I have children. I have come to the conclusion that this country won't be a good place for my children unless we have substantial justice; unless the relations between capital and labor are on a better basis. I wish to support any movement that will bring that about.'"

Even the late Postmaster General, a dyed-in-the-wool, old-line Republican, in his last two annual reports, advocated Government ownership of telegraphs, to be operated in connection with the Post Office Department, but Congress paid no attention to him. No Congress ever will give the public any substantial relief until the Progressives or genuine progressive Republicans prevail.

Under the system of permitting big business and the money power to go uncontrolled by law it is little wonder that they have acquired practically all of the wealth of the United States and that the average citizen finds himself unable, while paying unjust tribute to them, to get anything more out of life than the most meager living. No man can make me believe that under any fair system of laws in this country—a country having the greatest resources of any nation in the world—we would find any honest, sober, and industrious man working all of his life, 10 hours a day, for a bare living. But that is just the condition we do find in this country to-day. Under just laws no man or woman would be required to work more than 8 hours a day. Under just laws every able-bodied man who would work from the time he was 21 until age should entitle him to retire would be able to buy with his earnings a comfortable living for himself and family, to take a vacation of 30 to 60 days each year in the mountains or at the seashore, to educate his children, and to lay by an ample competency for his old age besides.

In conclusion, I desire to say that I was raised a conservative and am a conservative now. It is only the cold facts that I have tried to present in this discussion which might seem to make my remarks appear radical, if they do so appear. I was practically raised in a law office, and lawyers are, by their very nature, conservative. One of the first books I ever read was Blackstone's Commentaries, and one of the few things that I recall, outside of the fact that the author had a most remarkable vocabulary, is that he said that the object of the law is to protect the weak against the aggressions of the strong. If Sir William Blackstone were living to-day, and a citizen of the United States, he would be a Progressive, or a progressive Republican, which means the same thing. [Loud applause.]

Some of the progressive measures introduced in the Sixty-third Congress by Mr. LAFFERTY:

INTERSTATE TRADE COMMISSION.

A bill (H. R. 4384) to create an interstate trade commission.

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any person, company, corporation, or association engaged in commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, to hereafter employ in its business any child under 14 years of age, or to employ any female for less than $6 per week, or to work any employee longer than 8 hours in any one day or longer than 48 hours in any one week, except in case of an emergency or upon a permit from the interstate trade commission, which it is hereby authorized to issue temporarily upon a showing which in its opinion warrants such action: *Provided*, That employees engaged on railroad trains, steamboats, steamships, or other vessels or equipment of common carriers may be employed as long as 12 hours a day or as much as 72 hours a week, but such employees shall have at least 6 full days' rest each calendar month, and any person, company, corporation, or association violating any provision of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and for each separate offense shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not less than $50 nor more than $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 2. That every corporation engaged in commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, not subject to the provisions of the act approved February 4, 1887, entitled "An act to regulate commerce," and acts supplementary and amendatory thereof, and whose gross annual receipts or the total annual gross receipts of whose subsidiary companies for the calendar year 1911 were, or for any calendar year thereafter shall be, in excess of $5,000,000 shall be subject to the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. That every corporation subject to the provisions of this act, or that may hereafter become subject to the provisions of this act, is hereby declared to be a quasi public agency.

SEC. 4. That the price or prices at which any corporation subject to the provisions of this act shall sell or dispose of any article of merchandise, or any product whatsoever, shall be just, fair, and reasonable, and it shall be unlawful for any such corporation to sell or dispose of any article of merchandise, or any product whatsoever, at a price or at prices that are unjust, unfair, or unreasonable, and every corporation subject to the provisions of this act is hereby prohibited from so doing.

SEC. 5. That every practice, method, means, system, policy, device, scheme, or contrivance used by any corporation subject to the provisions of this act in conducting its business, or in the management, control, regulation, promotion or extension thereof, shall be just, fair, and reasonable and not contrary to public policy or dangerous to the public welfare, and every corporation subject to the provisions of this act in the conduct of its business is hereby prohibited from engaging in any practice, or from using any means, method, or system, or from pursuing any policy, or from resorting to any device, scheme, or contrivance whatsoever that is unjust, unfair, or unreasonable, or that is contrary to public policy or dangerous to the public welfare, and every act or thing in this section prohibited is hereby declared to be unlawful.

SEC. 6. That every corporation subject to the provisions of this act shall deal justly and fairly with competitors and the public, and it shall be unlawful for any such corporation to grant to any person or persons any special privilege or advantage which shall be unjust and unfair to others, or unjustly and unreasonably discriminatory against others, or to enter into any special contract, agreement, or arrangement with any person or persons which shall be unjustly and unreasonably discriminatory against others, or which shall give to such person or persons an unfair and unjust advantage over others, or that shall give to the people of any locality or section of the country any unfair, unjust, or unreasonable advantage over the people of any other locality or section of the country, or that shall be contrary to public policy or dangerous to the public welfare, and any and all the acts or things in this section declared to be unlawful are hereby prohibited.

SEC. 7. That whenever, after full hearing upon a complaint made to the commission hereinafter created, or after full hearing under an order for investigation and hearing made by the said commission on its own initiative, the commission shall be of opinion that any price or prices whatsoever demanded, charged, or collected by any corporation subject to the provisions of this act for any article of merchandise or product, or that any practice, method, means, system, policy, device, scheme, or contrivance used by any such corporation in conducting its business, or in the management, control, regulation, promotion, or extension thereof, is unjust or unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory, or unduly preferential or prejudicial or contrary to public policy or dangerous to the public welfare, or otherwise in violation of any of the provisions of this act, the commission is hereby authorized and empowered to determine and prescribe what shall be a just, fair, and reasonable price to be charged for such article of merchandise or product, to be thereafter observed in such case as the maximum to be charged until further order of the commission, and to determine and prescribe what practice, method, means, or system, policy, device, scheme, or contrivance is just, fair, and reasonable, and not contrary to public policy or dangerous to the public welfare, to be thereafter followed, and to make an order that such corporation shall cease and desist from such violation to the extent to which the commission finds the same to exist, and such corporation shall not thereafter charge or collect or accept for such article of merchandise or product a price in excess of the maximum price so prescribed, and shall adopt, conform to, and observe the practice, method, means, policy, and system so prescribed, and cease to use any device, scheme, or contrivance prohibited by the order of the commission.

All orders of the said commission, except orders for the payment of money, shall take effect within such reasonable time, not less than 30 days, and shall continue in force for such period of time, not exceeding 2 years, as shall be prescribed in the order of the commission, unless the same shall be suspended or modified or set aside by the commission, or be suspended or set aside by a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 8. That a commission is hereby created and established, to be known as the Interstate Trade Commission, which shall be composed of seven commissioners, and the said Interstate Trade Commission is referred to hereinafter as "the commission."

SEC. 9. That on the taking effect of this act the Bureau of Corporations shall cease to exist and shall be merged into and become a part of the commission, and the person who at that time shall be the Commissioner of Corporations shall become a member of the commission and continue as such for a period of two years, and said person shall also for a period of one year be the chairman of the commission, at the expiration of which time, and annually thereafter, the commission shall elect a chairman; and the Deputy Commissioner of Corporations shall become one of said commission, and shall hold his office for a period of one year. The commission shall appoint a secretary of the commission, who shall hold his office at the pleasure of the commission, and all the clerks and employees in the Bureau of Corporations shall become clerks and employees of the commission, and all the duties and powers of the Bureau of Corporations are hereby transferred to, granted, and bestowed upon the commission, and any funds belonging to said Bureau of Corporations which by law are authorized to be expended by said bureau are hereby transferred to the commission, which is hereby authorized and empowered to expend the same.

SEC. 10. That the commission shall consist of seven members, not more than four of whom shall be of the same political party. Except as hereinbefore provided, the members of the commission shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the first appointees shall hold their positions for periods of three, four, five, six, and seven years, respectively; and in making such appointments the President shall designate the length of terms of such appointees, and thereafter the members of said commission shall be appointed for a term of seven years. The members of the commission shall each receive a salary of $7,500 per annum, and the secretary of the commission shall receive a salary of $5,000 per annum. In case of vacancy the appointment shall be for the unexpired term of the member whose retirement from the commission caused the vacancy.

Any commissioner may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. No person in the employ of or holding any official relation to any corporation subject to the provisions of this act, or owning stocks or bonds thereof, or who is in any manner pecuniarily interested therein, shall enter upon the duties of or hold such office. Said commissioner shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

No vacancy in the commission shall impair the right of the remaining commissioners to exercise all the powers of the commission.

The commission is hereby authorized and empowered to make and establish rules and regulations not in conflict with the Constitution and laws of the United States to aid in the administration and enforcement of the provisions of this act, and may, by such rules and regulations, prohibit any particular or specific act or acts, practice, method, system, policy, device, scheme, or contrivance that is contrary to any of the provisions of this act.

That the decisions of the commission shall be final as to the facts, and in all cases of appeal from any decision of the commission the court shall have jurisdiction to pass only upon questions of law and to determine whether or not the commission acted within the scope of its authority, or whether or not the decision in effect confiscates property or takes the same without due process of law.

SEC. 11. That in case any corporation subject to the provisions of this act shall do, cause to be done, or permit to be done, any act, matter, or thing in this act prohibited or declared to be unlawful, or shall omit to do any act, matter, or thing in this act required to be done, such corporation shall be liable to the person or persons injured thereby for double the amount of damages sustained in consequence of any such violation of the provisions of this act, together with a reasonable counsel or attorney's fee, to be fixed by the court in every case of recovery, which attorney's fee should be taxed and collected as a part of the costs in the case.

SEC. 12. That any person or persons claiming to be damaged by any corporation subject to the provisions of this act may either make complaint to the commission, as provided in this act, or may bring suit in his or their own behalf for the recovery of the damages for which such corporation shall be liable under the provisions of this act in the Commerce Court; but such person or persons shall not have the right to pursue both of said remedies, and must in each case elect which one of the two methods of procedure herein provided for he or they will adopt.

In any such action brought for the recovery of damages the court before which the same shall be pending may compel any director, officer, receiver, trustee, or agent of such corporation defendant in such suit to attend, appear, and testify in such case, and may compel the production of the books and papers of such corporation. The claim that any such testimony or evidence may tend to criminate the person giving such evidence shall not excuse such witness from testifying, but such evidence or testimony shall not be used against such person on the trial of any criminal proceeding.

SEC. 13. That any corporation subject to the provisions of this act, or any director or officer thereof, or any receiver, trustee, lessee, agent, or person acting for or employed by such corporation, who, alone or with any other corporation, company, person, or party, shall willfully do or cause to be done, or shall willingly suffer or permit to be done, any act, matter, or thing in this act prohibited or declared to be unlawful, or shall aid or abet therein, or shall willfully omit or fail to do any act, matter, or thing in this act required to be done, or shall cause or willingly suffer or permit any act, matter, or thing so directed or required by this act to be done not to be so done, or shall aid or abet therein, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, upon conviction thereof in any court of the United States, be subject to a fine not to exceed $5,000 for each offense, and, in the discretion of the court, may be imprisoned in the penitentiary for a term not exceeding two years.

SEC. 14. That the commission hereby created shall have authority to inquire into the management of any corporation subject to the provisions of this act, and shall keep itself informed as to the manner and method in which the same is conducted, and shall have the right to obtain from such corporation full and complete information necessary to enable the commission to perform the duties and carry out the object for which it was created; and the commission is hereby authorized and required to execute and enforce the provisions of this act.

And upon the request of the commission it shall be the duty of any district attorney of the United States to whom the commission may apply to institute in the proper court and prosecute under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States all necessary proceedings for the enforcement of the provisions of this act, and for the punishment of all violations thereof, and the costs and expenses of such prosecutions shall be paid out of the appropriation for the expenses of the courts of the United States.

SEC. 15. That any person, firm, corporation, company, or association, or any mercantile, agricultural, or manufacturing society or other organization, or any body politic or municipal corporation, complaining of any act done or omitted to be done by any corporation subject to the provisions of this act, in contravention of the provisions of this act, may apply to the commission by petition, which shall briefly state the facts; whereupon a statement of the complaint thus made shall be forwarded by the commission to such corporation, who shall be called upon to satisfy the complaint, or to answer the same in writing, within a reasonable time, to be specified by the commission. If such corporation, within the time specified, shall make reparation for the injury alleged to have been done, it shall be relieved of liability to the complainant only for the particular violation of the law thus complained of. If such corporation shall not satisfy the complaint within the time specified, or there shall appear to be any reasonable ground for investigating said complaint, it shall be the duty of the commission to investigate the matter complained of in such a manner and by such means as it shall deem proper.

The commission shall have full authority and power at any time to institute an inquiry, on its own motion, in any case and as to any matter or thing concerning which a complaint is authorized to be made, to or before said commission by any provision of this act, or concerning which any question may arise under any of the provisions of this act or relating to the enforcement of any of the provisions of this act. And the said commission shall have the same power and authority to proceed with any inquiry instituted on its own motion as though it had been appealed to by complaint or petition under any of the provisions of this act, including the power to make and enforce any order or orders in the case, or relating to the matter or thing concerning which the inquiry is had, excepting orders for the payment of money. No complaint shall at any time be dismissed because of the absence of direct damage to the complainant.

SEC. 16. That the commission is hereby given authority on its own initiative to institute and conduct an investigation to determine whether or not any corporation subject to the provisions of this act was organized in violation of the provisions of the act approved July 2, 1890, entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," or is doing business in violation of the provisions of said act; and if, after investigation, the commission shall conclude that any such corporation was organized in violation of the provisions of said act, or is doing business in violation of the provisions of said act, the commission may issue an order citing such corporation to appear and answer to the charge in such matter; and if on final hearing the commission shall find that such corporation was organized in violation of the provisions of said act, it shall make an order providing for the dissolution of such corporation; and if the commission shall find that any such corporation is doing business in violation of any of the provisions of said act, it shall make such order or orders as will prevent the further violation of said act on the part of such corporation; and thereafter such corporation so found to have been organized in violation of the provisions of said act, or so found to be doing business in violation of said act, shall cease to engage in interstate commerce except upon such terms and conditions as shall be prescribed by the commission.

SEC. 17. That the following sections and provisions hereinafter mentioned, in so far as they are applicable and are not in conflict with the provisions of this act, are hereby extended to and put in force in all matters relating to or pertaining to the commission herein created and to every corporation subject to the provisions of this act; and the power, authority, and duties conferred by the sections and provisions hereinafter mentioned upon the Interstate Commerce Commission, so far as the same are applicable, are hereby conferred upon the commission created by this act; and the duties, liabilities, and rights conferred upon common carriers by such sections and provisions are hereby conferred upon every corporation subject to the provisions of this act; and the rights, privileges, and liabilities conferred upon any person or persons, firm, corporation, association, or locality by such sections and provisions are hereby conferred upon any such person or persons, firm, corporation, association, or locality, namely, sections 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 of the act approved February 4, 1887, entitled "An act to regulate commerce," as amended, and sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the act approved June 18, 1910, entitled 'An act to create a Commerce Court, and to amend the act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, as heretofore amended, and for other purposes."

SEC. 18. That this act shall take effect and be in force 60 days after its passage.

THREE-CENT PIECES.

A bill (H. R. 4356) to authorize the coinage of 3-cent pieces, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That as soon as practicable after the passage of this act there shall be coined at the mints of the United States a 3-cent piece of the standard weight of 60 troy grains, with no greater deviation from the standard weight than 2 grains each piece, and said coin shall be composed of 75 per cent copper and 25 per cent nickel. The diameter and the devices of said coin shall be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided, however*, That upon one side there shall be an inscription of the word "Liberty" and the year of the coinage, and upon the reverse there shall be an inscription of the words "United States of America" and a designation of the value of the coin. Said 3-cent piece shall be a legal tender in any payment to the amount of 30 cents.

SEC. 2. That all laws now in force relating to the minor coins of the United States and the striking or coining of the same, regulating and guarding the process of coinage, providing for the purchase of material and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of the coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for the security of the coin, or for any other purpose, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized.

SEC. 3. That from and after the passage of this act all 1-cent pieces coined at the mints of the United States shall be of the standard weight of 48 troy grains, with no greater deviation from the standard weight than 2 grains each piece, and shall be composed of 75 per cent copper and 25 per cent nickel.

SEC. 4. That all acts or parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY.

A bill (H. R. 2980) to establish a primary election for the nomination of candidates for President and Vice President.

Be it enacted, etc., That every nomination of a candidate or candidates for the offices of President or Vice President of the United States made by any political party, as hereinafter defined, shall be made in and by a primary election to be held in the several States at the time and in the manner herein provided; and it shall be unlawful for any person to be a member of or participate in the proceedings of any caucus, convention, or meeting of such political party called or held for the purpose of nominating any such candidates, or looking toward such nomination, in any method or manner except by and through the primary election established by this act.

SEC. 2. That any political organization which, at the presidential election last preceding the time herein fixed for any primary election hereby established, nominated candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States, and which cast in the aggregate in all the States 5 per cent of all the votes cast for President of the United States at the last preceding presidential election, reckoning the votes for opposing electoral tickets in the several States as votes cast for President, shall be deemed a political party for the purposes of this act; and any political organization, whether it has heretofore nominated candidates or not, which at the first primary election held hereunder proposes candidates for said offices in the manner herein prescribed, to be voted for at the first primary election or any succeeding election, whose candidates for President and Vice President of the United States receive the aforementioned percentage of votes cast shall be thereafter held to be a political party within the meaning of the act.

SEC. 3. That every person qualified under the laws of the State of which he is or shall be a citizen to vote for a governor or a Member of the House of Representatives in Congress at the election for said offices last preceding any primary election held under this act shall be a qualified voter at such primary election upon complying with the provisions hereof.

SEC. 4. That the primary election herein established shall be held in all the States and at each polling place in all the States on the second Monday of July, 1916, and upon the second Monday of July of every four years thereafter.

SEC. 5. That in those States in which by the law candidates for governor or for Members of the House of Representatives in Congress are nominated in and by a primary election, the two primaries may be held simultaneously by the same judges and clerks; otherwise the judges and clerks of the primary election for the nomination of candiadtes for governor or Members of the House of Representatives in Congress last preceding shall be the judges and clerks of the primary election held under this act. Vacancies caused by death, failure to appear, or refusal to act shall be filled by the judge or the judges appearing. Before entering upon their respective duties each of them shall take an oath of office which shall be substantially in the following form, to wit:

STATE OF ———, COUNTY OF ———, *ss:*

I, ———, do solemnly swear that I will faithfully perform the duties of a —— of the primary election for the nomination of candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, now about to be held.

——— ———.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this — day of ——, —.

——— ———.

In those States in which neither candidates for governor nor for Members of the House of Representatives in Congress are by law nominated in and by a primary election the judges and clerks of the last preceding general State election or national election for Representatives in Congress shall be the judges and clerks of the primary election held under this act. Vacancies caused by death, failure to appear, or refusal to act shall be filled by the judge or judges appearing. Before entering upon their respective duties each of them shall take an oath of office, which shall be substantially in the form heretofore prescribed.

For their services in holding each primary election herein provided for, and in making the returns herein required, each judge and each clerk shall receive the sum of $5, to be paid by the United States as hereinafter prescribed.

In the States having laws for primary elections, as aforesaid, the primary elections herein established shall be held according to the laws of the several States, in so far as they are practicable and not inconsistent with this act; that is to say, as to the polling places, the time of opening and closing the polls, the method of determining party

affiliations, if any, the manner of entering the names of voters upon the lists, and generally all things which go to the right of the voter to cast his ballot and to the manner of voting. The form of ballot throughout the United States shall be uniform, and is herein specifically set forth.

In the States having no laws for primary elections, as aforesaid, the following procedure shall be observed, namely: The polling places shall be the same or substantially the same as the polling places at the last preceding general State election or national election for Members of the House of Representatives in Congress. The polls shall open at 8 o'clock a. m. and close at 7 o'clock p. m. The judges at each polling place shall be provided with a list of the qualified voters of the polling precinct or district taken from the latest registration list or from the record of the last preceding general State election or national election for Members of the House of Representatives in Congress, at the discretion of the State board, and those persons so listed, and no others, shall be permitted to vote unless, where the polling list of the preceding election is used, it is made to appear to the judges under oath, first, that the proposed voter had become a resident of the precinct or district since the said last preceding election, and had cast his vote at said election in some other precinct or district of the United States, or had since the last election become of lawful age; or, second, that having been a qualified voter of the precinct at the said last preceding election was, by reason of temporary absence from the precinct or district on election day, or by reason of illness, unable to cast his vote at such election.

No canvassing or electioneering for or against any candidate shall be carried on within 100 feet of the polling place while the primary election is in progress. The clerk or clerks of the election shall, as the votes are cast, write the name and address of each voter, which list, having been certified by the judges, shall be returned to the State canvassing board hereinafter provided for with the returns of the election.

SEC. 6. That the ballot to be used in all the States and at all polling places shall be printed on plain white paper, and shall be in substantially the following form:

(Name printed in) Party.	(Name printed in) Party.	Independent of party.
For President of the United States.	For President of the United States.	For President of the United States.
☐ (Name printed in.)	☐ (Name printed in.)	☐ (Blank.)
☐ (Name printed in.)	☐ (Name printed in.)	☐ (Blank.)
☐ (Blank.)	☐ (Blank.)	
For Vice President of the United States.	For Vice President of the United States.	For Vice President of the United States.
☐ (Name printed in.)	☐ (Name printed in.)	☐ (Blank.)
☐ (Name printed in.)	☐ (Name printed in.)	☐ (Blank.)
☐ (Blank.)	☐ (Blank.)	

The columns for party candidates shall be as numerous as may be required, and there shall be one column without names of proposed candidates denominated, as aforesaid, "Independent of party." In the lines in the party columns shall be printed the names of proposed party candidates for President, Vice President, and at the left of each line a square, as shown, and the voter's choice shall be made known by crossing the square thus ☒.

In each party column there shall be a sufficient number of lines left blank, so that each elector shall have the opportunity to vote for his preference as the candidate of his party, even though the name of his preference is not printed on the ballot.

No voter shall vote in more than one column, and if he does the entire vote shall be rejected. A vote for two persons for President or Vice President shall also be rejected.

SEC. 7. That there is hereby established a national canvassing board for primary elections and for the distribution of both primary and final election publicity pamphlets, to be known hereafter in this act as the national board. It shall be composed of five persons, each of whom shall receive for his compensation, to be paid by the United States for his services in connection with each primary and final election, the sum of $3,000, and each of whom shall serve for four years and until his successor is appointed. The members of said board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, upon the nomination of the chairmen of the several national political committees, so that, in so far as it is possible, there shall be upon said board a member affiliated with each of the political parties as herein defined.

There is also established a State canvassing and returning board for primary elections and for the distribution of both primary and final election publicity pamphlets in each State. The said several boards shall be composed of three persons, each of whom shall receive for his compensation, to be paid by the United States for his services in connection with each primary or final election, the sum of $250, and each of whom shall serve for four years and until his successor is appointed. The members of said boards shall be residents of the State wherein they are to serve and shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, upon the nomination of the chairmen of the several national political committees, each of said chairmen having the right to name one person for each of said boards, so that, in so far as possible, there shall be upon each of said boards a member affiliated with each of the political parties as herein defined. The powers and duties of each of said boards are hereinafter prescribed.

SEC. 8. That no candidate for nomination as a candidate of any such political party for the offices of President and Vice President shall have his name printed upon the official primary ballot of his party unless at least 45 days prior to the date fixed for holding the primary election a nomination paper shall have been filed in his behalf with said national board. All nomination papers shall be in substantially the following form:

"I, the undersigned, a qualified elector of ——— County, and State of ———, and a member of the ——— Party, hereby nominate ———, of ——— County, State of ———, who is affiliated with and is a member of the ——— Party, as a candidate for the office of ———, to be voted for at the primary election to be held on the second Monday of July, 19—."

The said nomination paper shall consist of sheets with the above heading, of uniform size, about 8½ by 13 inches. No signatures shall be counted unless they are on sheets each having such form written or printed at the top thereof. No signer of a nomination paper shall sign more than one such nomination paper for the same office, and only one candidate shall be petitioned for or nominated in the same nomination paper. Each signer of a nomination paper shall add his residence, with street and number, if any, and the date of signing.

For all nominations for President and Vice President all signers of each separate part of a nomination paper shall reside in the same State. The nomination paper when filed shall not be withdrawn nor added to nor any signature thereon revoked or recalled. The affidavit or affidavits of a qualified elector or electors shall be appended to each such nomination paper, stating that he is personally acquainted with all or certain of the persons who have signed the same; that he knows them to be electors of the State or county, as the case may be, and believes them to be affiliated with the party named therein; that he knows that they signed the same with full knowledge of the contents thereof; that their respective residences are truly stated therein; and that each signer signed the same on the date set opposite his name; but such affidavit shall not be made by a candidate for nomination. If there be more than one such affidavit, they must, taken together, include all the signers of the nomination paper.

The nomination papers above described and required shall be signed as follows:

If for the office of President or Vice President of the United States, by at least one-half of 1 per cent of the voters of the party (as shown by the returns of the last general election) in each of at least five States, and in the aggregate not less than one-fourth of 1 per cent of the total vote of his party as shown by the returns of the last general election in the United States.

The vote to be taken for the purpose of computing the percentage shall be the vote cast for the head of the ticket.

The said national board shall cause to be printed and keep on hand a sufficient quantity of nomination paper blanks, in form as provided for in this act, and shall furnish the same on application to any qualified elector desiring to petition for the nomination of any candidate, or to any person who intends to be a candidate for the office of President or Vice President. Any such nomination papers or parts thereof may be sent either directly to the said national board or to the State board of the State from which they come, and by the State board transmitted to the said national board.

SEC. 9. That said national board shall cause to be prepared and printed as public documents both a primary election publicity pamphlet and a final election publicity pamphlet, which pamphlet shall, at Government expense, be mailed to each registered voter as provided in this section. At least 30 days prior to any primary or final election each State board shall notify the national board as to the number of such pamphlets that, in their opinion, will be required to supply each registered voter in their several States. At least 20 days prior to any primary or final election the national board shall send in bulk to the various State boards the number of such pamphlets so required, which pamphlets shall be inclosed in sealed manila envelopes and bear the Government frank. Each State board shall cause one of such pamphlets to be mailed to each registered voter at least 10 days prior to any such primary or final election. Such publicity pamplets shall contain only the statements and arguments of the several candidates for President and Vice President, or for nomination to those offices, which statements may include portrait cuts of the candidates, each candidate for President or for nomination for President being limited to eight pages, and each candidate for Vice President or for nomination for Vice President being limited to four pages. Copy for such pamphlets shall be filed with the national board by the respective candidates at least 30 days prior to any such primary or final election, and if the same contains any reflection upon the honor, integrity, or character of any other candidate proof shall be submitted that a certified copy thereof in full was served upon such other candidate at least 40 days prior to such primary or final election, in default of which such matter shall be expunged from the statement of any candidate by said national board. Each candidate shall pay for space in the primary election publicity pamphlet at the rate of $1,000 per page, or fraction thereof, to be covered into the Treasury of the United States by said national board. No charge shall be made for space in the final election publicity pamphlet.

SEC. 10. That at least 30 days before any such primary election the said National Board shall transmit to each State board a certified list showing the name and post-office address of each person for whom a nomination paper sufficiently signed has been filed in its office for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States, and at the same time shall transmit to the said board a sufficient number of printed ballots for use at the primary election in that State. The primary ballots shall be substantially in the form hereinbefore prescribed, and shall have printed upon them in proper columns the names of all the persons for whom sufficient nomination papers have been filed for President and Vice President. The names of candidates proposed for nomination for President and Vice President shall be so arranged that the name of each of the proposed candidates shall be first upon a substantially equal number of ballots.

SEC. 11. That each State board shall, immediately after receiving the ballots from the National Board, notify by written or printed letter each of the judges and clerks of election who are to act under the provisions hereof of their duties as herein prescribed, and shall put in the possession of the judges, or one of them, at each polling place a sufficient number of ballots for use at that polling place, and shall also take the necessary steps to supply said judges with any lists of voters that may be required by the laws of the State or by the provisions of this act, and shall further provide all supplies that may be necessary to enable the said judges and clerks to perform all the duties which the law of the State or this act imposes upon them, and it shall see that an arrangement is made for a suitable place in which to hold the election, the expense thereof to be paid by the United States as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 12. That upon the closing of the polls the judges and clerks shall immediately open the ballot box and take therefrom the ballots and count the votes cast for each proposed candidate for nomination for the offices hereinbefore mentioned, and after the votes are so counted the result of the canvass shall be certified upon a blank furnished for that purpose, upon which shall be shown the number of votes cast for each proposed candidate and the political party which proposes him, the names voted for in party columns not proposed through nominating papers, with the number cast for each, and also the number of votes cast for each person as a candidate independent of party. The certificate shall be signed by the judges and clerks and placed in an envelope, and the certificate so inclosed, with all the ballots and the tally sheets used at the polling place, shall be put in another envelope and returned, within 24 hours after the election has closed, to the said State board; and if the returns from any polling place be not received by the said State board three days before the time hereinafter fixed for the State canvass, the said State board shall forthwith send a messenger for any missing returns, the expense thereof to be paid as expenses for the said election.

SEC. 13. That on the second Wednesday following the primary election the said State board shall meet at the seat of government of the State and open and canvass the returns from each polling place in the State, and make abstract thereof, stating in words written at length the number of ballots cast in the State by each political party for each office; and also the number of votes cast for candidates independent of party,

the name of each person voted for, and the number of votes given to each person for each different office, and shall sign and certify thereto; and within 24 hours after the said canvass is completed transmit the same to the National Board at the seat of government of the United States. The State board in making its canvass shall canvass only the certified returns made by the several judges and clerks of election, but if any candidate whose name appears upon the primary ballot shall file with said State board a statement under oath that fraud was committed or error or mistake made in counting or returning the votes cast at any polling place, as to the office for which he was a candidate, in such specific terms that it furnishes reasonable ground to believe that a recount of the ballots would produce a different result as to his candidacy, the said State board shall thereupon recount the ballots cast at any such polling place for the office for which the contestant was a candidate, and if the result reached by the board on the recount of the ballots as to such office be different from that returned by the judges and clerks of said election, it shall be substituted therefor as the true and correct return and so regarded in all subsequent proceedings. The action of the board shall be final, and no other contest of any kind shall be permitted.

SEC. 14. That on the first Monday of August following any such primary election the National Board shall meet as a canvassing board and open and canvass the returns received from the State boards of the several States. If returns are not received from all the States, the board shall immediately send a messenger after the said returns, and the board may adjourn from day to day until they are received. The National Board shall make an abstract of its canvass, stating in words written at length the number of ballots cast by each political party separately for each office for which candidates are to be nominated under this act, the names of all the persons voted for, and the number of votes received by each person for each office, and shall sign and certify thereto. Any candidate receiving a plurality of the votes cast by his party, or independent of party, in any State shall be credited by said National Board with a number of votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which such State may be entitled, and any candidate so receiving a plurality of the votes of all the States shall be duly and legally named as the nominee of his party, or as a nominee independent of party, as the case may be, for the office for which he is a candidate, and shall be entitled to have his name printed on the official ballots to be voted at the general election whenever the laws of the several States provide for the printing of such name or names when nominated by a party convention, as has heretofore been the practice, or when the laws of any State shall hereafter provide for the printing of such name or names upon the official ballots at the general election. In any case of a tie vote between the candidates having the highest number of popular votes in any State for any office each shall be credited with an equal proportion of the vote of that State upon the basis herein named, and in any case of a tie as to the final result before the National Board, said board shall award the nomination to the candidate who received the largest popular vote.

The said National Board shall prepare and certify a list of the candidates for President and Vice President so named by each party separately, and shall deliver the same to the national party committee, and the said nomination shall thereafter be dealt with in the same manner as though the same had been made by party convention, as heretofore.

All subsequent proceedings which relate to the placing of the names of candidates for President and Vice President and for electors of President and Vice President upon the ballots for the general election in November shall be taken in the same manner and with the same effect as they have heretofore been taken when nominations for such offices were made by convention or through any other method.

SEC. 15. That when the said canvass by the national board is concluded and the certificates aforesaid made the board shall deliver the original abstract of all the returns to the Secretary of State, who shall file and preserve the same.

SEC. 16. That vacancies occurring in nominations made in any such primary election may be filled in any manner determined upon by the national party committee, and when so filled shall have the same force and effect as though made at a primary election.

SEC. 17. That nothing contained in this act shall be construed so as to prevent any voter from voting for whomsoever he may desire at any such primary election, but no person nominated independent of party shall be permitted to use the name of any political party authorized or entitled under this act to nominate candidates for such offices by primary vote.

SEC. 18. That any public officer upon whom a duty is imposed by this act who shall willfully neglect to perform any such duty, or who shall willfully perform it in such a way as to hinder the objects thereof, or shall disclose to anyone, except as may be ordered in a court of justice or as provided herein, the contents of any ballot or any part thereof as to the manner in which the same may have been voted, shall be punished by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000, or by imprisonment in the penitentiary not to exceed five years, or by both said fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 19. That any person who shall agree to perform any service in the interest of a candidate in consideration of any money or other valuable thing, or who shall accept any money or other valuable thing for such service performed in the interest of any candidate, or any person paying or offering to pay or giving or offering to give money or other valuable thing for such service, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500, or by imprisonment in the penitentiary not exceeding one year. But nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit any candidate from making contracts in good faith for the employment of one private secretary and two stenographers and for the announcement of his candidacy in the newspapers and for securing the names of voters required to file preliminary nomination papers and the payment of any reasonable compensation for such service: *Provided*, That no candidate for any primary nomination for the office of President shall spend or incur obligations, all told, in furtherance of his candidacy, in excess of $25,000. Nor shall any such candidate for Vice President spend or incur obligations, all told, in furtherance of his candidacy, in excess of $10,000. And any money spent or obligations incurred by others in furtherance of the interests of any such candidate with his knowledge and consent shall be deemed an expenditure made or obligation incurred by the candidate himself. Conviction under this section shall work a forfeiture of office and disqualification to hold any office of trust or profit under the laws of the United States.

SEC. 20. That any person offering or giving a bribe, either in money or other consideration, to any elector for the purpose of influencing his vote at a primary election, or any elector entitled to vote at such primary election receiving and accepting such bribe; any person making false answer under any of the provisions of this act relative to his qualifications and party affiliations; any person voting or offering to vote at a primary election who is not a qualified voter or not a qualified elector of the precinct where he offers to vote; or any person violating any of the provisions of this act; and any person knowingly procuring, aiding, or abetting such violation shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be fined not less than $100 nor more than $500, or be imprisoned not less than 30 days nor more than 1 year.

DIRECT ELECTION OF FEDERAL JUDGES.

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 26) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States making the Federal judiciary elective and subject to recall.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That in lieu of section 1 of Article III of the Constitution of the United States the following section be proposed as an amendment to said Constitution, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:

"ARTICLE III.

"SECTION 1. The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The judges, both of the supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices for a term of 12 years each and shall at stated times receive for their services a compensation which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office. Successors to all judges now in office, both of the supreme and inferior courts, shall be elected at the first general election at which presidential electors shall be chosen after the adoption of this amendment: *Provided*, That the Congress may by law prescribe that successors to only one-third of the membership of the Supreme Court shall be elected every four years until successors to the entire membership of said court shall be elected. The terms of all judges now in office, both of the supreme and inferior courts, shall expire and terminate on the first Monday in January following the election of their successors. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, may appoint judges, either of the supreme or inferior courts, to fill temporary vacancies. All judges, both of the supreme and inferior courts, shall be subject to recall at any general election at which presidential electors shall be chosen."

MAKING PRESS ASSOCIATIONS COMMON CARRIERS.

A bill (H. R. 1691) to regulate press associations engaged in interstate commerce.

Be it enacted, etc., That all persons, companies, corporations, associations, or cooperative concerns engaged in the transmission of news by letter, telegraph, telephone, or otherwise between the several States, or between any State or Territory and any foreign nation, or between any State and any Territory, or within any Territory, for hire or for any consideration or thing of value whatsoever, intending that the news so transmitted shall be printed in any newspaper, are hereby declared to be common carriers and hereby made subject to all the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended.

PROVIDING EASIER METHODS OF AMENDING CONSTITUTION.

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 60) submitting amendment in relation to amendments.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That in lieu of Article V of the Constitution of the United States, the following article be proposed as an amendment to said Constitution, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:

"ARTICLE V.

"The Congress, whenever a majority of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or on the application of the legislatures of a majority of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of this Constitution when ratified by two-thirds of the several States, either through their legislatures or by a majority of the qualified electors, under the laws of the said several States, voting upon said proposition under the referendum: *Provided*, That no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

[From the Congressional Directory, April, 1913.]

WALTER LAFFERTY, Progressive Republican, of Portland, at present supporting the platform and organization in Congress of the Progressive Party because in his judgment it comes much nearer to representing the sentiments and aspirations of the rank and file of the Republican Party than does the platform enunciated by the last so-called Republican national convention, is the fifth of a family of eight children, having four sisters, Ora, Gussie, Rosa, and Roxa, and three brothers, Luther, Albert, and Rolla, all of whom and both parents, Abraham M. and Helen (Kinney) Lafferty, are living, parts of the family now residing in each of the States of Missouri, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon; was raised in Pike County, Mo., on a farm, in which county his parents and all brothers and sisters were born, but was himself born on a farm near Farber, Audrain County, where his parents resided briefly; full name is ABRAHAM WALTER LAFFERTY, but has always been called Walter, and signs his name A. W. LAFFERTY; his father served in the Union Army, as did also his grandfather, George W. Kinney, who was born in Ohio; his mother's first cousin, Maj. Luther H. Cowan, Forty-fifth Illinois Infantry, was killed in battle before Vicksburg, May 22, 1863; both grandfathers served in Indian wars, his paternal grandfather being Lawson Lafferty, of North Carolina; his brother Rolla served in the provisional volunteers in the Philippines, enlisting when he was 17 and coming out with the rank of corporal; maternal grandmother was Mary Ann Gunn, of North Carolina, and his paternal grandmother was Hester Ann Martin, of Kentucky; his great grandmother Kinney was Eleanor Pierce; began studying law on the farm in Pike County; attended law department of the State university year 1895–96, and three years later received the degree LL. B. from that institution; was admitted to the bar of the Supreme Court of Missouri on examination June 5, 1896, five days before he was 21, and practiced law at Montgomery until December, 1904, during which time he served three years with the rank of captain in the Missouri National Guard and one term as prosecuting attorney; December, 1904, was appointed special agent of the General Land Office, and after brief preliminary instruction at Washington, D. C., was sent to Oregon, arriving at Portland March 20, 1905, where he has since resided; as special agent he took up the cause of the homesteaders, reporting that it was not the settler who was robbing the Government but the railroad companies and scrip applicants, and recommending more liberal treatment to settlers; resigned

as special agent October 1, 1906, and reentered the private practice of law; as prosecuting attorney in Missouri he secured the first convictions ever had in that State for the offense of communicating quotations by wire for the purpose of gambling in grain, stocks, and provisions, putting more money in the treasury in fines than his salary amounted to, and under a law which had remained unenforced upon the statute books of that State for 40 years; in Oregon his principal case has been the prosecution which he started in 1907 against the Oregon & California Railroad Co., being the first suit ever brought to enforce the terms of the act of Congress which 40 years ago granted to that company nearly one-third of the lands in western Oregon, but upon the express provision that every acre of the lands should be sold by the company to actual settlers only, in quantities not greater than one quarter section to any one settler, and for prices not exceeding $2.50 per acre, which case is now pending in the United States court at Portland, and involves 2,300,000 acres of unsold lands still held by the company unaffected by the claims of any innocent purchasers, the Government having already realized $1,000,000 on a compromise concluded in 1913 with those who bought portions of the granted lands contrary to law prior to the institution of the suit, the compromise having been made by authority of the act of August 20, 1912, which was introduced by Mr. LAFFERTY, and if the 2,300,000 acres of unsold lands still held by the company shall be sold to settlers as sought by the prosecution started by Mr. LAFFERTY, or forfeited to the United States, as asked in the Government suit filed one year later, and then opened to settlement (and not put into a forest reserve), in either such case homes of 160 acres each for 15,000 families will thereby be provided in the most beautiful and picturesque portion of western Oregon; was elected to the Sixty-second Congress and reelected to the Sixty-third Congress as the nominee of both the Progressive and Republican Parties.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance at this late hour that I rise to make any remarks in the House on the pending bill. I realize quite well that nothing I can say will throw any new light upon this subject, and I am also conscious that no remarks of mine or of any other Member on the floor of this House will change a single vote, for each Member of this House considers himself an expert on the tariff. [Laughter.] If each one could write a bill expressing his individual views, we would have as variegated an assortment of tariff bills as there were colors in Joseph's coat. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the country from my viewpoint on this bill, and the country will ever owe to our matchless leader, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee a debt of gratitude for bringing in this bill in the interest of the masses of the American people.

This bill, after exhaustive hearings on their part and laborious work, was submitted to a Democratic caucus. It has been approved by that caucus. It has the approval of our great Democratic President of the United States, and I believe fully carries out the platform of the Democratic Party, as expressed in Baltimore, for a revision of the tariff downward.

It is a bill that by every rule of political economy, every law of equity and justice, should reduce the cost of living—a bill that will relieve the toiling masses of humanity from many of the burdens of taxation that now rest upon them; a bill that distributes some of the burdens of government upon the idle rich, "who toil not, neither do they spin, and yet Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed as one of them." In our country a government of the people, for the people, and by the people in its fairest form must necessarily be run by party organizations.

In this country we have had two great parties. One of those parties is now divided, and the policy of the Republicans, whether they be standpatters or Progressives, has been a protective-tariff system. The Democratic Party has always opposed protection in every form and has contended for tariff for revenue only. I am opposed to protection in all of its forms. Protection, to my mind, makes it possible by law for the favored few to get without earning what other people earn without getting. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It enables a very few by class legislation to guarantee a profit to themselves by wringing from the consuming mass of humanity money they have earned and that they themselves should be permitted to enjoy.

The protective-tariff system was conceived and born in hypocrisy, and when it was first advocated its friends claimed that it was only intended to encourage infant industry, which satisfied the people for a while. They next claimed that it was intended to create new manufactories and bring about competition and enable the people to get goods cheaper. When this deception was exploded they told the people that the foreigners paid the tax, which no sensible or sane man in this day for one moment believes, and the Republicans themselves have abandoned this claim. They next claimed that this protection insured the workingman higher wages. After years of operation, when the workingman has become poorer and the tariff barons richer, they have at last abandoned this claim.

The present able Democratic Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Redfield, a millionaire manufacturer of engines, said publicly in a speech in the House of Representatives:

> Several years ago a representative of a branch of the Steel Trust came to me to sign a petition to Congress for an increase of the tariff on their production. I was one of them, and they talked freely to me. I asked why he wanted an additional duty. He replied, "We must keep up the American standard of wages for our working people." I asked how much of the proposed increase he would pay his workmen, and he replied that they had not got to that yet. I told him I had signed a petition for a reduction of the duty, but told him if he would enter into a contract with me to pay his men any part of the increase I would withdraw my name from the other petition and sign his. He replied, "You know I can't do that." He said his company was only paying 10 per cent, and they wanted to pay a larger dividend, and wanted to increase the tariff so as to do it.

The Republican Party now admit that the tariff should be reduced, but like all despoilers, hating to have their power to rob by law the many for their own enrichment taken from them they now advocate tariff boards and tariff commissions, claiming that the tariff reduction should be based on a report of a scientific board, which has never been done in the whole history of our country. It is simply another subterfuge for delay.

In my humble opinion the greatest issue before the American people is the tariff question. Realizing how important this question is to my people for the purpose of getting the practical workings of a protective-tariff system before them, I desire to briefly illustrate how they are affected by it. The only money received by the Federal Government from customs or a tariff on goods is on those goods imported into this country which pay the tax into the customhouse at the port of entry. Only one-fifth of the goods consumed in this country are imported, the remaining four-fifths used being manufactured here. The Federal Treasury receives from the customhouse on imported goods about $310,000,000, but this is not all the American people pay, for by this unjust system there is wrung from the American people about $1,540,000,000. The Treasury receives $310,000,000, the protective tariff and the favored few receive $1,240,000,000. You say how can this be so. I will illustrate: A suit of clothes costs $10 in England, when it reaches our customhouse, $9 tariff must be paid, and when the buyer pays for this suit he pays $10 plus the $9, making the suit cost him $19. Our tariff barons, being protected by a tariff wall of 90 per cent, charge instead of $10 for a similar suit, as they have no competitors, they charge $18—$1 cheaper than the imported suit. The $8 that was added on does not go into the Treasury of the United States, but goes into the treasury of the tariff barons; but it has been wrung from some American citizens as a bonus to the favored manufacturer, or tariff barons.

Under this system $1 out of every $5 unjustly taken from the people goes into the Treasury of the United States. The $4 of the money thus extorted from the American people go to Rockefeller, Carnegie, and other millionaire manufacturers, and makes it possible for them to grow richer and richer, while the poor man, with the cost of living higher than ever before, struggles, toils, and labors to get daily bread and clothes for himself and loved ones.

The only reason they can thus rob the American people is owing to the injustice and iniquity of the tariff law, which builds a high wall around our country which prevents competition and makes it possible for the few to exploit the many. A sewing machine made in America is shipped to the Orient, the freight is paid, and it is then sold in the Orient for $12, while an American in America is compelled to pay for the same machine $20 or $30. Farm machinery, shoes, and many other articles manufactured in America are sold abroad cheaper than in our own country.

This but shows the injustice of the Republican system, shows how our people are unjustly taxed, and I am unalterably opposed to this injustice, extortion, and despoiling the many for the few.

The fiscal policy of this country since the Civil War has been bottomed upon protection, and the Democratic Party realizing that that had been the fiscal party of the country in their convention declared for a gradual reduction of the tariff. I am myself an extremely low-tariff man. Had I my way I would place all of the necessities of life absolutely upon the free list and raise money to run the Government from other sources. But this bill pending now before the House carries out instructions and campaign pledges of the Democratic Party to revise the tariff downward. The bill places the following necessities of life upon the free list:

> Meat, flour, bread, boots and shoes, lumber, iron ore, milk and cream, coal, harness, saddlery, potatoes, salt, swine, corn, cornmeal, cotton bagging, agricultural implements, leather, wood pulp, Bibles, printing paper not worth more than 2½ cents per pound, typewriters, sewing machines, typesetting machines, cash registers, steel rails, fence wire, cotton ties, nails, hoop and band iron, fish, sulphur, soda, tanning materials, acetic and sulphuric acids, borax, lumber products, including broomhandles, clapboards, hubs for wheels, posts, laths, pickets, staves, shingles.

It has greatly reduced the duty on woolen goods, on cotton goods, on ready-made clothing, on blankets, and on many other articles of necessity, and it reduces the duty on sugar from $1.90 per hundred pounds to $1.30, and after May, 1916, places sugar

on the free list. The bill will relieve the consuming masses of the country from many of the burdens of taxation.

I have the honor to represent one of the greatest districts in the country. My people ask no special legislation for themselves. I have in my district lumber and cotton mills, but I shall not come here and ask to place those things which other parts of the country raise upon the free list or to reduce the duty upon them and to retain it upon the things that are raised in my own district. I am a Democrat and am against class legislation for anyone, whether they reside in my district or elsewhere. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, there is one special feature in this bill that I wish to refer to briefly, and I shall not inflict myself upon the House further—that is the income tax. That feature of the bill is especially most gratifying to me. In 1896, as a tribute to my father, I was nominated to represent his district in Congress, filling out his unexpired term. In speeches going over the district in 1896 I publically advocated an amendment to the Constitution of the United States so as to make it legal to levy an income tax to meet the decision of the Supreme Court in the Pollock case, in which the income-tax provision of the Wilson bill was declared to be unconstitutional. Thirteen years after I first advocated it Congress submitted such an amendment to the several States for ratification, and it has just been ratified. Therefore it is with great pleasure that I realize that that proposition has now become a part of the organic law of the land and that to-day it is legal to levy an income tax.

The great Committee on Ways and Means has provided for levying one. I think it is the fairest of all taxes, because, under an income tax, a man contributes to the support of the Government according to his ability to pay, according to the benefits and privileges he has received, and not according to his necessities. Under an indirect tax a man contributes because he must eat and he must wear clothing. He is thus forced to contribute to the support of the Government. An income tax equitably and justly distributes some of the burdens of Government.

When the Master was on earth He knew that the fairest way of contributing to the support of His church, which was His government, was by paying an income tax, for He commanded that each should contribute one-tenth of his yearly income. Again He recognized that those who were able to pay should pay, for when the rich men were casting into the treasury of their abundance and the widow gave her mite, He said, "She has cast in more than they all." Forty-seven of the countries of the world levy an income tax to provide revenue. I have no fight to make upon wealth. Any man who has honestly acquired wealth shows but an evidence of his industry, intelligence, and skill, and he has my profound respect, but I do say that a man with a great fortune is more able to pay for the support of the Government, for its care of him and his property, than is his less fortunate brother. This income tax will place some of the burdens upon him. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, without detaining the committee under the privilege already granted, I shall incorporate in my remarks a statement taken from the New York World, showing how this income-tax provision will affect some of the great millionaires of the country:

	Capital.	Income.	Tax.
John D. Rockefeller	$500,000,000	$80,000,000	$2,000,000
Andrew Carnegie	300,000,000	15,000,000	600,000
William Rockefeller	200,000,000	20,000,000	800,000
Estate of Marshall Field	120,000,000	6,000,000	240,000
George F. Baker	100,000,000	5,000,000	200,000
Henry Phipps	100,000,000	5,000,000	200,000
Henry C. Frick	100,000,000	5,000,000	200,000
William A. Clark	80,000,000	4,000,000	160,000
Estate of J. P. Morgan	75,000,000	7,500,000	300,000
Estate of E. H. Harriman	68,000,000	3,400,000	146,000
Estate of Russell Sage	64,000,000	3,200,000	128,000
W. K. Vanderbilt	50,000,000	2,500,000	100,000
Estate of John S. Kennedy	65,000,000	3,250,000	130,000
Estate of John J. Astor	70,000,000	3,500,000	140,000
W. W. Astor	70,000,000	3,600,000	140,000
J. J. Hill	70,000,000	3,500,000	140,000
Isaac Stephenson	74,000,000	3,700,000	148,000
Jay Gould estate	70,000,000	3,500,000	140,000
Mrs. Hetty Green	60,000,000	3,000,000	120,000
Estate of Cornelius Vanderbilt	50,000,000	2,500,000	100,000
Estate of William Weightman	50,000,000	2,500,000	100,000
Estate of Ogden Goelet	60,000,000	3,000,000	120,000
W. H. Moore	50,000,000	2,500,000	100,000
Arthur C. James	50,000,000	2,500,000	100,000
Estate of Robert Goelet	60,000,000	3,000,000	120,000
Guggenheim estate	50,000,000	2,500,000	100,000
Thomas F. Ryan	50,000,000	2,500,000	100,000
Edward Morris	45,000,000	2,250,000	90,000
J. O. Armour	45,000,000	2,250,000	90,000

In the $25,000,000 to $35,000,000 class, yielding incomes of $1,250,000 to $1,750,000 and taxes of $50,000 to $70,000, are James Stillman, J. H. Schiff, Charles M. Pratt, J. H. Flagler, Quincy A. Shaw, E. T. Bedford, E. T. Stotesbury, John Claflin, Henry Walters, E. C. Converse, Clarence H. Mackay, Nathaniel Thayer, W. H. Moore, and the estates of H. H. Rogers, Robert Winsor, George Smith, W. B. Leeds, W. Scully, John Arbuckle, J. Crosby Brown, John F. Dryden, W. L. Elkins, and O. H. Payne.

Now, another beneficial effect from an income tax is that under an indirect system of taxation the people do not realize that they are contributing the vast sums of money expended by the Federal Government, but when you have a direct system of taxation, and the tax collector goes to those who have to pay under this law and demands of them the amount due the Government, the result is they will realize that they are paying the money that runs this Government, and they will demand of their representatives economy in the administration of public affairs. We are all human; and, gentlemen, when your constituents demand a thing of you you are very apt to follow their desires.

In conclusion, I rejoice in the confident knowledge that when the final roll is called this great measure to reduce tariff duties and provide revenue for the Government will pass this House. When it becomes a law the American people will say the Democratic Party has "kept the faith" and been true to the people of the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

[Mr. FRENCH addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, in opening the debate last Wednesday on the pending measure the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Mr. UNDERWOOD, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of this House, uttered the following:

> The bills that we propose to the country are not new. We are not taking advantage of the American people in proposing them. A Democratic House was returned two years ago and wrote a series of bills revising this tariff, and we presented them to the country as our platform. They were indorsed by the national platform of the Democratic Party as a flag under which we would fight our battles. We went to the country, and the American people have returned to this House one of the greatest majorities any party has ever had in these Halls since the Civil War. We do not speak for ourselves, but we speak through the authority of an edict from the American people.

I do not believe that the gentleman really lays the flattering unction to his soul that the Democratic majority in this Congress is due entirely to the Democracy's stand on the tariff question. He knows, as we all know, that many of his colleagues on the opposite side of the broad aisle owe their presence here to the schism that existed in the temple of the protectionists of this country—a schism that not only lost us many seats in the House and Senate, but which also gave the country a President elected by a minority of its legal voters. And yet it is but fair to say that the country is anxiously awaiting the result of your labors on tariff legislation. That the heat and passion of a bitter political campaign have died away, and that the country is on the tiptoe of expectancy as to the program of the Democratic Party, now fully intrenched in both Houses of Congress, as well as in the Executive Department of the Government, was fully demonstrated when the President of the United States appeared before the joint session of the Congress on April 8. The announcement to the two Houses that the Chief Executive would deliver his message in person created rather a favorable impression.

The press of the country on the whole approved the innovation. I dare say that if President Taft had made a similar announcement a year ago he would have been denounced as a "reactionary" in many quarters, while if Col. Roosevelt had attempted a similar feat during his incumbency in the presidential office there would have been a considerable portion of our population that would have pronounced the proceedings "revolutionary." But partisan utterances that would have reverberated throughout the land in the case of these former occupants of the White House were not invoked against the present Chief Executive. His reception in this Hall was all that his heart could desire. It was one of the most dramatic incidents that has ever been witnessed under the dome of this Capitol. It must always linger in the memory of those who were privileged to see it. It was a bold stroke, a brilliant spectacle, excellently executed. During the eight minutes consumed in the delivery of the address every syllable, every word, every sentence was absorbed by the expectant assemblage. All ears were strained to hear a clarion note that should arouse the newly awakened hopes of triumphant Democracy. But the note was never sounded. The President had not proceeded far ere he uttered the following:

> We have sought in our tariff schedules to give each group of manufacturers or producers what they themselves thought that they needed in order to maintain a practically exclusive market as against the rest of the world. Consciously or unconsciously, we have built up a set of privileges and exemptions from competition behind which it was easy, by any, even the crudest, forms of combination, to organize monopoly, until at last nothing is normal, nothing is obliged to stand the tests

of efficiency and economy in our world of big business, but everything thrives by concerted arrangement. Only new principles of action will save us from a final hard crystallization of monopoly and a complete loss of the influences that quicken enterprise and keep independent energy alive.

That was the keynote of the speech; the basis of his argument. Thus early was the listener able to realize that the doctrines of Cobden, of Adam Smith, of John Stuart Mill and their school that "free trade means free competition" was the doctrine which the new President has taken for his guide in framing tariff legislation. It is the doctrine of the free trader, sugarcoat the pill as you may, and before the concluding word of the well-phrased message had been uttered it had become evident, at least to some of his listeners, that ultimate free trade is his hope and his desire.

I deny that the protective tariff is responsible for monopolies and combinations. If that be true doctrine there ought be no combinations nor monopolies in free-trade England, while the fact remains that Great Britain is honeycombed with combinations and monopolies. Why, even before the thirteen Colonies had freed themselves there were combinations and monopolies in England. As early as 1771 the owners of the collieries north of Newcastle on Tyne formed a combination to prevent competition, limit output, and maintain prices. This combination was repeatedly charged with all the iniquities attributed to its modern imitators. It was investigated by committees of Parliament no less than five times, and some of the reports against the combine were exceedingly severe. Court proceedings were instituted against it at times but they were vain. The combination existed for upward of 70 years. It was in 1844, only after the construction of railroads which enabled competing colliers to send their coal to London by train, that the combination was finally broken. The real beginning of the modern combinations in England was during the decade from 1880 to 1890. At that time the free-trade doctrine was in full operation and had been in full operation for many years. In 1887 a large combination, known as the Bath Stone Firms, was organized with a capitalization of approximately $1,700,000. They monopolized the entire business, excepting one firm, and have since then acquired practically all of the Portland stone properties.

In 1888, 64 firms combined to form the Salt Union, capitalized at $21,000,000. In 1891 the United Alkali Co. (Ltd.) was organized. It took in 49 separate firms, and its capital stock amounted to $42,500,000. In 1895 the Liverpool Warehousing Co. (Ltd.) was created by a combination of six firms. The capitalization was for $5,250,000. In 1896 J. & P. Coates (Ltd.), embracing five sewing-thread concerns, was organized, with a capital of $37,500,000. There were about 20 smaller firms standing outside of this combination. In 1897 most of the latter organized a combination of their own known as the English Sewing Cotton Co. Its capitalization was for $15,000,000. Subsequently these combinations created still another thread trust which they called the American Thread Co. In December, 1897, the Yorkshire Dyeware & Chemical Co., with a capitalization of $1,580,000, was created by a combination of 10 firms. Nine firms, in May, 1898, organized a combination known as the Linen Thread Co., with a capital of $10,000,000. In 1898 the Fine Cotton Spinners & Doublers' Association, with a capitalization of $33,750,000, was organized by a combination of 40 firms.

I have here a list of 26 additional combinations, all organized and created in free-trade England between 1898 and 1900, most of them being connected with the textile industries, as follows:

Name of company.	Date incorporated.	Number of plants acquired or controlled.	Capital.
United Turkey Red Co.	Jan., 1898	3	$6,000,000
British Dyewood & Chemical Co	May, 1898	4	2,850,000
American Thread Co. (Ltd.)	1898	13	18,600,000
Bradford Dyers' Association (Ltd.)	Dec., 1898	30	23,750,000
Yorkshire Indigo, Scarlet & Color Dyers' Association.	July, 1899	11	3,000,000
Yorkshire Woolcombers' Association	Oct., 1899	38	12,500,000
Borax Consolidated (International)	1899	7	16,000,000
Bradford Coal Merchants & Consumers' Association.	July, 1899	8	1,750,000
Woolen & Worsted Machinery Manufacturers.	Nov., 1899	7	1,450,000
United Indigo & Chemical Co	do	8	1,250,000
Barry, Ostlere & Co. (linoleum)	do	4	5,750,000
The Calico Printers' Association	Dec., 1899	60	46,000,000
English Velvet & Cord Dyers' Association	1899	22	5,000,000
British Cotton & Wool Dyers' Association	Apr., 1900	46	13,750,000
Bedford Lime, Cement & Brick (all local)	July, 1900		2,000,000
British United Shoe Machinery Co	1899	4	1,500,000
Flax, hemp, and jute machinery manufacturers.	July, 1900		6,000,000
G. & J. Baldwin & Partners (fingering and knitting wools and hosiery yarns).	Dec., 1900	6	4,250,000
Leeds & District Worsted Dyers' & Finishers' Association.	Dec., 1900	10	$900,000
Wall Paper Manufacturers (Ltd.)	do	30	21,000,000
Bleachers' Association (Ltd.)	1900	53	41,250,000
Associated Portland Cement Manufacturers (agreement with 4 other firms).	do	34	40,000,000
British Oil & Cake Mills	do	17	11,250,000
Rivet, Bolt & Nut Co. (practically all the manufacturers in Scotland).	do	15	2,750,000
Wholesale News Agents' Association (all firms in Bradford, Leeds, and Sheffield).	do	32	1,450,000
The Extract Wool & Merino Co. (Ltd.)	July, 1900	7	1,700,000

Macrosty, in his "Trust Movement in the British Empire," mentions a number of additional trusts in the woolen industry; while Levy, in his "Monopoly and Competition," treats of the Locomotive Trust, the Whisky Trust, the Tobacco Trust, the Cable Cartel, and the British and International Rail Syndicate. There is also a combination in the manufacture of glass bottles, which has an agreement with continental manufacturers to the effect that they will not enter the British market and the British combination covenants not to enter the continental market. But the most recent combination of which I have any knowledge is that made by the Standard Oil Co. with the Royal Dutch Oil Co. Hon. Frank B. Kellogg, of Minnesota, who has just returned from England, told me that through the efforts of this combination the price of gasoline to the consumer has been forced up to 42 cents per gallon in free-trade England, while in the United States the price ranges from 18 to 20 cents per gallon to the consumer. And there is no duty on oil in England. Neither is there a duty on oil in the United States. Nevertheless the Standard Oil monopoly has grown to gigantic proportions in the United States. That monopoly has been charged with all kinds of crimes, but it can not be truthfully contended that the protective tariff is responsible for its existence.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have shown conclusively that the assertion that monopolies and combinations owe their organization to the protective tariff is fallacious. They owe their existence to man's cupidity. The desire to get rich quick exists in free-trade England, even as it exists in the United States. And so long as men can combine to fix prices so as to prevent loss through cutthroat competition, so long as men can combine to limit output so as to prevent the overstocking of the market, so long will we have monopolies and combinations.

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to go into details on the pending bill at this time. Others have done that during this debate, and I will not cover the ground again. I confess I do not know upon what economic principles the pending measure has been framed. You have put finished products on the free list and placed a duty on the raw materials that go into those finished products. It seems to me that your purpose in this bill is to hit an American industry wherever you can see one. The future will soon determine the unsoundness of your views. But I feel that before I close I ought to place before the House a few figures as to conditions among the laboring classes in free-trade England and in the United States. I find in Whitaker's Almanack for 1912, page 509, that the population of England in 1911 was a little over 32,500,000. Of course that does not include Scotland, Ireland, or Wales. The number of paupers in England in 1911 was over 833,000. The population of Yorkshire, in which the great woolen industries of England are located, was somewhat over 3,700,000 in 1911. In this one county alone there were 78,000 paupers. This is in free-trade England. According to the census of 1910 the population of the United States was about 92,000,000. The number of paupers present in the almshouses of the United States on January 1, 1910, according to the statistics of the Census Bureau, was 64,266. So that, while our population is nearly 3 times that of England, the number of paupers in that free-trade country is considerably over 10 times as great as in the United States. In fact, the county of Yorkshire, with its great woolen industries, with its population of 3,700,000, has 14,000 more paupers than we have in our entire country. [Applause.]

According to the report of the comptroller of the currency for 1912 the combined population of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales is given as 45,289,000.

The number of depositors over there in the trustee savings banks was 1,849,043. Their total deposits aggregated a little over $258,000,000. The postal savings banks had 12,370,646 depositors, with an aggregate of a little over $859,000,000 deposits.

There was also held for depositors certain Government stock which at the end of the year 1911 amounted to $120,776,000 in the postal savings banks and to $12,934,000 in the trustee savings banks. The average deposit in the free trade United Kingdom in the trustee savings banks is $139.58, and an average of $5.70 per inhabitant. The average deposit in the postal savings banks is $69.44, and an average of $18.97 per inhabitant. The same authority gives the total population of the United States for 1912 at a little over 95,400,000 inhabitants. The mutual and stock savings banks have 10,010,000 depositors, with $4,451,800,000 deposits, or an average of $444.72 for each depositor, and $46.66 to the inhabitant. The postal savings banks in the United States have been organized but a few years. However, there are already 300,000 depositors and $28,000,000 of deposits. You will find the figures I have quoted on page 77 of the comptroller's report. They speak more eloquently than words of the great advantage the working people of the United States under a protective tariff have over their English competitors under free trade. You have the votes to put through your bill. We who oppose it hope at least that you will pass it speedily. The future will soon determine the soundness or the fallacy of your theories, and I for one do not doubt but that the Republican Party will be empowered to write a new tariff law, based upon the principle of protection for American industries, in 1916. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of entering upon a general argument for political effect upon the Democratic tariff bill, but I should like to call attention again to the fact that it is not a tariff for revenue only or even a tariff for revenue chiefly. It is a protective tariff, the protection much reduced, and dangerously reduced, as I believe, on many articles, but still a protective tariff, principally, with an income tax attached. It marks, as the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Mr. UNDERWOOD, said in his opening speech, "a new era in the fiscal legislation of this country." And yet in the inauguration of this new era certain precedents of the past, much criticized by Democrats and by free traders, have been followed. An enlargement of the free list has been a feature of many of the tariff bills passed since the war, and the charge has been made over and over again that Republicans have removed duties from strictly revenue commodities in order that they might retain or increase the high protective duties of war time.

Now, we do not find in this bill that the articles which are known as the best revenue producers, the articles upon which nearly all countries levy tariffs for revenue only, have been taken off the free list where they were put by Republicans—on the contrary, we find that the free list has been still further enlarged by adding to it sugar, the best of revenue producers, wool, and other articles, some doubtless for the purpose of furnishing free raw materials, but others clearly for the purpose of affording an opening for the tax upon incomes.

Now, I am a believer in a tax upon incomes, but I question whether the Federal Government should levy such a tax in normal times. Nothing is in a greater state of chaos than taxation in this country, but out of that chaos some few principles seem to have emerged, principles which are coming to govern the legislation of States when they are understood. Briefly stated, these principles demand that real estate should be left to be taxed by the cities, towns, and counties; that the States should raise their revenue from corporation, inheritance, and other taxes reaching personal property, the taxation of which by localities has generally broken down; and that the National Government should raise its revenue chiefly from import duties supplemented by certain internal-revenue taxes.

If I have correctly stated these fundamental principles of taxation, it follows that income taxes, which are taxes upon personal property chiefly, should be levied in normal times by the State governments and not by the National Government; and they should take the place of personal-property taxes, which in most States are still nominally levied through the assessors of the cities and counties. If this should be done, it would clear up in large measure the tangled mess in which our State tax systems find themselves.

Some States have already taken advance steps in this line. Washington has abolished taxation upon instruments of credit, and Wisconsin and Massachusetts levy income taxes, and the example of these States, I believe, is soon to be followed by others. Just what effect the "butting in" of the National Government with the income tax will have no one can clearly prophesy at this time, but it seems to me that the National Government is encroaching upon a source of revenue which normally belongs to the States, and I believe the probability is that this new national scheme of taxation will retard instead of hasten the general reform of taxation so greatly to be desired in our States.

There is clearly no necessity for a national income tax at this time, for the sum of a hundred million dollars, which the Ways and Means Committee expects will be raised by it, could have been very easily raised by small duties on articles put on the free list—duties so small they would not have affected perceptibly the price of those articles to the consumer.

I do not care to take the time of the committee by voicing the protests or complaints of manufacturers in my district at the changes proposed in the Underwood bill. I might mention the treatment which the pocket-cutlery industry is receiving, and I will say that it seems to me that the lumping together of several different varieties of buttons in paragraph 348 of Schedule N is unscientific, to say the least, as this paragraph includes buttons made by a variety of different processes of widely differing costs. There appears to me also to be a possible conflict between paragraph 348 and paragraph 384 of Schedule N with regard to buttons made from so-called vegetable ivory. As a product of vegetable ivory they appear to be dutiable at 30 per cent only, and I would respectfully ask the members of the Ways and Means Committee if it was not their intention to include in section 348 buttons made of vegetable ivory—tagua nuts—as well as buttons of ivory?

The people of my district are about equally interested in manufacturing and in agriculture; and the farmers will certainly not be pleased at the removal of the duty on some commodities and at the reduction of duties on many other commodities which they produce.

Among the main articles manufactured in my district none are more important or larger than those of agricultural machinery, and from the owners or managers of these large factories I have heard no complaints, though their products are placed upon the free list. Apparently they do not care for protection. Yet, in spite of this fact, I rather doubt the wisdom of the entire removal of duties upon their products. In my home city, the city of Poughkeepsie, on the Hudson, the largest factory, or at least the factory employing the greatest number of men, is the De Laval Co., which makes cream separators. It is a Swedish company and was established in this country because of the tariff on cream separators. The capital invested in it, so far as I know, is wholly Swedish capital. Now, with the duty removed these gentlemen may find it cheaper to make their separators in their home country of Sweden and ship them to America, thus throwing out of employment all the men now employed there. The threat of the International Harvester Co. to remove its cordage plant from Auburn, N. Y., to Germany is an indication of what might easily happen as a means of coercing labor if the products of that labor are to be on the free list.

I am not an extreme protectionist, and I find myself almost as frequently in agreement with the moderate protectionists of my party from the Northwest as with some of the gentlemen who have spoken from this side of the House. But I believe that serious damage is likely to result to some industries from the operation of this bill if it shall become a law unchanged, and I sincerely hope that it may be modified considerably before it does finally take its place upon the statute books. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose, and Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, April 28, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, recommending the repeal of the law authorizing the reimbursement of official traveling and subsistence expenses of inspectors in the Steamboat-Inspection Service (H. Doc. No. 37), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 4303) to establish in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the bureau of public highways and to provide for national aid in the improvement of the public roads; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 4322) for the reduction of postage rates on first-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 4323) to define and punish perjury in oaths used in the land offices of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4324) to establish a fish hatchery and biological station in the fourth congressional district of the State of Alabama at or near Currys Station, in the county of Talladega, Ala.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCOY: A bill (H. R. 4325) to amend section 19 of an act entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings; to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings; to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings; to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 4326) to protect legitimate competition; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4327) conferring upon tribes or bands of Indians the right of nomination of their agents or superintendents, to inspire them to interest themselves in their own affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 4328) to prevent common carriers from leasing, subletting, or permitting other persons, firms, companies, or corporations to carry for hire packages, parcels, or merchandise of any character, and requiring common carriers to furnish facilities and promulgate schedules of rates for carrying such parcels, packages, or merchandise on passenger, mail, or express trains, and providing for penalties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Memorial of the Legislature of California, favoring legislation providing for a farm demonstrator under the direction of the colleges of agriculture of the several States of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Legislature of Massachusetts, favoring an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 4329) granting a pension to John G. O'Neil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4330) granting a pension to Joel S. Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4331) granting a pension to Henry C. P. Roebling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4332) granting a pension to George C. Dale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 4333) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4334) granting an increase of pension to John H. Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 4335) granting a pension to Claud Hawkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4336) granting an increase of pension to Peter Dennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4337) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Redfern; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4338) granting an increase of pension to Adaline Norton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4339) granting an increase of pension to William Updegraff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4340) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4341) granting an increase of pension to William O. Bulger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4342) to correct the military record of Charles Creager; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 4343) granting an increase of pension to Emeline Baldwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4344) granting an honorable discharge to William Alexander; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 4345) for the relief of the legal representatives of James M. Weatherly, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 4346) to correct the military record of Abraham Collinsworth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 4347) granting a pension to Curtin Kresge; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring admission free of duty of wheat, oats, and live stock if flour, cereals, and meats are admitted free; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of J. L. Sharp, of Wellsville, and Charles Schafer, of Martinsburg, Mo., favoring amendment to the income-tax provision taxing mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of the Passaic Board of Trade, of Passaic, N. J., with briefs of sundry Passaic manufacturers, relative to the tariff rates in the proposed tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of the Ohio Butterine Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against any duty on peanut oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of sundry business firms of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring an amendment to the income-tax provision taxing mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. J. Hilbert & Co., Milwaukee, Wis., against the duty on perfumery, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. J. Hilbert & Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., against the duty on raw materials; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. N. Katz, of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the clause prohibiting the importation of aigrettes, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLANCY: Petition of sundry citizens of Onondaga and Cortland Counties, N. Y., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMPTON: Petition of Joseph W. Blair and other citizens of St. Clair County, Mich., favoring the passage of legislation to make an investigation into the prosecution of the charge of conspiracy of the editors of the Appeal to Reason, of Gerard, Kans.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of the Yolo County Board of Trade, by H. S. Maddox, secretary, and by W. F. Mixon, of Woodland, Yolo County, and by 102 other citizens of the State of California, protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of R. D. Robbins and 14 other business firms of Suisun; A. B. Wilson and 9 other business firms of Martinez; Benicia Hardware & Plumbing Co., by Theodore Reuger, and 12 other business firms of Benicia; A. C. Bowles and 16 other business firms of Vacaville; J. Rummelsburg Co. and 8 other business firms of Winters; Buckley & Grove and 10 other business firms of Dixon; J. M. Campbell and 7 other business firms of Davis; and P. C. Cohn and 7 other business firms of Folsom City, all in the State of California, favoring the passage of legislation compelling concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute their portion of the funds for the development of the local community, county, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of Lizzie Odlum, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the placing of Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Bricklayers' Benevolent & Protective Union No. 1, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring approval of an amendment to the Sherman law in relation to trade-unions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Austin Nichols & Co. (Inc.), of New York City, N. Y., against assessment of fee in relation to filing of protests against assessment of duties by the collector of customs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of T. K. Thomson, Stephen Freifeld, John J. McCarthy, and Samuel B. Moore, of New York, favoring an amendment to the income-tax provision taxing mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILMORE: Petition of sundry citizens of Rockland and Brockton and members of the Union Congregational Church, of East Bridgewater, and F. E. Lane and other citizens of Milton, Mass. favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from payment of tolls, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of M. B. Shantz and the Rochester Button Co., of Rochester, N. Y., against the reduction of the duty on vegetable ivory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the A. B. Newman Co., of New York, relative to hiding the caution label on packages of imported tobacco with the internal-revenue stamp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, New York, N. Y., protesting against the passage of legislation making an amendment to the Constitution granting suffrage to women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Consumers' Home Industry League, New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation to establish a permanent body of nonpolitical tariff experts to recommend, in conjunction with the Ways and Means Committee, safe and scientific tariff laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of New York State, protesting against any reduction of the present tariff rates on printed matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Stationery Association of New York, N. Y., protesting against the passage of legislation prohibiting the fixing of prices by the manufacturers of patent goods; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Salt's Textile Manufacturing Co., Bridgeport, Conn., favoring the passage of legislation causing the new tariff bill to take effect January 1, 1914; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Ladies' Auxiliary, New York Zoological Society, New York, favoring the passage of legislation prohibiting the importation of plumes and feathers of wild birds for commercial use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Chase-Hibbard Milling Co., Elmira, N. Y.; the George-Urban Milling Co., Buffalo, N. Y.; Henry D. Waters, Buffalo, N. Y.; and A. P. Youngblood Flour Co., New York, N. Y., protesting against the proposed change in the tariff on flour, wheat, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of 50 citizens of the twenty-third congressional district of New York, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY: Petition of C. L. Salter, A. A. Reenhaid, H. F. Meeker, W. A. Klein, N. C. Starr, and F. N. Woodward, Richmond, Ind., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of 19 citizens of Mankato, Minn., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: Memorial of the board of commissioners of Salt Lake City, Utah, favoring Government ownership of the telegraph and telephone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of W. E. Moore, Fred C. Hathaway, W. E. Tracy, H. E. Corless, and Louis W. Sloan, Salt Lake City, Utah, asking that the proceeds of mutual life insurance companies be exempted from the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVY: Petition of Dr. Charles H. Mierow, E. N. Farber, Louis Halle, Pasquale Ferri, J. Hart, Dr. William F. Mittendorf, E. Jarbus, Gustavus Balser, George P. Cammann, Stanley H. Dexter, H. C. Tuxbury, and Dr. F. S. Weisse, of New York City, protesting against an income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against admitting wheat, oats, flour, cereals, etc., free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Miss Anna Baldwin, New York, N. Y., protesting against the placing of Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Passaic Board of Trade, with briefs submitted by Passaic manufacturers, Passaic, N. J., relative to tariff revisions in the new tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Bricklayers' B. & P. Union, No. 1, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation exempting labor organizations from the Sherman law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Star Expansion Bolt Co., New York, N. Y., protesting against the proposed reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Baer Bros., New York, N. Y., protesting against the proposed change of duty on bronze powder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Leumann, Boesch & Weingart, Price & Pierce, and 2 other firms of New York, protesting against the assessment of a fee for filing a protest against illegal exactions of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Memorial of the Oswego Chamber of Commerce, of Oswego, N. Y., favoring the repeal of the order reorganizing the customs districts and the placing of barley on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Inland Daily Press Association, favoring the adoption of the zone system for postage on second-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Passaic Board of Trade, of Passaic, N. J., against certain changes in the tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Northern New York Library Club, favoring extension of the parcel-post rates to books; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of 2,000 citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., against certain changes in the tariff schedules affecting wheat, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALMER: Petition of sundry lace workers of Lehighton, Pa., protesting against any change in the present tariff on lace and lace curtains; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Bethlehem, Pa., favoring the passage of the McLean bill granting Federal protection to migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of the Beckkon Chemical Co. against the reduction of the duty on sulphide of zinc; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New Jersey, favoring an amendment to the income-tax provision taxing mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Passaic Board of Trade, Passaic, N. J., against the reduction of the tariff affecting the woolen, cotton, handkerchief, chemical, metal, and paper industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of James B. Devitt, Chicago, Ill., regarding the methods and policy of the Department of Agriculture toward the private development of the unsettled lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Cheney Bros., manufacturers, of South Manchester, Conn., relative to the silk schedule in the tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of sundry business firms of San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Oakland, Cal., against the reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the City Council of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring Government ownership of the telegraph and telephone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Red Cedar Shingle Manufacturers' Association, against placing shingles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Swayne, Hoyt & Co., of San Francisco, Cal., against the proposed duty on uncleaned rice; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THACHER: Petition of sundry citizens of Carver, Fairhaven, and Hanover, Mass., favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting from payment of tolls American coastwise shipping, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Marshfield, Oak Bluffs, Onset, Wareham, West Tisbury, Woods Hole, and South Dartmouth, Mass., favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petitions of sundry residents of the thirtieth New York district, favoring an amendment to the income-tax provision taxing mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *April 28, 1913.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH, a Senator from the State of Michigan, and ISAAC STEPHENSON, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	Norris	Smith, Mich.
Bacon	Gronna	O'Gorman	Smoot
Borah	Hitchcock	Oliver	Stephenson
Bradley	Hughes	Overman	Sterling
Brady	James	Owen	Stone
Brandegee	Johnson, Me.	Page	Swanson
Bristow	Johnston, Ala.	Perkins	Thomas
Burton	Jones	Pomerene	Thompson
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Robinson	Thornton
Chilton	Kern	Root	Tillman
Clapp	La Follette	Saulsbury	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Shafroth	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	Lodge	Sheppard	Walsh
Colt	McCumber	Sherman	Warren
Crawford	Martin, Va.	Shields	Weeks
Cummins	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Williams
Dillingham	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	Works
Gallinger	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	
Goff	Newlands	Smith, Md.	

Mr. KERN. I was requested to state that the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] is absent from the city on official business.

I wish to make the same announcement as to the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-four Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum is present.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I rise to speak to a question of personal privilege for a few minutes.

Since the last sitting of the Senate it has come to my attention that in the last few days there appeared in two newspapers of this city a foolish, ridiculous, absurd, and untrue statement about an alleged altercation between myself and a Senate elevator employee, one Charles Lamb, alleged to have occurred in an elevator cage in the Senate Office Building last Wednesday.

The articles put me in a most unmanly, ungentlemanly, undignified attitude. The articles are wholly, entirely, and absolutely false, untrue, and without a particle of fact or foundation. They are without a scintilla of truth in them. They are false in whole and in every part, every particular, and every particle. Not one statement in either one of them possesses one scintilla of fact or truth or foundation.

Upon hearing of them I sought out the young man mentioned in them as an elevator employee, Charles Lamb, and at the first opportunity, in the office of Mr. Werner, Superintendent of the Senate Office Building, I asked him in the presence of Mr. Werner if there was any truth in those articles. He said not one particle. I asked him if he inspired or caused the publication of them. He said he did not; that he regretted the publication of them; and that he had no idea how it came about. I asked him if, in the interest of truth, he would sign a statement to that effect, and he said he would do so gladly, cheerfully, and willingly, and he did do so of his own free will and accord. I have it and read it:

APRIL 26, 1913.

The articles appearing in the Times and another newspaper of this city about an alleged altercation between me and Senator MYERS are wholly false, untrue, and unfounded. At no place nor time did anything like it ever occur. I had nothing to do with the publication of either such article and did not inspire either.

P. C. LAMB.

At the time that was signed, Mr. Lamb had resigned his position in the employ of the Senate, a day or two before, and it was not signed under any fear of a discharge or of losing his position, because he held no position to lose; he had already resigned and was preparing to start to his home.

On New Year's Day of this year, the 1st day of January, 1913, in a public hallway, a corridor of the Senate Office Building, I had a few words with that young man, in which I admit that I was partly to blame, because I was overly vexed about a comparatively small matter. But the cause of it was nothing remotely resembling anything referred to in these two articles; not remotely resembling even in the slightest degree. Mr. Lamb made an explanation which was satisfactory to me, and I went my way.

Four or five days after that—in fact, on the first Sunday in January, which was the 5th day of January, 1913—I met the young man and we greeted each other as two ordinary acquaintances and passed on our respective ways.

From that day, the 5th day of January, 1913, until last week I never saw nor heard of Charles Lamb. I never gave him a thought. I did not know that he was in existence or in the city. I did not know whether he was in the employ of the Senate or not. As far as I was concerned he might have remained in the employ of the Senate the balance of his lifetime. I had no cause to desire that he should not remain in the employ of the Senate. For four months, until last Saturday, I had not seen him, and until last week for four months I had not heard of him and had not given him a thought.

Nothing like anything stated in these articles, nothing resembling in the remotest degree, at any time or place, anywhere, ever occurred; nothing that could be distorted by the wildest flight of the most disordered imagination into anything resembling anything there stated ever occurred.

Somebody, I know not whom, for some cause, I know not what, has started this foolish, absurd, preposterous report, and it got into a couple of the newspapers of this city—the Times and the Herald—and at least one newspaper in New York—the New York American.

The whole thing is a miserable, petty fabrication, and I should think that reporters and correspondents, who enjoy the courtesy of the Senate, in the way of press privileges, before they publish any such false, absurd, and ridiculous statement about a Senator, would at least ask him if there were a grain of truth in it. In this particular instance, if they want to be fair, they will be as quick to publish my denial and Mr. Lamb's written refutation as they were to publish the false statement.

This matter is trivial and frivolous, but, nevertheless, annoying and unjust. I could not afford the time to go to each and every Senator and tell him there was no truth in these ridiculous articles, and show him Mr. Lamb's written refutation. Therefore I take this occasion to speak to the Senators collectively, and to put in the RECORD Mr. Lamb's written refutation.

I never knew much about this young man, Mr. Lamb, until I talked to him in Mr. Werner's office last Saturday, and from his conduct and demeanor at that time I am glad to say that I believe him to be a gentleman and a man who wants to do what is right.

I feel that if the statements in those articles were true I would be unworthy to occupy a seat in this body; I would not be entitled to the respect and association of the other Members of this body; if they were true, I would not have any self-respect; and a man who does not respect himself should not have the respect of others.

Therefore, Mr. President, while this is a comparatively trivial matter, and while at first I thought I would not dignify it by giving it notice on the floor of this Chamber, and while I feel like apologizing to the Senators for taking up their time with so frivolous and ridiculous a matter, yet I felt it was so false and unjust a report that I wanted to take this opportunity to deny it and to submit written proof of its utter falsity in toto and in every part.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 20,000 additional copies of the report of the Ways and Means Committee on the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WILLIAMS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Knoxville and Vicksburg, in the State of Mississippi, praying for a reduction in the duty on sugar, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE. I present resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the resolutions were read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1913.

Resolutions relative to an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the practice of polygamy.

Whereas it appears from investigations recently made by the Senate of the United States, and otherwise, that polygamy still exists in certain parts of the United States, notwithstanding the enactment of prohibitory statutes by the several States thereof; and

Whereas the practice of polygamy is generally condemned by the people of the United States and there is a demand for its more effective prohibition by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby requests that Congress will enact and submit to the States for ratification an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting polygamy and polygamous cohabitation and giving Congress power to enforce such prohibition by appropriate legislation.

Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth is hereby directed to send a copy of these resolutions to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Massachusetts.

In house of representatives, adopted March 28, 1913.
In senate, adopted, in concurrence, April 2, 1913.
A true copy.
Attest:

FRANK J. DONAHUE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. LODGE. I present a petition of sundry shoe workers, residents of Lynn, Mass., praying for the maintenance of a protective tariff. I ask that the body of the petition be printed in the RECORD, omitting the signatures, and that the petition be referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Finance, and the body of the petition, omitting the signatures, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOE WORKERS.

We, the undersigned citizens of Lynn, Mass., believing that the best interests of the wage earners of the United States are promoted by a tariff policy which reasonably restricts foreign importations and protects the American standard of wages, respectfully petition Congress for such duties on imports as will safeguard our welfare and not injure or destroy legitimate industry, and we urge our representatives in Congress to advocate such measures as will afford adequate protection and maintain the present prosperity of the country.

Mr. LODGE. I present a petition of sundry leather employees and tanners, residents of Peabody, Mass., praying for the maintenance of a protective tariff. I ask that the body of the petition be printed in the RECORD, omitting the signatures, and that the petition be referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Finance, and the body of the petition, omitting the signatures, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEATHER EMPLOYEES AND TANNERS.

We, the undersigned citizens of Peabody, believing that the best interests of the wage earners of the United States are promoted by a tariff policy which reasonably restricts foreign importations and protects the American standard of wages, respectfully petition Congress for such duties on imports as will safeguard our welfare and not injure or destroy legitimate industry, and we urge our representatives in Congress to advocate such measures as will afford adequate protection and maintain the present prosperity of the country.

Mr. LODGE. I present a petition of members of the faculty of Wellesley College, Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of legislation to prohibit the importation of aigrettes and the plumes and feathers of wild birds. I ask that the body of the petition, omitting the signatures, be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Finance, and the body of the petition, omitting the signatures, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELLESLEY COLLEGE,
DEPARTMENT OF ZOOLOGY,
Wellesley, Mass., April 8, 1913.

The Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned members of the faculty of Wellesley College, wish to express to you our approval of the provision proposed by the New York Zoological Society for incorporation into the new tariff bill, and our earnest hope that it may be passed by Congress.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of Rev. Jesse G. Nichols and 32 other citizens, of South Hadley; Rev. B. R. Bulkley and 5 other citizens, of Beverly; Frederick Fosdick and 20 other citizens, of Fitchburg and West Fitchburg; Myron W. Richardson and 36 other citizens, of Boston; D. Emory Holman and 7 other citizens, of Attleboro; 147 citizens of Rockland and Brockton; 82 citizens of Marshfield, Oak Bluffs, Onset, Wareham, West Tisbury, and Woods Hole; Job C. Tripp and 33 other citizens, of Fairhaven; W. R. Kimball and 26 other citizens, of Lancaster; Roger Pierce and 8 other citizens, of Boston; Mayor George M. Wright and 37 other citizens, of Worcester; of 40 members of the Trinitarian Congregational Church, of Taunton; and of 27 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Amherst, Wollaston, and Uxbridge, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. GRONNA presented a petition of the faculty and students of Fargo College, Fargo, N. Dak., and a petition of members of the Audubon Society of North Dakota, praying for the adoption of the clause in the pending tariff bill providing for the protection of wild birds, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Fargo, N. Dak., remonstrating against the imposition of a duty on currants, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. OLIVER presented a memorial of sundry business men of Scranton, Pa., and a memorial of sundry business men of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against any reduction in the duty on wheels for railway purposes, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WEEKS presented resolutions adopted by the Federation of Socialist Clubs of Bristol County, Mass., favoring an investigation into the prosecution of the publishers of the Appeal to Reason, a Socialist newspaper, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of West Newton, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the closing of the gates of the Panama Canal Exposition on Sundays, which was referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

He also presented a memorial of 128 shoe workers, residents of Marlboro, Mass., remonstrating against any reduction in the duty on boots and shoes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of 25 members of the congregation of the Union Congregational Church, of East Bridgewater; B. T. Martin and 70 other citizens of Chelsea, West Somerville, Winthrop, and Everett; of 17 citizens of Gloucester, Marblehead, and Newburyport; of 15 members of the congregation of the Second Baptist Church of Palmer; of Carroll Lewis Maxey and 47 other citizens of Williamstown, Turners Falls, Adams, Granville Center, Pittsfield, and Shelburne Falls; Henry P. Wolcott and 93 other citizens of Cambridge; Rev. Samuel B. Capen and 20 members of the Central Congregational Church of Jamaica Plain; Maj. Charles S. Ashley and 45 other citizens of New Bedford; of 25 members of the Massachusetts Woman's Christian Temperance Union; of 60 citizens of Carver; of Rev. Joseph Dinzey and 37 other citizens of Hanover; of Michael Baker and 25 other citizens of South Dartmouth; Rev. John C. Breaker and 30 other citizens of Worcester; Rev. A. Morrill Osgood and 26 other citizens of Maynard, Burlington, Carlisle, and Stow; William H. Cobb and 53 other citizens of Newton; Rev. Frederick B. Allen, Archdeacon Samuel G. Babcock, and sundry other citizens of Boston; E. C. Colman and sundry other citizens of Woburn; Mrs. J. Malcolm Forbes and 61 other citizens of Milton and Boston; C. L. Judkins and 26 other citizens of Barre; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Attleboro, Foxboro, and Millville; John D. Brooks and sundry other citizens of Natick; of 135 citizens of Greater Boston; R. L. Bridgman and 49 other citizens of Newton; Rev. Cortland Myers and sundry members of the Tremont Temple and Eliot Congregational Church, of Boston; of 16 members of the State board of trade; of 30 members of the Chestnut Hill Branch of the National Alliance of Unitarian and other Christian Women of Massachusetts; of Rev. DeWitt S. Clark and 86 members of the Tabernacle Church, of Salem; of John C. MacInnes, Stephen Sawyer, Henry P. Murray, and 31 other citizens of Worcester; Rev. Emanuel C. Charlton and 18 other citizens of Brookfield; and of Hon. John D. Long and 59 other citizens of Hingham, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Charlestown and Marlboro, in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the adoption of the clause in the pending tariff bill providing for the protection of wild birds, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WORKS presented resolutions adopted by the city council of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the Government ownership of telephone and telegraph lines, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Humboldt Chamber of Commerce, of Eureka, Cal., praying that an appropriation be made for the continuance of the reconstruction of the jetties at the entrance to Humboldt Bay, Cal., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CUMMINS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Davenport, Iowa, remonstrating against placing a duty on currants, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of the National Business League of America, praying for the retention in the Consular

Service of all employees who faithfully discharge their official duties, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the city council of Peoria, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the Government ownership of all telephone and telegraph lines, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. GOFF presented a memorial of the H. S. Sands Electric & Manufacturing Co., of Wheeling, W. Va., remonstrating against any reduction in the duty on tungsten incandescent lamps, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Gulland-Clarke Co., of Elkins, W. Va., and a memorial of Ruffner Bros., of Charleston-Kanawha, W. Va., remonstrating against any reduction in the duty on manufactured oat products, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of the Modern Window Glass Co., of Salem; of sundry employees of the Doddridge Window Glass Co.; and of the National Window Glass Workers, all in the State of West Virginia, remonstrating against any reduction in the duty on window glass, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 77, American Federation of Glass Workers, of Morgantown, W. Va., remonstrating against any reduction in the duty on glassware, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Northcott-Tate-Hagy Co., of Huntington, W. Va., and a memorial of the West Virginia Rail Co., of Huntington, W. Va., remonstrating against any reduction in the duty on steel rails, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Gwinn Bros. & Co., of Huntington, W. Va., remonstrating against any reduction in the duty on flour and its by-products, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Lafayette Mick, of Burnsville; Dr. E. N. McCue and John F. McCue, of Horner; A. C. Jackson, of Sistersville; William C. Patterson, of Parkersburg; Z. M. Reese, of Watson; Edward Tinley, of Ona; E. A. Whiting, of Parkersburg; S. J. Brobst, of Fairmont; Clyde M. Crist, of Clarksburg; William B. Mathews, of Charleston; Hiram J. Lynch, of Parkersburg; Anna M. Boydston, of Morgantown; and C. Howard Long, of Mannington, all in the State of West Virginia, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the so-called income-tax clause of the pending tariff bill exempting the proceeds of all life insurance policies and all life insurance funds from taxation, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Sampson Holland and sundry other citizens of West Virginia, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation prohibiting any society, fraternal order, or organization from sending through the mails any written or printed matter representing such society, etc., which is already being used as a part of its title or name by any other society or fraternal organization, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented resolutions adopted by the common council of Lockport, N. Y., relative to the claims of the city of Lockport in the disposition of any and all power waters to be distributed at the head of the locks at that city, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Eastern Chisago County, Minn., remonstrating against increasing the height of the Nevers Dam on the St. Croix River, between Wisconsin and Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. ROOT presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Waverly, Ellinburgh, Schenectady, Berkshire, and Phelps, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the closing of the gates of the Panama Canal Exposition on Sundays, which were referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

Mr. PERKINS presented a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., remonstrating against the imposition of a duty on wheat, oats, and barley if flour, oatmeal, pearl barley, etc., are admitted free, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 922) providing for an increase of salary of the United States marshal for the district of Nevada, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 26) thereon.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 662) for the relief of Col. Richard H. Wilson, Fourteenth Infantry, United States Army, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 25) thereon.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2441) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, to report it with an amendment, and I submit a report (No. 18) thereon. I give notice that I will ask the Senate to take up the bill for consideration to-morrow morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2973) making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes, to report it without amendment, and I submit a report (No. 19) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

PURE-FOOD LAW—DEFINITION OF WHISKY.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing I return certain documents which were transmitted to the Senate by the President of the United States on July 13, 1911, in compliance with a resolution dated June 7, 1911, with reference to the definition of whisky, and so forth. The committee finds that all of the definitions of whisky are in print, and therefore they authorize me to submit the order which I send to the desk and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The order was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the documents and data submitted to the Senate on July 13, 1911, by the President of the United States in compliance with the resolution of the Senate of June 7, 1911, pertaining to the definition of whisky be returned to the President, as requested in his message transmitting the same.

ELLEN D. GIVENS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. By direction of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably with an amendment Senate resolution No. 61 to pay Ellen D. Givens 12 months' salary in lieu of allowance for funeral expenses of her late husband, and I submit a report (No. 22) thereon. The resolution is amended so as to strike out, before the word "months," the word "twelve" and insert "six."

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment reported by the committee was to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*," and to insert:

That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to Ellen D. Givens, widow of Edgar L. Givens, late a clerk in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

PAINT CREEK COAL FIELDS, WEST VIRGINIA.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 37, authorizing the appointment of a committee to make an investigation of conditions in the Paint Creek district, West Virginia, submitted by Mr. KERN on the 12th instant, to report it with amendments, and I submit a report (No. 24) thereon. I ask that the resolution take the regular course. I will not ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I see the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] is in his place, and I ask his attention. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate has reported back favorably, with amendments, the resolution offered by the Senator from Indiana in connection with an investigation of the troubles in the West Virginia coal mines. Not seeing the Senator in his seat, I asked that the resolution take its regular course. Request can be made for the present consideration of the resolution, but I think it would be better for it to go over for a day.

Mr. KERN. Let the resolution go over until to-morrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well; let the resolution take the regular course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably with an amendment Senate resolution 39, authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to conduct hearings, and so forth, and I submit a report (No. 20) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment reported by the committee was to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*," and to insert:

That the Committee on Appropriations, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized during the Sixty-third Congress to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL CLERKS TO SENATORS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 19, to authorize the allowance of an additional clerk to Senators having less than three, submitted by Mr. GALLINGER on the 17th instant, to report it with an amendment, to submit a report (No. 23) thereon, and with the recommendation that the resolution as amended do not pass.

I call the attention of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], and other Senators to this matter. The committee had one of three courses to pursue—either to report the resolution favorably, after amending it so as to make it plainer, to report it adversely, or to pass a motion to let it lie on the table in the committee. We thought it fairer to the Senate that it be reported adversely, so that the Senate could consider it. I ask if we can not fix a time at which we may consider it; let us say immediately after the morning hour at the next session of the Senate. Would that be agreeable?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I think the committee acted wisely in making a report so that this matter might receive the consideration of the Senate. I suggest to the Senator that he allow the resolution to go to the calendar, and it can be called up at some convenient time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well; that suits me. I merely thought that Senators might want to fix a time. If not, the resolution can go to the calendar.

Mr. GALLINGER. We shall doubtless have a hiatus in our proceedings before long, and we can call it up then for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. WILLIAMS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably with an amendment Senate resolution 60, authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to hold hearings and to send for persons and papers in connection with the same. I submit a report (No. 21) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment reported by the committee was to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*," and to insert:

That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized during the Sixty-third Congress to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject that may be pending before said committee, and to have such hearings printed for the use of the committee; that the expenses of such hearings be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the said committee and all subcommittees thereof may sit during the sessions of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Georgia:

A bill (S. 1557) to amend an act to establish postal savings depositories, approved June 25, 1910, so as to increase the rate of interest to be paid on postal savings funds by the banks in which said funds shall be deposited from 2½ to 3 per cent per annum; and

A bill (S. 1558) to fix the compensation of letter carriers of the Rural Delivery Service on and after July 1, 1913, at a salary not exceeding $1,400 per annum; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 1559) for the relief of Annie McColgan; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1560) granting an increase of pension to John Stauffer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1561) granting an increase of pension to William H. Mason;

A bill (S. 1562) granting a pension to William E. Monroe (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1563) granting a pension to Isaac Wise; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 1564) granting an increase of pension to George O. Colby;

A bill (S. 1565) granting an increase of pension to John T. Orcutt; and

A bill (S. 1566) granting a pension to Charles E. Stanley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 1567) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1568) relating to Navy retirements; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1569) for the relief of Elizabeth L. W. Bailey, administratrix of the estate of Davis W. Bailey, deceased; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 1570) for the relief of Michael D. Swan, alias Edward Swan;

A bill (S. 1571) to refund to Mary Beecher Longyear duty collected on certain rugs or wall hangings;

A bill (S. 1572) for the relief of David Smith; and

A bill (S. 1573) for the relief of Patrick Rattigan; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1574) granting 30 working days' leave of absence in each year, without forfeiture of pay during such leave, to certain employees at United States arsenals, gun factories, proving grounds, supply stations, and navy yards;

A bill (S. 1575) authorizing the President to issue a commission as major of Cavalry in the name of John T. Haines, with rank to date from March 3, 1911;

A bill (S. 1576) to correct the military record of Charles Bowen;

A bill (S. 1577) to locate, map, and mark the battle fields of Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, the Wilderness, and Spotsylvania Court House, and other minor engagements within or adjacent thereto, included in what is commonly known as the Wilderness campaign; and

A bill (S. 1578) for the correction of the military record of Maj. Horace P. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1579) granting a pension to John Welch;

A bill (S. 1580) granting a pension to T. Oliver Dowd, alias Terence O'Dowd;

A bill (S. 1581) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Manning;

A bill (S. 1582) granting a pension to Sarah M. Stone;

A bill (S. 1583) granting a pension to Sarah W. Loud;

A bill (S. 1584) granting a pension to Evalyn N. Conant;

A bill (S. 1585) granting a pension to Julia N. Jewett;

A bill (S. 1586) granting a pension to Arthur G. Bosson;

A bill (S. 1587) granting a pension to Ethel K. Guerin;

A bill (S. 1588) granting an increase of pension to Evelyn Barnette;

A bill (S. 1589) granting a pension to David K. Arrand;

A bill (S. 1590) granting an increase of pension to Lewis G. Whiting;

A bill (S. 1591) granting a pension to George R. W. Battis;

A bill (S. 1592) granting a pension to Robert Richards;

A bill (S. 1593) granting an increase of pension to Leucrecia M. Hodge;

A bill (S. 1594) granting an increase of pension to Eben N. Hewins;

A bill (S. 1595) granting an increase of pension to Handel P. Fisher;

A bill (S. 1596) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Forknall;

A bill (S. 1597) granting a pension to Margaret Fraher;

A bill (S. 1598) granting a pension to Honora Chandler;

A bill (S. 1599) granting an increase of pension to David Casey;

A bill (S. 1600) granting an increase of pension to Michael E. Breck;

A bill (S. 1601) granting an increase of pension to Mercie A. Brown;

A bill (S. 1602) granting an increase of pension to John R. Bouldry;

A bill (S. 1603) granting a pension to Anna S. Anderson;

A bill (S. 1604) granting a pension to Henry Hatch;

A bill (S. 1605) granting a pension to Ann T. O'Hara;

A bill (S. 1606) granting an increase of pension to Lloyd B. Joslin;

A bill (S. 1607) granting an increase of pension to Edward N. Pomeroy;

A bill (S. 1608) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Pratt;

A bill (S. 1609) granting a pension to Mahala E. Richardson;

A bill (S. 1610) granting a pension to Margaret B. Sheridan;

A bill (S. 1611) granting a pension to Matilda M. White;

A bill (S. 1612) granting a pension to Barton E. Gardner;

A bill (S. 1613) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta F. Bartlett;

A bill (S. 1614) granting a pension to Margery F. Daly;

A bill (S. 1615) granting a pension to Daniel Driscoll; and

A bill (S. 1616) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Daniels; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 1617) to further regulate commerce among the States and with foreign nations; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1618) granting to the Inter-City Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, the right to construct, acquire, maintain, and operate a railway bridge across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey:

A bill (S. 1619) to provide for the improvement of the personnel of the civil service; to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1620) to provide for representation of the United States in the Fourteenth International Congress on Alcoholism, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, all matters relating to international conferences are referred, I think, to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is entirely satisfactory to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1621) authorizing the appointment of Maj. George A. Armes, United States Army, retired, to the rank and grade of brigadier general on the retired list of the Army, without increase of pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 1622) providing for the erection of memorials to Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 1623) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia by adding a section thereto, to be known as section 875a;

A bill (S. 1624) to regulate the construction of buildings along alleyways in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1625) to regulate the use of public-school buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1626) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia regarding the taking of testimony in equity and divorce causes and proceedings for the annulment of marriages in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1627) to amend section 797a of chapter 18 of subchapter 15 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1628) for the creation of the police and firemen's relief and retirement fund, to provide for the relief and retirement of members of the police and fire departments, to establish a method of procedure for such relief and retirement, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1629) to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1630) to protect public health by regulating the production and sale of milk, cream, and ice cream in and for the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1631) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for registration of all cases of tuberculosis in the District of Columbia, for free examination of sputum in suspected cases, and for preventing the spread of tuberculosis in said District," approved May 13, 1908;

A bill (S. 1632) to amend the act of Congress approved April 22, 1904, authorizing the laying of water mains and service sewers in the District of Columbia, the levying of assessments therefor, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1633) to amend the laws for the protection of birds, game, and fish in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1634) to provide an additional method for enforcing and foreclosing tax sales and tax deeds in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1635) providing for the regulation and suspension of traffic and processions on highways in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1636) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to suspend and revoke certain licenses and permits;

A bill (S. 1637) making drunkenness in the District of Columbia a misdemeanor, and to provide a hospital for inebriates, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1638) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes";

A bill (S. 1639) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia"; and

A bill (S. 1640) to amend an act entitled "An act to distinctively designate parcels of land in the District of Columbia for the purposes of assessment and taxation, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1899; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 1641) granting a pension to Addison C. Walker; and

A bill (S. 1642) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Dyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIS:

A bill (S. 1643) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Esty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 1644) for the relief of May Stanley;

A bill (S. 1645) for the relief of the estate of Thomas M. Hackett, deceased;

A bill (S. 1646) for the relief of R. S. Thornton; and

A bill (S. 1647) for the relief of the estate of Henry Ware, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1648) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Connolly;

A bill (S. 1649) granting an increase of pension to Sigmund J. Messing;

A bill (S. 1650) granting a pension to Ida A. Mitchell;

A bill (S. 1651) granting a pension to William V. Feltwell; and

A bill (S. 1652) granting an increase of pension to James Garnett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HITCHCOCK:

A bill (S. 1655) to create a pensionable status for Nathaniel Monroe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1656) granting a pension to Martha E. Tracy;

A bill (S. 1657) granting an increase of pension to Lyra C. Garber;

A bill (S. 1658) granting an increase of pension to Lurenna J. Terrell;

A bill (S. 1659) granting an increase of pension to Adah B. Ray; and

A bill (S. 1660) granting an increase of pension to Mary Landers, now Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE:

A bill (S. 1661) relating to the maintenance of actions for death on the high seas and other navigable waters;

A bill (S. 1662) permitting suits against the United States for damages caused by vessels owned or operated by the United States; and

A bill (S. 1663) to authorize the maintenance of actions for negligence causing death in maritime cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 1664) concerning railroad tickets, and to provide a penalty for violating the provisions of this act; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 1665) for the relief of the trustees of the Davenport Female College; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOFF:

A bill (S. 1666) granting a pension to John H. Caldwell;

A bill (S. 1667) granting an increase of pension to David B. Ormiston;

A bill (S. 1668) granting an increase of pension to Effie M. Bing; and

A bill (S. 1669) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Baughman (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 1670) for the relief of Anastasios Argyros (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1671) for the relief of George Owens, John J. Bradley, William M. Godfrey, Rudolph G. Ebert, Herschel Tupes, William H. Sage, Charles L. Tostevin, Alta B. Spaulding, Grace E. Lewis, and Dolly Neely; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona:

A bill (S. 1672) granting a pension to Thomas F. Lancaster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 1673) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant further extensions of time within which to make proof on desert-land entries in the county of Grant, State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 1674) for the reinstatement of Lieut. Col. Constantine Marrast Perkins to the active list of the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENSON:

A bill (S. 1675) granting an increase of pension to James Jameson;

A bill (S. 1676) granting an increase of pension to John Eagan;

A bill (S. 1677) granting an increase of pension to Charles Brown;

A bill (S. 1678) granting an increase of pension to George W. Vincent;

A bill (S. 1679) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Oyster;

A bill (S. 1680) granting an increase of pension to Frank D. Murdock;

A bill (S. 1681) granting an increase of pension to Edward R. Dudley; and

A bill (S. 1682) granting an increase of pension to Horace L. Chadbourne; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLT:

A bill (S. 1683) granting an increase of pension to Addie St. Clair Hubbell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1684) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Medbury (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1685) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Waldron (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1686) granting an increase of pension to Lucie A. Hicks (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 1687) granting a pension to George Wood; and

A bill (S. 1688) granting an increase of pension to William A. Babcock; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE:

A bill (S. 1689) authorizing the accounting officers of the Treasury to allow in the accounts of the United States marshal for the district of Connecticut amounts paid by him from certain appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ABANDONMENT OF DESTITUTE PARENTS.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill providing against the abandonment of destitute, infirm, or aged parents in the District of Columbia. I may say, in passing, that it is identical with the bill which passed the Senate during the last Congress. I ask its reference to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The bill (S. 1653), providing against the abandonment of destitute, infirm, or aged parents, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

UNIFORM BILLS OF LADING.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill relating to bills of lading in interstate and foreign commerce. I will state that this is substantially the same as Senate bill 387, introduced by me several weeks ago, and as the bill which passed the Senate at the last session. There are several modifications which have been made by friends of the measure, and it is to satisfy their desires that the amended bill is presented.

The principal change is in sections 2 and 3 of the original bill, which provided for the form of the bill of lading. It is claimed that the Interstate Commerce Commission has the power to provide the form of a bill of lading. With the amendments contained in the modified form, that entire part of the subject would be left to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

There are several other changes, but they simply tend to perfect the bill and in no way change the plan or purpose of the measure as it was passed at the last session of Congress. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The bill (S. 1654), relating to bills of lading in interstate and foreign commerce, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. McCUMBER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $76,700 for the support and education of 200 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Wahpeton, N. Dak., and to pay the superintendent, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the administrator of the estate of John W. West, deceased, the sum of $5,000, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States standing to the credit of the Cherokee Nation of Indians, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $40,000 for an investigation into the cases referred to in the report transmitted to Congress April 22, 1912, relative to the names of all persons found to be equitably entitled to enrollment as members of either of the Five Civilized Tribes, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CUMMINS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $2,000 to print the proceedings of the annual convention of the National Association of Railway Commissioners, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE submitted an amendment authorizing the accounting officers of the Treasury to allow in the accounts of the United States marshal for the district of Connecticut amounts paid by him from the appropriation "Pay of bailiffs, etc., United States courts, 1912," to Selah G. Blakeman, $192, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—THOMAS F. MANGAN.

On motion of Mr. WORKS, it was

Ordered, That Thomas F. Mangan be authorized to withdraw from the files of the Senate all papers accompanying Senate bill No. 6505, Sixty-second Congress, second session, entitled "A bill granting a pension to Thomas F. Mangan," no adverse report having been made thereon.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. OWEN. On March 17 the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] reported back favorably from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate Senate resolution 13, special session of the Senate, authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to employ clerks, and it was considered, amended, and agreed to. On the 24th of April I moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to and that the resolution be recommitted to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, which was agreed to. I move that the vote be reconsidered by which the resolution was referred to the Com-

mittee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. OWEN. I ask that the resolution be considered.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ a clerk at $2,500 per annum, an assistant clerk at $1,440 per annum, and a messenger at $1,200 per annum, to be paid from "Miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

POLICEMEN'S AND FIREMEN'S PENSION ROLLS (S. DOC. NO. 10).

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, some days since I introduced a resolution asking for information as to the pension roll of the police and fire departments of the District of Columbia. A report has been made by the commissioners. I have casually examined it, and it seems to me it ought to be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, with a view of having the committee investigate the disbursing of the funds. The funds are collected from various fines and other systems of taxation here in the District.

I notice, on page 66, that one G. J. Burton, who is an ex-policeman, has been retired with a pension of $40 a month on account of the disease of locomotor ataxia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For the benefit of the Senator from Kansas, the Chair will state that the report has already been referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. It was referred on the 17th of the present month.

Mr. BRISTOW. That is what I rose to suggest in case it had not been done.

As I was saying, the report shows that a Mr. Burton, who is pensioned at the rate of $40 a month, having been retired because of the disease of locomotor ataxia, is now a clerk in the War Department receiving a salary of $1,400 a year. It also shows that one Isaac Pearson, who is pensioned at the rate of $90 a month, having been retired because of old age, is now a messenger or watchman in one of the departments at $720 a year.

While Mr. Pearson was retired at the rate of $90 per month on account of age, there appear to be other policemen who were retired at much lower rates on account of age. It seems that there is no rule and no law governing the amount which shall be paid. It is discretionary with the commissioners. They can give a policeman when he retires $90 or $20 or $50, or whatever they think he is entitled to, and if he recovers from his affliction he can go out and get employment and continue to draw this pension. I think it is a matter that the District Committee ought to examine with some care, with a view of having some law regulating these payments.

TRUSTS AND COMBINATIONS.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on next Monday, immediately after the routine morning business, I shall submit some remarks upon the subject of trusts and combinations.

THE JEFFERSON MEMORIAL COMMITTEE.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I was appointed originally upon the committee assigned to visit St. Louis in connection with the Jefferson memorial. I hoped to be able to go, but I find this morning I can not. Therefore I ask the consent of the Senate to withdraw or resign from that committee. I hope the Chair may be able to appoint some one in my stead who will be able to go.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the Senator from Iowa will be excused from service upon the committee. The Chair would be under obligation to the Senator from Iowa if he would suggest a successor who could go.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have made no inquiry, Mr. President. I am not able to make the suggestion just now, but I will inquire, and if I can find anyone who will go I will be glad to give the name to the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The announcement will not be made until later.

PRINTING OF TARIFF REPORT.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

House concurrent resolution 7.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 20,000 additional copies of the report of the Ways and Means Committee on House bill 3321—15,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, to be apportioned as follows: Two thousand to the Committee on Ways and Means, 1,000 to the House document room, 12,000 to the House folding room; and 5,000 for the use of the Senate.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming from a preceding day, which will be read.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 65, submitted by Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama on the 24th instant, as modified as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is hereby directed to inquire into and report to the Senate the number of men in the Diplomatic Service of the United States and in the Consular Service, the States from which appointed, the aggregate salaries of the appointees from the several States and the District of Columbia, and the political party with which such appointees were affiliated at the time of their appointment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this resolution, I take it, is intended to lay the foundation for a radical change in the present system of conducting the Consular Service.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I will ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he will yield to me?

Mr. LODGE. I will yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. It is merely to permit me to make a suggestion. I am going to ask that the resolution may lie over until the next sitting of the Senate, because I have some additional matter that I wish to present, and I desire to change the character of the resolution a little. I am not prepared to go on with it now.

Mr. LODGE. Of course I have no objection to the resolution going over, but what I desire to say about it can be said as well at this time as any other. I wish, first, to call attention to what has been done and what has been attempted in regard to the Consular Service, which I think has been somewhat overlooked.

It is a very natural desire on the part of the victorious party when they secure control of the administration to fill the consular offices with new men. I quite understand the pressure that exists. I quite understand the desire. I have been through similar situations myself on more than one occasion. But I think, Mr. President, just what has been done in regard to this service not only by successive administrations but by successive Congresses should be considered.

Appointments to the Consular Service of the United States until comparatively recent times have been simply through political favoritism. That system has been carried on by both parties. At times the changes in the service have been so complete that the whole service has been suddenly filled with new men. That condition was so prejudicial to the work of the service that the matter was taken up in Congress, and for many years efforts have been made to improve the Consular Service and make it what it should be—a service for the promotion of the export business of the United States and the protection of its trade and commerce.

The first attempt in that direction I find in a report, in response to a resolution of the House of Representatives, on the Consular Service, transmitted by President Arthur in 1882. That was followed by a message from President Arthur in 1884, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of State, which discussed the whole service with great elaboration with a view to its improvement. President Arthur again brought the subject before Congress in 1885. In the House the question was also taken up and pressed from year to year. The first effort was made in 1886, under President Cleveland's first term, when Mr. Belmont, reporting a bill from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, said:

> The chief purpose of this bill is to put the Consular Service of the United States on a salaried basis, to abolish the uncertain and demoralizing system of compensation by fees, and to bring within the control of Congress a large number of important consular positions which are now practically buried from public scrutiny.

In 1897 Mr. Adams, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, took up the question of the reorganization of the service. He made another report in 1898, another in 1900, and another in 1902. Finally he reported a bill for that purpose in 1903, and again in 1906, which was the year we passed the bill under which reorganization was undertaken.

In 1911 an attempt was made in the House for the improvement of the foreign service by a report by Mr. Lowden, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, a Republican, and later one with that object was made by Mr. Sulzer, the present governor of New York, covering the Diplomatic Service.

In the Senate the first attempt to reorganize the Consular Service, place it upon a business basis, and remove it from politics was made by one of the ablest and most patriotic Senators I have ever been associated with in this body, Senator Morgan, of Alabama. He prepared a very elaborate bill for the improvement of the service and submitted it, with a report, in 1895, during Mr. Cleveland's second administration.

In the following year he asked me to take charge of the measure, he being employed with other matters, and I reported the bill, embodying his report as my report for that year.

I reported again legislation to improve the Consular Service in 1900, in 1902, and finally in 1906, the bill under which the reorganization was affected. It will thus be seen that I reported the bill and made elaborate reports during a succession of Congresses from the Committee on Foreign Relations without obtaining any action. Finally, in 1906, we passed the bill which is the present law.

During the last decade of the last century there was a great growth in the export of manufactures from the United States, and the business men of the country, all the boards of trade and chambers of commerce everywhere, took up this matter of the Consular Service. Our service at that time was extremely ineffective. A great many inexperienced men were put into it and it was wholly inadequate for the proper care of the trade interests of the United States. These great business organizations brought the matter forward, pressed it on the attention of Congress for years, and with their active support we succeeded in getting through this bill. The bill did not go as far as they desired it to go. It did not go as far as I and some other members of the committee wished it to go. We desired to provide in the bill for promotions and examinations, but we were unable to obtain a majority of the committee or of the Senate for those provisions. We did, however, pass a bill which took the first step toward putting the Consular Service on a proper footing, which was to grade the consulates and to give to the nine grades proportionate salaries. Prior to this time the salaries were entirely haphazard. From year to year Senators and Representatives would get an increase here or there, and there was no regularity and no proper proportion was observed in the salaries with relation to the business done at the various offices.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. My attention was attracted by the suggestion the Senator made that in that bill they succeeded in getting adequate salaries for the consuls of the United States. I want in all seriousness to ask the Senator if he does not think the compensation now paid to consuls, consuls general, and even diplomatic officers of the Government is meager and totally inadequate to the service rendered?

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator from New Hampshire misunderstood me. I did not say adequate salaries. I said, or I meant to say, salaries better proportioned to the comparative duties of the different positions. Many of the consular officers are underpaid, and our Diplomatic Service is shockingly underpaid.

Mr. GALLINGER. I quite agree that the bill did greatly improve the matter of salaries by classifying the consuls and making the salaries equal in various classes. But it has during my entire service appealed to me as being rather a reproach to our Government that we are asking men to go away from their homes and serve the Government in this special capacity upon salaries that are scandalously low. That applies to the service from top to bottom as I look at it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. BORAH. Are the salaries paid for this service lower proportionately than the salaries of other officers of the United States?

Mr. LODGE. In the Consular Service?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. I think they are in many cases; not in all. Since the regrading of the salaries they are much more nearly proportionate to the duties of the offices than ever before. But the Senator must remember that we had one great abuse which I have not touched upon, and which I did not touch upon because it did not seem necessary to my argument to deal with it.

Originally, the consuls were paid by fees, and there were certain consular offices in the old days which were among the great prizes of politics. The London office, for example, was one of the best. It paid as much as $40,000 a year. In seeking improvements there was at first a certain proportion of the fees cut down, and then we cut off in the bill of 1906 all the notarial fees, as they were called. But even after the first cut down of fees some of the officers received immense salaries. There were a very few, of course, but nevertheless that was one great abuse we had to get rid of. It was disposed of first partially by department regulation and then completely by the bill.

In making up a large table of salaries it was inevitable that in some cases we did not pay the consul fairly, because there are many places where the fees are small and the duties at the same time very heavy, the place remote, and living expensive, and that has caused some consular officers to be underpaid. Those fees, however, we got rid of. I remember, if I may digress for a moment in order to give an idea of the fee system, that many years ago a distinguished gentleman held the office of consul in London. A friend went in to see him one morning and asked him to lunch with him. He sat there waiting for him to get ready, and he watched him signing his name and taking a guinea every time he signed it. He said to him as they walked off, "This seems to me a pretty good place." "Why," the consul replied, "it is as good as keeping a tollhouse on the Strand."

The old system of fees gave enormous salaries to certain officers. That abuse, as I have said, we are rid of, and of course we shall not return to it. In doing this, however, let me repeat that in making those adjustments which were more or less complicated a good many consuls now receive too little, while others, I think, are fairly paid.

Now, having done so much by the law, which was a very great step, the department proceeded to supplement it with regulations, and I want next to call attention to what the department has done.

The first effort to cure the abuses and improve the efficiency of the consular service was made by President Cleveland, who issued an order for examination of consuls of the lower salaries in 1895. There had been under President Harrison and again under President Cleveland when he came in for the second time an almost clean sweep of the consular officers, and Mr. Cleveland came to see very clearly and feel very strongly the injury which that old spoils system did to the United States and to its business. There is no part of the Government service where experience is so necessary and so valuable as in the consular service. It was with that end in view, in order to cure the evil of wholesale changes, that Mr. Cleveland issued his examination order of 1895. It was the first step, not a very long one, toward securing men of at least some initial fitness for the place. Under that examination order of Mr. Cleveland there are now in the service 2 consuls general at large, 11 consuls general, 65 consuls, in all 78, who came in under the examination order of 1895. That was as far as it was possible to go without legislation by Congress.

After Congress had legislated in 1906 a reorganization examination order was put into effect in the department by President Roosevelt, and under that order there have been appointed 3 consuls general and 75 consuls, in all 78.

It is since the adoption of the reorganization order of 1906 that the department has endeavored to give a proper distribution locally to the offices. Before that time there were no grades, no classifications, and no attention was paid to the distribution. The appointments were made on political lines and went chiefly to the States which happened to give their electoral vote to the party in power.

Since that time the department has endeavored, I know, to bring the quotas of the States to a greater equality. I have been over the list with some care, and I want to read to the Senate those 77 appointments—there is one missing, made, I suppose, since the report came in—which have been made since the law of 1906 was passed and the reorganization order of President Roosevelt was followed by the department. Those 77 appointments are distributed as follows:

Alabama 1, California 2, Colorado 2, District of Columbia 1, Delaware 1, Georgia 4, Hawaii 1, Illinois 7, Iowa 1, Kansas 1, Kentucky 2, Louisiana 2, Maryland 1, Michigan 2, Minnesota 1, Mississippi 3, Missouri 7, Montana 1, Nebraska 2, New Jersey 1, New York 3, New Mexico 1, North Carolina 1, Oregon 1, Oklahoma 1, Pennsylvania 8, South Carolina 4, Tennessee 6, Texas 2, Utah 1, Virginia 3, Vermont 1, Washington 1, and Wisconsin 1.

I think nobody can read that list and not see the effort that was made for a fair distribution. I notice that there is only one appointment from all New England in those six years. The Senator was reading the list of Massachusetts appointments. I know from my own personal experience that there was only one consul appointed from Massachusetts under President Roosevelt's administration, and he was in the service before the reorganization. The answer to requests for appointments was always that our quota was already so large, and it has been steadily reduced since that time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I suppose the Senator from Massachusetts knows that Massachusetts now has 37 in the Consular Service.

Mr. LODGE. Massachusetts has not 37 consuls and never has had, I am quite sure, more than 18. I think the number is now down to 12, as a matter of fact.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. That is my information taken from the reports.

Mr. LODGE. I am afraid the information may be incorrect. I am speaking, of course, only of consuls, not clerks, consular agents, or vice consuls.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. It is according to the reports which I have.

Mr. LODGE. I have the reports here; but at all events since 1906 only one has been appointed from all New England. That shows, I think, the efforts that have been made under the reorganization and under the system of examination to distribute consulships fairly among the different States, as they ought to be. It was impossible to properly distribute them all at once according to the quota. The one thing that was important was not to turn out of the service competent men.

Now, Mr. President, as to the examinations. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] spoke of mathematics, which is always brought up whenever anything is said about examinations. I have here the regulations governing examinations, from which it appears that—

The written examination will include those subjects mentioned in the Executive order, to wit, at least one modern language other than English—French, German, or Spanish; the natural, industrial, and commercial resources and the commerce of the United States, especially with reference to possibilities of increasing and extending the foreign trade of the United States; political economy, and the elements of international, commercial, and maritime law.

Those are all subjects which a consul ought to know something about.

It will likewise include American history, Government, and institutions; political and commercial geography; arithmetic (as used in commercial statistics, tariff calculations, exchange accounts, etc.)—

Which is part of every consul's business—

the modern history, since 1850, of Europe, Latin America, and the Far East.

Those are all subjects on which consuls should be informed.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Massachusetts think that the present consuls, or any considerable number of them, have passed that examination so as to demonstrate their knowledge of those subjects?

Mr. LODGE. Seventy-eight have passed the examination just described, and 78 passed an examination under the Cleveland order, which was an examination of much the same character.

Mr. STONE. Does the Senator from Massachusetts mean to say that they passed the particular examination to which he has just referred?

Mr. LODGE. All those 78 men who have come in since 1906 have passed examinations on those precise subjects, and they have all been required to understand one language other than their own. It is a very severe examination, as I have reason to know.

Mr. STONE. It is exceptionally severe, and in large part, to me, seemingly unnecessary for the proper discharge of a consul's duties.

Mr. LODGE. That is a difference of opinion. The examinations seem to me very well selected for those who are to perform consular duties. I think the examinations are on subjects that consuls ought to know about.

Mr. STONE. Well, take a consul in Germany, for example. The general duty of a consul is to look after the commercial interests of his country, to see, so far as he can, that discriminations are not made, and, if they are, to report them; to report commercial and industrial conditions in the country to which he is accredited; and to do what he can in the way of exploiting and extending the commercial relations between his own country and the country where he is located. As to a consul in Germany speaking the German language, becoming more or less intimate with the conditions at the post where he is located, the commercial environment about him, of what particular importance is it to know something about the maritime geography of the Orient?

Mr. LODGE. Well, Mr. President, I have not examined the posts to which the 78 men have been sent, but undoubtedly, as to these men, if one man speaks German and another speaks French, it is not likely that the Government will send the one who speaks German to France or the one who speaks French to Germany. All those subjects of examination are valuable in the Consular Service, for the main duty of a consul, of course, is everywhere the same, as stated by the Senator from Missouri. At all events, the result of this system has been that, in the first place, we have been able to secure the consular reports and bulletins as to business in the different countries, which we all receive and which have been of enormous value to the business of the country, as I know by the great demand for them. That information has to be gathered by intelligent and active men.

Moreover, in a certain proportion of places consuls have to perform more or less diplomatic duties. Of course, in China they have extra territorial functions; they have consular courts; but there are places, for instance like Munich and Dresden, where the Kingdom of Saxony and the Kingdom of Bavaria have completely independent governments within the German Empire. We have but one diplomatic representative in Germany, and that is the ambassador accredited to the German Empire, who is naturally placed at Berlin, and the consuls general at Munich and Dresden have to perform diplomatic duties. In the same way there are consuls in the colonies and in portions of the British dominions scattered all over the world where they are not in contact with our diplomatic representative and have very often serious diplomatic duties to perform.

Mr. OVERMAN. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. OVERMAN. Have not many of these consuls been in office so long in Germany, for example, that they become more German than American and those in France more French than American?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, under the system of grading the offices which was adopted in the law to which I have referred, and under the provisions of the regulations all men who enter the Consular Service for the first time enter in the two lowest grades. The result is that all vacancies as they occur are filled by transfers and promotions. There has been more motion and movement in that way than before; there is a constant movement; and it is against the policy of the department to keep any man very long in one place unless it is in some extremely exceptional position.

Mr. OVERMAN. While these men have been moved from place to place, they are more foreign than American, as I understand.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think so, Mr. President.

Mr. OVERMAN. A great many of them know nothing about our conditions. They have not grown with the country; they have been abroad so long that they really have ceased to be Americans.

Mr. LODGE. Why, Mr. President, there has been nothing so discreditable to this country and so harmful as sending a lot of green men abroad who know nothing about the business. There is no service in the world where experience is so valuable as in the Consular Service. These consuls all come home occasionally; they all keep in touch with their Government and their country. Of course it is for their immediate interest to do so. If they do not, they lose their places.

Mr. OVERMAN. A very remarkable statement was made to me, which I will give to the Senator for what it is worth, by a man who is a commercial traveler—a very good man, who has made a great deal of money in traveling abroad and selling our goods. He said that he never now went for information to an American consul, for when he had done so he did not get the information he wanted, and that he actually in many countries had to frequently pretend that he was a British subject in order to get the information he wanted; that he had found out by frequent travel abroad that our consular officers were not worth a cent; that they could give him no information; that they did not take that proper interest in him as an American citizen that they ought to have taken, and, therefore, as I have said, many times he was compelled to rely on consuls of other Governments. He has been traveling for years, and has sold goods by the millions abroad, but states that he could get more information from a British or a German consul than he could from one of our own consuls.

Mr. LODGE. That evidence is entirely exceptional, Mr. President. The evidence of all the boards of trade and chambers of commerce throughout this country is totally different. We had formerly a very poor Consular Service; there was great dissatisfaction among our people engaged in the export trade and in commerce on account of the inefficiency of the service, and, as I have said, it was largely through their efforts that this legislation was brought about.

To-day we have, as it is admitted abroad everywhere, one of the best and most efficient consular services in the world. It is desirable, too, that men should make a career in the Consular Service, just as they do in anything else, and not have them changed every four years and get an entirely new set of men who have to learn the business.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. So far as I could, notwithstanding interruptions, I have been giving attention to what the Senator has said, and I am impressed with the notion that he is making, as he always does, a very strong argument, although it seems to me a somewhat labored one, to maintain the existing system. I am not in favor of the existing system. After the Senator had read somewhat from a document indicating the scope of the civil-service examination which has to be taken for the Consular Service, including, among other things, a knowledge of commercial and maritime geography, I asked him whether he thought it was really important that a consul in the heart of Germany, engaged in the discharge of the important duties devolving upon him, should have a knowledge of the maritime geography of the Orient.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, an applicant is not examined for a consulate in Germany; he is examined for the Consular Service. He may be sent anywhere. I think a knowledge of commercial and maritime law and a knowledge of political and commercial geography must be useful to a consul.

Mr. STONE. It is useful to any man; certainly.

Mr. LODGE. Well, I think it is particularly useful to a consul.

Mr. STONE. I hope the Senator will not understand me as disparaging the importance to any man of having information on the subjects indicated in the document from which he has read. I think it would be valuable to a consul, and I think it would be valuable to any man in any branch of the public service, but I do not think it is essential or necessary.

I agree with the Senator that experience in this service, as in any other, is of very great importance, and I can well understand that a consul who has had experience in the service in any country is better equipped to discharge the duties of the place than a new man who has just entered it; but still we have no wish to exclude, or ought not to have any wish to exclude, other men from entering the public service. Now, I ask the Senator whether he believes that a man who is mature in years, who is in business and commercial life, and who has had large experience in that behalf is better qualified to go to any country to look after the commercial interests of our people, with a view to extending our commerce—and that is the main thing, for we want to increase our exports and our trade——

Mr. LODGE. We are doing that.

Mr. STONE. There are hundreds of men like that—and I am not speaking now from the narrow standpoint of politics, but from the broader standpoint of the public service—there are hundreds of such men in all the parties who would be excluded from this service if they were required to take that examination; and yet you can find a youth of 22 or 23 years, out of school recently, familiar with the curriculum and the instruction of the classroom, who would go through such an examination and secure a rating that would entitle him to be appointed, while an experienced business man of sound judgment and splendidly equipped, it may be, for actual, effective service, would not undertake that examination. I will say to the Senator—and I have no doubt what I am about to say has come within his experience, as I am sure it has come within the experience of other Senators—I have seen men who years ago were the graduates of colleges of high rank, but who have been engaged in important commercial and professional affairs for years, who have told me when they have looked over the questions of this examination that they could not undertake it; that they could have taken that examination 20 or 25 years ago, but they could not do so now. Even if they undertook it I venture to say they would be at a disadvantage in the contest with a young man just out of school who had had no commercial experience.

So far as my judgment goes, I believe the experienced business man, the commercial traveler, such as my friend from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] has referred to——

Mr. LODGE. I should think he must have been thoroughly unfit.

Mr. STONE. I mean that general class of men; but I do not see any reason why he should be thoroughly unfit, if he is telling the truth.

Mr. LODGE. Because he evidently did not know about his own Consular Service.

Mr. STONE. I think such men are better qualified to advance the commercial interests of the American people abroad than youngsters just sprouting their first mustaches, who are just out of the atmosphere and environment of college, without experience.

I will say further to the Senator, if he will pardon me, that I have traveled to some extent both in Europe and in the Orient and in other sections. I did not mean to force the Senator to sit down; but I have seen consuls—and if it were proper to do it I could name two or three of them—young chaps who were appointed because of political considerations more than anything else. I have one in mind. I will not give the name, but I will give the circumstances. He passed his examination. He was quite a bright young man, fresh from college. A certain President was approached by the editor and manager of one of the great newspapers of the Mississippi Valley. This young gentleman was a relative of his. He said to the President: "I supported you for nomination and election, and this is the one thing I ask.' The President sent him to one of the more important posts to our country in a commercial way, to which any man could be assigned, and sent him as consul general. Well, he was a bright young society fellow, of large wealth——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me at that point, that is just what can not be done under the present regulations.

Mr. STONE. But I can go to the President to-day and ask him to designate such a man for the examination and if he passes it——

Mr. LODGE. He could not do it without rescinding the regulations.

Mr. STONE. Why?

Mr. LODGE. Because he would have to rescind the Executive orders and regulations of the department to do it.

Mr. STONE. How are these consuls appointed?

Mr. LODGE. They are required to be appointed, under the regulations, to the lowest grade.

Mr. STONE. I know; but they are designated for examination——

Mr. LODGE. That may be.

Mr. STONE. And they are examined by the departmental authorities.

Mr. LODGE. The man to whom the Senator refers could not have had a place high up in the service. As a man entering in that way, he would have to be put in one of the lower grades under the present regulations. It might have been done before 1906 perfectly well.

Mr. STONE. I will say that this was done long after Mr. Cleveland went out of office.

Mr. LODGE. Probably; but some time intervened between the time Mr. Cleveland went out of office and 1906. It was done before 1906.

Mr. STONE. It was done after 1896.

Mr. LODGE. Eighteen ninety-six—ah, yes; I have no doubt of it. That is just what the present regulations undertake to correct.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Massachusetts has been long identified with the Committee on Foreign Relations, and has taken a prominent part in matters relating to that committee. Sitting by him is the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], formerly Secretary of State. I should like to know if I am wrong when I say that if I desire to have a man appointed consul my first step is to secure his examination. I went to President Taft and to President Roosevelt, and I asked to have young men designated for examination, and they were designated, stood a creditable examination, and were appointed.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. That is the way it is done now.

Mr. LODGE. They were appointed to the two lower grades. That is the way it must be done.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to conclude what I have to say. I have taken much more time than I had intended to take. However, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. I should like to ask one question of the Senator from Massachusetts. How long must a man who is appointed to the lowest grade serve in that grade before he is promoted to the next grade?

Mr. LODGE. There is no time at all fixed.

Mr. FALL. Then he can pass an examination and be assigned to the lowest grade and be promoted the next day, can he not?

Mr. LODGE. I never knew of such a thing being done. I suppose it is possible.

Mr. FALL. There is no regulation against it, and no law against it?

Mr. LODGE. He can only be promoted to the next grade above.

Mr. FALL. But he could be promoted to three different grades in one day?

Mr. LODGE. We are proceeding, of course, under regulations in this matter of examination and admission to the lower grades and promotion and transfer.

In reply to what the Senator from Missouri has said, Mr. President, I will say that I have in my time seen the service filled with these "valuable men who can not pass examination," and who, after a business career which may have been successful or may not, or after a professional career which may have been successful or may not, want a little change of climate and scene, and would like a pleasant official position abroad for four years. I saw the service largely filled in that way in the course of six months under the Republican administration of President Harrison. I saw it done again under the Democratic administration of Mr. Cleveland, the change being made then in something like three months. That class of valuable citizens who can not pass an examination, but who are so admirable for our purposes, and who can not speak any language but one——

Mr. STONE. Ah! On that point——

Mr. LODGE. Wait a minute, Mr. President. I will yield to the Senator, but let me finish. I saw the service filled with those valuable citizens who can not pass examinations, and the service became wretched in both cases. It became so bad that Mr. Cleveland himself issued his examination order in 1895. I have taken a Republican and a Democratic instance alike.

Mr. President, I have heard this complaint made again and again about these civil-service examinations. I am aware of their imperfections. I am aware of the technical mistakes that are made. I know the system is not perfect. We are not comparing it with an ideal system, but with the old, bad system, which was a thousand times worse, and which gave the United States a wretched service.

The American people put more faith in education, they spend more money on education, than any people in the world. The belief in the value of education for the people is almost a superstition in the American mind. The only places in this broad land where I have ever heard education sneered at are this body and the House when Members have been talking about offices that they wanted to make the spoils of politics. Then come the sneers at the young man from college, and the statement that he must have his chance only at the bottom of the service with no hope of promotion because he is a young man fresh from college, or fresh from school. Where would you have him come from, Mr. President? Is not that the whole hope and ambition of American life? And in his stead is to be put some elderly man, perhaps, who has failed, who has broken down in business, but who has political affiliations. Some of these political appointees, perhaps, are very bright and energetic men, but most of them are simply those whose political services are thought to deserve a Government reward, who can not pass the examination and have no special or tested fitness for the Consular Service.

Under the old political system we got some good men, of course, but the service as a whole was a poor service. The very partial system—as it has been admitted to be all along—that has been put in force through departmental regulations has, despite its shortcomings, improved the Consular Service enormously.

Mr. President, I am not speaking here to save a few Republicans who happen to be in the Consular Service. I can not even tell you who the men from Massachusetts are whom the Senator from Alabama [Mr. JOHNSTON] counts over so eagerly. I should be at a loss if I were asked, I know so little about it.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. It is not Republican offices that I am trying to save. What I am trying to do is to preserve the consular system as it is now, in order to keep, if possible, the great advantage we have gained through the improvements that have been made in recent years. That is all I care about in this matter. They may fill every place they like with a Democrat in the next four years; they may fill every one with a Democrat if they will submit them to the rules and regulations for examination that now prevail.

I dislike excessively this demand to know the politics of these men. It is not the business of consuls to have politics. Their business is to represent their country in a foreign land and to build up the business of their country, no matter whether the men who have the business are Republicans or Democrats. I do not want to see this service, which we have saved to this extent, retrograde again.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, of course I should never for a moment suspect that the Senator from Massachusetts would make any effort here to retain Republicans in the Consular Service or in any other service. That is a useless and an unnecessary assurance.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me at that point, the Senator might know that I am perfectly aware that it would be totally useless for me to attempt it, even if I wanted to; and I have no desire to attempt it.

Mr. STONE. It is not useless. It is far from being useless. Under the present law, rules, and regulations the appointment of a Democrat, if you put it upon party lines, is very difficult; I will not say impossible.

The Senator speaks of sneering at education and the college youth. Nobody is sneering at education. Nobody sneers at the young man who has come out of college with honor. We congratulate him. We congratulate the country on the possibilities of his future usefulness. Nobody would seek to exclude him from the public service. Give him ample opportunity to enter it. If he has that inspiration, which is an honorable one, encourage it. But I think there are other men, vastly more in numbers, thoroughly competent to represent the Government in any capacity, and able to discharge the duties of public office with even greater capacity and efficiency than a young man just out of college. I do not care what his grade in the college is, or how great honors have been conferred upon him, or the degrees conferred upon him in college. I believe that in the wide world of human experience we find a school of education that fits men for effective public service that is at least comparable to that which we find in the college.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. STONE. Just a moment, if the Senator will pardon me.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not want to seem unreasonable, but the Senator is not asking me a question; he is making a very able speech. At 2 o'clock the morning hour will be at an end and the resolution will go over, and I should like to conclude what I have to say.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. STONE. Let me ask the Senator a question. The Senator spoke disparagingly, a moment ago, of the inability of a man to pass the examination on languages, and referred to the fact that he could not speak more than one language. Only a few days ago, if I mistake not, the Senator himself, from his place here, declared that he did not approve of the provision requiring a man to speak more than one language.

Mr. LODGE. No, no; I did not, Mr. President. On the contrary, I indulged in a little irony about it, and I am sorry to say Senators on the other side did not see it.

Mr. STONE. The Senator indulges in irony often, but we usually take him seriously. Perhaps it is a mistake to take the Senator seriously.

Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to complete what I have to say. I decline to yield further.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts will proceed. He has the floor.

Mr. LODGE. I only wish to conclude what I have to say.

I have here, Mr. President, a list of the consuls at present:

Appointed under the reorganization examination order of 1906, 3 consuls general, 75 consuls; total, 78.

Appointed under President Cleveland's examination order, 2 consuls general at large, 11 consuls general, 65 consuls; total, 78.

Appointed under President Roosevelt's extension of Cleveland's examination order of 1905, 6 consuls general, 25 consuls; total, 31.

Then there are three or four other items.

All that there are now in the service appointed without examination and that came in before the Cleveland order are 1 consul general at large, 29 consuls general, and 56 consuls; in all, 86.

I have only to say in conclusion, Mr. President, that we have obtained a great deal of benefit from the system as now managed. It has proved itself a great improvement over the old system. I have had visions of these valuable men who can not pass examinations and who have not the advantage of speaking some language other than their own danced before my eyes on every occasion when there has been a civil service debate.

I know, and we all know, just what the valuable men are and how they are picked out. Some of them are valuable men. They are men who are picked out by us and by Members of the House of Representatives instead of being picked out or tested by examination. Even if we designate them they now have to be examined, and if they can not pass they do not get appointed. But the appointment of the valuable man who can not pass an examination, and knows no language but his own,

means simply a political appointment through the recommendation of Senators and Representatives.

I think, to put the matter in a nutshell, that we get a better service if men designated for the Consular Service are men of experience, men who have started young in the service and risen through the grades and who have been examined by some disinterested board composed of persons who know the subjects in which consuls should be versed, than when we choose them ourselves, excellent and admirable as we all are.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it seems to me there is one defect in the present regulations. I have not so much quarrel with the regulations as I have with the manner in which they are obeyed. I have never seen any reason why a man who was applying for a consulate in an English-speaking country—Great Britain, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, Cape Colony, Canada, and so forth—should be required to speak in a language other than English.

But my quarrel is not so much with the regulations as with the manner in which they have been carried out, in my opinion; and I hope to have that matter investigated some of these days. The regulations have not been obeyed. I may be wrong in it, but I believe the Senator from Massachusetts would hardly hazard the assertion that the regulations have been obeyed when several men go up to pass this examination, and they fix the test beyond which the applicant goes upon the eligible list at a mark of 80, men who have gotten 80 and more have failed of appointment, while men who upon the combined written and oral examination have gotten 79, 78, 75, and some as low as 65 have been appointed.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to say to the Senator that if the principle of competition has not been enforced under these regulations it ought to be, and I will join him in any legislation that will bring that about. I am not familiar with the appointment or the markings in the Consular Service.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand it, the principle of competition has not been even alleged to exist in regard to this matter.

Mr. LODGE. No; it is a pass examination.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is a pass examination of 80. What I am saying now is that unless I am mistaken, and I am rather inclined to think that the Senator will not hazard the opinion that I am, and that the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] will not, men have been appointed who have fallen below 80; that when the marks by the report of the secretary of the examining board show that they fell below it, in some way or other they have been raised and then appointed.

I hope that matter will be looked into. I do not make the assertion of my own knowledge because, of course, I have none, but unless I am mistaken that sort of thing has happened.

So my quarrel is not so much with the regulations as it is with the fact that the State Department, or men in it, somewhere, somehow manage to put their favorities in when they fail to come up to the mark and to keep other people out when they exceed the mark.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair regrets to announce that the morning hour has closed, and, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 577.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] will yield to me for just one moment, I stated this morning that I would to-morrow ask the Senate to consider House bill 2441, the sundry civil appropriation bill. I find that there are a number of Senators who desire to be present when that bill is taken up but who wish to attend the dedication of the Jefferson memorial at St. Louis.

Therefore, in order to accommodate them, so that they may be in attendance on both occasions, I give notice that I will not ask the Senate to take up the bill for consideration until Monday next.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. KERN. With the consent of the Senator from West Virginia, I desire to submit a motion with reference to the committee assignment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS].

I move that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] be assigned to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of State and to the chairmanship of said committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, it will be so ordered. The Chair hears none.

ADDITIONAL CIECUIT JUDGE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 577) authorizing the President to appoint an additional circuit judge for the fourth circuit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint an additional circuit judge for the fourth circuit, who shall receive the same salary as other circuit judges now receive, and shall reside within the said fourth circuit.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, when this bill was taken up some days ago I objected to it because we will on the 1st of July have four circuit judges for assignment, and there is now a vacancy in the place formerly held by Mr. Archbald, it being vacant since his removal by impeachment. I wanted some one to state why it is necessary to create another circuit judge when we have now a vacancy that is not filled and when there will be four circuit judges at large within two months to be assigned. I should like to have the Senator from West Virginia give us a reason why this additional place ought to be created under those circumstances.

Mr. CHILTON. Does the Senator wish me to answer him now?

Mr. BRISTOW. Certainly. I am not going to make any extended speech. I simply want to get a little information.

Mr. CHILTON. When I come to discuss the bill I will address myself to that part of it. I do not want to break in on the Senator's remarks.

Mr. BRISTOW. I would be very glad to hear the Senator now.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, I do not know that the fourth circuit is any more interested in that subject than any other circuit in the United States. The statute provides that the circuit judges shall reside in their circuits. The fourth circuit desires an additional judge who will reside in that circuit.

We have nine circuits in the United States, every one of which has three or more circuit judges. Some of them have as many as four. Some have been created since the condition mentioned by the Senator from Kansas has existed. On this bill proposing to do justice to the fourth circuit he reserved the occasion to make an objection. He said nothing about it when the other circuits were provided with their full quota of circuit judges.

I do not know that I am called upon to say what we shall do with the Commerce Court. I can only say what I will vote to do with it. I have voted with the Senator from Kansas to abolish the Commerce Court, and I am prepared to do it again. So far as I am concerned, I hope there will be no judge appointed to fill the vacancy which now exists in that court. I do not want to have such a judge assigned to us, because we want a judge in the fourth circuit who is familiar with the common-law practice that obtains in two of the States in the circuit, and because we want a judge who is peculiarly fitted, as we understand, to deal with the great land questions that come up in the States of Virginia and West Virginia. There is a system of practice prevailing there that is just as unique as the western mining-land system. It is just as unique, if I may say so, as the Louisiana practice. Certainly no judge appointed from another State will be acceptable to the bar of any one of the five States that compose the fourth circuit.

We have a circuit court of appeals in that, as in all other circuits, composed of three judges. We have been limping along, as I said the other day, with only two circuit judges. No other circuit has been treated in this way. We have been going along with two, and the only way we can make up the circuit court of appeals is to call in from one of the States a district judge. That brings about this condition of affairs: When we call in a district judge he must leave his business, no matter what condition it may be in. He must drop it just, it may be, at the time he is called upon to serve on the circuit court of appeals. It may be injunctions; it may be receiverships; it may be other important business; but he must leave it all and go to Richmond and sit on the circuit court of appeals. Then he must stay there until those cases are decided; he must prepare opinions; and it mixes up that business with the business of the district courts in the different States.

I know we have been put to great inconvenience in West Virginia for several years on that account. We have the testimony of both the judges of that circuit that this additional judge is needed. We have the testimony of the district bench, and we have that of the entire bar of every one of the States in that circuit.

We do not propose to pause here and deal with a great public question like the abolishing of the Commerce Court. That is a matter for Congress to deal with at the proper time, and it ought to deal with it in a manly, courageous way. If it wants to abolish the Commerce Court, we ought to pass a bill to abolish it and deal with those judges when we come to that question.

We ought not to adopt the system of sending circuit judges down to one of the circuit courts who are not familiar with our practice and not acceptable to the bar and not acceptable to the brother members of the bench.

A bill similar to this has passed the Senate on two occasions. It passed, I think, in the Sixty-first Congress, and it passed in the last Congress. Not a single objection was made to it in the Committee on the Judiciary, and not a single objection was heard in this body. As I said, a similar bill has passed this body twice. The same condition existed at the last session. The Senator from Kansas said nothing about it then. He made no objection to the bill, and it was passed unanimously.

I am not called upon here to answer the Senator's question any further. We simply do not want those judges. We want the fourth circuit dealt with as other circuits have been dealt with, and we want the Senate to treat the fourth circuit fairly and justly.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, the position of the Senator from West Virginia is this: Here are four circuit judges. There were five. One of them was removed, but the fifth place still remains. The law that created these five additional circuit judges provides that after a service of a certain time on the Commerce Court they shall be assigned to circuits. The Senator from West Virginia says we do not want them in the fourth circuit; we want another additional judge. Well, why does he not want them? Are they not competent?

Mr. CHILTON. I do not know.

Mr. BRISTOW. The law requires them to be assigned. What are you going to do with them? Are you going to assign them or not? Are you going to appropriate their salary from year to year with nothing for them to do because a Senator does not want them to be assigned to a certain circuit where he happens to live?

I do not think that anything was ever presented to an intelligent body of men more ridiculous than this proposition to create an additional circuit judge when we have five with one vacancy, and there are four judges now who will have nothing to do except to be assigned somewhere. The Senator living in the fourth circuit says we do not want any of them there; we want to have some one else appointed. It looks to me like legislation to make a place to put a judge in the vacancy; that it is necessary to take care of somebody.

Mr. CHILTON. May I ask the Senator a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. BRISTOW. Gladly.

Mr. CHILTON. It is impossible to create a judgeship without fixing a place to put somebody in, because only somebody can be a judge. Of course, the Senator's question answers itself. This is undoubtedly a bill to create a place to put somebody in, but I want to ask the Senator this question: Take the place of Judge Archbald. He was a circuit judge, was he not?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes.

Mr. CHILTON. That place is vacant, is it not?

Mr. BRISTOW. It is.

Mr. CHILTON. Somebody has to be assigned to that position, does he not? It is a vacancy under existing law.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes, surely.

Mr. CHILTON. Why should not that judge be assigned to that vacancy rather than to assign another judge to the vacancy in the fourth circuit?

Mr. BRISTOW. What is the use to create another place when the place is not filled now?

Mr. CHILTON. Fill it with this judge. Under the existing law you must have another circuit judge. They must be assigned from the circuit court bench. There is no such thing per se as a Commerce Court judge. You assign to the Commerce Court a circuit court judge when you have a vacancy on the Commerce Court?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes.

Mr. CHILTON. There is no circuit clamoring for the court to take one of their judges. If you appoint this judge, and the President wants to do it, and the regulation is a proper one, assign him to it, but give us our quota in our circuit.

Mr. BRISTOW. There is a vacancy now in the judiciary and a place to fill. This is a proposition to create another place and leave the vacancy and not fill it.

Mr. CHILTON. No; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. BRISTOW. He must be assigned somewhere.

Mr. CHILTON. It is not an accurate statement that the Senator makes. There is a vacancy on the Commerce Court, but that could be filled from the circuit judges already in existence.

Mr. BRISTOW. There is a vacant circuit judgeship.

Mr. CHILTON. Yes; that may be true.

Mr. BRISTOW. It is true.

Mr. CHILTON. You do not have to appoint some one in his place. You can assign him from a circuit.

Mr. BRISTOW. It is an evidence that no additional circuit judges are needed when the place has gone on for months and has not been filled; and on the 1st of July there will be four judges holding these places to be assigned. If an appropriation has been made for the continuation of the Commerce Court some of them would be retained in the Commerce Court and others assigned, and some other circuit court judge brought in and assigned to the Commerce Court. This is simply a plan to create another judge when we have already a vacancy, and when on the 1st of July we will have four circuit judges without anything to do ready for assignment.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BRISTOW. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. I was about to make a suggestion to the Senator from Kansas.

I investigated this matter as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. Undoubtedly the fourth circuit ought to have an additional circuit judge in order to transact the business which must be done in that circuit. It must be true, also, that in any orderly and well-arranged system the circuit judges should be appointed from the circuit in which they are to hold their courts.

I have great sympathy with the Senator from West Virginia in his opposition to the assignment of the judges who have held the Commerce Court for permanent work in the fourth circuit, and that is without disparaging in the least degree their judicial qualifications. But, on the other hand, the position of the Senator from Kansas is unassailable. We have more circuit judges than we need if the Commerce Court is to be abolished, as I think most will agree that it ought to be and as nearly everyone concedes it will be.

In view of these conflicting positions, all of which I think are sound, although that may be paradoxical, I propose an amendment to the bill. I ask the Senator from Kansas if this amendment would not meet the objection which he has raised to the bill? I propose to add to the bill the amendment which I have sent to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. Add, at the end of the bill, the following proviso:

Provided, That the office of circuit judge to which Robert W. Archbald was originally appointed is hereby abolished, and no successor shall be appointed to fill said office.

Mr. BRISTOW. That would utilize the vacancy. I think that improves the bill very much, because it simply utilizes a position that was created some years since.

Mr. CUMMINS. It does provide for the fourth circuit the additional circuit judge to which it is entitled and it prevents the accumulation of circuit judges which are unnecessary. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. BRISTOW. Then we can take care of the other four judges when we get to that matter later on. That will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I hope the Senator means that we will take care of them by abolishing the places.

Mr. BRISTOW. I would be very glad to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the bill.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. President, I indulge the hope that the Senate will favorably consider this bill. It is meritorious and it will greatly facilitate the administration of justice in the fourth circuit.

For quite a number of years past I have been the senior circuit judge of that circuit, and I think the Senate will pardon me if I say that I am in a position at least to suggest to the Senate that which the Senate owes that great section of the country.

The fourth circuit is composed of five States—North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, and Maryland. It is the only circuit among the nine of the United States that has not at least three circuit judges, some of them having four and even more.

What takes place in the circuit courts of appeal or in the district courts? How are they held and how constituted? The circuit judges as well as the district judges compose the appellate court. We have had but two circuit judges. That has necessitated the summoning, the designation under the law, of at least two district judges to attend every term of the appellate court. Frequently three judges are called from the

district courts to sit on the bench of the circuit court of appeals, thus necessarily closing their district courts.

The dockets of the courts are becoming congested. It is impossible when a district judge is sitting on the appellate court that the business in his district can be properly carried on. He may hurriedly make a trip into his district, leaving the appellate court in order to do so, that the decrees absolutely essential to the people of his district should be hastily passed.

Now, another thing, and I speak from experience, having been there for 20 years past, the dockets have increased at a wonderful rate. The character of the business has assumed different proportions. That section of the country has passed through a wonderful development, and that development is of a character that has given to the circuit court of appeals as well as the district courts in the fourth circuit an unusual amount of business of a high grade. Railroads have been built all through that land in the last 8 or 10 years. Primeval forests have been invaded, especially in the great State of North Carolina and in the States of Virginia and West Virginia. Mines have been developed wonderfully. Oil and gas and coal have brought into those States an immense amount of capital, and that has necessarily brought a character of litigation that is worthy the attention of the Senate.

Now, you may say that with the district judges attending the appellate court the cases on the appellate docket will have due consideration. Grant it; but does it not necessarily follow that the cases on the district dockets will not have due consideration?

Now, a word with my friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW]. There seems to be a mistaken idea as to the method pursued in the courts of the United States. That which is practiced in one district is utterly in conflict with the practice in another. The only cases in the courts of the United States where the practice is the same are admiralty and equity, and so far as those cases are concerned the old English practice as it existed when the Constitution of the United States was adopted is the practice to-day. But in all other character of litigation, all actions at law, the practice in the courts of the United States, by virtue of the act of Congress of the United States, is the same as the practice in the State courts where those Federal courts are located.

I have practiced 20 years in the fourth circuit. Twenty other years I was the presiding judge of that circuit. Yet I would hesitate to-day to go into other districts and other circuits either to practice or to hold a court.

We have in the districts of this Nation courts that are held according to what we call code procedure. We have that in the fourth circuit as to two States. We have also in the practice in these courts what is known as the common-law procedure, the old procedure that Chitty wrote about many, many years ago, and with which some of the members of the profession whom I see before me are well acquainted. In other States we have a mixture of the two, while in one of the circuits of the Union the Code Napoleon still prevails. Tell me what a judge in one of these districts would do, or what a practitioner in one of these districts would do, if picked up and unceremoniously placed on the bench or at the bar of those courts where that practice is so absolutely and essentially different.

I say that condition has existed through all these years in the fourth circuit. Congress recognized that situation of affairs. The Judiciary Committees of both the Senate and the House have reported favorably bills like unto this. There has been no legislation quoad that matter. It is a matter that it will not be profitable to investigate. It is not essential that we should. Let us permit the dead past to bury its own dead, and let us look at the requirements of the living present. In that fourth circuit another judge is required. Why should the fourth circuit be selected as one of the places which the judges of the Commerce Court are to occupy? They are distinguished gentlemen; I say naught against them; they are men learned in the law; they are men of vast experience; they are men who in the locality whence they came have been honored by their fellow citizens; and they are men who hereafter will honor the localities whence they came. There is room enough for them and room enough in the circuits and districts in which they reside.

That is a wise provision of our law which requires a district judge to live in and to be appointed from the district in which he lives; a wise provision of the law that requires a circuit judge to live in and be appointed from the circuit. Why was that provision put there? For the very reason that I have indicated; because in one section of the country the practice and the procedure are entirely different from what they are in the others; because they have been familiar with both in their years of practice at the bar and are capable of disposing properly of the litigation in their circuits.

Another reason is that district judges and circuit judges can not always be in perfect health and ready for the performance of duties in their circuits or districts. We have had it so in the fourth district that we have had but one circuit judge, another being incapacitated. That brings in three district judges; that closes three district courts three times a year, or six months in the year. Is that equity; is that justice; is that fair to a great section of the country represented and known to-day as the fourth circuit?

This is not, Mr. President, asking a favor. It is simply asking justice. It is simply asking the Senate of the United States to do to that great circuit—to bar, to bench, to the citizenship of that circuit—that which is essential to the due administration of justice therein. I thank you, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I do not intend to offer any vigorous objection to the bill as amended, because I am willing to accept the opinions of the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from West Virginia as to the necessity of the third judge; but this bill abolishes one vacancy that we now have and creates a place within the circuit to be filled.

I was interested in the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia in regard to the impracticability of assigning the judges of the Commerce Court. He, in closing, seemed to think—at least I infer that he so thinks—it would be well to keep them as a kind of waiting list, somewhat like post-office clerks and the street car motormen, so that if anything happens to a man who is on duty one of these judges can be assigned. I do not think we ought to begin that kind of a policy; and when the duties of the Commerce Court are completed on the 1st day of July, I hope that the same action will be taken in regard to the remaining four judges that this amendment takes in regard to one of them.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I was unfortunately absent when the amendment was offered and adopted. It would have made little difference, however, to the action of the Senate if I had been present. I simply rise at this time for the purpose of voicing my protest against it, because I have never yet changed my mind from the time we organized this court until now about its necessity and its importance. I think it is a serious mistake, and I shall be perfectly willing to trust the President of the United States in advising with his Department of Justice as to whether or not a man should be assigned to the Commerce Court. It appears that the majority of the Senate are not willing to trust him on that proposition, and, therefore, say that he shall not assign, however necessitous the occasion may be, a circuit judge to serve even until the 1st of July. I myself think it is queer legislation and strange action for the Senate to take; that, so long as this court is in existence and the vacancy is upon it, the President shall not be permitted to assign to that bench a circuit judge now in existence to complete the work. I am opposed to abolishing the court, as I have been heretofore, and shall on every occasion vote against abolishing it; but I submit there is absolutely no excuse for the action which has been taken this morning.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. CHILTON. I think the Senator from Michigan misapprehends the amendment. I do not understand that the amendment abolishes any court. It simply says that we have enough circuit judges to be assigned to that court, and a circuit judge can still be assigned to that Commerce Court.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Then I have been misinformed. I understand that the bill as amended was to the effect that no circuit judge should be assigned to the Commerce Court.

Mr. CHILTON. Oh, no; the Senator is wrong.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Well, my remarks are entirely out of place, then, because I had been informed after coming into the Chamber that that was what had been done. I beg pardon of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment again stated. There seems to be some misunderstanding in regard to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be again stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill add the following proviso:

Provided, That the office of circuit judge, to which Robert W. Archbald was originally appointed, is hereby abolished, and no successor shall be appointed to fill said office.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WASHED PAPER MONEY.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Thursday last I presented correspondence which I have had with various presidents and cashiers of many banks in this country, representing every State in the Union, in protest against the practice which is known as washing money. For certain reasons that correspondence was withdrawn at the time, but I now again present the communications, and ask that they be printed as a public document.

My prompting in this matter is that I think it is of vital importance to the people of this country. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] on Thursday last, when I presented these communications, stated that I would get as much advertisement out of it by publishing one as by publishing the mass. Advertisement I feel I do not require. I do not ask it, neither do I care for it, but I do insist that a people can not have too much good, clean money. Money is the life blood, the circulation of a commercial nation. The publication of one of these protests would not be satisfactory. They treat of different subjects and different phases of the subjects. Cashiers claim universally throughout the length and breadth of this country that there is that which is known as the "cashier's feel." They can feel, they say generally, a good or a counterfeit bit of money; but with this laundrying process that has been established through some agency, I hardly know what—certainly not by the action of the Congress of the United States—the use of caustic soda and soapsuds washes out the character of the bills. The result is that these washed bills are commonly known as being "the counterfeiter's delight."

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I was a member of the committee that agreed to a provision of the law permitting our currency to be washed, very strong representations having been made that it was feasible and would result in very great saving to the Treasury of the Government. I had very grave doubts at the time as to the advisability of the legislation, but I yielded to what seemed to be an overwhelming opinion that it was well to make the change in the law. I will ask the Senator from New Jersey if he has any bills in his possession which have been washed, so that we may see the effect of the process?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am so unfortunate that I come before the Senate with neither washed nor unwashed bills. [Laughter.] I have no bills in my possession. I have no doubt I might appeal to the banker of the Senate, our friend, the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], and he might be able to show one or two bills of both varieties; but I have none.

Mr. SMOOT. I will lend the Senator one if he wants it, and will take his word that he will pay it back.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have to say, however, that regardless of the fact as to whether the Senator from Utah or the Senator from New Hampshire may or may not have a bill, the protest against the practice is almost universal. As I said the other day, I have 587 letters from bank presidents and cashiers, representing every State in the Union, protesting against this process.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I understand that. Of course we know that the Senator has been engaged in this laudable enterprise, and yet it seems rather singular to me that we have not a specimen of the currency which would show the disastrous results of putting it through a laundry. I have had several bills in my possession—mostly of small denominations—since we passed the law, and I do not know whether they were washed or unwashed.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That may be true, so far as the Senator's experience is concerned; but to a cashier taking these bills over the counter it makes a very great deal of difference. I have this to say with regard to that particular phase: Recently in Philadelphia seven Indian head counterfeit $5 bills were taken over the counters of banks in two days and accepted as genuine in the belief that they were what were known as "washed bills." Cashiers insist that the washing makes it almost impossible to detect counterfeits; that the fine lines, the engraver's work, upon which we spend so much of time and money, have been washed out. As some of the cashiers have stated, it takes some time to scrutinize bills and to ascertain whether they are genuine or otherwise. Hence they are known as "the counterfeiter's delight."

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me a moment there—and I would be the last Senator to object to anything the Senator from New Jersey might ask as a favor of the Senate, and I do not propose to object to his request, for I think it is a reasonable one—I venture to ask the Senator whether he has any information from the Treasury Department that counterfeiting has been on the increase since this law was passed?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have no information to that effect, but I have a statement to that effect in these letters over the signatures of the writers, bank presidents and bank cashiers. I have here two letters from gentlemen who were former Members of this body. One of these letters, from Hon. N. B. Scott, formerly a Senator from West Virginia, states:

> Referring to your inquiry, would say that it is our firm conviction that washed money ought not to be again put into circulation by the Treasury of the United States.
>
> It is faded in appearance, has not the body of even an old unwashed bill, and customers do not like to receive it; in fact, ask that it be exchanged for new.
>
> Its faded appearance always creates a suspicion in the mind of the party receiving it, and the currency of the United States should be of such high character, fine workmanship, and pleasing to the eye that there should never be a single doubt about it.

I have still another letter signed by a gentleman who was a former Member of this body, Hon. W. M. Kavanaugh, of the same tenor.

I have letters from bank presidents asserting that the bankers would be quite willing to furnish the cost of issuing new bills, although they insist that this would be a most unreasonable exaction, inasmuch as the Government profits most liberally by the present arrangement.

Mr. GALLINGER. It certainly would be unreasonable. Mr. President, I simply want to add one word, and that is, if the Senator were asking us to pass a bill dealing with the subject, I should insist that we have information from the Treasury Department and that we should see some specimens of these washed bills; but, as the Senator simply asks to have a document printed giving the results of his inquiries, it seems to me it is very proper that he should be granted that privilege. I will ask the Senator if he has any letters on this subject from that little neck of the woods called New England?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have a number of letters from New England.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator need not read them.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will give briefly a list of the number of letters I have received from the different States:

Statement showing the number of letters received from each State.

Alabama	7
Arizona	1
Arkansas	8
California	28
Colorado	2
Connecticut	8
Delaware	4
District of Columbia	1
Florida	5
Georgia	12
Idaho	10
Illinois	37
Indiana	17
Iowa	14
Kansas	11
Kentucky	8
Louisiana	4
Maine	6
Maryland	13
Massachusetts	25
Michigan	15
Minnesota	5
Mississippi	4
Missouri	5
Montana	5
Nebraska	13
Nevada	5
New Hampshire	5
New Jersey	22
New Mexico	3
New York	60
North Carolina	5
North Dakota	5
Ohio	18
Oklahoma	15
Oregon	9
Pennsylvania	49
Rhode Island	3
South Carolina	6
South Dakota	6
Tennessee	7
Texas	25
Utah	4
Vermont	6
Virginia	11
Washington	17
West Virginia	7
Wisconsin	10
Wyoming	2
Total	587

Referring to Tennessee, I have a letter from the president of one of the prominent banks in Tennessee, in which he refers not only to this particular system, but to the coinage feature, and says that he would like to tar and feather the man who presumed to put pantalettes and pantaloons on the American eagle.

Mr. GALLINGER. Perhaps the washing may remove those incumbrances. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I offer these letters in all seriousness. I do believe their publication would result in benefit to the people of the United States and that the abolition of washed currency would largely prevent counterfeiting. I simply ask, Mr. President, that the letters to which I have referred may be printed as a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am not going to discuss at this time the feasibility or the desirability of preventing our currency from being washed. I had no idea of that when, on Thursday last, I objected to the printing of this mass of 587 letters upon this one subject. I am perfectly willing that we should, and I think that we ought, at a very early date, ascertain from the Treasury Department whether the washing of the currency is a success or a failure; but I do believe, Mr. President, that the printing as a public document of 587 letters upon this one subject for one purpose, without an examination beforehand, is altogether improper.

If we continue the printing of public documents as lavishly as we have been doing, it will not be long before every telegram which comes into the Senate will be made a public document; every letter which comes in the shape of a petition or protest will be made a public document; there will be no article written in any magazine in this country that appeals to any particular Senator but that a request will be made that it be printed as a public document. I had the figures on Thursday last to call to the attention of Senators showing the extent to which this practice is growing, what the cost amounts to in dollars and cents, and how it has been abused in the past.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if there is not danger of making so many things "public documents" that we shall have no longer any such things in the country as private documents?

Mr. SMOOT. I am not going to pass an opinion on that, but I will say to the Senator that the way we are going now it is fast reaching that stage.

Mr. President, I have no objection at all to those letters being offered for the consideration of the Senate, and, if the Senator so desires, allowing copies of as many as he wishes to be put into the RECORD without the signatures, so as to call the attention of the public to this question.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. But if you drop the signatures, many of the communications would lose character.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say that I will take it for granted that the letters are signed by 587 of the very best bankers there are in the United States. I will admit that without a question. I do not know but that there is something in the contention that ought to be investigated. The Senator can not be more interested in this subject than I am, because I believe the American people ought to be given a sufficient quantity of clean and perfect currency and not be compelled to use dirty currency. This question is not new to me. In the revision of the printing laws the whole subject was gone into thoroughly, and I agree now that much of the currency in the United States that is being used should not be handled by the people, because it is so dirty.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Would it not be a wise thing to let the Senator from New Jersey select one, two, or three of the best letters advocating this policy and publish the names only of the signers of the other letters?

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing that the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado shall be carried out and I should be willing to have added a statement to the effect that the Senator from New Jersey has 584 additional letters on the same subject.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think it would be all right to have a few of the letters printed and to have the names of the signers of the other letters inserted; but to have five hundred and some odd letters printed does seem to me unnecessary.

Mr. SMOOT. The only question about putting the names of the signers to the petitions—and that is what we have got to construe these letters as being—is that we have always heretofore objected to putting in the RECORD a long list of names to petitions.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. But, Mr. President, right here, if the Senator will permit me, these letters are varied. They treat of various subjects, such as the clipping of money, making the size of the bills smaller—I believe the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] introduced a bill recently prohibiting that—also with reference to the minting of coins and to washed money.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator need worry a minute about a bill passing here or even an order being issued by the department reducing the size of our currency, as has been proposed. I do not think there is a particle of danger of that being done. I will say to the Senator that I would even join with him in passing a bill to prevent any such thing as that if I really felt it were necessary, and I am perfectly willing to help pass such a bill, even though I do not think it is necessary, because I do not believe the size of our bills should be changed. However, the only question involved at this particular time is whether or not the currency should be washed. Mr. President, I believe that the whole proposition will be brought to the attention of the American people by printing one or two of these letters in the RECORD, and, of course, those who are interested will see the discussion that has taken place on the subject. It is upon that ground that I shall object to the letters being printed as a public document.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to say further with reference to the suggestion advanced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], that I believe the circulation of filthy currency, which is in use to-day, is almost a crime. The Government of Great Britain, the Government of Germany, and the Governments of many other European nations, as I am informed, never send out a bill to be used a second time.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator refers to the £5 note of the Bank of England.

Mr. President, when the printing bill was under consideration and we were trying to have printed the back of our currency on machines other than hand presses, one of the objects I had in the change was to enable the Government to engrave enough currency so as to prevent the condition about which complaint is now being made—the dirty, filthy money circulating among the people. Therefore, I wish to say to the Senator that I am in sympathy with him so far as his main proposition is concerned; but let us stop this everlasting evil—and it is an evil—of printing every letter or petition presented to us as a public document. I ask the Senate now, and I shall ask them in the future, whenever the question arises, to stand by the Committee on Printing on this proposition, and to stop this growing evil.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have no desire, I beg to say, Mr. President, to multiply the burdens of my Government, neither have I any desire to publish a lot of matter that will simply be trash. As I have thought over and gathered in my mind the list of documents ordered printed, many of which were proposed by no less a distinguished Senator than the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], I have thought that we might have curtailed a good part of them, but when it comes to money—and God knows none of us have too much of it, at least I never have had—I say that that which we have ought to be clean and good. Hence, with that view I have presented these letters, which were instigated by a little document sent out that was called "The Counterfeiter's Delight," which I had asked to have published as a public document. It was thought to be superfluous, I think, by some of the Senators, but it has brought about 587—nearly 600—responses. As I have said, I want nothing that will multiply the burdens of government, but I do want that which will add to the general welfare of the country in which we live, and I believe that the publication of these letters would be an aid in that direction.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, as I have previously stated, I will not object to the Senator's request, but it does look like burdening the RECORD unnecessarily to print the texts of so many letters, and I will ask the Senator this question: Would not the Senator be content to print, say, three or four of the letters from presidents of large banks of the country and then give a list of the others, simply saying that similar letters have been received from the president of the First National Bank of Concord, N. H., for instance, and make a list of that kind? I think the Senator from Utah would not object to that, and it seems to me it would answer the same purpose precisely.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall not object to that, if the Senator wants to go even that far.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I should like to accommodate the distiguished Senator; but this matter is close to my heart, and I ask that the letters be printed. I will, however, find no fault with any Senator whose views may differ from mine. I have the greatest respect for a man with opinions, and I would give but little for him if he did not have the courage to stand by them. So you can not offend me. Do as you please, gentlemen.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall object to the printing of the letters as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I move that we take up the report of the Committee on Rules which was made on Thursday last.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the report.

The SECRETARY. Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 64):

Resolved, That Rule XII be amended as follows:

"3. Immediately after and before the result of each roll call is ascertained and announced the clerk shall call the names of the absentees."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if that resolution was reported favorably from the Rules Committee?

Mr. OVERMAN. The committee itself unanimously instructed me to report it. The committee thought it would probably save time. Instead of having Senators who are absent come in after the roll is called and ask to have their names called again, we think probably it will save a great deal of time to allow the Secretary to call the roll of absentees. It is done in the House of Representatives and in many other legislative bodies.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from North Carolina if he does not think it will very frequently occasion a useless waste of time? There are occasions when it would be necessary, and we would save time by calling them. Why should it not be amended by saying "on the request of any Senator"?

Mr. OVERMAN. Any Senator can request to have it done now. I think it is done quite often.

Mr. SWANSON. Only by unanimous consent. We ask unanimous consent to do it.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is frequently done, and the Committee on Rules thought we had better make a rule to have it done all the time. It will take very little time. The House has 400 Members. The roll of absentees is called there, and they seem to get along very well. We only have 96 Members. We can call the absentees at the present time.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, may the resolution be read again?

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, that would require on every roll call, whether a quorum had developed or not, a call of the absentees.

Mr. OVERMAN. Of course, if we make it a rule of the Senate it will have to be done on every roll call.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. It will if we make it read that way, of course.

Mr. OVERMAN. I say, under this resolution it will have to be done on every roll call. Hardly a roll call is made here without Senators coming in afterwards. We lose a great deal of time in coming over from the Senate Office Building.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I think probably that is true; but my notion is that it is going to take a great deal of extra time.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Committee on Rules thought that Senators who are at work at their desks in the Senate Office Building, upon hearing the bell ring, if we call the absentees, will get here in time. It frequently happens that a Senator will come in and seek recognition from the Chair and ask to have his name called. That takes up more time than simply calling the absentees.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the same thing would happen under this rule. If a Senator came in late he would still ask to be recognized and ask to be recorded. Under this amended rule it seems to me we will lose a great deal of time, because it is compulsory that the roll of absentees shall be called. I do not believe the absentees are called in the Senate one-tenth of the time at present.

Mr. OVERMAN. The absentees are seldom called, but there is hardly a time when some individual Senator does not rise and ask to have his name called. Frequently Senators are just behind the time their names are reached in coming over here from the Senate Office Building, and they get up later and ask to have their names called; whereas if their names are called regularly it will save all the time required for calling the President's attention to the matter, the recognition of the Senator, and then calling his name. That takes time.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course if the Senator really wants to have the resolution acted upon, I am not going to make any objection to it to-day, for this reason: I think when it has been in force for a month or two the rule will have to be changed back to the old form. Therefore I shall not make any objection.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not care anything about it. It is no pet measure of mine. The Committee on Rules unanimously favored it. It is done in the House of Representatives, and it is done in many legislative bodies.

Mr. SMOOT. Before the resolution is passed, however, I want to call the Senator's attention to one thing. The word "Clerk" should be stricken out, and the word "Secretary" inserted, because we never say "Clerk" in the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is right. I accept that amendment.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. OVERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON. If this rule is adopted, will a Senator be foreclosed from gaining recognition after the call of the absentees?

Mr. OVERMAN. Not at all.

Mr. BURTON. The rule in that regard will be the same as now?

Mr. OVERMAN. The same as now; yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I move that the word "Clerk" be stricken out and the word "Secretary" inserted.

Mr. OVERMAN. I accept that amendment, Mr. President.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let the resolution be again read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the resolution as it is proposed to be amended.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That Rule XII be amended as follows:

"3. Immediately after and before the result of each roll call is ascertained and announced the Secretary shall call the names of the absentees."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, if there be no other business to be presented to the Senate, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 1 hour and 48 minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

EXPENSES OF EXTRA SESSION.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 2973, which is a bill making a small appropriation to meet the pressing emergencies growing out of the present session.

The Secretary read the bill (H. R. 2973) making appropriation for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I do not rise to offer an amendment, because I doubt if any amendment is necessary; but I desire to call attention to lines 5, 6, and 7, on page 2, which provide $55,000 "for stationery for Members and Delegates and Resident Commissioners, at $125 each, for the first session of the Sixty-third Congress." Of course that is a matter which the House itself, I suppose, should consider for itself.

It occurs to me that if they desire to make this appropriation for stationery, in addition to the annual appropriation, exactly doubling it, it might be well to call attention to the fact that it would be as well for them to make it out of the contingent fund instead of the Senate agreeing to a doubling up of the stationery account and giving each Member of the House of Representatives $250 per annum instead of $125 per annum, as the Senate has, and as the law contemplates.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. This appropriation for stationery for the present special session of Congress does give to each Member of the House of Representatives $125 more for stationery than Senators receive. In the House, I understand, the appropriation for stationery is drawn by the Members in lump; they draw it all at once, and new Members who come in are without stationery.

Mr. SMOOT. No; they are not without stationery when they come in. Of course they then get stationery under the regular appropriation that is made.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. As I understand it, without this appropriation the new Members of the House would not get any stationery before the 1st of July.

Mr. SMOOT. They will get it just as soon as the appropriation bill passes.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Exactly; but the appropriation is not available until the 1st of July. In the interim the new Members of the House could not get any money for stationery.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I was not speaking of the annual appropriation of $125 for each Member for stationery. In that

there is not any difference; it is the same for the House as it is for the Senate. Is not the appropriation carried exactly the same for both bodies in the same bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is; but in the Senate the appropriation is divided up by the months.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That is simply a matter of detail and bookkeeping.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is true; but it is different in the House. A new Senator gets as much per month for stationery as an old Senator.

Mr. JAMES. If the Senator from Virginia will permit me, in the House a Member has a right to go to the stationery room and draw upon his account long before that money is due. He has just the same opportunity to draw his stationery that a Senator has.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Exactly.

Mr. SMOOT. A new Senator and a new Member of the House are in exactly the same position.

Mr. JAMES. They are in the same position.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. As a matter of practice, I am told that in the Senate each Senator gets $125, and it is available for him by the month; that a new Senator who came in on the 4th of March now gets each month just as much for stationery as a Senator who has been here in previous years.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Do I understand the Senator to say that if his stationery account is provided for in the appropriation bill at $125 a year he can draw from the stationery room only $12.50 the first month?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I understand that is the practice of the financial clerk's office.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. No; that can not be.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The financial clerk told me so today. That is all I know about it. I asked him about it and that is what he told me. He told me it was done under the direction of either the Committee on Rules or some other committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Committee on Accounts.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. No; I am speaking of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate or some other committee has undertaken, perhaps arbitrarily, to control it.

Mr. OVERMAN. No committee can control it. It is controlled in the appropriation bill. If the financial clerk has made that rule, he had no right to do it; it is an arbitrary rule.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. He can certainly get $125 worth of stationery the 1st of July if he wants it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The practice of the Senate, the financial clerk told me, is that every new Senator in this body is entitled to receive and is receiving just as much stationery as I am receiving. But whether that be true or not, this provision for $125 for the special session has been put in the bill by the House of Representatives, and according to the comity between the two Houses each House has been permitted to fix its own expenses.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I was not seeking to object to the provision. As I said in the start, I was not saying that the Senate should have a greater allowance for stationery, because I think we have ample. I was simply calling attention to the fact that the economic Democratic administration is providing twice over the annual appropriation of $55,000 for stationery for Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am sorry to see the Senator from Wyoming trying to make a little political capital out of this matter. There is none in it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Not a bit.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There can not be any in it. The Republicans did exactly the same thing whenever there was an extraordinary session of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from Virginia will pardon an interruption, unless my recollection is very far astray, and I do not think it is, the House has at all times provided stationery for each session. I understand the Senate has provided stationery for its Members for each Congress. As to how it was, whether the action of the House or the action of the Senate was based upon a statute, I confess I do not know, because I have not seen the statute, but it has been invoked once or twice, and it would be well enough to read it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that it is provided for both bodies in the legislative appropriation bill each year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not provided, however, for the extraordinary session.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. It is provided for in the annual appropriation bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It could not have been provided for the extraordinary session, because it had not been called. My recollection is that the House has always had stationery provided for each session—for an extraordinary session as well as for a statutory session.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is nothing new about it, at any rate.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, there is no occasion to dodge the point. It is true the House takes twice the amount the Senate does this year, when we have an extra session. It is true, however, that they have done so before.

It is also true, notwithstanding the debates upon the House floor, which sometimes criticize the Senate very severely for the amount of the clerk hire that it has, the House Members have over $650,000 for their clerks that does not appear as appropriated for committee clerks, as ours does. Those are matters which we understand very well. They are privileges which the House enjoys; and sometimes, when the Senate gets oversensitive, we forget the fact that the House provides for every Member and every Delegate a clerk at $1,500 outside of and in addition to committee clerks. Then they go on and provide liberally for clerks of committees, while in the Senate the Senator who has a committee is perhaps worse off than if he had no committee—he has no more help generally than the Senator who is not the chairman of a committee.

So in this case, as the Senator says, it is not new. It has gone on for some time. But, nevertheless, there is twice the amount given each Member of the House for stationery than we have for Senators during extra sessions.

Now, as to the law, it is just the same for both Houses. The practice which has been inaugurated on the Senate side, I think, has been largely because the financial clerk considers the matter as a convenience to him, and Senators have taken it for granted that it was all right. So once in six months, I think it is, Senators have their accounts settled. I presume a Senator could draw all of his stationery allowance the first month, perhaps, if he insisted upon it, the same as is done in the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, one word more in justice or in vindication or whatever it may be of the House with regard to clerkships.

Each Member of the House has one employee, regardless of his chairmanship of a committee. Then each committee in the House has a certain number of employees, depending upon whatever may be granted, in proportion to its weight of work. Each Senator, no matter who he is, whether he is on a committee or not, has two employees, which is twice as many as a Member of the House. This is regardless of his committee assignments. At the present, at any rate, each chairman of a committee in the Senate has three employees, while chairmen of committees in the House have only two. Each Member of the House by right of being a Member of the House solely, and without regard to chairmanships, has $1,500 a year for a clerk. Each Member of the Senate, regardless of his employment as a chairman, has two employees. So it can not be said that a Member of the House has a larger clerical force than a Member of the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. But the Member of the House represents in some cases but a thirtieth or a fortieth of his State, and a Senator represents half of it. A man in the House serves on one or two committees, possibly. A Senator may serve on 8 or 10 committees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not arguing that.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just one word.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I hope the Senator will not expect me to yield for a discussion of something which does not at all touch the question before the body.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, just one word and I am through. I am not arguing that. I was merely disputing the claim that a Member of the House has any greater clerical assistance than a Member of the Senate and demonstrating that he has only half as much; that is all.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do not think in this connection it is a matter of any importance to discuss which body has more clerical assistance. I will not go into that matter, but will very briefly repeat substantially what I said before. This provision in the bill does give to a Member of the House $125 more for stationery than a Member of the Senate gets, and it has been the custom to give that additional $125 per annum for the extra session just as this bill provides. It is not an innovation; it is a recognition of what has been the prevailing usage for a long time, and it has been acquiesced in by the

Senate on the doctrine of comity which exists and which, I think, ought to exist between the two Houses.

If the Members of the House think they ought to have this additional $125 to pay for stationery during the extraordinary session of Congress, I do not feel like resisting their demand. But I have not been willing to insert in the bill a like provision for $125 for the extra session for each Senator. The Senate can do that if it sees fit. I find that $125 a year pays for my stationery. It pays for all the stationery that I need in my official work. In years when I have expended more than $125 for stationery it was due to the fact that I was doing a great deal of correspondence on personal matters, but I believe $125 is sufficient to buy all the stationery a Senator needs to conduct his correspondence in connection with his official work.

For that reason I do not favor amending the bill by allowing a Senator $125 more than is necessary for his official work. If the Senate desire to increase the compensation which they receive, let them do it by a direct enactment and add $125 to their salaries. I do not believe it is required for stationery. Therefore I do not favor amending the bill.

Mr. STONE. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. No; but there is the discussion of a suggested amendment. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] raised the question.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I said that I had no intention of offering an amendment; that so far as I am concerned I think we are receiving enough allowance for our stationery.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senator does not propose to offer an amendment?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Not at all; I was simply drawing attention to the matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Then there is nothing to discuss. With this explanation I simply leave the matter to the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think it is well to put in the RECORD precisely the facts in this case. The legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, carrying appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, provides, first—

> For stationery for Senators and the President of the Senate, including $6,000 for stationery for committees and officers of the Senate, $18,125.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> For stationery for Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates from Territories, and Resident Commissioners, including $5,000 for stationery for the use of the committees and officers of the House, $60,000.

That, Mr. President, is the law, and the law makes a provision covering stationery for both this body and the other body for the year ending June 30, 1914.

I do not propose to offer any amendment or to make any special criticism, but I think if we are to double the stationery account for either branch of Congress when we have a special session, that ought to be included in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, so that we may know precisely what Congress is doing in this regard.

It is barely possible that each Member of the House of Representatives needs just twice as much stationery as a Senator. It seems inconceivable to me that that can be so, but whether it is so or not, I am not going to make any factious opposition to this provision of the bill or offer any amendment. Yet it is rather an extraordinary mode of legislation.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I concede the force of the suggestion, but my judgment is that they are to determine whether they need the additional allowance of $125. They have determined that they do need it, and I do not feel that it would be wise for the Senate to intervene.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the chairman of the committee did right.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there are some considerations bearing on this particular appropriation that apply to the House of Representatives or at least that have applied in the past, which do not apply here. It is true that at the last special session of Congress an appropriation of this kind was made for the purpose of purchasing stationery for the Members of the House of Representatives. In other words, while they did not perhaps technically appropriate it, the effect was to appropriate $125 for each Member for every session of Congress.

A few years ago the Members of the House of Representatives did not have typewriters, for instance, supplied by the Government, and a great many supplies of that kind. Prior to the building at least of the House Office Building the Members had to buy typewriters, and they used them in their official work the same as they did their stationery.

I know that in the 10 years of my membership in the other House I wore out on an average more than one typewriter a year that I had to buy myself. We bought those typewriters through the stationery department. They are for sale there to Members at a reduced rate; that is, they have the benefit of the wholesale rate by getting them through the stationery room. It was just as important to have the typewriter as it was to have the paper to use in the typewriter.

Typewriter supplies and various supplies of that kind I understand the individual Members of the Senate were not required to buy, because for quite a number of years Senators have been supplied with typewriters by the Government.

I believe I express the experience of nearly every Member of the House of Representatives when I say that $125 a session did not reimburse the actual money that almost every Member of the House expended for the purposes that I have mentioned. If you would confine it only to stationery, then $125 a session would be more than enough; but including those things that I have mentioned and others that will occur to the mind of every man who will give it any thought, that sum came very far from paying the expenses.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator has illuminated the subject, and he made a very strong point in favor of an additional appropriation when he stated that the Members of the other House had to buy typewriters. I assume, however, that that rule does not now prevail, does it?

Mr. NORRIS. I presume not, although it would be necessary if a Member of the House should take his typewriter back and forth; and I am inclined to think that it would not be allowed under the rule that prevails there. I was a Member of the House of Representatives when the House Office Building was erected, and I bought typewriters just the same as I did before, though not so many of them, because I had one to use here in Washington and two at my office at home.

Mr. GALLINGER. We all have to do that. I do not know what is the rule or the custom of the present Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate; but I served for a considerable time as acting chairman of that committee and I always refused to let Senators take typewriters back and forth to their homes. I think it a very bad practice.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know what the practice was as to whether or not that had been done.

Mr. PENROSE. I never heard of it being done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If no amendment be proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, before the bill passes from the Committee of the Whole into the Senate I desire to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. I have had no opportunity to read the bill carefully, but he undoubtedly can explain something that I do not quite understand. I call his attention to section 2, under the head of "The Panama Canal." Omitting the parts of the section which are not material to my inquiry, I read in this way:

> SEC. 2. That during the fiscal year 1914 all moneys received * * * by the Panama Railroad Co. * * * shall be credited to the appropriation from which payments for the materials, supplies, labor, or other services were originally made.

What appropriation is there for the Panama Railroad Co. to which the moneys received by the Panama Railroad Co. could be credited?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, the explanation of that clause in this bill, as I understand, is this: There are appropriations made for the Panama Canal, and those appropriations are used for a great many purposes, such, for instance, as the operation and maintenance of the supply department at the canal and the support and maintenance of the Panama Railroad. When those moneys, for instance, become moneys that are paid out for supplies and ships—and it is very much in the nature of a business that the Government has been compelled to do down there because there are no private agencies to furnish those supplies——

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand that; but the Panama Railroad Co. is an independent corporation, in name at least; all of its stock is owned by the United States, and is in the hands of the Secretary of War as trustee. I do not remember that we have ever made any appropriation for the Panama Railroad Co., and I am sure that the chairman of the committee would not desire that all the moneys received by the Panama Railroad Co. should be credited to any appropriation made by the Congress of the United States.

I remember a controversy a short while ago with regard to the transfer of the Panama Railroad Co. from the control of the corporation itself to the Government generally, and I remember that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW], who at one time examined the whole situation there and reported upon

it, very strenuously objected to the transfer. It seems to me that, without further legislation, if we were to transfer to any appropriation or to any fund the moneys received by the Panama Railroad Co., the whole situation there would be paralyzed.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President——

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will permit me——

Mr. CUMMINS. I have necessarily read the language hastily.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator from Virginia will allow me, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] to the law which was passed regarding the canal, and which is alluded to in the bill. If he will read section 6 of that law, he will find that it provides exactly what this proposes to do after the completion of the canal; and this is merely putting into action that law during the coming year.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand that; but that is the very question. We have not legislated in any way for the disturbance of the relation which now exists for the year 1914, and nothing that we have done takes effect until the completion of the canal. How would the railroad company be maintained, how would it be operated, where would it get its money, if all the moneys taken in by the company are turned over into some fund for which we have appropriated?

Mr. WARREN. The railroad is provided for with its own earnings, and of course the net amount is all that is to be turned over to the Treasury or anywhere else.

Mr. CUMMINS. It may be that the suggestion made by the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] is correct; I have not studied the subject carefully enough to know; but as I read the section hastily, it would require the crediting—I do not know what would be done with the money physically—but it would require the crediting of all the moneys received by the railroad company to the appropriation named in the section.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. As I understand, a great many supplies are furnished out of the Panama Canal appropriation to the Panama Railroad Co., and, unless the Isthmian Canal Commission is to collect that money back, it would soon be absolutely out of funds, and without this provision in the law that money would be covered into the Treasury.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia is mistaken about that. The railroad company is not an expense at all on the canal commission; it is an independent corporation; and, if it gets anything from the commission, it pays for it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator will just let me explain, that is exactly what this provision is intended to remedy. The railroad company is an entirely separate organization. If it pays the money on its purchases back to the Panama Canal Commission and it is turned into the Treasury of the United States, how would the canal commission carry on its operations? It would soon be bankrupted and would be without the money to do its legitimate work if it were unable to collect for the things which it sells to the railroad company.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator from Virginia will just give me a few moments, I will explain to him exactly how it is done.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think, if the Senate will take the time to listen, it is explained in the utmost detail by the letters from the War Department. The same thing is done in respect to furnishing materials to the railroad company—and the actual sales by the canal commission to the railroad company amount to over $2,000,000 a year—but if the canal commission is to have that turned into the Treasury of the United States, it would be taking out of its appropriation that much money and would leave the canal commission without the money to carry on its operations.

Mr. CUMMINS. I would have no objection whatever to the course suggested by the Senator from Virginia. That, however, would be money received from the Panama Railroad Co. and not money received by the Panama Railroad Co. This provision covers all that is received by the Panama Railroad Co.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It covers money received by the Canal Commission for its sales to the railroad company.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is not what the bill says. The bill provides:

> That during the fiscal year 1914, all moneys received by the Isthmian Canal Commission, or the governor of the Panama Canal, from any services rendered or materials and supplies furnished employees, the Panama Railroad Co.—
>
> And so forth.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is it exactly—all moneys received by the Canal Commission for any supplies or materials furnished by the commission to the Panama Railroad Co.

Mr. CUMMINS. That would not be the construction that I would put upon it; but, as I now understand, the chairman of the committee means money received by the Isthmian Canal Commission or the governor of the Panama Canal from any services rendered or any materials and supplies furnished employees by the Panama Railroad Co.

Mr. ROOT. "Furnished to."

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Furnished by the Canal Commission to the Panama Railroad Co.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is not what it says.

Mr. ROOT. It does not say either "to" or "by." There is a preposition omitted.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The context is amply sufficient to make it clear that it is the money received by the Canal Commission from the railroad company.

Mr. CUMMINS. If that is what is meant——

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is absolutely what is meant and that is the legal intendment of this bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not believe that is what it says.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the Senator will notice what follows the words "received by the Isthmian Canal Commission" he will see that it means moneys received from any services rendered or materials and supplies furnished employees or the Panama Railroad Co., and so forth.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is not what it says.

Mr. OVERMAN. I say that is what it means.

Mr. CUMMINS. If that is what it means, I have no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There is no doubt whatever about that. I think if the Senator from Iowa will read it carefully he will discover that there is no doubt whatever about the legal intendment and effect of this provision. It is designed simply to prevent the money received by the Canal Commission from being turned into the Treasury of the United States instead of being kept by it. When it furnishes these supplies or renders these services it collects the money for them, and that money so collected constitutes a part of the appropriation made for the canal If that money were turned into the Treasury of the United States it would amount to about $4,000,000 a year taken out of the appropriations made for the canal.

Mr. CUMMINS. I entirely approve of that course, but unfortunately the provision does not cover that.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It would take about $4,000,000 per annum from the amount appropriated for the canal.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, if the provision means what the Senator from Virginia thinks it does, nobody objects to it. But, as I read it, it proposes to take whatever profits the Panama Railroad Co. as an individual corporation may earn and credit them to the appropriations for the canal, which is an entirely different thing. You might as well use the money that is appropriated for maintaining the Post Office Department for some other purpose. The Panama Railroad Co. is an entirely separate corporation. It conducts its own business and deals with the Panama Canal Commission the same as any other corporation would deal with the Panama Canal Commission, and the profits which that company earns ought not to be credited to any appropriation for any purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I can not understand the section in any other way than as the chairman of the committee says he interprets it. It seems to me very plain. The section reads as follows:

> That during the fiscal year 1914 all moneys received—
>
> By whom?—
>
> by the Isthmian Canal Commission, or the governor of the Panama Canal—
>
> Received from what source?—
>
> from any services rendered or materials and supplies furnished employees—
>
> Not only employees, but who else?—
>
> the Panama Railroad Co., the Canal Zone government, the Panama Government, and other departments of the United States Government, from hotel and hospital supplies and services; from rentals, wharfage, etc.; from labor, materials, and supplies, and other services furnished vessels and to those unable to obtain similar labor, materials, supplies, and services elsewhere, shall be credited to the appropriation from which payments for the materials, supplies, labor, or other services were originally made.

Mr. BRISTOW. If it means that, I have not the slightest objection to it.

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly what it says, and that is exactly what it means.

Mr. BRISTOW. If I can have the attention of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], I should like to have his construction on that language, because I think he realizes the absolute importance of maintaining the entity of the Panama Railroad corporation and of not mixing it up with the Canal Commission.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator from Kansas will excuse me merely to set him straight before he goes into another matter, the item to which he alludes as profits is still covered. If there are any profits under a subsequent clause in this bill, they are to be covered into the Treasury of the United States. The bill not only keeps intact the actual amount of money appropriated for canal purposes, and prevents its being turned into the Treasury, but it specifically provides that the profits shall be turned into the Treasury.

Mr. CUMMINS. Would the chairman of the committee have any objection to inserting the word "from" after the word "employees" in line 9?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say to the Senator——

Mr. SMOOT. If we insert the word "from" after the word "employees," we ought to insert the word "from" after the words "Railroad Co." and before other words, and then it would read in this way:

From any services rendered or materials and supplies furnished employees, from the Panama Railroad Co., from the Canal Zone government, from the Panama Government,

And so forth.

There is no necessity for that.

Mr. CUMMINS. The word "from" is used immediately afterwards, where it reads "from hotel and hospital supplies and services."

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. Why was it inserted there?

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, the railroad company is a separate and distinct corporation from the Panama Government and the Canal Zone government. The Senator knows that the Government has certain hotels there, and that in the past the money received from these sources has been accounted for in a different way. All this provides for is an entire change of the bookkeeping system. That is all there is to it.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is what the Senator from Utah says it means; but when I read it, and I have some familiarity with the English language, the impression I received was just the contrary. I may be wrong about that, but I do not see any reason for insisting upon the exact language used here, if there is any doubt at all about it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am very sure, if the Senator from Iowa would take the time to go through this bill carefully and study it in its details as I have done, he would free his mind from any doubt about what it means. There is not, in my judgment, any ambiguity. It simply maintains intact the appropriations made, for canal purposes. When the canal authorities use some of that money in furnishing labor, materials, or supplies of any sort to other independent agencies like the Panama Railroad Co., it is by this provision permitted to collect that money and to keep it for proper and legitimate purposes, the purposes for which the appropriation was made, except as to profits which are required to be turned into the Treasury of the United States; so that no more is received by the canal commission than the amount intended for and appropriated to the canal commission by Congress.

Mr. BRISTOW. Since there seems to be a wide difference of opinion as to the meaning of this provision, I should like the opinion of the senior Senator from New York on its construction.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, it seems to me that everyone is agreed upon the proposition of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], which is, I understand, in accordance with the request made of the War Department by Col. Goethals for the purpose of enabling the commission to make their bookkeeping on the canal conform with the necessities of the business in which they are engaged under the direction of law.

I think the discussion arises from two different interpretations of this language. It is agreed apparently that when the Panama Canal Commission—or, after the change takes place, the Government—out of money appropriated by Congress acquires supplies and furnishes those supplies to others, the money that comes in compensation for them is to be credited to the appropriation, so that it can be spent over again without having to come in here.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes.

Mr. ROOT. In that way, treating an appropriation that we make as if it were capital, Col. Goethals can turn the capital over two or three times a year without having to come back and put it into the Treasury and have it reappropriated. We are all agreed to that. The question is whether or not this language gives effect to that. It seems to me there is a preposition omitted; that the expression is elliptical; that there is implied a preposition which, if included, would obviate the difficulty and make it certain.

The language here specifies certain sources, the proceeds from which are to be credited to appropriations instead of being put into the Treasury. There are four separate sources, and each of them is introduced by the preposition "from":

First. All moneys received from any services rendered or materials and supplies furnished employees, the Panama Railroad Co., the Canal Zone government, the Panama Government, and other departments of the United States Government.

Second. Moneys received by the Isthmian Canal Commission from hotel and hospital supplies and services.

Third. Moneys received by them from rentals, wharfage, and so forth.

Fourth. Moneys received by them from labor, materials, and supplies and other services furnished vessels, and to those unable to obtain similar labor, materials, supplies, and services elsewhere.

All the proceeds from those four sources are to be credited to the appropriation, because they come from the sale of material bought with the money appropriated. There is a little ambiguity in the description of the first class of the sources from which that money is to come:

From any services rendered or materials and supplies furnished—

I think it means—

to employees, to the Panama Railroad Co., to the Canal Zone government, to the Panama Government, and to other departments of the United States Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from New York if that is not the necessary interpretation?

Mr. ROOT. I think that is what it means, now. I think when it speaks of money received by the commission from services rendered or supplies furnished employees, furnished the Panama Railroad Co., or furnished the Canal Zone government, it means furnished to those persons, and so forth.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator makes it so absolutely plain in his statement of the case as to exclude the possibility of any necessity for inserting the preposition "to." He has demonstrated that that is what it means.

Mr. ROOT. I think that is what it means. I think it is a case of the indirect object. We mean furnishing supplies to the Panama Railroad Co., and so forth. I should have no doubt about the meaning; but the fact that Senators are in doubt and in difference about the meaning might make it worth while to obviate that doubt by putting in the preposition. I think it would be clearer if the preposition "to" were included before that class of sources of the moneys.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the object of the bill is to do just exactly as the Senator from New York has stated. If the word "to" is inserted, I do not think it will change the meaning a particle.

Mr. BRISTOW. It will remove any doubt.

Mr. SMOOT. Other Senators may think otherwise. If the commissioners receive money for any services rendered or materials or supplies "furnished employees," of course it means "furnished to employees." There is no question about it in my mind.

Mr. BRISTOW. Then why not insert the word "to"? That will remove any doubt.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, of course the insertion of that word would do no harm; but I hesitate to see a word inserted that is so absolutely unnecessary, which is demonstrably unnecessary, and let the bill go back to the House. It is far preferable that it should go back without any amendment whatever, because, as we know, the House is not organized for the purpose of considering differences between the two Houses; and I think unless there is some plain necessity for changing the bill it is much better not to change it.

I have from the department almost the very words of the Senator from New York, with these four sources divided up in red ink, showing exactly what sources these moneys are expected to be received from, and what should be done with them after they come back to the Panama Canal government. There can be no doubt or difficulty about the interpretation of this law. It is unnecessary to take the time to refer to these documents, which are long; but Col. Goethals and the Secretary of War, or the officers in charge of this work at both places, have been through this bill, and they have even furnished me with a detailed statement showing every dollar that by past usages would be received, and exactly what would be done with the money.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to say to the Senator from Virginia that there is no difference of opinion between us as to

what ought to be done, and I agree that the Canal Commission should have exactly the authority that the Senator says this bill gives it. I think, however, the insertion of the word "to" would remove the doubt, and certainly the House would not hesitate to accept the amendment and pass the bill with that word in it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. But, Mr. President, I dislike very much to see a word inserted that is absolutely unnecessary, and I think the Senator will see this is if he will go through the provision carefully. I can not see why we should make an amendment unless there is some reason for it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kansas will hear just one little statement on this subject, it seems to me it must remove the doubt from his mind. If I say I furnish him clothing, or say I furnish clothing to him, is there any difference in the meaning or can anyone draw the conclusion that there is any doubt about the way I put it first? It is the most common way of expressing the furnishing of goods to say "I furnish him" or "I furnish to him." I can not see the necessity of delaying the matter and sending the bill to the House with that little word inserted as an amendment.

Mr. BRISTOW. It will have to go there anyhow.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not intend to offer any amendment. If the Senator from Virginia is willing to take the chances of that construction, the responsibility is his. If the proper construction be as just suggested by the Senator from New York, then it would mean that any moneys received by the Isthmian Canal Commission on account of any services rendered or materials and supplies furnished to the Canal Zone government should be disposed of as provided in the bill. Inasmuch as the Isthmian Canal Commission is the Canal Zone government, what supplies or services or materials does the Isthmian Canal Commission furnish to the Canal Zone government, and what services or materials does the Isthmian Canal Commission, under the law, furnish to the Panama Government?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Isthmian Canal Commission furnishes to the Panama Railroad Co. $2,292,000.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not asking that. Of course, if that is true of the Panama Railroad Co., the same construction applies with regard to the Canal Zone government. Now, the Isthmian Canal Commission is the Canal Zone government. How could the Isthmian Canal Commission furnish any supplies or render any service to the Canal Zone government, or how could it furnish any supplies or render any service to the Panama Government? What authority of law is there for any such transaction as that?

I only instance that to show that the interpretation that has been put upon this language by the Senator from New York may not be quite the interpretation that would be put upon it by the department.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The interpretation given by the Senator from New York is the interpretation which is put upon it by the department—by Col. Goethals.

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes; but Col. Goethals does not construe this law.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. He has been consulted about it, and he has asked that this arrangement be made.

Mr. CUMMINS. And if he did, while I have high regard for his great capacity as an engineer, I would hardly concede him the same superiority in the construction of the law. I simply absolve myself from any responsibility in the matter by saying that I think it is ambiguous, and that it does not mean what the Senator from Virginia indicates that it should mean.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am perfectly satisfied that the interpretation I have given to it, and the interpretation which the War Department gives to it, is the correct one, and that there will be no difficulty and no responsibility connected with it that anybody need avoid or be disturbed about.

Mr. BRISTOW. Why not remove any doubt by inserting the word "to" in line 9, before "employees," as suggested by the Senator from New York?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think that would pervert the meaning of the whole bill. That is not where the Senator from New York proposed to insert the word "to."

Mr. BRISTOW. That is where he proposed to insert the word "to."

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Oh, no; the Senator from New York proposed to insert it at the end instead of the beginning of the provision.

Mr. BRISTOW. No; the Senator from New York suggested the insertion of the word "to" in line 9, before the word "employees," as I understood the Senator's statement. That simply makes plain and removes any doubt as to the correctness of the construction placed upon the bill by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. So the Senator argues that there is a difference between "furnishing him" and "furnishing to him"?

Mr. BRISTOW. I think that makes it very plain.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is all there is in it. If I say I will "furnish the Senator from Utah," if that means something different from "furnishing to the Senator from Utah," then his position is well taken.

Mr. CUMMINS. Such is the diversity of human judgment that I do not think the word "to" ought to be used.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Well, I certainly do not.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think there ought to be inserted before the words "Panama Railroad Co." the word "from."

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The word "from" is used before each item embraced in the provision.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not think, however, the word "from," as used in line 7, reaches the Panama Railroad Co. I think the construction to be given to it would be "moneys received by the Panama Railroad Co.," as I said originally.

Mr. BRISTOW. That would be entirely wrong, "moneys received by the Panama Railroad Co."

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It means "from." I do not see how there can be a doubt about it. The language means "received by the Panama Railroad Co."

Mr. CUMMINS. That is what it ought to say, then.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There can not be a doubt about it.

Mr. CUMMINS. It would not make any difference whether it was for services rendered or materials and supplies furnished or not; if the Isthmian Canal Commission received from the Panama Railroad Co. a sum of money, that money would be credited to the proper appropriation.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am very sure there is no trouble whatever in the language used.

Mr. ROOT. What about dividends?

Mr. CUMMINS. It does not receive any dividends under the law.

Mr. WALSH. Following the inquiry made by the Senator from Iowa, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee if he can advise us just what the Isthmian Canal Commission might supply to the Canal Zone government or to the Panama Government, and what authority of law there is for the Isthmian Canal Commission to supply anything to the Panama Government?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It may be building material. I have not an itemized statement of what is furnished, but only the amount. The department furnished me a statement for the year 1912. The year 1913 is not yet completed, the financial year ending the 30th of June. Taking the year 1912, the Canal Zone government will furnish $137,000 and the Panama Government $55,000. When those things are furnished, and when they are paid for, this bill provides that the money received for the things so furnished shall not be turned into the Treasury, but shall be retained by the Isthmian Canal Commissioners for the purposes for which it was originally appropriated. If they make any profit, they must turn that into the Treasury of the United States; but it simply enables the Panama Canal Commissioners to maintain intact the amount which was appropriated for canal purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Has the chairman of the committee any information as to the character of the material and services rendered the Panama Government?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. No; I have not an itemized statement. I have simply the amounts in most instances. In some instances they say "labor and material," "sale of material," etc., but there is not a complete itemized statement of the articles furnished—simply the dollars and cents.

Mr. WALSH. I was simply curious to know what character of supplies was being furnished.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think it is material and supplies and labor. Those items would substantially embrace all that they furnish and receive money for.

Mr. SMOOT. In this connection, Mr. President, if the chairman has no objection, I think it would be a very good idea to put in the RECORD a letter addressed by the Secretary of War to Hon. JOHN J. FITZGERALD, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, explaining this provision.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am glad the Senator has made that suggestion. I intended to offer it to be put in the RECORD. I will add a memorandum, a letter addressed to me dated the 22d of April, and an itemized statement of all the items that

make up these amounts, which aggregate about $4,000,000, and which, without the provisions contained in this bill, would diminish the canal appropriation by $4,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the papers referred to may be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 2, 1913.

Hon. THOMAS S. MARTIN,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am inclosing for your information and consideration a copy of a letter I am addressing to the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations relative to certain legislation in connection with appropriations for the Panama Canal for the fiscal year 1914 which it is desired shall be inserted in the sundry civil appropriation bill, which it is presumed will be passed at the forthcoming session of Congress.

This letter is self-explanatory, and I hope that the recommendations contained therein will receive the approval of your committee and the Senate when the bill comes before you for action.

Very truly, yours,

LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War.

APRIL 2, 1913.

Hon. JOHN J. FITZGERALD,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FITZGERALD: I beg to invite your attention to the following section, which was reported by your committee in the sundry civil appropriation bill at the last session of Congress:

"SEC. 3. That during the fiscal year 1914 all moneys received by the Isthmian Canal Commission or the governor of the Panama Canal, from any services rendered or materials and supplies furnished employees, the Panama Railroad Co., the Canal Zone Government, the Panama Government, and other departments of the United States Government, from hotel and hospital supplies and services, from rentals, wharfage, etc., from labor, materials, and supplies and other services furnished vessels, and to those unable to obtain similar labor, materials, supplies, and services elsewhere, shall be credited to the appropriation from which payments for the materials, supplies, labor, or other services were originally made, except that moneys received from the sale of material and equipment purchased and used for construction purposes, and as a reimbursement for the expenditures incurred in constructing waterworks, sewers, and pavements in the cities of Panama and Colon, including interest on such expenditures, excluding payments on account of the expenses for maintenance of such waterworks, sewers, and pavements incurred under agreement with the Panama Government, and otherwise herein disposed of, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; and except that after the canal is opened for use and operation the net profits accruing from the operations herein authorized shall annually be covered into the Treasury of the United States, as provided for the profits accruing from the business authorized in section 6 of the Panama Canal act.

"That until the close of the fiscal year 1914, when any material, supplies, and equipment heretofore or hereafter purchased or acquired for the construction of the Panama Canal is no longer needed, or is no longer serviceable, it may be sold in such manner as the President may direct, and without advertising in such classes of cases as may be authorized by him."

As you are aware, the above-quoted section was stricken out on the floors of both the House and the Senate on points of order, but as the bill failed to become a law on account of its being vetoed by the President, it is presumed that your committee will again report a similar bill early in the next session of Congress, and in this connection it is hoped that your committee will see fit to reinsert the section above referred to for the reasons hereinafter set forth.

Col. Goethals, chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission, in a letter addressed to Maj. Boggs, chief of the Washington office of the commission, submits a statement prepared by the examiner of accounts, dated March 17, 1913, a copy of which is inclosed herewith. This statement shows in parallel columns the acts of August 24, 1912 (sundry civil act), March 4, 1907, and the Panama Canal Act of August 24, 1912. This statement shows very clearly the necessity for the proposed legislation, which Col. Goethals states that he believes should not be construed as new legislation, in view of prior legislation on this subject. In this connection the following self-explanatory extracts are quoted, for your information, from Col. Goethals's letter:

"Section 8 of the act of March 4, 1907, was introduced in the sundry civil bill by the Committee on Appropriations, and I assume did not come under the jurisdiction of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, since it was enacted into law without opposition. You will note that this section imposes certain restrictions on collections, and section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (sundry civil), makes the legislation more general than the previous act. The Panama Canal Act of August 24, 1912, practically establishes a capital fund and requires all profits to be turned into the Treasury of the United States.

"When the estimates were submitted in November to the Committee on Appropriations it was understood that some time during the fiscal year for which the appropriations were asked the canal would be in an operating condition, and it is still anticipated that ships will operate through the Canal during the fiscal year referred to; that supplies will be sold to ships; collections will be made; and the terms of the Panama Canal Act will become operative. We have to reckon with accounting officers of the Treasury, and, in order that there may be no mistake, the act of 1907 and the two acts of 1912, relating to the subject of collections, were consolidated and amplified in such a way as to leave no doubt in the minds of the accounting officers as to the disposition that is to be made of collections from the various sources. Instead of applying certain collections to construction and engineering, they are to be applied to the departments which bear the expense. Proceeds of sales to vessels and others using the canal are to be turned in partly to the capital fund authorized by the Panama Canal Act and the profits as miscellaneous receipts to the Treasury Department. There was no intent to introduce any new legislation, but an effort was made to so combine existing legislation, setting it forth in such terms so that, administratively, no difficulties would be encountered with the accounting officers of the Treasury."

Col. Goethals further states in his letter that he hopes that section 3, as formerly reported by your committee, will be enacted into law in the next sundry civil appropriation bill, in order to avoid any complications relative to collections that might subsequently arise if the language of section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (sundry civil act), only is repeated.

The importance of this legislation is apparent when it is realized that in the absence of such provisions receipts from the sale of materials and supplies furnished by the Isthmian Canal Commission will, under section 3618 of the Revised Statutes, have to be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and may not be withdrawn except in consequence of a subsequent appropriation made by law; hence the total of these receipts will be lost to the appropriations for the canal for the future. It is also understood that the estimates for the fiscal year 1914 were based on the assumption that all moneys received by the Isthmian Canal Commission from any services rendered or material and supplies furnished would be available during that fiscal year, through being credited to the appropriations from which payments for the services, etc., were originally made, and therefore, unless this is authorized, these estimates will not be sufficient for the work contemplated. In this connection it is noted that purchases are now made by the Canal Commission for the Panama Railroad Co., the Canal Zone government, and for hotel and hospital supplies and services, additional efficiency and economy resulting from this consolidation. Under the appropriation act for the current fiscal year, and under the proposed section 3, the collections on account of the sales to these departments return to the canal appropriation. If, however, the proposed section 3 is not passed, these receipts must, after June 30, 1913, under the general laws as construed by the comptroller, be turned into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. This would necessitate either a radical change in the methods of purchasing, with an increased expense, or an additional appropriation of $1,000,000 or more to reimburse the commission for the amounts turned into the Treasury. Moreover, if additional appropriations are necessitated in order to cover the amount taken into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, in the absence of the desired legislation, the total appropriations for the canal will not give a fair figure as the cost of the canal.

The last paragraph of the above-quoted section 3, authorizing the sale during the fiscal year 1914 of canal material which is no longer needed or which is no longer serviceable, in such manner as the President may direct, is merely repeating the legislation which is now in effect for the fiscal year 1913, and hence it is not believed that it should be construed as new legislation.

In view of the foregoing it is earnestly hoped that your committee will do all that is practicable to secure the enactment of the legislation above indicated in the next sundry civil appropriation act.

Very truly, yours,

LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War.

EMPIRE, *March 17, 1913.*

Col. GEORGE W. GOETHALS,
Chairman and Chief Engineer, Culebra, Canal Zone.

SIR: I return herewith the papers relative to legislation in regard to collections stricken from the sundry civil bill on points of order, which was forwarded to this office with your memorandum of March 14, with the request to note and return with statement showing new legislation (not covered by previous acts and Panama Canal act) section 3 contemplated.

In order to enable a ready comparison between the existing and the proposed legislation I have arranged in one column below, section 8 of the act of March 4, 1907, section 3 of the act approved August 24, 1912, and the part of section 6 of the Panama Canal act applicable, and in a column parallel thereto the proposed legislation as contained in the sundry civil bill as reported to both the House and the Senate by the committees in charge.

ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912.

SEC. 3. All funds realized during the fiscal year 1913 by the Isthmian Canal Commission from the performance of services by the commission, or from rentals, or from the sale of materials and supplies under the custody or control of the commission, are appropriated for expenditure under any of the foregoing classified appropriations for the department of construction and engineering.

ACT OF MARCH 4, 1907.

SEC. 8. All amounts due from employees, whether to the commission, * * * for transportation, board, supplies, or for any other service, are hereby authorized to be deducted from the compensation otherwise payable to the said employees * * * to be credited to the appropriation out of which the transportation, board, supplies, or other services were originally paid.

PANAMA CANAL ACT.

SEC. 6. * * * The President is also authorized to establish, maintain, and operate, through the Panama Railroad Co. or otherwise, dry docks, repair shops, yards, docks, wharves, warehouses, storehouses, and other necessary facilities and appurtenances for the purpose of providing coal and other materials, labor, repairs, and supplies for vessels of the Government of the United States and, incidentally, for supplying such at reasonable prices to passing ves-

SUNDRY CIVIL BILL.

SEC. 3. That during the fiscal year 1914 all moneys received by the Isthmian Canal Commission or the governor of the Panama Canal from any services rendered or materials and supplies furnished employees, the Panama Railroad Co., the Canal Zone Government, the Panama Government, and other departments of the United States Government, from hotel and hospital supplies and services; from rentals, wharfage, etc.; from labor, materials, and supplies and other services furnished vessels and to those unable to obtain similar labor, material, supplies, and services elsewhere, shall be credited to the appropriation from which payments for the materials, supplies, labor, or other services were originally made; except that moneys received from the sale of material and equipment purchased and used for construction purposes, and as a reimbursement for the expenditures incurred in constructing waterworks, sewers, and pavements in the cities of Panama and Colon, including interest on such expenditures, excluding payments on account of the expenses for maintenance of such waterworks, sewers, and pavements incurred under agreement with the Panama Government, and otherwise herein disposed of, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; and except that after the canal is opened for use and operation the net profits accruing from

sels, in accordance with appropriations hereby authorized to be made from time to time by Congress as a part of the maintenance and operation of the said canal. Moneys received from the conduct of said business may be expended and reinvested for such purposes without being covered into the Treasury of the United States; and such moneys are hereby appropriated for such purposes, * * * and any net profits accruing from such business shall annually be covered into the Treasury of the United States. * * *

SEC. 3. * * * That until the close of the fiscal year 1913, when any material, supplies, and equipment heretofore or hereafter purchased or acquired for the construction of the Isthmian Canal is no longer needed, or is no longer serviceable, it may be sold in such manner as the President may direct, and without advertising in such classes of cases as may be authorized by him. * * *

the operations herein authorized shall annually be covered into the Treasury of the United States, as provided for the profits accruing from the business authorized in section 6 of the Panama Canal act.

That until the close of the fiscal year 1914, when any material, supplies, and equipment heretofore or hereafter purchased or acquired for the construction of the Panama Canal is no longer needed, or is no longer serviceable, it may be sold in such manner as the President may direct, and without advertising in such classes of cases as may be authorized by him.

Collections from employees for supplies and services are now credited to appropriations, as provided in section 8 of the act of March 4, 1907. The one word "employees" in section 3 of the proposed legislation covers the same subject matter, and the only change made by section 3 is the disposition of profits on supplies and services furnished employees as miscellaneous receipts. All collections received by the commission, except from employees and except from other departments of the United States Government, are, under section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912, deposited, first, as miscellaneous receipts, and then credited by appropriation warrant to appropriations for the department of construction and engineering. Under this provision all but a very small part of all collections could be credited in exact accord with the proposed section 3—that is, to the appropriation from which payment for the material or service was originally made.

The items the disposition of which is changed are the collections from hospital services and supplies received from others than employees and the collections from the Panama Government. In the one case the department of sanitation's appropriations are affected and in the other the appropriations for the department of civil administration. There is this difference at the present time: The department of construction and engineering gets the benefit of any profits over and above the actual cost of material or services furnished, whereas under the proposed section 3 the departments of civil administration and sanitation appropriations would be credited with the actual disbursements only from their appropriations, while the net profits would be covered in as miscellaneous receipts.

In the case of collections from the Panama Government also the payments now made on account of the construction of waterworks, sewers, and pavements in the cities of Panama and Colon are credited to appropriations for the department of construction and engineering, although the cost of this work was estimated for within the total cost of the canal, and any credits on this account afford the commission that much additional money with which to carry on the work. Section 3 proposes that these collections from the Panama Government shall be covered into the Treasury, where they belong. The collections from the Government of Panama on account of maintaining the waterworks, sewers, and pavements are, however, credited to the appropriation in order to conform to the provisions contained in items 7, 8, and 9 of the appropriations for the construction of the canal, authorizing the use of these collections for performing the work which is required to be done by treaty obligations.

The items included in section 6 of the Panama Canal act are as follows:

1. Receipts from wireless operations, and from
2. Operations of dry docks, repair shops, yards, docks, wharves, warehouses, and other necessary facilities and appurtenances for providing coal and other materials, labor, repairs, and supplies to (a) vessels of the United States and (b) passenger vessels.

These receipts, with the exception of the net profits which are to be deposited in the Treasury annually, are to be credited to the appropriations.

The items not included in section 6 of the Panama Canal act and not covered by permanent legislation and which are by the provisions of the proposed section 3 to follow the same course as the collections under the Panama Canal act are collections from or on account of—

1. Employees.
2. Hotel and hospital supplies and services.
3. Labor, material, supplies, and services furnished those unable to obtain same elsewhere.
4. United States Government departments other than vessels.

The collections which are not included within the provisions of section 6 and are not disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the regular fiscal year authority—that contained in section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912, but which are rightfully disposed of in accordance with general provisions of law, are:

1. Reimbursement by the Republic of Panama of the cost of constructing waterworks, sewers, and pavements, including interest on such expenditures.

2. Receipts from material and equipment purchased and used for construction purposes; that is, from unserviceable equipment and material and equipment no longer needed.

Below I give a table showing all the collections that would be in any way affected by the provisions of section 3 of the proposed legislation, classified in accordance with the three provisions at present in force. Section 8, act of March 4, 1907; section 3, act of August 24, 1912; and section 6, Panama Canal act. Opposite each item is shown the disposition that would be made of the collections: (1) By the act of March 4, 1907; (2) by general laws as construed by the comptroller; (3) by section 4 of the act of August 24, 1912; (4) by section 6 of the Panama Canal act; and (5) by section 3 of the proposed legislation, and whether credited to appropriations or miscellaneous receipts under these various provisions:

Table showing moneys received by the commission for supplies, services, etc.

Sources of revenues covered by sec. 3 proposed legislation, classified under the other provisions applicable.	Disposition under various provisions.							
	Act of Mar. 4, 1907.	General laws as construed by comptroller.		Sec. 4, act Aug. 24, 1912, deposited as miscellaneous receipts and reappropriated to C. & E. appropriation.	Sec. 6, Panama Canal act.		Sec. 3, pending sundry civil bill.	
	App.	App.	M. R.		App.	M. R.	App.	M. R.
1. Collections under sec. 8, act of Mar. 4, 1907.								
From employees	x						x	
Profits from above	x							x
2. Collections under sec. 4, act of Aug. 24, 1912, made during fiscal year 1913.								
(a) Those included in sec. 6, Panama Canal act:								
Wireless operations (not specifically mentioned in sec. 3, proposed legislation)				x	x		x	
Operations of dry docks, repair shops, yards, docks, wharves, warehouses, and other necessary facilities and appurtenances, for providing coal and other materials, labor, repairs, supplies, etc., to:								
Vessels of United States		x			x		x	
Passing vessels			x	x	x		x	
Net profits		Part.	Part.	x		x		x
(b) Collections other than those included in section 6, Panama Canal act:								
Panama R. R. Co.			x	x			x	
Canal Zone government			x	x			x	
Panama Government, except for expenditures on waterworks, sewers, and pavements in Panama and Colon			x	x			x	
Reimbursement of cost of constructing waterworks, sewers, and pavements, including interest			x	x				x
Expense of maintenance waterworks, sewers, and pavements			x	x			x	
United States Government departments, other than vessels		x					x	
Hotel and hospital supplies and services	Part.		Part.	Part.			x	
Labor, material, supplies, and services furnished those unable to obtain same elsewhere	Part.		Part.	Part.			x	
Material and equipment purchased and used for construction purposes (i. e., unserviceable equipment and material and equipment no longer needed)			x	x				x
Profits on above	Part.	Part.	Part.	x		x		x
Rentals, wharfage, etc.			x	x	x	x	x	
Mainly covered by Panama Canal act					(Part each.)			

In some cases you will see that a part is credited one way and a part another. The intent of the entire provision is to dispose of all collections along the lines of section 6 of the Panama Canal act, and to credit to miscellaneous receipts all profits and all other collections which should not be credited to appropriations for the canal.

Three items of collections the disposition of which must be made along the lines of the proposed legislation—or radical change must be made in methods of purchasing, at an increased cost, or additional appropriations of a milion dollars or more must be made for the year 1914—are the collections from the Panama Railroad Co., the Canal Zone government, and the collections from hotel and hospital supplies and services.

The relations of the Panama Railroad Co. and the Canal Zone government with the Isthmian Canal Commission are necessarily so intimate, and there is such necessity for the rendition of services for these

two interests by the commission, that there is no reason why the collections from them should not be treated in a manner similar to the treatment of collections from other departments of the United States Government. They are agencies of the Government to the same extent as the District of Columbia, the Philippine Islands, and Porto Rico are agencies from which collections are made and disposed of as proposed in section 3. While a short paragraph could be drafted which would cover the absolutely essential items, any paragraph of that kind would leave important items open to construction and involve many difficulties in connection with accounting for the funds.

As will be seen from the comparison on page 2 of this letter, the second paragraph of the proposed section 3 follows exactly the second paragraph of section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912. One covers the fiscal year 1914 and the other the fiscal year 1913, and provides for the sale of material, supplies, and equipment heretofore or hereafter purchased or acquired for the construction of the Panama Canal which is no longer needed or is no longer serviceable.

Respectfully, H. A. A. SMITH,
Examiner of Accounts.

WAR DEPARTMENT, *Washington, April 22, 1913.*

Hon. THOMAS S. MARTIN,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: Referring to previous correspondence relative to certain legislation in connection with appropriations for the Panama Canal for the fiscal year 1914, which it was formerly desired should be inserted in the sundry civil appropriation bill, and particularly to my letter to you of the 15th instant, I beg to advise you that on April 18 I received a letter from Mr. ADAMSON inquiring whether, in incorporating section 3 of the old sundry civil bill in the forthcoming deficiency bill, it would not be well to substitute the word "hereafter" in lieu of saying "during the fiscal year 1914," so as to make the legislation permanent.

A cable containing the substance of that letter was immediately sent to Col. Goethals, and a reply was received from him yesterday suggesting that instead of the use of the word "hereafter" it would be preferable to use the words "after June 30, 1913," in order that the new method of accounting would begin July 1 next, instead of the date of the act. Col. Goethals pointed out that this also would make the legislation permanent.

I addressed a letter to Mr. ADAMSON on this subject yesterday, a copy of which is inclosed herewith, but the letter could not have been received until to-day. In the meantime I find that the bill (H. R. 2973) "making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes," containing in section 2 thereof the legislation relative to the Panama Canal which has been the subject of this correspondence, passed the House yesterday, April 21, and therefore there was no opportunity to make the suggested change on the floor of the House.

In view of the foregoing it would be appreciated if your committee would change the language of section 2 of the bill referred to so that the first few words would read:

"SEC. 2. That after June 30, 1913, all moneys received by the Isthmian Canal Commission," etc.

Very truly, yours, LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War.

WAR DEPARTMENT, *Washington, April 21, 1913.*

Hon. W. C. ADAMSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ADAMSON: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 17th instant, in reference to incorporating section 3 of the old sundry civil bill in the forthcoming deficiency bill, and inquiring whether it would not be well to substitute the word "hereafter" in lieu of saying "during the fiscal year 1914."

A cable containing the substance of your letter was sent to Col. Goethals, and a reply has been received from him suggesting that instead of the use of the word "hereafter" it would be preferable to use the words "after June 30, 1913," in order that the new method of accounting would begin July 1 next instead of the date of the act. Col. Goethals states that this also will make the legislation permanent.

In view of the foregoing, it is requested that steps be taken to change the language of the section referred to so that the first few words will read:

"That after June 30, 1913, all moneys received by the Isthmian Canal Commission," etc.

Thanking you for taking the initiative in bringing up this suggestion, I am

Very truly, yours, LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War.

ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION,
Washington Office, April 28, 1913.

Memorandum for use in connection with statement showing disposition of collections by the Isthmian Canal Commission under the operation of section 2 of pending bill (H. R. 2973), and also disposition in event this legislation fails.

The principal reasons for the passage of the desired legislation are as follows:

1. An increase in the appropriations for the fiscal year 1914 of approximately $3,000,000 will be necessary to cover moneys which will have to be turned into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts if the legislation asked for fails of passage, as the estimates for the fiscal year 1914 were based on the assumption that all moneys received by the commission from any services rendered or materials and supplies furnished would be available during that fiscal year through being credited to the appropriations from which payments for the services, etc., were originally made.

2. The apparent cost of the canal will be increased, as it is believed by most people that the cost of the canal will equal the total of the appropriations made therefor, and credits will not be considered.

3. The consolidation of the work of certain departments of the Isthmian Canal Commission and the Panama Railroad, particularly in connection with the purchase of supplies, which has been in existence for the past two years and which has resulted in increased economy and efficiency, may have to be changed and such work carried on under separate organizations at additional expense.

4. The contemplated legislation was not intended to introduce any especially new features, but an effort has been made to so combine existing legislation that administratively no difficulties would be encountered with the accounting officers of the Treasury, the principal change, however, being that collections due to sales or services by the sanitary department will revert to the appropriations for that department, and similarly with respect to the department of civil administration, instead of all going to the department of construction and engineering, as under former and present laws. A copy of the present laws is attached hereto.

ACTS OF CONGRESS RELATIVE TO DISPOSITION OF COLLECTIONS BY THE ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION.

An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 8. All amounts due from employees, whether to the commission, Panama Railroad Co., or contractor, for transportation, board, supplies, or for any other service, are hereby authorized to be deducted from the compensation otherwise payable to the said employees, and to be paid to the authorized parties or to be credited to the appropriation out of which the transportation, board, supplies, or other service was originally paid.

* * * * * * *

Approved, March 4, 1907.

An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 3. All funds realized during the fiscal year 1913 by the Isthmian Canal Commission from the performance of services by the commission, or from rentals or from the sale of materials and supplies under the custody or control of the commission, are appropriated for expenditure under any of the foregoing classified appropriations for the department of construction and engineering, and a full and separate report in detail of all transactions under this section shall be made to Congress.

That until the close of the fiscal year 1913, when any material, supplies, and equipment heretofore or hereafter purchased or acquired for the construction of the Isthmian Canal is no longer needed or is no longer serviceable, it may be sold in such manner as the President may direct, and without advertising in such classes of cases as may be authorized by him; and the President is authorized, in his discretion, to sell and convey to the Republic of Panama the building situated in the city of Panama known as "the Administration Building," together with the ground on which the same is located, for a sum of not less than $80,000, and the proceeds of such sale, if made, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

* * * * * * *

Approved August 24, 1912.

An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 6. * * * The President is also authorized, in his discretion, to enter into such operating agreements or leases with any private wireless company or companies as may best insure freedom from interference with the wireless telegraphic installations established by the United States. The President is also authorized to establish, maintain, and operate, through the Panama Railroad Co. or otherwise, dry docks, repair shops, yards, docks, wharves, warehouses, storehouses, and other necessary facilities and appurtenances for the purpose of providing coal and other materials, labor, repairs, and supplies for vessels of the Government of the United States, and incidentally for supplying such at reasonable prices to passing vessels, in accordance with appropriations hereby authorized to be made from time to time by Congress as a part of the maintenance and operation of the said canal. Moneys received from the conduct of said business may be expended and reinvested for such purposes without being covered into the Treasury of the United States; and such moneys are hereby appropriated for such purposes, but all deposits of such funds shall be subject to the provisions of existing law relating to the deposit of other public funds of the United States, and any net profits accruing from such business shall annually be covered into the Treasury of the United States. * * *

* * * * * * *

Approved August 24, 1912.

Statement showing disposition of collections by the Isthmian Canal Commission under the operation of section 2 of pending bill, H. R. 2973, and also disposition in event this legislation fails.

Nature of collections.	Amount.	Disposition under section 2, H. R. 2973.	Disposition if section 2, H. R. 2973, fails.	Disposition under former acts, which indicates that Congress has heretofore granted similar legislation.
1. From services rendered or materials and supplies furnished:				
a. Employees		To basic appropriation	To basic appropriation	Basic appropriation.
b. The Panama Railroad Co	$2,292,000	do	To miscellaneous receipts	Appropriation construction and engineering.
c. The Canal Zone Government	137,000	do	do	Do.
d. The Panama Government	55,000	do	do	Do.
e. Other departments, United States Government		do	To basic appropriation	Basic appropriation.
2. From hotel and hospital supplies and services	270,000	do	Part to basic appropriation and amount shown to miscellaneous receipts.	Part basic appropriation and part construction and engineering.

Statement showing disposition of collections by the Isthmian Canal Commission under the operation of section 2 of pending bill, H. R. 2973—Continued.

Nature of collections.	Amount.	Disposition under section 2, H. R. 2973.	Disposition if section 2, H. R. 2973, fails.	Disposition under former acts, which indicates that Congress has heretofore granted similar legislation.
3. From rentals, wharfage, etc	$50,000	To basic appropriation	To miscellaneous receipts until canal opened; then part to basic appropriation and part to miscellaneous receipts.	Appropriation construction and engineering.
4. From labor, materials, and supplies, and other services furnished vessels and others unable to obtain same.	325,000	do	Part to basic appropriation and part to miscellaneous receipts.	Part basic appropriation and part construction and engineering.
5. From sale of material and equipment purchased and used for construction purposes.		To miscellaneous receipts	To miscellaneous receipts	Appropriation construction and engineering.
6. From reimbursement cost of constructing waterworks, sewers, and pavements in cities of Panama and Colon, including interest, except (see item 7).		do	do	Do.
7. Amount needed for maintenance of waterworks, sewers, and pavements.	50,000	To basic appropriation	do	Do.
8. Profits on above items		To miscellaneous receipts	Part to basic appropriation and part to miscellaneous receipts.	Do.
Total	[1] $3,225,000			

[1] This indicates loss to appropriations based on actual collections for fiscal year 1912. Similar figures for 1914 would have to be estimated but would probably be approximately the same.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I wish to express a dissent to the paragraph from line 9 to line 15, on page 6, providing for the sale of Panama Canal supplies no longer needed, because I believe that those supplies ought to be used for the construction of railroads in Alaska, or for necessary work to be done on the Mississippi River. The supplies that we have at Panama, if sold, will be sold as junk and will bring very little money. We can use them, if they are properly preserved, in the operations of the Government, I think, very economically.

We have now a bill before the Committee on Territories for the construction of railroads in Alaska, which the Government will have to construct in order to get to our coal fields there. I believe that instead of selling these supplies we ought to keep them and use them in that work. There might be supplies that would be useless for those purposes which could be disposed of.

I will not move to strike out the paragraph, but I simply express these as my views, hoping that the administration will not sell supplies that could be used either on the Mississippi River or in Alaska for the purposes suggested.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, may I make a suggestion to the Senator from Kansas? If the committee reports the bill to which he has just referred, it will be quite simple to make provision that any material, supplies, and equipment purchased or acquired for the construction of the Panama Canal and no longer needed and serviceable for that purpose may be applied to the new purposes. This language is very general; it does not limit it to serviceability for the construction of the Panama Canal, and it is very easy to bring in legislation authorizing the use in conformity with this law.

Mr. BRISTOW. I agree to that suggestion.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, May 1, 1913, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 28, 1913.

COMPTROLLER OF THE TREASURY.

George E. Downey, of Indiana, to be Comptroller of the Treasury, in place of Robert J. Tracewell, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Lewis T. Erwin, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for the District of Alaska, Division No. 4, vice Henry K. Love, whose term has expired.

PROMOTIONS IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Passed Asst. Surg. Carroll Fox to be surgeon in the Public Health Service, to rank as such from December 1, 1912.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Francis Albion Carmelia to be assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service, in place of Surg. H. D. Geddings, deceased.

Lionel Eclan Hooper to be assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service. New office.

Luther Walker Jenkins to be assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service, in place of Surg. S. D. Brooks, promoted.

Liston Paine to be assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service, in place of Asst. Surg. R. H. Lyon, resigned.

Moses Victor Safford to be assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service. New office.

Ernest Winfield Scott to be assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service. New office.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

John T. Hamilton, of Stacy, Mont., to be receiver of public moneys at Miles City, Mont., vice Joseph C. Auld, term expired. This nomination is in lieu of that sent to Senate March 17, and confirmed same day, in which Mr. Hamilton's first name was stated as James, according to erroneous recommendation.

POSTMASTERS.

NEW JERSEY.

James P. McNair to be postmaster at Paterson, N. J., in place of George W. Pollitt. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1912.

TEXAS.

J. M. Richards to be postmaster at Weatherford, Tex., in place of Robert B. Milliken, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 28, 1913.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR.

H. S. Breckenridge to be Assistant Secretary of War.

AUDITOR FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

R. W. Woolley to be Auditor for the Department of the Interior.

RECORDER OF GENERAL LAND OFFICE.

L. Q. C. Lamar to be recorder of the General Land Office.

GENERAL APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

J. B. Sullivan to be general appraiser of merchandise.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

W. W. Roper to be appraiser of merchandise at Philadelphia, Pa.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

H. H. Manson to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Wisconsin.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

S. B. Berry to be receiver of public moneys at Montrose, Colo.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

F. O. Williams to be register of land office at Kalispell, Mont.

F. Delgado to be register of land office at Santa Fe, N. Mex.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Clarence L. Reames to be United States attorney for the district of Oregon.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

TO BE CHAPLAIN.

W. R. Arnold to be chaplain, with rank of first lieutenant, in the Army.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

Second Lieut. H. H. Arnold to be first lieutenant.

MEDICAL CORPS.

Lieut. Col. Charles M. Gandy to be colonel.
Maj. Frederick R. Reynolds to be lieutenant colonel.
Capt. James M. Phalen to be major.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

TO BE REAR ADMIRALS.

Capt. George S. Willits.
Capt. Walter F. Worthington.
Capt. William N. Little.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

S. J. Griffin, Cullman.
R. D. Williams, Opelika.

ARKANSAS.

J. E. Pringle, Hoxie.
John D. Wilbourne, Pine Bluff.
Mrs. L. H. Hall, Pocahontas.

FLORIDA.

E. J. Roux, Fernandina.
A. B. Brown, Fort Pierce.

GEORGIA.

S. D. Cherry, Donaldsonville.
M. S. Cornett, Lawrenceville.

INDIANA.

W. S. Pugh, Greenfield.
W. Kostbade, Hobart.
J. Davidson, Lyons.
W. E. Aydelotte, Sullivan.

LOUISIANA.

W. G. Chapman, Lake Arthur.
C. De Blieux, Natchitoches.
H. H. Schindler, Sulphur.

MASSACHUSETTS.

George T. McLaughlin, Sandwich.

MICHIGAN.

E. C. Maxwell, Carleton.
F. B. Carr, Dundee.

MISSISSIPPI.

C. W. Carr, Newton.
E. T. Butler, McComb.

MISSOURI.

R. H. Moran, Clarksville.
M. W. Spurling, Higbee.
W. G. Pike, Martinsburg.

MONTANA.

W. Crofft, Chouteau.

NEBRASKA.

F. Cox, Sutherland.

NEW JERSEY.

E. T. Lanterman, East Orange.
James P. McNair, Paterson.

OHIO.

Albert Schnell, Morrow.

OREGON.

J. A. McMorris, Condon.
A. Longwell, Echo.

PENNSYLVANIA.

C. S. Lichleiter, Elk Lick.

TEXAS.

B. M. Burgher, Dallas.
D. A. Paulus, Hallettsville.
R. H. Newton, Midlothian.
I. J. Wright, Mission.
J. W. Shaw, San Diego.
T. Durham, Wellington.
T. H. Hood, Wortham.

VIRGINIA.

P. W. Pugh, Broadway.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 28, 1913.

POSTMASTER.

TEXAS.

Norman H. Martin to be postmaster at Weatherford, in the State of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *April 28, 1913.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We come to Thee, O God our Father, with glad and thankful hearts that we are involved in a plan which can not fail of its ultimate purpose because of Thine infinite wisdom, power, and goodness. Yet history, observation, and experience teach emphatically that we may retard its progress as individuals, as a Nation, as a race, by opposing the will of its projector. Teach us, O God our Father, how to work together with Thee for the end which all true men long for, hope for, pray for, that Thy will may be done in earth as it is done in heaven. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, April 26, 1913, was read and approved.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR EVENING SESSION.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. CLINE to preside at the session this evening.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321, of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is not my purpose this morning to talk about the tariff, but to briefly discuss the alien ownership of land in this country.

I maintain as a principle of good Government that a nonresident alien should not be permitted to own a foot of land in America. The situation in California is a very critical one, and I trust that I may not say anything that will in the least tend to prevent a friendly settlement or embarrass our State Department in its effort to retain the friendship of Japan, but before I would surrender the right to control a foot of American soil to Japan or any other nation on earth or to permit any other nation to dictate the land laws to one of these sovereign States, I would fight. I hope that this administration will take a firm stand on this question and settle it for all time, by telling the whole world that we will not tolerate any interference with our domestic concerns.

I am not at all in sympathy with the view taken by some of the courts that the treaty-making power is absolute and unlimited. If this is the correct view, then the President and the United States Senate can by the exercise of the treaty-making power amend, alter, or repeal any of our State laws, and the will of the President and the United States Senate is supreme and not the will of the people of the States, as expressed in their statutes and constitutions.

I maintain that it is the sacred duty of the President and United States Senate not only not to make a treaty that would infringe upon the constitution and law of the State, but it is their highest duty to sustain the States in their rights and to prevent this very unwarranted interference on the part of other nations with the State constitutions and with the State laws. This is one of the principal reasons for the very existence of our Federal Government. If now our Federal Government shall in spite of the will of the people of these States force them to submit to the dictates of foreign powers, the love and regard which our people now have for the Federal Government will cease and in its place will be kindled a spirit of hatred.

It is just as much the duty of the Federal Government to protect these State governments as it is the duty of the Federal Government to protect itself. The destruction of the States by the treaty-making power means the destruction of the entire Federal system, and we substitute a national central control for a local State control. The coercion of the people of California in this right is a precedent for any coercion, however

drastic, when in the future the demand shall be made by a powerful Government. It will be a miserable piece of cringing cowardice for us to yield now, and I am with the good people of California in their fight, and I am willing to vote the last dollar in the Treasury for the defense of her right to control her sacred soil.

What is involved in this controversy? Is it not the right of the people of the State to protect themselves and their citizens in the control of their soil? The land of a nation is the foundation upon which all her hopes and prosperity must rest. Shall a Japanese subject demand the rights of a citizen of the State of California? Shall he enjoy all of the benefits of our civilization and not be compelled to defend it? Shall he enjoy the use of all of our highways and other Government institutions and be permitted to drain the soil of all of its products, thus causing the burden to be in that proportion greater upon the citizen who will live and die in California and leave an estate which he has drawn from California lands to be taxed to maintain our high state of civilization? Does Japan complain because her people want to leave her shores and swear allegiance to our Government and to take up arms, if necessary, to defend California against Japan? No; she complains because her people can not come and remain with us and draw from our soil its riches and send them to Japan to sustain her people and her Government across the sea, subject all the while to His Majesty the Emperor of Japan and protected by him, and who can in the event of war assemble all of his loyal subjects already in this country, and with their substance which they have drawn from our soil wage war against us. I say if we must have war or submit to this indignity, then I am for war. What would Washington say under such conditions—war or submission? What would Andrew Jackson say—war or submission? What would Cleveland say—war or submission?

Mr. Chairman, I accord to Japan all the equal rights with ourselves. I would as quickly resent a demand from our Government upon Japan to permit an American citizen to own land in Japan contrary to the laws of Japan as I do now resent Japan's effort to compel us to submit to her demands.

The question as stated by Gov. Johnson is just this: If the proposed anti-alien land laws give offense to the Government at Tokyo, the California executive absolves the State from all blame on the ground that Federal statutes have already drawn the line which the State now seeks to establish. The proposed law only bars from ownership of land an alien who can not or will not become a citizen of the State, and if Japan is affected, then that is due to the fact that a Japanese can not become naturalized. How, then, can the United States Government complain? She and not California is to blame. If Japanese are denied citizenship because the United States will not permit them to become citizens—and the proposed legislation simply provides that no alien who can not become a citizen can own land—there is no discrimination because of the California law but because of the law of the United States, for if the United States shall remove this restriction, then the proposed law of California will not prevent a Japanese owning land. I think it the duty of every loyal citizen of all of our States to stand for California and her rights in this fight for her own citizens and their descendants.

The power to make treaties is conferred upon the President of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur therein. The Constitution also provides that all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of the States to the contrary notwithstanding. But every treaty, as provided in the Constitution, shall be made in pursuance of the Constitution of the United States. In other words, the right to make a treaty must be in accordance with the Constitution itself. The purpose of this clause in the Constitution was to take away from the States the right to make treaties or to deal with foreign powers as a State.

Right here I may say that at the time the Constitution of the United States took effect, and when the members of the Constitutional Convention were assembled, many of the States, or so-called Colonies, not only had made but were then engaged in making treaties with foreign nations in respect to their own affairs. Therefore the mere conferring on the Federal Government of the right to make treaties was no inhibition upon the States, unless the States were specifically deprived of that power in haec verba, because if you will note the discussions of the members of the Constitutional Convention at that time you will find that they discussed the concurrent powers of the States and the Federal Government, and the mere conferring upon the Federal Government of the right to make a treaty without depriving the State of that right would mean that there might be all sorts of complications arising in dealing with foreign powers. So that it seems to have been an afterthought during the discussion of the treaty-making power, and was not included in the original draft of the article providing for the President to make treaties by and with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate.

The States, by this clause of the Federal Constitution, have delegated all of their treaty-making powers to the Federal Government. It is my contention that the treaty-making power is to be exercised by the Federal Government with foreign powers in reference to purely international matters which do not affect our internal domestic concerns. The States did not delegate any power to the Federal Government to control the land in the State. As soon as a Territory is admitted into the Union as a State all of the lands in that State immediately pass under the control of the State government, except the public land of the United States.

Now mark you this: The Federal Government, with the House of Representatives, with the Senate, and with the President all giving solemn consideration to a bill, can not deprive a State of the right to make her own land laws; and I say it is absurd to contend that the President of the United States, with only two-thirds of the Senate concurring in making a contract with a foreign power, can do what both branches of Congress and the President combined can not do under the Constitution. And yet the courts have intimated that the treaty-making power is unlimited and absolute. This I emphatically deny. As soon as the land is entered and disposed of by the Federal Government the Federal Government never acquires any right or control over such lands. It was never dreamed by the fathers of the Constitution that there would ever be a demand, either on the part of the Federal Government or any foreign power, to control the method, manner, and right to acquire land in any State or to dictate her method, manner, and right of descent and distribution.

It will be conceded that where the States have permitted an alien to acquire title to land that then the alien government, in order to enforce the rights of its citizen, must deal with the Federal Government through the President and the Secretary of State. Even then the President and Secretary of State should only assure the alien government that the alien shall be dealt with fairly and honestly and in accordance with the laws of the State. If this were not true, then we would be in this absurd and anomalous situation that the alien would have rights superior to the rights of the people of the State who were citizens thereof, because it will not be questioned that every citizen of the State is absolutely under the control of the laws of the State and so is all of the property which he owns in the State, but the alien would enjoy rights superior to the citizen and could appeal to the President and the Secretary of State to invoke a treaty and have the Federal courts enforce his rights under the treaty irrespective of the laws of that State.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CLINE). Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Of course the State can not make any treaty. Is there any way in which foreign Governments can, by any process whatever, secure to their citizens rights of property in the States?

Mr. SISSON. Absolutely none, except——

Mr. MANN. What is the exception?

Mr. SISSON. My contention is except that the State itself shall make land laws which shall permit the alien to acquire lands.

Mr. MANN. That is not a matter that a foreign Government can secure—that is a matter purely for a State to determine?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. We claim that we have a right to make treaties with foreign Governments under which we shall secure to American citizens property rights in foreign countries?

Mr. SISSON. That is true.

Mr. MANN. And we exercise that right?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I understand the gentleman's contention is that that is a one-sided arrangement. We have a right under the Constitution to make a treaty with a foreign nation which will secure to American citizens property rights in foreign lands, but conversely can not make a treaty which will secure to foreigners in our own country?

Mr. SISSON. Yes; but the gentleman should not lose sight of this fact, and that is that the Government of the United States has no right, nor has the Government of any country,

where the treaty-making power is limited, either by an unwritten constitution or by a written constitution, to exceed that authority, and no Government but a despotic government—and the gentleman will find this to be the universal rule—has ever sought through the treaty-making power to break the laws where the laws are made in conjunction with the treaty-making power.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will pardon me. I know the gentleman has given this subject considerable study heretofore, and I am interested in his views, although I do not desire to be considered as expressing my own views on the subject. But is it not a fact that somewhere there must be lodged in every Government complete sovereignty, and if we insist that a foreign Government has complete sovereignty to grant certain rights in that country there must be lodged somewhere in the United States complete sovereignty of equal character?

Mr. SISSON. That is true in so far as the treaty-making power has obtained the right and the power from the Government or the people of the country to make the treaties, and it is a universal construction of international law that those parties making the treaty shall be cognizant of the power of the party making the treaty. Now, Chief Justice Marshall lays down this rule—and I am glad the gentleman called my attention to that, because I want the committee at this time to understand the rather curious difference in the right of the United States Government to make treaties, and all other nations in the world, at the time that Marshall delivered that opinion. There have been some changes in some of the Governments since that time, owing to the fact that they, too, have adopted constitutions, but that is quite a long story. Chief Justice Marshall laid down this rule and said that all of the international lawyers and all the countries contended, and it was admitted to be a fact, that a treaty made between two nations prior to the time that the United States Government entered the treaty-making world was considered to be a contract between the treaty-making powers of the two Governments, and had no operation infra-territorially unless it was promulgated by the proper authority and the proper power in the Government to compel the citizens to observe the treaty. The responsibility for the violation of the treaty rested entirely with the party that made the treaty for the Government; but, said Chief Justice Marshall, in the United States a peculiar thing happens. Immediately upon the treaty being ratified by two-thirds of the Senate it becomes the supreme law of the land, and every citizen, without promulgation of it except the mere publishing of our laws, becomes amenable to that treaty and can be punished criminally for violation of the treaty if its terms so provide. And yet, according to Chief Justice Marshall, that rule did not apply in any other country of the world at that time.

This is one of the most interesting fields of investigation that I have gone into, and there are many more intricacies and difficulties than I dreamed could arise from the treaty-making power. But I will say here now that my opinion is that a stream can not rise higher than its source, and that the reserved powers of the State specified in the tenth amendment can not be exercised by the entire Congress of the United States with the President; and if that be true and the Constitution is the supreme law of the land it is utterly impossible for the President and the Senate to acquire a right or a power superior to the right of the entire Congress, because the entire Congress can repeal any treaty. I presume that is admitted by every Member of the House. If the contention of some of the State courts—not of the Supreme Court of the United States but of some of the State courts—is correct and true, the only supreme power and the only power in the Federal Government that can be unrestrainedly exercised is the treaty-making power. It is against that opinion and contention that I am to-day making protest. I think it is highly dangerous in a Republic like this for that sort of a power to be vested in the President and one branch only of the Legislature. I take the position that no patriotic court, no Congress, or President who loves an American citizen above that of every alien would entertain even for a moment the view that the alien could have, through the President and the United States Senate, rights and privileges under the Federal Constitution superior to the rights and privileges of an American citizen under that same Constitution. In other words, that an alien would have the right to go into a forum and have his claims upon a piece of land adjudicated, not under the laws of the State, but under a treaty made by the President and United States Senate in conjunction with a foreign power. If that foreign power could thus dictate the land laws and policies of a State in reference to her lands through a treaty with another nation, then why could not the President and the Senate dictate the election laws of any State through the treaty and compel the State to give the ballot under such terms as the treaty provides? Why could not the President and the Senate provide that an alien within a State committing the crime of murder should not be subject to the laws of the State and tried by the State courts but be tried by a tribunal provided for in a treaty? It seems to me that such contentions are absurd. If such contention is sound, then the President, with two-thirds of the Senate present ratifying his action, would have it in their power to overturn every State constitution and to abrogate every State law.

By the way, I will state that in discussing that matter I am not discussing the probability of the United States Senate and the President ever doing such a thing. I am discussing their power to do it, and if I am right in my contention the President and Senate can exceed their powers, and when they do such treaty is null and void. One of the reserved powers of the States is to control the lands within the State, and it must follow that the Federal Government has no power of denying that right.

I therefore conclude that the people of California have the absolute and unquestionable right to pass just such laws in reference to the acquisition, alienation, and devise of lands as in their judgment is proper and best for them, provided that in the administration of these laws they are applied to all of the citizens of California and of the United States alike and do not infringe upon the fourteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution.

No alien has the right to invoke the protection of the laws of this country, except where he is traveling with the proper passport or where he is permitted in the Government under some permission granted him by law, and further, where he is assaulted or imprisoned without provocation on his part. He is simply safe in his person and property and is entitled to protection simply as a human being while he domiciles with us. His presence here ipso facto does not give him the right to acquire property, to devise property, or to transact business. The only way in which he can acquire all the rights of a citizen of the United States is by declaring his intention to become a citizen of the United States and renounce all allegiance to any foreign prince or potentate or Government, and more especially the prince, potentate, or Government from which he comes.

The word "domicile" I use in its technical sense. That is that right which a human being has of remaining on God's earth, and because he happens to be for the time being on a portion of this earth which has been set apart by a certain people and controlled by them, and those people have appropriated that portion of the earth, they have no right under the modern and humane international laws to lay violent hands upon him or his property. That is an inherent, inalienable right which is respected by all the civilized nations of the world. It was not true a few generations ago.

No greater curse could befall the people of California or the people of any State in this Union than to have the lands fall into alien hands and for such State to be reduced to the alien landlord domination which is the curse of Ireland to-day. Give me a country where the land is owned wholly by the people that are citizens of that country. Every foot of American soil has been purchased with the blood of our fathers, and they have bequeathed it to us, their children, as a sacred heritage, and we should preserve every foot of it for our American citizens and their posterity to the furtherest generation. [Applause.] I want the American flag to always float over American soil owned by Americans and not to float as a mockery over soil owned and controlled by aliens.

I might say, by way of parentheses, that if we shall throw down the gates of immigration, if we shall by treaty or statute law permit the yellow race to have equal rights in this Government with the people of the United States, then in a few years the Government of China and the Governments of the East could duplicate every citizen in America, and it would not in any way injure that country or those countries, but would be a relief to them and would render less troublesome the congested condition of their population, and our population in America would be doubled by aliens. We should preserve the soil for America and Americans, and that through our State laws. I am unwilling that we should begin now, upon the demand of the Japanese Government, a friendly Government—and I hope we will always remain friends—to recede from our policy of permitting our States to control their own domestic concerns.

I agree with the statement made by Senator ROOT, who has gone carefully into this question and who is quoted in the press as saying, in substance, that there is nothing in any treaty now existing between Japan and the United States which will prevent the State governments passing any land laws in reference to the Japanese, or any other people so situated under treaties as

the Japanese people are, as the States may deem proper unless in conflict with the Federal Constitution. We not only do not violate a treaty, but, he says, we violate no international law and no principle of international government. What right has the Government of Japan to complain when a citizen of any other country has no right to own a single foot of land in the Empire of Japan, because under the laws of Japan the only rights that another citizen has is the right of lease, the right to use and pay rent for land; but the title to the land will never pass from a Japanese subject to the subject of any alien, and it ill becomes her now to complain because the good people of California are seeking to do practically the same thing. [Applause.]

The highest evidence of the wisdom of the people of California in taking this early step—and the step is not taken too early; probably they have already waited too long—to prevent the alien ownership of her soil is the present attitude of Japan.

What better evidence do we need that we should take a step early, as I shall show you in a moment if I have the time. The dangers of alien ownership of the soil are admitted by all of the great lawyers of England. I shall show, if I have the time, that the cause of the dismemberment of Poland was the alien ownership of land. Theirs is a beautiful but sad history of a patriotic struggle for liberty. At every doorstep there was stationed a so-called patriot who himself had acquired money from the Czarina to buy the land in Poland. Everyone who reads Chitty's Blackstone will recollect in the footnote how beautifully that great lawyer, Mr. Archbold, described the dangers to a people who permitted alien ownership of land.

When vast numbers of aliens from any country own vast quantities of our land, that causes such nation to make an effort, through the Federal Government, to force the people of such State to surrender greater rights and privileges to such alien landowners. Just in proportion as aliens own our land, just in that proportion will the alien governments control our lands and the fruits thereof. Because if Japan raises the question seriously at this time and threatens us with war, what will she do in the future, when millions of her subjects shall be permitted to acquire land in this country? When an alien acquires personal property he can dispose of it or take it with him; but when he owns land and upon this land builds his home, owing allegiance all the while to the alien government, he is a constant and fixed menace.

Every student of the law is first taught in book 1 of Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England that if an alien could acquire permanent property in lands, he must owe allegiance equally permanent with the property to the King of England. In other words, if the alien was willing to defend the Government which was then the Government of the King, he could be admitted to all the rights of any other subject of the King, because upon "office found" his allegiance was true and sincere to the monarch from whom he sought to own land. If this were not true, the King might find himself surrounded at any time by men who were not true to him, but were true to some foreign prince or potentate. For this reason the common law has always been jealous of foreigners owning land. In Chitty's edition of Blackstone's Commentaries we find in a footnote that Mr. Chitty himself says that—

from the Conquest till upward of 200 years afterwards it does not appear that strangers were permitted to reside in England, even on account of commerce, beyond a certain time, except by special warrant, for they were considered only as sojourners coming to a fair or a market, and were obliged to employ their landlords as brokers to buy and sell their commodities; and we find that one stranger was often arrested for the debt or punished for the misdemeanor of another, as if all strangers were to be looked upon as a people with whom the English were in a state of perpetual war, and therefore might make reprisals on the first that they could lay hands on.

Every young attorney also, when he studies Chitty's Blackstone, will find in book 1, chapter 10, "Of the rights of persons," on page 278, that among other reasons which might be given for not permitting aliens to own land it is intended to be—

by way of punishment for the aliens' presumption in attempting to acquire any landed property, for the vendor is not affected by it, he having resigned his right and recived an equivalent in exchange.

But Mr. Archbold, in footnote 8, on the same page of this edition of Blackstone's Commentaries, says:

A political reason may be given for this which I think stronger than any here adduced. If aliens were admitted to purchase and hold lands in this country it might at any time be in the power of a foreign State to raise a powerful party amongst us, for power is ever the concomitant of property. This may be more easily illustrated by briefly stating the measures taken by Russia prior to the dismemberment of Poland. For a considerable time previous to this act—an act which has certainly cast an indelible stain upon the powers concerned in it—the Czarina sent several of her subjects with large sums of money into Poland to purchase all of the estates that offered for sale, at the same time professing publicly the greatest attachment to the interests of that devoted Kingdom. This had a double effect, for it not only raised in that country a powerful party completely devoted to her interest, but it at the same time and in the same ratio divested a large proportion of power and influence from the nobles. This proved a solid foundation for her subsequent acts, for afterwards, when she laid aside the veil which covered her designs, the country was so enfeebled by the measures she had taken that notwithstanding the glorious and persevering struggles of a Kosciusko it fell an easy prey to her rapacity.

The English Government, up until a few years ago, considered every alien in England as a common enemy, and, as I have shown, students of the law will remember that an alien found in any portion of England coming from the same country as another came who had committed a crime was held responsible for the crime of his escaped brother alien, the law holding that all aliens were common enemies and that they had no rights.

So you will find that the principle I am discussing is not a new one but an old one. If the United States Government yields to the demand on the part of Japan, every other nation, including China, would have the right to make the same demand, and our Nation would be humiliated and disgraced in the eyes of all the world. Our first and highest duty is to protect American citizens against this alien domination of our soil.

God knows there is not an American here that would permit the horde of Chinese to leave their shores and invade this country, depriving labor of its wage and the farmers of America of their land, because no farmer in America can own land, with our standard of living and our standard of wages, in competition with a Chinaman, who would live on what the American farmer throws away.

I know that Lincoln, when he made his argument in reference to slavery in the United States, appealed to the people of the North, not upon the abstract proposition of liberty and freedom, not upon the abstract rights of colored men, but he made the appeal which found lodgment in the hearts of the laborers of the North that was like this: "Do you laboring people want to work in competition with slaves, when the owner brings them here and gives them nothing but victuals and clothes? Do you bricklayers want to lay brick in competition with slaves? Do you farmers in Illinois want to own land in competition with slave owners of the South?" And he won the election on that very sensible and rational and high ground.

I take the same ground with reference to the ownership of the soil by our own people, and in this way only can we maintain our high standard of living and our high standard of manhood. I would not surrender this standard until we had spent the last life and the last drop of blood that could be spent in so righteous a cause and impoverished our country for a hundred generations. [Applause.]

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I do not know that the gentleman intended to, but I am afraid that he left the impression he does not want to leave. From my knowledge and information I do not think the Japanese are less objectionable to the American people than the Chinese. I think the standard of living is similar.

Mr. SISSON. It was not my intention to draw odious comparisons. My own reason for calling especial attention to the Chinese is that they have from four to five hundred million people and Japan has only forty-odd million people. In other words, the danger of Chinese immigration is just in proportion greater than that of Japanese immigration owing to the vast disproportion of the population in the two countries. My contention is that a special duty rests upon the Federal Government, and that the highest duty and the highest obligation which it owes to the States is to protect them in their rights. [Applause.]

Our first and highest duty is to protect American citizens against this alien domination of our soil. I want the United States Government to hold up the hands of these States so long as they are using every effort and every means to prevent the alien ownership of land by strong and drastic laws. This is the duty and obligation which the Federal Government owes to the States. It is a duty I am willing to perform. I do not shrink for one moment from the obligation, nor should any Member of Congress decline to fulfill this obligation to the very letter. The President of the United States and the entire Senate ought never attempt to make any treaty with any foreign power which would repeal one jot or one tittle of a State constitution nor one statute law which she has passed.

If the State has trespassed upon the rights of the Federal Government, there is only one power on earth with which any of these States have to reckon, and that is the Federal Government itself. I maintain that every law, either in the State constitution or in her statutes, that does not conflict with the Federal Constitution, is sacred. No power on earth, not even the Federal Government itself, has the right to lay its hand in violence upon the State and deny her this sovereign right. Every Government dealing with the Federal Government through the Federal

authorities should understand now and for all time to come that the Federal Government is one of delegated and not of inherent powers, and that all powers not specifically granted to the Federal Government in the Federal Constitution are reserved to the States, and that the President of the United States and the Senate of the United States not only do not have the right to coerce these States but it is the most sacred obligation which they have assumed to preserve inviolate the rights of these States, and that every life in America and the last penny of her vast resources are forever pledged to the maintenance of these rights under our glorious Federal system—an indissoluble union of States, possessing every sovereign power except that which is specifically granted in the Constitution to the Federal Government—and that all of the people and all of the States and all of the property of all of the people and of all of the States, as well as their sacred honor, is pledged to the maintenance of this system, and that no power, prince, or potentate, and no combination of all of these, shall ever be permitted to in any way interfere with these sacred and blood-bought rights.

Mr. LEVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. LEVY. The gentleman stated that Japan allows no ownership of land. I have an article here which states that they allow ownership for 999 years.

Mr. SISSON. The matter that the gentleman speaks of is a lease which is granted to a subject upon the very same doctrine that used to prevail in England on the system of "office found," if the gentleman knows what that is. Now, you may acquire through special permission of the Emperor of Japan at certain ports, at certain landing places for goods, title for commercial purposes, and you can acquire land for doing a banking business by special permit, but no alien can acquire the fee simple title to land in Japan, and if the gentleman from New York has investigated the subject he knows it. I do not care what the gentleman's newspaper clipping shows.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. TOWNER. Is there anywhere in any treaty provision between Japan and the United States any statement that either party can acquire and own real estate?

Mr. SISSON. None at all, so far as I have been able to consult the treaties. I will be very frank with the gentleman. I have looked for all the treaties, but I do not know whether I have found every one or not, but I have not been able to find it in those that I have found, and if Senator ROOT is correctly quoted in the newspapers, he says identically the same thing.

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman is a first-class lawyer, and I want to put in the language of this treaty and——

Mr. SISSON. I will be very glad if he will.

Mr. TOWNER (continuing). What the then understanding was.

And they may there own—

That is, each party in the land of the other—

And they may there own or hire and occupy houses, manufactories, warehouses, and premises which may be necessary for them, and lease lands for residential and commercial purposes.

And so forth.

In other words, they may buy houses and warehouses, but not the land on which they stand. They may, however, lease the land upon which they stand.

Mr. SISSON. And that is the only treaty I have ever found where they even have that right.

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. And that was a right which was granted after Japan became one of the commercial nations of the world, and it became to their commercial interest to permit men to have residences there in order that they might do business with those very men. They gave them that right for the establishment of business houses, the establishment of branch houses. They could lease the land for warehouses, for certain water frontage, for commercial purposes.

Mr. LEVY. Will my colleague allow me? The second way for foreigners to hold land in Japan is by the forming of a "shadan." This is a group of three or more foreigners, legally incorporated and constituted to hold land in fee simple anywhere in Japan for the purposes mentioned in the articles of incorporation.

Mr. SISSON. I do not understand exactly what the gentleman means. The only right they have to own land at all is practically the ownership that is indicated in the treaty, except by a special permit from the Emporer of Japan you may lease land for a certain number of years.

Mr. LEVY. Nine hundred and ninety-nine years.

Mr. SISSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, to continue my argument where I was interrupted.

If Congress should pass a law abrogating the land laws of any State, such a law would be unconstitutional and void, and the court would so hold. In other words, Congress can not enact a law giving a citizen of Virginia a right to acquire lands in North Carolina in violation of the land laws of North Carolina, and yet it is contended that the President and "only two-thirds of the Senate present" concurring can make a treaty with a foreign power which will not only abrogate the laws of North Carolina but will annul any constitutional provision of that State notwithstanding that the State was within her rights under the Federal Constitution prior to the treaty.

Let us see where this contention will lead us. Suppose the President and two-thirds of the Senate present should make a treaty with Japan that all of the subjects of Japan should have the right to move to California and become citizens thereof and should have the right to vote the day they landed there and an election was being held, will it be conceded that they could vote? They certainly could, unless it is admitted that the President and Senate must be controlled by the specific powers conferred upon them and can not invade the reserved powers of the State. If the power to make a treaty is an absolute power and unlimited except as to the will of the President and the Senate, then the Constitution is a farce and Article X is a mockery. Absolutely no power is reserved to the States.

Suppose the President and two-thirds of the Senate present should make a treaty with the King of England that he should take over all of the New England States and that they should become a part of the British possessions and all of the property of the citizens of those States should be divided among such English subjects as His Majesty might name. No one will contend that the President and the Senate would have such a right. It is absurd you say. Yes; but if the President and the Senate are to be the sole judges of what they may or may not do under the treaty-making power of the Constitution, then they, if they determined upon so radical and absurd a position, might do such a thing and enforce it if you concede that the power to make a treaty is absolute.

My contention is that the President and Senate can do no such thing, because they have not the power under the Constitution, and not because they have the power and will not do such a thing. If the President and the Senate are not restrained by the Constitution, then they are possessed of a despotic power. If they can make a treaty on any subject and bind the people of the States and abrogate one law which the States have passed and had the right to pass, then they could make a treaty abrogating the entire constitution of that State and all of her statute laws, and have the power to destroy by this method all of the States, whose creature the Federal Government is, and by this very lawful method make themselves supreme. I contend that no such power is conferred by the treaty-making clause to the President and to the Senate. Their right to make a treaty under that clause, "anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding," meant only to take away from the States the right to make treaties, because at that time the States had made treaties and had passed laws to enforce them. The sole purpose of that clause was to place power to make treaties in the hands of the Federal Government and to divest the States of that power. It was never intended that through and by this clause the President of the United States, with the consent of the Senate, should invade the sacred reserved powers of the States and to give to the President and two-thirds of the Senate more power over the people of the States and of the United States than the entire Congress could have—more power even than Congress has to extend rights and privileges to our own citizens—because Congress as a whole is limited by powers granted in the Constitution in their activities and powers of control of the States and the citizens thereof; but not so with the President and the Senate if the treaty-making power is an absolute one; because under a treaty, rights superior to the rights which a citizen enjoys, might be conferred upon an alien, which to my mind is absurd. So I am impelled to the conclusion that the treaty-making power can never deprive the State of a reserved power, because I can not believe that the States ever conferred more power upon the President and Senate than they did upon the President, Senate, and House of Representatives combined. Nor do I believe that the power exists under the Constitution to permit the President and Senate to destroy our Federal and State Governments through the treaty-making power. I therefore deny the right of the treaty-making power to invade California and compel her to permit aliens to own her own lands in spite of California's desires and wishes.

If such power does exist under our Federal Constitution, we should at once amend that instrument and take away such power. If it exists with us, it is the only Government except

the absolute despotisms, because Chief Justice Marshall, in Foster v. Neilson (2 Pet., 313), says:

A treaty is in its nature a contract between two nations, not a legislative act. It does not generally effect, of itself, the object to be accomplished, especially so far as its operation is infraterritorial, but is carried into execution by the sovereign power of the respective parties to the instrument. In the United States a different principle is established. Our Constitution declares a treaty to be a law of the land.

Now, I submit that before it can be a law of the land it must not trespass upon the reserved power of the States. If it does not and is within the power of the President and Senate to make, it is the law of the land by virtue of the fact that the President and the Senate have not exceeded their authority. If they have, then to that degree the treaty is null and void and the court should so declare. It can not be contended that the President and Senate can not exceed their authority in making a treaty; and if they do, then the people of the States and of the United States are not bound by it.

But, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the fact that the position which I have taken is one which has not always been accepted by the courts of the country I think it is the soundest and the best policy. I am unwilling that the present generation should be bound by precedents of the past to such an extent that the people of this day must slavishly follow the precedents of the past laid down by courts long since dead. I am unwilling that the fleshless fingers of dead judges shall reach up out of the grave to hold the present generation in their bony grasp to the extent that we can not do our own thinking and act in the light of the glorious present.

This California question is far-reaching and important in its results. Nearly all of the States of the Union have statutes regulating the rights of aliens in reference to acquiring real estate. Some of the States have removed all disabilities, but the majority of the States have some limitations of some sort upon the rights of an alien to acquire an interest in land. It would be impossible in a discussion like this to show the various degrees of limitations expressed in the laws of the various States. Nearly every State has some limitation as to the right of an alien to own land. Some limitations are very, very mild, and are graded, as it were, up to the most drastic limitations, which prevent an alien owning land at all, unless he becomes a citizen of the United States or declares his intention of so becoming a citizen. These State laws have been passed for the protection of the respective States; and even though the courts of the country should slavishly follow the wicked precedents of the past, and should sustain the President and the Senate in making a treaty with a foreign nation enabling the citizens of such Nation to own property just as a citizen of the United States could own property, the principle is so unsound that I am unwilling to submit to it without a protest.

This Democratic administration should announce the doctrine to the world, with no uncertain tone, that the Congress of the United States proposes to recognize the right of the people of these States to determine who shall own the lands within the State, and that the Government of the United States will not prevent the States from making such land laws as they see fit and proper, provided they do not discriminate against citizens of the United States; and we should further announce that the Government of the United States will not interfere with a sovereign State because it does not desire citizens of a certain foreign nation to own lands in that State unless they can become citizens of the State and amenable to the laws thereof. If the President and Senate should commit themselves to any other proposition, we will have internal broils at home and endless international complications and intermeddling in our domestic concerns occasioned by the constant complaint of the alien landowner to his home Government.

It is the attribute of sovereignty of any nation to exclude from its borders any citizen or citizens of any other nation in the world. It has the right to admit the citizens of a friendly nation and to deny admission to the citizens of an unfriendly nation. It has the right to decide for itself whether it is for the best interests of its people to admit a certain race of people or not. The Supreme Court of the United States has decided in numerous cases that it is the inherent sovereign right of any nation to exclude from its borders any race of people that can not be assimilated, and that the sovereign power of the Government has the right to make such discriminations as it sees fit and proper, and that no immigrant from such foreign nation has any right to complain because the laws of the country require them to be transported whence they came. So even, if the Members of Congress do not agree with me in the opinion which I entertain in reference to the treaty-making power in the Federal Constitution, they certainly will not disagree with me in the conclusion, that we should, in our sovereign capacity as a people, permit the people of the States to determine who their friends and associates shall be.

No Senator should vote for any treaty that would give to the citizen of a foreign nation the right to acquire land in a sovereign State contrary to the laws, interests, and wishes of the people of that State. I think every treaty entered into should provide in haec verba that it will not interfere with the constitution or laws of any State which are made in accordance with the Constitution and not in violation of any of its provisions. An alien who has acquired rights to property under existing laws should not be deprived of these rights by any law enacted after such alien had acquired such title, but I would stand for the principle that the sovereign State shall be protected in so far as the laws which she enacts affect the rights of aliens in the future.

My own opinion is that every State in the Union should forbid the alien ownership of lands, and that Congress should never pass any treaty that would annul, change, or modify such laws. I believe that the people of California know more about the conditions in California than the people in Maine, and I do not believe that the Senators from Maine or Mississippi or any other State should ever cast their votes to take away from the people of California their sacred right to control their domestic concerns and to determine who their associates and the associates of their children shall be.

Now, gentlemen of the committee, there were many other matters in reference to this treaty right that I would have liked to have analyzed, but my time will not allow. Since I can not conclude my remarks, I would like to call attention to the fact that the crowded conditions throughout the Asiatic countries may bring about the very conditions which the great Emperor Napoleon looked forward to when those people should learn the arts of war and lay aside their old religion and doctrine of contentment and when they become restless and ambitious. On one occasion he pointed to the map of the world and said, "There lies China, a sleeping giant. Let the world beware how she awaken him." And right now is the time for this Congress and this administration to be fair with all the world. We have the inalienable right, every nation has the inalienable right, to admit a friendly alien or exclude an unfriendly alien. Every nation has the right to say, We are willing to permit a certain class or a certain color or a certain race of people to come and live with us, because we have determined that we can assimilate them, but if we should determine that a race different in color to ours will be inimical to us and our happiness it is our highest right to exclude them altogether. Let us maintain this principle with our lives and sacred honor. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would not be entirely frank in this presence this afternoon if I did not at the outset speak that which is uppermost in my mind. The youngest of a family, a daughter of 6, city born and bred but curious always about the country, came at last to a visit on a farm and had her first view of a cow and a cow's most valuable function.

The daughter came home in the evening silent and philosophical; but at last she spoke. She said, "Well, I have found out where milk comes from; and I am not pleased."

I ask every Member here, Do you think we would be revising the tariff as we do if all the people of the United States understood the method of our procedure? If each of your constituents understood that tariff debate here was merely "talk," that it altered no opinions, changed no votes, corrected no inequalities in the measure, do you think your constituency would be entirely gratified? If the man from home could come into this presence, the adherent who sits on the front seat at the campaign meetings and blisters his palms in applauding you, if he could understand that after the committee and the caucus have decided on the omnibus measure that all amendments will be voted down, without rhyme or reason, whether they are meritorious or not, I do not think he would be exactly happy. If the constituents knew that the leader of the majority—the able, courteous gentleman from Alabama—is as supreme here as Napoleon after Austerlitz and that their Congressman is a helpless indorser, that and nothing more, I do not think the folks back home would joy in your presence here or enthusiastically insist upon your vindication and triumphant return. If they knew that should a man appear here and offer to mankind for the first time the Ten Commandments as an amendment they would be promptly voted down as not having originated in the Ways and Means Committee or the Democratic caucus——

Mr. MANN. They would not be adopted on their merits now on that side.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not think they would be particularly overjoyed. And if this is your first experience with an omnibus bill, and you are finding out where a tariff bill comes from, I do not think that you are exactly hilarious.

Never fear. It will never be known. It is spoken in confidence, not to go beyond those doors.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], who occupied the floor on Wednesday last, has spoken with some doubt as to the future of the Republican Party. His utterance was significant in this: That he and those who think with him are not typical of the leadership of their party. For the leadership of the Republican Party has no doubt; it indulges in no self-analysis; it still has the attitude of dominion; still speaks with the voice of authority; still dallies with its pride in the past, and clings to life in the happy hope of a day of national misfortune, when, through Democratic error or ill luck, a chastened people will turn submissively again to them, and to them not only, but, with contrite heart, to their chief doctrine—a prohibitive tariff. Theirs is a condition of mind that reads nothing significant in the humiliating achievement in a national election of only 8 electoral votes, a condition of mind that sees no evidence of fatality in a loss in four years of 4,193,000 votes. It is the Bourbon mind that, long accustomed to power, can not learn and never will learn; for the Republican leaders, those who perverted the purpose of that great party, have no real compromise with the embarrassments of their day, and this is best shown not by their attitude in the cocksure days of dominion, when the Payne-Aldrich bill was framed; nor yet in this latter day, when they are waiting for an ungrateful people to apologize, but it had its best illustration in that time which followed the passage of the tariff law, when the Republican leadership, calm eyed and serene, faced a nation in revolt.

Said the eminent gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] in that day, upon this floor on May 12, 1910, six months after the passage of the Payne-Aldrich bill, when popular revolt against the broken platform pledge of a downward revision was raging:

> I am here to-day to say that we did keep our pledge to the very letter, both of the platform and of the speeches of the presidential candidate.

In indorsement of that sentiment there was applause upon the Republican side.

"Ah," but some one may say, "it was not the House that sinned; it was the Senate." Let us see about that. In defense of his law Mr. PAYNE said:

> I want to say right here, having been through the third conference report on these tariff bills, that at no time under any circumstances about any bill has the House had as much its own way in settling the disputes in conference as it had in this very bill which is now the law of the land.

And again, in indorsement of this statement, the RECORD shows "Applause on the Republican side."

And did the author of the bill expect defeat for his party? Not at all. With political disorder on every hand and popular protest crying aloud and revolution raging everywhere, the gentleman from New York, concluding his encomium on the Payne law, hurled this defiance at the Democrats:

> We will meet you next November. We will meet you with this law. We will meet your food prices. We will meet you with lower food prices, notwithstanding what you may say about this law. You exult now. You always do in May. We celebrate in November.

There was applause again on the Republican side. It is violating no confidence to say that he did meet you in November—but he did not celebrate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Democrats celebrated. The northern Democrat, however, celebrated with considerable reserve. In many instances the Democratic candidate for Congress in the North had the feeling that he had been elected through a determined popular purpose not to elect him but to defeat his Republican opponent. He had a sense of weakening obligation to his Democratic brethren, a sense of broadening responsibility to the voters of all parties. He did not overuse the party name in his speeches or dwell too fondly on the superiority of his party's faith.

The party lines were down. Rings were collapsing and bosses of both parties were being sent into exile. The voter was becoming independent and the old methods of machine control were passing. The Democratic Congressman conformed. In many instances he wanted to conform, but whether he wanted to or not, he conformed to public sentiment. And inasmuch as the Republican defeat had seemed in part, at least, a rebuke for a failure to revise the tariff downward, the Democrats in Congress set out on the revision of the tariff. How did they set out to revise the tariff? A schedule at a time. There was no omnibus tariff bill then. There was no talk of rules to cut the right of amendment and debate and separate votes. There was little of the haughty spirit of control. They did not offer many schedules. They offered a few. The schedules were not all good. But their details were all visible. They could be examined. And a representative of the people could vote intelligently.

A year, two years, have passed, and now comes the most significant development of the hour—the Democratic assumption of partisan control of public sentiment. They have the White House and the Congress. They gained them through a dissolution of old party lines and old party prejudices. And now they have set out to restore them again. In the midst of a day when nearly every precinct, county, and State has turned against its boss, its ring, and its machine, the Democratic Party, the beneficiary of the new order of things, has set out heart-free and sedulously to restore them again. The work begins here. Here is the inauguration of the process which puts party success above the public weal. Secrecy in caucus here, the gag, the omnibus bill, and unfair methods of legislation here precede and point the way to the restoration of the machine in the State, the ring in the county, the boss in the precinct out over the country. [Applause on the Republican side.] In two years the Democrats, come into power timidly after long absence from place, have grown quickly bold, and we have as the dominant, striking, significant note of our hour the air of absolute Democratic assurance of successful control, by machine methods, of the electorate.

How soon will the assurance that has departed from correct legislative methods to unjust ones, how soon will it turn to arrogance? How soon will follow fast on the heels of arrogance the inevitable fall? Let some of the Democrats consider. The waters of the political passions and prejudices of the past have gone over the old partisan wheel in this land. They will never turn that wheel again. A goodly proportion of the Democrats in Congress were elected by the votes of men who had been outraged by the performances of the Republican bosses, and who in asking for relief from obviously excessive tariff duties desired and still desire to retain what is best in the protective policy. And let the Democrats remember that as the revolt against a prohibitive tariff grew, there was simultaneously a movement among Democratic voters away from the old free-trade view and toward the belief in a policy of sufficient protection to put the American on equal terms with his foreign competitor in the world's markets. This merger of formerly antagonistic elements in the country has been a potential factor in confusing old party lines. Surely many Democratic Congressmen know the extent of that sentiment in their districts, and some of them must sympathize with this view. And yet, after two years of power granted conditionally upon their ability to respond to public demands, regardless of party, these Democrats propose to vote for an omnibus tariff bill, of which the author, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], said last Wednesday, "The Democratic Party stands for a tariff for revenue only, with the emphasis on the word only," and that this bill was written with no idea of protection.

The same Democrats, blindly responding to the same partisan machine methods, are indorsing the promise to the consumer of lower cost of living. In May, 1910, the gentleman from New York said: "We will meet you with lower food prices in November." So to-day the Democrats are making the same old promise in the same old way. It might have been a profitable political promise 30 years ago, or 20 years ago. But it was not a profitable promise three years ago, and it will not prove profitable now, for the greater part of the people of the United States have come to know that other elements besides the tariff enter into the higher costs, the operation of middlemen, transportation charges, waste, overcapitalization, our credit system, storage, manipulation of markets, the urban congestion, the gain in gold supply, the excesses of unregulated trade, among them.

The greater part of the people of the United States know this fact, and they no longer consider the tariff as the one fundamental social problem, convenient as the party candidate may regard it. On the contrary, the electorate is turning to a survey of all the factors involved in the problem and with especial eagerness to the great economic, humanitarian questions which the Progressive Party has essayed to identify and solve.

Few men, if any, know this tariff bill. There are men who have knowledge of single schedules or paragraphs in it, but as a rule even that knowledge is not technical and therefore is to a degree uncertain. If the bill passes—and it will—before next Christmas its sponsors will be preparing amendments to it. No man can grasp an omnibus tariff bill. A single schedule is difficult enough, heaven knows. And yet a measure of this kind, needing always light, was drawn first in a committee sitting behind closed doors. The information the committee had was incomplete, unreliable, and chaotic, the typical jumble of data

characteristic of unscientific tariff hearings. Finally adjusted on a compromise of the unknown differences among the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee, it was placed before a secret caucus for conventional consideration. It was not changed much there. It will not be changed much here. It is a long measure, containing thousands of items, each of them presenting its own peculiar problem, and hundreds of them touching intimately, vitally, and in many instances technically the daily life of our 90,000,000 people. This measure, a giant switchboard connecting every home and store and factory in the land, is to be set up under the gag and duress of caucus rule. There is to be no opportunity to correct its inequalities, should they be discovered, by separate record votes, and record votes here are the potential votes. This is the haphazard way of an omnibus tariff bill. It is unfair and it is unwise. No man would treat his own business thus, no man would treat his own family thus, and no man ought to treat his Nation so. [Applause.]

I shall vote against this omnibus measure. I have voted for and against Democratic tariff bills in the past when they were presented separately, so that discriminating and intelligent votes could be cast. There is no man here who can say that I have voted against any measure because it was of Democratic origin.

If the Democratic Party should break this omnibus bill up into parts and give time for intelligent consideration and separate record votes on each of the schedules and the income-tax feature, a principle which I strongly favor, I would vote for those schedules which I thought to be right and just and founded on information and I would vote against others. In my legislative experience, where the good and the bad are mingled in an omnibus measure, I have always tried to cast a vote based on my best judgment and information. If the good predominated in a measure, in my opinion, I voted aye; if the bad, I voted no. In this bill I believe the bad predominates. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRINGER] challenges the Progressives to carry out that part of the national platform which pledges downward revision. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois that the Progressive Party stands for a downward revision of the tariff with wisdom, justice, and reason. It has pledged no one to stand for an omnibus bill that will necessarily and admittedly cause injury to thousands. The Progressive Party is for revision to a competitive protective basis and industrial growth; it is not for free trade and injury and destruction. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I regret I can not. I must go on. The Progressive Party stands for a true competitive tariff, a protective tariff which shall equalize the conditions of competition between the United States and foreign countries, for the manufacturer and for the farmer, and which shall maintain for labor an adequate standard of living, and it believes in proceeding scientifically, upon information, with the presumption in favor of the consuming public, and with fair legislative methods—a schedule at a time.

What information has the House upon this bill?

Let me give a single instance of the injustice of the methods we are pursuing.

Paragraph 202 of the bill reads as follows—under dutiable list:

Wheat, 10 cents per bushel.

Paragraph 648—under free list—reads as follows:

Wheat flour and semolina, provided that wheat flour shall be subject to a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem when imported directly or indirectly from a country, dependency, or other subdivision of Government which imposes a duty on wheat flour imported from the United States.

Note now that the duty on wheat is specific, a stationary duty, and that the duty on wheat flour is an ad valorem, a fluctuating duty. Canada levies a duty against flour from the United States. Now read a letter from a miller in Wellington, Kans., George H. Hunter, under date of April 14, 1913:

DEAR MR. MURDOCK: We have no objection to the duty being entirely removed on wheat and flour.

If there is a duty, it should be specific and on both wheat and flour alike.

If a specific duty of 10 cents a bushel be placed on wheat, a specific duty of 50 cents per barrel should be placed on flour and not an ad valorem duty on flour.

If a specific duty of 10 cents a bushel be placed on wheat and a 10 per cent ad valorem duty on flour, it would work out just the same, provided wheat would be worth $1 in Canada, but in case wheat should be worth only 50 cents per bushel in Canada, then Canadian mills would have an advantage over American mills of 25 cents per barrel on flour.

Is he right? It appears to me that he is. Do you know that he is wrong? You do not. And if he is right, do you call that a competitive rate?

Here is another instance:

Paragraph 190 of the bill reads as follows:

Under the dutiable list: Cattle 10 per cent ad valorem.

Paragraph 552 of the bill reads as follows:

Under the free list: Meats; fresh beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork, bacon and hams; meats of all kinds prepared or preserved, not specially provided for in this section.

Now, listen to a letter from John A. Edwards, a cattleman of Eureka, Kans. In his letter to me he says that free cattle is of little concern to the cattle raisers, but that they are opposed to the entrance of meat, because inasmuch as the foreign packer happens to be the American packer also, he will use the provisions to the injury of the cattle raiser. Then he adds:

But should there be foreign, but not American butchers, who might have meat they wish to ship to our shores and sell, they would be prevented by still another insurmountable obstacle. Our packer either owns or controls or has leased all the ocean space of meat-carrying refrigerator vessels. No one can import except our packer. We are very certain of this fact, because during the history of the cattlemen of Kansas exporting has been tried. At every foreign market we found that our American packer was guarding the foreign entrance. So strong is he in his control that he can absolutely prevent any cattle man in America from shipping abroad. It certainly follows, then, that the American packer can prevent the foreign butcher from entering our ports.

Is this cattleman right? It seems so to me. Do you know he is wrong? You do not. And if he should be right, what will your provision amount to?

These are but two views of the least technical items among thousands. Nearly every item in the bill has as many angles. In each of them are controlling facts. But Congress does not know them and can not know them under present methods.

There is a way to revise the tariff correctly, and that is in the open, with time for consideration, with full right of amendment and debate, a schedule at a time, and upon data scientifically gathered by men specially trained for the work.

Therefore the Progressive Party stands for the creation of a scientific nonpartisan tariff commission, to be advisory to Congress, with power and authority to elicit information and collate data upon which to base a competitive protection tariff.

The Democrats are against such a commission; and the Republicans who dominate their party, are they for it? Some of the Republicans have spoken favorably of it. But what does the record show?

I have in mind two scenes, both of them on this floor. Both are illuminating, for they show how futile it is for the people to expect tariff relief from the old parties. The first scene was on May 23, 1910. There was pending an appropriation in connection with the action of the President in carrying out a provision in the act of August 5, 1909—the Payne law—for the appointment of a tariff board under the maximum and minimum clause of this act. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] reserved the point of order. Mr. Dalzell, of Pennsylvania, for the Republicans, explaining what transpired in conference with the Senate, said:

The House conferees said to the Senate conferees, "You have a provision in here that looks to the creation of a tariff commission, and the House is opposed to a tariff commission and will never agree to the bill in that shape."

Mr. Dalzell also said:

I am opposed to a tariff commission. For practical purposes a tariff commission would be utterly worthless. I can not conceive of a more mischievous scheme to unsettle the business conditions of the country than is to be found in the proposal to establish a permanent tariff commission.

The point of order was sustained, with Mr. MANN, of Illinois, in the chair.

For while the board, now no longer in existence, had been established with limited powers, there was still a widespread public demand then that a permanent tariff commission be established. The agitation of the question by Senator Beveridge and others had awakened the Nation to the actual necessity of light upon the subject of the tariff. In our long tariff history, a history of recurring periodic fear, distrust, agitation, unrest, business disturbance, and disorder, every party which had offered and defended a random, guesswork tariff had finally paid the penalty to an indignant public. The people had wearied of the system which made the business of the country the football of the politicians.

For 30 years there had been a demand for a scientific revision upon data adduced by a nonpartisan commission. There were those in the Republican Party who feared to resist that public demand longer, and under this pressure, in January, 1911, a tariff commission bill passed the House. This bill was made the unfinished business of the Senate February 28, 1911. Finally Senator Beveridge was able to force action and the bill passed the Senate on the morning of March 4, 1911. There followed in the House that morning one of the most curious scenes in the history of the American Congress. The people

were about to come into possession of a law that would bring justice to producer and consumer and peace to business and equity to domestic commerce and expansion to our foreign trade. The bill for a tariff commission was at last about to pass and become a law. At high noon the Congress would die.

Here and in many of the State legislatures it is not an infrequent trick to turn back the hands of the clock just before the hour of adjournment. The clock was not turned back that morning. The House went from one scene of disorder into another. After great difficulty that morning, with the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and others making points of no quorum and demanding the ayes and nays, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. DALZELL, succeeded in placing before the House a resolution from the Committee on Rules providing that the tariff commission act should be acted upon at once, "the previous question being considered as ordered on a motion to concur in the Senate amendments 'en gross.'"

The measure was about to become the law of the land. If it had become the law, history might have—would have—been different to-day.

Mr. FITZGERALD, opposed to the measure, in the midst of the great confusion, made the point of order against the resolution.

The Speaker, Mr. CANNON, was about to rule when Mr. FITZGERALD moved to adjourn. Mr. DALZELL made the point that the motion was dilatory. This was argued in the midst of tumult. The precious moments were passing. But after a time the Chair sustained the point of order. Mr. FITZGERALD appealed from the decision of the Chair. That was held to be dilatory. Mr. DALZELL explained the resolution and asked for the previous question. After the viva voce vote Mr. FITZGERALD asked for a division. The ayes for the resolution were 127, the noes 77.

Mr. FITZGERALD demanded tellers. Then Mr. DALZELL demanded the yeas and nays. It took about 35 minutes in that day to call the yeas and nays. Every minute now was doubly precious. There was laughter in the House when Mr. FITZGERALD exclaimed:

Oh, well, if the gentleman wishes to filibuster, all right.

The yeas and nays were ordered and called. The question then came on agreeing to the resolution. And the record here becomes unusually interesting. Mr. FITZGERALD demanded a division, Mr. DALZELL called for the ayes and nays. And now the Clerk called the roll for the first time. At the end of that proceeding Mr. TAWNEY submitted a conference report on the general deficiency bill. The roll call, which is not interrupted as a rule, had been half finished. Upon Mr. TAWNEY's motion, the tumult in the Chamber grew. Points of order were made, Members were in great confusion. The vote was taken on the conference report, although the vote had never been completed on the tariff commission resolution. Division was demanded, and then the ayes and noes. The dry-as-dust CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which indulges in no descriptions, says on that day "many Members rose." The Speaker cried, "The Sergeant at Arms will take the mace and see that the gentlemen are seated."

The RECORD says:

The Clerk proceeded with the calling of the roll. The Sergeant at Arms, bearing the mace, appeared at the head of the center aisle.

The yeas and nays were called. So the conference report was agreed to. Then, in a storm of renewed confusion, the half-completed roll call on the resolution was taken up. The motion on the resolution carried. Then Mr. FITZGERALD moved to recommit the Senate amendments to the Committee on Ways and Means. Mr. DALZELL made the point of order. The point was argued. The Speaker overruled the point of order. Mr. FITZGERALD demanded the previous question on his motion. Mr. TAWNEY, of Minnesota, made the point of order that it was dilatory. After great confusion, the previous question was taken. Mr. PAYNE and Mr. TAWNEY demanded tellers. Mr. PAYNE demanded the ayes and noes. The ayes and noes were ordered. The vote was now on the motion to commit. That roll call was never finished. In the midst of it high noon was approaching, the resolution was withdrawn by Mr. PAYNE, and the bill for a permanent tariff commission died.

There are some scenes in Congress that leave no adequate record behind them. On the day of this scene, on March 4, 1911, the Republican Party was passing out of the control of the House. The Democrats were opposed to a tariff commission openly. The Republican leaders were claiming to favor it. Here was the one chance to give the people of this country a great reform.

The resolution, which was delayed by a filibuster and finally withdrawn, if brought forward 12 hours sooner, or 6 or 4, could have been adopted and the measure passed. But the Republican leaders did not bring it forward in time. The people of the United States and a majority of their Senators and Representatives were for it. The leaders were not for it, and the tariff-commission bill died. There is sometimes written in a dreary page of obscure parliamentary wrangle the end of some great and worthy aspiration when the will of the many seeking to write itself into concrete law has been defeated by the machinations of a few. But there are times when it is not done without penalty, and the turn in fortune of a great party, proud, powerful, magnificent in its memories and achievements, but grown deaf to the voice of the people, has sometimes swung upon as small a pivot as this.

Eventually the Nation will have its way in the matter. If justice to the producer and wage earner and consumer can be accomplished through a tariff passed intelligently and based on data expertly gathered and understandably presented, every day under the old blind, haphazard, random method will bring the consummation nearer realization. And the Progressive Party stands for the earliest possible accomplishment of this reform. It is not for any halfway, sham-efficient, make-believe measure. It is for a commission with power and authority to adduce all the facts. It ought to be scientific; it ought to be nonpartisan; it ought to be authorized to report both to the President and to the Congress; it ought to have not merely the right of statistical survey of a situation but the right to bring to its task all the faculties which will develop helpful information. With such powers it will be of value not only in revisions of the tariff where they are undertaken a schedule at a time and abreast the industrial changes of the day but also in the production of data in conjunction with the regulation of excesses of domestic trade, which are not due alone to the tariff.

The political and economic view of the tariff by the Progressive Party is grounded in a belief that a prohibitive protection tariff, as advocated by the Republicans, isolates American industry and weakens it for contest in foreign neutral markets; that a Democratic for-revenue-only tariff exposes the American producer to injurious competition and robs American industries of the strength necessary for the conquest of foreign fields; that a Progressive tariff, equalizing conditions of competition between the United States and foreign countries, maintaining for labor always an adequate standard of living, will, without weakening industry by giving it too much help or too little, put the American where he belongs, by his efficiency, his energy, his genius, and his deserts—out into the markets of the world equipped to win his rightful share in a fair contest for the world's business.

Necessary to that achievement are facts. And a nonpartisan scientific tariff commission can produce the facts. And with the facts once in hand and with the help of the other measures for industrial growth and economic justice which the Progressive Party advocates there will come, with the period of exclusiveness past under a Progressive tariff, peace and plenty and prosperity at home, not for a few but for all, and abroad for America and Americans world-wide commercial conquest. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, I thank you. [Applause.]

I append the minority report on the Underwood bill made by me as a member of the Ways and Means Committee:

MINORITY VIEWS.

(To accompany H. R. 3321.)

If there had been wanting in the tariff experience of the past proof of the absolute necessity of a tariff commission, as proposed by the Progressive Party, the present measure, H. R. 3321, alone would supply it. As a result of the methods used in the preparation of this bill the few men who drafted it are not warranted in feeling certainty as to its effects and most of those who have indorsed it in caucus as a party measure can not have in the nature of things other than a superficial knowledge of its provisions. This view is addressed not to the income-tax feature of the bill, a most commendable method of raising revenue if the statute be equitably drawn, but to the determination of the rates of import duties and the preparation of the free list. The rates of duties and the free list embrace 4,000 and more items and touch directly or indirectly every line of industry, husbandry, and trade in the country. All the provisions of the bill in the matter of the tariff, in greater or less degree, enter into the delicately interrelated adjustment of the Nation's industrial life. Yet this task of revision, admittedly difficult always, has been undertaken again with the old disregard of correct methods for the collation of accurate information and in defiance of a universal popular demand that the tariff shall be revised scientifically, a schedule at a time, upon data that is not ex parte, with full right of debate and amendment and without secrecy in caucus or committee and without cloture in Congress.

The error which characterized the earlier stages of preparation of the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act, framed by the Republicans in 1909 and now the law of the land, was repeated in the preparation of this measure. As before, the information elicited by the Committee on Ways and Means at hearings was largely the ex parte evidence of the manufacturer or the importer, information which is unsystematic and which as a rule obscures rather than illuminates. As a result the rates based upon such information either in friendly credence of it or in antagonistic disbelief, while they may approximate the estimated revenues they are expected to produce, can not and do not make for a just tariff as between the producer, the wage earner, and the consumer. The rates in the bill were

made in secret and the adjustment of differences between the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee, an adjustment which is basic and vital in the construction of any tariff measure, took place behind closed doors. The measure was then passed on to a secret party caucus where the fact that only a few changes were made in the committee draft is not proof of the measure's invulnerability but evidence of a perfunctory consideration given the long technical bill. If the history of the bill to this point should be followed by caucus gag rule in its consideration in the House, the measure will lack in its method of construction in the House none of the indefensible features which have marked the course of previous tariff legislation and which have caused the whole Nation to look upon tariff revisions as either selfish or inexpert and to view every tariff change with anxiety and distrust.

The Democratic Party has proposed a tariff which will be injurious to many industries and may be destructive to some. Under the guise of reducing the cost of living it may destroy the very basis of our industrial prosperity. Proposing and promising to cheapen the food and clothing of the workingman, it may take from him the very means by which he can earn his livelihood. Proclaiming in one statement that it is cheapening the articles used by the farmer, in the next statement it opens the American market to foreign agricultural and dairy products. As a Progressive, I agree with the principles of an income tax; I agree with the effort wherever it has been exercised wisely to reduce excessive duties, but I dissent with all emphasis to the assertion that in the majority of instances the rates of duty in this bill are based on data sufficiently full, accurate, and reliable to make certain that justice will be done the consumer, the wage earner, and the producer. I believe that the tariff can be revised with justice to the consumer, the wage earner, and the producer if the plan proposed by the Progressive Party is followed. This plan contemplates a policy of trade expansion. It stands for the extension of our foreign commerce. It would have the American producer develop that measure of strength which will enable him to maintain himself and to prosper in foreign neutral markets as in the new Orient and in other fields which are opening to him. The Progressive Party believes that that measure of strength can not come to him if, on the one hand, he is the dependent of weakening prohibitive tariffs or if, on the other hand, he is exposed to unrestricted foreign competition.

The Progressive Party's position on the tariff is therefore distinct. It does not believe in the Democratic position as outlined in the Baltimore platform of 1912, which proposes to remove all protection. It does not believe in the Republican position which, as evidenced by the last Republican offering, the present Payne-Aldrich tariff law, proposes to keep the duties prohibitive. The Progressive Party believes in a protective tariff which shall equalize conditions of competition between the United States and foreign countries, both for the farmer and the manufacturer, and which shall maintain for labor an adequate standard of living. This would be a true competitive tariff, and the Progressive Party maintains that in the framing of such a tariff consideration of all factors affecting the competitive strength of an industry here and in foreign lands is prerequisite. Therefore the Progressive Party would bring to the task complete machinery for the development of data in regard to all those factors through the creation of a nonpartisan scientific tariff commission. This commission should be empowered to report as to the cost of production, efficiency of labor, capitalization, industrial organization and efficiency, and the general competitive position in this country and abroad of industries seeking protection from Congress; and as to the effect of the tariff on prices, on operations of middlemen, and on the purchasing power of the consumer; and as to the revenue-producing power of the tariff and its relation to the resources of government; and it should be given power also to prescribe a uniform system of accounting for the protected industries.

Upon all facts collated by the tariff commission the Progressive Party would construct a tariff bill, one schedule at a time, in the open, not upon haphazard information, but upon facts adduced by scientific research and free from the distortion of designing interests and selfish purpose. Without such facts and such data as a basis for levying duties no tariff measure can be just. Without the assistance of such a tariff commission any omnibus tariff measure must continue to be a leap in the dark.

The Progressive Party proposes to let in the light. It stands for an effective tariff commission with power to elicit information. The history of the recent Tariff Board and the manner of its destruction, the history of a bill for a permanent tariff commission which passed the House in the last session of the Sixty-first Congress, was held back in the Senate by the Republicans until March 3, and finally killed in the House on March 4 by a Democratic filibuster, show plainly how vain it is to hope for relief along the lines of effective tariff commission reform from either the Republican or the Democratic Party.

The continuation of the old method of tariff construction has become a national scandal, unjust alike to consumer and producer, unfair to labor, and destructive of the peace to which legitimate business is entitled. Therefore the Progressive Party offers its plan of an effective tariff commission.

Asked to choose between extortion on the one hand and injury to industry on the other, I, as a member of the Progressive Party, believe that in the consideration of this bill, if opportunity be offered, support should be given to any proposition, whatever its origin, effecting a reasonable reduction of a duty obviously excessive; but that support should not be given to radical reductions offered wholesale and not founded in reason or on adequate information and presented in an omnibus bill.

VICTOR MURDOCK.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I wish the Chair would notify me when I have consumed 50 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee). Fifty minutes?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] has entertained the House with a prophecy which I put into the RECORD, it seems, in May, 1910.

Well, when I said that, one Theodore Roosevelt was hunting lions in Africa [laughter] and I did not dream, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] did not dream that he would go back on his promise to the people of the United States, and come back and ask for a third term of the Presidency, and then attempt to break up his party which had honored him, by running independently or on another ticket, with the sole purpose and effect of putting the Republican Party in the minority. If my friend from Kansas had dreamed of that he would not then have joined in the applause on the Republican side with which my prophecy was greeted. [Laughter.] He voted for the "infamous" Payne measure when it came into the House, and, if I remember correctly, he voted for the conference report after that came to the House. If I am wrong about that, I will accept his correction.

Mr. MURDOCK. I did not vote for the conference report.

Mr. PAYNE. I accept the gentleman's statement as to that.

Mr. MANN. He followed my lead at that time.

Mr. PAYNE. But he voted for the bill as it was first reported to the House.

But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] is making prophecies himself to-day. He ought to have profited by my example. [Laughter.] He ought to have remembered the recent election in Chicago, where, while his present party had two to one over Taft last November, they were beaten this spring by three to one by the Republicans; and in St. Louis, where Roosevelt made that famous effort to rally the 25,000 people who voted for him last fall, but he only got 4,200 of them to vote his ticket this spring. In Michigan, where he went this spring with his lieutenant, Mr. Beveridge, to annihilate the Republican Party, Michigan that gave him 60,000 and more plurality over Taft last fall, Michigan this spring, after his effort and his monopoly of effort in campaigning, turned to the Republican Party and elected the very judges whom he had denounced personally upon the stump. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But, of course, the principal portion of the so-called Progressive Party now in this House have simply a loose-jointed prophetic view which they are taking of the situation, and they seem unable to realize that like the bumblebee their party was the biggest in the borning and has been losing ground ever since. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, was the revision of 1909 a revision downward? Does any man ask that question to-day? If he does, I take up the majority report, signed by all the Democratic members of the committee, at page 481. These figures come from the official records of the Treasury Department, and from this majority report it appears that the average ad valorem duty on all imports the last year of the Dingley law, and the lowest year of the Dingley law or the next to the lowest, was 23.88 per cent; and in 1912, under this much maligned, slandered, and lied-about existing tariff law, it was 18.58 per cent, a reduction of 22.2 per cent on the Dingley ad valorem rates.

And then, reading a little further from that report, I find that the present committee estimate the duties to be raised the next year under their bill at $267,000,000 on the same imports that came in in 1912, when the average ad valorem was 18.58 per cent; and on the same calculation their average ad valorem would be 16.27 per cent, an average ad valorem reduction of 12.5 per cent from the last year of the present law. After all this holloing and shouting and lying for four years the committee come in with that official report, which is correct. The only doubt I have about the correctness of it is as to the ad valorem under the present bill, because it is upon importations which will be greatly changed in the first year that they barely cut down the ad valorem 12.5 per cent as against 22.2 per cent by the present law.

Why, the revision was downward, Mr. Chairman. No man that ever read the bill with sufficient intelligence to have broken into Congress ever doubted it in his heart after he had gone through the bill. Oh, the extravagance that was indulged in! Why, my genial friend, the Speaker of the House, honest as he is, with an honest exuberance of imagination which sometimes leads him away from the straight and narrow path, indulging his imagination in extravagant statement, said soon after the bill was passed that our maximum duties, adding 25 per cent ad valorem in case we did not get fair trade relations, were put in there knowing that we would not get any fair concessions from the countries across the water, and were intended as a joker to raise the duties 25 per cent ad valorem above what they were in the minimum tariff. His thinking apparatus was not working at that time. I laughed at him about it the other day, and he said, "Oh, well, you would have done it if you had dared to." Did it ever occur to him that being men with some sort of sense we would not dare to add 25 per cent ad valorem to the rates in this bill as a joker to come in on all imports? We knew that Great Britain would give us fair trade relations and that she would get the minimum rate of duty. Knowing that, we knew that her rivals—Germany, France, and Russia—would give us fair trade relations, and they did, and now come in here with their imports at the lower rate of duty. They all took advantage of our concessions. Every unfair trade discrimination has been removed under this maximum and

minimum provision, and our exports have increased by leaps and bounds. But, Mr. Chairman, let us come down to a little later history of this subject, and this is in the history of the last four years. My Democratic friends have been experimenting with the making of tariff bills. They came in here and said they did not need any information to write a revenue-tariff bill. My friend from Alabama, Mr. UNDERWOOD, has had a change of heart within two years. He made a speech in the House of Representatives on the Tariff Board bill, in which he said he was for it, and the Democrats should be for it. Why? Because in writing a Democratic revenue bill it was more necessary, he said, than in writing a protective-tariff bill to have accurate information that would come from a tariff board.

When he got into power he went at it with blacksmith's tools, as was correctly described by the Senator from Wisconsin, in forming a tariff bill, and with no more information than he could gather from what we left him two years before.

He started out to make a revenue bill, but the committee failed, and they confess in their report that it will fall short $68,790,000, and this in addition to the present corporation tax of $30,000,000. They are compelled to provide for a deficit of $99,000,000, including the corporation tax. As a tariff-for-revenue measure it is a signal failure. If the threatened stagnation in business should materialize there will be a material falling off in customs revenue and in income-tax receipts, creating a large deficit.

He made a metal schedule, and they have criticized Mr. Taft because he vetoed that metal schedule. Why, one Woodrow Wilson made a speech in the campaign in New Jersey in which he solemnly told the farmers that Taft had vetoed the metal schedule, which gave all agricultural machinery free entrance into the United States without the payment of duty.

Now, agricultural implements were not in the metal schedule at all. I do not blame Mr. Wilson so much for that, because he was busy with other matters and could not get down to that. [Laughter.] Agricultural implements were in the farmers' free-list bill, where you put the farmers' products on the free list and agricultural machinery as a sop to the farmer. Then Mr. Wilson went on to say that "You have to pay $125 for a binder in this country, and the same binder sells in England for $100. My farmer friend, why do you have to do it? It is because if you go there to get one of those binders and bring it into the United States you have to pay 15 per cent duty."

He did not know that there was no duty on any agricultural machinery coming from Great Britain into the United States by a provision in what is called the Payne-Aldrich bill, four years ago written with my own hand. He did not know that; he was not to blame for it. Who could expect him to understand the tariff? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Of course, he is making bills now. The gentleman from Alabama, who has had some experience in the matter, is brushed aside, and Mr. Wilson makes the bill and the caucus follows Mr. Wilson. He has learned an awful sight since the campaign, and has just now become a tariff expert.

My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] criticizes Taft for vetoing the metal schedule. On what ground did he veto it? Why, because many of the rates would stop the wheels of American progress and close the factories. The gentleman from Pennsylvania criticizes him, but he has consented to various changes in the metal schedule since the bill went up to Mr. Taft to be vetoed. The original Underwood bill that went to Mr. Taft provided for a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem on cutlery, including razors. Why? When we were making the tariff bill we put 35 per cent on razors that did not cost over a dollar a dozen—not a dollar apiece, but a dollar a dozen—a little sentiment in favor of the poor man's razor. I do not know as that would do him any good, but the razor that cost 8 cents apiece was sold to him for $1.50. They got the price of a dozen and 50 cents besides for a single razor. On razors above that price we put a specific duty amounting to 70 per cent ad valorem. What was the result? These people who had been making cheap razors, under the high duty, under the Dingley law, lost their business. One concern told me that they had been selling 30,000 dozen of them, and after the change in the law they did not make any under it and had to buy cheap German razors because they had to supply some with every bill of goods they sold.

Then Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. PALMER came along and saw it, and so they put 35 per cent duty on all cutlery, including razors. These cutlery people went before the Senate committee, which then had a hearing, and it appeared in these hearings that that would destroy the industry, but the Senate, if they heard, did not heed, and the bill passed and went to the President at 35 per cent duty on all razors and cutlery.

But it seems these gentlemen have been reading up on the subject of cutlery, and they come in here now with 35 per cent on articles that do not cost exceeding $1 a dozen, and 55 per cent on all that cost exceeding $1 a dozen. Did you vindicate Mr. Taft when you did that, and you applied it to all the cutlery schedules? Oh, how you have talked about him on the stump. Will you ever go around and correct it and apologize for what you said?

On grit shot you put a duty of 20 per cent in your bill you sent to Mr. Taft, and you raise it 50 per cent above that. What did you do it for? You got the information last spring after your campaign that Mr. Taft had over a year ago when he vetoed your bill and saved the American manufacturer.

Let us take umbrellas. These people complain they could not make any umbrellas at 30 per cent, because you had put more than that on the raw material. You raised it and make a duty ad valorem equal to the duty on the raw material in this present bill, and so on. I can not take my time in showing you all of the things. You know about it. Get up here in the House and apologize to William Howard Taft for the injustice you have done him on the stump and let the American people know that you were not telling the truth then, although you thought you were, because of your imperfect knowledge of the subject. [Applause on the Republican side.]

For reasons to which I may allude later, you put printing presses on the free list in that bill that you sent to Mr. Taft. They had carried a duty of 45 per cent. We lowered the duty to 30 per cent, and you put them on the free list in the bill Mr. Taft vetoed. When you wrote this bill you put them in at 15 per cent. Why did you do it? Was any industry jeopardized?

If you thought you were not injuring any business by putting them on the free list, why did you put on a duty of 15 per cent? Of course you knew that the magazines and the newspapers would a little prefer to have them on the free list. Why did you not still insist upon doing what the magazines and the newspapers wanted done? Why did you dare put on 15 per cent in the face of their antagonism, if it was not because you knew that Mr. Taft was right and that if you left them on the free list it would simply stop the business in the United States?

Gentlemen talk about the ample time we have had in respect to this bill; that it was published three weeks before it was introduced into the House. Oh, yes; the caucus print was published three weeks before, but that was subject to the decree of the White House and the decree of the caucus, and changes were made in the bill. We did not get the bill that was introduced into the House until late in the day the day before it was called up in the committee for the action of the committee, and the next day it was called up here, and we were expected to engage in debate upon it. There were so many things in the bill to criticize, however, that he who runs may read, and we have had something of a lively debate from that time to this on this side of the House. For some reason or other gentlemen on the other side do not care or do not dare to discuss the bill. They are afraid they will meet their speeches when they get into the next campaign, and they are exhibiting a good deal of discretion in the matter, and I commend their judgment. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Why in the world did you change your views in regard to a tariff board or a tariff commission? My friend from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] comes in and thinks, apparently, he is the whole thing at this blessed moment in respect to a tariff commission—he and his party. I supposed that I had had some connection with that matter before. [Laughter.] I introduced a bill in the House that passed both Houses. I suppose the gentleman voted for the bill. I do not know that he did, but I presume he voted for it then. His views were different then from what they are now on some subjects. I do not know whether he voted for that bill at that time or not.

That bill met with the commendation of nearly the whole House, the Democratic Party included. All but a baker's dozen of Democrats voted for that bill. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] indorsed it in a speech, as did the present Speaker of the House. It was just the thing they wanted. I had introduced the bill after consultation with half a dozen gentlemen who had introduced similar bills, harmonizing their views and getting, with their aid, a better bill than any one of them had introduced, in my judgment. That bill failed of passage because of a filibuster, and now, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] comes in and seems to blame me and the Republican Party for that failure. We promptly sent the bill over to the Senate, and with their usual fast movements there they got it back on the very day we adjourned with a half dozen amendments. I tried to get an agreement in the House upon those amendments, and then we introduced a gag rule—the best gag rule we could get under the circumstances—to accomplish the business. If I had had my way, we would have had a gag rule that would have compelled Members to vote for these five amendments en bloc, and then we would not

have had any trouble; but the only trouble and friction came from such men as now represent the Progressive Party, because they said they could not vote for such a gag rule.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield——

Mr. PAYNE. So we had to take the best we could—no; I can not yield now. He says we had a yea-and-nay vote on every proposition. Well, the Constitution did that; we could not prevent that, and I made the best fight I could every minute, but I was beaten at the last moment by the Speaker recognizing a gentleman to move to concur in the amendment, I think, on the sundry civil bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield for a correction of his statement?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CRISP). Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not propose to answer questions.

Mr. MURDOCK. This is not a question; I want to correct the gentleman's statement. The rule did provide for an agreement to the Senate amendments in gross. The gentleman stated it did not.

Mr. PAYNE. It did not; we had to vote on each separate amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. The rule says in gross.

Mr. PAYNE. The rule did not say "en bloc"—that is the way it read when we did things in that sort of a way—and I hope the gentleman will learn his lesson from what happened to the tariff-board bill, and hereafter will not be so conscientiously scrupulous about doing business in the House when it is necessary even to vote for half a dozen trivial amendments en bloc in order to get a bill through so as to accomplish a greater good. So it failed. The filibuster came on the other side of the House from a few Democratic Members, and they were responsible for its defeat. Well, we did get a clause in an appropriation bill, and under that clause the President was enabled to appoint a tariff board; and it turned out, most fortunately, that while that Tariff Board did not have the authority to subpœna witnesses and compel the attendance of witnesses and get a look at their books, still they got gentlemen to come before them by request and submit their books to inspection, and the board reported that this lack of authority was not any particular handicap. And then we fought for another appropriation that should continue the Tariff Board in existence; and lo and behold, a change! The Speaker of the House now and the leader of the majority now had changed their views overnight on the subject, and they were opposed to the Tariff Board and they were opposed to any appropriation. Oh, they did not want the light let in; that is all. Now, I am in favor of a tariff board. Why? Because we spent all the time for nearly two years in getting information to make the law of 1909; and with this great subject, with the diversified interests that have multiplied in this country, we were not able to get all the light on the subject we wanted. Oh, how I wish we had had a report of the Tariff Board on the wool schedule in 1909! If we had had that you would not be here now. I could not convince the majority of the committee, although my ideas have not changed much now on the wool schedule since 1909, and they are reflected in the bill I have introduced in the House after hard preparation. It will stop the criticism some day, because it will become a law and be on the statute books substantially as introduced, and when it is free wool will be gone. [Applause on the Republican side.]

How you have progressed on wool, upward and downward—like a crawfish, backward and forward. I was in hopes you would leave a monopoly of that business to our Progressive friends. They make better progress when they are going backward than when they are going forward. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Two years ago you had a wool bill, which was brought in by Mr. UNDERWOOD, at 20 per cent duty "to meet the depleted and depleting revenues." You remember that kindergarten lesson which I was enabled to give the gentleman in regard to the daily reports of receipts and disbursements in the Treasury, showing him there was not a shadow of excuse for any revenue duty on wool to meet a "depleted or depleting Treasury." The revenues were abundant. That has been one of the good qualities of the present law—it is a revenue producer. We do not have to borrow money to help out the revenues. Nay, nay. The revenues have been good and so large that for the last two years we have been paying cash for building the Panama Canal [applause on the Republican side] and have not issued bonds, although we have ample authority under the law. Twenty per cent on wool for revenue! And it went over to the Senate, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE said 35 per cent. In the conference committee the Senator said 29 per cent. That was his ultimatum, and the gentleman from Alabama, as mild and bland as ever he did anything in his life, with a smile on his countenance, said, "Twenty-nine per cent, Mr. LA FOLLETTE." Twenty-nine per cent seemed to be the proper caper that should be the duty on wool according to the gentleman's idea then.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The rate of Senator LA FOLLETTE's was 35, the conference rate was 29 per cent.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; the conference rate was 29. They jumped the difference in some way between 20 per cent and 35. That was the gentleman's view of it then. Then he starts in this year, and according to all the newspaper reports from the secret meetings of the majority committee—and I am not complaining about the secrecy; that is the only way a majority of a committee can make a tariff bill, and if the gentleman from Kansas ever should be in charge of one he would be convinced of that before he was 15 minutes older.

My good Lord, what a crowd he would have around him all the time; he would not even get a chance to eat; and all of them professing to be honest, and showing what the rates would do to them, one claiming they were prohibitive and the other ruinously low.

And in the secret conference, I understand, they voted at one time for 15 per cent duty on wool. And then it was reported that the chairman had been outvoted and we had to have free wool, and then it was reported it was left to the President as the only man in the United States who could fix the proper duty on wool, or lack of duty, and that he said we must have free wool. And they have been shouting free wool ever since. [Laughter.] Now, that is not all of it. The hair of the Angora goat has always been rated with wool since the time when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, and the same duty has been put on goat hair as on wool. If wool should be free, goat hair should be free, too. They raise some goats in the United States. There are 3,000,000 of them. They say that 2,999,999 of them are in Texas [laughter and applause on the Republican side], and Texas must have a duty on goat hair. Texas is quite a State, and has a good many Democratic Representatives. I do not know how it was done. The Speaker used to say that the tariff of 1909 was the Payne-Aldrich-Smoot bill, and I expect he will get up and shout some day from his place, "All those in favor of the Underwood-Wilson-Garner bill will say 'aye,'" just from the force of habit and from his devotion to the truth of history. [Laughter on the Republican side.] And then all the products made from goat hair were put on at a higher rate of duty, as compensatory duty to the goats in Texas. Oh, what a record you have on wool! A man who has been traveling in Ohio stopped me on the street car this morning. He says the farmers there are all up in arms about the Underwood free-wool bill? They relied on you last fall when you said you would not injure any business. They thought you really meant it. They do not think so now. Those farmers do not think so up in Ohio. They have it in for the Ohio Members if they vote for free wool. I suppose they will so vote, because the average new Member thinks that his position here depends on the number of jobs that he can get for his constituents. I could tell them differently. They expect a man to be honest to his convictions and stand up to his duty, and when he does, and tells them so, and tells them why, they have confidence in him.

I had the first serious fight in my campaign last fall that I ever had. I went out on the stump in my district, into every village and every hamlet, and made speeches in the afternoon and in the evening, rode around to see my constituents, and told them I was ready to give an account of my stewardship. And when the old soldiers gathered in the audience, I told them I voted against the Sulloway bill and against the Sherwood bill, because I thought they were unjust; that the Treasury could not stand and the soldiers did not need such extravagant pensions. I got the soldier vote in my district, too. They like a man who is square and honest in his convictions and is not afraid to state them to his constituents. Most of the votes I lost, which went to the Bull Moose Party, were lost on account of the reciprocity with Canada. I told them I informed the President that I would stand by that agreement. I did. I was kept out of the House by sickness, and could not even come here and explain my vote on that subject. I told them what my views were. I knew they did not correspond with theirs. Many of the farmers of my district live right along on Lake Ontario, near the Canadian market, and the farmers there would be affected if they were affected anywhere in the country. Well, they thought they were going to get enough Bull Moose votes to beat me. They got some, a little over 8,000, in the district for their candidate. But I am here yet.

Gentlemen, do not be so terribly afraid of your shadow. Do not think that patronage is going to help you out. Why, most of the postmasters in my district have been appointed and reappointed for the last 15 years, and until recently the fourth-

class postmasters. They were a faithful lot, and wherever they were faithful, the administration wanted to appoint them. Now, honestly, have I gotten any patronage out of that? It does not come that way. I do not know how it is in your districts, but the people in mine have too much sense to be bought that way. I have been voting against your seed distribution ever since very soon after I came here. The seeds belonging to the people of my district have been distributed to them by me, but I have not failed to tell them on the stump that I voted against the appropriation. A Member of Congress came to me and wanted to know how I dared to do it when the majority of my constituents were farmers. I told them I did not believe the farmers of my district could be bought with 10 cents' worth of seeds, but, if there were any, I did not want them to vote for me. I never lost any votes on account of that.

If you are against this bill, say so; if you want it, say so, and let your constituents know it. I am spending some time on the wool schedule, but it will go through the House as you have it. The rumor is that there will be trouble with it in the Senate. I do not know.

The Senator from Nevada is a pretty vigorous sort of man, but he has more sense than the average Democrat. [Applause on the Republican side.] And there are other people talking like him over there as to what they will do. I do not care what he will do or what they will do. It is their business. It is your funeral, not mine. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I want you to have it according to your own program. I may offer some suggestions for the betterment of the bill, but I know you will not adopt them. If you would follow my advice on wool, I would offer more suggestions.

Oh, no; the caucus has decreed! [Laughter on the Republican side.] By the way, I have had experience with a number of tariff bills, and this is the first time that any party met in caucus every time they had a tariff bill to get all the members to pledge themselves to vote. It is not a good way to legislate. [Applause on the Republican side.] Why, if you brought your wool bill in here, instead of into the caucus, it would have given us some chance to tell you that the revenues under the present law are neither depleted nor depleting, but that, on the contrary, we have an abundance of revenues, as we have ever since the enactment of the present law.

We should have over $50,000,000 surplus this year, and I think we shall have that much surplus at the end of the year, anyway, although we shall not have as much as we otherwise would on account of this bill that you have introduced, because people are now holding back importations in order to flood the country with importations at a lower rate of duty, and that may make some difference in the revenues from this time on to the 30th day of June.

Referring to the Tariff Board, I know that many of you are in favor of it, but you were led off by your party. Why should the establishment and maintenance of a tariff board be a party question? If the information to be obtained by such a board is needed by the Members on either side to make up a tariff bill, why should it be made a party question?

Of course my friend from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] needs it for his vanishing party, in order to keep it on the surface of things. [Laughter.] But you on the Democratic side do not need it, because you have a majority of two to one here. You should vote your honest convictions on that subject and give us a tariff-commission bill. You have the power. Amend it to suit yourselves, but first give us one that will elicit information. Great heavens, you will need it before this bill has been on the statute books a year. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] You will see the necessity for it.

Oh, how you have tried to play to the farmer in this bill! You pledged yourselves to take off the duties from provisions and food and to cut them away down; yes, put them on the free list. Then you ran up against the farmer. You put a bill through here, taking the duties off farm products, over a year ago. They amended it in the Senate so that it should apply only to contiguous territory—Canada—but not to the whole world. You heard from the farmer then, and since then you have been trying to hedge. If not, why did you put a duty of 10 cents a bushel on wheat, while you put flour on the free list? You heard from the millers, and so you put 10 per cent on flour from countries that put a duty upon our flour.

Now, you knew that did not mean anything. There is not an intelligent member of that committee—and in that list I include all the 14 Democratic members, as well as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK]—who does not know that that duty of 10 per cent does not amount to anything. The Canadian Council can meet 15 minutes after President Wilson has signed this bill, and will meet, and take the duty off flour. The great milling industries of this country, some of whom are making 5 and none of them over 10 cents a barrel on flour, will have to pay from 45 to 55 cents duty on the wheat they buy to make a barrel of flour.

Do you suppose the farmers do not understand that little joker? Do you suppose there is a farmer who can read and write—and most of them can—that takes the papers, who does not know that a duty of 10 cents a bushel on wheat does not do him any good if Canadian flour is to come in free of duty? Why, the Canadians would rather export it into this country in the shape of flour. I understand they have a milling capacity there not two-thirds of which is now utilized, and they are waiting for you to make this blunder; and you seek to appease the farmer by putting a duty on his wheat that will do him no good as long as you have flour on the dutiable list at 10 per cent or let it come in free.

The committee adopted the same policy on buckwheat and rye and the flours made from them, but the pressure of the buckwheat flouring mills, nearly all located in the State of Pennsylvania, was too great, and so buckwheat and buckwheat flour are on the free list. Of course, the farmers who raise buckwheat will be enthusiastic over this provision.

You are playing the same trick with respect to meats, taking off the duty of 1½ cents a pound on meats and keeping the duty on cattle and animals that produce the meats.

How much good does that do the farmer, the honest, horny-handed tiller of the soil? You know it does not do him any good. You know that he knows it will not do him any good. Why try such a subterfuge as that? You try to appease him by putting agricultural implements on the free list. Yet the manufacturer's prices of agricultural implements in the United States are less than what they get for them abroad, and I can prove it to the satisfaction of any one of you. If you will give me a tariff board, I will prove it to you. The farmer of the United States gets them just as cheaply as anyone else, unless the retailer charges more here for his services than he happens to charge in some foreign country. Why, I read Mr. Wilson's speech in New York, I think, just before the election, when he was not talking to the farmers, but talking to the dwellers in the city. He had seen, as I had seen, in the New York Times the day before that American beef sold in London at 13 cents a pound less than it did in New York City, and he gravely told them it was all on account of the tariff. He did not know that the tariff on beef was only a cent and a half a pound. Of course he never taught mathematics at Princeton [laughter], but that was not necessary to enable him to know that a cent and a half duty taken off the article would not make 13 cents difference in the price.

And so it goes. How are you coming out on this thing? You are putting sugar on the free list in the course of three years. Sugar is a great farm product. There are 625,000 tons of beet sugar produced in this country and over 300,000 tons of cane sugar in Louisiana. Add to that the Hawaiian and the Porto Rican and the Philippine Islands output, aggregating 1,900,000 tons, against the 1,800,000 tons we import from Cuba, which constitutes our entire sugar supply.

Who wanted the duty taken off of sugar? Was it the ultimate consumer? Why, if he is intelligent he knows that the retail price of sugar in the last 20 years nearly all the time has been as cheap and as low in this country as in Great Britain—5 cents here and "tuppence ha'penny" there.

Mr. HELGESEN. It is only 4½ cents here.

Mr. PAYNE. I am talking about the retail price.

Mr. HELGESEN. That is the retail price.

Mr. PAYNE. I am speaking of the period of 20 years. I know it is sold generally by the grocers without a profit, and it is the only thing I know of that they do sell without a profit. The wholesale price here was a little more than it is in Great Britain. They do not produce any sugar there. They do not have this 1,000,000 tons of sugar coming in from their own producers every year as we do here in addition to that coming from our island possessions.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CRISP). According to the gentleman's request, the Chair advises him that he has used 50 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. I will take 10 minutes more than I gave myself in the first place. [Applause.] I want to say this: The demand for free sugar came from the refiners in this country, and they came before the Hardwick committee. I want you to read just what they said. They told them why. They said this beet sugar comes in and destroys the market for their product once a year, lasting from three to six months. They are experiencing it now. It has lasted longer this year, and the pesky beet sugar comes into the market at a lower price, and they have to lower their price to the people to whom they sell. They said they wanted the duty taken off, and some of them said frankly that taking off the duty would destroy the beet-

sugar industry. I quote from the hearings of the Hardwick committee:

Refiner Claus Spreckels, president of the Federal Sugar Refining Co., said before the Hardwick committee:
"I would have free trade—absolutely" (pp. 2277 and 2278 of the hearings).
Charles R. Heike, secretary American Sugar Refining Co.:
"That (free trade) would destroy the industry absolutely in this country, and I would approve of that" (p. 292).
William G. Gilmore, of Arbuckle Bros., refiners:
"The thing to do is to take off the duty, and personally I would advocate it" (p. 1169).
James H. Post, president National Sugar Refining Co.:
"If Congress did not need the revenue from sugar, I would like to see free sugar" (p. 527).
William A. J. Jamison, of Arbuckle Bros.:
"If there was no tax on the importation of sugar, we would be able to run more constantly and sell more sugar. I think a cent a pound should be taken off at present, and later a little more, until the duty is entirely removed" (pp. 1195, 1196).
Edwin F. Atkins, vice president American Sugar Refining Co.:
"I think the independent refiners say truly that it is for the refiners' interest to have a low rate of duty rather than a high rate of duty, and reduce the basis of value upon which they can sell (p. 174). Beet sugars are taking away the trade of the refiners year by year" (p. 48).

Now, I had rather take their opinion on that subject against themselves than the opinion of the whole 247 Members sitting on the other side of the aisle, or anybody else who does not know a sugar mill from a stable. The sugar refiners know what they are talking about. You did this under the supposition that you were going to reduce the price of sugar. When your three years are up and you have passed through another congressional election and you get within sight of a presidential election—it is very strange that you should fix this at three years, is it not? Nobody can understand that. Nobody can see the reason why. You say it is in order to let the sugar producer "brace up" in this country. Brace up against what? Why, get a job somewhere at $2 a day, if there are any jobs hanging around loose by that time, or crowd somebody else out by competing with him at $1.50 a day. You want to let the farmers brace up and accommodate themselves to the conditions and the circumstances. Now, sugar may go down for a while. In this bracing-up process everybody will want to sell before the duty is taken off; but when you have ruined the sugar-beet industry you will have done what the refiners asked you to do—destroyed that industry—and you will have given the refiners the market, so that they can keep it "balanced" by getting the same price for sugar at the time when beet sugar should be in the market that they do when it is not. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Do you remember what happened a few years ago? There was a scare, and they said that the sugar crop had failed in foreign countries; that the crop would be short six or eight hundred thousand tons. There was a very serious condition of things, and they got sugar up to 7½ cents a pound at retail. The price went up all over the world. What will happen when you have a real shortage of a million tons which is now produced in the United States? Oh, how it will rise; how it will rise! The price will rise because there will not be enough to supply the demand, and you had better think about the law of supply and demand.

Are you going to get any reduction in the price of sugar by reason of your tariff cut? I have made a good many of them, and I did not succeed in getting any reduction in price. Why, I remember things like lumber. We reduced the duty on it, and the price went right up. We put a little more duty on shingles and laths and started up the shingle mills, and the price of shingles and laths went down. We put a little more duty on ladies' stockings, a subject of which you are ignorant. [Laughter.] It started up the American mills in competition, and women have been getting their stockings cheaper ever since that day. Why? Because it brought in competition. You cut down the duty on stockings, knowing nothing about it, and you will see the price of women's stockings go up, too. [Applause.] Oh, you will have a sweet time reckoning with the people on these foolish things that you have put in this bill. [Laughter.] The price of hides went up after we put them on the free list.

Now, you put a duty of 20 per cent on diamonds, and you will make it free for every smuggler that wants to get them into the United States. That has been the experience in the past. Prof. Wilson in 1894 put a duty of 25 per cent on diamonds, and what was the result? In 1895 $2,000,000 worth of diamonds was imported; in 1896 $2,700,000, and in 1897, when they had learned the art, there was only $625,000 worth imported. Then it was put back to 10 per cent, which is the highest duty that can be collected. Some men would like to put 100 per cent duty on diamonds, and I would not object to it if we could collect it, but as a revenue producer it is only a revenue producer when you put the duty at 10 per cent.

I was told by the representative of an American firm in Paris in 1895 that they did not import any diamonds into the United States. Why? Because they said there was 25 per cent duty which was not collected, and they would have to pay that duty if they imported them, and they could buy them in the United States for the foreign price with a trifle of about 10 per cent added, and no questions asked.

Now, we imported under the Dingley and Payne laws an average of $21,393,000 worth of diamonds against your average of $1,600,000 worth. We collected annually about five times the duty at 10 per cent that you collected under the Wilson bill at 25 per cent.

You play the demagogue, do you? Why do you not come out with honest statements? There is no excuse for you not knowing about this thing. I left you the documents showing it all through, and you had them to refer to. [Laughter on the Republican side.] You ought to have brought them down to date. You had the exports and imports and the duties, and it was a great object lesson to you. [Laughter.]

Then you take the duty off from paper and pulp to the extent that it is used by newspapers and magazines. What do you do it for? You cut off the revenue. This is a revenue bill. What do you do it for? Was there any demagogism about that? You took it off from printing presses and restored it at 15 per cent. What did you do that for? It can not be possible that you are expecting any honorable publisher of a newspaper or a magazine to indorse your bill or praise you because you have done that and look kindly upon it. Are you not old enough to know that gratitude is but a lively expectation of favors to come? [Laughter and applause.]

Then your 5 per cent reduction on goods brought in foreign vessels, seeking by this bill to repeal the treaties which you mention in another section and copy from former laws by this 5 per cent reduction. You who have hollered against subsidies now walk right into it and vote a subsidy of 5 per cent duty to the shipmaster who brings it in, instead of having it paid into the Treasury of the United States.

And I see that while foreign nations complain of this, my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has the same answer to them that he has to those whose industries are facing impending ruin. He says that we are not going to hurt their treaties and that we are not going to destroy any industries in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CRISP). The gentleman's time has again expired, unless he desires to occupy more time.

Mr. PAYNE. Have I used an hour, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I will suggest to the gentleman from New York that he take the five minutes that have been allotted to me.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman from Kentucky very kindly says that he will grant me the five minutes that have been allotted to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from New York controls the time upon his side, but was simply notifying him in accordance with his request as to the time that he had used.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes. Then I shall yield myself five minutes more. Mr. Chairman, I want to get down to that interesting statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER]. He says theory can put a statute upon the statute books, but that it can not keep it there. Well, he had better be worrying over that. [Laughter on the Republican side.] It can not. He says this bill must have the united support of the political party that is responsible for it, and it must permit American industry to proceed toward the capture of a larger share of the world's market without causing embarrassment or bringing distress to any large body of people. Mr. Chairman, it has not won the approval of the party that is enacting it, neither in Congress nor by a large majority out of Congress, for they are complaining of this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] It will embarrass industry from one end of the country to the other. Why are these people meeting in organized meeting, why are they appealing to the Senate for hearings, and why is the Senate committee wavering on giving them hearings?

Why is it that this universal disapproval comes up from the body of the people who are in any way interested in business? Embarrass business! Oh, how easy it would have been to make a tariff bill that would not have injured business if you had only had a tariff board, if you had only given diligent attention to what facts you did have before your committee. In the last campaign you told the people that you would not injure business, and many of them were foolish enough to believe you. It was a promise then. It must be fulfilled in this bill. They will not

take any more promises after that. What are they told? That they must go out and perfect their shops and perfect their methods of manufacturing, and put themselves in a position to pay the biggest wages in the world and meet the greatest competition from the cheapest labor in the world. Our President echoes this idea. Let him tell it in his own way:

(Woodrow Wilson at Gloucester, N. J., Aug. 15, 1912, Associated Press report.)

There is one label that I often see on goods sold in our shops that makes me blush a little bit. That label is "made in Germany." Why should that be a commendation? Why should you prefer to buy something made in Germany rather than something made in the United States? The only conceivable reason is that you believe that the hands that made that in Germany were better trained than the hands that made the similar article in the United States. And what I don't like to admit, but must admit, is that in some instances that is true. We don't give our lads a chance to learn how to do the work as well as it is done in Germany, because the German Government long ago saw the signs of the times, saw that they must live by science, by knowledge, by skill, by the infinite dexterity of their hands, and that if they were to be masters in the world of commerce they must also have supremacy in the world of knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, he did not know that in 1890 the manufacturers of the United States appeared before our committee and said that the foreigners were stealing our trade by falsely labeling their goods as having been made in the United States, and that they, the manufacturers, wanted printed and stamped on every imported article the country of its origin. That was the reason that the mark "made in Germany" was put on those goods, which so shamed our good President. If he had only had the explanation, he would not have been shocked, and he would not have had to exhibit his shock to the people of the United States. They wanted it put there, and why? Because our people were making the best goods in the world, as they are to-day. They have gone forward in the front ranks and no nation can excel them. But the labor costs more here and you can not hide behind your proposition that they accomplish more. We are paying double on the piece rate, for the unit produced, that they pay in the Old World, and there is no way to make that up unless we make up the difference in the tariff rates. Go on, gentlemen, the time is soon coming for your reckoning. Go right on, and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] will find that he has not a united Democratic Party behind this bill, and that the people of the United States will not stand peaceably by and see their industries and their factories injured and destroyed, or permit them to remain idle. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I take advantage of the leave to print to add the following brief notes:

The worst feature of the whole bill is the ad valorem feature, and although they have copied the new system of valuation verbatim from the present law—section 11—they will never be able to do away with the frauds that are so universally practiced by dishonest importing firms the country over.

The committee have very wisely retained the provisions for the issuance of bonds, copied from the present tariff law. In all human probability the administration will need to avail itself of this provision in the not distant future, if this bill becomes a law.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania says, it is true that theory may write a tariff law, but it can not keep it upon the statute books. It is especially true of the present faulty and un-American measure, constructed on the lines of free trade, which does not even attempt to carry into effect the assurance, so often repeated in the late campaign, that no business would be injured.

The committee are evidently fearful of the effects and results of their own bill, as is also the President. The President suggests that some manufacturers may stop business for effect. If he looks deeper he will see it is an effect wholly legitimate, the cause of which is written into every page of the present bill. The manufacturers are closing down their works, expecting that goods will be bought abroad cheaper than they can sell them under the provisions of this bill. They are going into liquidation in order to save what little they have, and the President may well be alarmed at the outlook.

The insulting suggestion that our factory people must learn to do better work comes with ill grace. It is an insult to the American manufacturer, who to-day is leading the world. Our methods are everywhere better than those abroad; our tools are better, our factories better equipped, and run on better lines than those of any other country. It will be impossible for our people, with all their inventive ingenuity, to pay the high wages they have been paying, when this ruinous competition begins, which not only cuts off profits, but threatens most serious cuts in the price of labor and the frequent stoppage of machinery, putting factories on one-half or one-third time in many industries

It is a matter of extreme regret that the committee have stricken out the maximum and minimum provisions of the present law, under which so much has been obtained in the way of smoothing out difficulties and giving us equal trade relations with other countries. We are getting the minimum provisions of foreign tariffs wherever we are entitled to them, and the restrictions on the products of the United States have been changed to a sensible basis, so that there is no cause for friction.

It is regretted that no provision is made for the minimum duty. Paragraph 4–A simply gives the President the power to do what he already had the power to do. President Taft used this power in enacting the Canadian reciprocity agreement, which was not binding until submitted to and approved by Congress. The President has always had the power to do this without any such provision as in this bill.

The dumping clause, copied from the Canadian tariff, is purely and simply a protective measure. It is somewhat ridiculous that after all the condemnation of the protective policy the committee should adopt it in this bill by a new provision so drastic as they have made it in their dumping clause. I fear it will not accomplish its purpose. The same difficulties surround it that surround the question of the market value on articles imported which carry the ad valorem duty.

The most commendable things in the bill are those copied verbatim from the present law. It is gratifying to note how largely this committee has approved of the act which they have so roundly condemned, but seldom criticized. Whole schedules are adopted without change. The administrative features have few amendments, and fewer still of any importance.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I always listen with great interest to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], especially when the gentleman from New York discusses the tariff. He has been longer a member of the tariff-making committee of this House than any other Member, and he is better posted on tariff questions than any man I know on the Republican side of the House. He speaks always for the Republican theory of a protective tariff. I was surprised at the opening of this debate, however, to hear from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] for four years had submitted in silence to the criticisms of his bill, and that certain obnoxious features of the Payne bill against which the people of this country have rebelled were inserted in the bill in opposition to the wishes of the gentleman from New York whose name the bill bears. The country, therefore, for the first time is now told that the tariff measure which has been so overwhelmingly repudiated at the polls did not even meet with the approval of the gentleman who drew it; that he was even against his own bill. This admission takes away from the Payne law its last friend, and we are told that even the author of the bill is against it and always has been against it. Now the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] occupies considerable time upon this floor in prophesying all sorts of disasters to the industries of this country, the breaking down of our foreign trade, the lowering of wages, a less manufacturing output, if our bill becomes a law; and then he closes by announcing that the day of reckoning is almost here. Why, the day of reckoning is here. The day of reckoning in this country commenced some 10 months ago, when it was evident that the Republican Party, divided against itself, could no longer stand.

In the month of July of last year, when the people of this country knew and when the manufacturers themselves knew that we would have a Democratic revision of the tariff, a tariff which would strike at the profits of the eastern manufacturers, a real revision downward, such a revision that it would require no experts to determine whether it was down or up, just as soon as the people of this country found that out, just as soon as the manufacturers found that out, there commenced a period of increased output of the factories of this country, and for nine months the increase has been going on. For the nine months ending with the month of March of this year we exported $1,908,006,372 worth of goods, while during the nine months ending with the month of March, 1912, we only exported $1,711,408,267 worth of goods. In other words, during the nine months ending with the month of March of this year, during that period when the country knew and the manufacturers knew that this awful blow described by the gentleman from New York was to be struck at our industries, we increased our exports $200,000,000. The country has known for a month, or more than that, the character of this bill. The hearings were completed before the commencement of the month of March, and the manufacturers knew what to expect. We have heard no voice of disapproval—the kind of disapproval

described by the gentleman from New York—from any section of this country. Why, during the month of March of this year we only exported in crude materials for use in manufacturing a little over $36,000,000.

During the month of March of last year, before it was evident the Democrats would win the election this last fall, we exported over $73,000,000 of crude materials for use in manufacturing. In other words, during the month of March, 1912, when the manufacturers had every reason to believe the Republicans would win, had every reason to believe that the same kind of tariff they had always been getting would continue, we exported of crude materials for use in manufacturing from this country over $73,000,000. During the month of March of this year there was only exported from this country about half that amount of crude materials to be used in manufacturing. That is the kind of blow we are striking at the manufacturers of this country. When they knew exactly what was going to happen, instead of transferring the manufacturing business of this country across the seas to the factories of England, Germany, and France, they go to work and buy up the crude materials we have been sending abroad, and they get ready to use them here in our own factories. Does that look like hard times for the manufacturers of this country? For the nine months ending with the month of March of this year we imported $1,401,000,000 worth of goods of various kinds. During the nine months ending with the month of March, 1912, we imported only $1,203,000,000. In other words, during the nine months which have passed since it became apparent to the country and to the world that the Democrats proposed to control the various branches of this Government we have imported $200,000,000 worth more goods than we imported in the same nine months of the previous year. Trade conditions have improved; the balance of trade is now and will be on our side in the future.

We have imported more goods, we have exported more goods, and we have done this in face of the fact that we are going to have this awful tariff revision downward—this disastrous blow to the industries of this country—described so vigorously by the gentleman who has just taken his seat. In no uncertain terms for years the people of this country have been demanding a revision downward. They have demanded it always just before an election, and it got to be a sort of habit on the part of Republicans to promise it always just before the election and to break their promise just after the election, and to say we have been returned by such an overwhelming majority to power that it indicates the people still have confidence in us and that they still want us to go on administering the affairs of this country in the same old way. Finally the Republicans were compelled to promise more definitely than before, and they were compelled to pretend to keep their promises to revise the tariff downward.

The result of their pretended revision downward was the bill of the gentleman who just took his seat, which revised the schedules, not downward, but upward. Against that sort of revision the people of this country rebelled, and on account of that kind of Republican failure to keep promises the Democratic Party was swept into power in all the branches of this Government. Talk about the Democratic Party getting into power on account of a split in the Republican Party! Talk about this country being in favor of a protective tariff! The Progressive Party would never have been able to get the number of votes they did get in this country—and they seem to have obtained more than the Republican Party—if they had not denounced the bill of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], who has just taken his seat; if they had not promised reforms and revisions downward, and if they had not promised to continue no longer in the footsteps of the old Republican Party.

The people of this country want this tariff revised downward; they want competitive conditions reestablished in the relation this country bears to all the world. And we have tried to do that. They want the tariff made lowest upon the necessaries of life, and they want it made highest upon the luxuries, and in this bill we have honestly tried to do that.

The bill we are considering and which will soon become a law represents the dawn of a new era in the fiscal policy of this Government. For over a quarter of a century a contest has been waged throughout the country for a national income tax. The people have overturned, by a referendum vote of the States, a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States by writing into the Constitution an amendment making possible income-tax legislation, and to-day we are able to place upon the statute books a scientific revision of our taxes, carrying out the Democratic theory that luxuries shall be more heavily taxed than the necessaries of life. The bill we are considering makes lighter the burden of taxes upon the consumers of the country and compels great wealth to contribute its fair share toward paying the expenses of our National Government.

Wherever a nation has adopted an income-tax system and given it a fair trial it has never been repealed. A tax upon incomes becomes now an important part of the fiscal policy of this Government. We make it highest upon the great incomes and lowest upon the small incomes. We tax 126,000 incomes amounting to between four and five thousand dollars per year, and upon these incomes we collect only $630,000, an average of $5 per income. On the other hand, this tax will reach 100 incomes amounting to over $1,000,000 each per year, and upon these 100 incomes we expect to collect nearly $6,000,000, $60,000 per income. We tax 425,000 incomes in all, and we expect to collect upon all of them the sum of at least $70,000,000. It may exceed that amount, but we feel confident it will not be less than that.

I know of no swollen fortune which has not been made possible by the favors of government. Swollen fortunes are based nearly always upon franchises—national, State, or municipal—or upon tariff protection or upon patents. I undertake to say that very few, if any, great fortunes have been accumulated in any way except through the favor of government—national, State, or municipal. Under these circumstances there is a peculiar justice in compelling the recipients of large incomes to contribute a small portion of their incomes to the support of the Government. The great nations of the world are doing this, and when we pass this bill we are simply placing ourselves in line with modern methods and modern policies. During nearly all of the period of our existence as a Nation we have collected taxes in the most expensive way, based upon consumption. Back of tariff walls manufacturing interests have flourished and increased the amount of their dividends at the expense of the consumers of the country.

The effect of our system of taxation has been to increase the price of goods to the consumer, whether he buys goods manufactured abroad or goods manufactured at home. Nearly everything he buys is taxed, and the taxes he pays, if he buys American goods, do not find their way into the Treasury of the United States. In other words, a protective-tariff tax confers upon the protected interests the right not only to levy taxes but to collect them and distribute them in dividends to the holders of watered stocks.

This system during the period of the ascendency of the Republican Party became so firmly fixed that it seemed impossible to dislodge it or to modify it in any particular. Throughout the land were heard murmurs of discontent so unmistakable and so persistent that the Republican Party found it necessary repeatedly to promise to revise the tariff downward, but, controlled always by the protected interests, immediately after a national election, when the party found itself again intrenched in power, it forgot its promises, and when finally compelled by a thoroughly aroused public sentiment to pretend at least to keep its promises, it placed, as I have stated, upon the statute books a tariff law which revised not downward but upward the schedules against which the Nation had protested; and as a result, the Democratic Party, pledged to an unmistakable downward revision of the tariff, has been returned to power in all the branches of this Government. And it has kept its promises by presenting now this tariff bill for the consideration of Congress, which reduces the tariff average from 41 per cent to 24 per cent, which puts an end forever to the war tariffs of long ago. The bill we present furnishes to the people of this Nation the relief they have been demanding and the relief we have promised.

The people will understand for themselves in the near future that this is a revision downward and will realize the fact that under a Democratic administration the burdens of Federal taxation have been shifted and have been placed where they will bear lightest upon the toiling masses of the people.

The claim is made by many of our opponents that goods will be no cheaper to consumers than they have been heretofore, and that the people of the country will find when they purchase goods from retailers throughout the country that the prices will be no lower than they now are. Even if this statement is true, we still will have accomplished much if we merely stop the upward tendency and prevent further increases in the cost of living. However, the major portion of our opponents simply claim that the reductions we have made will not materially decrease the cost of goods to the consumer. The testimony of manufacturers recently taken before the Ways and Means Committee is to the effect that there has grown up in the country an expensive system of distribution, so expensive that when goods reach the consumer in a finished form and ready for consumption the price to the consumer will be so little reduced that the consumer will not get much benefit from

the reductions we have made. To illustrate what I mean, the manufacturers of clothing insist that the cloth in an average suit of clothes will cost the tailor who makes it up into a suit only 75 cents or $1 less per suit than he now pays, and they insist that this slight reduction will not be appreciable and the consumer will not particularly care for it. Makers of thread insist that the thread which goes into a suit of clothes made up by a tailor will, under our reduction, cost but little less than it costs now. The button manufacturers of the country insist that the buttons which go upon a suit of clothes will cost the man who makes up the suit but little less than they do now, not enough to speak of. Manufacturers of cotton and silks insist that the trimmings and the linings which go into the finishing of a suit of clothes will cost the tailor who makes the suit only a little less than they cost now. But I undertake to say that when all of these and similar reductions are added together we will find the present tariff bill will considerably reduce to the consumer the cost of a suit of clothes, and when the same rule is applied to his linen, his underwear, his overcoat, and hat and other articles of apparel, including shoes, which we place upon the free list, we will find a considerable reduction in the cost of living has been made possible. The testimony taken before us shows that a suit of cheap clothing made out of wool substitutes, costing now $10, will cost under this bill with wool substitutes on the free list and with the other items just a little cheaper than they now are $2 less than it now costs.

Dress goods will be cheaper. The amount that goes into one dress will not be appreciably cheaper they say, and admitting the claim that each of the materials which go into the manufacture of a dress will not be appreciably reduced in price, yet I undertake to say the aggregate reduction will be appreciable.

A miller said to me the other day free flour will not make much difference in the price to the consumer of one loaf of bread. In fact, the difference in the cost of the flour that goes into a loaf of bread would be so small as not to be noticed by the consumer, but they all agree that flour will be cheaper. In a year an average family will consume many loaves of bread, and the aggregate saving in this item alone will amount to something that is appreciable. We have reduced the taxes on all foodstuffs, and while the price of no one unit will be appreciably reduced, yet when the many food units necessary to maintain a family for a year are considered together we will find that the reductions which are small applied to one food unit will amount to something in the aggregate.

It is agreed that the price of sugar will be cheaper, a cent and a half cheaper per pound, at least. As a Nation we consume over 80 pounds of sugar per capita per year, and our consumption of sugar per capita per annum is increasing. In its sugar bill alone an average family of five persons will, when this bill goes into effect and when sugar becomes free, as it will three years from now, effect a saving on this article each year alone of a considerable amount.

We put lumber on the free list. We intend to make it easier for the people of the country to build homes. We can not reform all the evils for which high protective tariffs are responsible in a day. We do not promise at the outset to accomplish in a year all the reforms the people of the country are demanding, but we do claim that in the bill we are presenting now we are taking a long step in the right direction.

Originally the present high tariffs were levied for the purpose of meeting the tremendous obligations made necessary by the war between the States. They have until recently been continued in effect upon the theory that we were protecting infant industries against the competition of Europe. These industries, however, have grown so strong that they are able to compete successfully across the seas, and the argument in favor of infant industries is no longer advanced. The contention now is, and the argument used before the Ways and Means Committee recently by representatives of the protected industries was, that we must retain these schedules as they are, especially the textile schedules, in order to enable our manufacturers to pay to workmen the wages they are now receiving, and we have been seriously told that in order to maintain the American standard of wages in the textile industries and the American standard of living we must maintain the tariff rates as they now are.

It has been the policy of the Republican Party to write into our tariff laws in order, first, to protect infant industries and later on to protect the wages of laborers, the rates demanded by the protected industries. In other words, the manufacturers have been permitted by the Republican Party to write these schedules themselves. We have refused to extend to them this privilege. This bill has been written by the Democratic members of a great committee of this House and has been amended and approved as amended by a caucus of all the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives, and the result is a bill written in the interest of the consumers of the country.

The woolen schedule of Republican tariff bills from 1867 down to the present time has been controlled by William Whitman, of the Arlington Mills. The Arlington Mills are located in Lawrence, Mass. Mr. Whitman said recently that he was "a little more interested, if anything, in cotton than in wool." And the cotton manufacturers, under the direction of the Arkwright Club, have controlled the cotton rates. In order to ascertain to what extent the textile schedules of Republican bills have maintained wages in Lawrence it is only necessary to examine the report on the strike of the textile workers in Lawrence, Mass., in 1912, prepared under the direction of Charles P. Neill, Commissioner of Labor. On page 20 of this report Mr. Neill makes the following statement:

> It is obvious from the figures of earnings that the full-time earnings of a large number of adult employees are entirely inadequate to maintain a family. Thus the full-time earnings of 7,275 employees, or about one-third of the total covered in this investigation, are less than $7 a week. Of the 7,275 earning less than $7 a week 5,294 were 18 years of age or over, and 36.5 per cent of the 5,294 were males. These wages, however, are not peculiar to Lawrence. Wages of textile workers in that city are not lower than in most other textile towns.

The same report shows that these employees are huddled together in small apartments. In one case the commissioner found 17 persons occupying a 5-room apartment. Another household of 16 persons occupied a 5-room apartment, and another 5-room apartment was occupied by a household of 15 persons. The rent most commonly paid was from $2 to $3 per week for a 4-room apartment and $3 to $3.50 per week for a 5-room apartment. After the head of a family paid $2 to $3.50 per week rental for his rooms it can readily be seen how much he had left for food and clothing for his family.

The testimony taken before the Rules Committee at its recent investigation is fresh in the minds of all of us. Whole families lived without ever tasting meat, and when they rebelled against such conditions as this and attempted to send their children to other cities in order that the burden upon them might be less while they maintained their strike for higher wages, they were denied this right by the authorities of Lawrence, and long lines of police drawn up in front of the railroad station enforced the mandate of the mill owners. When the workers in the textile mills protested that they were not at work, and asked and insisted that they be permitted to send their children to homes of friends in other cities, where they could be taken care of, the answer, in effect, was, "Return to work at the wages we propose to pay, or see your children starve."

The evidence taken before the Committee on Rules is available, and shows the absolute falsity of the statement that tariffs in the textile schedules are maintaind at the request of manufacturers for the purpose of enabling manufacturers to pay high wages to their employees.

Down in Boston the Arkwright Club meets. The gentlemen who belong to this organization have been able to avoid so far the penalties of our antitrust laws. According to the testimony of Mr. S. B. Chase, a mill owner of Fall River, Mass., before the Ways and Means Committee, the cotton mills of Fall River had some sort of a mysterious sliding scale, under which wages were reduced in Fall River 17½ per cent in 1908. This particular reduction, however, he insists, was not brought about through the Arkwright Club.

Mr. Chase is the president of the King Phillip mills in Fall River, Mass., which paid in 1902 16 per cent on its capital stock, and which paid 6 per cent on its capital stock until 1907. In 1907 there was a 50 per cent dividend, payable either in cash or stock, and all the stockholders preferred to take stock. In that year and in each subsequent year down to the present time, including 1908, when the reduction in the wages of employees occurred, this mill has continued to pay 6 per cent on watered stock and all. In 1908 the Flint mills, of Fall River, watered their stock 100 per cent and paid 8 per cent on their stock, water and all, and at the same time reduced the wages of employees. The Davol mills, of Fall River, in 1908, watered their stock 25 per cent and paid their usual 6 per cent dividend and have been paying it ever since. According to the statement of the secretary of the Arkwright Club, in 1907 the vote for curtailment of the output of New England mills was almost unanimous, and according to the agreement they reached, 10,000,000 out of 13,000,000 spindles in New York and New England curtailed their products at least 10 per cent.

In the present bill we are not trying to protect profits of manufacturers. It might be advisable at this time to call attention to some of the profits New England mills are distributing under the present tariff laws. The Acushnet Mills, of New Bedford, paid 16 per cent in dividends from 1902 to 1910, and in 1910, in order to cut down their apparent profits, they increased their capital stock 100 per cent, and in 1911 their dividends amounted to 8 per cent. The Bristol Mills, of New Bedford, pay from 4 to 6 per cent in dividends every year, and

watered their stock 20 per cent in 1908, and in that year and in succeeding years they have continued to pay 5 to 6 per cent on their stock, water and all. The Butler Mills, of the same city, pay from 5 to 9 per cent each year in dividends. In 1910 they made a stock dividend of 20 per cent, and in 1911 they paid 8 per cent upon their stock, water and all.

The Dartmouth Mills, of New Bedford, paid on their common stock 8 per cent in 1902, 1903, and 1904. In 1905 they paid 20 per cent; in 1906, 26 per cent; in 1907, 66 per cent; in 1908, 66 per cent; and in 1909 they increased the amount of their common stock 100 per cent and divided it among their stockholders in order to keep down dividends. The same year they paid 13 per cent upon their common stock, water and all; and in 1910 they paid 16 per cent upon the common stock so watered, and in 1911 the same amount. In 1909 this company made a stock increase of 50 per cent on their preferred stock, and paid 5 per cent upon their preferred stock so watered in that year, and have been paying 5 per cent ever since.

The Gosnold Co., of New Bedford, watered their stock 50 per cent in 1909, and have continued ever since paying 6 per cent dividends on their stock so watered. Prior to that time, in 1906 and 1907, this company paid a dividend of 15 per cent. The Page Co., of New Bedford, made a stock increase in 1910 of 33⅓ per cent. They pay 4 or 5 per cent in dividends each year, and the fact that their stock is watered has made no difference at all in the amount of their dividends. The Soule Co. made in 1909 a stock dividend of 20 per cent. Prior to that time they had been paying 8 per cent in dividends, and they paid the same amount the next year.

Over in Fall River, Mass., the same condition of exorbitant profits prevails. In 1903 the Bourne Co. of that city watered its stock 40 per cent. In 1902 it paid 12½ per cent. After it watered its stock it paid 3½ per cent and pays 6 per cent now on watered stock and all. The Davol Co., of Fall River, made a stock dividend of 25 per cent in 1907 and kept on paying 6 per cent as usual on its stock so watered. The Laurel Lake Co. made a stock dividend of 100 per cent in 1907 and in that year paid 14 per cent on its stock. It paid 13 per cent the next year on water and all and has paid from 6 to 8 per cent ever since. The Merchants' Co., of Fall River, made a stock dividend in 1907 of 50 per cent and continues paying from 4 to 6 per cent upon its stock so watered. The Pocasset Co., of Fall River, watered its stock 100 per cent in 1907 and kept on paying 6 per cent. The Richard Borden Co., of Fall River, watered its stock 25 per cent in 1907, paid 20 per cent dividends in 1907 and 13 per cent dividends in 1908 upon its stock so watered. The Sagamore Mills, of Fall River, made a stock increase of 33⅓ per cent in 1909. Prior to that time they had been paying from 7 to 30 per cent per annum in dividends. Since that time they have been paying from 7 to 8 per cent on the stock so watered. The Tecumseh Mills, of Fall River, made a stock dividend of 50 per cent in 1906 and the next year paid 14½ per cent on the stock so watered. It has been paying from 6 to 9½ per cent since then. The Troy Mills, of Fall River, made a 100 per cent bond dividend in 1909 and in spite of this increased burden these mills have continued to pay from 8½ to 13 per cent on the stock and in 1907 these mills paid dividends of 67 per cent, and prior to that time dividends of 20 per cent per year were frequent.

I might continue this review of the profits of New England mills, but I have called attention sufficiently to their profits to indicate, I think, that if the rates we propose in this bill affect the earning capacity of these mills the employees who work in them ought not to bear the burden. I contend that the stockholders in these mills can afford to get along with less profits than they are now receiving, and we frankly admit that we have not attempted in this revision to protect the profits of mill owners.

The revision we propose ends the alliance between the protected woolen mills of the East and the wool-producing States of the West, and there never was a better time to do this than now. All arguments in favor of maintaining the sheep industry by protective tariffs fail under the conditions confronting us to-day. Protection upon wool is maintained upon the theory that it keeps up in this country the price of wool; that it maintains the sheep industry. Under the evidence taken by the Ways and Means Committee, Boston is at times the cheapest wool market in all the world, and to-day raw wool is as cheap in Boston as it is in England. Therefore, under a high protective tariff, the producer of wool is selling his wool in the cheapest of the world's wool markets. We are the only Nation in the world, except Russia, maintaining a tariff upon raw wool.

The sheep industry as conducted in this country depends for its extent and importance upon how far the plow has encroached upon sheep pastures. As agriculture increases in importance sheep disappear. To-day we have in the country 12,000,000 less sheep and lambs than we had 10 years ago. In Ohio we have 2,000,000 less sheep to-day than we had in 1880. In Illinois we have to-day only half as many sheep as we had in 1870. Vermont was a sheep-raising State in 1840, having at that time within her boundaries 1,600,000 sheep. To-day there are less than 100,000 sheep in the State. The large herds to-day are found in the mountain States, and in the last decade every mountain State except Montana and Nevada shows a decrease in the number of sheep, and Nevada is not yet a great sheep-raising State, having to-day considerably less than 1,000,000 sheep.

Under these circumstances who can claim that a tariff on raw wool to be carried into the finished product is of the slightest benefit to the sheep industry of the United States? Under the leadership of William Whitman, of the Arlington Mills, many of the farmers of this country in the States producing sheep have been persuaded that a protective tariff is a benefit to their industry and for that reason they have been following Republican leaders.

It is contended that during the free-wool period there was a falling off in the number of sheep in the United States. The falling off in those years was not greater than in the years which have followed. During the years the Wilson bill was in operation there was a falling off in the supply of sheep in Australia. If free wool here injured the sheep industry and brought about a decrease in the number of sheep in this country, Australia, our competitor in the wool markets at that time, ought to have profited by it. In Australia they had a hundred million sheep in 1894. In 1897 the number of sheep in Australia had decreased to 82,000,000 and in 1898 there were only 79,000,000 and in 1899 only 72,000,000. By 1900 the number of sheep in Australia had decreased until there were only 70,000,000 in the country. In the face of such facts as these every argument in favor of high-taxed woolen clothing in order to enable the sheep industry to thrive falls to the ground. The sheep industry in this country will thrive when wool becomes a by-product, and when that happens in the system of animal husbandry, which is being forced upon us by changing agricultural conditions, we will have more mutton and we will have more wool.

For years, ever since 1867, the wool schedule of the tariff bill has been the very keystone of the arch of protection and was so recognized by Republican tariff makers, and they have maintained it through the machinations of William Whitman and the Arlington Mills almost intact from 1867 to the present time, upon the theory that they were protecting the sheep growers of the country.

They have carried the tax upon raw wool into the manufactured product, and every man, woman, and child who wears woolen goods in this country has paid more for them on account of this alliance between the woolen manufacturers of the East and the woolgrowers of the West.

If it was maintained for the purpose of helping the sheep industry in this country, how does it happen at the present time that there are many million less sheep in the country than there were 10 years ago? How does it happen that in the old way, the way that has prevailed in the world from the time shepherds watched their flocks by night, that the plow has driven out the sheep? There was a time when New York was a great sheep-raising State. That time has passed. There was a time when Ohio was one of the greatest sheep-raising States. That period has passed, too, because the decrease in the number of sheep in Ohio is just as great proportionately as it used to be in the older States where they tried to raise sheep.

The only States in this country where there has been an increase in the herds in the last year, or even in the last four or five years, have been Nevada and Montana and perhaps some slight increase in Utah.

Sheep are being raised now, as they always have been, as they always will be, in a highly cultivated country, upon the lands that can not be cultivated. As we decrease the area of the sheep pastures by diversified farming, by resorting to irrigation, by increasing the size and number of our farms, we drive the sheep toward the mountain States until to-day we find them on the mountain slopes of the West.

Why continue in this country this unholy alliance which taxes the people more for their woolen clothing, taxes the people more for their woolen blankets, in order to maintain an industry which decreases as the plow drives it out and which will always disappear as agriculture approaches? Is it maintained for the purpose of enabling the wool producers to sell their raw wool in a high market in order to enable them to obtain more for raw wool than they otherwise could obtain? Why, Boston is often the cheapest wool market in all the world, and at the present time there is hardly any appreciable difference in the price of wool in Boston and abroad.

They talk about the number of sheep decreasing in this country during the free-wool period of the Wilson bill; but they decreased no more rapidly then than they have since. If the number of sheep decreased on account of the Wilson bill, then Australia, our competitor in the world's market, ought to have profited by it, but during these years, when the number of sheep were decreasing in the United States, the number of sheep were decreasing also in Australia. Therefore there is no reason for a tariff on raw wool except the reason given by the prominent exponents of the protective-tariff policy—that it is the very keystone in the arch of protection.

We recognize that it is, and with all the force of a mighty party, with all the impact made possible by 20 years or more of waiting, we have kicked the keystone from the arch, and the arch is already commencing to crumble. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We are making the kind of revision we ought to make, the kind of revision the people of this country expect us to make.

This is not a free trade bill, but it will fail of its purpose if it does not bring about a freer and an easier exchange between the products of this country and the products of other countries.

Great natural barriers, rivers and lakes, oceans and mountain ranges, will continue through the centuries to separate nations as they do now. Within their own certain defined boundaries nations will continue to exist and develop each for itself its own ideas and ideals, its own theories of government, its own industries. But with the advent of new methods of transportation and communication over seas and under rivers and mountain ranges may we not express the opinion that these natural barriers still separating nations are not as formidable as they were even a decade ago? And as the nations of the world get closer and ever closer together, as mountains and seas and rivers lose their importance as agencies which separate nations, may we not hope that the time is coming—is almost here—when the artificial tariff barriers nations build against each other will prove to be less formidable than they have been in the past? May we not hope that the time is near when sugar cane will be produced in the Tropics and when the dwellers in tropical lands will trade it to us for the products of our colder North? May we not hope that the time is coming when the finer laces and the finer cotton fabrics will be produced in Ireland and England and France, where climatic conditions make possible their cheaper production, and may we not expect to trade for these goods the stronger, more durable fabrics which we can produce here cheaper and better than they can ever hope to do?

We have developed here in a little over a century a great Nation, and the rapid development which has startled the world has been possible because of the fact that each section of our country has been producing what it was best adapted to produce, and across State lines, without any tariff obstructions, each section has been and is exchanging the products which it can best produce for the products which other sections of our common country can best produce. We have developed rapidly and quickly and well because trade routes have been free across rivers, lakes, and mountain ranges.

Nations will continue to exist within their natural boundaries, separated also by traditions and religions and prejudices, but may we not hope that with the establishment of peace tribunals, with the improved and quicker methods of communication, there will come a time—perhaps not so far off now as many think—when the commercial nations of the world will build fewer great fortresses along their boundaries, will no longer exhaust the productive energies of their citizens in expensive preparations for war and carnage upon land and sea, but will prepare to contend, each against the other, in the great trade markets of the world unhindered by towering tariff walls? May we not hope that a time is coming when each section and nation, unaffected and unhampered by unnatural trade conditions and restrictions, may be permitted to produce what it is best adapted to produce and may be permitted to trade its products for the products of other sections and nations? Men and nations do not work and produce best when protected, restricted, or stimulated; they grow strong and self-reliant and accomplish great results when they are free. Is it not peculiarly appropriate that we, the greatest of the nations, should take the first long step in this direction?

Oh, East is East and West is West, and never the two shall meet
Till earth and sky stand presently at God's great judgment seat;
But there is neither East nor West, border, nor breed, nor birth,
When two strong men stand face to face, tho' they come from the ends of the earth.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY].

[Mr. HARDY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] desire to use some of his time?

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the resources of our country are so numerous and so varied as to surpass those of any other nation. The boundless expanse of our prairies with their marvelous fertility of soil; the vast deposits of ore and coal so abundantly provided; the cascades and waterfalls which furnish so cheap and abundant a power to supplement that derived from coal; the noble rivers which constitute natural arteries of commerce; a varying climate, which is adapted to the production of the fruit and vegetation of nearly every clime—in these and many other respects too numerous to mention, nature has given facilities for the accumulation of national wealth and the advancement of individual prosperity which are unrivaled in the broad world and which no other people can hope to acquire.

But a nation can have and keep no more than it produces or brings into form which is useful to man. Axiomatic as this statement is in its truth, simple as it is in expression, clear as it is in thought, it has not always been regarded, but all attempts to ignore it have met with disaster. Unfortunately for us to-day the experiences of the past do not prevent new teachers arising, with promises which never have been and never can be fulfilled, but which are so seductive and alluring as to beguile the restless and entrap the unwary. Vast as these resources are, if undeveloped they remain but curiosities which attract the gaze of the idle. The blessings of the Almighty will have been conferred upon us in vain if we ourselves turn to other climes and other races for the creation of all those innumerable things which supply our wants and for which nature has furnished us with the material in such abundance. Great as is the loss which we would sustain by discarding or neglecting these inestimable benefits, the injury is small compared to that which we would suffer if those priceless possessions, the brains and hands of the American people, were left inactive and idle. A freedom such as ours leaves untrammeled for the highest usefulness both thought and labor, and only the want of opportunity for their use can prevent the development of the keenest brain and most productive hand. Opportunity being wanting the qualifications become as nothing, and the wealth and comfort that might have been produced for each other are never created. But it is not sufficient to give the laborer an opportunity to work. This is much, for the day has been under policies similar to those brought forward by the bill before us when he was denied even that privilege. So, too, will those days come again when this bill becomes a law. The opportunity to be offered him must be one that brings him a reasonable degree of comfort for himself and family, in short a living wage, which can only be obtained for him by creating and maintaining conditions which will permit its payment.

There are different theories as to how these great economic questions should be determined. I do not here intend to analyze them. Systems avail but little as against results.

The Republican Party presents to the Nation to justify the protective principles which it has advocated a balance sheet showing the profit which has resulted from their application. With each succeeding decade in which our party has been in power wage standards have advanced, the comforts of life have been more widely distributed, the wealth of the Nation has increased until we reached a condition of prosperity beyond the hope or dreams of years not far away.

Under its wise guidance we have developed our manufactures, agriculture, and mines until the wants of 95,000,000 people are nearly all supplied by an exchange of native commodities created from native resources. In 1910 our factories added $9,000,000,000 in value to the material which they used. Our farmers created nearly as much. Our forests yielded lumber to the amount of $684,000,000, and our fisheries supplied $54,000,000. From agriculture and manufacturing alone there was a grand total of $20,000,000,000, the product of American soil and American hands. This vast sum staggers calculation and baffles the most acute mind in estimating the extent to which we have availed ourselves of the resources of our land, but as a result more than one-third of the wealth, daily accumulated by the whole world, is acquired by the United States, and more farms and more homes are owned by our workingmen than all the laborers of the rest of the world combined.

Permit me here to digress a little. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], in his speech last week, told us that American saws were sold all over the world as the best in their line that could be produced. This may be true, but if true, how has it been brought about? The answer is that this

condition could never have existed had not this industry been built up, sheltered, and fostered through years of trial by a protective tariff. The very statement that the gentleman makes is in itself a tribute to one of the many and magnificient triumphs of the protective policy and the economic genius of the Republican Party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But all these splendid achievements count for nothing with the Democratic majority of this House; and by the pending bill they submit a proposition to close to a large extent our factories, to stop the development of our natural resources, and invite the world to share on favorable terms the profit and resulting wealth of the greatest and best market in the world—the market of the United States. The distinguished gentleman from Alabama has said that this bill will inaugurate a new fiscal policy. Its policy is widely different from that now prevailing, but it is not new. It is the same old plan in worse form and carried to greater extent, and it will bring the same or worse results than heretofore. It is not merely a tariff-for-revenue measure, but such of its provisions as may properly be called protective are generally so imposed as to be injurious rather than beneficial.

It is admittedly drawn for the purpose not of increasing the development of our native resources but of increasing the use of foreign products. The extent to which this would be carried and our manufactures thereby displaced, they undertake to tell us in the tables presented with the report on the bill. But our Democratic friends are singularly unfortunate in the selection of their statisticians. Two years ago when they presented the wool bill, with a 20 per cent duty on wool, they then estimated that under it the increase of importations of wool would be over $40,000,000 and of manufactured goods over $19,000,000. When it was expected that the rate in the present bill would be 15 per cent on wool they got out a handbook estimating that the additional importations of wool would be $27,000,000. Now, proposing to take the duty off of wool entirely, they estimate in these tables no increase whatever in its importation and only a slight increase in manufactured goods upon which they have made great reductions. Such statistics are worthless, and it would be idle to total them, but it is safe to say that an enormous increase in importations will take place upon the enactment of the bill. Under the Wilson bill of unhappy memory and Democratic rule, the balance of trade theretofore existing in our favor as against foreign countries was reversed and our gold supply drained to pay the debts incurred by purchases of foreign goods. The stimulus since given manufacturing by protection has so developed them that we now have a balance in our favor of $500,000,000 annually. Large as our balance now is, I have no hesitation in saying that this bill is so drawn that when in full operation it will disappear, and foreign creditors to whom we owe millions in interest will call for our gold in payment. These increased importations must displace American goods of equal value and every day's work put into them deprives an American laborer of his daily wage. When the manufacturer sees his market slipping from him and the laborer loses his job; when, in order to retain any considerable portion of our trade the wages of our workingmen must be decreased, their standards of living lowered, and their purchasing power reduced, the same blight that spread over our industries under the Wilson bill will again paralyze business.

A discussion may fairly arise as to whether a tariff should be levied for revenue only, or for revenue when needed and also for protective purposes; both rules can not be right, and in this illogical bill neither is adhered to. There was a time when what is called the principle of free raw material was good Democratic doctrine. It may be now in spots, but it has been little regarded in making up this bill. It is said that if the manufacturer gets his raw material free, he can compete in the markets of the world; but this is true only when his costs and wages are reduced to the lowest world prices.

Notwithstanding there is some protection in this bill, it is not necessary to state that in making it up the question was not considered as to whether the duty imposed on imported goods would equal the difference in cost between that at home and abroad. No one pretends that any examination as to wages was made or that any duty was based on the difference in wages or any other costs which are higher here than in foreign countries. The Democratic report accompanying the bill itself states, in large type, that the "cost of production theory" is "rejected." In one sense this was a superfluous statement. But few of us expected our Democratic friends to be so candid. At last they confess to the owners of factories that in framing this bill they cared nothing about his manufacturing costs, and to the wage earner that they did not consider his compensation.

It is somewhat of a surprise to have the members of a party which has always professed to be so friendly to the workingman now not merely admit, but boldly assert, that in fixing a tariff rate they were wholly indifferent to his wages, and that they would not take them into consideration. I know, of course, that some fine-spun theories are given as a reason for making this declaration; but the workingman will not be much interested in the reasons for the rule as in its application. The stern logic of its consequences in lowering his pay will soon convince him, through resulting poverty, that theories will not buy clothes or fill the dinner pail.

Mr. Chairman, I have not long been a Member of this House, but I have been here long enough to see our Democratic friends continually shift their ground until I know not where to find them. Two years ago it was the tariff-for-revenue principle that was to be adopted, next the new competitive-duty theory was advanced, and now we are told that all figures as to the cost of production are to be cast to the winds in making up a tariff. As the last theory is the newest, I wish to briefly pay my respects to this astonishing declaration.

Some critical gentlemen upon our side have complained of the lack of hearings or of their exceeding brevity. But why have hearings at all when costs are immaterial? For what purpose were such hearings as did take place? They were not needed under this new theory. Is it possible that they were held simply for the purpose of attempting to satisfy the producer with mere form while denying him the substance? Some other gentlemen, still more critical, have suggested that at a previous session, by a large majority of this House, a statute was enacted providing for a tariff board, and among those who then favored it were the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, leader of the majority, and our honored Speaker, who presides with so much urbanity, ability, and fairness. But why have a tariff board? A tariff board is primarily established for the purpose of ascertaining costs; and what have costs to do with the question, anyway? The new gospel answers "Nothing."

The Republican Party has committed itself irrevocably to the principle that a commission should be appointed to ascertain the cost of manufacture at home and abroad, and that when these costs are so ascertained our platform declares that the difference between them will measure the tariff rate which should be applied. If there ever was a day when the manufacturer was permitted to determine the rates for and by himself, that day is past and gone. If there ever was a day when the only question to be determined in fixing a particular rate was whether it was sure to be high enough to practically exclude all importations and competition, that day is also past and gone. I believe that I voice the sentiments of the Republican Party to-day when I say that the rates should neither be so low as to abandon to the foreigner our own market—the finest market of the world—nor so high that the unscrupulous may have an opportunity to take advantage of it to monopolize any branch of trade or unduly advance the price of any commodity.

The Tariff Board already created, although not with powers as full as we could desire, and, unfortunately, discarded by a Democratic House before its work had been carried to anything like the extent we desired, rendered two reports of great value, one of which—that upon wool and manufactures from it—is so full and complete as to be a model in its way and to be acknowledged as a world-wide authority. But this report presented facts conflicting with Democratic theories and Democratic legislation. So, although our Democratic friends had joined in the creation of this board, no sooner had this report been produced than they became vociferous for the abolishment of it. To avoid the inevitable conclusions from the facts presented in it they were obliged to invent the new theory that the costs of production should be rejected. We welcome the issue thus presented and invite the earnest consideration of the American people to be given to the bill providing for such a commission, which we have introduced, confident that their sober judgment will be in its favor.

But once reject all consideration of cost of production, how easy it becomes to make a tariff. This explains some of the most singular provisions in this bill. Everyone knows that Congress has been flooded with letters containing protests against provisions in the bill whereby a raw material is made dutiable and the product manufactured therefrom left free of duty, or a partly finished product is given a higher duty than the completed article. "Surely," said the writers, "this is a mistake—a clerical error; it never could have been intended; as soon as the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee have their attention called to it it will be corrected. It is absurd to put a tariff on our raw material and expect us to sell our

product duty free." Vain hope. The most damaging of these provisions were not and will not be corrected. Why? Because any scientific reason can be given therefor? No. Scientifically they are blunders, egregious and monumental. But they were not and will not be corrected, because they were put into this law for political effect.

There has been some talk about the classifications of this bill. The real classification of it depends upon the location in which the article was produced—upon the necessity of pacifying some particular class of voters by leaving to them some shadow of the provisions under which they have heretofore been so prosperous. In other words, its classifications are political and geographical. Witness the effort to retain the farmer's vote by putting a duty on wheat, while at the same time offering the consumer flour duty free—by putting a duty on cattle and leaving meats of all kinds, fresh and cured, absolutely free. True, flour is not free from countries that impose a duty on it when exported, but the Canadian duty was simply imposed in retaliation for ours; and how long after the enactment of this bill will it take Canada, where a duty can be changed by executive order, to get its flour on the free list? When this is done the American miller can only pay the Canadian price for wheat, and the farmer's protection will only exist in theory and not in fact.

With reference to cattle the farmer's situation will be even worse. There is no possible way in which this duty on cattle can be of any benefit to the farmer, for in any event the finished product of his pastures must be offered for sale in a market free of duty. The price of his cattle and hogs, when fattened and sold, will be determined by the price of meats, and meats are to be free. In many ways this duty on cattle is an actual damage to the farmer. Young cattle are relatively his raw material, but if he wishes to replenish his herds from Canada or Mexico, he must pay a duty on his supplies, and sell his finished product in the open market of the world. Thus this bill, as regards cattle, exposes the farmer to competition on meats of the cheap lands and cheap labor of Canada and Argentina, but handicaps him in addition by this duty.

Every product of the fields and forests of Canada is admitted free of duty or at a greatly reduced tariff. Mr. Chairman, I never had been able to understand why the Canadians rejected the reciprocity treaty, when it was such a good bargain for them. I understand it now. They had the political foresight to see that the Democratic Party was coming into power and would give them everything they wanted without asking anything in return. [Applause on the Republican side.]

What excuse can be given for some of the rates in the agricultural schedule? If wheat flour is to be free, why put a duty on rice flour? As the bill puts potatoes on the free list, why should a duty be put upon peanuts? Can anyone suggest a reason, except the latitude where these products are, respectively, raised. Never was so much latitude taken in the preparation of a bill as in the one under consideration, and it is not all geographical as in the instances mentioned. Seriously, Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that the Democratic pilots of the tariff ship have lost their bearings entirely and without helm or rudder, compass or light, are drifting aimlessly on an economic sea—their motto: Any port in a political storm.

It is impossible, in the short time that is allotted to me, to analyze fully even the more important schedules of this bill, but since gentlemen on the other side usually talk in generalities, I wish to call attention to some of its remarkable provisions that I may further justify the position which I have taken.

The metal schedule is treated largely upon the geographical and political lines. Band iron for cotton ties used in the South is to be free. All other band iron and steel is to have a 12 per cent duty. Pig iron made in Alabama—and elsewhere, of course—bears a duty, but steel rails made from it in Pennsylvania and Illinois are free. Perhaps the most peculiar of the political classifications is that which puts smooth wire on the dutiable list, but when it is further developed by being twisted and barbed, to make barbed wire, it is made free, as another bid for the farmer's vote. Is it any wonder that a bill containing such provisions is framed in secret caucus and behind closed doors?

The wool schedule—Schedule K—ought to be revised, and the Republican Party is not only desirous of making this revision, but is ready promptly to perform it. Let it be conceded that the rates on raw wool in the present law do not work out equably. This is corrected in the bill which we will offer. It may as well be admitted that the cloth rates of the present law cover duties which render them too high, especially on the cheap grades of cloth. But this, too, is corrected in the bill which we have offered and will again offer. We know that its presentation at this time is a thankless and a fruitless task. If our votes had been sufficient it would have passed at the last session. If our votes were sufficient it would pass now. We give it to the American people as an evidence of how ready and willing we are to place upon the statute books tariff rates in accordance with the facts found by an impartial board. It would give reasonable protection to the American manufacturer and laborer, while obviating every objection to the present law which could be made by any person who believes in protective principles. At the same time it has been so carefully drawn as to prevent any undue advantage being taken by means of its rates.

When we come to consider how this schedule was framed for the proposed bill, we find it was originally intended by our Democratic friends to put a 15 per cent tariff on wool, and the first edition of their handbook so stated; but for some reason, possibly pressure originating at the White House, in the final draft of the bill wool was made free, and the woolgrower found that the doctrine of free raw materials was to be rigidly applied to him. In the expressive slang of the day the sheep raisers were to become the tariff "goat." Time forbids that I discuss this particular provision, but it has been completely analyzed by others, and I pass to the manufactured articles covered by this schedule.

Fortunately for us now, but unfortunately for the country at the time, we have an experience to guide us in the workings of somewhat similar provisions under the Wilson bill. Not satisfied with the provisions of the Wilson bill, however, and seemingly fearing that something connected with the woolen industry might escape destruction, the framers of this bill have reduced the rates far below the havoc-creating provisions of that destructive statute. Scarcely anything has escaped from the beginning to the end of the bill. But stay! I had almost forgotten. There was the Angora goat to be taken care of; an animal which roams by the thousands in the Southern States pasturing on gulch and brush land worth at least 25 cents an acre. Here protection and protective theories were invoked. Angora wool, tops, yarns and cloth made from goat wool or hair, bear a duty ranging from 20 to 40 per cent ad valorem, and this "infant industry," if I may use that term so much derided, is most comfortably protected and preserved.

Let us for a moment compare the duties on cloth in this bill with those of the Wilson bill. Both this and the Wilson bill make wool of the sheep free of duty, but this bill puts a duty upon cloth in which the wool content is the chief value at only 35 per cent. The Wilson bill gave a 40 per cent duty on cloth not worth over 50 cents a pound and over that value fixed a duty of 50 per cent. Cloths worth not to exceed 50 cents a pound would not have their chief value of wool unless made of shoddy, which is cheaper even than cotton. Thus the low rates of the Wilson bill were imposed upon a class of goods which under the proposed bill would go mostly in the cotton schedule, and for all practical purposes we can compare the 35 per cent rate of the bill before us with the 50 per cent rate upon cloth of the Wilson bill. Notwithstanding the rates of the Wilson bill were so much higher than this bill, the stagnation of the woolen industry was such under its operation that in one year 7,000,000 pounds of American-grown wool could not be used at home and had to be exported. Is there any reason given why the American manufacturer can better compete now than then? On the contrary he is suffering under additional disadvantages, for since that time his wage scale has increased 35 per cent, and the excess of the cost of his machinery above that abroad has also increased. It takes no prophet to predict how this bill will affect the cloth manufacturers.

The Wilson bill sent our sheep to the slaughterhouse, left wreck and ruin in the woolen industry, and deprived men of employment in the mills by thousands. I can now but admire the daring with which the Democratic majority now flings through this schedule its defiance to both capital and labor, but I humbly yet firmly condemn their judgment.

The cotton schedule is too important to pass without special notice. The rates of the present law are unnecessarily high—so high that, in my judgment, they might be safely reduced an average of one-third, if averages supplied the proper method of making reductions, as they do not, although often used in framing this bill. The report of the Tariff Board shows that so far the American people have not suffered by reason of these rates; but that, on the contrary, by reason of a depressed condition of the trade, cotton manufactures have often been sold by the mills below cost. Competition has ever been strong in cotton goods, and no trust or combine has ever fixed the mill prices. This, of course, does not show that the rates ought not to be revised, and we are willing and ready to revise them if a reasonable time is given, and the rates should accord with the report of the Tariff Board in respect to this schedule as elsewhere. We ask again that they consider the report on

the cotton schedule, as we have asked heretofore. The action of their secret caucuses gives us little hope or expectation that this will be granted, but the refusal makes an issue between us and them upon which we are quite willing to go to the country at large.

The details of this schedule are so numerous as to prevent in my limited time anything like a complete view. Here the rates in this bill are, as elsewhere, upon an ad valorem basis, with a new classification not heretofore attempted. Cotton is a commodity which varies so much in price, having fluctuated from 9 to 16 cents a pound, that any application of ad valorem rates to materials composed of it must result in extreme fluctuations in the duty, in many instances doubling the amount of it and in many cutting it in two. But it is unnecessary for me to dwell upon the advantages of having a specific rate in the cotton schedule, and I pass to the consideration of other items.

When we examine the provisions of this schedule we find that it also is framed upon geographic lines. The report of the Tariff Board shows that the low grades of cloth manufactured in the South need no protection, or at least only a nominal one. They are well taken care of in this bill. The same is true with reference to yarns. The higher grades of cloth manufactured in the North in many lines now largely imported are inadequately protected. No attention is paid to costs in the varied and numerous processes which are applied to the cloth in finishing it or in special processes of weaving.

All of these processes, whether those in which the American cost is no larger than the European or whether the most complicated and intricate weaves of the Dobby or Jacquard looms, in which the American cost of production is more than double that of the European, "with one fell swoop" are thrown into hotchpotch, and whether one of the simplest is applied or many of the most intricate, all are covered by an advance in the duty above the rate on the plain cloths in the gray of 2½ per cent. Mr. Chairman, such a method of tariff rate making is not simply a blunder; it is an economic crime. In law gross negligence that results in the destruction of human life is called manslaughter. The provisions to which I have referred ought to be called trade slaughter.

It is said that this bill will make goods cheaper. I think it will; but when goods become cheap labor becomes cheap, and if the housekeeper buys cheaply the farmer must sell cheaply. Never can our opponents, by any method, make purchases cheap and sales dear. They will bring about fewer sales and fewer purchases. There will be less work. Less work means not only more idle men but lower wages, and the more men that become idle, the poorer they will become individually, and the poorer the Nation will become.

What country is there among the great nations of the world that uses the system, so far as there is a system, upon which this bill is prepared? England and England alone.

One person in ten among the laboring classes in England is a pauper, and one out of five must at some time in his life receive assistance from the poor rates. So clear and so plain is it that its workingmen can never expect to lay up anything for their advancing years, that the principle of old-age pensions has been forced upon its Parliament and enacted into a law. And this is England. The land of free raw material, where the manufacturer gets everything that he uses duty free. I know that the sun never sets on its world-encircling territory. I know that by the exercise of this system it has reached out and gathered unto itself the markets of the world, but I know, too, what a fearful price she has paid for it. I know—and you know—that for the workingman in England the star of hope never rises; that the dark shadow of want never lifts from his habitation; and the gaunt wolf of hunger ever threatens at his door.

We of the Republican Party seek for the farmer and the laborer some other prospect besides the benefit of a cheap coat and a bare subsistence. We want the farmers' products to bring in a fair return for his toil and investment. We insist that the workingman's wages must be governed by his work and his worth and not by that which will merely enable him to exist. We wish to put hope in his breast and ambition in his mind through a fair compensation for his work, which will open up to him a brighter and a better future, bring him comfort and independence, and, most important of all, shall give him the opportunity to exercise the highest and best citizenship. For the promotion of these much-desired objects we shall look to the proposed bill in vain. The workingman has asked for bread, and he will find that he has been given a stone. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] is recognized.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, this measure was agreed on in a Democratic caucus and will be passed in the House without alteration. A discussion here is of no effect, but only a method by which the views of Members may reach the country through the medium of the RECORD, as the caucus consideration of the bill was not published. The real debate and legislation was in the caucus. I shall not discuss the schedules. Their favorable consideration by the committee and the caucus is an assurance of the wisdom of the bill as a whole and that as a policy it responds in the main to the established principles of the Democratic Party.

It is true that the measure is, and of necessity must be, crude in some respects. It may be that exact equality in the distribution of the burdens of taxation is not fully observed in some instances in the bill. It is possible that in view of the conditions heretofore existing in our revenue system the reductions in tariff duties are in some cases too great. I shall briefly discuss some of the underlying principles of taxation upon which the measure rests. We can not hope to have after half a century of protective tariff a measure enacted for the purpose of revenue only, perfect in its details, nor in strict accordance with the accepted principles of the party in power that formulates it. Governments have always used the taxing power to enforce the theory upon which they are established or administered by its dominant political force. Imperial or autocratic governments use this power to strengthen their influence and control over the subjects of their dominion by accustoming them to the continued concentration of authority in a select or ruling class which is made subordinate in some measure to the dictator or imperial head. Taxation in such governments is directed to this end. The support of royalty is the chief purpose. In every modified or constitutional monarchy the same power in a less definite method is exercised—but with none the less effect—to uphold the ruling classes and confer on them benefits that do not come to the masses of the people who pay the taxes. Such views are, of course, obnoxious to self-respecting freemen. The right to assess and collect taxes is the vital power of all governments. They can not exist without it. Upon the proper exercise of this power depends, more than upon any other function of government, the liberty, the prosperity, and the happiness of the people.

In a Republic the taxing power is presumed to be exercised in obedience to the Constitution for the promotion of the welfare, not of the few or ruling class but of the great masses of the whole people, upon the theory that government is inaugurated for the protection of the people and that its powers should be exercised to that end. But there may be such a serious perversion of the taxing power, even in a Republic like ours, as to endanger its perpetuity by the pursuit of theories that in their ultimate effect establish a ruling class based on wealth secured under the forms of law which give distinct advantage and power to the classes and enable them to obtain dominion over the majority of the people. This results from the fact that the party dominant in the affairs of government—without violating the Constitution in the exercise of its legislative discretion, of which discretion no other power has control—may so lay the burdens of taxaton as to benefit the few and jeopardize the rights of the many. When our Constitution was formed the intense spirit of patriotism which bore to a successful conclusion the greatest of all political revolutions was chilled in its ardor by internal strife and dissension and disagreement among the Colonies in the formation of the American Republic. The spirit of 1776 was not breathed into the Constitution, nor yet was the rule of monarchy tolerated by its expressed terms. The Constitution in its essential features was a compromise between the principles of free government and limited monarchy. Its federalism was too intense to secure the blessings of freedom, and the Republic could not have survived but for the amendments to the Constitution, in which all of the most sacred guaranties to the American citizen are contained. There were two great parties contending for supremacy at the beginning. One, rapidly forming from the remnant of toryism, wheeled into line for political action on the fall of monarchy, restoring as best it could under the Constitution conditions, theories, and policies of the mother country. It assumed the control of the new Republic as a conservative force between modern monarchy in governmental practices and a progressive Republic. It proposed a system of Federal taxation for the protection of certain defined interests by the exercise of that power in their favor, and therefore to the disfavor of the balance of mankind. This was the Federalist Party. It sought in restricted form the exemplification of the

doctrine of monarchy. It was the old and not the new idea of things that it upheld.

But when the spirit of revolutionary freedom again asserted itself the Federal Party in the United States was shattered on the rock of the alien and sedition laws, and its great and powerful antagonist, the Democratic Party—or as it was then called the Republican Party—resting its faith on the doctrine of equality and justice among men, succeeded to the control of the affairs of the Union. It was this party that made the amendments to the organic law that enabled the Union for the first time to be properly called a Republic among the nations of the earth. The successor to the Federal Party was the Whig Party, a great and in many respects a wise political organization, but, unfortunately, inheriting from the Federal Party its theory of taxation. Thus the struggle continued as to whether the powers of our Government should be used to promote the welfare of a select and powerful class seeking the domination of national affairs, or whether that power should rest with and secure blessings for the masses of the people. This great party, too, fell in the struggle against the rule of the people, and the latter-day Republican Party arose upon its ruins to press for the half of a century—by reasons of unfortunate conditions which held it in power—the rule of the classes against the people, exercising the powers of taxation to strengthen its political forces by a system that protected the American manufacturer against competition in trade and forcing the consumers—the people—to submit to the dictation of trusts, combinations, and monopolies which it created and fostered under its tariff laws. The Democratic Party, under every condition of adversity—which I need not now recount—has presented as the cardinal principle of its faith equality, uniformity, and justice in taxation. It has advanced this theory as the corollary of its principles, and triumphing in the great national contest in 1912 in every branch of the Government, it now proposes to destroy the Republican policy of inequality and injustice to the masses and afford some protection to the common people against the rapacity and greed of the enemies of popular government. How shall it be done? How can it be done? Examine the policies and the effect on the people of the enforcement of the systems of taxation of the respective parties and determine which is conducive to the popular good and which is destructive to the popular welfare.

The Constitution vests in Congress the power to assess and collect taxes and duties upon imports, in the manner therein indicated, for the support of the Government. Thus the constitutional authority to deal with the great question of taxation rests with Congress. The Republican Party, following the precepts of Federalism and Whiggery, have announced and enforced the principle that taxes are not to be imposed upon the people merely for the purpose of supporting government, but, as shown in the very title of their tax bills, to encourage manufacturers and American industries. The encouragement of manufacturers and American industries in all branches of trade in a legitimate way is altogether wise, but how did they propose to encourage? By the enactment of laws which gave protection to the American manufacturer in trade and commerce against competition from abroad. In other words, they fixed the tax upon imports so high as to prohibit importation in certain particular lines of articles from foreign countries, and thereby gave directly to the people engaged in those lines of manufacture in the United States the exclusive market. It was said that this exclusive market was in the interest of the American people because it gave employment to labor and furnished a market for the products of the farmer. But a long experience with this system has demonstrated the fact that while those engaged in the manufacture have reaped vast wealth from the policy the laborer has not yet obtained any benefits other than the pittance of a living, and that the farmer has obtained no benefits because the system has given him no advantage which he would not otherwise have had. But this view of the system has been in a measure abandoned, as well as the theory that the foreigner paid the tax, as it is well known that only the consumer pays the tax; that the importer, if an article is brought into the United States, pays the cost of carriage, the tariff tax, and adds both to the cost of the article, together with his profits, and profits are sometimes added two or three times by reason of the fact that the article passes from the importer to the wholesaler, the jobber, and the retailer, each of whom takes a profit from the consumer, the people, and all of which is involved in the last price charged to the consumer.

But the baleful effects of the system do not end there. Competition is destroyed in most articles by reason of the high tariff and the American people do not get the benefit of the foreign production, but they must take alone the American production under a system that enables the American producers to take unto themselves such profits as they desire and choose to exact. In those instances where there is no importation, of course, there is no revenue and the Treasury of the Federal Government gets no benefit, because of high duties prohibiting imports. Thus it is that the power of the Government is exercised, in the instances where it is desired to give special benefits to certain classes, to divert the revenue from the Government by this indirect system into the coffers of the favored class. And how does this happen? It is because the protection thus afforded against competition enables the home producer to have a successful monopolistic market and to charge for his productions just such prices as he will. The people are at the mercy of the favored. But it may be said that competition among men engaged in the same line of industry would reduce to a proper minimum the cost of the articles manufactured. The combination between men engaged in the same line, the trusts, upon particular articles, by which a large proportion of the factories are shut down and a large portion of labor excluded from work and profits divided among those in the trust whether producing or not, has made this system of domestic competition an utter impossibility in the commercial affairs of our country. The effect of this legislation, whether intentional or not on the part of the Republican Party, has brought about in the United States, as the natural result of its principles, an untoward condition that is destructive of the supremacy of the masses not only in its application, but in a result that has created untold wealth, carrying with it the power to control the affairs of Government. You may ask me whether the Democratic position is more consonant with the principles of free institutions and more in the interest of the masses of the people than the policy of the Republican Party.

The answer is that the Democratic doctrine can not be and is not in itself a perfect system, and none can be, because of the conditions in a country like this, diversified in its interests and extensive area; but the principle upon which the doctrine rests is sound, and the application of the doctrine will in its effect give more benefit to the vast majority of the people than any other known system of Federal taxation. It rests upon the theory that the greatest good must come to the greatest number, and that, if exact equality and uniformity and justice can not be secured in the assessment and collection and disbursement of taxes, the nearest approach possible shall be made to it, and therefore it presents certain fundamental principles of taxation which we believe are conducive to the welfare of the people. First, the Democracy says that the Government shall not exact from the people in any form more taxes, more of their substance for the support of the Government, than is necessary to administer the affairs of the Government economically. Is not this a sound principle? Should the people be made to pay more to support their Government than is needed to support it economically? Is not any other theory unjust to the people? Is not any other doctrine oppressive to the people? Next in the application of this doctrine to raise revenue for the support of the Government it insists that the burden of taxation shall be laid with equality and justice. How is this to be accomplished? Can there be such a thing as exact equality and exact justice in the application of a principle of taxation to a thousand varied articles produced under varied conditions over a vast area of a common country? It must be answered that exact equality and exact justice in all instances is an impossibility by reason of these conditions. Then, what principle shall we adopt to obtain this recognized right of equal distribution of burdens of taxation and equal benefits to arise from the system?

It is evident that we must resort to a policy that will bring about this result as nearly as possible, and while it can not be brought to mathematical certainty it can be obtained for the great and overwhelming masses of the people by the enforcement of the doctrine that the least of the burdens of taxation, the smallest tax, shall be imposed upon those articles that are the necessities of life to the end that the necessities of life may come to the great masses of the people as cheaply as possible and the cost of living reduced to the minimum; again, that the burdens of taxation shall rest most heavily on the luxuries of life. Why, it may be asked, should the burdens rest more heavily upon the luxuries of life? It is because the principle of equality can not be fully obtained under a tax system different from this policy. The few enjoy the luxuries of life not necessary to their existence; they have the means of obtaining them. They are possessed of wealth and immense power, and the Government protects that wealth, and therefore they should bear the burden of taxation in proportion to the great benefits the Government gives to them in the protection of their interests. To me this seems a logical and sound conclusion. To me it seems the necessary result of those principles of government which

the Democracy professes, principles that recognize the superiority of no class and no distinction in American citizenship, but equality under the Constitution and equal rights and opportunities for all affected by taxation resting on the means of individuals and not on individuals themselves so far as possible. It is inconceivable that so many of our people should have adhered to the doctrine of protection. Of course the 200,000 men who have been the protected beneficiaries of the system are to be expected from selfish motives to adhere to it.

But how those of the vast laboring classes of this country and the farming interests of this country, which have not received and can not receive ultimately any benefits from such a system, particularly under the industrial conditions which maintain in the United States, support such a doctrine is beyond our conception. It is said that there are 15,000,000 of American citizens—ordinary laborers—who are engaged by the 200,000 men at the head of the great industrial and protected system of the Union. It is said that some 3,000 articles fall under the dominion of this power. Let us assume as true that which is clearly false, that these 15,000,000 of American workmen have obtained special benefits in connection with their superiors under whom they are working under the protective or noncompetitive system of trade in the United States, under the monopolistic system of trade, under the trusts and combinations, then put to them the question, Is it right that you should receive these benefits as against the 80,000,000 of people who are engaged in other pursuits and do not receive them? Is it not safer for you; is it not better for you that laws that maintain equality and justice should prevail rather than those that grant special favor to you? How can any logical mind reach the conclusion that in the establishment of justice 80,000,000 of people must pay tribute to 15,000,000? The American people have evidently reached the conclusion that the conditions under which they are living were not the best for them; that it was not a good thing to maintain a system of government that would make a few multimillionaires and secure no blessings to the balance of mankind. They have evidently reached the conclusion that the world has very much wealth in it and that that wealth is the product of labor, and that if a system is devised and administered under the forms of law which enables a few men to sequester that wealth, hoard it, handle it, and control it in their own names and for their own selfish purposes that the balance of the people must of necessity be injured to the extent of the sequestration.

The Democratic Party is going to remedy these conditions. It can be and will be done, in part, by the pending bill. But let us not be mistaken. All the trusts in the United States and all the combinations in restraint of trade and in opposition to the supremacy of the people do not come on account of a protective-tariff system, although that system was the mother and for years the protecting hand that guided the great trusts. There are other combinations; there are other monopolies; there are other trusts than those that arise under the tariff system. They have come by reason of the fact of private legislation in their own interest and of natural monopolies under which they are controlled. These can not be reached except through the process of the criminal law. The power of taxation can not be successfully invoked for their suppression. It can be and is invoked in the shape of an income tax in this bill to force them to a just contribution to the support of the Government. The mission of the Democratic Party is not accomplished with the passage of tariff bills according to its theories of government nor indeed would it by the passage of laws that would effectually destroy trusts and monopolies. The accomplishment of these ends would only tend to bring our country to the condition which it should have, and under a proper administration of law and obedience to the principles of our Constitution would have, had and enjoyed for the last half of a century. These enactments will operate to the expansion of our trade, to the reduction of the cost of living at home, and the rehabilitation of the merchant marine which has been destroyed under the protective system and under the registry laws of the Government. But far beyond these economic questions the development of the principles of free government under the Constitution is the mission of the Democratic Party. There can be no inertia in government—inactivity means dissolution and death. The conditions which we now seek to remedy perhaps would not have existed if the people had had full control of their Government. Why is it that a situation in the economic administration of our affairs could exist such as that we have described? How is it that the powers and functions of government can be taken and perverted from the public interest to private interest?

Why is it that legitimate legislation in the interest of the people can be checked and legislation ever enacted in the interest of the classes seeking dominion and legislative, judicial, and executive control of the Government under the power of wealth? It is largely because that under our Constitution the Government is too far removed from the people. Under such a system equal or better opportunity exists for a select class than the people to rule. The Federal Government must be brought closer to the people and the people to the Federal Government if liberty and justice are to be preserved. Our people look upon the Federal institutions in a measure as foreign, and, in many places, even inimical to their welfare. This would not be true if the people had full participation in the affairs of government. So long as their duties toward the Government apparently are so meager their slight participation in its affairs does not produce a profound interest, and just so long the opportunities of those who have designs to accomplish through the instrumentalities of government may be successful. In the States, where the people elect all of their officers at the ballot box, the rights of the citizens are jealously guarded, but in the affairs of the United States that profound interest which the people take in their State affairs is not manifest. If you will give to the citizen the right to cast his vote directly for President, as has recently been done for Senators; if you will give him the right to vote for his district attorneys, for the Federal judges, who must determine questions of property rights and often of life and liberty, in which he is concerned; if you will give him the right to vote for the marshals to execute the Federal processes, for the collectors who gather the Federal revenues, and for the postmaster at the office of his residence, you will give to him an interest in Federal affairs that will make him the guardian of Federal liberty and rights.

Who can call this a Republic save in name, when of all the vast thousands of offices that are necessary to administer its affairs only the Representatives in Congress and now Senators are elected by a direct vote of the people at the ballot box? Let us trust that there is no way to impede the march of Democratic thought and sentiment. Let us trust that the day is not far distant when this Government shall be in fact as it is in theory under the direct control and dominion of the masses of the people; when conditions shall be such that the mere discretion of men in office shall dominate no longer but the law shall be dictator. Let us maintain a government of law and not of men.

While we guard sacredly the rights of the States, let us not neglect the development of the constitutional powers of the Federal Government for the promotion of the welfare of the people. Our authority in actual exercise now reaches far beyond the seas. Our influence is felt among all the nations. Our foreign relations are ever enlarging. Our national duties and obligations are increasing, and we may yet be forced to the conclusion that for the peaceful solution of great international questions it may be wise for the States to grant the Union further constitutional sovereign power. The future may bring perplexing issues on account of the exercise of sovereignty by 48 different States over one and the same subject in an essentially different way, while the central Government is powerless on the same question to meet just domestic or international demands. But these are questions for the future, and it is not now and it will not be safe for the States to concede any more of their sovereignty to the United States until our Constitution is amended and revised so as to force the Government under all conditions to respond promptly and effectively to the demand of the will of the majority of the people.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] is recognized.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, the average American citizen requires no expert knowledge of the tariff question to perceive the fundamental errors which are misguiding the hands of the Democratic tariff tinkerers. I grant it is not malice which prompts the ruthless shaking of the legal foundation upon which American industries have been built; it is innocence, rather, the innocence of the child playing in close proximity of a red-hot stove.

As a party our Democratic friends still permit the cotton grower's hand to write their tariff bills and his mind to dictate their policies. The cotton grower—and he is but human, as we all are—wants to sell his product at the highest possible prices and to buy all his necessaries at the lowest possible prices. As he has to fear no outside competition with his own product, he is naturally for either free trade or a revenue tariff, which is free trade in principle. It is free trade because protection as a principle is eliminated, and where it occurs as a part in a revenue tariff it does so only as an incident—in the opinion of the framers of the pending bill even as an unwelcome incident.

And there you are. When we had no manufacturing industries to speak of in this country the interests of the cotton grower were the common interests of all, and at that time free trade was no doubt the right policy; but while a revolutionary change of conditions has occurred, while nearly one-half of the American people now depend upon manufacturing as a livelihood, Democratic policy has remained unchanged. It is barren and unfruitful and does not consider the needs of either the manufacturer or the wageworker but only the interests of the cotton grower and of those who sell noncompetitive products.

From the standpoint of the general welfare this is one of the fundamental errors underlying the Underwood bill. Moreover, our friends have forgotten that under the last Democratic tariff even the cotton grower did not prosper, because the people had no money to buy his product, so that its price went down to 4 cents a pound.

Another fundamental error is the assumption that all American manufacturers have grown rich and fat under Republican tariffs. The fact is that the vast majority of them, owing to fierce competition, have to be content with but small profits, and, indeed, have to do very close figuring to make both ends meet. The great fortunes which have been built up in the United States are not due to the tariff; in fact, have no connection with it, but are the result either of enhanced land values, of valuable patents, or of the exploitation of natural resources. The American manufacturer, who often risks his all and usually has his all invested in his plant, deserves credit for his enterprise rather than the slurs heaped upon him by the free-trade party.

It would be almost criminal, Mr. Chairman, to disturb the prosperous condition of the country by tariff tinkering were it not for the high cost of living. That is generally recognized as the excuse for the attempted legislation. And yet, have our friends on the other side ever investigated just what the articles are that have gone up in price? Permit me to say that, speaking generally, they are not the tariff-protected goods, but the foodstuffs, the products of the farm. It was for this reason that President Taft proposed reciprocity with Canada. In return for proper concessions he aimed to enlarge the supply of our breadstuffs, and so reduce the high cost of living. How furiously that plan was criticized! But what will those same critics say when they read the Underwood bill and find that it will open our gates to Canada without exacting a single concession in return. Right in this connection let me suggest that the country will watch with bated breath the redemption of the Democratic promises to the effect that farmers, under a Democratic tariff, would receive the same high prices for their products as before, while the laboring men of the cities would be enabled to buy the same products much cheaper than before. This will be solving the problem of making both ends of the seesaw go up at the same time. The Republicans pointed out the impossibility of such a feat, but in vain. Enough people followed the "false prophets" to give them a plurality of the votes, because people had forgotten what followed the enactment of the last Democratic tariff bill. My prediction now is that the main effect of this legislation will be to cripple the industries, reduce wages, and throw labor out of employment to such an extent as to seriously decrease the demand for farm products, owing to the inability of the masses of the people to buy them at any price. As a consequence I predict that the farmers will be the first to join the industrial classes in their demand for a restoration of the beneficent policy of protection.

In the kindergarten in which this bill was framed the most important factor seems to have been entirely overlooked, namely, the American standard of wages and the desirability of maintaining it. The United States is a high-wage country; practically all others are low-wage countries. It is not true that we can make up for the advantage which our competitors enjoy on that account by the employment of better machinery and more efficient workmen. If this was true at one time, it is no longer true to-day, for the manufacturers of Europe have not only bought our machines, but improved on them, and as to the efficiency of labor, it is patent that when several generations of the same family work at the same trade, as is the custom in Europe, they must become proficient, and at least the equals of those of us who are engaged in the same line of trade. As a general proposition, I believe it to be absolutely true that the American manufacturer, owing to his intelligence and enterprise, could easily compete with all the world on equal terms, provided he can get his labor as cheaply as his foreign rival, but if it costs him more than his competitor to manufacture his product all his ingenuity will avail him nothing, and he will be unable to compete. Then, the only question to determine is, Does it cost him more? Fortunately there is no lack of authentic information on that point.

It is admitted by all that American wages in nearly all industries are two and three times higher than wages in foreign countries, and it is this difference which it was sought to equalize by the Republican policy of protection. This wise policy placed the home manufacturer on an equal footing with his foreign competitor and at the same time protected the American laboring man in his high standard of living and against the reduction of his wages to the European level. There is no escape from the conclusion that to strike down this protection will have the effect of either putting both the American manufacturer and all his employees out of business or of reducing wages to the foreign level. This is not a theory, but a lesson which under the Wilson-Gorman bill we learned by bitter experience, and as the people had evidently forgotten that lesson, it seems they will have to learn it anew.

It was generally expected that the Democratic Party on assuming power would reduce the tariff. It had pledged itself to that policy, and, besides, everybody knows that, owing to its free-trade heart, it bears a grudge against the very institution of the customhouse. There was a disposition among the people, even among the majority who voted against President Wilson, to give them a chance, in the belief that after 16 years of exile they had learned the lessons of adversity and would be careful and considerate in putting their peculiar theories into practice. But how many votes, do you think, would they have received if the Underwood bill had been before the country previous to the election as a sample of what radical action they proposed to take? How many Members of Congress would they have elected on the issue of granting the foreign manufacturer a direct advantage over the home manufacturer? It is safe to say we would have neither a Democratic President nor a Democratic Congress, for the vast majority of the American people, I believe, are still of the opinion that legislation shall be so shaped as to give the advantage to our home industry, or at least to place both the American and the foreign manufacturer on an equal footing.

Let me show you briefly the effect the Underwood bill will have on the great State of Missouri which I have the honor in part to represent. It seems almost as if my State had been singled out for special punishment by that star chamber board known as the Committee on Ways and Means, and this is the more surprising because one of our Democratic colleagues is a member of the committee. Taking the products of the farm we find first that wool, lumber, corn, meat, hogs, and potatoes are placed on the free list. Our free-trade friends are telling the farmer that Missouri, as an interior State, is too far removed from exporting countries, like Canada, to fear their competition. In other words, that prices in Missouri would not be affected by importations of these articles. The fact is, of course, that such imports, even if they do not reach Missouri, would have a general effect upon prices; but supposing it were not so, how then would free trade in these products reduce the cost of living? On cattle the duty has been fixed at 10 per cent ad valorem and on wheat it has been reduced from 25 to 10 cents a bushel. As to wool, it is generally believed that that industry will be wiped out by the bill, not only in Missouri but everywhere. The sheep raisers of the country will be told, I suppose, what Chairman UNDERWOOD told the sugar growers, namely, to get ready and go into some other business.

While the farmers will be sure to suffer, the mining and manufacturing industries in Missouri are hit still harder. When we Republicans succeeded in securing a duty of 1 cent a pound on zinc in the Payne bill a wave of prosperity at once struck the Joplin district. Now, this duty has been cut in two and as a result it is predicted that the mines will again have to shut down, as it will be impossible for the operators to compete with the Mexican product, at least, as soon as quiet is restored in the neighboring Republic. This is a clear illustration of what I stated before—that in many cases the American producer has been placed at a clear disadvantage as compared with the foreign producer. The reason is, of course, the difference in wages. The same is true in the case of lead and glass and barytes. The people of Jasper and St. Francis Counties, I predict, will long remember the Underwood bill as well as the party responsible for it.

Coming to the manufacturing industries of St. Louis, I judge from the protests which I have received that disaster will befall many of them as a result of the proposed legislation, and I believe I have heard from all of them. Those more seriously affected are boots and shoes, milling, chemicals, cigars, stained glass, bags and bagging, dry plates, and lithographing. Boots and shoes have been placed on the free list, and why? Because it has been stated that our shoe manufacturers have been successfully selling abroad; hence, if they can compete with foreigners in their own markets they can compete with them here. It is true that American shoes are bought abroad, because they

were better shaped and more elegant than the European article, but of late the foreigners have not only secured American machines but also imitated American lasts, and as a result their competition in the American market has become formidable even under the Payne rates, and for the simple reason that the wages paid in the shoe factories of Germany, Denmark, Austria, France, Norway, and Switzerland average less than two-fifths of those paid in the United States. There is not the slightest semblance of privilege or monopoly connected with the shoe trade, and to deliberately place our manufacturers at a disadvantage on account of the difference in wages is a grave injustice. At present shoe manufacturing is one of the most flourishing industries of St. Louis, employing thousands of workingmen. What is to become of it?

Milling, another of St. Louis's great industries, is affected by the provision which places flour on the free list and imposes a duty of 10 cents per bushel on wheat. Here we have a tax on the raw material and free trade for the finished product, which means a premium on the importation of flour from Canada. The same is true of oats. Raw oats carry a duty of 10 cents a bushel while manufactured or rolled oats were placed on the free list. This is too much even for the leading Democratic paper of St. Louis, and it thunders against this "inconsistency" editorially.

Manufacturing of chemicals is one of our most sensitive, because youngest, industries, and was also one most difficult to establish against the monopoly of the Old World, especially Germany. The deep cuts in the schedules will therefore be most keenly felt and probably result in quite a number of compounds not being manufactured here in the future.

The Payne law limits the free importation of cigars from the Philippine Islands to 150,000,000 annually. The Underwood bill removes this limit, so that the American cigar makers are thrown into direct competition with the Filipinos, whose wages, according to the last statistics, are only $96.50 American money annually, or 30 cents per day. And, of course, there is nothing to stop the Tobacco Trust from going to the islands and manufacturing, with the use of the cheap labor there, all the cigars the American market can carry. This is a most serious proposition for the hundreds of small manufacturers in St. Louis and elsewhere, as well as for the men they employ.

A staggering blow which it will not be able to survive is dealt by the new Democratic tariff to the stained-glass window industry, an infant industry in the true sense of the word, its recent establishment in this country being solely due to the protective tariff. We have one such factory in St. Louis whose products, from the standpoint of art, compare favorably with the best European importations. The duty on stained-glass windows is now 45 per cent, which barely equalizes the difference of wages abroad and here, but enabled the establishment of the new art in the United States. The Underwood bill provides in one section for a reduction to 30 per cent and in another that such windows shall be admitted free if donated to churches, and so forth. As church windows are in nearly all cases actual donations, this provision will wipe out the industry, and the only alternative of the manufacturers will be to move their plants to Europe and export their art products made by the cheaper foreign labor to America. If the committee acted with their eyes open, I do not hesitate to say that their action is an outrage which should be resented by the people. In this case the excuse of cost reduction will not count, because there was open and free competition between the manufacturer and the importer, and the latter still had the bulk of the business and, further, because after the industry is struck down the foreigners will raise the price at their own pleasure.

There is another case in which the duty on the raw material and the finished product has been made the same, to the detriment of American manufacturing. I refer to bags or sacks and the material, "plain woven fabrics of single jute yarns," from which they are made. The duty is 25 per cent ad valorem, and its effect will be that a considerable portion of the manufacturing of burlap bags now done in this country will be done abroad. St. Louis has several bag factories which will be affected by the change.

The deep cuts of the rates on window glass, it is asserted by manufacturers, will make it doubtful whether they can continue to operate their plants in this country, even, so they say, if wages were cut in half and all idea of profit abandoned. This change seriously affects Valley Park and southeast Missouri.

St. Louis has several dry-plate factories. Representatives of these and other concerns appeared before the committee and urged an increase of duty from 25 to 40 per cent, as the present rate was not sufficient protection against English plates made by cheaper labor. But the committee heeded the advice of an importer who appeared at the same time, and instead of increasing the rate reduced it to 15 per cent; and so in nearly every instance have American interests been ruthlessly subordinated to foreign interests. Indeed, the title of the bill should be changed to read "A bill to encourage foreign industries at the expense of American labor."

I realize that all protests against this free-trade bill will be lost, like the voice in the desert; but I desire to go on record with these statements to show the contrast between Republican and Democratic policies. No human being is infallible, and no party is, but it is worse than inexcusable and an offense against public welfare for any set of men to put into effect ideas which have proven erroneous and detrimental to the prosperity of the people.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE].

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in the closing hours of the general debate on this proposition I venture we have all been interested in the discussion of the greatest subject that can affect the business of the country. I have been glad to have information from the old Members of this House, drawn from the deep-driven wells of their knowledge, and also the views of the new men. We have been delighted with the hope of the good things to come, from our side, and we have despaired at the prophecies of the gentlemen on the other side. We have declarations that this is to be the best tariff ever written, from our side, and we have heard the statement that it is the most dangerous measure that Congress has ever considered, from the other side.

But in all these observations I was particularly interested in the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], who, out of the wind cave of his retirement, while the black bats and hobgoblins were flying about him, as he saw in the dim light of his surroundings—the retirement of a great party—what was going to happen to him. My friends, his condition demands the commiseration of every man on this floor. He knows what we are going to do to his only legislative baby. We are going to escheat those rights that he sought to invest it with under the Constitution to 90,000,000 of people by the adoption of this bill. And we are going to restore those rights that have so long been installed by class and partisan legislation.

I am surprised particularly at the gentleman who has just concluded his remarks, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN]. The wildness of his observations, the incorrectness of his statements, are surprising, coming from a man who has occupied a seat in Congress for four years—the statement that free raw material was a Democratic doctrine! The Democratic Party in national convention has never expressed itself on the question of free raw material unless it was on a single item, and that one once. Why, the reason is clear. It was because we believe in a tariff for revenue only. And when you reach that position the detail of proposition as to where the levy purely for revenue shall be laid is purely a matter of individual judgment, and the Democratic Party has never sought to dictate that particular feature. In other words, the detail of a principle in its application can never subordinate the principle itself.

Why, the gentleman says, "We want to give the people relief on the wool schedule." That is the most amusing declaration I have heard in all this discussion—that any Republican wanted to give the 90,000,000 people in this Republic relief on the wool proposition when they have insisted for 30 years upon enthralling the people of this country with the most outrageous rates under that proposition that ever existed in any tariff bill. They are willing now to eat out of the hand that smote them for a violation of a sacred promise to reduce the tariff, and thus to bask in the good graces of the people.

There have been other Governments where commerce or law or art has been the predominant national characteristic. The foreordained destiny of this Republic is to produce and to distribute wealth. In our purpose are centered all the forces—all those tremendous powers—law and art and commerce; painting and sculpture and music; the calm, dignified mantle of the law; and the sanctity of a Christian force in morals. These, with our environment of nature's resources, make up for us a condition that awakens in every man a devoted admiration for his citizenship and his country.

In the feeding and the housing of people, in the proper ministry to their wants, lies the highest purpose of human endeavor. Government is a great problem. The diversity of our climate, the interdependence of our activities, the mysterious and complex forces of a mixed civilization, the unfathomable possibilities that may be wrought out for our good or that might be visited upon us by the great swarms of humanity about us, all clamoring for recognition of their assumed rights, warn us of the fact that the labor we are engaged in is a seri-

ous business. The solution of our problems does not lie alone in writing the rates of duty a little higher or a little lower or in writing no rates at all, but in the coordination, control, and equitable distribution of all those commingling agencies of our production and distribution; in all of which every man must contribute, under law, an untiring service "to produce and distribute the material boons won by such study, such devotion, such patriotism to the myriads who have sprung from the earth's bosom in this summer of political liberty." This is essentially, the world over, the age of supply and demand. The contest we are waging in this Chamber is for trade, world-wide trade, and the legislation we are writing is the attempted equal balancing of all those complex industrial forces, both at home and abroad, that make for our supremacy. It is our duty to direct the trend of these forces so that in the volume of development there shall always result even-handed justice to all.

I have no purpose to discuss the minute detail of this bill. I was not in harmony with a few of the details and so expressed myself in the consideration of the bill in caucus, as every Member had a right to do. You have so often been told that this character of legislation is always a compromise. The preponderance of wise provisions is so great over the provisions written in the bill on details on which we differ that it should receive the enthusiastic support of every Member of this body. I therefore confine myself to those controlling general principles that mark the divergence of the two great parties in their respective fiscal systems and to which the disciples of each are committed.

In an exhaustive discussion of the Payne bill by the present Speaker of the House in March, 1909, he said: "Revolutions do not go backward." Succeeding events have demonstrated the wisdom of that declaration. The economic history of the country presents no parallel to the revolution we have witnessed. The people have pursued the heresy of high protection with a vigor that bespeaks a national conviction. The evolution of unstable theories and wild vagaries of government have never been surpassed by the growth that the protective theory has made in the last 40 years under the guise of being a wise and equitable fiscal policy. The system of the body politic for nearly half of the life of the Republic has been so thoroughly infiltrated by and saturated with the doctrine of governmental paternalism for selected classes of its citizenship—even to the extent of guaranteeing profits to favored lines of business—that the most difficult lesson at this late day to learn is that no citizen has a vested right in the taxing power of the Federal Government for his own personal benefit. Almost the entire public business of the country depends upon the method of collecting and disbursing revenue, and very largely in collecting duties on imports. The two parties have always differed as to the latitude of constitutional power of the Government to levy and collect taxes. It has been the theory of the Democratic Party for more than 100 years that the only just and equitable right the Government had to levy a tax was to collect money to discharge the economical expenses of the Government. For 50 years the rival of our party has insisted that the Government itself has power under the Constitution to discriminate between its citizens and impose, levy, and collect taxes upon all the people for the benefit of a small class of the people. The contest between us for all that time has been for a fair and honest constitutional taxation as against a high and usually prohibitive tariff.

I have heard the usual jabber about free trade by both the older and the younger Members of this body on the Republican side since this discussion began. Every Member knows that free trade is an absolute impossibility, and he likewise knows that the Democratic Party never, in its platform or elsewhere, advocated free trade. We appropriate a thousand millions a year to pay the expenses of the Government. Somebody must pay that sum. It can only be derived by taxation in some way. Every man knows that free trade could not exist without a system of direct taxation. The customhouses are here to stay, because it is the easiest indirect method of collecting taxes. But the customhouses are not to be converted into an agency for protected interests to destroy competition through excessive tariff rates. The times have changed when the word "protection," associated with the Coal Trust, the Steel Trust, the Leather Trust, is coming to be as obnoxious as it was powerful in the earlier history of the protective theory, and this condition is easily explained. The greed and avarice of men seized with political cunning were not content with a reasonable rate of taxation, but insisted on such rates that made the system odious to the people.

Now, what is admitted with reference to the so-called protective principle? It is this: Certain classes of citizens are special favorites of the policy through a protection that gives them advantage, not only over all competition but over the markets of this country in which every man must purchase, and the amount collected above a rate that would shut out competition does not go into the Treasury but into the pockets of the protected interests. The purpose of raising a rate is to keep competition out of the market and give the favored manufacturer or dealer an exclusive opportunity. All this at the expense of the general public. There is not a protectionist on this floor that is willing to reduce a rate on imports so as to create a fair competitive market, both in which to sell and in which to buy. What has been the consideration for this special favoritism in taxation? It is a matter of common knowledge that the alliance between the Republican Party and the special interests was made for their mutual benefit. It became a national scandal that the Republican Party maintained itself in power by contributions from special interests, and in return they were protected by that party from suffering any reduction in the enjoyment of practically prohibitive tariff rates. So notorious it became that Congress enacted special legislation to prevent contributions exceeding a certain amount and compelled the committees receiving contributions to disclose their sources and when and how the money was expended. Now, how has this protection theory been operated? Necessarily, when you lay a tax on imports you raise the price of these imports by the amount of the tax. Men, seeing how easily the system worked, found that if you raised the import duty high enough no imports could come in, because the home manufacturer could just undersell the importer, keep him out of the home market, and that would permit the home manufacturer to fix the price of his product in the home market, where the purchaser was compelled to buy, and Congress has accommodated the tariff grafter by putting the rates so high that he could cut out all competition. What does such destruction of competition mean? President McKinley said, in his last utterance, "We can not always hope to sell to people from whom we buy nothing." We are an exporting people, and if we permit the home manufacturer to control completely our ports against the foreigner we can not expect him to take our meat products, agricultural products, and the products of our diversified industries unless we trade with him. Consequently, our commerce languishes. Prohibitive tariff duties prevent foreign trade from coming to us, and we are prevented thereby from selling to them. The greed of the tariff beneficiaries closes all opportunity of trade and compels 90,000,000 people to buy of them in a restricted market. What is left for the American farmer, for instance, but to carry his products abroad and sell them in the world's markets and come back home with the proceeds and buy in a Government market? I say Government markets, because Congress, through special legislation, makes it impossible for him to buy abroad and bring his purchase in. If you inquire how Congress justifies itself in granting this benefit to a favored few and how the favored few justified themselves in taking this gratuity, I answer, in the McKinley bill, the Dingley bill, the Payne-Aldrich bill, the large Republican majority was simply the agent of the special-privilege classes, and the interested parties themselves were permitted to write the rates in the tariff measures. No one denies that proposition.

The tariff agents use the stock story that they want the high rates so that they can maintain the American wage scale and the American plane of living. It is a matter of common knowledge that the protected interests go to the fields of the unemployed and buy their labor in the cheapest market that has that product to sell without regard to the American wage earner or his plane of living. Not a Democrat in the House would raise such serious objections if through the meshes of this conspiracy a part of the tariff taxes could filter into the wage earner's pockets and he receive a portion of these unwarranted exactions wrung from the American public. I have so often heard the "old, old story" of anxiety for the American wage earner handed to the public as a blind for higher and more exclusive rates of protection. These rates are pro forma retained because of the difference in labor cost of the articles produced here and abroad. Our export history returns show that Americans are skillful enough and resourceful enough to make all the world's goods as cheaply as any foreigner makes them. I have not so much concern about the difference in the cost of production as I have in our trade relations. I have never lost an opportunity to say that no nation ever had a permanent history that does not have a great export trade. With our unlimited resources, our skill, our virile life, we outrival the world in production.

That the beneficiaries of special tariff legislation shadow their privilege behind the stock arguments of protection to American labor is completely revealed in the recent Lawrence, Mass., woolen strike. This industry, the especial pet of the Republican Party, has been favored with the most indefensible tariff exactions ever given to any line of manufactures. Not a

single Republican in this body has had the courage to face the high tariff taxes on his side and in the name of American Christian civilization condemn the system under which the Lawrence, Mass., woolen mills flourish like a green bay tree. They could employ and pay the American laborer a fair living wage and still reap immense profits. What are the facts? I quote from the report of the congressional committee that recently investigated the outrageous conditions that exist there:

There are 60,000 operatives in the Lawrence mills, and of that vast number 86.3 per cent are foreign born or American born of foreign parentage, less than 14 per cent American born.

The congressional investigation covered 21,000 persons employed in the mills. Of this number 7,295 received less than $7 per week of 56 hours. It is fair to assume the rates would hold good with the whole 60,000, and consequently more than 21,000 received less than $7 per week. It was definitely shown that in a family of five the trust had forced the wages so low that it was necessary for the father to take with him in this struggle for existence two of his children over 14 years of age to get the absolute necessaries of life. Necessity forces a large number of mothers with small children to enter these mills to help earn a living for the family. This is an illustration of what the tariff grabber will do when he has an opportunity, and this report states that Lawrence is not an exception from the manufacturing textile mills in the North Atlantic States. In the unsatisfied demands on the army of human serfs living under this protected wage scale, unsatisfied with the blood of their victims, they have lately built up a new process of making money by doing what is termed "speeding up" the machines and putting employees on piecework and compelling them to make what is denominated a "premium profit" or lose employment. The Payne bill that we by this measure seek to repeal makes a hollow mockery of its pretended interest on behalf of the laborer and consumer. The American people have been bunkoed by the sophistry of protection to American labor.

I do not have the opinion of the American laborer that his Republican friend has of him. I do not believe he is the pampered, incapable, and helpless individual he is pictured. I do not compare him to his disadvantage and humiliation, or question his ability to maintain himself and the commerce of his country against all competition. Climate, the Anglo-Saxon blood that flows in his veins, the fostering care of a democratic form of government, his intelligence, his ingenuity, his inventions, his efficiency, have made the American laborer the wonder of this commercial age. Into the world's markets last year he sent—

Manufactures of iron and steel	289,128,000
Copper and manufactures of	126,770,000
Agricultural implements	41,436,000
Wood and manufactures of	105,840,000
Mineral oils, refined and crude	124,210,000
Chemicals, etc	26,074,000
Leathers and manufactures of	64,460,000
Cotton, manufactures of	52,450,000
Paper and manufactures of	21,165,000
Electrical machinery	23,000,000

and sent those products of his skill into every market of the world in direct competition with everybody. Even if in the very few highly protected industries the American laborer is the beneficiary of the protective theory, a proposition I do not concede, there are multiplied thousands in mines, on the farm, in construction work, behind the counters, and in every clerical calling in our diversified life who are not in any manner benefited. The Federal Government raises its strong arm to isolate the American market from competition for the tariff grabbers, permits them in certain lines of industry to divide up the consumers and territory among themselves, and makes the American laborer the common property of them all. To tax out of competition the products of the privileged classes, the woolens and other cloths, ready-made clothing, and put into competitive markets the products of the unprotected classes is an unjust and unfair discrimination. Those masters of production, once intrenched, not only fix their own prices, that the great masses of citizenship are compelled to pay, but they likewise fix the price of labor in their restricted market that labor is compelled to take.

Look at our unfettered domestic commerce, unrestrained, except by freight rates. We have grown to be the greatest business people on earth. Our diversified industries, the volume of production, the multiplied needs of a great cosmopolitan people extending over a vast amount of territory presents a conclusive argument of what we could do abroad if this artificial restriction of trade were withdrawn. Our increased commerce with the Philippines, Porto Rico, and Hawaii are illustrative of what freer trade relations will do for us if you extend these conditions to all the world's markets. Our domestic commerce is greater than that of all Europe combined and nearly 50 times the volume of our export trade. There is no American but what looks with pride upon the marvelous industrial advancement we have made. I would not cast a vote to the detriment of any legitimate industry. Those institutions and combinations, however, that have enjoyed the beneficial support of legislation must observe that there is an equality of justice and equity that must be invoked.

The people know they have been discriminated against by the Republican Party. The intelligence and conscience of the American people is awakened, and they will enforce a square deal. High protection and Republicanism are synonymous terms, and neither can exist without the other. The Republican Party has no permanent and equitable system of civil government. It has existed upon a false basis, and the people have concluded that its unnecessary exactions in the way of high protective rates ought to cease and have returned to power the only party that pretends to have any policy to correct the injustices under which they have striven.

This bill is drawn to accomplish two distinct purposes—to lower the rates of duty on imports to a reasonable competitive basis, to change in part our present fiscal policy. Congress is advised by manufacturers that to lower the rate of duty to a competitive basis will force some invested capital to go out of business. Capital that can not operate on a competitive basis ought to seek other fields of investment, otherwise a change in the rates under which are sheltered some of the most vicious combinations would be a senseless proceeding. Are we to assume that the Government is to continue to tax the American people to hotbed a business on a reasonable profit basis, for the express benefit of a few people who have their money invested in lines of business that could not survive except by such Government aid? Such a proposition is at total variance with that wholesome law of competition in trade. If the Democratic Party has ever stood more firmly for one doctrine than another, it was for an equal opportunity for every citizen of the Republic.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WILSON of Florida). The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CLINE. I should like to have five minutes more.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. CLINE. Our national life is our commerce, and running parallel with the law of supply and demand is that other natural, necessary, and equitable law of fair competition that ought to ramify every commercial transaction. Every man who sells his toil or expends his money for merchandise has a sacred and inalienable right to competition for that toil and money, and no Government ought to legislate so as to abridge that right. Every man who makes or offers for sale a dollar's worth of goods ought to have a free and unrestrained market for the same. Competition is an impossibility under a high protective tariff. The rates of duty under the Payne bill are in all essential particulars a reproduction of the Dingley law that destroyed competition in American markets. Let me call a Republican witness of high authority. I quote from a speech by Senator CUMMINS on consideration of the Payne bill:

Complete, substantial competition is no longer a factor in American commerce. * * * The right of a consumer of any article or commodity to competition is dearer and higher and more sacred than the right of the producer to protection.

Whenever you eliminate competition by a preferential statute like the Dingley law or the Payne law you invite monopoly of production, conspiracy in restraint of trade, crushing of competitors by first lowering rates and then raising them, discrimination of prices to different persons in different localities, and political corruption. In preferential tariff legislation, on whatever theory it is based, the dual right to profits of the business, both to the manufacturer and the laborer, is defeated.

In the natural operation of the law the forces that enter into production are complementary and competitive, but when legislation deflects the natural law into favoritism the power to determine the amount of profit and to whom they shall go is given to the investor of capital, and that always destroys competition. I care not how complicated the civil state may be—and I mean by that society—the one controlling fact is that our welfare depends upon giving to society the largest possible output of a given article at the lowest possible cost, and can only be maintained by prohibiting any interference with the natural law of competition.

The statement has been frequently made in this discussion that if we increase importation to that extent we are transferring the American field of employment to cheap foreign labor. This is on the false premise that the volume of production is to continue to remain the same. If we have increased so marvelously our production in a limited market, why should we not even more largely increase them for an unlimited market?

If lowering the duty will make woolens and cottons cheaper, why will not more people wear woolen goods and all the people wear more and better qualities of both woolens and cottons? If that is true in the manufacture of textiles, why will it not be true in every other line of manufactures? And the laborers consequently have larger fields of employment, which the competition sought for in this bill will provide.

The important feature of this bill is the income-tax provision—distinctly a Democratic measure. During the long reign of the Republican Party it refused to countenance the income tax as a means of raising revenue. The leaders of that party knew that an income-tax law meant pulling down the rates of duty that the special interests were enjoying and the contributions by them made to the Federal Treasury. They joined the Democratic Party in the Sixty-first Congress to submit a constitutional amendment providing for an income tax. Simply, however, to postpone the day of the enactment of an income-tax law and believing that a sufficient number of States would not ratify the amendment authorizing Congress to perfect it by legislation. The assessment of incomes is the most equitable and just system of taxation. It conduces to a fair and equitable distribution of burdens and is based upon the universally accepted doctrine of taxation—that in addition to a tax on articles of consumption there should be a tax upon incomes properly graduated. Always and everywhere, when the demands for greater justice in the distribution of the burdens of taxation have arisen, the income tax has been resorted to. In this country, with its greatest commerce, wealth, and opportunity for the development of natural resources, why should we not reach the colossal fortunes for some support to the Government in whose system of taxation their possessors heretofore have found so much favor?

The rates of taxation provided in this bill to be paid on incomes are as follows:

On all net incomes of $4,000 to $20,000, 1 per cent.
On all net incomes of $20,000 to $50,000, 2 per cent.
On all net incomes of $50,000 to $100,000, 3 per cent.
On all net incomes of $100,000 and upward, 4 per cent.

I quote from the New York World to show how the tax will effect some of the great millionaires of the country:

	Capital.	Income.	Tax.
John D. Rockefeller	$500,000,000	$50,000,000	$2,000,000
Andrew Carnegie	300,000,000	15,000,000	600,000
William Rockefeller	200,000,000	20,000,000	800,000
Estate of Marshall Field	120,000,000	6,000,000	240,000
George F. Baker	100,000,000	5,000,000	200,000
Henry Phipps	100,000,000	5,000,000	200,000
Henry C. Frick	100,000,000	5,000,000	200,000
William A. Clark	80,000,000	4,000,000	160,000
Estate of J. P. Morgan	75,000,000	7,500,000	300,000
Estate of E. H. Harriman	68,000,000	3,400,000	146,000
Estate of Russell Sage	64,000,000	3,200,000	128,000
W. K. Vanderbilt	50,000,000	2,500,000	100,000
Estate of John S. Keanedy	65,000,000	3,250,000	130,000
Estate of John J. Astor	70,000,000	3,500,000	140,000
W. W. Astor	70,000,000	3,600,000	140,000
J. J. Hill	70,000,000	3,500,000	140,000
Isaac Stephenson	74,000,000	3,700,000	148,000
Jay Gould estate	70,000,000	3,500,000	140,000
Mrs. Hetty Green	60,000,000	3,000,000	120,000
Estate of Cornelius Vanderbilt	50,000,000	2,500,000	100,000
Estate of William Weightman	50,000,000	2,500,000	100,000
Estate of Ogden Goelet	60,000,000	3,000,000	120,000
W. H. Moore	50,000,000	2,500,000	100,000
Arthur C. James	50,000,000	2,500,000	100,000
Estate of Robert Goelet	60,000,000	3,000,000	120,000
Guggenheim estate	50,000,000	2,500,000	100,000
Thomas F. Ryan	50,000,000	2,500,000	100,000
Edward Morris	45,000,000	2,250,000	90,000
J. O. Armour	45,000,000	2,250,000	90,000

How can there be, in all fairness and equity, any objection to taxing these vast volumes of wealth to provide a part of their own protection? If necessary, the Government would be required to spend every dollar in the Treasury, call out the standing Army and Navy for their security.

There is not a civilized Government on earth but that taxes incomes; but places the burdens of supporting the Government on those best able to bear it. Even in our possession of Hawaii they have an income tax. The wisdom of constructive statesmanship of the Democratic Party was never more clearly proven than in this measure that seeks to relieve the masses of $100,000,000 of taxation on what they eat and wear and place that amount upon the great fortunes of the wealthy. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD].

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, one of the most serious questions with which any government has to deal is the subject of taxation. It is impossible to maintain any government, either National, State, or local, without large sums of money to meet the necessary expenses of maintaining it. The United States Government and the State and local governments are maintained by some system of direct taxation levied in amount according to the value of the property which each individual owns.

In the National Government a different system has been devised, one which is not fully understood by the masses of the people, because the taxes assessed are paid without their knowledge of the amount or the time of payment in most instances. In State and local governments taxes are assessed in amount according to the value of one's estate, as in the National Government taxes are levied in amount according to the extent of consumption.

National taxes are raised in three ways—by customs dues, internal-revenue taxation, and stamp sales. The expenses of the Post Office Department, which amount now to more than $275,000,000 annually, are paid almost wholly by those who use the mails—those who use them most paying the greatest amount of revenue by reason of their purchasing the greater number of stamps; those who use them least paying the least amount of revenue on account of using a limited number of stamps.

Internal-revenue taxes are obtained by levying a tax on liquors and tobacco. The sum raised by this tax amounts to about one-third of the total revenue received each year for the maintenance of the Government.

The third method of taxation—customs dues—is a tax levied upon goods which are brought into the United States for sale. Under the tariff law rates are fixed, and each individual commodity is expected to pay a certain amount of taxes. This tax is paid at the port of entry by the importer of goods; the amount of tax thus paid is added to the value of the goods, and the consumer who finally receives the goods must pay the taxes imposed at the customhouse. Many individuals do not realize that any burden is imposed upon them by reason of this taxation. For many years a political organization in this country undertook to mislead the people by proclaiming that the people would not be affected by this taxation, that the tax is paid by the importer and does not in any wise affect the purchaser in this country. But this theory has long since been exploded, and the people now appreciate the fact that the tax thus imposed is eventually paid by the consumer of the article on which the tax is levied.

There have always been two ideas of taxation with reference to customs duties in the United States—one that the tax should be levied for the purpose of raising revenue to meet the expenses of the Government and that the only purpose which makes justifiable the levying of this tax is to meet governmental expenses. The other is that this tax should be levied primarily for the purpose of protecting the manufacturer of American goods against the competition of foreign-made goods. The former is the view which has been entertained by the Democratic Party at all times; it contends there is no excuse for the levying of a tax solely for the purpose of protecting a small class of American citizens. It is true, of course, that under a protective system revenue is raised which is used for the purpose of meeting the expenses of the Government. It is also true that under the revenue system which is advocated by the Democratic Party the manufacturer in the United States of goods similar to those on which customs duties are levied will receive benefit from such taxation in the way of protection, because it will enable him to sell his goods at a higher price than he could if no such tax were levied. Such a tax levied in any instance enables the American manufacturer to sell his goods at a higher price than he could receive if no such tax were imposed; in other words, the importer who buys the goods abroad and brings them to the United States must pay, in addition to the original cost and the transportation charges, the tax that may be levied on the goods, which adds to his cost price; while the manufacturer of such goods in the United States can sell his goods at the price of the imported article, and thereby secure the benefit of the increased selling price to the extent of the tax imposed.

According to the protective theory the tax should be imposed in order that the manufacturer of goods in the United States might receive from his customers the highest price. The Democratic Party insists that the Government has no right to levy a tax primarily for that purpose. Yet it is true that under the Democratic tariff the manufacturer of like products in the United States is protected and benefited to the extent of the tax imposed on the foreign article, and receives from the purchaser a price enhanced by the amount of the tariff duties paid upon like imported articles. In other words, the consumer of manufactured goods in the United States, whether he buys goods which are imported or goods which are manufactured in this

country, has to pay an increase in price for the article equivalent to the amount of the duty imposed on the imported product.

The pending tariff bill is not exactly as I would have written it, but no tariff bill has ever met in all its details the views of any one man. There are several features in it that I would change, but the measure taken as a whole is, in my judgment, a splendid bill and responsive to the tariff plank in the Democratic platform and to the wishes of the American people as expressed at the polls for downward revision.

This bill is framed in the interest of the consumer, and will have the effect of reducing the cost of living. It may not reduce it as much as some would hope, because many of the existing duties are prohibitive and the reduction of the tariff may not affect the price down to a point where the tariff would be competitive. But this legislation is in the interest of the people, and I hope it may become a law without any material change and that it may be given a fair test.

The people have not had the opportunity to determine the merits of a genuine Democratic tariff law since the Civil War, and I am especially anxious that they shall be given the opportunity of giving this one a fair trial, for if they do I feel confident there will come to the American people what came following the Walker tariff—a disposition to let well enough alone and recognize the question of taxation as settled along Democratic lines in favor of a tariff for revenue in the interest of the consumer and in the abandonment of the idea which has prevailed for 40 years—that tariff should be levied for protection's sake.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how the time stands at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has consumed 17 hours and 58 minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has consumed 18 hours and 8 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, among the other iniquitous provisions of the pending tariff bill is the agricultural schedule, which schedule, in my opinion, is unjust and unfair to the farmers of this country, and will be disastrous to them, and it is an effort to try and gain political advantage to the Democratic Party by attracting the favorable attention of the voters in the large cities of the country.

I represent a district of intelligent, progressive, and successful farmers, who have prospered under the protective policy, and when they realize the unfairness of this schedule, as they will if it becomes a law, you can be assured they will repudiate it at the first opportunity.

My purpose in rising at this time is to have read a letter, written by one of my constituents who has for many years been a large and successful grower of live stock in South Dakota, which expresses his views upon the proposition of putting meats on the free list. It is as follows:

FAULKTON, S. DAK., *April 22, 1913.*

Hon. CHARLES BURKE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURKE: I want to write you in regard to the proposed tariff bill putting meats on the free list. I believe that this is the very worst thing that could happen to the live-stock industry. I believe that it would ruin that industry throughout the United States.

It is a well-known fact that the packers own over 50 per cent of the packing and meat industry in Argentina and Brazil. They are the only ones that could possibly handle those meats, and they would use it as a club over the producer of live stock without very much benefit to the consumer.

I can not see for the life of me why there should be a 10 per cent duty left on cattle and then have free meats. Your duty on cattle would have a tendency to raise the prices of cattle going into the feed lots in the corn-belt States, or make them higher for the corn-belt feeder, and then, when they go to market, after they are fat, he would have to compete with free meats.

I certainly believe it would be better all around to have a duty on dressed meats and have cattle come in free, as then the feeders, after they got their cattle fat, might have some protection. If this bill goes through and puts meat on the free list, it is going to affect every farmer and every laboring man, and I honestly believe that it is going to affect the laboring man first, because it will put him on a basis with the wages they pay in Mexico, Argentina, and Brazil.

What the cattle industry needs most, and the cattlemen, is some encouragement, and there will be plenty of live stock in the United States in a very short time. If the cattlemen have to go back to the prices of four or five years ago, they will just simply get out of the live-stock business and quit running them just as fast as possible, as everybody knows that prices prior to, say, four years ago did not justify anybody in raising cattle, and thousands of people went broke in the live-stock business. The packers or consumers can not expect the people to go back to those prices and raise cattle at a loss, and cattlemen throughout the country will simply quit.

I wish you would drop me a line and let me know what your views are along those lines. With kindest regards, I am,

Yours, respectfully,

P. H. O'NEIL.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CARR].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CARR] is recognized.

Mr. CARR. Mr. Chairman, a sufficient revenue is the inevitable problem of government. Not to provide privileges, but to maintain the national life, is the purpose of this bill. Not to succor an infirm industry but to support the Government of the United States should be the object of taxation. With the thought uppermost in our minds, and the consequence upon our consciences that, first or last, whatever the system, this money must be collected from the people, we impose the lightest burdens upon the weakest shoulders. And as it is our Democratic thought that each citizen should receive from society a reward commensurate with his service to society, so now it is our Democratic purpose that each citizen shall contribute to the administrative necessities of society in proportion as he has been the recipient of its benefits.

Opposed to the Democratic doctrine of taxation for revenue only is the Republican theory of a tariff for protection. It has been argued on the other side of this Chamber that if we so lay the tariff duties as to afford the home manufacturer an exclusive home market, he will pay higher wages to labor, keep running to their fullest capacity the mills and factories of the country, and thus assure the prosperity of all the people. We are asked to protect the manufacturer that he in turn may accord labor its just wage. This argument is premised upon the principle once enunciated by Alexander Hamilton, the founder of the old Federal, now the Republican Party, that the Government should take care of the rich and the rich will take care of the poor. Yet labor is compelled to organize against this protected capital in order to secure a living wage. We have seen infant industries, for the development of which a tariff was first laid in the name of protection, grow to the stature of trusts actually controlling the markets of the world and defying the laws of the land. And these infants are here still pleading for protection. For protection against whom do they plead? Surely not against the foreign manufacturer, for in many instances he is undersold in his own market. Can it be against the very labor whom the tariff was supposed to benefit?

Mr. Chairman, how have these infants, which have been the beneficiaries of the Nation's bounty, taken care of the poor? Ask the textile workers of New England, who so long have been fighting for a fair share of the fruits of their labor. Ask the toilers of the great Pittsburgh district where the Steel Trust has held lordly sway. Read the answer in the burned faces and blistered hands of men who have toiled their lives away for the scant wage that under this system grows ever scantier. Yet the doctrine of Hamilton remains the creed of the Republican Party: "Let the Government take care of the rich and the rich will take care of the poor."

Mr. Chairman, there never was a doctrine so untenable as that a high tariff makes high wages. I assert that the occupations that are not protected are generally better paid than the protected ones. The bricklayers, the masons, the carpenters, and the independent artisans receive higher wages than those that toil in the highly protected industries of the country. If a protective tariff insures high wages, why are the labor unions necessary to keep up the standard of wages in protected industries?

Labor receives just what it is able to compel capital to pay, and no more. As a general rule capital secures labor at the smallest possible cost, and American labor is compelled to compete in the open market. If labor were given a fair share of the joint earnings of capital and labor, the iniquities of the tariff would not be so flagrant. There would at least be the justification that while bearing the burden of taxation labor is the recipient of a part of the exactions of special privilege.

Mr. Chairman, for every dollar that goes into the Treasury of the United States through the customhouse by reason of the present tariff about $15 go into the pockets of the protected interests of the Nation. In order to raise $1 of revenue for the support of the Government our people are taxed $15 for the support of the protected interests. What a burden to impose upon our people under the guise of protection. To call such a doctrine the "protective doctrine" is simply an attempt to hide its deformity beneath an engaging garb of rhetoric.

The advocates of the doctrine of protection believe the infants should still be protected, and justify their selling abroad cheaper than they sell at home on the ground that it enables them to dispose of their surplus stock. How does this doctrine appeal to the farmer when he finds that most, if not all, the implements of the farm which are made in this country can be purchased more cheaply abroad than at home? And what

must be the surprise of the American artisan to know that practically all the tools of his trade made in this country in which there is an ounce of iron or steel are sold abroad more cheaply than at home? What must be the astonishment of the American traveler to find American-made watches competing with English watches in English markets?

The Underwood bill seeks to make equitable our system of taxation. Heretofore the heaviest duties have been laid upon the necessaries of the poor, rather than upon the luxuries of the rich. This measure has not only reduced the tariff upon these necessaries, but in some instances has placed them upon the free list. The duty on sugar has been reduced to 1 cent per pound, with the provision that at the expiration of three years this commodity will go upon the free list. It is not denied that sugar can not be produced in the United States in competition with sugar made in the Tropics, unless the whole people of the country be charged practically two prices for this household necessity. The total capital invested in the sugar industry in Louisiana is approximately $35,000,000, and the value of this industry in the other Southern States increases the amount to $50,000,000. And yet the people of the United States pay annually, by reason of a tariff on sugar, three times the total sum invested in this industry in the United States.

A short time ago Senator Aldrich declared that the wool schedule was the keystone in the arch of protection. For years past, since 1867, we have attempted to justify the tariff on wool on the ground that we were protecting the sheep growers of the country. Yet during this period there has been a decrease of more than 10,000,000 sheep in this country; and raw wool was selling in Boston last week cheaper than it was selling in London. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that notwithstanding a tariff on wool, the sheep industry is declining. But a few years ago practically every State had its quota of sheep. As land became more valuable for agricultural and manufacturing purposes, the sheep industry was driven westward, until to-day the only place sheep are raised primarily for wool is in a few of the States of the extreme Northwest. East of the Mississippi River wool has become a by-product. The average farmer in the East does not have 25 sheep, and this notwithstanding the fact that the tariff on wool has been consistently maintained for more than 40 years. The demand for a tariff on wool comes alone from a few of the woolgrowers of the West who have systematically combined with the woolen manufacturers of the East to keep a tariff on both wool and woolens at the expense of the great mass of the people of the country.

There is little, if any, difference in the price of wool at home and abroad, and, with the exception of Russia, no other country maintains a tariff on this product. But even granting that the placing of wool on the free list would make a difference of a few cents in the selling price of wool, think of the reduced price at which the farmers of the Nation will be permitted to purchase practically every article in use on the farm. The Underwood bill seeks to reduce the tariff to a revenue or competitive basis, mindful of all legitimate industries. More than this no industry has a right to ask, and less than this the Underwood bill does not propose. This was the theory of tariff legislation before the era of trusts and monopolies. The tariff that was first laid with apology is now imposed with arrogance. The tariff that was necessary to meet the expenses of the Civil War is now collected in the name of protection. The man who toils for a daily wage is frequently in no better financial condition at the close of a long life than when he began the grind in the brutal treadmill. Year by year he sees the wealth of the Nation passing into fewer hands; daily he sees others waste while he must want; and he wonders what is wrong with an economic system that creates these conditions.

In 1910 a Democratic Congress was commissioned to revise the tariff downward as a result of the failure of the Republican Party to keep faith with the people as promised in its platform two years before. After the assurance given to the people prior to the election of 1908, the Republican Party proceeded to revise the tariff by increasing duties, by the enactment of the present Payne-Aldrich bill, the most infamous revenue measure ever evolved by duplicity and deceit in the history of this Nation.

The answer to this betrayal of trust came, as I have said, in the election of 1910, when a Democratic House was chosen. The Sixty-second Congress framed a tariff measure embodying in its essential details the wishes of the people as expressed at the polls, but that bill was vetoed by President Taft. The election of 1912 was a solemn, emphatic, and determined protest against the Payne-Aldrich tariff, and the bill now under consideration is the answer of the Democratic Party to the insistent demand of the country for tariff revision. Notwithstanding the plain duty of this Congress, there are those on the other side who, unmindful of the lessons of these elections, still insist upon a continuation of prohibitive duties. The fight for tariff reform has been a long, hard battle. No interest intrenched in special privilege willingly surrenders. Supporting the Republican Party in 1912, as in the past, was the untold wealth that greed and avarice had filched from honest toil. There were captains galore in the ranks, but there were few privates. Notwithstanding its depleted lines, it fought with a determination born of despair. The gentleman from Missouri, now our distinguished Speaker, in an address describing that contest, quoted from Byron's "Destruction of Sennacherib":

> The Assyrian came down like the wolf on the fold,
> And his cohorts were gleaming in purple and gold;
> And the sheen of their spears was like stars on the sea,
> When the blue wave rolls nightly on deep Galilee.
>
> Like the leaves of the forest when summer is green,
> That host with their banners at sunset were seen:
> Like the leaves of the forest when autumn hath blown,
> That host on the morrow lay wither'd and strown.

And, with a few slight changes, the last stanza of that poem fitly describes the anguish of the Republican Party of to-day:

> And the widows of privilege are loud in their wail,
> Their idols are shattered in the temple of Baal;
> And Democracy, triumphant, unscathed by the sword,
> Hath reclaimed for her own this land of the Lord.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that there is a better and brighter day soon to dawn in our long struggle for economic independence. I believe that men are coming more and more to see the evil tendency of present conditions. It can not be that all that is good and great in our Government is to be bartered away for the golden dross that glitters only to deceive. In this fruitful land, marvelous in its resources, unlimited in its possibilities, capable of sustaining a population of untold millions, there should be equal opportunities for all. The struggle of life will not always be ours; it will pass some day to those we love better than ourselves. It was said in olden time that your old men shall see visions and your young men shall dream dreams. The vision of the old and the dream of the young among Democrats has long been of that good day when the black flag of privilege shall no longer rule the high seas of human exchange. To the young man, especially, equal opportunity is the very lure of life. What will his talents, his learning, his industry avail him if the door be closed? What will it profit him that Yorktown fell if privilege is still to make the law? What can it mean to him that Lincoln lived if slavery still abides and lashed millions bear the cross up our industrial Calvary? Why Valley Forge if the bruised feet of millions must forever crimson the frozen way of want; if the blazing fires of industry hold no warmth for those that kindle them? The future bears him small hope upon its wings if a few are to be exalted upon the thrones of privilege, while artificial inequalities bear others down into the quagmire of poverty and despair.

The magnitude of commercial thought and enterprise is the calm, cold logic of events. The combination of brains and money has formed the corporation that in its inherent possibilities of service and stripped of its adherent vices must quicken the blessings of distributed wealth and happiness. The statesmen of this day must hold with even hand the scales of justice, permit no injury to the weak, and do no injustice to the strong. Labor and capital are not independent and can prosper best only through united service. Whatever is unjust both must surrender. Neither ignorant prejudice nor calculating rapacity must be suffered to hinder or obstruct our progress. Yet that progress must be an honest progress, and it must be upon a business and not upon a political basis. The people will not exchange their liberties for any commercial prosperity, however admirable. The complaint that comes to-day is that great aggregations of capital have been receiving special favors at the hands of the Government and that legalized extortion is being practiced upon honest enterprise and toil.

Mr. Chairman, we should all be interested in the general prosperity of all the people. Whatever contributes to the common good should be written into our laws. We are interested in the extension of our commerce. We can not live to ourselves alone. American products must find foreign markets, and it is true of nations as of individuals that we can not hope to sell to those from whom we will not buy. The highways of trade should have no barriers and an extension of our markets will solve at least one of the problems that has given us so much concern. Products congest in our markets; mills and factories close; and we are told that the cause is overproduction. We should establish such foreign trade relations as will permit of an exchange of those commodities in which the nations of the world respectively excel, invoking such tariff duties as will stimulate our industries to a healthy competition with those abroad. By such means alone can we hope for that permanent prosperity that comes with the adoption of the true system of political economy.

I want the conditions such that your boy and my boy will have an equal opportunity in the race of life. We may be able to leave them no silver or gold, but we can leave them that. I have in mind the picture of a day when the old order will give place to the new. It is not a picture of blood and tears, of conquest and carnage, of wrecked hopes and ruined homes. It is not a vision of the privation that visits the huts that fill the valley, or the revelry that swells from the mansions on the hill. This picture has the painter given almost life itself, but it is one that time will tarnish and the decades destroy. Rather let us behold the inspiring vision of a contented people who have forgotten the arts of warfare in the nobler pursuits of peace, a country in which reason shall sit enthroned the supreme arbiter of international rights, a land in which capital and labor shall have sealed in equity a covenant of everlasting unity, by which the fires of industry shall redden every sky, with the music of the forge and the furnace, the mill and the workshop rendering a perpetual anthem to the pursuits of peace, a nation chastened by a century of trials, and bright with a new birth of industrial freedom. [Loud applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS] is recognized.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, it is a needless waste of the vitality of any Republican as well as a useless consumption of the time of this House to attempt to convince the Democratic majority here that danger lurks and possible disaster lies in this more or less free trade tariff bill they are about to pass through this House and foist upon the country. The Democratic Party is committed to that policy. The Democratic Members of Congress here are its chance agents to put that policy into execution. I use the words "chance agents" advisedly. But for the unfortunate split in the Republican Party other agents would be here occupying the places of many of you gentlemen and carrying different instructions from your constituents.

I am not unmindful of the fact that before the last election the country generally had determined upon a substantial, if not radical, revision of the tariff downward. And to illustrate that feeling on the part of the public I want to relate a conversation I had with one of my rural constituents in the heat of the last campaign. He said:

The Republican speakers of this Nation (you with the rest of them) need not be going around over the country trying to convince the voters of the land that their salvation lies in the election of the Republican ticket. There is a great unrest throughout the country; the people feel that there is something wrong; they do not know what the wrong is, but they do know that they want a change. The farmer has for so many years been getting such good prices for his products that he feels secure in these prices and, therefore, does not fear a change. The high cost of living has pressed down with a heavy hand upon the great army of American laborers and the dwellers in cities and towns, and it must be remembered that these dwellers constitute the big part of our population. All these are dissatisfied with present conditions; they believe that the tariff is largely responsible for these conditions and that the Republican Party is responsible for the tariff. It is true the people do not know just what is wrong, nor who is to blame, and you can not reason with them about it. They are like a child who begs for candy from an indulgent father, and when told that the candy will be injurious to its health the child is not convinced. The only way that the child can be convinced is by the painful and injurious effects of the actual eating of the candy; and the only way the people of this country will be convinced that a free trade or tariff for revenue only policy will inure to their detriment and not their benefit is to actually have a dose of it. They do not know that the Republican tariff is responsible for the things of which they complain, but they think so and are willing to strike blindly in the dark in the hope of finding a remedy. The Democratic Party professes to have a panacea for all the country's ills and ailments, and in her despair the country will turn to the Democratic Party for relief.

My philosophical friend and constituent did not go so far afield in his speculations and prognostications. While the Democratic majority in this House is more or less the child of chance, and more or less the child of unfair gerrymandering, and more or less the child of unrest, and more or less the child of Republican divisions and dissensions, still the fact remains that it is here, and the further fact remains that it feels itself divinely chosen to administer to the wants and needs of an expectant public. The first cure-all they expect to administer to their patient, the public, is an overdose of the Underwood tariff bill. And I want to say for the leader of the majority, Mr. UNDERWOOD, the father of this bill, that he is an able and honorable man, a polite and courteous gentleman. He believes he has, but fears he has not, found the remedy for the country's ills in the bill that bears his name. He warned the country in his opening argument the other day that he did not expect any precipitate reduction in the high cost of living. It would appear that he is looking for a soft place for himself and party to fall; but let me warn them that there is no soft place. If your bill fails to meet the expectations of the public, the public will turn upon you and drive you from power. You have preached long and loud that in the teachings and preachings of your party lies the country's salvation. Your chief and long-heralded remedy lies in the tariff bill before us, and if it fails, woe unto you, and may the good Lord have mercy on your troubled souls and coveted jobs. And if your tariff bill succeeds in disturbing business to any large extent and lowers the high cost of living not at all, it will be good-by Malindy to the Democratic ascendancy for years to come, unless the Progressive Party takes enough votes from the Republican Party to again encompass its national defeat four years hence. It will never do it after that time. I am just a young and inexperienced doctor, and this country is a big patient, and I may be wrong in the diagnosis of its case, but I do not believe that free trade or tariff for revenue only is the panacea for this country's aches and pains. The high cost of living lies not so much with the tariff nor is it caused in any great degree by reason thereof. The high cost of living lies in the profits of the middlemen, and not so much with the manufacturers, farmers, or other producers. Your bill strikes at the manufacturers, the producers, and the farmers and leaves untouched the operations and machinations of the dangerous middlemen. The farmer is not getting too much for the products of his farm, nor do I believe that the majority of manufacturers, as such, are making any exorbitant profits on the products manufactured by them, although some of them are.

It looks to me that the high cost of living and the high cost of everything else lies mainly in the unlawful combinations and agreements in restraint of trade. There is scarcely an article that we eat or wear that is not trust controlled; and if not trust controlled at least "agreement" controlled—many of them by the so-called "gentleman's agreement." Every few days there comes to light some new trust to us hitherto unknown which either regulates the price or controls the output of some article of general use and common convenience or consumption. You can scarcely name an article produced in factory, mine, workshop, or on the farm the price of which is not in some way regulated before it reaches the hands or homes of the consumers. Take the farm products of the United States for example. In the year 1909 the farmers of this country produced more than $9,000,000,000 worth of products. Assuming that they used one-third of these, they would sell the remainder for $6,000,000,000. It was worth that much to the farmers; but when their $6,000,000,000 worth of stuff in 1909 reached the tables of the consumers it cost them (the consumers) $13,000,000,000. In other words, the price of farm products was more than doubled from the time they left the farmers' hands until they reached the hands and homes of the consumers. The farmer is not getting an exorbitant price for his products. He is not to blame for the high cost of living. We are not paying to him too much for the products of his farm. In fact in many instances we are not paying him enough. The price of his products is more than doubled from the time they leave his hands to the time they lie on our tables ready for use. The profits of the commission houses, the wholesale merchants, jobbers, and a dozen and one other hands the farmers' products go through before reaching the consumer is where the trouble lies.

The Underwood tariff bill we are now discussing does not reach that trouble. It offers no remedy. It proposes none. It strikes a blow at the farmer; it tries to make him the pack horse and burden bearer in reducing the high cost of living as did President Taft's reciprocity pact with Canada, and we all know what happened to President Taft in the last election.

The Underwood bill puts the farmers' products on the free list, or greatly reduces them from what they are now, upon the theory and in the hope that the farmers' prices will be reduced, and that the consumers will profit thereby. That was the hope of President Taft in dealing with the "Lady of Snows." The distinguished author of this tariff bill now before the House complained in his speech the other day that the farmers' products had increased in price 93 per cent since 1897. It is true they have increased some in price to him, but the great increase has been from the time they left the farmers' hands to the time of reaching the tables of the consumers.

The Underwood tariff bill strikes at the farmer a body blow, but does not even raise a finger against the middlemen. This Democratic tariff bill does not provide a remedy for the high cost of living. It tries to rob Peter to pay Paul; it indicts and will proceed to punish John Smith, the innocent, because John Jones, the guilty, has committed the wrong. It punishes thrift, industry, and right living and rewards the slick manipulator, or combination of manipulators, in putting the price of bread beyond the reach of the pallid lips of the starving poor. I have a faint and hazy recollection that some years ago a great and distinguished Democrat electrified a national convention of his party by saying, "You shall not press down a crown of

thorns upon the brow of labor." There was something said about not crucifying mankind upon a cross of gold, but, of course, he did not mean that, for we hear nothing about that nowadays; but he did mean what he said about the crown of thorns. Let us see how that crown of thorns business is now operating or will operate under the Underwood tariff bill. For example: The present tariff on a bushel of onions is 40 cents. The Underwood bill provides that it be reduced to 20 cents a bushel, and this is done in the hope of reducing the cost of living to the consumer. No consideration is being shown the farmer, the one who, by his toil, produces a bushel of onions. The only solicitude is for the consumer. Let us see how it is going to work out and whether or not the consumer will be benefited. The State of Ohio is probably the greatest onion-producing State in the Union. The raisers of onions in that State, out on their farms, get only 28 cents a bushel for them, while the market price in Philadelphia, New York, and Boston is $1 per bushel; so the farmer only gets 28 cents, while the other 72 cents goes to the railroads, or commission merchants, or jobbers, and so forth. Onions that reach the cities and that cost not more than 40 or 50 cents a bushel are sold to the city trade for $1 per bushel and much more in some places. Who gets the 50 cents? It is the middlemen. These onions increase in value 50 cents per bushel from the time they reach the city until they reach the table of the consumer. In other words, the middlemen get 50 cents profit for handling every bushel of onions. Does your tariff bill reach this evil? Does it make any arrangement to prevent the profits of the middlemen? If the middlemen raise the price of the farmer's foodstuffs 50 cents on every dollar's worth of onions from the time they reach their hands until they reach the table of the consumer, how do you expect the Underwood tariff bill to reduce the cost of living when it fails to reach the machinations of the middlemen—the seat of the trouble?

The proposed tariff bill fails to place a restraining hand upon the rapacious greed of the unbridled middlemen. Do you suppose the fact that the onion producers on the Bermuda Islands and elsewhere can, through your tariff bill, lay a bushel of onions down on our shores for 20 cents a bushel less than they could heretofore will make much difference in the price of onions when they reach the table of the consumer? It is true that it will seriously affect the American farmer. He raises his onions by the hands of well-paid American labor while the Bermuda Island onion raiser produces his onions by or through the cheap labor of the islands; but if the price of the farmer's onions in this country can increase in price 50 cents a bushel from the time they reach the city until they reach the table of the consumer through the machinations of the middlemen—do you not suppose that the untrammeled middlemen—and your tariff bill leaves them untrammeled—will soon see to it that the profits shall go largely to themselves and not to the consumer by reason of the 20 cents per bushel tariff reduction proposed in the Underwood bill? If the middlemen can, through some manipulation of the market, increase the cost of the farmers' hard-earned products 50 cents on the dollar after they reach their hands do you not suppose they can make arrangements to keep the other 20 cents on a bushel, or at least the most of it?

I was reared on a farm. When I was down home some months ago the farmers thought they were doing mighty well to get 75 cents a bushel for their Irish potatoes, but when I got on the train to come to Washington and ordered dinner they charged me 20 cents apiece for those same potatoes. That happens every day in the year all over this great country, and yet there is no tariff tax between the States. There can be none. The present law carries a tariff duty of only 25 cents per bushel on potatoes. The Underwood bill has put them on the free list. Is there anybody who seriously believes that this will seriously affect the price of potatoes to the ultimate consumer?

I have called attention to these two items to illustrate the character of the Underwood bill and its attitude toward the American farmer. The truth is that Schedule G of the Underwood tariff bill either puts the whole of what the farmer raises and has to sell on the free list or greatly reduces the present tariff rate. It is all done, so the framers of the bill claim, to fulfill the pledge of the Democratic Party in its platform that it would greatly reduce the cost of living if intrusted with power. It has been intrusted with power, and this tariff bill is the fruits of its labor.

President Taft, with a zeal worthy of a better cause, called Congress together in extraordinary session two years ago with the undisguised purpose of reducing the cost of living at the expense of the American farmer. I want to quote somewhat at length from a speech I made on the floor of the House at that time. I pointed out then what I conceived to be the serious mistake of the President and how the position of Mr. Taft would undo his party by overthrowing the Republican doctrine of protection. It did undo him. The country held him and not the Democratic Party responsible for the proposed reciprocity pact with Canada. I said this: "In my judgment the high cost of living in this country gave birth to the reciprocity treaty with Canada." It was in the hope of reducing the cost of living and relieving the masses of that burden that the reciprocity measure had its origin. Stripped of all disguise, that was and is both its aim and object. The President intimated so much in his measure of January 26 last, when he said:

> Reciprocity with Canada must necessarily be chiefly confined in its effect on the cost of living to food and forest products.

The President was and is sincere in his belief that the cost of living in this country is too high and that the great mass of the American people demand a reduction therein.

The Democratic Party, with its ear to the ground and with the hope of ingratiating itself with the American electorate, coupled with a desire, I grant, of being responsive to the public will, came forward as the chief champion and defender of this measure emanating from a Republican President. It is true that the cost of living is too high. I am also free to say that there is a just popular demand for a reduction in prices; but I shall not agree that the farmer should be the pack horse and the burden bearer of these blessings to the rest of humanity. If corn is too high, so is clothing; if potatoes are too high, so are rice and sugar. If cattle are too high, so is beef. If wheat is too high, so is flour. If hogs are too high, so is pork. If the raw materials which the farmer produces and has to sell are put upon the free list under this bill why are not the products made out of the raw materials which the farmer produces likewise put upon the free list? Why is the farmer forced to sell his wheat in a free market and then buy back the flour made from that wheat in a protected market? Why protect the manufacturer of flour at the expense of the farmer? If the farmer's cattle and hogs are put upon the free list, why have not beef and pork likewise been put upon the free list? Why protect the great Beef and Pork Trusts at the expense of the farmer? Why protect the trust products and leave the farmer's products unprotected?

If the rye and oats which the farmer raises are too high, so is the hat which he wears upon his head and the shoes he wears upon his feet likewise too high. Why have not they been put upon the free list in this bill? You have put upon the protected list the things which the farmer buys; why do you leave off of the protected list the things which he sells? The things which the farmer buys no less than the things which he sells go to make up the cost of living.

Under this reciprocity agreement the tariff duty of 25 cents per bushel has been removed from the wheat which the farmer sells, while a duty of 50 cents per barrel has been retained on the flour which the farmer buys. In other words, the great flour mills of Canada are given the opportunity of buying from our farmers their wheat free and then selling to our farmers the flour made from their own free wheat with a protection of 50 cents per barrel.

Under this Canadian pact a tariff duty of 10 cents per bushel has been removed from the oats which the farmer sells, while a duty of 50 cents a hundred pounds has been retained on the oatmeal and rolled oats made out of the oats bought of the farmer free.

Is it right for the Beef Trust and the great packing concerns of the country to buy free live stock from the farmer and then be protected by a duty of 1¼ cents on every pound of meat which the farmer buys?

Is it fair and just and right to remove protection from the farmer's barley and protect the brewer at the rate of 45 cents per hundred pounds?

Is it fair and just and right to remove protection from the farmer's rye and protect the distiller at the rate of $2.00 per gallon on the whisky made therefrom?

Is it fair and just and right to remove protection from the farmer's corn and barley and wheat and rye and oats and tomatoes and other vegetables and protect the manufacturers of these products into articles prepared for the farmer's consumption?

Is it fair and just and right that the Beef Trust and packing concerns, the millers, the bakers, the brewers, and all the rest shall be protected in what they make out of the products they buy from the farmer free?

Under this reciprocity agreement things which the farmer produces and has to sell were put upon the free list, but the things which he can not produce but has to buy were placed on the protected list. In other words, the manufactured products in the main are protected; the farmer's products in the main are unprotected. Both Canada and the United States under

this agreement propose to protect their factories, but mutually agree that the products of the farmer of both countries may enter the markets of the other free of duty.

Is it right that the American manufacturer should be permitted to buy the things he consumes from the Canadian farmer free and go on selling his manufactured and protected products to the unprotected farmer of our country? Grant that the price of living is too high, is not that which the farmer buys too high as well as that which the farmer sells? And, as a matter of fact, the farmer in the main is not getting an exorbitant price for the products of his farm.

The Secretary of Agriculture in his report—1911—shows that the farmer does not get 50 per cent of the price the consumer is forced to pay for agricultural products. He also points out that the prices received by farmers in many instances were even less than the cost of production, and that the middleman and not the farmer is the one mostly responsible for the high cost of foods. The trouble lies with the middlemen. The profits are made after the farmer's products leave him and before they reach the table of the consumer. Is there anything in the reciprocity pact designed to remedy this evil? Nothing. Should the farmer be singled out as a victim and made the burden bearer for all other classes? In an effort to reduce the cost of living should the farmer's pocketbook be the only pocketbook called upon to contribute to that end? But the argument has been made here by gentlemen on this floor that the reciprocity agreement with Canada will reduce the cost of living and at the same time will not affect the price of farm products. Since it is conceded by the President, the author of the reciprocity agreement with Canada, that the agreement will chiefly affect the products of the farm, and since the farmer's products are the ones put upon the free list in this bill, it is beyond my conception to understand how the cost of living is going to be reduced without reducing the cost of farm products; and it is equally incomprehensible to me how the farmer's products are going to be reduced in price and the farmer profited thereby. How is it going to help the farmer to sell what he has to sell in a low market and buy what he has to buy in a high market is a problem the solution of which the champions of this measure will have to solve, for they solemnly tell us that the farmer is going to be blessed and benefited by the transaction and that he should welcome the day when he sells cheap and buys high.

The Democratic orators in the last campaign preached to the city dwellers that if they would only intrust them with power they would greatly reduce the price of living by reducing the price of many necessities of life, and before these same orators had gotten a mile out of town in the farming districts they were telling the farmers how they were going to protect them and be their special guardians by taking the tariff off the things they had to buy.

In the speech I made in the Sixty-second Congress, and to which I have referred, I made this statement:

> The reason why the Democratic Party embraced with such undisguised delight the opportunity to pass the Canadian pact was that it is a heavy blow to the time-honored doctrine of Republican protection. In fact, it is in many respects a radical free-trade measure. It does not stop with the "tariff-for-revenue-only" doctrine of the Democratic Party. It does not look to revenue at all; its most earnest advocates admit that we will lose from two to ten million dollars in revenues yearly by reason of the passage of this bill. It would not surprise me if we lost yearly $50,000,000 in revenue.
>
> The central idea in the fertile brains of the Democratic Members of this House, and the motive which actuated their hearts in the passage of the Canadian reciprocity measure, were to strike a body blow to our protective system.
>
> They are not unmindful of the fact that the protective system is a logical whole—that protection must either apply to all industries or apply to none. You can not protect the American manufacturers and leave the farmers unprotected. Protection must protect everybody that needs protection or protect nobody.

And yet in the face of the fact that the Democratic Party claims to be the farmers' undying friend, it supported through its Representatives on the floor of this House, with surprising unanimity, the reciprocity pact with Canada which would have done so much, had it become effective, to the serious detriment of the farmers of this country.

And this same Democratic Party, with the same pretended love for the farmer, now proposes in the Underwood bill to put his broom corn, buckwheat, potatoes, corn and corn meal, wheat, hogs, beef, veal, mutton, pork, lamb, bacon and hams, milk and cream, and so forth, on the free list. But to compensate for all this and make amends to the farmer for the wrongs done him in the Underwood bill the Democrats have placed rags on the free list. I want to give the Democratic Party credit for that. They have shown great and exceedingly clear insight in the effect their bill will produce on the country, and to meet the demand for rags that is soon to follow have generously placed them on the free list. I believe in giving credit where credit is due. I congratulate the Democratic Party on this wise provision. But the Democratic Party says it is going to compensate the farmer for having reduced or placed on the free list all the products of the farm by admitting free of duty agricultural implements. The Underwood tariff bill carries exactly the same provision in regard to agricultural implements that the so-called farmers' free-list bill carried in the last Congress, and what I said regarding that bill at that time is equally applicable to the present bill. At that time I had this to say:

> Now, let us look at some of the provisions of this so-called farmers' free-list bill. It provides that "plows, tooth harrows, disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse rakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, cotton gins, farm wagons, farm carts, and all other agricultural implements—whatever that may mean—of whatever kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts * * * shall be exempt from duty when imported into the United States."

The gentlemen on the opposite side of this Chamber maintain that they propose to pass this bill in the interest of the American farmer. That being their avowed purpose, it would be well to look dispassionately at the situation and see whether or not this portion of the bill, if passed, will redound to the benefit of the farmers of our country; and to what extent, if any. If this part of the bill, if passed, will greatly benefit our farmers, then it ought to receive the hearty support of all the Members here.

To ascertain whether or not this part of the bill, if enacted into law, will benefit our farmers it is necessary to determine at least three things:

1. What is the present status of the articles mentioned in this part of the bill relative to tariff duties?

2. What are the prices on these various articles now in our own country and abroad?

3. And what effect, if any, will the passage of this bill have on the price of the articles mentioned herein?

Addressing myself to the first inquiry, I find under section 476 of our present tariff law, which is now in operation, that "plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse rakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, and cotton gins, and so forth, shall be imported into this country free of duty," provided "no tax or duty" shall be imposed on us "on like articles imported from the United States" into other countries, and in the event any foreign country refuses to let us ship our agricultural implements, and so forth, free of duty into it, then we charge that country 15 per cent ad valorem for shipping its like implements into this country and enjoying the privilege of our American markets.

Is there anything radically wrong about these provisions of our present tariff law? We offer to let farming implements of other countries come into this country free of duty if they will let our farming implements go into their country free of duty. Anything unfair about that? Is it right for us to give the various countries of the world a free market for their agricultural implements in this country and, in turn, be denied a free market for our agricultural implements in theirs?

Should we discriminate against our own industries or any part of them in favor of the industries of foreign countries? Should the American manufacturer, simply because he is a manufacturer, who employs well-paid American labor be discriminated against in favor of another manufacturer who employs cheap foreign labor? Is it right that American manufacturers of agricultural implements, who employ American labor, should be forced to pay a duty on the agricultural implements which they send to other countries and let the manufacturers of agricultural implements of other countries, who employ foreign labor, send their agricultural implements into this country free of duty? Such a course discriminates against both American capital and labor. And, besides that, it is my information that the International Harvester Co.—and which is sometimes referred to as the Agricultural Implement Trust—has manufacturing plants not only in America but in Canada, Sweden, Russia, France, and Germany, and that agricultural implements are as cheap, or about as cheap, in America as they are elsewhere.

If this be true, and if this tariff law which is soon to be enacted here is to remain long in force, would it not be a wise idea for the International Harvester Co. and other concerns in the United States engaged in making farm implements to remove their plants to Canada and elsewhere and save the thousands of dollars annually which are now paid this Government in tariff duties for the privilege of shipping and selling agricultural implements into this country?

In that event this Government would not only lose the thousands of dollars paid in tariff duties, but our wage earners would lose $50,000,000 annually now paid American labor in the manufacture of agricultural implements.

In 1905 the United States produced $111,344,975 worth of agricultural implements. There were in the year 1900, 46,582 wage earners employed in the United States in the manufacture of agricultural implements. In that year there was $157,707,951 of American money invested in the manufacture of these implements. The State of Kentucky alone had $1,735,595 invested in this enterprise, and paid Kentucky wage earners over $200,000. The State of Illinois had $62,202,320 invested in the manufacture of agricultural implements, and paid over $9,000,000, exclusive of officers' and clerks' salaries to American wage earners.

To let the cheaply made agricultural implements be shipped into this country free of duty would be, indeed, an unjust and unfair discrimination against American capital and American labor, especially in view of the fact that tariff duties must be paid by us on all the agricultural implements which we send for sale to other countries.

Since agricultural implements are already as cheap in this country as elsewhere, and since we lose thousands of dollars in revenue for this Government and transfer millions of dollars from American to foreign labor, it is evident, it seems to me, that this section of the farmers' free "fake" bill, if enacted into law, will hurt, not help, both the American farmer and the American people generally.

I would like to discuss other provisions of this bill, but time forbids. While I have not had an opportunity to give the income-tax provision the thought and study such a great question deserves, my present inclinations are to support it. The rich and prosperous are not bearing their just share of the burdens of the Government under our present system of taxation. But the trouble with this sort of legislation is to know when and where it is going to stop. If sufficient encouragement is given to the movement, the time may come when the rights of property will no longer be safe. I have great faith in the capacity of the American people to properly guard and protect their rights in the future as well as at the present, and I will vote for the income-tax provision of the Underwood bill if I have an opportunity to cast a separate vote for that part of it; but the Underwood bill, taking it as a whole, I can not and will not support. It places coal and timber on the free list, and the district I have the honor to represent is rich in both of these. I would discuss them at length if discussing them would do any good. Nothing that I can here say, nothing that any Republican can here say, will prevent the passage of this bill. The Democrats of this House have decided in caucus that this bill shall pass, and pass it will. I simply want to register my protest against it by my words and by my vote. The Democratic Party has promised the country that business shall not be disturbed and that the high cost of living shall be reduced, neither of which pledges it is going to keep through the passage of this bill. This bill will not reduce the cost of living. You are not going at it right. And if you would listen to me, I would say, "Call off your dogs, gentlemen; they are barking up the wrong tree." Your bill does not strike at the heart of the trouble in the high cost of living. When you can frame and put into execution such laws as will prevent a few men through "gentlemen's agreements" and otherwise from controlling the output and price of almost every product and commodity of the farm, mine, workshop, and factory, not forgetting ladies' hats, you will have gone a long way toward solving the problem of the high cost of living. [Applause.] I want to insert as part of my remarks an editorial and an article appearing in the National Farmer and Stock Grower, published at St. Louis, Mo., and an editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Press of April 24, 1913.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Press, Thursday, Apr. 24, 1913.]

A BILL TO REDUCE AMERICAN WAGES.

The report on the Democratic tariff bill discloses nothing of importance that the bill itself did not reveal, except its frank acknowledgment of the protection-destroying principle on which the bill is framed. American industries receive no favors, however slight. On the contrary, ingenuity is exerted to avoid giving them even incidental favors.

The authors of the bill estimate that it will increase imports about one-third and that those imports will pay very much less customs revenue than under the present tariff, and altogether leave a deficit of $68,750,000 to be made good by the income tax. What will make good the $240,000,000 worth of American products that the increased importations will displace? Who will make good to American men and women the wages that are now paid to the producers of this $240,000,000 worth of American goods that the new tariff will throw out of the market? A very radical change is here proposed, and the purpose is frankly expressed to invite and stimulate the importation of the products of foreign labor in order that those making the same goods on this side of the ocean may feel the full strain and stress of foreign competition.

This is expected to bring down the cost of living in this country. What avail will it be to the thousands who are thrown out of work that the cost of things is reduced when they have no money at all to pay for them? What joy does it give a man to find prices reduced if his wages are reduced even more? The market can absorb only about so much, and if this is supplied by American industry, American manufacturers and American workmen will receive and circulate here at home the money value of the commodities. If the $240,000,000 of goods now made here are brought in from abroad by the new tariff, as its framers predict, it will send that much American money or its equivalent across the water. It will represent the profits of foreign producers and the wages of foreign workmen, while a proportionate amount of our own mills and our own workmen are idle.

To stand the foreign competition, which this Democratic tariff bill is framed to invite, the wages of American workers, men and women, must come down to the foreign wage level. On no other basis can our manufacturers compete, and even then only the strongest of them can survive the competition. A bill "to reduce American wages and to close American mills" should be the title of this measure. With this report behind it, this Democratic tariff bill comes before Congress without disguise, naked and unashamed of its un-American purpose to discourage home industry and to encourage in its stead and greatly increase the importation to this country of the products of foreign labor.

—

FARMERS AND THE TARIFF—WHAT CONGRESS IS LIKELY TO DO AND WHAT CONGRESS WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR IF THE PROTECTIVE SYSTEM IS LEGISLATED OUT OF BUSINESS.

The National Farmer and Stock Grower is not a political paper, and we regret very much that protection of American farming, manufacturing, and commercial interests, through the collection of customs duties, is considered a political question when it really is an economic and business matter—one that can not be decided in connection with social and sentimental questions that so largely influence the alignment of political parties.

We venture the assertion that if the people of the United States were permitted to vote on the tariff question alone and not have it mixed up with all other subjects that divide people into parties the vote on the tariff would be overwhelmingly in favor of the protection to American industries of all kinds through the imposition of customs duties that would shut nothing out entirely, but would collect some money for the support of the Government on all raw materials and manufactured goods admitted from foreign countries.

In lawmaking Congress exerts a wonderful power, and it is often exercised unwisely and to the disadvantage of the American people. A case in point is the removal of the tariff on coffee, which enabled the foreign combinations to put up the price before the coffee reached our seaports and almost doubled the cost to the American importer and trebled the profits of the Brazilian syndicates that control the output.

Another example of misdirected legislation is taking the duty off hides, which has resulted to the benefit of the owners of foreign hides, who simply added the duty to the price. They paid the duties to the United States Government when the duties were collectible by law, and put it in their own pockets when they found that the United States Government had made them a present of it by admitting the hides free of duty.

We understand the general idea in Congress is that all they have to do is to remove the 1½-cent-a-pound duty on dressed meats or the small duty that is paid on imported beef cattle and then go around to the butcher shops and buy beefsteaks 10 cents a pound cheaper. They are entirely mistaken. They can make a present of the duties to the foreign syndicates engaged in the meat trade, but they can not prevent them accepting and keeping the present. They can admit cattle on the hoof free of duty, but there the power of Congress ends. They can discourage the American farmer and induce him to get rid of his sheep, but they can not get him to start up again. The wheat grower, who has a nice old time producing wheat that will pay a profit of $6 to $10 an acre under present circumstances, can easily be induced to quit raising wheat, but when Argentine and Canadian wheats come in on top of a good crop here and the market becomes demoralized for the time being, then look out for the farmer forgetting to sow the usual crop of wheat in this country.

Congress can do much damage, but can not heal the sores again. People in the United States are not going to prosper on the money that goes to Australia for wool, or on the money that goes to Canada for wheat, or on the money that goes to Argentina for beef. We prosper on the money that is paid to our own people. It goes out and it comes back again. It gets into circulation. But the money that is sent abroad remains there, and our exports are not any larger from that source of revenue.

The farm productions of this country are ample for all purposes. One-half of the time our grain productions sell at prices that barely return the cost of production. There has never yet been a time when there was a bonanza in grain growing. Through years of low prices and sacrifice, cattle have for once reached what may be called high prices, but only because of the changes that on the one hand have destroyed cattle ranges, but the cattle ranges cut up into farms have not yet produced the maximum of beef. Year in and year out farm productions bring moderate prices, and the burdens of the consumer are not caused by the wholesale cost of anything the farmer raises.

We have no hesitancy in saying as our editorial opinion that the admission of farm products free of duty from other countries will gradually undermine the productive industries of this country. The change will not take place in a day, but we will soon be in the position of a family when the head of it gambles his earning away instead of taking the money home to his wife. Industrial enterprises will be in difficulties, for the reason that trade will be dull and wages high. Less people will be employed and many industries will be at a standstill. The farmer will be able to feed himself, but he will find himself short of money; he will practice economy and produce crops that cost the least for seed and the least cost for labor.

Farmers will remember that Canada saved us from the acts of our own Congress, so far as the bogus reciprocity bill was concerned, but we can not expect to have Canadians refuse free trade when they are still able to conduct their own protective system. We can not expect much assistance from manufacturers who are protectionists, because they are usually protectionists for themselves alone; and we can not expect much help from anyone unless we do the work ourselves. Congress will finally have to accept responsibility for its acts, but that is away off. When great injury is done and can not be undone, it is poor satisfaction to fix the blame, and that is all the recourse we will have.

In another column will be found an article entitled "Our industrial policy." If every farmer who is interested in this subject will address a Congressman and a Senator indorsing this policy it will be harder and harder to get a bill through Congress that will do away with the protective policy of the Government, so far as the farming interest is concerned.

OUR INDUSTRIAL POLICY—WE ARE IN FAVOR OF ALL FOREIGN FARM PRODUCTIONS PAYING A DUTY FOR THE SUPPORT OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT, AND TO PAY IT AT THE FRONT DOOR.

The National Farmer and Stock Grower is in favor of the United States customhouse collecting a reasonable range of duties upon all foreign farm products and all manufactured goods admitted into the United States from foreign countries, said duties to be applied to the support of the National Government.

By the tariff policy that we advocate fully one-half of the money required for the support of the National Government should be collected at the customhouses, besides furnishing the farmer and manufacturer the very moderate amount of protection to which they are entitled. We are opposed to the admission of foreign farm products free of duty, because admission of such products duty free always leads to the advantage of the foreign merchant and speculator and causing increased burdens to be imposed on our own people.

Taking the duty off hides has been entirely in the interest of foreign countries and to the detriment of our own people; admitting coffee duty free enabled the formation of a South American combination that has raised the price three for one, and every time foreign goods are placed on the free list there is the same result. With moderate import duties received by the United States on various products as now collected the total that is covered into the United States Treasury is over $300,000,000 a year, and if not collected that way will have to be collected by direct taxes upon our own productions. The admission of foreign goods free of duty results in higher prices to the American consumer and higher taxation also upon our own products to make up the necessary revenues.

Every farmer in the United States is taxed by his county and by the State; he also pays a share of the taxes collected in various ways for the support of the Federal Government. We believe that in return for his support in tax money and in time of necessity for his personal services the American citizen is entitled to preference in his home market for his own productions from the laws of the Government he supports. We believe that the advantages of our own markets belong to the citizens of the United States, and that all foreign farm productions should pay a duty at the front door as the goods are admitted. In times of scarcity, caused by drought or other unavoidable influences, the foreign farm productions can come in under light duties on a fair basis, and in times of abundance the country thrives better without them.

We believe the farmer as a producer outranks all other people; the manufacturer is next; but without the farmer's products the manufacturer would have to shut his doors.

Legislation against the farming interest is the height of folly, and special discrimination against the farmer is a political crime. Legislation against the farmer will cause more poverty in the cities than most people imagine. The nonproducing, so-called, consumers in cities will be the first to find it out and be the greatest sufferers.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, on the 4th day of July, 1776, the people of America declared their political independence of the mother country, and on the 4th day of July, 1789, they placed upon their statute books their first decisive declaration of commercial independence.

The earlier declaration was an expression of freedom and equality for all men, the latter a deliberate expression in law of the means whereby the former might be obtained and maintained. It is not a little singular that in 1913, 124 years later, there is an effort by a great party to enact into law the theory and the assertion that the first statute of the new Nation by its First Congress was a constitutional mistake and blunder; that the great minds who in convention framed our organic law did not know, as Congressmen, its powers and limitations, and that the Father of his Country, who approved the law, did not comprehend its purport or its provisions.

The First Congress was confronted with an imperious demand for immediate money; it was also confronted with the urgent necessity to encourage and protect manufactures. It met both conditions under the same act—a protective tariff yielding revenue—clearly, certainly, definitely, without hesitancy, and without question, demonstrating indubitably that, great and consummate as had been their ability in framing the Constitution, equally great was their ability to enact the requisite laws adapted to and in conformity with it, so written as to produce adequate revenue and to inspire, to foster, and to promote American energy, skill, enterprise, and industry.

Concerning the principle and the policy, the right and the wisdom of a protective tariff, there was then no party division, nor was there division then among the great leaders of either party. Madison, of the school of Jefferson, was its advocate in Congress, and Hamilton, the Federalist, was in full accord.

Where they stood then the Republican Party now stands. What they advocated we advocate, their principles are ours, and notwithstanding the tremendous popular electoral vote which placed Mr. Wilson in the Executive chair, I unhesitatingly assert, without fear of successful contradiction, that where the fathers stood in 1789 and where the Republican Party stands to-day, stand also this hour in an overwhelming majority the people of the United states. [Applause on the Republican side.]

On the 4th of November last there was no mandate from the people to the Democratic Party to revise the policy of the Nation, to write a tariff for revenue only, to disclaim and deny all protection to all American industries, to stay the unparalleled prosperity of all the people (which is the unquestioned and undeniable fact of to-day), to return to the not-forgotten sloughs and quagmires and the valleys of dark despair of approximate free trade, to feed on the dry husks and the bitter herbs of an exploded, delusive, and illusive theory. To the great body of our citizens it is not necessary to repeat the sad lessons of the past.

The impossibility of prosperity under a tariff for revenue only has been demonstrated too thoroughly, too often, and too recently to call for repetition. With many millions of our citizens its utter failure is yet a tragic memory, while all have recourse to history and can determine and denounce as they read. They know, who will, that such a tariff laid upon competitive foreign products is both a delusion and a snare. It builds for some while it destroys for others. When written only to produce revenue a tariff should be placed so that its burdens may be borne equally, wherein lies equity. In such matters equality is equity, and inequality is inequity. It is not that such inequality and inequity is the limited and the rare, it is that it is the usual and should be the expected. It is not that it comes unforeseen and occasionally, but it is in its very nature and in its necessary application foredoomed to be unequal, unfair, discriminatory, oftentimes totally destructive, always unjust, inequitable, and indefensible. Such a tariff can never be fair to the people as a whole or in any considerable part, can never be just and wise in principle, safe or salutary in use.

Such products of the foreign factory or the farm as are hopeful articles of large importation are stimulated to activity by low rates of duty; such foreign products as are not suggestive of large importation are charged with a higher duty to gain some revenue; and, regardless of the reasons therefor, the proposed tariff illustrates the wide—the very wide—range in the scale of duties placed upon articles which are competitive with the products of our people. Without stating or considering the reasons therefor, but knowing only that professedly not one rate has been written with the purpose or intent to protect a single American industry, but solely with an eye alert for revenue, we find this tariff bill, like all its predecessors of a similar scope and purpose, full of low rates of duty or no duty at all, so framed to inspire, encourage, and stimulate importation of articles with which the industrial world of America is in sharp competition, while other paragraphs in the same schedule, for reasons which appeal to its makers, have a high, almost prohibitive, rate, practically excluding competition.

Against these low rates the American producer must strive in competition, selling in this lower, less favorable market, while quite possibly he must buy his raw material even from one who has the "accidental" protection peculiar to tariffs so constructed. Many of our industries must struggle for existence in the world's market, with admittedly adverse conditions of labor cost, buying their needed materials of those not exposed to foreign competition, unaffected by the labor conditions of other lands, undisturbed by tariff changes.

To illustrate, "machine tools," an important industry in my State, has now a tariff adequate only to fair protection—of 30 per cent on its finished product—and House bill 3321 reduces this to 15 per cent. This industry is not a monopoly or a trust. There are 224 competitive establishments in 18 different States, employing 30,000 wage earners, with a total annual output of $40,000,000, with an annual average income for the past 10 years of 8.95 per cent on actual invested capital, which have no material protection because of patents. A "machine tool" is of the class of lathes, planes, drills, and the like, and is not the tool of the individual workingman but of the manufacturing concerns which use them in cutting, shaping, and forming metal. Their use has never enhanced but has always reduced the cost of the articles made by them, while, both directly and indirectly, their manufacture and use have lowered the cost of many of the necessaries of life.

The American machine-tool builder has sharp foreign competition, especially in Germany and England, through equally scientific shop systems, equal physical capacity in their skilled workmen, equal plant equipment, with capacity to turn out the same amount of work man for man, and through a wage cost of about one-half. In fact, during the years from 1900 to 1910 in the neutral market of France, not prejudiced in Germany's favor, the American growth has been from 35,000,000 francs to 45,000,000 francs, while Germany has increased from 35,000,000 francs to 110,000,000 francs. We have gained 10,000,000 francs, Germany 75,000,000.

During the past 10 years the American machine-tool industry has steadily lost strength in continental Europe, while during

that same period under the 30 per cent rate there has been a steadily growing invasion of the American market by its foreign competitors, and under the proposed rate of 15 per cent the consequences to the machine-tool industry can be nothing less than disastrous unless met by a lower cost of production, which, under the already highly organized and highly specialized machine-tool shops of America, can only be found in a lower wage to the workmen. But against this means of reduction in the cost of the machine tool comes the hard fact that the incidental protection of associated industries in many instances permits those favored concerns employing the same class of labor and using the same materials to maintain the same wage scale as at present, a wage scale which, indeed, no American industry should be prevented by any tariff rate in any tariff law from maintaining. Between this upper millstone of a foreign competitor producing the goods at 30 to 40 per cent less cost than the American concern and his incidentally protected associated manufacturer, preventing all possible relief in a lower wage scale to its workmen, what is there left to the machine-tool industry and its employees but bankruptcy to the one and loss of employment and wage to the other? Among those associated industries of which I speak, employing the same class of skilled machinists and using the same general class of materials, are automobiles and automobile bodies, rated in H. R. 3321 at 45 per cent ad valorem; motor cycles and finished parts thereof, 40 per cent; bicycles, 25 per cent; breech-loading shotguns and rifles, and the like, pistols of all kinds, 35 per cent; files, file blanks, rasps, and the like, 25 per cent; screws, 25 per cent; umbrella and parasol ribs, 35 per cent; wheels for railway purposes, and the like, 25 per cent; nippers and pliers, 30 per cent; and all articles composed wholly or in chief value of iron, steel, and the like, whether wholly or partly manufactured, 25 per cent.

In making this comparison I am not suggesting that any of these rates has been laid on any other ground than for revenue only. On the contrary I assume, as I have a right to do, that they have been placed solely and carefully on that basis. With that assumption I invite attention to an analysis of these rates as affecting these different industries, and a clear appreciation of the injustice, inequality, and inequity which under the system invoked follows as regularly, as exactly, and as certainly as night follows the day.

I would invite your attention to another schedule in which my constituents are most deeply interested. I would take you to Barre, Vt., the largest center of the granite industry of the world. Thirty years ago the granite industry in Barre had practically no existence; under the fostering conditions of a Republican protective tariff since 1883 it has now no rival.

In paragraphs 100 and 101, H. R. 3321, we find manufactured marble placed at a rate of 45 per cent, reduced from 50 per cent, and manufactured granite at 25 per cent, reduced from 50 per cent. Why the gross dissimilarity in the rates on the finished product? Under the tariff for revenue of 1894 for three years the rate of duty on manufactured granite was at 30 per cent, aside from those three years, from 1883 to the present it has remained with marble at 50 per cent.

Why the change? Aside from the most ordinary monumental purposes both may be classed as luxuries. As a revenue producer it should be so placed and taxed. A man who is able to build a house of marble at a cost of $12 a cubic foot will not notice a change of 5 per cent in his favor, but the Government will lose just that much revenue. Why the reduction of 50 per cent in the rate of duty on granite and of 10 per cent only on marble? Largely they are competitors. Examination of the report of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means discloses no specific explanation, hence, if found, it must be in the general principles underlying the revision—table 4, page 9, classes marble as a luxury. If a luxury, why any reduction? Is not manufactured granite also a luxury? What man of moderate means buys either, except for ordinary monumental purposes at moderate expense? In what regard is granite, save for such monumental purposes, a necessity? Why is it excessively reduced?

Table 5, page 11, deals in necessaries. Schedule B is anxiously studied, but evidently granite is not classed as a necessity; but grindstones are, and the tariff burden on grindstones should be reduced in accordance with the declaration of purpose on page 9 "to the lowest possible point commensurate with revenue requirements"—and the "robber" protective tariff of 1909 rates them at $1.75 per ton and the "immaculate" competitive tariff of 1913 at $1.50 per ton, a reduction of 25 cents on a ton, of eighty-nine one-hundredths of 1 per cent, or about 3 cents on a 300-pound grindstone. And similarly are luxuries, such as marble, lowered, instead of increased, 5 per cent, and the tariff burdens reduced on the necessary grindstone eighty-nine one-hundredths of 1 per cent only.

Aeroplanes are classed as luxuries, and in accordance with the manifesto on page 9 the committee has kept in mind the "making the luxuries of life bear their proper burden of the tariff responsibilities." Under the "ill-conceived" tariff of 1909 aeroplanes as luxuries were rated at 45 per cent; under H. R. 3321 only 25 per cent—not an increase but a reduction; yes, a reduction of 20 per cent!

"Comfits and fruits of all kinds, preserved, containing over 10 per cent of alcohol," tariff of 1909, 90.98 per cent—H. R. 3321, 70 per cent; and "game, except birds," the excoriated tariff of 1909 places at 2½ cents per pound and the proposed tariff of 1913, which is to make the "luxuries of life bear their proper burden of the tariff responsibilities"—this tariff reduces the duty on game to 1½ cents per pound. "Oriental rugs and carpets, and those woven whole for rooms," under the plutocrat tariff of 1909 bear a rate of 58.10 per cent; under the Democratic poor man's tariff relief of 1913 are rated at 50 per cent. Evidently the Republican tariff of 1909 placed a too heavy burden of responsibilities on luxuries which it is the clear duty of the Democratic tariff of 1913 to correct by lessening them.

There is no answer in the bill or the report to my question: Why is the tariff on manufactured marble reduced only 5 per cent and the tariff on manufactured granite reduced 50 per cent? But there is a reason, and perhaps I find it. In No. 4 of the hearings, relating to Schedule B, on page 565, I find the statement of Mr. Frank J. Harnold, of Townsend, Townsend & Co., 453 West Twenty-first Street, New York City, representing the National Association of Wholesale Granite Dealers, comprising 18 firms engaged in the business of selling domestic and imported granite monuments at wholesale. He recommends that the tariff on manufactured granite be reduced from 50 per cent to 20 per cent. He claimed that at 20 per cent ad valorem the cost of the imported article would be in excess of the cost of the domestic article, and to prove it he submitted a brief in which he shows that certain granite, f. o. b.—

Aberdeen, Scotland, costs $22.87; that the duty, at 20 per cent, is $4.58; freight and delivery f. o. b. cars New York is $7.11; making a total of $34.56.

That certain domestic granite f. o. b. cars at quarry is $30; omitting all transportation charges to the same distributing point, which from Barre, Vt., is easily equal to the freight charges across the water, which, if added at $7.11, makes a total of $37.11, or an excess in cost of $2.55.

That certain other granite f. o. b. Aberdeen costs $59.61; duty, at 20 per cent ad valorem, is $11.92; freight and delivery f. o. b. cars at New York, $18.72; total, $90.25.

That certain domestic granite costs f. o. b. cars at quarry $87; omitting wholly transportation charges to the same distributing point, equal from Barre, Vt., I feel sure, to the shipping charges across the Atlantic, namely, $18.72; total, $105.72; against the American producer, $15.47; and that also certain other granite f. o. b. Aberdeen costs $60.82; duty, at 20 per cent ad valorem, $12.17; freight and delivery f. o. b. cars at New York, $19.13; total, $92.12.

That also certain other domestic granite costs f. o. b. cars at quarry, $88; omitting wholly transportation charges to the same distributing point, which is probably equal to the shipping charges on sea, $19.13; total, $107.13; less, $92.12; to the disadvantage of the American producer, $15.01.

No manufacturers of granite were heard, and the rate of duty was cut to 25 per cent, substantially granting the request of the importer. Whether it was because the importer requested a tariff that would invite competitive importation or because the committee regarded this industry, whose finished product is practically all labor, as one which should be stripped bare of protection and left to combat its foreign rivals with a wage scale that is high while theirs is low, I cannot say, but such is the result of their action—and the consequences must be most serious.

Wages in Barre, Vt., and vicinity: Cutters, 40⅝ cents per hour, minimum; polishers, 40⅝ cents per hour, minimum.

Foreign: Cutters, 15 cents per hour average; polishers, 14 cents per hour average.

When the present bill of prices expires the new bill will require $4 a day for eight hours.

The granite business of the United States is in no sense a trust; each manufacturer is in competition with every other. In Washington County, Vt., my home county, there are over 140 manufacturing concerns in direct competition with each other, and I am advised that the same condition exists all over the United States. Should the tariff be raised 100 per cent over the rate of to-day it would not at all affect the prices of the product, owing to the sharp competition which prevails. It would mean simply increased production within the United

States without increase of price to the consumer. If the tariff is reduced so that foreign competitors ship their manufactured product into this country to any considerable extent, it will reduce the output of our manufacturers without lessening the cost to the consumer.

This is a case where that for every foreign monument sold in the United States American labor manufactures one less. The American laborer gets just so much less opportunity to sell his product, and the American manufacturer parts with his profits for the benefit of the foreign producer and the home importer. House bill 3321 makes foreign manufactured granite an easy competitor with American manufactured granite upon terms which give the foreigner marked advantage in our own markets. This is not the tariff revision promised the people by the Democrats in their platform of 1912, nor is it in accord with the declaration of President Wilson in his anteelection speech at Pittsburgh, when he was quoted as saying that his party proposed—

Merely a reconsideration of the tariff schedules such as will adjust them to the actual business conditions and interests of the country. Their desire is not to check but to aid, not to embarrass but to quicken.

In this tariff the Democratic Party make a vigorous assault on nearly every industry in which my constituents are interested. Not alone granites and freestones, but all manufactures of wood, all products of agriculture, of the farm and of the mill, all woolens and cottons, they have either transferred the article to the free list outright or have so reduced the rate of duty as to admit and invite foreign competition on terms which put the American producer at a distinct disadvantage and compels an immediate readjustment of cost in production or a final surrender of the enterprise.

There is no considerable cost reduction possible, except by a lowered wage scale; and no condition should be invited or permitted, if preventable, the effect of which is to reduce any wage scale or lower the standard of living for any American workman. The true standard for all Americans in all particulars is not cheapness but excellence.

The reason given for this attack on the industries and enterprises of my constituents is that it will reduce the cost of living; but it is not so to be accomplished. Recent experience in free hides and free rubber, free coffee and teas, is illustrative of my position. To lessen expense to the user of boards, planks, and other lumber is the explanation given for placing these articles on the free list, but it will not lessen the cost of a single board or plank to the American consumer. A reduction of one-half of the rate in the tariff of 1909 lessened no price to the consumer.

The Canadian lumberman in no case got less than half of the reduction; in many cases he had all; in no case did the reduction reach the consumer. Already the alert Canadian lumberman in making his contracts for next year's delivery is providing that in event of a reduction of tariff on any article of wood in any process of manufacture he shall have the benefit by an increased price for his product, sometimes equal to the cut, and never less than a 50 per cent advance. The larger the deal the larger the Canadian's share in the tariff cut. It will not lower in any part the cost to the consumer, but by the simple operation of the most ordinary law of economics it will transfer the wood manufacturing industry from the United States to Canada; will compel American invested capital to suffer large loss; and will throw out of employment a large force of skilled employees who know no other craft than this.

The people of the United States still favor a protective tariff; they prefer prosperity in America; they enjoy and would promote and maintain our standards of living; they favor in its broadest and most beneficent sense the slogan of "America for Americans"; they love and would cherish the American home; they have faith in the free school, in the free church; they have confidence in, respect, and regard for the manhood and the womanhood which all these forces produce; they would maintain the open door from poverty to prosperity, the pathway from ignorance to knowledge. Under the economic system yet prevailing has been secured the unparalleled general and genuine happiness and prosperity of our people.

It is not a change of system but a readjustment of plans and methods to suit changed conditions which is desired by the American citizen. The ultimate American consumer must be assured of a fair price in the American market. Formerly this was obtained by competition within the United States among producers of the same class. Latterly this has been prevented to a considerable degree by monopolies which have throttled internal competition. The Democratic antidote presented in House bill 3321 is to adjust the tariff so as to permit and invite competition from abroad, without any regard to the relative production cost of the competing articles, and with no effort to provide any relief through tariff schedules to the American producer because of the admitted higher wages which he is compelled to pay.

The true way, the Republican way, is to adjust the tariff so as to retain the American market for the American producer so long as he sells his products at a fair price to the American consumer and subject him to competition from abroad when, and only when, his prices to the consumer are unfair, undue, or exorbitant.

We contend that the fair price and the proper tariff to maintain it shall be ascertained by a scientific investigation through a permanent nonpartisan board or commission into every economic feature, condition, or factor which will aid in ascertaining and definitely determining the true difference in production cost of every foreign product seeking entry at our ports to compete with the similar products of America.

This plan is derided by our friends on the other side of the aisle; it is declared by them to be impracticable and, in fact, impossible. We, on our side, admit that it is no easy task; but in the presence of the thousands of millions of invested capital in thousands of thriving cities and villages all over our broad land, in the face of the millions of prosperous wage earners living under American conditions, with opening American opportunities to every child born within their homes, the continuance and maintenance of which conditions are so dear to every true American heart, so important and essential in every aspect of our national life, we are willing, nay, we are eager, to essay the task, to make practical the impracticable and to accomplish the impossible. We have faith in the ability of the American people to master ultimately an admittedly involved, intricate, and difficult problem.

To the brave, the strong, the masterful, there are no inaccessible mountain tops, no unthreaded canyons, no impassable rivers, seas, or plains. The end sought justifies and requires the best thought, the greatest care, unlimited industry, and the highest courage. We on this side of the aisle turn from your trembling, effeminate, disheartening "You can not" to the resolute, strong, and resourceful "We will." [Applause on the Republican side.]

In the tariff scheme of the Republicans we would save the ship, not scuttle it. We would conserve, not destroy; we would not endanger even. No untried theory, however attractive, should be balanced against the welfare of the Nation. It is still wiser to study markets rather than maxims. It is better to be sane and safe than spectacular and dangerous. We will play no game of hazard when the stakes are the happiness and prosperity of our people, the glory and grandeur of our beloved country. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILDER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILDER] is recognized.

Mr. WILDER. Mr. Chairman, I propose to devote a few minutes only to lining up a few headings that I shall develop more at length in the RECORD. I do this for the reason that I could not be expected to be given as much time as I would like in order to say what I have on my mind. I will make a few observations and then perhaps a few suggestions.

Mr. Chairman, I went through the panic of 20 years ago—or into it—and while I supposed at the beginning of it I had a competence, I lost every dollar I had and was $125,000 in debt when I got through with it. It took 10 of the best years of my life to make my name good. I know something about the conditions of 20 years ago, and I wish to speak largely from matters of history and self-evident conclusions drawn therefrom. We were told of the robbery and iniquity fostered by the tariff to protect the rich and destroy the poor; we were shown the glories of free trade of other nations, and if one will take the trouble to compare the sayings of the principal actors of 20 years ago with those of to-day the deadly parallel column would make a modern crematory look like 30 cents. True, the conditions are different to-day, but the principle is the same. The balance of trade has been running largely in our favor for many years, and our financial strength and wealth by far exceeds that of 20 years ago, and we can bear more distress; yet the people on whom the burden will first fall must feel it just the same. I shall show later how closely allied the tariff is with the question of wages. There are exceptions, of course, and always will be so long as we are human, where the rule does not apply; yet all principles are inexorable, and we can not defy them without paying any more than we can defy the laws of nature without suffering.

Mr. Chairman, so far as I can observe from the address of the President before the two Houses and from the remarks of other speakers, the speeches that have been made here, as I have already said, are very similar to those that were made 20 years

ago. We hope the result may not be the same. I wish to point out in the President's address a few remarks that it seems to me had he been as well acquainted with the practical side of our industrial and economic system as he is with the theoretical side and the schoolroom and books he would not have made them. I wish to quote as a foundation for this remark something once said to me by the then leading chemist, Prof. Josiah P. Cooke, of Harvard University, when I was working with him to produce a device which he very much desired for the laboratory. He stated: "I know what I want to accomplish, and you know how to accomplish it." He then gave me a little dissertation or homily of what education consists in. He said that he had observed many times that the dunces in the classics were at the head of their classes in the laboratory, and vice versa. He said he had written a little pamphlet, and gave me one, wherein he maintained that "education was the acquisition of useful units of knowledge," and although I am a member of the bar, and know a factory from alfalfa to zinthum, I wish to add my testimony to that of Prof. Cooke, that to know a factory is no less a science than to know the law; and, indeed, a man can make a far better bluff with the law, and in less time, than he can become a fine mechanic, say nothing about the intricacies of business and other kindred things. I am going to speak about these things from the knowledge of one who has had a wide and varied experience. Until I was 29 I spent my life in school, on the farm, in the mill, and as a merchant, and then manufacturing until I was 45, when I was admitted to the bar. I have traveled this country all over many times, have been to Europe on somewhat extended tours three times, and have been to Panama and other places with a view to educating myself in matters of human welfare, and I hope to call attention to the facts related to and involved in this tariff discussion so that they will be simple and manifest.

The President in his address spoke of the "duty laid upon the party now in power at the recent elections." President Wilson got less votes than William J. Bryan had at two times when he was a candidate and by far less votes than Taft had four years ago. He is President simply because of the dissension in the Republican Party. The leaders of both minorities in the House are objecting most vehemently and pleading for their country ineffectively that this tariff bill shall not be enacted. The responsible leaders of a majority of the American electorate are doing everything in their power to prevent the adoption of this bill. To talk about such "duty laid" is a mere travesty. The "burden carried" that Mr. President refers to must be the splendid prosperity of the past 16 years. The President is apparently a joker. He asks that the "burden be lightened." Does he mean that if workingmen have less work it will "lighten their burdens"? Can it be the "radical alterations in the conditions of our economic life which the country has witnessed within the last generation" when the same talk was given us 20 years ago?

We are all anxious to "square them with the actual facts." Theories look very beautiful to one who has not given his life in an effort to get the theories and facts together and found that in a last analysis he must square himself with life as he finds it instead of with fine-spun theories. "The law of nature" would demand that we put ourselves on a par with the 300,000,000 Chinese and other countries generally. The law of prudence demands that we take care of this country and make it the grandest in all the earth—that we make it a country of all nations, who can by their character and their disposition affiliate with our civilization, and those whom we refuse to receive should be the criminals, the insane, and those who by their heritage can not appreciate our institutions and the civilization of this country. The true test is whether the goods can or should be produced in this country, together with the facts, is there a substantial amount imported? The President would be surprised if he knew what a large proportion of the business of this country is absolutely free from trusts or "artificial arrangements," yet substantially all of it is to be slaughtered alike. The test seems to be whether or not the strongest can stand it, which practice would slaughter all the weak, which the Democratic Party professes to love and protect. The President discredits himself and offends every true American when he uses these words: "And put our business men and producers under the stimulation of a constant necessity to be efficient, economical, and enterprising, masters of competitive supremacy, better workers and merchants than any in the world." They are all this to-day. The utter fallacy of this thought ought to be apparent to everyone who thinks. The American manufacturer to-day excels the world. Now, if he is to learn from his foreign brother how to compete, as the President suggests, the way is clear. He competes in every respect to-day, except in that the American workingman is better paid. The way is perfectly clear. To compete with the foreign manufacturer, reduce wages to a par of the foreign manufacturer; and, rightly analyzed, this is exactly and necessarily what the President's words portend. The American's wits needs no whetting. Again, he suggests that the Americans are stupid. I resent the imputation for myself and for those Americans who may have been as studious and diligent and resourceful in their field of Americanism as has been the President in his. If the American must "whet his wits" so as to compete with the foreigner, as I have said before, he reduces the wages of American workingmen to the level of the foreigner. The wits the President speaks of become apparent in this way, and this way only. Correctly analyzed, his is a bid for the American manufacturer to reduce his wages to the level of other countries. He states it would be unwise to move toward this headlong.

Will some one tell us, if this bill is not drastic and headlong, how they would go to work to make one so with wool from 11 cents per pound to free, and so forth? What does he mean by a "chance to change"—go into some other business? Is he purposely going to destroy many lines of business? He states that we need the outlet and the enlarged field of energy more than we ever did before. Why? Because he proposes to let in a flood of foreign-made goods? As a rule there is no artificial stimulation except to pay American wages. He says he thinks the tariff should be adjusted as a matter of judgment exercised item by item. Has this been done, does he think, in a month's time? The American manufacturers and workmen of to-day are superior in their methods, skill, and ability to dare and do to anything in the world; they can compete with anything in the world with the same wages, and this is the issue.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] in his principal speech drew a great deal of applause from his followers when he drew attention to the amount that the tariff had been reduced on the various schedules. Now, that reduction is supposed to reduce the cost of living or to reduce something. Who is going to pay it? Those who usually pay these things, who are summed up in the word labor. The assumption is certainly made by this applause that something is to be lowered or some advantage is to be gained by the reduction of these tariff schedules. Now, I am as much in favor as anyone of reducing the rates on the tariff schedules to what I would call a competitive basis, namely, so that under all schedules not made exclusively in this country, where no tariff is needed, they shall be that low so that there is certain competition; indeed, I think I would make an automatic tariff, so that on such goods as can be made in this country the rate would be lowered gradually until there was a reasonable amount of importation, perhaps 10 to 25 per cent, so that it might be known and realized that our American manufacturers were working as close as they could to a low schedule, and when it reached a larger amount than 25 per cent—or if these are not the right limits, fix the right limits—the tariff should be raised. American manufacturers are perfectly willing to stand up to any reasonable competition and let the public prescribe the wage, but it is against all true Americanism that the wage market, which is the fundamental of everything made, shall go into competition. The Republican Party is not in favor of its going into competition except among themselves. The Republican Party is not in favor of supporting the people of other countries abroad. If they want to have our American wages, our American living, our American civilization, let them come to America with a view of becoming American citizens, and I believe all men who come to this country and remain five years and make no move toward becoming American citizens should be subject to deportation, and I believe the aliens in this country should be limited in their privileges of citizenship wholly aside from the privilege of voting. I have been reliably informed that less than 5 per cent of those taking part in the recent disgraceful affairs in Lawrence, Mass., were American citizens. Such a thing should be impossible with aliens.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] spoke particularly of a few specialties like Disston saws and the Walk-Over shoes, and then undertook to apply the tariff to these special trade-marked things. You can not do it. He should have applied it to standard things like cotton and wool and low-priced articles. If he was better acquainted perhaps with the details of manufacturing and knew how these things operate, I do not think he would have made that statement. Henry Disston & Son, in Philadelphia, I think is the oldest and largest manufacturer of saws in this country, possibly in the world, and anyone experienced in these lines knows that it takes a long time to develop a good saw. It has more tricks than a cat has lives. Furthermore, it will

not work perfectly unless it has perfect care. I began to file and set and handle saws when I was 13 years old, and I know what I am talking about, and it was tiresome to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] discuss and draw conclusive conclusions on a matter about which he apparently knew so little. There are few manufacturers but what will pay more for a Disston saw than any other saw made, for it has a mechanical and continuous activity that is important at every stage of its usefulness; if it is not right in the first place it is never right. The Walk-Over shoe is a common trade-marked, much-advertised specialty. A person buying this shoe pays substantially more for the same grade of shoe than they need to pay, but they obtain a certainty. It can not be applied to cotton cloth, nor worsted nor woolen; they have certain fixed standards which must be mastered by those handling them successfully, whereas a sawyer can not be expected to be an expert on saws, and if he learns to take care of them he does mighty well, and in all factories of any size the man who uses the saw does not keep it in order, but a specialist is appointed to do this work. Nails, structural iron, and thousands of other things come into this field of standards, whereas one has only to think to recall specialties. Of course there is a field in between specialties and standards, but it is utterly confusing to use such illustrations in reference to the tariff.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make the particular statement, which I will develop later, that the question of tariff is a question of wages. I said a few years ago that it was largely wages, but directly and indirectly it is all wages. If you do not think it is, watch the development of it that I will give. Many speakers refer to the wage scale in any given product, then, after having set up their effigy, proceed to riddle it by showing that wages can only be affected to this extent, whereas, as a matter of fact, directly or indirectly, everything that comes into our hands is a question of wages. The so-called laboring man is wont to say that everything is produced by labor, hence everything belongs to labor This proposition is just near enough right to mislead as if it were wholly wrong. Let us use the term "workingman," for I think we have the assurance somewhere that a man who will not work neither shall he eat, and this country has no use for the idle poor or rich who are able to work. There are those who do not want to take the risk of business, for sometimes there are no earnings whatever; other times they are large, but when there are no earnings but losses the laborer gets his pay just the same, and right here I want to say on the whole the American manufacturer does not get more than a fair return. Thousands of them never succeed at all. Some get gain by adopting questionable methods far beyond what is fair. This should be corrected so far as possible, but in order to do it the wheat should not be destroyed; but even so, we heard of this way back some years ago when a certain old gentleman by the name of Laban cheated his nephew, whose name, if I remember rightly, was Jacob, on the question of "who's who" in wives. Later this said Jacob gentleman put up a scheme on the old man in reference to what his, Jacob's, wage should be, and all of you who are acquainted with the Book in which the history of these proceedings is given will remember how the young man tricked the old gentleman by an ingenious trade whereby the young man was to have all the "ring-streaked and spotted" of the flocks and the old gentleman was to have the standard goods only, and it became necessary after awhile to send the young man away in order to prevent his becoming the possessor of all the flock. The story is well worth rereading in view of the terrific howl there is to-day as to some people getting more than their share. It is true, and always has been true, to some extent, but we should not harm the very ones we pretend we want to foster and save as the chief objective of our beneficence. Now I will make one illustration. I think any of the others can be followed through from it.

Take an ordinary steel jackknife. The ore in the ground is worth little or nothing; this will be equally true whether with a jackknife or steel bridge. The miners are paid for mining it; the railroads, or steamship companies, or both, for transporting it (more than half of all our transporting charges are paid out by the transportation company at once in wages); let us assume that it goes to the furnace where it is made into pig of some kind; next to the puddling furnace, and made into steel, and then to a rolling mill and made into sheets or beams. Although there is much detail and intricacy to these processes thus far in the production of ordinary Bessemer steel, and the higher grade steel like Mashel's, is produced by a much slower and much more expensive process, in both material and skill, in any event we arrive at the raw material, and some of the glib talkers then start to make the jackknife, eliminating the fact that up to this point it is more certainly all workmanship than it is further on. We will then pass the jackknife factory without description and we have the completed article emerging from the factory. There is probably not a man in this House who has a jackknife in his pocket that he did not pay more than twice as much for as the manufacturer received for it. I will make some remarks as to where this difference goes later. Now, if this is made in this country more is paid for it at every stage of the proceedings; that is, to the workmen in wages, regardless of whether the tools are the mining tools, transportation company's tools, or in the furnace or factory; the tools, machinery, and buildings all cost to make according to the American standard; but you say some one gets a rake-off all along the line. Well, the workman is worthy of his hire just the same whether he is traveling on the road with his goods, or digging in the office to get his trial balance, or is worrying about how to meet the note due the next day, or is realizing the responsibility more or less that rests on his shoulders to keep his business successful for the families dependent upon it. But you say: "Yes, but these fellows build them a nice house every once in a while." True; who gets the money when they build them a nice house; does not the workman? But you say: "Yes, but he invests in railroad bonds and other things," but who gets the money; are not more railroads built and is not more money distributed? We are driven to the final conclusion that it is all work, save only the possible certainty, if you please, that it is not fairly distributed; but the question of distribution is not my chief objection now, because no one can buy anything with an empty pocketbook; they may be able to buy on credit, but they can not buy anything for cash if they have no cash, regardless of the price; and while you may hinder a man by reducing his wages you destroy him most by importing what he has been making. The reduction of wages is a partial loss; importation is a total loss because it is all work. Here are thoughts enough which if one will follow them out closely he will be surprised at the certainty of truth in my original statement. Much more might be said on this subject, but those not acquainted with this exposition can think anything else out that they want to, with this information before them.

Mr. Chairman, I said I would say something more about the difference between what the consumer pays and what the producer gets. It has been shown, and we have all seen the figures, that we are paying more than twice as much for our farm produce as the farmer receives. If it has not been said before, I will say that we also pay more than twice as much on the average for our manufactured goods as the original producer receives, but the rule must be taken generally as an average, and where it is less in one case it is enough more in another to balance. Now, if our method of distribution could be reduced to a reasonable sum the consumer's price would be fairly satisfactory. It would seem as if 25 per cent of the consumer's price ought to pay for the distribution. This would make an item costing 75 cents from the producer sell to the consumer for a dollar, whereas the average of items for which the producer receives 75 cents is sold to the consumer for $1.50, and often much more. If the producer could sell direct to the consumer this would be facilitated, but we must not forget, in order to do this, much of the high cost of living is fastidious taste. And, besides, we are not satisfied with the living which our forefathers had. The poor people to-day have a living far beyond what I had when I was 10 years of age, and I was not distressed in the least. I saw a woman come into the House Office Building only a few days ago, and there was a slight indication that she was here for a purpose, and I queried to myself, What can she be doing here? She had on a fine new silk hat, good enough for anyone, dressed well, and to my surprise she went into the cleaning room and after a while emerged to scrub up the floors in the House Office Building. I have used these illustrations almost wholly for the purpose not of deprecating the good living people have to-day, still less the plenty of work, but simply for the purpose of showing that the complaint would be largely removed if we could get the product from the factory to the consumer on reasonable terms, but the merchants and middlemen are not wholly to blame. People all over are buying goods far beyond even what is good for them. A skilled physician told me a short time ago that no person after reaching the age of 50 years should eat heavy meat. If we were arbitrarily by some force put upon the diet that was best for us, the high cost of living would be gone, but we have gotten into a habit of everybody kicking everybody else instead of doing their own part. I know this is not the popular way to state it, but it is the true way, and anyone who will honestly stop to think will admit it. There are exceptions, of course, but this is the rule. There was no time ever in this country when a person, by the

same prudence, thrift, and frugality, could lay aside so large a portion of his income as can be done to-day.

Mr. Chairman, there is another point in the bill about which there should be more explanation, namely, the 5 per cent allowed on goods imported in American bottoms. A premium should not be paid, Mr. Chairman, on imports. We should discourage imports. The premium should be paid on exports. Furthermore, is it for the poor man or the rich man that this 5 per cent is being allowed? The poor man sometimes owns a dory or something of that sort, but he never owns ships. The 5 per cent is given to rich men. Ten times the blessing would come to this country if we offered a bounty paid on exports, regardless of whose ships they were carried in. Anyone can understand this import-export business if he applies it to his own transactions. Anyone knows if his income is a thousand dollars a year and his outgo or living expenses twelve hundred dollars he is running in debt at the rate of two hundred dollars a year. On the other hand, if his income is a thousand dollars a year and his outgo eight hundred, he is gaining somewhere at the rate of two hundred dollars a year. In other words, the balance of trade is in his favor. A merchant or manufacturer knows if his pay roll, expenses, and living are $5,000 more than his sales, and the stock keeps about the same, he is running behind at the rate of $5,000 a year, and it is exactly the same with this country. Americans spend abroad, in the first place, and aliens take abroad, likely, well up to $200,000,000 a year, perhaps more. Hence, to keep ourselves square with the world we must export by this amount more than we import, else we are running behind as a country; and the aim should be not to increase our imports, as previously stated, but to keep them as small as possible and increase our exports, that the balance of trade may be as largely in our favor as possible. In other words, that the country's favorable balance of trade may be as large as possible.

Mr. Chairman, again, if you want to reduce the tariff, why take the lowest class of wage earners, those employed in the woolen and cotton mills? The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] a year ago asked me to admit that the average wage of the people in some of those mills was $5.25 a week. Well, if he thinks so, why attack them? They are the poorest class of laborers we have. I should think they might have been spared.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few further remarks about the various reasons for tariff. By tariff I do not mean a prohibitive tariff; that is a misnomer; no tariff should be prohibitive except it is something that, for sufficient reasons, we want to keep out of the country altogether; but there are five important functions of the tariff—"free trade," "tariff for revenue" (American wages for American workmen, commonly called), "protection," "trade balance," and "reciprocity." We will assume, to bring it within the Constitution, that the principal element all the way through is for revenue, but it seems to me utter folly to hinge it altogether on this feature. Some men select a wife because she is beautiful, others because she is rich, again because she may be in fine society, others because she may have a graceful form, but as a matter of fact it is constitutional that she be a woman, and these other graces are all-important and should properly be considered, but no one of them prevailing. Free trade as talked more or less by the Democratic Party is merely imprudence, if not recklessness. In the first place, it is not free trade anyway; it is giving our markets to others regardless of whether or not they give their markets to us. It is our business to care for the great trust that Almighty God has put upon us in disclosing to us the manifest destiny of this country, and He expects us to do it in a businesslike way, and He does not expect us to throw away our heritage, but to use it with a fair, honorable, and high purpose. We may give our markets to those who give their markets to us. This is reciprocity, however; or our markets on certain things for markets on certain other things. The free list should be composed of articles that will facilitate our well-being. A tariff for revenue only is purely mercenary. The tariff should raise as much money as possible commensurate with other beneficent results. THE MUCH-MOOTED DOCTRINE OF PROTECTION, WHICH I PREFER TO CALL THE WORKMAN, IS NOT ONLY PROPER BUT THE ONLY METHOD WE HAVE OF CONTROLLING THE BALANCE OF TRADE AND THE WORKMAN'S SCALE OF WAGES, AND THE WORKMEN SHOULD NOT OVERLOOK FOR A MOMENT THAT THE MAN WHO HAS THE MOST CAN LIVE THE LONGEST IN DULL OR DISASTROUS TIMES; AND IT IS THE WORKMAN WHO OUGHT TO BE MOST CONSIDERED, AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THEIR NEED OR INABILITY, AND IT IS MERELY A QUESTION OF ADJUSTMENT SO THAT WE MAY PAY AMERICAN WAGES. IT IS NOT A QUESTION AT ALL OF WITS. THE AMERICAN WORKMAN KNOWS HE IS THE EQUAL, IF NOT THE SUPERIOR, OF ANY WORKMAN ON EARTH, BUT HE DOES NOT WANT TO WORK FOR THE SAME WAGES, AND THIS IS WHAT THE TARIFF MEANS TO HIM, AND HE WILL FIND IT OUT SOONER OR LATER THAT A LOWER TARIFF MEANS IF IT LOWERS THE PRICE OF GOODS AT ALL THAT IT COMES OUT OF HIM.

The balance of trade should always be considered. For this country to prosper we must always sell more goods, with what Americans and aliens take abroad, than we buy from abroad. It is wondered many times how England gets along with such a large free-trade or free-market system, but England has thousands of millions of dollars invested abroad, which brings in hundreds of millions every year in interest or income, and she draws a little from every corner of the earth. We draw little from investments abroad. Reciprocity is a feature that should always be considered to foster interchange of trade. Even though we may make the tariff ourselves arbitrarily, it should be taken into consideration what tariff can be levied on this particular article or that particular article with a view to inducing the largest possible return of trade from any given country.

Mr. Chairman, finally, I want to call attention to this fundamental principle: All enterprise, all business activity in this country, is a distribution of wealth at home. All importation is a distribution of substance abroad. The distribution of wealth at home may be unfairly made—and by wealth I mean that which is current, our present activity and wages. By substance I mean that which we have accumulated, for we must first have before we can buy abroad. Our proposition is not to support the workmen across the water by importation. If they value our civilization, they must come over here. Reducing the tariff is going to do one of two things. If it reduces the cost of our purchases, it must come out of some one—that does not mean sharpening our wits, but that the wage must be reduced—or if we are to reduce by importation, the whole wage is gone. You must choose between these things.

Mr. Chairman, the third Massachusetts district, which I have the honor to represent, has as wide a range of manufacture as any in the country. I have counseled with many expert manufacturers in various lines and have weighed very carefully what I have said, and have used much of this expert information in addition to my own practical knowledge, and I am sorry that I can not quote at length from such valuable sources, but have mentioned such affairs which are largely elemental and inevitable and which can not be changed on either side of the aisle. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I trust I will not be considered unduly officious if I undertake to utter a few commonplace observations in defense of the sugar industry just before you expunge it from the roll of existing American industries.

With the eloquence of a Demosthenes we have been informed by Members of this House that the people demand a reduction in the cost of living. I sincerely hope that each and every Member of this House will bear in mind at the same time the duty he owes to the public, with whose prosperity he has been intrusted.

Mr. Chairman, I have been also importuned by a wise constituency to exert my best efforts to reduce the cost of living. However, that same constituency, in the same breath, philosophically instructed me to contravene and oppose in my humble way every and any attempt on the part of this House to imperil or improvidently destroy any legitimate business. Now, I will make this prefatory statement that I am aware of the fact that it is declared to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government has no right or authority under the Constitution to levy tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue. This is a Jeffersonian principle and in accordance with the principles of true Democracy, because true Democracy demands the greatest good to the greatest number. Mr. Chairman, under Republican rule the moneyed people—the great manufacturing industries of this Nation—have reaped enormous profits at the expense of the masses of the people. Much of these duties were paid by the poorer classes on the necessaries of life, and by the farmer on tools and machinery that are sold in a foreign market at a less cost than at home where they are manufactured, and this charge falls heavily on the State of Louisiana, which is essentially an agricultural State. I believe in the policies and the traditions of the Democratic Party, and I unhesitatingly say that a duty on sugar is in accordance with the principles laid down in the Democratic platform. Furthermore, I believe that as the farmer is taxed heavily for tools and machinery, it is fitting and proper that he should be in some slight manner safeguarded in the product of his toil, especially when this can be done without violating any of the doctrines of Democracy.

Protection for the sake of protection, of course, is untenable, but I do not ask for a protective tariff, but, on the contrary, for the imposition of a revenue duty. It is conceded that the

Democratic Party believes in imposing tariff for revenue, and surely no free-trade theorist dare undertake to refute that sugar is an ideal revenue producer. It is preeminently the best subject upon which to lay a revenue duty. It directly conveys to the coffers of the United States Treasury approximately $53,000,000 per annum, which sum is used to defray and meet the expenses of the General Government. One-sixth of the entire revenue collected by the United States Government on imports is derived from sugar; and sugar to-day is the cheapest necessity of life produced by the American people. Yet, under the assumption that we are legislating for the good of mankind in general, we single out this great and unrivaled revenue-producing industry for the guillotine, unconsciously at the behest of the Sugar Trust. The belief that pervades this country to-day—that is, that sugar should be placed on the free list—is attributable solely and alone to the activities of the Sugar Trust. It precipitated the fight. It has disseminated this belief. Why? Surely not for philanthropic reasons; not for the benefit of down-trodden humanity. No; this cold, calculating, and grasping combination would never do anything that even tended to safeguard the interests of the people. An assertion to the contrary would provoke a smile from the lips of an Egyptian mummy. When the storm of this battle subsides and the smoke disappears in the distance you will observe its fine Italian hand.

Men have died from time to time and worms have eaten them, but not for love.

The Sugar Trust is about to destroy the domestic sugar industry, but not for love of the American people. The question, then, naturally arises, Why? For the reason that the domestic sugar sells in competition to the trust-produced article. It is the domestic sugar that has kept down the prices of sugar, and the verity and correctness of this statement will come home to you before many more moons and strike conviction deep down into the breast of the American people. The Sugar Trust will dump free raw sugar on American soil immediately after this bill is enacted into law and force down the prices of sugar until it accomplishes the destruction of the domestic sugar industry; then it will arbitrarily fix the price of sugar for the American consumers. When this time comes you will be reluctantly forced to stand before the American people and say to them that "I have again erred, and, distressing as it is to admit it, not on the side of the people." It is inconceivable to me how anyone can seriously urge that the destruction of the domestic sugar industry will cheapen sugar. In the summer of 1911, when it became palpably obvious that there would be a shortage in the world's sugar crop, the American refiners were compelled to pay a shade more for raw sugar. However, was there a corresponding increase in the price of refined sugar? No; the American Sugar Refining Co. advanced the price of refined sugar from $4.90 in July to $6.50 in October. The Federal Sugar Refining Co. increased the price of its product to $7.25 and the Arbuckle Bros. to $7.50.

In October, when the domestic beet sugar was put on the market at $6.50, it became imperatively necessary for the refiners to lower their prices or transitorily retire from the market. Consequently, in December the same year, the prices had dropped to $5.53.

Wallace P. Willett, the sugar expert of Willett & Gray, stated before the Hardwick committee that if it had not been for the marketing of the sugar-beet product the price of sugar in America would have gone higher than ever before. Mr. Willett said in part before the committee:

The moment our American beet-sugar product became available on the market the rise stopped, and owing entirely and totally to this American production refined sugars were 1½ cents lower than they were at the highest point. But for that American production we to-day would be buying sugar at the world's prices.

Therefore it is evident to those whose comprehension has not been dulled and warped by prejudice that the refiners had a monopoly of the business and availed themselves thereof by arbitrarily augmenting the price of their product until the domestic crop invaded the market. If it had not been for the marketing of the American production these humanitarians would have extorted untold millions from the American people.

The domestic sugar therefore minimizes the profits of the great refining companies of the United States. Hence its home production inures to the benefit of the consuming public. To maintain a duty on raw sugar stimulates and encourages the development thereof, and thereby prevents the refiners from securing a monopoly of the market.

We are told that free sugar will cheapen that commodity, the wisdom of which can only be determined in a measure by a comparison of the prices that prevail in the United States with the prices which obtained in foreign countries. Now, in Germany the retail price of sugar is higher than it is in the United States; Russia likewise; Brazil, the prices are higher; British India, the largest producer of cane sugar in the world, the price is simply a shade under the price in this country; Argentina doubles the price in the United States. In brief, the price of sugar in this country is lower than any other in the world except England, Belgium, Sweden, Denmark, and Turkey. Yet we are determined to place the ban on the domestic sugar industry. In Sweden, Japan, Brazil, and Union of South Africa import duties are laid upon sugar primarily to encourage the industry, incidentally for the purpose of revenue. In Russia, Spain, Italy, Canada, and Denmark a protective tariff is imposed on imported sugar to foster and stimulate home production.

Foreign competition will not affect to any perceptible extent the sugar trade, because of the proximity of the Cuban sugar plantations, in which the refiners are so deeply interested. European competition, on account of the ocean freight, will be a negligible quantity, unless it is bolstered up by bounties, and this is unlikely, nay, impossible, in the face of the Brussels agreement. In other words, we are going to be left to the tender mercies of the American Sugar Refining Co., the Federal Sugar Refining Co., and the Arbuckle Bros.

We are clamoring for free sugar, which we candidly admit will destroy that industry, yet we write into the platform of the Baltimore convention "that we will enact no legislation that will injure or destroy any legitimate industry." Why did you embody that declaration in the Democratic platform? That sentence is as clear and as lucid as the English language is capable of making any sentence. There is nothing ambiguous, equivocal, or uncertain about it. No one can intelligently distort its meaning or justify any misinterpretation thereof. We are told to-day that it does not mean what it clearly enunciates. We are politely and graciously informed that we are laboring under a delusion. It seems to me that it is inadvisable for us to go to equivocating, quibbling, or hairsplitting in our dealings with the American people. That significant sentence was incorporated into our platform for a purpose, and well indeed has it served its purpose. That plank in our platform, more than any other one, assisted in returning, after two decades, a Democratic President and a Democratic Senate, and now we are expected, I presume, to go back to our districts and say to our constituents, "You poor benighted souls, you have undertaken to interpret that which was written by the hand of a stra egist." Congressmen on this floor representing doubtful districts, I venture to say, have many times since the last election said of that clause, "Thou wert my guide, philosopher, and friend."

Mr. Chairman, we are reminded that we are engaged in a "hothouse industry," and are excoriated and ridiculed for attempting to make sugar in a temperate zone. We are also informed that cane is a tropical plant, and many other illuminating remarks of the same tenor.

It is charged that we are engaged in an economically illegitimate industry. However, those who undertake to denounce our industry and brand it as illegitimate, tacitfully concede that the manufacturers of woolen goods are unable to subsist without a little incidental protection.

Those of you who believe in free trade may extract and glean from declamations of this character satisfaction enough to justify your own judgment in voting for free sugar. However, let me tarry you on your mad and reckless rush to destroy this great industry just long enough to say to you that the people who are engaged in this alleged "hothouse industry" are directly responsible for the cheap sugar that the American people consume to-day, and this you can not successfully gainsay. The ingenuity, skill, intelligence, and brains of the Louisiana producers of sugar have given to the world more improved and modern machinery than all other persons therein engaged. It is alone this machinery that has enabled the producers of sugar to cheapen it, and now you satirically say to him that you must abandon your "hothouse industry"; hurl to the four winds of the earth a hundred and fifty million dollars therein invested; and throw out of employment thousands of men, women, and children depending thereon for their livelihood, and then you will go before the American people and appear in the rôle of a philanthropist. Firmly do I believe that Barnum knew whereof he spoke when he said the American people wish to be fooled.

Give the Louisiana sugar industry an additional respite and before many years it will have strength to stand alone. When that time comes it will be able to compete in the open market and we may not reproach ourselves with having killed it by the application of a principle that, however wise in its general application, would be prematurely applied in this instance. There is no iron-bound policy that can be applied to every condition with equal benefit. Of course, you who recoil from the

mere mentioning of sugar as you would from a leper will in a tragic manner vociferously declare that that "hothouse industry" has been fostered by the American Government for a hundred years. That is very correct, and I desire to remind you that in 1870 the cost of production was from 12 to 13 cents per pound. Now it costs less than 3¾ cents. Suppose the Ways and Means Committee had then placed sugar on the free list—placed it on a competitive basis—do you believe for one second that you would buy sugar to-day on Pennsylvania Avenue for 5 cents per pound? A duty has been laid upon sugar since the organization of the Government under both Democratic and Republican administrations. It has always occupied a conspicuous place on the dutiable list. Every Democratic President that has occupied the White House has recognized that an import duty on this product was equitable and fair, not alone to the producer, but also to the consumer. Now, if we are averse to traveling along beaten paths that experience and time have demonstrated to be necessary to industrial development, we should at least diverge therefrom gradually and rationally.

John C. Calhoun not only voted for a high duty on sugar, but furthermore stated that the Government should encourage its production in this country.

John G. Carlisle, once Speaker of the House and Secretary of the Treasury in the Cabinet of President Cleveland, speaking of the duty on sugar, said, in part:

> The repeal of this duty, therefore, while it would undoubtedly reduce the revenue, would afford very little relief to the people in comparison with the relief that would be afforded by the repeal of duties upon any other articles in common use.

A more pregnant truth has not been uttered since that day on this all-important question. The conditions which then obtained are still extant.

Therefore, as you readily observe, that the friendly attitude of Congress after Congress has led our people to conclude that an import duty on sugar was an underlying and basic economic principle in the scheme of our Government. Hence our people year after year enlarged and extended the scope of this great industry. They have bought expensive mills and machinery requiring an enormous outlay of capital.

Yet, in spite of these facts, in the twinkle of an eye, without rhyme or reason, you seek to destroy an industry and convert the machinery thereof into worthless junk after our people have engaged in this industry for, lo, these many years under the hope and inducements held out to them by both of the great political parties. Now, I respectfully assert that no fair or unprejudiced mind can with justice to itself countenance or approve this attack within our own citadel. In my judgment it is contrary to every principle of justice, reason, and fair dealing, repugnant to the true spirit of the Democratic platform, and in utter disregard of the policy enunciated to-day by our party.

I wish to say that it is at least impolitic to foster and safeguard an industry to-day under any pretext and improvidently forsake it to-morrow. Such an unsteady, unstable, and shifting policy may be productive of very calamitous results. Without madness, pique, or spleen I admonish you to calmly consider the danger that lurks in such methods.

I may be injuring my standing with my party and induce a score or more of Democrats to question my party fealty. I will say, however, not in a spirit of egotism, that I may be espousing the principles of democracy long after some of my critics may be reluctantly forced to accept the ineffable sweetness of private life by reason of their political cowardice. But be that as it may, I intend to represent the best interests of my district. I am here to endeavor to foster and encourage the growth and development of its resources. Hence I will not remain silent as the grave when there is an obvious attempt to enact into a law a bill that provides for the destruction and the wiping out of one of the chief industries of my State upon the continuation of which the welfare and prosperity of my people largely depend. The irresistible effects of this proposed bill would be worse than the ravages of the boll weevil and the devastation wrought by the flood waters of the mighty Mississippi. Therefore were I to give my vote to its passage I would be derelict to the highest duty of citizenship.

Now, I presume that every Member advocates that which he conceives to be to the best interest of his country with a sincerity as deep as ever permeated the human breast. If there is anyone who does not he should be relegated to private life for the good of his country.

I am averse to and deprecate any effort on the part of any Member of this House to impugn the motives of his colleague. I am going to vote the views of my constituency, and in doing so I will transgress no cardinal principle of democracy, violate no part or provision of the Democratic platform, nor deviate one jot from the policy under which we are presumably proceeding.

Mr. Chairman, legislation of this character, in my judgment, is inspired by a misconception of the wishes and needs of the people. Instead of stimulating industrial development, it seems that we are determined to do all we can to stifle it.

We are writing into this bill the obituary notice of the sugar industry—placing the heavy hand of oppression thereon—and our work will, beyond the peradventure of a doubt, inure to the benefit of one of the most unconscionable trusts under the blue canopy of heaven, the Wall Street refiners.

We are proceeding on the assumption that when we remove and relegate to the past a duty on sugar we, in consequence thereof, strike at the very vitals of the Sugar Trust. It is my belief that we are groping in the dark, and it will not require an oracle to bring our errors to light. The advocacy of free sugar by the Sugar Trust is per se sufficient to indicate to me the path that I should follow. These effervescent proponents of free sugar are sinking their knives deep into the vitals of this industry, but after its sepulchral rest they will be called upon to explain to an inquiring and not altogether gullible constituency the cause of high sugar.

The State of Louisiana has stood by the Democratic Party with a fidelity rarely ever surpassed or excelled. She has always given to the Democratic Party her electoral votes with one exception; sent throughout the country speakers in every presidential campaign to espouse and advocate the principles of Democracy, and has regularly contributed to the cause large sums of money to help defray the expenses incident to presidential campaigns. Now, its first official act is unquestionably calculated to temporarily impoverish the State whose loyalty it courted and enjoyed.

For years yellow fever disastrously militated against the development and growth of our State, yet we fought it with a determination never equaled by the human race and, finally, our efforts were crowned with success—yellow fever was consigned to eternal oblivion. Then we enjoyed several years of prosperity; that is, up until 1908, when the boll weevil invaded our State and the ravages wrought by that destructive and deleterious insect resulted in destroying practically the entire cotton crop, and in a measure pauperizing certain sections of the State. Now, while we were engaged in making heroic efforts to rehabilitate ourselves, the flood waters of the historic Mississippi poured in and devastated and swept everything before it. Individual fortunes were destroyed and our people left homeless, with famine staring them in the face. But we met, fought, and controlled, with the assistance of an Almighty God, this calamity, as we fought and subjugated other apparently insurmountable obstacles that have been thrown across our path in life.

And now, while my people are earnestly struggling to reestablish themselves, but still staggering and quivering under this last catastrophe, the party which Louisiana has stood by and supported, as I have said, with unfaltering allegiance, has again assumed the reins of government, and it at once, without ceremony or qualms of conscience, proceeds to deal the State a blow below the belt over which our party seemingly gloats, and we are expected to sit silently by while one of our greatest industries is sacrificed on the altar of a misapplied policy.

Now, I gratuitously mention these facts; however, mistake me not. I am not asking nor do I intend to appeal to you for any consideration of sympathy or humanity. I put my plea for a revenue duty not upon sentimental grounds. I desire to stand or fall by the Democratic platform and the policy recently enunciated by our leaders. It seems to me that you refuse to impose a revenue duty on sugar, which will not injuriously affect, but on the contrary will inure to the benefit of the consuming public, simply because in your judgment you think it may incidentally benefit an American industry. In other words, we appeal for even-handed justice.

Our party has announced to the world that it believes in a tariff for revenue and this revenue to be collected solely from the imposition of tariff duties on luxuries. Away with such sophistry. A perfunctory analysis of this proposed bill will compel anyone who is open to conviction to admit that we are throwing the strong arms of protection around some colossal combinations under the guise of collecting revenue, when in truth and in fact they yield no revenue. "Consistency, thou art a jewel."

Why was crude rubber and raw silk placed on the free list? Both are ideal articles on which to lay a revenue duty. No one would be so unfair to himself as to affirm that sheep and cattle are not necessaries of life. Meat is the food that puts the red corpuscles in the veins and brings the blush of health to the cheeks of our children; therefore should be found on the table of the poor as well as the rich. However, we discover that both sheep and cattle appear on the dutiable list. Why? Certainly not for the purpose of revenue, for the revenue col-

lected from this source is too infinitesimally small to even mention. Now, they produce no revenue and are necessaries of life, yet they both appear on the dutiable list. How in Heaven's name can our party justify its position or its shifting policies before the American people? Where is the Solomon who can rationally vindicate the actions of our party? We again find raw wool on the free list. This, we are informed, will destroy the industry. But, on the other hand, we find woolen goods on the dutiable list, presumably for the purpose of revenue. Of course, this will afford manufacturers, inadvertently, incidental protection. This incidental protection will enable them to compel the "people" we hear so much about these days to pay more for their clothes. How are you going to reconcile your tariff-protected articles with your treatment of the wool, sugar, and other necessaries of life, I am at a loss to conjecture. However, I do admit that these items have been defended with marvelous dexterity; but sometimes eloquence, ingenuity, and even persuasion fail.

Some of the Members of this body when they speak of the farmer exhibit strong signs of emotion. During these eloquent and illuminating dissertations we are carried beyond the thoughts of the farmer into admiration for achievement in oratory. But this buncombe serves no good purpose, as it brings the farmer nothing of a tangible or substantial nature. He needs, and demands, results. We frankly admit that he is the backbone and taproot of this Nation. The Nation's prosperity depends primarily on the prosperity of the agriculturist, and we assure him, before election, that we will be found in the front ranks with those battling for the advancement and development of the agricultural interests of this country; in brief, that we will favor any legislation that will inure to the benefit of the rural population. Yet as soon as we become a Member of this great lawmaking body, in our great anxiety to evidence our grateful appreciation of his worth, we put on the free list the product of his honest toil and industry, and the tools and machinery without which he could do nothing are placed on the dutiable list. A sentence of condemnation is going to be placed on our duplicity, and there is no escape from it.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I hail from the State of Wisconsin, and my one reason for speaking briefly is to make a comparison of Wisconsin with Alabama in a certain respect. Both States have practically the same population. Wisconsin has four times as many manufactures, according to the census report, as Alabama; but I do not care to refer to that feature of it. I wish to ask a question that is asked by the people of my State with reference to the tariff bill, regarding the comparative showing made by two States as to the effect of the bill.

It does not require any profound knowledge of tariff making to say with the voice of prophecy that if this bill gives relief from present tariff injustice and meets the promises of its confident supporters, then in this country we may throw away rules and methods sacredly accepted by lawmakers since our Government was founded; rules of conduct which to-day are guiding other countries of the world; and henceforth we must depend upon the spirit of infallible personal genius to steer our craft over industrial seas that bristle with commercial derelicts, sunken icebergs, and hidden rocks.

I speak briefly from the standpoint of a new Member, who confesses unfamiliarity with tariff schedules or with conditions that should be fully known before intelligent individual action can be had on this tariff bill. No apology is offered for lack of knowledge, because approximately one-third the membership of this House is composed of first-term Congressmen, none of whom, it is safe to say, has any definite knowledge concerning the justice or fairness of all proposed schedules contained in the bill on which we are to vote.

Older Members advise me that tariff legislation involves much detail and expert knowledge; that less than a score of Members have any intelligent conception of all the schedules proposed in this bill, of the reasons on which they are based, or of the ultimate effect on the country of innumerable changes to be wrought in existing law.

If, then, more than 400 Members are unable to vote intelligently on all the schedules, how are we at this time to predetermine the effect of the bill upon the country? Are we to accept a revolutionary experiment in tariff legislation through a bill reported by the committee to the House practically as introduced a few days ago—a bill of 218 pages, containing many thousands of items—without any testimony on which to justify our votes? Who prepared the bill, and when or where were these schedules determined? What public or private hearings have been had in support of a measure that arbitrarily slashes tariff rates and places hundreds of commodities on the free list?

Pride of authorship goes with this bill, for notwithstanding loud-voiced protests have reached the outside world through doors of the secret Democratic caucus, all is now silent. No argument is more potent than the steam roller, as we are soon to experience in the House on this bill. With doubtful parentage and no birth record or pedigree to its credit, the bill comes to us through the offices of its guardian ad litem, the distinguished chairman of the Democratic Ways and Means Committee of the House.

Thousands of items have been placed before the House to be accepted in their entirety. Schedules prepared by unknown influences are to be sacredly preserved. Not one amendment will be permitted from Republicans or other minority Members. This is the ultimatum. In all its glory the old Republican car of juggernaut was never equal to the modern invention that forces the Underwood bill upon the American people, and the duty of every Member who can not support the measure is to register a protest against its method of preparation and passage and then without delay to accept the rule of the majority. Further than this, I believe, every patriotic citizen hopes that the Underwood bill will meet the predictions of its supporters, reduce the high cost of living, give continued prosperity to the country, and for years to come settle the troublesome tariff question.

BILL DISCRIMINATES AGAINST WISCONSIN.

In registering a brief protest against this measure I do so representing a constituency that is discriminated against by the bill. No privileged interests of Wisconsin are demanding a lease of life, although many substantial industries in our State are apprehensive of results. Doubtlessly weak business interests, here and there, in our State and throughout the country will go under, but responsibility for preparing a bill has been placed upon Democratic shoulders, and carping criticism from political opponents is ill timed. To point out defects showing the spirit of discrimination is sufficient for my purpose.

Wisconsin is an agricultural State, so is Alabama, the home of the distinguished gentlemen whose name the bill bears, and each State boasts of about the same population. Whatever may be the consequences, Wisconsin does not receive nor ask favors for itself, under the bill, that are not granted to the country at large. With its $90,000,000 annual production of dairy products alone, almost two-thirds of the total amount of manufactured products of every character in Alabama for 1909, Wisconsin will maintain its lead in this one industry because soil, climate and water are advantages superior to tariff walls, however high. Its barley and other grains will also continue to stand first in character and production per acre, whether the Underwood bill succeeds or fails. Wisconsin sheep and mutton will capture sweepstakes at every annual international contest, as for many years past, whether or not wool goes on the free list or dressed mutton comes in free from Canada.

In agricultural products our State will share in the general prosperity or depression following the passage of this bill, but it will continue to maintain its position in products raised per acre, because fertility of soil and intelligent farming are not dependent upon tariff schedules. If the Underwood bill that discriminates against the farmers of the country becomes a law we must accept a situation which is the logical result of its verdict, rendered by the country last November.

Manufactures must also conform to that judgment. The 182,583 wage earners in the factories of Wisconsin, who produced $590,306,000 in manufactured products in 1909—the latest available census report—will be able to withstand the shock of a sudden reduction in schedules as well as will the 81,972 employees living in Alabama, whose total manufactures, aggregating $145,962,000, amount to less than 25 per cent of Wisconsin's products, according to the same governmental authority. We have more employees and more interests at stake, but Alabama and Wisconsin have people and interests in common to protect.

DISCRIMINATIONS FAVOR ALABAMA.

Inquiring as to specific items, why does the Underwood bill give to the farmers of the North the empty pretense of protection while tobaccos of the South are protected by rates ranging from 35 cents to $2.50 a pound? Why does the crop of 418,007 bushels of dried peas harvested by the Alabama farmer receive a protective duty of 9.55 per cent ad valorem while $31,667,000 of flour manufactured in Wisconsin is expected to pay 10 cents more per bushel for wheat to grind than do our Canadian competitors who, under the bill, will enter our markets free of duty? What legerdemain of reasoning justifies throwing our doors open to woolgrowers of Australia and the world at large, against whom the Wisconsin farmer must hereafter compete, while 79,349 Angora goats in Mr. UNDERWOOD'S State are protected with tariff duties for the first time in the history of the country? On what theory of "revenue-only" reasoning, aside from political power, is Alabama enabled to save its own goat while it gets ours?

What broad statesmanship has been employed in the construction of this bill which forces 31,968,195 bushels of Wisconsin potatoes on the free list to yearly compete in the home market with tubers from Canada and abroad while in the same schedule 1,573,796 bushels of Alabama peanuts, raised during the same year, are to be protected by a rate of from 10.12 per cent ad valorem to 18.75 per cent in this tariff-for-revenue document?

Without disrespectful allusion to the Democratic tariff bill or the inspiration that possessed its unknown authors, it can truthfully be said that the bill embodies a peanut protection policy, with free-trade frills, while masquerading under the illusive title of "a tariff for revenue only."

A sign posted in the window of a Pennsylvania Avenue grocery store, one block from the Capitol Grounds, for the past week reads "The best granulated sugar 4 cents per pound." Market quotations show that sugar has been cheaper during the past year than for over a decade, and that the price has remained practically stationary during that period, notwithstanding other necessities of life have advanced with the high cost of living. Independent sugar manufacturers insist that this is a practical exposition of the protection principle because independent factories have maintained competition and prevented the Sugar Trust from controlling the home market. It is further insisted that sugar refiners, or the so-called Sugar Trust, are the only ones to benefit by the free-sugar provision in this bill, because beet-sugar and other factories will be unable to compete with foreign sugar growers. Through the destruction of local sugar factories the markets of the world will be controlled by the trust octopus, eventually resulting in higher prices. In support of this claim it appears, while sugar is quoted retail at from 4 to 5 cents in practically every city of the country, the wholesale April quotations in Canada are given at 4.44 cents; Austria, 4.20 cents; Germany, 4.35 cents; France, 5.60 cents; and Russia, 7.44 cents per pound. Have the beet-growing farmers of the country become too rich, or have independent sugar factories rolled in wealth while securing lower priced sugar for the American consumer than is paid by the people of other countries? Thousands of beet growers in my own State are engaged in raising the 256,124 tons of sugar beets used by our own factories in 1911, and these farmers received $2,000,000 for their crop, which they spent at home.

Last year 30,000 acres were devoted to the culture of sugar beets for factories that manufactured approximately 25 pounds of sugar for every man, woman, and child in the State. These factories were erected under an express promise by existing law and under the belief that sugar was as much entitled to protection as tobacco, dried peas, Angora goats, or peanuts.

BILL WILL DESTROY WISCONSIN INDUSTRIES.

Members of the Ways and Means Committee advise me that if sugar is admitted free, as proposed by this bill, it will wipe out every factory and give to the trust a clear field for future operations. Wisconsin growers and manufacturers must abide by the Democratic ultimatum, and if they would secure special privileges granted by the bill they must turn their attention to raising peanuts, tobacco, dried peas, and Angora goats. When farmers get 30 cents a bushel for potatoes that retail for $1 or sell cabbages at the farm for $5 a ton that retail for $25, when manufacturers receive 5 cents a yard for cloth that retails for 25 cents, something more than tariff laws is responsible for the high cost of living. The duty of exposing indefensible schedules that bristle throughout this bill is being performed by experienced Members, and I have pointed out these items only because, like many others that can be mentioned, they are glaringly unjust.

The public weal is a first consideration, and it is unsafe, as well as illogical, to favor special interests in one locality at the expense of the rest of the country, which must pay the price exacted by such interests. While I do not charge that the framers of this bill have intentionally discriminated against one Commonwealth in favor of another, a brief examination of the proposed schedules emphasizes Gen. Hancock's historic utterance, when as a Democratic candidate for the Presidency he declared, "The tariff is a local issue." The principle of protection which governs commercial transactions of nearly every European country of comparative importance, has been too often defined to require any exposition, and from any logical standpoint it is unwise and absolutely unjust to wipe out protective duties because they have been allowed to grow prohibitive on certain items, however culpable the agencies may have been that framed unjust tariff schedules in the past.

A SECRET CAUCUS TARIFF BILL.

The Democratic majority can not halt or turn back if it desires to do so. It must go on and give to the country a new tariff bill according to its promise and its commission from the people. If it does not legislate wisely or, if drunk with power, its present unwieldly majority swings the pendulum to an opposite extreme, the judgment of a disappointed people will be visited upon those now in power as it has been visited on every other party that failed to measure up to its promises or obligations. What shall be said of secret caucus methods or the deliberative judgment of Congress when a Democratic Member, Mr. ADAIR, of Indiana, informs the House (p. 417 of the RECORD):

I shall vote for this bill as it was reported from a Democratic caucus without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t." * * * If we were to read out of the Democratic Party all Members who took issue with the Ways and Means Committee in our caucus on certain items of the bill, then there would be none left to sustain the committee in presenting the bill as finally agreed upon to the House.

This is the caucus steam-roller bill that Congress is asked to pass. Can any language characterize it and its support more fittingly than this confession?

It has been stated on this floor by Republican Members, older than myself in service here, that the Republican Party has reaped the whirlwind because of incompetent leadership and a failure to keep its pledges. Our Democratic friends will have cause to remember this verdict if the bill is passed in its present form. Promises to make a gradual revision downward, to disturb no legitimate business interests, to act with caution even if with determination, were pledges that gave to the Democracy its present power. Will the Underwood bill bring public confidence or desired relief? There are Republicans present who believe in the tenets of their party and have rendered lifelong service to its principles, yet on whom the yoke of party rests so lightly that their vote would have been cast in favor of a bill not radically opposed to principles in which they believe. Questions confront us, however, on which this measure must stand or fall.

WHO WILL BENEFIT FROM THE BILL?

Will the Underwood bill cause capital to seek investment? If so, when or where? Will it give employment to one additional laborer? Will it increase the wages of a single employee? Will it start the furnaces or add to the looms on this side, or across the water? Will it increase the price of farm products in a single instance? Will it persuade one boy or one girl to remain upon the farm? Will it eliminate the jobber, wholesaler, and the middleman who to-day receive more than one-half of the average cost of articles which move from the farm and factory to market? Will it bring prosperity or disaster to the country?

If goods from abroad are brought here in large quantities and substituted in use for domestic manufactures, what is to become of the factories erected on this side of the water, and what provision does the Underwood bill make for the thousands, aye, millions, of employees who to-day are dependent upon these same factories for a livelihood?

The income-tax provision contained in the Underwood bill is a faint attempt to collect taxes under the constitutional power recently given to Congress. It is a step in the right direction, that has been successfully tried out in Wisconsin under a better law; but if well administered the proposed measure will become an efficient revenue producer. Many Republican Members would support the income-tax feature of the Underwood bill with slight amendment, but in order to do so they are compelled to vote for an entire tariff bill which contains too many objectionable features to justify its support.

If the Underwood bill works successfully, as its defenders predict, if it refutes all precedents and all economic laws in bringing greater prosperity to our people, we of the minority will unite in praise for a measure that must succeed, if at all, through fortuitous chance rather than from foresight or deliberate calculation.

If, on the contrary, the party in power loses a golden opportunity to command the confidence of the country, if this tariff revision falls down because of dark-lanterned methods of preparation or unscientific schedules, then Republicans who do not believe in Aldrichism nor in a stand-still policy must be ready to accept their full share of responsibility for any failure hereafter of our own party to keep its pledges.

A TARIFF COMMISSION IS DEMANDED.

No bill, however carefully drawn, will fully meet public expectation, but any bill presented here for passage affecting the whole economic and fiscal policy of the Government should be prepared with deliberation and in the light of day. Our country is growing so rapidly that tariff changes can not be safely made except by schedules based upon a careful investigation of facts. This method is indorsed by the present Republican minority which has declared in favor of a strong tariff commission, and as evidence of its faith has accepted the woolen schedule that was unanimously supported by the Republicans of the House at the last session. That schedule invites confidence in its pro-

visions because of its careful preparation based upon tariff commission findings, while its substantial reductions from the Aldrich rates now in force give renewed weight to the argument that tariff revision is a job for the surgeon's knife and not for the bludgeon.

Rates on woolen goods fixed by the Underwood bill are from 25 per cent to 50 per cent, on the average, lower than those fixed by the Wilson law of 1896, but for 16 years the Wilson law has performed a ghost walk before the country whenever Democratic tariff tinkering is recalled.

It is a bold prediction to say that by cutting the Wilson law rates in half, the Underwood bill will put the ghost to sleep. It is also a reckless presumption that in the preparation of any tariff law destined to meet with approval of the country, political influences and exigencies can be safely substituted for economic principles. Three weeks ago to-day a triumphant Democracy entered this House charged with the fulfillment of party pledges. Secret caucus rules now hold the party together. A minority composed of Republicans, third-party Progressives, nonpartisans, and independents stands with solid front opposing the passage of this bill. Fresh from the people, unbound by caucus rule, governed by individual conscience, not partisanship; by justice, not expediency, the unanimous voice of the minority Members bespeaks a judgment that will be pronounced by the American people upon the Underwood bill. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KINDEL].

Mr. KINDEL. Mr. Chairman, after all I have heard pro and con on the Underwood tariff bill I am reminded of the words of the Scripture:

> I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue.

First, I would criticize the reckless handling of the truth by the gentlemen on the minority side of the House when they make the wholesale charge that the new Members are intimidated and bribed into voting for the Underwood bill in order to get patronage or desirable committee assignments. I have been honored with appointment on one committee, from which I was obliged to resign because I did not want to jeopardize my chances of getting on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to continue the work I have been engaged in for 21 years. I desire very much to be placed on this committee, but whether I am or not, I am for the Underwood bill, first, last, and all the time, as the only fair and honest tariff bill that has been presented to Congress by the majority party in 16 years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Second, I would take exception to the practice of the minority in branding the majority as cowardly, vicious, hypocritical, and otherwise unworthy of public confidence. I am not one of those who believe that he or his party has a monopoly on virtue. It will no doubt surprise even some of my Democratic friends to learn that I discovered two Republican postmasters in my district with 100 per cent records for efficiency, whom I am urging for reappointment, in spite of much opposition from my colleagues and the Postmaster General. [Laughter.] I am a believer in civil service in practice as well as in theory, for that is the doctrine of the Democratic platform, upon which I was elected. May the meal-ticket, mugwump Democrat take heed of the fate that befell my predecessor. [Laughter and applause.]

I am a manufacturer and a granger and not a politician. I warned him four years ago that he would have to do certain things to see that we in Colorado got a square deal and fair play. He defaulted in that particular, and two years later I decided to get some one else to run, but I had to run myself on a Prohibition ticket. [Laughter.] I am a German and I drink beer. With a glass of beer in one hand and a Carrie Nation hatchet in the other I got 17,000 votes. [Laughter and applause.]

In like manner I now give warning to the gentleman from Wyoming—of many terms here—that, though he gallantly praises the women of his State, who have voted there for 43 years—since 1869—the women of Wyoming will prove his political downfall. [Laughter.] All that is needed is to instruct the women as to the real issues and they will vote right, as was demonstrated last fall in my district, when they retired my predecessor, a protection Democrat, and elected a real Democrat by from 3,000 to 5,000 votes more than the State and National ticket, and that, too, in a Republican stronghold. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Once it is inculcated into the minds of the women of Wyoming that it is equitable transportation rates and not high tariff that is needed to develop the illimitable resources of Wyoming and the trans-Mississippi West they, like the voters of Colorado, will displace their present Representative and Senators by Democratic successors.

Wyoming, with a population of 146,000, has scarcely any manufacturing industries. The latest manufacturing statistics for the State, found in the report of the Thirteenth Census, shows but 2,867 wage earners. With all its high-tariff representation in Congress and with high tariffs prevailing it was unable to operate successfully its soda mills, glass works, and other manufacturing industries. How can Wyoming and the entire Rocky Mountain section with such freight rates be anything but a one-lung hospital, a globe trotters' station, and a repair shop?

It is true that the Wyoming freight rates have been equalized somewhat, both eastward and westward, by reflection of the Kindel efforts in Colorado. This is certainly not to the credit of the gentleman from Wyoming, who poses as a grammarian, a parliamentarian, and a Missourian, whom we hope to show before the next congressional election just where to get off. [Laughter.]

I regret to say that under high tariff we have lost in my own city of Denver two woolen mills, a paper mill, cotton mill, rolling mill, tannery, cooper shop, match factory, white-lead works, cement works, stove works, boiler works, medicine plant, tin-can factory, hardware factory, knitting factory, saddle factory, envelope factory, and several other factories. I do not pretend to say that protective tariff was responsible for this loss, but they certainly were not able to exist under high tariff and discriminative freight rates.

A most fitting epitaph in this connection would be that of Kingsley:

> So fleet the works of man, back to the earth again;
> Ancient and holy things fade like a dream.

To expand and develop our matchless western resources we must have commercial equality—the currency of transportation as well as the currency of cash. It is not high tariff we need, under which and in spite of which these enterprises were lost to us, but a square deal—fair freight rates.

A certain old Roman made himself famous by declaring that "Carthage must be destroyed," and sticking to it till Carthage was destroyed. I petition the Democratic Party to emulate that old Roman by declaring that discrimination must be destroyed, and sticking to it until discrimination no longer exists either in tariff or transportation.

Now, on the sugar question the gentleman from Wyoming said in part:

> It is certain no new factories would be built, and in a few years at most the beet-sugar industry would be but a memory of the constructive character of Republican and the destructive character of Democratic policies.

I want to read a telegram, showing that we are going to build more factories:

GREELEY, COLO., *April 24, 1913.*

Congressman GEORGE KINDEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Officers of the Weld County Beet Growers' Association incorporated the New Freedom Beet Sugar Co. to-day to build beet-sugar factory in Weld County. I am confident of the continued prosperity of the sugar industry, even though the tariff be reduced as recommended.

WARD DARLEY.

To show you what has happened to our section, take the freight rates westward; they are on the books to-day, and you are paying $2,000,000 for an Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate transportation tariffs.

Here are a few examples of tariff (freight) rates, of which the gentleman from Wyoming "keeps on layin' low and sayin' nuffin":

Carpets:	
New York to Pacific coast, per 100 pounds	$1.50
New York to Wyoming points	3.50
Boots and shoes—rubber:	
New York to Pacific coast	1.50
New York to Wyoming points	3.13
Structural iron and steel:	
Pittsburgh to Pacific coast	.80
Pittsburgh to Wyoming points	1.20½

I helped celebrate the opening of the Woolworth Building in New York the other day, and I am getting at what it will cost to duplicate that building in Wyoming or San Francisco. I am satisfied it will cost 200 per cent more per ton mile to drop the material off in Wyoming.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. KINDEL. Mr. Chairman, let us take up the question of the rate on wool. From California terminals to Boston the rate on wool is $1 a hundred; that is, for wool in the grease. From Wyoming to Boston, a thousand miles shorter distance, it is $1.76. Talk about manufacturing and protection! The gentleman from Wyoming could not have started a scouring mill in his State, much less a woolen mill. The scoured-wool rate from California terminal points to Boston is $1.30; from

Wyoming it is $4.22½. The rate from Cheyenne to Omaha on scoured wool is $2.35. Manufactured woolen goods and cloth from Omaha back to Cheyenne take the first-class rate—$1.25. Talk about tariff! It is freight rates. That is what is the matter with Wyoming.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I will say that the people of Wyoming are not full of prunes for electing a man like the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. [Laughter.] They could not afford to be. Here is the rate on prunes: California to New York, $1.10, while from San Francisco to Cody, which is about the center of the gentleman's State, it is $1.63. It is too expensive to be full of prunes in Wyoming. Thus I could go on, Mr. Chairman, but I will not inflict myself any further on the House at this time, as this is my first attempt. [Cries of "Go on!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FITZHENRY].

Mr. FITZHENRY. Mr. Chairman, when the pending measure is signed by the President of the United States, as it undoubtedly will be, it will mark the first great advancement in the battle which the common people of this country have been waging for more than a quarter of a century to regain control of their own Government. With the passage of this bill the people of this country are serving notice upon all men that no person, either natural or artificial, can acquire a vested private interest founded upon the taxing power of a free people. It marks the end of a fiscal policy which has very aptly been described as "the great American delusion," and means the adoption of a new policy in the manner of raising the revenues of the Government.

The policy of a high protective tariff as exemplified during the last half century in the United States was conceived during the exigencies of war and nurtured by a special privileged class, who, through the susceptibility of succeeding Congresses and administrations, have come to believe that they can, as a matter of right, use the taxing power of our Government for their own aggrandizement.

No country on the face of the earth has been so generously blessed with the richest of resources necessary for the comfort of a people and the development of civilization as this one. Yet, after a trial of this unwise and fundamentally wrong high-tariff policy, our great natural resources have been plundered and dissipated, and by its application it has created and developed classes in our midst by establishing tariff-baron and special privileged aristocracy and degrading the laboring classes. The beneficiaries of the special privileges doled out in former tariff laws have permitted the captains of industry to sell their products in protected markets and exacted millions of tribute from the people of the country, while these same captains of industry have been permitted to buy their labor in the free-trade markets of the world.

This high-protection policy has limited the markets of our commerce; it has destroyed the American merchant marine and hindered our development; it has fostered inefficiency and destroyed rigid economies in great industrial institutions; it has made goods scarce and unduly increased the cost of living; it has lowered wages and overworked and degraded labor; it has exploited the lives of children and been the incubator of trusts; it has corrupted our politics and encouraged reckless extravagance in governmental expenditures; it has placed a premium upon conspiracies in restraint of trade.

In the infancy of the Republic patriotic statesmen found it expedient in raising revenues for the purpose of economically administering the affairs of the Government to so levy their customs taxes as to subsidize and encourage new industries in a land entirely detached from former bases of supplies. But this practice was not indulged in to any very considerable extent until the statesmen of this country reached a consciousness of the fact that such practices were in violation of the Constitution of the United States, and that sooner or later, if the practice was continued, it would become a menace to the perpetuity of our Government. It became apparent to the fathers that if we would perpetuate our heritage we must keep constantly in view the polar star of the new Government, that doctrine so vividly elucidated by the author of the Declaration of Independence and the founder of the Democratic Party, "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none." This was the seed which was planted upon American soil to grow and develop into the sheltering tree of life of the Republic. This doctrine was kept constantly in view by the statesmen of the early epochs of our history until our customs-tax system became exemplified in what was known as the Walker tariff of 1846.

Prior to the enactment of the Walker law great political battles had been waged upon the tariff question. This act was so free from discriminations against producers and impositions upon our people and was such a satisfactory revenue producer that the tariff question ceased to be an issue between the then great political parties. For a considerable period in our history, while the country was operating under the Walker law, the tariff question was never mentioned in the platform of any great political party. Great prosperity reigned among our people; our foreign commerce grew to tremendous proportions. It was under this law that our flag was seen upon every sea, and its presence at once bespoke the largest, the fastest, and the finest ships engaged in foreign commerce.

At the beginning of the last century our flag covered a tonnage of 970,000 tons, but half of the British tonnage of that time, which was 1,850,000. Gradually our commerce gained upon that of the mother country, until in 1860 our shipping amounted to 5,350,000 tons, while that of Great Britain, including her colonies, was 5,713,000 tons. Even these figures do not convey all of the facts. A part of the tonnage was steam, and as steamers can make quicker voyages than other vessels they were rated at a higher carrying capacity. In 1860 we had a much greater steam tonnage than England, and when this fact is taken into consideration the total carrying power of the two countries in that year was, United States, 7,969,000 tons; Great Britain, 7,219,000 tons. It will thus be seen that in 1860 the young Republic was not only enjoying peace with all the world and prosperity at home, but for once in her history she was the merchant-marine mistress of the seas. This was the condition which existed during what might be called the last Democratic tariff in our history. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Consider the next picture. Internal strife developed, and we were thrown into the dread arbitrament of war. It at once became apparent that there would be a heavy draft upon the Government Treasury, and as a war measure the customs duties were greatly increased by Congress, with the understanding, of course, that as soon as the war was over we would return to a revenue basis.

Just prior to the Civil War 69 per cent of the total imports and exports of this country were carried in American ships and 31 per cent in foreign ships. Ten years later the proportions were almost reversed, 35 per cent of our foreign commerce being under the American flag and 65 per cent under foreign flags. In 1880 only 18 per cent of our foreign commerce was carried in American ships, and it has continued to dwindle, year after year, until in 1912 it had shrunken in the neighborhood of 9 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, two great causes have contributed to this result. When the war broke out it was but natural that our shipping should decline. Ships of the Confederacy took out foreign registry to elude the Union Navy, while those of the North went under foreign flags to escape the southern privateer. It was at such an unhappy hour in the history of this Republic that economic adventurers and those seeking to profit off of congressional bounty began their careers. Under the guise of assisting in the reconstruction of the country the war taxes were not only maintained but increased. It was then that the wise ones, under the guise of encouraging infant industries, saw that by virtue of a high protective tariff they would be permitted to use the taxing power of the Government for the attainment of private ends. Strange to say, Congresses and administrations have been susceptible to this cry, and while the country was recovering from the unfortunate condition created by civil strife huge fortunes were amassed, and those who had been reaping the harvest developed a school of statesmenship and furnished the sinews of political warfare so bountifully that for now well-nigh a period of half a century the same influences have maintained an almost unbroken hold upon the Government of this country. This policy has brought about the results I have heretofore intimated by limiting the markets of our commerce, aided by unwise and unreasonable navigation laws, our foreign shipping has been absolutely destroyed, and the American seaman has become a negligible quantity in over-seas transportation.

Under the Payne-Aldrich tariff law and its predecessors the high protective policy has so effectually prohibited competition with great American industrial institutions that it placed a premium upon consolidation and conspiracies in restraint of trade and monopoly. By the invention of the process of capitalizing and financing special privileges, granted by law, sufficient funds have been raised to make it possible to compel consolidation or surrender of independent plants, or the annihilation thereof, to such an extent that trusts and monopolies have literally taken hold of the industrial life of this country.

The pending bill is not ideal even from a Democratic standpoint, but it is such a decided step in the right direction and along lines demanded by the people in the campaigns of 1908, 1910, and 1912 that no Democratic Member can hesitate to support it. The bill does not fully meet the ideas of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who presented this bill to the House, but it is the beginning of a series of tariff revisions which in years to come will bring about a freer trade among our people and between this and other nations, and is a full compliance with the demand for an immediate downward tariff revision. It will have a tendency to break the power of the great trusts and monopolies of this country upon our markets.

The baneful effect of the high protective policy is illustrated by the sugar trade.

For more than a century the Government has been protecting and encouraging the sugar industry in the United States, either by a protective tariff or a bounty, at a tremendous cost to the people. Under the Payne-Aldrich law a duty of 1.95 cents was levied upon refined sugar. For the convenience of calculation let us consider that duty as 2 cents. The annual consumption of sugar in the United States is about seven and one-half billion pounds. Whether this tariff tax of 2 cents a pound on sugar is levied upon sugar which finds it way from the cane fields and beet-sugar factories of this country or from foreign markets to the tables of the consumers of this country, every pound of it bears either the tariff or the bounty of 2 cents. In round numbers this tariff amounts to a tax upon the American people to the extent of $150,000,000. Upon that portion of the sugar upon which a tariff tax is collected at the custom-houses, the revenue goes into the United States Treasury, and during the year 1912 the Government received from that source about $52,000,000, leaving the stupendous sum of $98,000,000 that was collected from the American people that went into the coffers of somebody other than the Government. Where did it go? It is a well-known fact that the sugar industry of the United States is controlled by the American Sugar Refining Co.—the trust—and that the sugar market of the country is absolutely dominated by that trust.

This tremendous special privilege, in the hands of the sugar kings of this country, has enabled them to control the price of raw material produced in this country as well as their market, and being so generously favored they have been able by the negotiations of its stocks and bonds to not only control the sugar-refining business, which involves the market for sugar cane, but also to control the sugar-beet factories of this country. With the tremendous protection on sugar and the long period of time which the sugar-cane industry in Louisiana and Texas has been encouraged by this Government, the total cost of the cane industry in those two States to the American people is almost beyond human conception. Yet the lands of the cane planters will be worth just as much for other crops, their implements and stock will be just as valuable in the cultivation of other crops, while that portion of their possessions which will become useless, if they are compelled to go out of the cane-growing business, would not exceed $30,000,000. After a century of encouragement to this institution we have reached a consciousness of the fact that sugar cane is a tropical plant and can not be grown profitably in a temperate zone. More than this, this great tax that is levied upon the American people to encourage that industry has not always found its way into the pockets of the planters of sugar cane, for upon repeated occasions the planters of Louisiana and Texas have been compelled to sell their raw sugar at prices much less than the world's price, with the sugar tariff added. Why? Because there was practically one buyer for their crop—the Sugar Trust.

It is said the placing of sugar on the free list will ruin the beet-sugar industry in this country. This assertion, I believe, is absolutely untrue. Beet sugar can be manufactured for considerably less money than cane sugar, and, so far as the growers of sugar beets are concerned, they have been compelled to sell their product in practically a free-trade market under the old law. The duty under the Payne-Aldrich tariff law on sugar beets amounts to only 10 per cent ad valorem, or about 55 cents per ton. In addition to this, American beet growers will continue to have the legitimate natural protection which comes to them from the tariffs of water and railroad transportation. After a careful examination into the facts, I am firm in the belief that the modification and final repeal of the duty on sugar will not interfere in the least with the growth of sugar beets and the manufacture of beet sugar, but may squeeze the water out of the stocks of the Sugar Trust. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The proposed law makes a radical reduction in the tariff on sugar, and futher provides that on the 1st of May, 1916, it shall go absolutely on the free list. This delay in placing sugar upon the free list is a special consideration given to the people of Louisiana and Texas in the light of their unfortunate experience in the last few years. In some sections their crops have been destroyed by pests, and last year great floods dealt havoc to their industry. The history of the development of the Sugar Trust is but the recital of the development of similar trusts in protected lines.

One of the cardinal principles of Democratic tariff making has been the placing of raw materials upon the free list. One of the important reasons why raw material should be admitted into the country free of duty, if only a revenue duty is to be levied upon manufactured products, is because practically all other manufacturing countries admit raw material free of duty. A duty upon raw material to the extent of a protective rate at once increases the cost of the manufacturer's products into which the raw material is made, and to that extent amounts to a discrimination against the home manufacturer and in favor of the foreign manufacturer. The Republican policy of taxing raw materials has really been a disadvantage to the home manufacturer, because it handicaps him in the competition which he meets in the markets of the world. This has been one of the causes which has assisted in the limitation of the foreign commerce of this country. The doctrine of free raw materials is one that was believed in and applied by such great Democrats as Mr. Walker, Mr. Morrison, Mr. Mills, President Cleveland, and the present Secretary of State, Mr. Bryan.

President Cleveland, in his last annual message during his first term, enunciated the Democratic doctrine upon raw material in the following language:

> The radical reduction of the duties imposed upon raw material used in manufactures or its free importation is, of course, an important factor in any effort to reduce the price of these necessaries. It would not only relieve them from the increased cost caused by the tariff on such raw material, but the manufactured product being thus cheapened that part of the tariff now laid upon such product as a compensation to our manufacturers for the present price of raw material, could be accordingly modified. Such reduction or free importation would serve besides to largely reduce the revenue. It is not apparent how such a change can have any injurious effect upon our manufacturers. On the contrary, it would appear to give them a better chance in foreign markets with the manufacturers of other countries who cheapen their wares by free material. Thus our people might have the opportunity of extending their sales beyond the limits of home consumption, saving them from the depression, interruption in business, and loss caused by a glutted domestic market, and affording their employees more certain and steady labor, with its resulting quiet and contentment.

In 1892 he was reelected to the Presidency, together with a Democratic House, but without a Democratic Senate. A tariff-for-revenue-only bill was passed by the House, known as the Wilson bill. When it went to the Senate its revenue features were destroyed by amendment, and protective features interposed. Finally, after the passage of the bill as amended by the Senate, it came back to the House for conference, and upon this occasion President Cleveland wrote a communication to Mr. Wilson, the then chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in which he spoke as follows:

> One topic will be submitted to the conference which embodies Democratic principle so directly that it can not be compromised. We have in our platforms and in every way possible declared in favor of the free importation of raw materials. We have again and again promised that this should be accorded to our people and our manufacturers as soon as the Democratic Party was invested with the power to determine the tariff policy of the country.
>
> The party now has that power. We are certain to-day as we have been of the great benefit that would accrue to the country from the inauguration of this policy, and nothing has occurred to release us from our obligation to secure this advantage to our people. It must be admitted that no tariff measure can accord with Democratic principles and promises or wear a genuine Democratic badge that does not provide for free raw materials. In these circumstances it may well excite our wonder that Democrats are willing to depart from this the most Democratic of all tariff principles, and that the inconsistent absurdity of such a proposed departure should be emphasized by the suggestion that the wool of the farmer be put on the free list and the protection of tariff taxation be placed around the iron ore and coal of corporations and capitalists.
>
> How can we face the people after indulging in such outrageous discriminations and violations of principles?
>
> It is quite apparent that this question of free raw materials does not admit of adjustment on any middle ground, since their subjection to any rate of taxation, great or small, is alike violative of Democratic principle and Democratic good faith.

Hon. William J. Bryan, the present Secretary of State, in the Fifty-third Congress discussed the question of free coal, using this language:

> They tell us that free coal can not benefit the interior. Take the tariff off from coal so that the New England manufacturers can buy it for less and they can manufacture more cheaply, and then by cutting down the tariff on the products of their factories we can compel them to sell at a lower price to the people of the South and West. That is the reason our folks are interested in free coal. So long as we lay burdens upon what the manufacturers use they can with some justification ask a tariff on the product of their looms.

Mr. Chairman, in the first place I believe we can make no permanent progress in the direction of tariff reform until we free from taxation the raw materials which lie at the foundation of our industries.

In 1892, in another speech in Congress, Mr. Bryan reaffirmed the Democratic position upon this subject in the following language:

It also takes away entirely those specific or compensatory duties which were added to the ad valorem rates to enable the manufacturers to transfer to the back of the consumers the burden which a tariff on raw materials placed on the manufacturer. The reason why I believe in putting raw material on the free list is because any tax imposed on raw material must at last be taken from the consumer of the manufactured article.

You can compose no tax for the benefit of the producer of the raw material which does not find its way through the various forms of manufactured product and at last press with accumulated weight upon the person who uses the finished product. Another reason why raw material should be upon the free list is because that is the only method by which one business can be favored without injury to another. We are not in that case imposing a tax for the benefit of the manufacturer, but we are simply saying to the manufacturer, "We will not impose any burden upon you." When we give to the manufacturer free raw material and free machinery we give to him, I think, all the encouragement which people acting under a free government like ours can legitimately give to a free people.

As great as was the disagreement between Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Bryan upon questions of finance, it will be seen by these quotations that their ideas upon the question of free raw material in tariff making was entirely harmonious. Indeed, their views as then expressed were in harmony with those of all of the great Democrats of history and the views of the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. UNDERWOOD], under whose direction this bill was drawn. This bill has been constructed upon that line.

During these debates I have been greatly entertained by gentlemen upon the other side of the aisle who have attacked the measure. It has been alluded to as the "Underwood patented competitive tariff"; it has been stated that it was neither a protective measure nor a free-trade measure; it was neither fish nor fowl; and that is true. In so far as the duties levied by this proposed law may incidentally be advantageous, it is protective; in so far as the necessaries of life which the people are demanding are concerned, it is a free-trade measure. In addition, it furnishes the industries of this country with free raw material with which to work in their mills and factories. But the decisive change of policy in our fiscal system which is evidenced in this bill is the changing of our revenue system from one of protection to one of competition. Gentlemen on the other side of the House do not seem to understand the difference, and that is not at all remarkable, because there are none so blind as those who will not see.

Protective tariff either prohibits or limits competition or it is a failure. The competitive tariff encourages competition. The differences between these two systems is very much akin to the difference between a maximum and a minimum schedule of freight tariffs.

My own State—Illinois—is a pioneer in the movement to regulate railroads. It has a railroad and warehouse act, which creates a commission composed of three citizens, and one of the duties of this commission is to prescribe a reasonable maximum schedule of freight rates. It was never designed that the commission should prescribe a freight tariff for current use, but it is provided for the fixing of a maximum schedule beyond which no railroad can go. In other words, in order to be a reasonable maximum schedule it must be liberal enough to permit the smaller struggling lines of railroad, which operate wholly within the State and are not connected with any through lines to the extent that they could participate in through business, might live. A rate that would be a reasonable price for the transportation of freight upon such a railroad might be an exorbitant price for another railroad differently situated and which was so located that it participated in through business. The railroads of Illinois, like the captains of industry of the United States, readily saw this and encouraged the commission to prescribe a liberal maximum schedule. Neither the commissioners nor the legislature ever dreamed that such a schedule would become a current schedule for everyday use. Just as some of the members of this body, when adopting very highly protective tariffs, probably did not dream that the industries affected would use any more of the protection afforded than was necessary to protect themselves from the aggression of foreign competitors. But a few years ago the shippers of Illinois discovered that the rates charged them for shipments originated in and destined to points in Illinois were so much more than the interstate rate that they could not compete with shippers engaged in similar lines living just across the State line. The wholesale grocers of Cincinnati and Columbus could make shipments of their goods from those points into central Illinois at a lower freight rate than the local shippers could procure for short hauls to the same customers. In a hearing before the railroad and warehouse commission it was determined upon the evidence of canceled freight bills that the citizens of Illinois were paying from 75 per cent to 300 per cent more for local shipments in the State than the shippers of Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan were paying for local shipments of the same kind of goods the same distance and in many cases upon the same railroads. An inquiry into this condition of affairs disclosed the fact that the railroads of Illinois had simply adopted the maximum schedule of the State as their current schedule, while in Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan the rates were the product of the Central Traffic Association, composed of representatives of the various railroads, and that their schedules instead of being a maximum schedule was a minimum schedule.

In other words, the minimum schedule was established for the purpose of legitimatizing competition between the railroads themselves, while in Illinois the harvest was so rich that the railroads under the guise of State regulation simply accepted the maximum rate in lieu of a competitive rate. "Oh," it may be said, "yet the State of Illinois prospered and developed wonderfully, and did so while this law has been upon the statute books." This suggestion, however, is answered by the thought that Illinois is so blessed by nature that she has prospered and developed in spite of this handicap, just as the United States has prospered and developed in spite of the Republican high protective policy.

Tariffs in this schedule are constructed for the purpose of raising revenues sufficient to administer economically the affairs of this Government. While doing this they are so constructed as to encourage competition, keeping down the cost of living, which is ever going higher and higher, while the Republican tariff prohibits competition on all commodities the prices of which are not fixed in the free markets of the world. As I said before, this law may bear some inconsistencies, it may not be perfect, but it is the product of an honest effort to keep faith with the people of this country by making an immediate and rational downward revision of the tariff. It is the result of conservative patriotic deliberation. It is a full compliance with the Democratic platform; it is a fair response to the request of President Wilson in his recent message to Congress when he said:

We must abolish everything that bears even the semblance of privilege or of any kind of artificial advantage, and put our business men and producers under the stimulation of a constant necessity to be efficient, economical, and enterprising masters of competitive supremacy, better workers and merchants than any in the world. Aside from the duties laid upon articles which we do not, and probably can not, produce, therefore, and the duties laid upon luxuries and merely for the sake of the revenues they yield, the object of the tariff duties henceforth laid must be effective competition, the whetting of American wits by contest with the wits of the rest of the world.

The pending measure not only liberated a vast number of commodities so as to stimulate trade, but the amount of revenue which will be raised from the customs taxes provided under it is many millions of dollars less than the amount raised under the present Payne-Aldrich law. The deficit created by this radical change is amply provided for by the levying of a very moderate income tax. It is estimated that the income-tax feature of the present law will raise substantially $80,000,000 of revenue, thus placing a just portion of the burdens of government upon a class of people who never have paid their proportionate amount of the taxes collected to defray the necessary cost of administering our national affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute more to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FITZHENRY. Mr. Chairman, when the arguments interposed by those who have resisted this measure are carefully considered the objections advanced may be reduced to a comparatively few propositions.

First, a strong appeal has been made for a retention of the rates of the present Payne-Aldrich law, which have been so overwhelmingly and so justly repudiated by the people at the polls. The burden of the argument of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle has been that the duties as laid down in that measure were just and proper. This position is taken now in the light of the arguments of many of the same gentlemen last fall, when it was admitted that the Payne rates were probably a little too high and should be reduced. If the people's rights are to be considered in tariff making at all, it is plainly the duty of this House to pass this bill. In 1908 the Republican national convention declared for the revision of the tariff because the rates of the old Dingley law were excessive and burdensome. President Taft, in a public speech following that convention, interpreted the platform to mean the "downward revision" of the tariff.

On the promises of a downward revision the Republican Party was returned to power, with full control of both branches of Congress, when the present Payne-Aldrich tariff law was enacted. It did not take the people of the country, who in the end pay all of the tariff exactions, long to realize that instead of making "an immediate downward revision" of the tariff that the Republican Party had fooled those who had intrusted them with power and in special session had made a decidedly "upward revision" and increased the burdens of the people. Yet these are the rates that gentlemen would have the Democratic Party put in the pending measure. They would have the present Congress and administration break faith with the people in the hope that an outraged public opinion might return their party to power. How presumptious is their proposition! Should we break faith with the people as they have done it would do the Republican Party no good, for if public opinion can be analyzed at all the American people have fully decided to relieve themselves of the onerous burdens of high and prohibitive tariff taxes. The Democratic Party is the instrumentality chosen to perform this duty; it is now endeavoring to honestly execute a public trust committed to it. Should we do as you did four years ago an outraged public opinion would at the next election relegate the Democratic Party to the "valley of the shadow of death," as it has your party, and the next Congress would be made up of members of the new Progressive Party, with as large a majority as we now enjoy.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], one of the Republican leaders of this House, in a speech the other day correctly described the predicament of his party. You will remember he said:

> We failed to move with the age. That was the head and front of our offending. The Republican chieftains could not adjust their views to modern schools of thought. They persisted in governing the country in their own way, not in the country's way, and so we came to grief. * * * It makes very little difference now whether the Payne law was a fulfillment of my party's pledges, as I earnestly believe, or whether it was a double-dealing, interest-controlled, diabolical perversion of our promises, as the country believes, or wishes to believe. The Nation does not want the Payne law; the Nation will not have the Payne law.

Yet in the light of the testimony of so distinguished a witness as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], the burden of the argument of gentlemen on the other side of this House is a plea that the old tariff rates of the Payne law be reenacted into the pending measure. The Democratic Party does "move with the age." The people have made their demands upon their Representatives in no unmistaken tones, and it is the purpose of the Democratic side of this House to give the people not only what we think they should have but what they want. Aside from the matter of principle, we would indeed be dull if we failed to profit by your experience.

Second. The next objection urged is that the tariff rates as laid in the pending measure are not "protective," but are competitive. In other words, the complaint is that the rates contained in this bill do not prevent or prohibit competition but encourage it. We at once plead guilty to this impeachment, and I might add that that is why many of us are here to-day. It was because the Republicans would not "move with the age" but, rather, insisted upon granting special privileges to favored manufacturers at the expense of the people that their forces in this Chamber are a shattered and dismembered minority to-day.

Third. The one paramount objection to this bill that has been urged all through this debate is that the law does not provide for a nonpartisan tariff commission to ascertain the difference in the cost of production of goods and commodities at home and abroad. Gentlemen say the Congress should have accurate information of facts concerning tariffs procured by a tariff board before it enacts a tariff law. They did not need a tariff commission to advise them when they passed the McKinley bill nor the Dingley bill. They needed no tariff commission to advise them when they passed the Payne-Aldrich bill, increasing the tariff rates each time. Do gentlemen believe that "accurate information" is unnecessary to increase the taxes of the people but very necessary to reduce them?

This is strange reasoning, but it is their position. They provided for a commission in the Payne bill, but that was after they had fixed the rates, and their President deliberately vetoed measures passed by the last Congress for the relief of the people, because the Tariff Board had not yet reported the facts concerning the schedules affected. Finally, after the Tariff Board did report upon those schedules and established the fact that reductions proposed by the Democratic measures were very conservative, and after the same bills were reenacted, then their President vetoed the measures again for reasons that were satisfactory to himself.

All these touching appeals in behalf of a tariff commission are idle and, in my judgment, made for "home consumption." I question their good faith, for nobody knows better than the gentlemen on the Republican side of this Chamber that the Democratic Party wants all the information it can get concerning tariffs. Gentlemen know that in the last Congress the Democratic Party provided for the creation of a tariff commission that is designed to be one of the permanent departments of this Government. Their Tariff Commission was found unsatisfactory, and the information it furnished proved to be incomplete, fragmentary, and unreliable. It refused to furnish sources of information to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. An expert employed by it gave up his position in disgust and printed several articles exposing the methods of the Tariff Board, and detailing facts tending to support the charge that their board was deliberately suppressing and emasculating facts in order to sustain the rates of the Payne-Aldrich law, upon which both your party and your Tariff Board were repudiated by the country.

The Democratic Party created the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, with a tariff division, in connection with the Department of Commerce at the last session. This board has even more power than the Tariff Commission of the Taft administration. The important duties of the bureau, as provided in the Democratic measure, which is now a law, are these:

> To ascertain, at as early a date as possible, and whenever industrial changes shall make it essential, the cost of producing articles at the time dutiable in the United States, in leading countries where such articles are produced, by fully specified units of production, and under a classification showing the different elements of cost, or approximate cost, of such articles of production, including the wages paid in such industries per day, week, month, or year or by the piece; and hours employed per day; and the profits of manufacturers and producers of such articles; and the comparative cost of living and the kind of living; what articles are controlled by trusts or other combinations of capital, business operations, or labor; and what effect said trusts or other combinations of capital, business operations, or labor have on production and prices.

This bureau was not of service in the writing of the pending measure, as Members well know, because the late Republican administration refused to authorize an appropriation for that purpose. But I give notice now, upon the authority of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. UNDERWOOD, the matchless leader of the majority of this House, that this new bureau, whose duty it is to procure the information you apparently so much desire now, will be vitalized by an appropriation at the present session. Gentlemen well know that under the Constitution of the United States this Congress has absolutely no power to delegate the making of a revenue measure to a tariff commission, nonpartisan, bipartisan, or otherwise. They know that the most any bureau or commission can do is to furnish Congress with information. Tariffs are only provided for the purpose of raising revenue, and can lawfully be provided for no other purpose. The Constitution expressly requires that all bills relating to revenue must originate in the House of Representatives.

It is idle to talk of taking the tariff out of politics, but you can do what the people did last November—you can take designing politicians away from the tariff. Tariff making is merely tax levying, and it has been said that the science of taxation is the science of government. This being true, how can the tariff question ever be taken out of politics? You can stop passing laws that will put $7 in the pockets of a favored few while you are putting $1 in the vaults of the United States Treasury, and that is exactly what the pending measure proposes to do. That is why the few who have so long been so greatly benefited by the enjoyment of the special privileges of high-tariff laws are so strenuously opposing this bill.

The sincerity of the opposition of the bill upon the tariff commission grounds can be ascertained by a brief inquiry. Since the Constitution requires that all revenue bills must originate in the House of Representatives—and it would require an amendment to the Constitution to permit them to be originated by a nonpartisan tariff commission—why have not either the Republican or the Progressive minorities in this House offered a bill to submit a constitutional amendment to the several States for ratification authorizing a "tariff commission" to perform that function?

One of the crowning features of the pending measure is that it provides for a graduated income-tax law. Under the old tariff system of taxation the revenues of the Government have been raised by a tax upon the things which human beings use in providing food, clothing, and shelter for themselves, and this tax has been paid when these commodities of necessity and convenience, or the means of procuring them, are purchased. In other words, a tariff tax is a consumption tax. The poor man's family pays practically the same amount of taxes as the richest,

because the actual difference in the consumption between the rich man and the poor man is not great. In this way the poor man is required to pay more than his proportionate share of the expense of the National Government, and it is to remedy this great injustice that the Democratic Party has made a very substantial reduction in the tariff taxes, and to meet this deficiency caused by this reduction provision is made in the pending bill for a tax upon the incomes of the well to do and the rich, as well as the incomes of corporations.

Under this new feature of taxation each will be taxed in proportion to the benefits of the Government which he enjoys, as evidenced by his annual income. Under the present system the richer a man grows the less he pays in relation to his prosperity or income toward the expense of running the National Government. The purpose of this law is to make it necessary for each person to pay in proportion to his individual prosperity. The income tax is not laid upon those whose incomes are less than $4,000 annually, while those persons whose incomes exceed that amount are required to pay a tax of 1 per cent upon the amount over $4,000. In addition to this tax the Underwood bill provides that an additional tax of 1 per cent shall be paid upon all net incomes in excess of $20,000 and not over $50,000; 2 per cent additional upon all incomes over $50,000 and not over $100,000, while an additional tax of 3 per cent is levied upon all net incomes of $100,000. The normal income tax levied upon individuals is also levied upon the incomes of corporations, with the exception, however, that the corporation is not entitled to the $4,000 exemption.

Since this bill has been introduced the Members of this House have been deluged by circular letters sent out by the great insurance companies of this country to policyholders and signed by policyholders and mailed to the Members of the House. The law levies a tax upon all insurance companies except fraternal societies and associations not organized and conducted for financial profit. The law expressly exempts from the operation of the income-tax law the proceeds of a life insurance policy paid upon death, but this exemption does not seem to be satisfactory to the big insurance companies. They say that they are doing business upon the mutual plan and by a system of advertising have succeeded in making every policyholder believe that he is participating in all the profits of the insurance company. Yet a recent investigation established the fact that $100,000 worth of stock of the Equitable Co., of New York, sold for $3,000,000. It has assets amounting to more than $400,000,000.

One hundred dollar shares of stock in the Ætna Life were reported to be worth more than $10,000; $100 shares of Metropolitan Life, $15,000; $100 shares of the Prudential, $17,000. The attempt of these great insurance companies to have this House amend this bill so that it will not apply to them was, in effect, asking the Congress of the United States to grant that company an exemption in the nature of a special privilege that would make the stock in their company, which is owned by individuals, still increase in value by leaps and bounds. The corporation tax as now laid in this bill will not have the effect of embarrassing the rights of a single policyholder, but it may prevent the value of the shares of capital stock from increasing to more enormous values. This tax is one which does not interfere with the policyholder, but has to do with the income of the stockholder, and I believe that this feature of the income-tax section of the proposed law is one of the most noteworthy features of the entire act.

The enactment of the pending measure into law will prove to be the greatest achievement in revenue lawmaking of the last 50 years. The farmer who has been compelled to sell all of the products of his farm in the free markets of the world in competition with the world and who has, on the other hand, been compelled to buy the things he uses and needs in a protected special-privileged market, will find abundant relief in this measure. The laborer and mechanic who have been compelled to sell their labor in the free-trade labor markets of the world and yet been compelled to buy all of the necessaries of life and their tools of industry in a protected special-privileged market, will find great relief. This bill metes out justice to the poor as well as the rich. It is written in the interests of the vine-clad cottage as well as the stately mansion. It is written to encourage the thrift of our manhood and womanhood. It will rebuild and reestablish the American merchant marine, which will bear the products of our labor, our factories, and our fields to other climes. It is the first great Democratic step to equalize the burdens of Government among the people and tends to equalize the opportunity of every citizen for liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It is the fruit of the great doctrine "equal rights to all and special privileges to none." [Applause on Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the time is so limited that I am not permitted to make some general observations relating to some of the speeches that have been pretended and feigned as arguments against this bill. Inasmuch as my time is so limited, I will confine myself to some remarks that I have prepared.

Mr. Chairman, I will not be expected in the brief time allotted to me to say anything that will change the vote of a single Representative on the other side of this House, because they came here wearing peculiarly goggled glasses, furnished and fitted on them by the sleek, pampered, favored few and specially designed so that their visions are always and constantly focused on the heaping hoards of accumulated riches they have been giving to them by legislating to them a "reasonable profit" on their business. No one on your side of the House, once fitted up in this splendidly fashioned visor, can see the other side of a proposition, and never will unless the courageous leader of the second great political party in this country gives you another sparring match. In the event that he does, he will get your so-called goggles, and unless you can muster more patriotism than you now have you surely will be knocked stone blind.

I was very much amused the other day when the astute gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], who almost lost his voice yelling "soup house," prefaced his remarks by saying:

> Viewing your legislation as we do, our profound regret with regard to it arises from the fact that while you alone are responsible, the evil effects we anticipate can not be confined to you or those who agree with you, but will fall as a deadly blight upon the whole body of our people.

How easily and truthfully he might well have said:

> Viewing our legislation as we do, our profound regret with regard to it arises from the fact that while you alone will be responsible for depriving our specially favored industries from a further continuance of their illegalized "reasonable profit," which we wished again to anticipate, and can now no longer be confined to our industries or those who agree with us, but the benefits of the Underwood bill will fall as a delightful godsend upon the whole body of our people.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Your "reasonable-profit" system of legislation has made it possible to-day that you view the horrible spectacle of about 10 individuals in this country owning almost 90 per cent of all the wealth of the whole body of our American people, who have thought they were living under a free flag and in a free country. Almost all of the speeches from the other side of the House declare to be in favor of a tariff that will be fair to both the manufacturer and the consumer. And yo you say to enact such a law you must tax one class to get a "reasonable profit" for the other. The task of doing this is as difficult as it will be to find water naturally flowing uphill. Oh, but you say the consumer does not feel an indirect tax, and then we pay our employe s so much better wages under this system. Now, let us see if this be true.

The cost of living under your system has in the last 10 years increased about 50 per cent to every consumer, and the average increase in wages paid to the laboring man is about 20 per cent. You would therefore have the wage earner believe that you can take 50 cents from him and give him back 20 and by that process make him ultimately rich or well off financially. For years you got away with this kind of argument, but you now find that your false and deceptive theory will no longer win. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If everybody was so prosperous and the entire country was going along so well with its equal and fair taxation, as you claim, why did you not return to power as formerly? You now realize how false the doctrines of your "reasonable-profit money gods," which you espouse and proclaim, have been.

The protection theory of taxation with a "reasonable profit" for the manufacturer will be successful when it gives and legislates a like reasonable profit to the men and women and boys and girls who are creating the wealth. If it is fair, as you view it, to legislate a "reasonable profit" to one man or class of men, it is equally as fair to legislate a reasonable profit to all other men, women, and children who create this wonderful profit. Then it would be that more than 6,000,000 wage earners in this country would share in all these fabulous creations of wealth. That theory of legislation would be unconstitutional and you know it. Then, any theory of "reasonable profit" legislation to any class is unconstitutional.

On account of this theory of taxation you find yourselves the miserable remnant of a once popular party. The few of you who are here to-day do not agree upon a plan of attack against the great majority on this side of the House. The only proposition you can unite upon is to yell "soup houses" and "panic." Your tracks in the golden sands of this Republic have overtaken you, because they were made by the light of a false theory. You are wiping them out by that part of your anatomy where the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] said the Democratic badge is worn. [Applause on the Demo-

cratic side.] You are now leaving only a blurred mark on this same sand. And you have left a very marked blur upon the happiness and contentment of 6,000,000 wage earners. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In the past you have promised relief and were relied upon to give it and returned to power only to do what you had promised you would not do. On these promises for the four presidential elections, preceding the last one, your party came in by an overwhelming vote of the people. Your promises were broken as fast as you could break them. In the campaign of 1908 you and your leader, Mr. Taft, specifically promised to give relief by revising the tariff downward. It was revised not downward, but upward, and then proclaimed as the best tariff law ever enacted by Congress. It is the law made following the campaign when your platform defined a protective tariff to be one that "equals the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a 'reasonable profit' to the American industries." It was the finishing touch of fancy Republican legislation, in utter violation of their solemn pledge to the people. Again in the last campaign, after a spectacular convention in Chicago last June, where many of your honest and courageous men told you what not to do, and in the face of this warning, intoxicated with the glory of former delusions, you put your O. K. upon what you had done for the past four years and former administrations and put your clumsy leader on the pike for a second heat. Yes, your candidates and your "reasonble-profit" theories came in in these former four elections by an overwhelming vote, but went out at the last election by unanimous consent.

If about 10,000 votes had been properly placed in the puny States of Utah and Vermont, you never would have been heard of at the roll call of electors when the vote for President was taken.

In the infamy of your false doctrines birth was given to a new and not third party, but a second party. It is the Progressive Party, made up of men who do not fear to do what they think is right. And under the terms of their program or contract or platform with the people, as they may choose to call it, they are pledged to vote with us on the tariff until they can secure a scientific nonpartisan tariff commission. Some Republicans are inclined to dislike Progressives because Republican downfall is attributed to them. They are not to be blamed. They nor no other intelligent person could tell what you would do by what you said. It reminds me of the adage "The truth itself is not believed from one who often has deceived." They did not know where you would go nor what you would do. It reminds me of an Irish sculptor who came to this country. The Irishman found work at his trade. In going to and from his work he was accustomed to pass a graveyard. One morning as he went to work he saw a newly erected monument in the graveyard and went over to see it. Upon viewing it he found it to be the monument of Patrick O'Brien, of Kilkenny, Ireland, which was the home of the sculptor, and being a fellow countryman he took time to read the inscription, which was:

As you are now, so once was I;
As I am now, you, too, shall be;
Prepare thyself and follow me.

All day long the sculptor thought over this epitaph, and that night as he started home he took his chisel and underneath the inscription chiseled these words:

To follow you is not my intent
Until I know which way you went.

[Laughter.]

So it is; no one was warranted, except the officeholders and favored few, in following the Republican Party.

In the last campaign it was announced from one end of this country to the other by the Republicans and Progressives that this country would be ruined if the Democratic Party went into power. Misery, want, and starvation would be everywhere throughout our land and country. I hardly believe they actually thought so. No one believes that Republicans and Progressives are not patriotic. If they are patriotic, as all believe, and they actually thought that if the Democrats should come into power misery, want, suffering, and starvation would go into every nook, corner, and recess of this fair land over which Old Glory proudly waves, ever and ever bespeaking "the land of the free and the home of the brave," then they would have joined hands and gone to the ballot box on November 5 like true patriots and good Samaritans to save this country and its people.

Good patriotic people to-day everywhere throughout this land and country will lend their help and votes to pass the Underwood tariff bill and all measures that the people of this country demanded by their votes, instead of singing swan songs of the dying and fatted, favored few.

Much has been said to the effect that Thomas Jefferson was a high protectionist. None who know his history and his teachings will ever become so blinded as to believe it. As has been said here in this committee by my colleague from Illinois [Mr. STRINGER], Jefferson advocated nothing in all his career that would tax all the people for the benefit of the few. No Republican in former years ever considered any of Jefferson's utterances as tending toward the protective or "reasonable-profit" theory of the Republicans of to-day. It is a new discovery by the latter-day saints of the shattered remnant.

No one will dispute the fact that under the system of government handsomely rendered us by the Republicans for the last 50 years, nine-tenths of all the wealth of the country has aggregated into the hands of about 10 persons. Now, suppose we take a glance at what was said by Lincoln, whose every heart throb was wholly and completely in sympathy with the masses. He is the idol of all Republicans. Just a few days before his assassination he wrote:

It has indeed been a trying hour for the Republic, but I see in the near future a crisis arising which unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the future of my country. As a result of war, corporations have been enthroned, an era of corruption in high place will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until all wealth is aggregated in a few hands, and the Republic is destroyed. I feel at this time more anxiety for the safety of my country than ever before—even in the midst of war. God grant that my fears may prove groundless.

Mr. Chairman, corporations were enthroned after the close of the Civil War by special tariff taxation. Ah, who would say that an era of corruption in high place had not followed when you have an abundance of undeniable testimony that corporations and the money power of this country have made public officials in the legislatures of this country and molded legislation in their favor in return for their liberal support. Is there any doubt but that the money power is endeavoring to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people when it tries to scare the wage earners and laborers by howling "soup houses," "panic," starvation, and destruction when it finds its past favors now slipping from it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

All know that by this system for the last 50 years the wealth of this country has been aggregated in the hands of a few. Then the prophecy of the great Lincoln is being daily verified.

Again he wrote:

I affirm, it as my conviction that class laws, placing capital above labor, are more dangerous to the Republic at this hour than chattel slavery in the days of its haughtiest supremacy. Labor is prior to and above capital and deserves much higher consideration.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

This was a great prophecy. The day of this dreaded dream of the immortal Lincoln has dawned. Corporations and money lords bent and throttle the body politic, all because they are and have been receiving a legislated "reasonable profit" at the expense of labor and the masses.

"Is there no balm in Gilead?" Yes, Mr. Chairman; there is. The people spoke with no uncertainty at the last election at the rate of about eleven and one-half millions to three and a half millions against the past policy of the Republican Party. And it is our duty now to release the people from that unjust and unrighteous system of taxation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Trusts and monopolies by the hundreds have entwined this fair land of ours under this system within the last 50 years. Honest competition has been stifled and driven out. No man dares to enter into business without first bowing down his head to kiss the toe of these hydra-headed monsters of greed and avarice to obtain their consent. Trusts, indeed, have been enthroned, and our Republican friends say they must be further protected and given a "reasonable profit." So reasonable has that profit been under this protection that they all can and do make and manufacture American products here in our own country, pay the freight on these products of their factories from here to England, Germany, Russia, and many other foreign lands, and there sell them in competition with the products of those countries cheaper than they can sell them to the American people at the doors of their factories. Protect an industry at home so much that it can not treat you with the same respect that it does the foreigner. Even American sugar sells cheaper in London than at home. God forbid that I may ever give support or sanction to such a law.

Let all such laws be outlawed. Let us have an end of all special legislation, except for patriotic service.

If a manufacturer is paid $30 for a suit of clothes under the tariff, which without tariff could have been bought for $16, the wage worker who earned the $30 and bought the suit is robbed of $14. The law compels him to pay $30 for $16 worth of goods; compels him to work for half price and buy for double price. The manufacturer gets a clear gift of $14. Such laws are wealth to the industry. They are poverty and death to the

wage earner. Trusts and monopolies have the right idea and clever methods. It's their infernal rapacity for greed that prevents them from declaring a general increase in wages of from 50 to 300 per cent and an almost equal reduction in selling price and still amass multiplied thousands annually. By them the people are plundered. Competition is killed, bought out, or starved out. They are conscienceless and unpatriotic. They know less about conscience than Balaam's ass knew about the principles of Hebrew grammar. Never again let it be said that this has been a Government of the rich, by the rich, and for the benefit of the rich.

Mr. Chairman and Democratic colleagues, in the beginning of the nineteenth century it was Napoleon's ambition, greed, and lust for power that not only prompted him to become conqueror of the French and Spanish empires, but also to try to become conqueror of the sea. It was Lord Nelson who was in command of the British Mediterranean fleet. With only 13 ships he sailed to the West Indies after the enemies' fleet, which numbered 30. Not finding them there he sailed back in pursuit. Lord Nelson obeyed orders, and on the 21st day of October in 1805 came in conflict with the conqueror. Nelson said in plain and forceful words to his soldiers, "England expects every man to do his duty"; and the battle of Trafalgar was won and England saved from invasion.

In the campaign last year, which ended on November 5, the Democratic Party came into its own, and now has a plain duty to perform to save our people from further invasion, and the concordant cry everywhere is that the great Democratic Party expects every Democrat to do his duty. You will do your duty by voting for the Underwood tariff bill. The country expects it and Democracy demands it, and then it is the favored few will receive the scriptural injunction:

> Go to, now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted and your garments are moth eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered, and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days.

And the people will be blessed. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to proceed now?

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CHANDLER]. [Applause.]

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I know little about the tariff, but, strange to say, though a modest and retiring man, I have suffered from no embarrassment whatever from any private conversations on the subject that I have had with any Member of this House. My excuse for speaking at all upon the tariff is the justification of Col. Ingersoll for discussing the immortality of the soul. He said that where nobody knew everybody had a right to guess.

Now, after listening to the tariff discussions of a week I have some very positive convictions, with a few reservations. I know perfectly well that the Democrats are wrong. I also know perfectly well that the Republicans are wrong, and at times I have serious doubts about the Progressives. [Laughter.]

I wish to deprecate, in the very beginning, the spirit of partisanship and sectionalism that pervades the tariff discussions in this House. I do not intend by this to read a lecture to anyone or to rebuke anybody. You know that the Progressives are nonpartisan. We have in our party all kinds of people of good qualities. I do not see why Democrats and Republicans should be eternally at each others throats. I do not see why sectionalism should forever embitter the debates in Congress. The historical Democratic Party is entitled to the gratitude, homage, and love of the world. The historical Republican Party is equally entitled to the love, homage, and gratitude of mankind. When we look backward across a century and a quarter of magnificent national history we see that the two great parties founded by Jefferson and by Lincoln have divided almost equally the glittering prizes and splendid triumphs of American public life. The first half century was a period of almost unbroken Democratic triumph. Federalists, Whigs, and Know-Nothings occasionally dotted an "i" or crossed a "t," but the great chapters of our early history were written by Democrats. The great founder of the Democratic Party is said to have written the Declaration of Independence, assisted by about four others. Louisiana, Florida, and Texas were added to the Union during the early Democratic régime. In other words, Democrats rounded out the early Republic from sea to sea. And any Republican who does not view with patriotic pride the Democratic achievements of all those years is an incomplete and unpatriotic citizen. [Applause.]

Then came the Republican Party, with a mission almost divine—to free the slave and maintain the Union and to build upon the foundation laid by Democrats a finer form of a better political civilization. During these 50 years of almost unbroken rule this masterful party witnessed the emancipation of a race, carried to the benighted of distant lands our language, our literature, and our laws, builded the most marvelous industrial civilization known to the children of men, and in every struggle of its magnificent career carried above the embattled hosts, and ofttimes through clouds of darkness and despair, in one hand the torch of progress and in the other the starry banner of the free. And any Democrat who does not stand with uncovered head in the presence of the record of the Republican Party is likewise an incomplete and unpatriotic citizen. [Applause.] In other words, the great achievements of both the Democratic and Republican Parties are the common heritage of all Americans everywhere. These considerations should destroy all unpatriotic desire to malign and misrepresent.

But I have not eulogized these two political parties for mere purposes of amusement or pastime or from any desire to please or conciliate. I have done it simply as a protest against the attempt to substitute personality for argument and to use the shibboleth of sectionalism as a means of winning applause.

We Progressives sincerely hope that the adoption of our national program will destroy sectionalism and promote political fraternity in the Nation by offering to all the voters of the land, men and women alike, from North, East, South, and West, a program of principles and a medium of political expression that will be acceptable to them.

I wish at this time to pay my respects to the venerable leader of one of the minorities on this floor. My distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. PAYNE] quoted figures this morning to show that in a few months or years there will be nothing left of the Progressive Party. But, unfortunately for an exhaustive discussion of the subject, the gentleman did not go far enough. He told you what had happened in St. Louis, in Chicago, and in Nassau County, N. Y., but he did not tell you what happened in Massachusetts at the recent special election for a Member of Congress. He did not tell you that in the first national election after last November, in the first election in which national issues were considered, the Progressive Party substantially maintained its own, while the Republican Party lost 45 per cent of its vote. [Applause.] He failed to state that with the personality of Roosevelt out of it, with the theft of the Chicago convention out of it, and with the moral considerations that entered into the last campaign entirely removed, the Progressive Party in Massachusetts served notice upon the world that it had come to stay. [Applause.]

I also wish to pay my respects to my distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. On last Saturday afternoon he treated the House to a most extraordinary performance. He sought to discuss the tariff by ridiculing and defaming the Progressives and Roosevelt. He called attention to the very few Progressive Members in this body and derisively sought to locate them here and there. He showed, by doing this, that he was ignorant of the true philosophy of history. He ought to know that quantity does not count, but that quality does. He ought to know that in the magnificent developments of the civilization of this earth numbers and masses have counted for little. He ought to know that Emerson was right when he said, "All history resolves itself very easily into the biography of a few stern, stubborn characters," and that when we say France we do not mean France, we mean Charles the Great, Henry IV, Louis XIV, and Napoleon Bonaparte.

He ought to know that his own party, the Democratic, is but the lengthened shadow of a single man; that the Reformation sprang from the brain of Luther, and that Christianity came from the teachings of a few unlettered fishermen casting nets for a livelihood in the waters of Gennesaret.

Furthermore, a becoming spirit of gratitude and candor would have suggested to him that it was nothing but right and just to say to you that behind the 19 Progressive Congressmen in this House stands a vast army of more than 4,000,000 voters, who love their country better than their party and are more than willing to sacrifice all the traditions of party politics to realize the highest good for the Commonwealth. And before the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] assumes to make fun of the Progressive Party he should remember that in the electoral college our party cast eleven times as many votes as his party. Our party registered 88 electoral votes, while his party received only 8. You should not forget these figures, and above all things you should not lose a proper sense of humor nor a sense of the due proportions of history. A proper sense of humor would have kept the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] from referring derisively to the few

Progressives in this House. A proper sense of gratitude would have also deterred him. Instead of delivering a bitter tirade against the Progressives he should have made this kind of speech:

"My little Progressive friends, you are welcome here. We are glad to see you, for if you had not been here there would have been no Democratic majority. [Applause.] Stand pat. Do not be afraid; we will protect you if the Republicans get after you. Do not feel bad in your present isolation. We know how you feel; we have felt that way ourselves. We were in your fix for a half century, excepting a few short years. We were a sad, small, hopeless, humiliated minority, and if it had not been for you Progressives we would still be wandering around in the same desert in which the public had confined us for nearly 50 years." [Applause.]

I respectfully suggest that this would have been the proper speech, under the circumstances. Instead, like a big bully just out of jail, he jumped on the first small boy he met.

Then he saw fit to take a fling at Roosevelt. He referred to the suggestion once made by Roosevelt that the inscription, "In God we trust," should be removed from our gold dollar. Now, my esteemed colleague should not have made a reference of that kind. Roosevelt suggested that this be done as an act of reverence, in order to separate the kingdom of God from the kingdom of Mammon. [Applause.] Furthermore, I respectfully suggest to Democratic Congressmen and to the Democratic Party that they should not refer to nor tamper with the gold dollar. [Applause.] Under the leadership of Dick Bland for nearly three decades and during the free-silver saturnalias of Bryan they used every endeavor to degrade the gold dollar in every market of the world. I repeat that Democrats should be careful in their behavior toward this coin.

Again, the same distinguished gentleman called Roosevelt "a wild man from Africa" and in the same breath invoked the spirit of Andrew Jackson upon a Democratic Congress. When Jackson went to Salisbury to study law they called him "the most roaring, rollicking, game-cocking, horse-racing, card-playing, mischievous fellow ever seen in this town." But, mind you, this was only the boy, the stripling, the sapling, if you please. This was not "Old Hickory," the grown-up tree, with gnarled branches and ripened trunk.

Jackson once killed a man named Charles Dickinson in a duel; he threatened to hang Calhoun as high as Haman; tried to horsewhip Thomas Benton; challenged Gen. Winfield Scott to a duel; overran Florida without Executive orders and had two eminent British gentlemen hanged, thereby nearly bringing us into a war with Great Britain and Spain; and, when President, broke up his Cabinet by his own headstrong violence. This was the mild-mannered man whose spirit was invoked in this House by a Democratic Congressman in the same breath that he employed to call Roosevelt the wild man from Africa.

I have referred to Jackson and Roosevelt in this connection only to illustrate to you the ludicrous inconsistency of a Democratic mind engaged in congressional debate. [Laughter.] But a more serious matter now confronts us. My esteemed colleague from Alabama seriously asserted that Roosevelt had never hurt or "busted" a trust. Now, what connection Roosevelt's record as a "trust buster" has with the discussion of the tariff I do not know. I am aware that there is a theory that the tariff is the mother of the trusts. Indeed, a distinguished gentleman only to-day asserted in this House that the tariff was "an incubator of the trusts." Maybe so and maybe not. We know as a matter of fact that England is loaded down with trusts, and yet they have no tariff over there. But if the gentleman from Alabama thinks to identify Roosevelt and the Progressive Party, if he seeks to find an inseparable connection between the tariff and the trusts, and if in the same breath he censures and ridicules the Progressives and Roosevelt by charging that Roosevelt never hurt or "busted" any of the trusts, and that the Progressives are therefore not to be believed when they say that if intrusted with power they will revise the tariff or curb the trusts, then let me say that we accept the challenge and join the issues offered.

I shall now proceed to show that Roosevelt curbed, crippled, destroyed, and "busted" more trusts than all the Presidents of the Republic who went before him. [Applause.] In the language of Thomas Jefferson, "let facts be submitted to a candid world." I am going to quote you two editorials from two great Democratic papers to prove that Roosevelt during his term as President was the greatest trust "buster" of the earth. [Applause.] I want to offer this proof at this time and make it a matter of record, because the Progressives are going to introduce antitrust legislation in this body a little later on, and we want Democrats and Republicans to know in advance what Roosevelt's record on the trust question is and where it may be found.

I shall read you first an editorial from the New York World, an able, brilliantly edited, independent Democratic journal. At the time this editorial was written the judgment of the World was absolutely unbiased. There was no reason for concealment or misrepresentation. A full, free, and unbiased statement of facts was intelligently and fearlessly uttered. I read this editorial all the more cheerfully and unhesitatingly, because in politics, as in law, the most valuable testimony is that drawn from a hostile witness. And this editorial of the New York World, a Democratic organ, and an ardent advocate of the election of Judge Parker in 1904, of Bryan in 1908, and of Wilson in 1912, is by far the bitterest denunciation of Democrats and the completest vindication of Roosevelt, in the matter of trusts, to be found in the political literature of this generation. This editorial was written the day following the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Northern Securities case in 1904. Let me read it. The title of the editorial is simply "Facts," and they are numbered in parentheses from 1 to 6. The World says:

(1) The antitrust law was framed by a Republican, was passed by a Republican House and a Republican Senate, was signed by a Republican President.

(2) The law remained a dead letter on the statute books during the entire second term of Grover Cleveland, a Democratic President. Through those four years of Democratic administration all appeals and all efforts of the World to have the law enforced were met with sneers, jeers, and open contempt from a Democratic Attorney General, Richard Olney, who pretended that the law was unconstitutional, and who would do nothing toward prosecuting violators of it.

[Applause.]

(3) The first effort to enforce the law was made by Theodore Roosevelt, a Republican President. The first Attorney General to vigorously prosecute offenders and to test the law was a Republican Attorney General, Philander C. Knox.

(4) The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, given as a finality from which there is no appeal, upholding the law as perfectly constitutional and absolutely impregnable in every respect, as the World for 12 years constantly insisted, was due to five judges, every one of whom is a Republican.

(5) The dissenting minority of the court included every Democratic judge of that tribunal, to wit: Chief Justic Fuller, of Illinois, Mr. Justice White, of Louisiana, and Mr. Justice Peckham, of New York. All those distinguished Democrats not only voted against the constitutionality of the law, but denounced it as a danger to the Republic.

[Applause.]

And here is the milk in the coconut:

(6) Under these circumstances it does not seem probable that the Democrats can make great capital in seeking to monopolize the antitrust issue and charging the Republican Party with the crime of being owned body and soul by the trusts.

[Applause.]

It is just as well to record some plain truths, however unpleasant or surprising. Such is the exact language of the New York World, the leading Democratic journal in the East, written in 1904, when there was no inducement to misrepresentation or concealment.

Oh, but you say, these are glittering generalities. You have used fine rhetoric, but you have failed to tell us what trusts he has curbed or destroyed. Then I will enumerate. I will cite another editorial from a Democratic paper, the New York Times of June 22, 1906. Remember that this paper is now also no friend of Roosevelt, although it was friendly to him at the time the editorial was written. The Times said:

Waiting with the crowd at Trondhjam to see King Haakon crowned, Mr. William J. Bryan being importuned for an expression of opinion upon Democratic chances of success in 1908 made no direct answer but shaped his thoughts on another subject in this language: "I will say this, the next election will decide whether America is to swallow the trusts or the trusts are to swallow America."

That is the subject. That is the text. Here is the discourse or sermon of the Times on that subject:

Much has escaped the attention and knowledge of Mr. Bryan during his travels. Evidently he has not seen the American newspapers. If he had, he would know that so far from trying to swallow America, or any other solid food, most of the trusts are now too scared to eat anything. They are taking thought, not wherewithal they shall be fed, but how they shall be saved. One look into the hunting room of the White House would convince Mr. Bryan that he is far, very far behind the times—that he is prophesying of past events, beating in doors already wide open, and gravely concerning himself with superfluous works. There hang the heads of a larger number and wider variety of octopedean monsters than could be found in any other gentleman's collection. Moreover, the incomparable hunter is still at it, panting maybe with the exertion incident to past triumphs, but flushed with the joy of present pursuit and bigger bags yet to be made.

We invite Mr. Bryan's attention to the lengthening roll of trusts, trade restrainers, monopolizing corporations, and other isolated offenders recently chastened or still under chastisement.

There is the Tobacco Trust, compelled by the decision of the court to lay bare its guilty secrets and yield up the presidents of two of its constituent companies to indictment. In a proceeding begun under the Sherman Act the Paper Trust has been bidden to discontinue its unlawful price-fixing arrangements.

Mr. HARDWICK. Would it bother the gentleman if I should ask him one question?

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Not at all.

wage earner. Trusts and monopolies have the right idea and clever methods. It's their infernal rapacity for greed that prevents them from declaring a general increase in wages of from 50 to 300 per cent and an almost equal reduction in selling price and still amass multiplied thousands annually. By them the people are plundered. Competition is killed, bought out, or starved out. They are conscienceless and unpatriotic. They know less about conscience than Balaam's ass knew about the principles of Hebrew grammar. Never again let it be said that this has been a Government of the rich, by the rich, and for the benefit of the rich.

Mr. Chairman and Democratic colleagues, in the beginning of the nineteenth century it was Napoleon's ambition, greed, and lust for power that not only prompted him to become conqueror of the French and Spanish empires, but also to try to become conqueror of the sea. It was Lord Nelson who was in command of the British Mediterranean fleet. With only 13 ships he sailed to the West Indies after the enemies' fleet, which numbered 30. Not finding them there he sailed back in pursuit. Lord Nelson obeyed orders, and on the 21st day of October in 1805 came in conflict with the conqueror. Nelson said in plain and forceful words to his soldiers, "England expects every man to do his duty"; and the battle of Trafalgar was won and England saved from invasion.

In the campaign last year, which ended on November 5, the Democratic Party came into its own, and now has a plain duty to perform to save our people from further invasion, and the concordant cry everywhere is that the great Democratic Party expects every Democrat to do his duty. You will do your duty by voting for the Underwood tariff bill. The country expects it and Democracy demands it, and then it is the favored few will receive the scriptural injunction:

> Go to, now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted and your garments are moth eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered, and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days.

And the people will be blessed. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to proceed now?

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CHANDLER]. [Applause.]

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I know little about the tariff, but, strange to say, though a modest and retiring man, I have suffered from no embarrassment whatever from any private conversations on the subject that I have had with any Member of this House. My excuse for speaking at all upon the tariff is the justification of Col. Ingersoll for discussing the immortality of the soul. He said that where nobody knew everybody had a right to guess.

Now, after listening to the tariff discussions of a week I have some very positive convictions, with a few reservations. I know perfectly well that the Democrats are wrong. I also know perfectly well that the Republicans are wrong, and at times I have serious doubts about the Progressives. [Laughter.]

I wish to deprecate, in the very beginning, the spirit of partisanship and sectionalism that pervades the tariff discussions in this House. I do not intend by this to read a lecture to anyone or to rebuke anybody. You know that the Progressives are nonpartisan. We have in our party all kinds of people of good qualities. I do not see why Democrats and Republicans should be eternally at each others throats. I do not see why sectionalism should forever embitter the debates in Congress. The historical Democratic Party is entitled to the gratitude, homage, and love of the world. The historical Republican Party is equally entitled to the love, homage, and gratitude of mankind. When we look backward across a century and a quarter of magnificent national history we see that the two great parties founded by Jefferson and by Lincoln have divided almost equally the glittering prizes and splendid triumphs of American public life. The first half century was a period of almost unbroken Democratic triumph. Federalists, Whigs, and Know-Nothings occasionally dotted an "i" or crossed a "t," but the great chapters of our early history were written by Democrats. The great founder of the Democratic Party is said to have written the Declaration of Independence, assisted by about four others. Louisiana, Florida, and Texas were added to the Union during the early Democratic régime. In other words, Democrats rounded out the early Republic from sea to sea. And any Republican who does not view with patriotic pride the Democratic achievements of all those years is an incomplete and unpatriotic citizen. [Applause.]

Then came the Republican Party, with a mission almost divine—to free the slave and maintain the Union and to build upon the foundation laid by Democrats a finer form of a better political civilization. During these 50 years of almost unbroken rule this masterful party witnessed the emancipation of a race, carried to the benighted of distant lands our language, our literature, and our laws, builded the most marvelous industrial civilization known to the children of men, and in every struggle of its magnificent career carried above the embattled hosts, and ofttimes through clouds of darkness and despair, in one hand the torch of progress and in the other the starry banner of the free. And any Democrat who does not stand with uncovered head in the presence of the record of the Republican Party is likewise an incomplete and unpatriotic citizen. [Applause.] In other words, the great achievements of both the Democratic and Republican Parties are the common heritage of all Americans everywhere. These considerations should destroy all unpatriotic desire to malign and misrepresent.

But I have not eulogized these two political parties for mere purposes of amusement or pastime or from any desire to please or conciliate. I have done it simply as a protest against the attempt to substitute personality for argument and to use the shibboleth of sectionalism as a means of winning applause.

We Progressives sincerely hope that the adoption of our national program will destroy sectionalism and promote political fraternity in the Nation by offering to all the voters of the land, men and women alike, from North, East, South, and West, a program of principles and a medium of political expression that will be acceptable to them.

I wish at this time to pay my respects to the venerable leader of one of the minorities on this floor. My distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. PAYNE] quoted figures this morning to show that in a few months or years there will be nothing left of the Progressive Party. But, unfortunately for an exhaustive discussion of the subject, the gentleman did not go far enough. He told you what had happened in St. Louis, in Chicago, and in Nassau County, N. Y., but he did not tell you what happened in Massachusetts at the recent special election for a Member of Congress. He did not tell you that in the first national election after last November, in the first election in which national issues were considered, the Progressive Party substantially maintained its own, while the Republican Party lost 45 per cent of its vote. [Applause.] He failed to state that with the personality of Roosevelt out of it, with the theft of the Chicago convention out of it, and with the moral considerations that entered into the last campaign entirely removed, the Progressive Party in Massachusetts served notice upon the world that it had come to stay. [Applause.]

I also wish to pay my respects to my distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. On last Saturday afternoon he treated the House to a most extraordinary performance. He sought to discuss the tariff by ridiculing and defaming the Progressives and Roosevelt. He called attention to the very few Progressive Members in this body and derisively sought to locate them here and there. He showed, by doing this, that he was ignorant of the true philosophy of history. He ought to know that quantity does not count, but that quality does. He ought to know that in the magnificent developments of the civilization of this earth numbers and masses have counted for little. He ought to know that Emerson was right when he said, "All history resolves itself very easily into the biography of a few stern, stubborn characters," and that when we say France we do not mean France, we mean Charles the Great, Henry IV, Louis XIV, and Napoleon Bonaparte.

He ought to know that his own party, the Democratic, is but the lengthened shadow of a single man; that the Reformation sprang from the brain of Luther, and that Christianity came from the teachings of a few unlettered fishermen casting nets for a livelihood in the waters of Gennesaret.

Furthermore, a becoming spirit of gratitude and candor would have suggested to him that it was nothing but right and just to say to you that behind the 19 Progressive Congressmen in this House stands a vast army of more than 4,000,000 voters, who love their country better than their party and are more than willing to sacrifice all the traditions of party politics to realize the highest good for the Commonwealth. And before the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] assumes to make fun of the Progressive Party he should remember that in the electoral college our party cast eleven times as many votes as his party. Our party registered 88 electoral votes, while his party received only 8. You should not forget these figures, and above all things you should not lose a proper sense of humor nor a sense of the due proportions of history. A proper sense of humor would have kept the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] from referring derisively to the few

Progressives in this House. A proper sense of gratitude would have also deterred him. Instead of delivering a bitter tirade against the Progressives he should have made this kind of speech:

"My little Progressive friends, you are welcome here. We are glad to see you, for if you had not been here there would have been no Democratic majority. [Applause.] Stand pat. Do not be afraid; we will protect you if the Republicans get after you. Do not feel bad in your present isolation. We know how you feel; we have felt that way ourselves. We were in your fix for a half century, excepting a few short years. We were a sad, small, hopeless, humiliated minority, and if it had not been for you Progressives we would still be wandering around in the same desert in which the public had confined us for nearly 50 years." [Applause.]

I respectfully suggest that this would have been the proper speech, under the circumstances. Instead, like a big bully just out of jail, he jumped on the first small boy he met.

Then he saw fit to take a fling at Roosevelt. He referred to the suggestion once made by Roosevelt that the inscription, "In God we trust," should be removed from our gold dollar. Now, my esteemed colleague should not have made a reference of that kind. Roosevelt suggested that this be done as an act of reverence, in order to separate the kingdom of God from the kingdom of Mammon. [Applause.] Furthermore, I respectfully suggest to Democratic Congressmen and to the Democratic Party that they should not refer to nor tamper with the gold dollar. [Applause.] Under the leadership of Dick Bland for nearly three decades and during the free-silver saturnalias of Bryan they used every endeavor to degrade the gold dollar in every market of the world. I repeat that Democrats should be careful in their behavior toward this coin.

Again, the same distinguished gentleman called Roosevelt "a wild man from Africa" and in the same breath invoked the spirit of Andrew Jackson upon a Democratic Congress. When Jackson went to Salisbury to study law they called him "the most roaring, rollicking, game-cocking, horse-racing, card-playing, mischievous fellow ever seen in this town." But, mind you, this was only the boy, the stripling, the sapling, if you please. This was not "Old Hickory," the grown-up tree, with gnarled branches and ripened trunk.

Jackson once killed a man named Charles Dickinson in a duel; he threatened to hang Calhoun as high as Haman; tried to horsewhip Thomas Benton; challenged Gen. Winfield Scott to a duel; overran Florida without Executive orders and had two eminent British gentlemen hanged, thereby nearly bringing us into a war with Great Britain and Spain; and, when President, broke up his Cabinet by his own headstrong violence. This was the mild-mannered man whose spirit was invoked in this House by a Democratic Congressman in the same breath that he employed to call Roosevelt the wild man from Africa.

I have referred to Jackson and Roosevelt in this connection only to illustrate to you the ludicrous inconsistency of a Democratic mind engaged in congressional debate. [Laughter.] But a more serious matter now confronts us. My esteemed colleague from Alabama seriously asserted that Roosevelt had never hurt or "busted" a trust. Now, what connection Roosevelt's record as a "trust buster" has with the discussion of the tariff I do not know. I am aware that there is a theory that the tariff is the mother of the trusts. Indeed, a distinguished gentleman only to-day asserted in this House that the tariff was "an incubator of the trusts." Maybe so and maybe not. We know as a matter of fact that England is loaded down with trusts, and yet they have no tariff over there. But if the gentleman from Alabama thinks to identify Roosevelt and the Progressive Party, if he seeks to find an inseparable connection between the tariff and the trusts, and if in the same breath he censures and ridicules the Progressives and Roosevelt by charging that Roosevelt never hurt or "busted" any of the trusts, and that the Progressives are therefore not to be believed when they say that if intrusted with power they will revise the tariff or curb the trusts, then let me say that we accept the challenge and join the issues offered.

I shall now proceed to show that Roosevelt curbed, crippled, destroyed, and "busted" more trusts than all the Presidents of the Republic who went before him. [Applause.] In the language of Thomas Jefferson, "let facts be submitted to a candid world." I am going to quote you two editorials from two great Democratic papers to prove that Roosevelt during his term as President was the greatest trust "buster" of the earth. [Applause.] I want to offer this proof at this time and make it a matter of record, because the Progressives are going to introduce antitrust legislation in this body a little later on, and we want Democrats and Republicans to know in advance what Roosevelt's record on the trust question is and where it may be found.

I shall read you first an editorial from the New York World, an able, brilliantly edited, independent Democratic journal. At the time this editorial was written the judgment of the World was absolutely unbiased. There was no reason for concealment or misrepresentation. A full, free, and unbiased statement of facts was intelligently and fearlessly uttered. I read this editorial all the more cheerfully and unhesitatingly, because in politics, as in law, the most valuable testimony is that drawn from a hostile witness. And this editorial of the New York World, a Democratic organ, and an ardent advocate of the election of Judge Parker in 1904, of Bryan in 1908, and of Wilson in 1912, is by far the bitterest denunciation of Democrats and the completest vindication of Roosevelt, in the matter of trusts, to be found in the political literature of this generation. This editorial was written the day following the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Northern Securities case in 1904. Let me read it. The title of the editorial is simply "Facts," and they are numbered in parentheses from 1 to 6. The World says:

(1) The antitrust law was framed by a Republican, was passed by a Republican House and a Republican Senate, was signed by a Republican President.

(2) The law remained a dead letter on the statute books during the entire second term of Grover Cleveland, a Democratic President. Through those four years of Democratic administration all appeals and all efforts of the World to have the law enforced were met with sneers, jeers, and open contempt from a Democratic Attorney General, Richard Olney, who pretended that the law was unconstitutional, and who would do nothing toward prosecuting violators of it.

[Applause.]

(3) The first effort to enforce the law was made by Theodore Roosevelt, a Republican President. The first Attorney General to vigorously prosecute offenders and to test the law was a Republican Attorney General, Philander C. Knox.

(4) The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, given as a finality from which there is no appeal, upholding the law as perfectly constitutional and absolutely impregnable in every respect, as the World for 12 years constantly insisted, was due to five judges, every one of whom is a Republican.

(5) The dissenting minority of the court included every Democratic judge of that tribunal, to wit: Chief Justic Fuller, of Illinois, Mr. Justice White, of Louisiana, and Mr. Justice Peckham, of New York. All those distinguished Democrats not only voted against the constitutionality of the law, but denounced it as a danger to the Republic.

[Applause.]

And here is the milk in the coconut:

(6) Under these circumstances it does not seem probable that the Democrats can make great capital in seeking to monopolize the antitrust issue and charging the Republican Party with the crime of being owned body and soul by the trusts.

[Applause.]

It is just as well to record some plain truths, however unpleasant or surprising. Such is the exact language of the New York World, the leading Democratic journal in the East, written in 1904, when there was no inducement to misrepresentation or concealment.

Oh, but you say, these are glittering generalities. You have used fine rheotric, but you have failed to tell us what trusts he has curbed or destroyed. Then I will enumerate. I will cite another editorial from a Democratic paper, the New York Times of June 22, 1906. Remember that this paper is now also no friend of Roosevelt, although it was friendly to him at the time the editorial was written. The Times said:

Waiting with the crowd at Trondhjam to see King Haakon crowned, Mr. William J. Bryan being importuned for an expression of opinion upon Democratic chances of success in 1908 made no direct answer but shaped his thoughts on another subject in this language: "I will say this, the next election will decide whether America is to swallow the trusts or the trusts are to swallow America."

That is the subject. That is the text. Here is the discourse or sermon of the Times on that subject:

Much has escaped the attention and knowledge of Mr. Bryan during his travels. Evidently he has not seen the American newspapers. If he had, he would know that so far from trying to swallow America, or any other solid food, most of the trusts are now too scared to eat anything. They are taking thought, not wherewithal they shall be fed, but how they shall be saved. One look into the hunting room of the White House would convince Mr. Bryan that he is far, very far behind the times—that he is prophesying of past events, beating in doors already wide open, and gravely concerning himself with superfluous works. There hang the heads of a larger number and wider variety of octopedean monsters than could be found in any other gentleman's collection. Moreover, the incomparable hunter is still at it, panting maybe with the exertion incident to past triumphs, but flushed with the joy of present pursuit and bigger bags yet to be made.

We invite Mr. Bryan's attention to the lengthening roll of trusts, trade restrainers, monopolizing corporations, and other isolated offenders recently chastened or still under chastisement.

There is the Tobacco Trust, compelled by the decision of the court to lay bare its guilty secrets and yield up the presidents of two of its constituent companies to indictment. In a proceeding begun under the Sherman Act the Paper Trust has been bidden to discontinue its unlawful price-fixing arrangements.

Mr. HARDWICK. Would it bother the gentleman if I should ask him one question?

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Not at all.

Mr. HARDWICK. Was this before the Tennessee Coal & Iron incident, or afterwards?

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. This was in 1906. The gentleman knows the dates. This was published June 22, 1906.

Mr. LAFFERTY. That was before the Tennessee Coal & Iron report.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Yes; before it. Listen now. I will give you an enumeration, if you want them:

The Drug Trust has been enjoined, both as an association and as individuals, not to continue in effect retailers' price lists fixed by the manufacturers.

The Federal sleuths are on the trail of the Gunpowder Trust with explosive intent.

Against the Fertilizer Trust 80 indictments have been found, and suits are under way to break up an unlawful combination between cottonseed oil mills and phosphate works.

We need not dwell upon the awful drubbing administered to the Beef Trust, which is about to pass under the discipline of rigid Federal inspection of its products. Furthermore, in Kansas City, the other day, three great packing concerns, and the very ones that have been so shown up in Chicago, were found guilty by a Federal jury of accepting unlawful rebates from the railroads.

The Standard Oil Co., the biggest and most formidable of all the trusts, is writhing under Commissioner Garfield's exposure of its monopolistic and forbidden practices, and shivers in daily expectation of a summon to court.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad Co. was punished for departing from its published freight rates in transporting coal to New England under a contract with the New Haven Road.

The New York Central Road has been investigated for giving rebates to the wicked Sugar Trust.

The great and proud Pennsylvania Railroad has been shamed by the Interstate Commerce Commission's disclosure of its promiscuous bribery of its subordinate officials by independent coal operators.

Then there is the rate bill, which puts all the freight systems of the country under Federal regulation as to their freight charges; which makes pipe lines, sleeping cars, and express companies common carriers, thus bringing them under Government control, and which decrees the divorcement of product and traffic from transportation, making it necessary for the coal roads to part with their mine properties.

I want you to bear in mind that I am reading this in answer to the declaration that Roosevelt had never busted or hurt a single trust.

Mr. Bryan knows, of course, what has happened to the great insurance companies. Their power of control over finance, business, and legislation has been broken.

Bear in mind that this is a Democratic paper talking all the time.

Now, here concludes the Times:

This is a list of achievements with which the most ambitious President might be content, upon which he might be well satisfied to rest his reputation. But it is not enough for Theodore Roosevelt. "I should dearly love to roast a Quaker," said Sidney Smith. Being asked by one of his listeners if he had considered that the Quaker would suffer acutely during the process, he replied: "I have considered everything." Mr. Roosevelt is now, according to report, resolved not to roast but to imprison one great railroad president as an example to the others. All the great railroad presidents have been invited by the Interstate Commerce Commission to come and tell their story and submit to cross-examination. They are summoned by invitation or suggestion, rather than by subpœna, in order that the proceeding may give them no immunity from indictment and the jail. An invitation extended in this spirit is naturally most alluring. At the proffer of these hospitable attentions their bosoms glow with the grateful joy with which the condemned criminal regards the headman sharpening his ax or the pirate's captive watches the crew projecting over the ship's side the plank he is to walk.

Could men in that frame of mind, men sweating in guilty terror and ready to scream with fright at their impending doom, be at the same time formulating plans for swallowing America? Mr. Bryan has chosen the wrong issue again. Long before he sees the tally sheet of the convention roll call which his Democratic friends expect will make him their candidate the trusts will sleep under the blossoming daisies. The acts of Congress and the decisions of the court have already tamed them and are in a way to make them as harmless as cooing doves. Mr. Roosevelt says that Secretary Taft is the only Republican who can beat Mr. Bryan in 1908.

[Laughter.]

I have to read this whole editorial. [Laughter.]

Now, if Mr. Bryan comes to America to engage in a warfare upon the trusts anybody can beat him. He will be fighting not windmills, but ghosts of dead things. It is the conservatism of Mr. Bryan in comparison with the radicalism of Mr. Roosevelt that has newly commended him to attention and dawning confidence. Possibly he might make headway as a friend and protector of distressed corporations. The work of trust smashing has been swift and rude. Mistakes have been made of which time and experience will suggest the needed correction. Inevitably there will be reaction against radicalism. It is in the field of conservative statesmanship that Mr. Bryan will find his opportunity.

Mr. CLINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. I can not yield; my time is so limited.

Mr. CLINE. Just for a second. I wanted to ask whether in that list of prosecutions or investigations the Harvester Trust is mentioned?

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. This was in 1906, and Mr. Roosevelt had not yet gone out of office. There is no mention here of the successful conclusion of the suits against the Standard Oil Trust and the Tobacco Trust. The suggestion has been made that nothing ever came out of it that amounted to anything, but I wish to remind the gentleman that Roosevelt was not the judiciary of the country.

Mr. HARDY. Is there any mention there made of his having invited Paul Morton into his Cabinet?

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. You have heard the entire editorial.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. Is there any mention there——

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Before I yield I will ask the Chairman how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one minute remaining.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Gentlemen, I am not half through my speech, and I have only one minute. I will ask if I may have an extension of five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is within the control of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. But I want it understood that I am not here to defend Mr. Roosevelt. He needs no defense from me. His official record is his impregnable defense. His public career is the pride of his countrymen, the ornament of history, and the wonder of the world. [Applause.] His influence for civic righteousness falls like a perpetual benediction upon his countrymen everywhere. He is the grandest combination of conscience, heart, and brain beneath our flag, and monuments will be dedicated to him long after the small-calibered peanut politicians of the American Congress who seek to deride and defame him have passed into merited oblivion and into dust. [Applause.]

Now, let me say in conclusion that there are many things in the pending tariff bill that I favor. Many of its features appeal to me strongly. My party platform calls for the immediate downward revision of all those items in the schedules of the present tariff law that may be shown to be exorbitant, and this without waiting for the information furnished by a tariff commission. I stand squarely by my party platform. But there are different ways of moving downward. You can go down a hill in a sleigh to the music of tinkling bells and joyous laughter. This is happy, healthful, downward movement. Or you can pitch over a precipice and land at the bottom a mangled mass. This is destruction and suicide. I fear that our Democratic friends have revised the tariff downward in a way that means destruction to many of our most important industries and to living wages for millions of our American workingmen. For these reasons I can not support the bill.

The boast of the Democrats is that the proposed new tariff law will force competition between manufacturers in the United States and those in foreign countries, and that in consequence import commodities will be reduced in price and the high cost of living diminished. This is pure speculation. But it is certain that under the operation of the new law, if this bill is passed, American laborers will be forced into competition with the cheap labor of Europe. The result will be either starvation wages or enforced idleness, with a notable decrease in American savings-bank deposits.

The new tariff bill is to be commended in that its intentions are good. It is designed to reduce the high cost of living. And to this end most foodstuffs are put on the free list. This includes meats, flour, bread, milk and cream products, salt, swine, corn, fish, and cornmeal. But it is to be doubted whether this benevolent design will be accomplished. The optimism and expectations of Democracy are in danger of being thwarted and defeated by many intervening causes that affect the high cost of living. Chief among these causes is the law of supply and demand.

For a number of years the price of all kinds of meats has been steadily rising. Our Democratic friends ascribe this gradual increase in price to the high tariff and the Beef Trust. They seem to ignore the simple law of supply and demand. During the last 20 years our population has been increasing by leaps and bounds, at the same time that our general meat supply has been diminishing.

In 1900 there were more than 69,000,000 meat cattle, cows, bulls, and so forth, on the farms and ranges, with 1,600,000 not on farms or ranges. In 1910 there were only 61,000,000.

In 1900 there were 61,735,000 sheep and lambs, with 231,000 not on farms or ranges. In 1910 there were 51,800,000.

In 1900 there were 64,680,000 swine, with 1,800,000 not on farms or ranges. In 1910 there were 58,000,000.

The rapid increase in population and the equally rapid decrease in the bulk of the meat supply are more potent factors, in my judgment, than the tariff in affecting the high cost of living. It remains to be seen whether the anticipated increase in the importations, under the new law, of cattle, sheep, and swine from Canada, Mexico, and elsewhere, will seriously affect the high cost of living in the matter of meat consumption. There is good authority for the assertion that the law of supply and

demand is operating as seriously in Mexico and Canada as in the United States.

The trouble with the Underwood bill is that it is crudely drawn, is based upon insufficient information, and goes into effect before American business interests, that are certainly entitled to consideration and respect, have time to adjust themselves to the changed conditions that must inevitably follow. The last German and French tariff laws did not become operative until a year after their passage. We should have shown some consideration to American business men by allowing them at least six months to adjust their affairs to the requirements of the new tariff.

The fact is that we need a nonpartisan tariff commission to deal with the subject of tariff legislation. The whole subject of tariff reform should be taken out of the hands of politicians and placed in the hands of nonpartisan business experts whose duty it would be to study the tariff question scientifically rather than politically. The Progressive Party is the only political organization in the country that sincerely favors a nonpartisan tariff commission.

The incorporation of the income-tax bill into the tariff bill was a clever political move on the part of the Democrats. From a parliamentary point of view, it was both legal and legitimate, and it would be, therefore, wrong and ungenerous to style it a political trick. But the result, nevertheless, has been to place many Congressmen in a serious dilemma. I am now and have always been in favor of a graduated income tax. I believe firmly in this principle of taxation; and, notwithstanding its numerous defects, I should very much like to vote for the income-tax feature of the general revenue bill. But I understand that I shall be compelled to vote "aye" or "no" on the entire bill; and I shall be compelled to vote "no," for I believe that present conditions are more tolerable than will be those created by this new Democratic tariff measure. However, I do not want to be understood as expressing satisfaction with present conditions. I repeat that the tariff question will never be correctly settled until we have the aid of a nonpartisan tariff commission to help us in the task.

I am opposed to this bill because I believe that its effects will be exceedingly injurious to the prosperity of the people of the great city that I have the honor, in part, to represent. New York is the metropolis of the Nation. Every commercial and industrial interest of consequence is represented there. What is helpful or hurtful to the Republic is helpful or hurtful to its greatest city; and if the new tariff law paralyzes American industry and degrades American labor, the people of the metropolis must inevitably suffer from the national paralysis and degradation. I shall vote against the passage of this bill because I believe that by so doing I am serving faithfully the highest interests of both the Nation at large and the great city that I am proud to call my home. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is with a great deal of diffidence that I undertake either to discuss the tariff question or to follow so distinguished and eloquent a speaker as the gentleman from New York [Mr. CHANDLER] who has just preceded me. He said he was diffident and eloquent a speaker as the gentleman from New York [Mr. calmer when he thought of the fact that nobody in the House knew much more about it than himself.

I am unlike the gentleman from New York. I feel like the most of men who are here before me this evening are well versed on this question—a thousandfold better versed on it than I am—and it is for this reason that I feel diffident.

I want to say that the distinguished and eloquent gentleman from New York, the gentleman who belongs to a new party and who says that he thinks a great question like this ought to be discussed calmly and dispassionately, that he makes a delightfully eloquent speech—not on the tariff but upon Col. Roosevelt. Did he discuss the tariff calmly and dispassionately? Did he discuss the tariff at all? Who knows—those who have been sitting here for the last half hour and have listened to him—what are the views of the gentleman, or the Progressive Party, on the subject of the tariff, judging from his calm (?) and dispassionate (?) speech? But I do not want to discuss Col. Roosevelt or the Progressive Party.

I want to discuss the question of the tariff for a few moments, if you will bear with me. The Republican Party, if I understand these gentlemen, believe in a tariff fixed on the basis of the difference of the cost of production at home and abroad, with an addition for a freight rate, and with a "reasonable profit" to protect the manufacturer, or to protect the producer. What that reasonable profit is, gentlemen, is the limit of the American people to stand for.

Every succeeding Republican tariff has been higher than the one before. I ask this great expert sitting here before me, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], Is not that a fact? Taking the general average, is it not true that the McKinley bill was higher than the bill that preceded it, and the Dingley bill higher than the McKinley bill, and the Payne bill the highest of them all?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that to be correct, and the gentleman to be wrong; but be that as it may, I have been in the House nearly two years, and I want to say that I have not heard a single man—Republican, Progressive, or what not, who has stood here or elsewhere—undertake to defend the Payne tariff bill except Mr. PAYNE himself. And, remarkable to tell, in listening to the distinguished and eloquent gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] the other day, I found that Mr. PAYNE did not believe in two schedules in his own bill—Schedule I and Schedule K. There is nobody willing to stand for it, and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts himself pleaded in confession and avoidance.

But they say the Republican Party believes in something else, and that is a tariff board. Of course, a nonpartisan tariff board composed of only protectionists! What has been the uses to which you have put that board? Why, it was simply provided to give an excuse to the American people for the high rates of taxation that you imposed upon them, and that was all.

But here comes our friends the Progressives. As I understand the science of government, it is really and truly the science of taxation. The attitude of a political party toward its government is its real attitude on the question of taxation. What is this party's attitude on taxation? Why, in the platform of the Progressives they said something about the rates of the Payne bill being too high, but what does the distinguished and splendid gentleman from Kansas say about it? He says, "Oh, we are very different from the Republicans with whom we have formerly been associated; we have an entirely new scheme. These Republicans believe in a tariff board. We have got a better scheme than that; we want to let things remain where they are until a 'scientific commission' passes on these questions."

Therefore it seems the only difference between the old-time Republicans and the new Progressives is the difference between a "tariff board" and a "scientific tariff commission." All are in favor of a protective tariff. Now, gentlemen, I need not discuss the Democratic view, because it is in this bill. I am thoroughly and heartily in favor of the bill. It is a long step in the right direction.

As explained by our majority leader, we are opposed to any commission. We are opposed to any tariff board, because we believe that the Ways and Means Committee of this House is more competent than any board or any commission to deal with this subject.

The Constitution and laws of this country provide that this body shall fix its tariff laws, and we believe we have all the information and ability to fix them. I want to say that in my judgment no abler body could be found in this country to do this work. The various members of this committee have all shown here on the floor of this House and in the caucus a remarkable intimacy with the facts in which they are dealing, and the distinguished author of this bill is the ablest statesman, I believe, in this or any other country on the question of tariff duties. He and his Democratic colleagues on the committee deserve the thanks of every American consumer. As he explained, he is for a competitive tariff, meaning by that the basis on which the tariff duties shall be fixed is the difference between the cost in this country and the cost abroad, together with the addition of reasonable rates.

If we are to have a tariff at all, there can be no doubt that this bill is the proper kind of a tariff. I am heartily in favor of this bill. The bill puts most foodstuffs on the free list. It puts many articles of necessity on the free list, it reduces the tariff upon all articles of necessity, and is certain, in my judgment, to reduce the cost of living in this country. The bill is distinctly in favor of the consumers, and as the consumers form the great majority of the people in this country—indeed, as all the people are consumers, while only a few are protected producers and manufacturers—the bill is easily and manifestly to the great interest of the great majority of the people of the country.

FREE LIST.

The free list in this bill is the largest free list that has ever been given to the American people.

The farmer gets his plows, harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, drills, planters, mowers, thrashing machines, cultivators,

cotton gins, wagons and carts, and all other agricultural implements free of duty. The southern farmer gets his cotton bagging, so long in the hands of the Bagging Trust, free of duty. He also gets his ties for baling up his cotton free of duty.

The consumer gets his biscuit, bread, and buckwheat flour free of duty. Cash registers, linotypes, sewing machines, typewriters, tar and oil spreading machines used in the construction of roads are all brought in free. Coal is also made free. Corn meal is made free of duty. Gloves of all kinds are made free of duty. Fertilizers are to be brought in free. Iron ore, lard, leathers of all kinds, lemons, fresh beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, bacon, hams, meats of all kinds come in free. Milk and cream come in free. Horseshoe nails and the like come in free; also oatmeal and rolled oats, oils of various kinds, potatoes, salt, tanning materials, wheat flour, lumber and all kinds of wood, wool of all kinds; while on sugar the tax is reduced one-third and taken off entirely in three years. All of the foregoing articles directly have to do with the present high cost of living, and putting them on the free list will certainly bring about a reduction in the high cost of living.

REDUCTIONS.

While the tariff has been taken off altogether on the articles above enumerated, the duties have been reduced on practically every necessity of life. These duties have not been indiscriminately cut down, but they have been reduced with two definite objects in view. One is relieving the people of an unjust burden of taxation inflicted upon them by the Republican Party, and the other is a due regard for the industry affected with a view of permitting every legitimate industry to continue its business and prosper.

PROTECTION IS WRONG.

Mr. Chairman, my belief about the tariff is this: That the whole scheme of a protective tariff is wrong in principle. Indeed, I may go further than that and say that while I believe that this bill ought to become a law, and while I am thoroughly and heartily in favor of this bill at this time, I believe that any system of tariff duties is wrong in principle. I do not believe that any government is justified in principle in fixing a tariff, the results of which gives a portion of the tax to a certain favored class of people and a portion of the tax to the government. Any tariff duty practically works this result. All taxes ought to be imposed upon a basis of benefits received by the taxpayer. I do not believe in class legislation, and I hope the day will soon come when it will be possible, without any injury to business, to remove all tariff duties, for I believe that the removal of all tariff duties will work to the greatest good of all the American people.

EXCUSE FOR PROTECTION.

A number of excuses are offered by the protectionists for a high tariff. They say that in the first place that because the tax is an indirect tax that the people do not feel it; that each one is taxed only a small amount, and that he does not realize that he is being taxed when he buys his food and his clothing and other articles of consumption.

Under the protective system it is estimated that for every dollar that the Government gets out of the tariff duties four dollars is legislated into the pockets of the protected manufacturer or protected producer.

Is this right in principle? Can it be defended in principle? Why, Mr. Chairman, it is no more to be defended than any other jobbery is to be defended. This combination between the protected producer and the protected manufacturer and the Government is not much better than for the Government to go into partnership with a band of highwaymen, with the understanding that the highwaymen are only to take a very small amount from each person and that the Government is to get one-fifth of the proceeds and the band the remainder.

But the protectionists say that it is to encourage home industries. Mr. Chairman, I notice that they are not laying so much stress on this phase of the question of late. Our home industries do not need to be thus encouraged by an improper alliance with the Government. A home industry which can not stand by itself ought not to stand. The American people ought not to be taxed to encourage industries that can not stand by themselves. Why should the great body of the people be taxed for a limited class of manufacturers and producers? Why should the merchants and artisans and farmers and miners, and all those that work and labor by the sweat of their brow and consume, be taxed for the benefit of a small class of favored producers and protected manufacturers? Is there any reason for it? Can it be defended as a matter of right? And yet that is what our Government is doing under the Payne tariff law.

It is estimated that we now get about $300,000,000 of revenue from tariff duties, and at the same time the American people are taxed twelve hundred million more—according to estimate—which goes into the pockets of the protected manufacturer and protected producer of certain protected articles. That is certainly not right.

But they say it is for the benefit of the laboring man. Ah, Mr. Chairman, that has been the artful dodge of these Republican protectionists for a long time. How many laboring men did this committee have before them, urging that a protective tariff be upheld for their benefit, and on the other hand, how many manufacturers did they have before it? There were many manufacturers and practically no laboring men. In addition to that these very manufacturers who stated that the high tariff would be for the benefit of the laborer were compelled to admit that in all factories that three-fourths or four-fifths of the work was done by cheap imported foreign labor. They are the worst enemies of American labor instead of being their friends. But they say that it is such a small tax that the people do not feel it.

The time was when we were obliged to have a tariff on imports in order to obtain sufficient revenue for this Government. That time has passed. The income-tax amendment has solved that problem. We can now run this Government without tariff duties at all. We can run this Government without a protective tariff, without a tariff for revenue only, without even a competitive tariff. We can run it with all ease, and I want to show you just how simple a problem it is.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. UNDERWOOD] gave the figures the other day. He said that for the next fiscal year it would take about $995,000,000 to run the Government. He expected to get the revenue in the following way:

From post-office revenue, $280,000,000; from internal revenue, $322,000,000; from sale of public lands, $5,000,000; from incidental sources, $52,000,000; from customs duties, $267,000,000; from income tax, $69,000,000; total, $995,000,000.

INCOME TAX FAIREST.

Take these figures. Take the $322,000,000 that come from internal revenue and add 40 per cent on whisky, cigars, and tobacco, all articles of luxury, and increase the tax on all these articles, which would not be felt by this country at all, and what do you have? You have $128,000,000 more. Then add your $5,000,000 from public lands; then the $52,000,000 from general sources. Add to this $280,000,000 from the post office, and then your $69,000,000 from the income tax, and add 200 per cent on the income tax, and you get $138,000,000 more, which furnishes you the $995,000,000 necessary to run the Government without any customs duties. In other words, you raise the income tax on wealth 200 per cent and you get your money. Oh, you say, you can not do that, as that would raise the income tax too much. Have you seen Judge HULL'S figures? If you have, you will find that even if this income tax is raised 200 per cent more than it is in this bill it will then be only one-half the income tax that England puts upon her incomes. They claim also that if you put any greater tax on liquors you can not get more revenue, because it will increase the number of illicit stills. This is not true. Whisky ought to be taxed high and strictly regulated.

The income tax is the fairest tax in the world, and there is no better way of raising revenue to run the Government. Duties upon imports is a tax upon the consuming public and falls most heavily upon the poorer class of our people. The income tax falls on those who are able to pay it and those who derive most benefit from the Government.

PRESENT SYSTEM INDEFENSIBLE.

But the protected interests, so powerful in the Republican Party, say: "What are you going to do about labor and our infant industries?" I say that the industry, whether it be a producing industry or a manufacturing industry, that can not stand alone in this country ought to fail. It is a matter of principle, it is a matter of right. Why should the whole American people be taxed for the benefit of a few favored classes, whether producers or manufacturers? Suppose this Government should undertake to levy a tax of 1 cent upon every man, woman, and child for the benefit of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], who sits before me. Such a tax would produce $1,000,000 and would not hurt any one especially, and it would be a great boon to the gentleman from New York. But could anyone defend that kind of an individual tax? Yet this protective tax is the same thing. We raise upward of $300,000,000 from custom duties, and at the same time, according to the figures of the experts, twelve hundred millions of dollars are legislated into the pockets of the protected manufacturers and producers. It is not right, and it is not fair. It is indefensible. As for the laboring people, I believe I can say for them that

they prefer an income tax to a tariff tax which does not protect them.

THE SECTIONALISM IN THIS BILL.

Mr. GARDNER, of Massachusetts, said we ought not to be sectional in framing this bill, and by inference he declared our bill is sectional. I want to say to him in all kindness, because I am a great admirer of his, and he is one of the most courteous, able, and delightful men in this House, I want to admit this bill is sectional. But I say the section it favors is his section and not the section we come from—in the South or West. I want to call the attention of the gentleman and of other gentlemen who believe as he does, if you should build a wall around your portion of this country it would not be 60 day before you would need succor from the outside world. You do not produce your own wool. You do not produce your own cotton. You do not produce your own coal. You do not produce your own foodstuffs. You do not produce your own mill machinery. You do not produce any raw material. All these things you get from other parts of the Nation. You are absolutely dependent upon the rest of the country for your daily sustenance. Under these circumstances ought you not treat the rest of the country in a spirit of fairness? Ought you to desire longer to place or keep these enormous tax duties upon the rest of the country for your particular benefit? This bill simply cuts down your unfair profits, and, if you will permit me to say it, it seems to me you ought to see the situation as it is and be in favor of this bill. The time has passed when this Nation is obliged to raise its revenue from custom duties, and those who are interested in manufacturing protected articles and those who are interested in producing protected material should bear this in mind.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, the passage of the income-tax amendment to the Constitution marks one of the greatest epochs in this Government. It marks the end absolutely of a protective tariff, and the beginning of a system which will eventually develop into free trade with all the nations on the earth. The old outrageously unjust system of taxing the whole body of the consuming public in the interest of a small class of protected manufacturers and protected producers is obliged to go.

There are not only internal reasons for this, but there are external reasons for this. Protection might have been all right when this country was composed of a mere strip along the Atlantic and there was great difficulty in getting enough revenue to support the Government; but now that we have become a great Nation and are branching out; now that we own Alaska, the Philippine Islands, the Hawaiian Islands, Porto Rico, and Panama, it means trade expansion. We have arranged in this bill to have free trade with all these dependencies. The reasons are manifest. Because of our increased trade abroad our exports amount to the mighty sum of $4,000,000,000. It is absolutely necessary that the tariff wall that we have built around us should be leveled in order that our people get the full benefits of their commercialism.

We are legislating in this bill in favor of the American ships. We want the trade and commerce of all nations. Our people are ambitious to sell and lead in the markets of all the world, but we can not do it with an effete worn-out system of high-tariff laws in our country. If we want to trade with other nations, we must let them trade with us without restriction. It is a proposition very clear to my mind, and I believe the American people have likewise waked up to the same situation, and if the last election means anything at all it means that in the future, as soon as we can adjust ourselves to the new conditions, that the American people will trade just as freely with all the other nations of the earth, and they will trade just as freely with us, as we now trade in and among our own States. It is a condition which we ought all to bend our energies to bring about.

If the States were permitted to fix import duties, no doubt certain individuals and classes in the several States would be greatly benefited, but every sane person who understands commercial conditions knows that such tariff duties would be ruinous to interstate trade and the welfare of the people generally. No one for a moment would propose such a change. Now that science and invention have brought the nations of the earth in closer contact and closer commercial communion than even our States were 100 years ago, it must necessarily follow that the old system of putting up a tariff wall to bar out trade and commerce with other nations must of necessity go by the board. In our new conditions and surroundings a tariff on imports can only be defended on the grounds that it is necessary to secure revenue for the maintenance of the Government, but now that we know that this scheme of taxation is so unfair and unjust and so discriminating; now that we know it is so unnecessary; now that we know that we can raise the revenue for the maintenance of our Government by a scheme of taxation that everyone, regardless of politics, must admit is fair and just—taxes levied not upon the rich and poor in equal degree, but taxes levied in accordance with benefits received—we ought, and I believe we will, adopt that system of taxation as soon as we can adjust ourselves to it without serious injury to our American commerce and to our American business and industries. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY].

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill proves our sincerity to the pledges of the Democratic platform, and it will be a source of pride to me to have been a member of the majority, whose good fortune it is to pass this bill to relieve the burdens of the people of this country. It will be a help to all—to the laborer as well as to the business man, to the farmer as well as the mechanic—and I have no fear that our American manufacturers will fail to meet competition from abroad. I feel that American enterprise and American ingenuity, which has never failed to overcome obstacles in the past, will adjust itself to the changed conditions due to this bill, and that in a short time the country will be enjoying unbounded prosperity.

But while I am proud of this bill as a whole, while I am proud of the party that will have the honor and credit of passing it, while I congratulate our colleagues on this side of the House, and especially the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee on his matchless leadership, and while I am glad to stand squarely on the Democratic platform and raise my voice in support of Democratic doctrines, I feel that I ought to utter one word of warning. Why should the income tax be laid unless absolutely necessary?

I disagree with my distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] that the income tax has come to stay. When the question of the constitutional amendment was before the House and all the legislatures of the country, especially New York, it was stated that the income tax would not be enforced except in times of war and dire necessity. This is the most obnoxious kind of taxation, yet I am heartily in favor of levying an income tax if the necessities of the country warrant it.

The income tax has been the cause of financial distress in nearly every country in which it has been enforced. Since the enforcement of the high income tax in England "soup houses" have been more in demand than ever. The late Samuel J. Tilden was elected President of the United States on this very issue—his opposition to the income tax—and after his election it was promptly repealed. The enforcement of the income-tax section of the pending bill will cause inquisitorial investigation throughout the country into every household and into every one's private affairs whether he earns one dollar a day or a thousand. Why impose upon the people of the United States by passing this income tax section so soon after its ratification by the State legislatures and enforcing it so promptly?

Our distinguished leader [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has stated that after the pending bill is enacted into law the deficit will amount to about $69,000,000 from internal-revenue taxes, custom taxes, and other incidental sources to be made up by the income tax. At the present time there is in the general fund of the Treasury $140,301,272.14 cash, and balance expended out of the general fund reimbursable from proceeds of Panama Canal bonds not yet sold $171,755,804.11—which is equivalent to cash in the Treasury—making the enormous total of $312,057,076.25. At the end of the present fiscal year the surplus will amount to about $40,000,000. The surplus for the Post Office Department will amount to some $5,000,000 for the present fiscal year, and for the next fiscal year will amount to some $20,000,000. The deficiency of $1,785,523 in the Post Office Department for the past fiscal year was made up by the first of the present year—before the parcel-post law went into effect—and there is now a surplus in the department. Since the parcel-post law went into effect the receipts over expenditures have been so large that I can frankly say that there will be an increase in the surplus for the department, and this will continue to increase to such an extent, which, together with the large customs receipts collected from the increased importations which will follow the enactment into law of this bill, that within the course of a few years there will be no need of levying a tariff to raise revenue for running of the Government. Why not allow the corporation tax to remain in force, and, if you do, the collection therefrom will amount to about $32,000,000 yearly. This, together with the surplus for this year, will more than make up the deficiency of $69,000,000.

If by any unforeseen circumstances there should be a deficiency after this bill is enacted into law it should be paid out of the general fund of the Treasury every year until the surplus therein decreases to $50,000,000, and in no case should

it be allowed to exceed this amount. I am opposed to a full and overflowing Treasury; it excites the cupidity of everyone whose business it is to promote enterprises requiring public money. With a bare Treasury there would be no incentive for a raid upon it, and it would be the greatest safeguard that could surround the administration.

I have always followed in the footsteps of Thomas Jefferson, the father of Democracy, who was opposed to having the tax-gatherer at the doors of the people, and have no fear of success when we follow in his footsteps. Therefore, I deplore the enforcement of this obnoxious class of taxation when we are at peace with the world and have an overflowing Treasury.

The distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] is in error when he states that the income tax has proven popular in most countries where it is enforced. The enforcement of taxation of this kind will reflect more upon the laboring classes than it will upon the rich, and will be the cause of spreading a feeling of socialism throughout the country. I have grave fears for the party that is the cause of levying this iniquitous taxation on the people without justification, and when the dove of peace is hovering over us and not the slightest sign of a war cloud in the sky. It would endanger our chances of success at the polls at the next presidential campaign.

I am one of those who believe that this tariff bill will not create a deficit; on the contrary, I am convinced that for the first six months of its existence the revenue receipts from customs duties will be far in excess of the amount now collected and will make up any deficiency. At the end of 18 months instead of a deficit it will create a surplus in the Treasury. This being the case, I am in favor and urge that the income-tax section of the pending bill be so modified as to postpone its enforcement until the balance in the general fund of the Treasury does not exceed $50,000,000. [Applause.]

I will print the following as a part of my remarks:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, April 28, 1913.

Hon. JEFFERSON M. LEVY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEVY: In response to your request of to-day over the telephone for a statement as to the revenues for the current half of the fiscal year, I have to inform you that as postmasters' accounts are rendered quarterly, and the following quarter is required to audit and settle them, it will be readily seen that definite figures are not yet available for the March quarter for the purpose of showing the fiscal transactions in that quarter or as indicative of the probable transactions in the quarter ended June 30. However, revenue reports from the postmasters at New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, and St. Louis for the months of January, February, and March, 1912 and 1913, are at hand and show percentages of increase over the same months of the previous years, as given in the following table. The marked increases in receipts for January, February, and March, 1913, is unquestionably due to the inauguration of the parcel-post system, which became effective January 1, 1913, and the percentages of increase in receipts for three months in 1913 over 1912 will give an idea of the increased business due to the parcel-post system, when compared with the receipts for the same months in 1912 over 1911.

	Per cent of increase, 1913 over 1912.	Per cent of increase, 1912 over 1911.
New York:		
January	22.34	1.45
February	14.65	3.96
March	15.99	7.19
Chicago:		
January	29.91	8.97
February	29.45	3.17
March	12.98	2.23
Philadelphia:		
January	8.17	0.46
February	6.91	4.24
March	12.29	2.04
Boston:		
January	14.17	4.50
February	13.43	3.51
March	17.06	2.62
St. Louis:		
January	14.86	2.23
February	13.98	2.06
March	10.87	5.27

Respectfully,

A. M. DOCKERY,
Third Assistant Postmaster General.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, it is a very significant fact that while the platforms of the different political parties declared in favor of downward revision of the tariff that the Democratic Party was the only one which promised to perform that task cautiously and in such a way as not to injure or destroy legitimate industries. To quote from the national Democratic platform:

We recognize that our system of tariff taxation is intimately connected with the business of the country, and we favor the ultimate attainment of the principles we advocate by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry.

When party platforms are ambiguous or require explanation the chief candidate on the ticket has by custom come to be understood as the proper one to interpret to the voters the meaning of the platform.

Mr. Wilson, the candidate of the Democratic Party for President, undertook to interpret the provision of the Democratic platform just quoted.

WILSON INTERVIEWED.

According to a special dispatch in the New York Times of August 1, 1912, from Sea Girt, N. J., Congressman Redfield, now Secretary of Commerce in President Wilson's Cabinet, was interviewed by a special correspondent, to whom he said concerning Gov. Wilson, with whom he had just talked:

He is not for free trade. He is not for drastic action of any kind. He is willing to work through a series of years to accomplish the result of a tariff for revenue, at which he aims. He is not disposed in any way to inflict changes that would upset and destroy business. His views are clear and sound, and he has no rash or hasty ideas.

I outlined the situation to Gov. Wilson in this way: I told him that a big manufacturer had all his capital tied up in his plant, and that the tariff was a large figure in the cost of his goods. I said this manufacturer could not turn his stock over in a week, or a month, or even a year, as a wholesaler could. If the tariff on his goods were 50 per cent where it ought to be only 20 per cent then there would be an opportunity for the display of great wisdom.

In outlining this case I did not urge clemency upon the governor. I said the revision ought to be as full and complete as the case demanded, but that the revising ought to be done in gradual stages, not in sudden jumps. I suggested stages of, say, 5 per cent a year until the 20 per cent basis was reached. That would do justice and conserve business interests at once.

I compared the tariff problem to the case of a man who owed you $5,000. If the whole lump sum were demanded at once you would probably put him out of business, but if you agreed to take $50 a month until the sum was paid you could get your money in full and your debtor could save his business. I want to see the governor (Wilson) give every business a chance, and yet I believe that every schedule in the present tariff bill could be improved by a downward revision.

We talked of the need of a general downward revision on almost every schedule in the tariff. The revision should be thorough, but should be made by degrees. We should make progress slowly, in my judgment, instead of trying to clear too much in one jump. We want to reform the tariff, but we do not want to do more harm than good. Business men have money invested in their plants, machinery, and stock, and this money can not be turned over like a department store turns over its goods. A store gets rid of its stock quickly; a manufacturer slowly. The work need not be less thorough if done by steps instead of by a single leap.

The governor has his own views as to fairness and moderation in dealing with the trusts. We talked considerably about them. It is my opinion that the governor believes that the Government should first establish its own policies so clearly that it could be readily understood instead of being misinterpreted.

After Congressman Redfield had gone, Gov. Wilson talked about him to the reporters.

"I enjoyed him and was greatly instructed by him," said Mr. Wilson. "Most people who talk about the tariff talk about general principles. Mr. Redfield talked facts almost exclusively."

"And did Mr. Redfield speak to you in favor of a general downward revision at a slow rate of speed?"

"Oh, as to that," replied the governor, "we are perfectly agreed. You fellows sent to your paper some extracts of a speech on the tariff that I made some time ago. I am not for free trade, but for gradual downward revision."

SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE.

While in Mr. Wilson's speech of acceptance there is a clear declaration in favor of downward revision of the tariff, it is qualified by these words:

We do not ignore the fact that the business of a country like ours is exceedingly sensitive to changes in legislation of this kind. It has been built up, however ill-advisedly, upon tariff schedules such as I have indicated, and its foundations must not be too radically or too suddenly disturbed. When we act, we should act with caution and prudence like men who know what they are about and not like those in love with a theory.

WILSON AT DETROIT.

In a special dispatch to the New York Times under date of September 19, 1912, from Detroit, Mich., Mr. Wilson was quoted as follows:

In all my speeches on the tariff I have made it clear that changes in the tariff must be made slow enough not to disturb legitimate business interests.

WILSON ON RECORD AGAIN.

Again, in a speech delivered in New York, November 1, 1912, reported in the New York Times, Mr. Wilson said:

I get telegrams about every second hour now asking me to deny that I am a free trader, showing that there are some persons in the United States who believe that the Democrats do not understand the business structure of the country in which they live. How many Democrats were there at the last election? Not enough to elect a government, but almost half the voters in the United States were Democrats even then, more than half of them are now, and unless these gentlemen are all

going out of business they are not going to vote to destroy business or to touch any sound or stable thing in the United States. But I am wasting my breath. Nobody believes for one moment that the Democratic Party is going to upset honest business in the United States.

NO MANDATE FROM THE PEOPLE.

In spite of these direct appeals to protectionist voters, Mr. Chairman, and in spite of the fact that many of them voted for him, Mr. Wilson received far from a majority of the votes. He lacked a million votes of receiving a majority, and of the votes he did receive a portion were protectionists. There were many votes of protest. Some voted for Roosevelt because they did not like Taft; some for Wilson because they were afraid of Roosevelt. The mandate of the people was obscure at best. His party, therefore, has no moral right or commission from the people to enact a radical, drastic tariff measure.

So I appeal to you gentlemen who have given your approval in caucus to the introduction of this bill to consider well the probable operation of it. You can not afford, after the preelection promises of your candidate for President and other leaders, to turn a deaf ear to those who plead with you for justice to the farmers and other producers.

First of all, it should be remembered that for many years the tariff duties upon farm products were absolutely valueless to the farmers. During that period, while the manufacturing industries were being built up the farmers were constantly being advised to stand by the protective system, with the assurance that a home market would eventually be created which would be valuable to them. This home market did not come, however, until the last few years. In other words, the farmers were the last to receive actual benefits from the protective system, and under this Underwood bill they are the first to be brought to the block for slaughter.

THE FARMERS CRUCIFIED.

As other speakers have already called particular attention to the discriminations and the rank injustices done the farmers in the agricultural schedule, I shall discuss only briefly the items in this schedule. The duty upon wheat is reduced from 25 cents per bushel to 10 cents per bushel. Barley from 30 to 15 cents per bushel. Oats from 15 to 10 cents per bushel. Butter from 6 to 3 cents per pound. Beans from 45 cents per bushel to 20 cents per bushel Eggs from 5 cents per dozen to 2 cents per dozen. Hay from $4 per ton to $2 per ton, and potatoes are put on the free list. Flour is also put upon the free list, and it is claimed by farmers in my district that free flour will ultimately mean that it will make the duty of 10 cents per bushel on wheat of little value. They, the farmers of my district, believe that they are entitled to have reasonable duties imposed against both wheat and flour.

Potatoes sold in our State last year, f. o. b. cars, for 25 cents per bushel. It is true that in some of the States potatoes retailed for from $1 to $1.25 per bushel, but if those who are responsible for the introduction of this Underwood tariff bill wish to reduce the cost to the consumer, attention should be given to the middlemen and retailers, rather than to the farmers, whose profit upon potatoes at 25 cents per bushel is very small, as there is a large amount of labor involved in raising that crop. In that connection it might be well to remember that the labor in raising potatoes, as well as the item of labor generally upon the farms, costs more than the labor upon the Canadian farms. Canadian farmers are permitted to secure strong, healthy, industrious young Scotchmen, or strong young men of other nationalities by writing to the Allan Steamship Co., or some one of the other steamship companies, advancing the cost of transportation, and in that way secure such men for a year's work at a very low price, and the amount of work they do is exceptionally large as compared with the quantity of work done by many of the men whom our farmers must employ at higher wages. This can not be done by the American farmers on account of the alien contract labor law.

It should also be remembered that the Anglo-Japanese treaty went into effect the 1st day of this month and that the Japs have a practically open door to Canada.

WORSE THAN CANADIAN RECIPROCITY.

In addition to flour and potatoes, the following products will be admitted to the United States absolutely free if this bill is passed:

Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, bacon, cured meats, milk and cream, condensed milk, wool, rye and rye flour, swine, tallow, corn and corn meal, bran and wheat screenings, broom corn, lard, flax straw, buckwheat and buckwheat flour. It is the belief of those who have given this subject the most careful study that the Underwood bill, if it becomes a law, is bound to be more injurious to our farmers than the Canadian reciprocity treaty, so called, could possibly have been had it taken effect.

Imported cattle, sheep, and hogs are taxed 10 per cent ad valorem to make it appear that the farmers and live-stock growers are being protected, but when it is found that beef, pork, mutton, hides, and wool come in duty free the agricultural schedule is demonstrated to be a sham.

It is claimed that the farmers will be able to buy their farming machinery cheaper. This is not true. The special report of the Department of Commerce upon the Harvester Trust shows that all farm machinery is now sold cheaper in the United States than in any foreign country. This is corroborated by the fact that there are no importations of farm machinery, and there is no duty against English manufactured machinery.

But granting, for the sake of argument, that farm machinery can be purchased cheaper, it should be remembered that each article of farm machinery is supposed to last for several years, while what the farmer has to sell is sold each year. As the farmer has more to sell than to buy, he is damaged by a horizontal cut in tariff rates; but, so far as this bill is concerned, a horizontal cut in the tariff has not been made. On the contrary, the farmers have been discriminated against, and they have been made to suffer to carry out the appearance of reducing the high cost of living.

Economy will decrease the farmer's expenditures, but no amount of thought or foresight will add to the price of what he has to sell, therefore the all-important thing is to preserve all the markets we have. Of these the home market is by far the most valuable.

COMPETITION.

Competition under fair conditions is the principle for which we should stand. For instance, if it should prove to be true that the discriminating clauses of this bill against the flour manufacturers should drive them out of business it would mean that the farmers' market for wheat would depend only upon the competition of foreign buyers. Or if the mills can continue to do business that their ability to buy wheat will be decreased.

A dozen years ago when a large portion of the wheat grown in the United States was shipped abroad the farmers were unable, as a rule, to sell their wheat for the export price, that is to say, the Liverpool price less cost of transportation. In our State the prices ruled all the way from 6 to 10 cents per bushel below an export basis. Since then many flour mills, both large and small, have been built in our State and others, which has created a constant local demand for wheat, with the result that wheat has been for a number of years selling at a premium over the export value, in other words, above the Liverpool price with the cost of transportation deducted.

That is one instance of the value of home competition, and the principle holds true, or will hold true, under proper laws of regulation with other industries in the United States. If the manufacturer of any article in this country is driven out of business, and we are thus made dependent upon the production of other countries, we will certainly suffer on account of the lack of competition by home manufacturers. It is desirable to have competition from those living in other countries, but it should be fair competition, and the home manufacturer should be protected to the extent of the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad. Competition is the great principle which should at all times be kept in mind, not only in the framing of a tariff bill but in the framing of all laws passed by Congress respecting the commerce and industries of the country, and it should never be forgotten that the sweeping away of tariff duties is just as likely to prevent competition by destroying established industries at home as it is to secure competition by taking off all barriers to foreign importations. For example, the American woolgrower can not compete upon equal terms with the Australians, because under the favorable conditions of that country the Australians can afford to raise sheep profitably and give away the wool. But what will the final result be under free wool? Sheep raising will cease to be an industry in this country, which will probably affect Australian wool, raising its price. It will also affect the market for meat by reason of the decreased supply of domestic mutton, and thus undoubtedly increase the price of other meats.

And so it will be found that at all times competition is the correct principle, and that the only way to secure competition is to place our farmers, manufacturers, and other producers upon equal terms with foreign producers. Any other plan will either destroy our industries or lower the standards of American living.

No one will deny that there are abuses existing and that there are inequalities and injustices under the present tariff act to correct. But a plan of relief should be found without striking a blow at the farmers, destroying commerce, and paralyzing honest business. The remedy should not be worse than the disease.

THE DOG AND THE SHADOW.

The fable of the dog and the shadow is in point. It happened that a dog had gotten a piece of meat and was carrying it home in his mouth to eat it in peace. Now, on his way home he had to cross a plank lying across a running brook. As he crossed he looked down and saw his own shadow reflected in the water beneath. Thinking it was another dog with another piece of meat, he made up his mind to have that also. So he made a snap at the shadow in the water, but as he opened his mouth the piece of meat fell out, dropped into the water, and was never seen more. Beware lest you lose the substance by grasping at the shadow. [Applause.]

The country is in a highly prosperous condition to-day. To quote from a disinterested source, Mr. F. D. Warren, editor of the Socialist newspaper, the Appeal to Reason:

Measured by every standard of prosperity, the past four years have been the most prosperous in the history of the United States. Bank deposits have been greater; railroad earnings have been larger; dividends have been more regularly paid and of more generous proportions; working men, women, and children have been more steadily employed; wages have been higher than in any four-year period in the history of the Nation. The demand for farm products has grown enormously and at prices that have lined the purses of the fortunate land-owning farmer with gold and silver.

Why not be true conservationists? Why say to the farmers, manufacturers, and other producers, "Here's your hat. What's your hurry?" There is not a town or city in the United States that will not go to some expense to secure the location of factories, and sometimes they are even given bonuses, and most of the States have immigration agents or development commissioners who seek to bring in farmers. Why should the Nation have a different policy from a town, city, or State? Why not hold fast that which we have? It is much easier to destroy than to create. This does not mean that we should maintain the present tariff schedules. I speak as the representative of a large farming district and with some knowledge of the subject, as I have personally devoted some time to farming for several years. The farmers will not object to substantial reductions all along the line, but they naturally resent being converted into pack horses, and will vigorously denounce as time goes on the attempt to make them wholly responsible for the high cost of living. The farmers know, too, that the cost of living has been increasing all over the world. This bill practically puts grain and stock raisers' products on the free list. The most superficial examination of the agricultural schedule will show that.

In conclusion permit me to again quote President Wilson upon the subject of the tariff:

When we act we should act with caution and with prudence, like men who know what they are about and not like those in love with a theory.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. CLINE having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3321 and had directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess until 7.30 o'clock to-night.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 7.30 o'clock to-night.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 7.30 o'clock p. m. by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. CLINE].

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill—with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER].

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to represent in this House a part of the city of New York, the great metropolis of the western world and the chief market place for the products of the United States.

I have listened with great interest to the discussion during the past week and have noted with keen regret that in some of the speeches delivered there seems to have been a disposition to align the rest of the country against that great metropolis. This has been very strange to me, for I have always felt that the people of the great agricultural communities of the land depended upon us just as much as we do upon them. It has been well said, "That the riches of the country come out of the earth," and while that is true to a large degree, nevertheless, but for the market place where you might exchange your commodities and receive cash or its equivalent, your prosperity would amount to little. And so, at the mouth of the magnificent Hudson we have built up a great city of which every citizen of the United States should be duly proud. It has occurred to me that the prosperity of that city is the barometer of the success of the entire country; that through our gates from the rest of the world come the products of the other countries to be distributed throughout our land, and, again, through our gates goes the produce of the farm and the mill into our great ships and across the ocean to be delivered to all the rest of the civilized world. And so, when men have risen in their places both at this session and at other times to criticize our method of doing business and our magnificent success, it has seemed to me that they were attempting to injure in the eyes of the world that magnificent city, whose growth is unequaled in the history of time, whose standing is first as the greatest manufacturing city of the world, and which is to-day, or soon will be, the greatest financial city of any period.

Now, as I said a moment ago, what has been your prosperity has been ours, and I think it but fitting that I call the attention of the country to the development of that great city under the benign influence of a Republican tariff and the administration of that party here at the seat of government. I am going to give you just a few figures showing the great progress which has been made in the wealth and business of that great city. I submit the following. First, as to the amount of money deposited in our banks:

Deposits in savings banks, New York City, Jan. 1, 1898	$545,379,256
Deposits in trust companies in New York City	358,380,703
Deposits in State banks of deposit in New York City	189,046,695
Total deposits in national banks Dec. 17, 1896	528,003,025
	1,620,809,679
Deposits in savings banks, New York City, Dec. 31, 1912	1,167,322,204
Deposits in trust companies, New York City, Dec. 26, 1912	1,096,478,972
Deposits in State banks, New York City, Dec. 26, 1912	398,886,193
Total deposits in national banks Apr. 4, 1913	1,370,112,212
Total deposits in New York banks	4,032,779,581

You will observe that the savings banks deposits during 14 years have increased from $545,000,000 to $1,167,000,000, more than 100 per cent; and when I tell you that the savings banks are prohibited from receiving deposits from any one person exceeding $3,000, you can readily appreciate the fact that this gigantic increase in the savings of the people of a community is, in the end, the great evidence of its prosperity. In addition to this the total deposits in all the banks of the city have increased in the past 14 years from $1,620,809,679 to $4,032,779,581. This shows that in addition to the prosperity of the working people of our city the business men have prospered beyond anything to be dreamed of. Some one might say that the whole wealth of the country has come to us. This is not so, as I can demonstrate to you in a moment.

In December, 1896, the total deposits in all of the national banks of the country amounted to $2,142,556,399, while in February of this year the total deposits in the same banks amounted to $8,361,165,397, an increase of $6,218,608,998. An examination of the records will show that the proportionate increase of deposits in the national banks outside of New York City is greater than that in the great metropolis.

Now, as a further evidence of the development of the metropolis of America under a Republican tariff and a Republican administration at Washington, permit me to show the assessed valuation of the real property in that city. You will observe, beginning in the year 1900—

1900	$3,168,557,000
1905	5,221,582,000
1910	7,044,192,674
1912	7,861,898,890

You will observe that under a Republican administration at Washington the assessed valuation of the real estate in New York City has increased in the short space of 12 years over 150 per cent, or nearly $4,700,000,000.

I have here figures relative to the number and cost of the new buildings constructed in New York City from 1900 to 1912, inclusive:

Year.	Number.	Cost.
1900	6,281	$78,416,002
1901	7,655	145,892,583
1902	6,496	111,535,299
1903	7,502	112,326,826
1904	11,365	150,148,816
1905	17,359	244,648,193
1906	17,345	221,886,227
1907	16,162	179,050,346
1908	13,967	162,912,548
1909	19,190	254,061,035
1910	13,608	194,059,390
1911	13,770	178,098,154
1912	13,000	210,505,237
Total	163,700	2,244,140,675

These figures are startling when you stop to consider that we have constructed during the past 12 years in New York City over 163,700 buildings, and that over 100,000 of these buildings are dwelling houses for one and two families, and that of these 100,000 over 95 per cent were purchased by the people who occupy them. These houses are being purchased at from $4,000 to $7,000 from the savings of the mechanic, the clerk, and the small storekeeper.

Another evidence of the development of the city is the increase in post-office receipts. I have the figures here, beginning in 1900, which indicate that the post-office receipts in the city under a Republican tariff and a Republican administration have increased during the space of 12 years over $16,982,579, about 150 per cent:

1900	$11,129,379
1901	12,147,064
1902	13,597,881
1903	15,262,710
1904	16,524,563
1905	17,879,214
1906	19,715,808
1907	21,483,769
1908	21,525,484
1909	22,948,415
1910	25,485,349
1911	27,219,637
1912	28,111,958
Total	253,031,296

I might go on with innumerable instances. Let me cite the growth of the manufacturing industries taken from the Census Reports. In 1899 the number of people engaged in manufacturing industries in the city of New York were 432,000, and the value of their product was $1,172,877,000; the capital invested in these industries was $853,338,000. In 1904 the amount invested in the manufacturing industries of New York City was $1,100,000,000, and the salaries and wages paid amounted to over $220,000,000, the value of their product over $1,526,000,000, the number of men employed exceeded 530,000, while in 1909 the capital invested was $1,365,000,000, the value of the output was $2,029,000,000, the amount paid in salaries and wages was $445,000,000, and the number of men employed over 650,000. I can tell the story in no better way than to print from the Census Bulletin on Manufacturing, published in 1910, the following:

New York City is not only the leading city and the commercial center of the United States, but also the industrial metropolis, holding first place in the total value of manufactured products as well as in many individual industries. In 1909 the population of New York City was practically equal to that of the State of Ohio, and exceeded only by Pennsylvania, Illinois, and New York itself, but the value of its manufactured products exceeded that reported by any State except Pennsylvania and New York. This predominance in manufactures is closely connected with the abundant supply of labor, its large immigrant population being in particular an influential factor in causing manufacturing enterprises to locate there. New York City is the chief center of trade between the United States and Europe and also one of the principal distributing points for domestic trade. This commercial importance has also contributed greatly to the high rank of the city in manufacturing industries and to making New York the financial center of the United States, thereby rendering it easy to obtain capital for the establishment and extension of such industries.

Measured by the increase in value of manufactured products, the industrial development of New York City from 1904 to 1909 was greater than from 1899 to 1904, the increase being $503,169,570, or 33 per cent, for the period 1904–1909, and $353,652,745, or 30.2 per cent, for the period 1899–1904. During the more recent 5-year period the average number of wage earners in the manufacturing industries of the city increased 89,286, or 19.2 per cent, as compared with an increase of 76,130, or 19.6 per cent, for the earlier period. Of the 44,935 manufacturing establishments reported for the State in 1909, 25,938, or 57.7 per cent, were located in this city; the proportion for 1904 was 56 per cent, and for 1899, 53.5 per cent.

The establishments in New York City reported 55.2 per cent of the wage earners and 60.2 per cent of the value of products for the State in 1909, as compared with 54.2 per cent and 61.3 per cent, respectively, in 1904. The value of the city's manufactures represented 9.8 per cent of the total value of manufactured products for the United States in 1909 and 10.3 per cent in 1904. Of the 243 industry classifications employed in compiling the 1909 statistics for manufactures of the State, 217 were represented in this city, 131 of which covered industries with products valued at more than $1,000,000.

There were 21 industries in New York City in 1909 for which a value of products in excess of $20,000,000 was reported. For two of these industries, the refining of cane sugar and the smelting and refining of copper, statistics can not be presented separately without disclosing the operations of individual establishments. The other 19 industries, arranged in order of value of products, are indicated in the following tabular statement, which shows the absolute and relative increase in this respect between 1904 and 1909, and also the percentage which the value of products for each industry represents of the corresponding total for the State:

Industry.	Value of products: 1909.			
	Amount.	Per cent of total for the State.	Increase over 1904.	
			Amount.	Per cent.
Clothing, women's	$260,477,000	97.8	$98,058,000	58.2
Clothing, men's, including shirts	218,411,000	82.1	68,927,000	46.1
Printing and publishing	183,509,000	84.6	45,007,000	32.5
Slaughtering and meat packing	95,862,000	75.4	39,924,000	71.4
Foundry and machine-shop products	63,853,000	41.4	5,916,000	10.2
Tobacco manufactures	62,488,000	81.5	11,903,000	23.7
Bread and other bakery products	61,904,000	71.8	17,904,000	40.7
Liquors, malt	53,469,000	68.8	10,301,000	23.9
Millinery and lace goods	51,239,000	98.3	18,896,000	58.4
Fur goods	39,874,000	96.5	14,595,000	57.7
Gas, illuminating and heating	34,117,000	80.6	4,402,000	14.8
Paint and varnish	26,664,000	93.4	3,824,000	16.8
Musical instruments, pianos and organs, and materials	25,516,000	75.8	6,586,000	34.8
Furnishing goods, men's	25,496,000	60.4	8,883,000	53.5
Patent medicines and compounds and druggists' preparations	24,984,000	66.9	6,868,000	37.9
Lumber and timber products	24,122,000	33.3	2,903,000	13.7
Copper, tin, and sheet-iron products	23,303,000	60.6	5,914,000	34.0
Artificial flowers and feathers and plumes	21,098,000	99.7	17,132,000	432.0
Confectionery	20,062,000	78.6	6,017,000	42.8

It will be noted that for five of the industries included in the preceding tabular statement more than 90 per cent of the total value of products for the State was reported from New York City, the proportion rising as high as 99.7 per cent in the case of the manufacture of artificial flowers and feathers and plumes. In seven other industries the establishments located in New York City contributed more than three-fourths of the total value of products for the State. For only two industries included in the table—the foundry and machine shop and the lumber industries—was less than one-half of the total value of products for the State reported from New York City.

The leading industries in New York City in 1909 were the making of women's clothing and of men's clothing. There were 5,521 establishments in the two industries combined, which gave employment to an average of 161,400 wage earners and manufactured products valued at $484,888,000. The printing and publishing industry was next in importance, with 2,883 establishments, 48,322 wage earners, and products valued at $183,509,000. The value of the products of the three industries just mentioned represented 32.9 per cent of the total value of manufactured products for the city, and they employed 37.9 per cent of the average number of wage earners engaged in all manufacturing industries.

In addition to the 118 industries presented separately for New York City in Table I, page 62, there were 99 others which for various reasons are included under the head of "All other industries." Some of these industries were among the most important in the city, 36 reporting products in 1909 exceeding $1,000,000 in value. These industries are: Awnings, tents, and sails; babbitt metal and solder; bags, other than paper; baking powders and yeast; billiard tables and materials; chocolate and cocoa products; cloth, sponging and refinishing; cordials and sirups; cork, cutting; dentists' materials; dyestuffs and extracts; flavoring extracts; flour-mill and gristmill products; glue; grease and tallow; hat and cap materials; hats, straw; iron and steel, steel works and rolling mills; iron and steel forgings; labels and tags; lapidary work; liquors, distilled; mineral and soda waters; moving pictures; mucilage and paste; oil, linseed; oil, not elsewhere specified; oilcloth and linoleum; paper patterns; pencils, lead; petroleum, refining; signs and advertising novelties; smelting and refining, copper; sugar refining, not including beet sugar; tin foil; wire. Of these, 4 reported products valued at $10,000,000 or over; 6, products between $5,000,000 and $10,000,000 in value; and 26, products between $1,000,000 and $5,000,000 in value.

Of the five boroughs which form New York City, the Borough of Manhattan is the most important industrially, the value of the manufactured products reported by the establishments within its limits in 1909 constituting 68.4 per cent of the total for the entire city. The proportions of the total contributed by the other boroughs in that year were as follows: Brooklyn, 20.6 per cent; Queens, 7.5 per cent; the Bronx, 2.1 per cent; and Richmond, 1.5 per cent. Each borough made substantial gains from 1904 to 1909 in all items covered by the manufactures statistics, with the single exception that the Borough of Richmond shows a decrease in the number of proprietors and firm members. The relative increase in value of products was much greater in the Boroughs of Richmond and Queens, however, than in the city as a whole, while in the Borough of Brooklyn it was considerably less, the percentages of increase being as follows: New York City, 33; Borough of Richmond, 76.1; Borough of Queens, 63.2; Borough of Brooklyn, 11.7; and the Boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx combined, 37.2. The leading industries in the Borough of Manhattan were to a large extent the same as those previously enumerated for the city as a whole, while in the Borough of Brooklyn refined sugar was the leading product; in the Borough of Queens, smelted and refined copper; in the Borough

of the Bronx, pianos and organs and materials; and in the Borough of Richmond, soap.

The totals presented for New York City do not include the statistics for three establishments operated by the Federal Government, namely, the United States navy yard, with 3,622 wage earners and products valued at $7,032,416 in 1909; the United States naval clothing factory, with 96 wage earners and products valued at $670,198, located in Brooklyn; and the United States Lighthouse Establishment, with 60 wage earners and products, such as illuminating and signal apparatus and machinery and other lighthouse supplies, valued at $995,745, located at Tompkinsville, in the Borough of Richmond.

I have often wondered if the gentlemen who have written this tariff bill—mostly lawyers, men who have had little to do with the business of the country, men who have not had to brush shoulders with the everyday workingmen, men who have not had to solve the problems of business—were competent to prepare legislation of this character which deals with the business of the everyday life. I am an employer of labor, and a man once said to me that I could not be a friend of the workingman because I employed him. Study the business problem of New York City, consult the workingmen themselves, the real workingmen, not some of the demagogues who claim to lead them, the man who labors himself, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred he will tell you that his employer is his best friend. Their interests are one. In our city in the past 15 years there has been an average increase in compensation among the working people of at least 40 per cent, and while it is true that prices have increased in proportion, nevertheless, the people of that city are more prosperous than at any time in the history of the country, and to-day if a man will make the least effort it is easier to save money out of his wages than ever before. I might go into detail and discuss this bill, which I am fearful will bring disaster to our city and the country.

Take, for instance, the lumber schedule. I am a builder. I construct from 50 to 100 houses every year in the city of New York. I am what you might call the ultimate consumer. I buy the lumber and cut up and put it in buildings. Now, when the Payne tariff bill was under discussion I thought perhaps there was something to a reduction of the duty on lumber, and I went home and talked to the lumber merchants in my city and asked them if the duty on lumber was reduced would any benefit come to me, and then to the people to whom I sold and rented my houses. The men to whom I talked said "Absolutely not," that the very moment we reduced the duty on lumber that moment the Canadian would raise the price. And so he did. The very next day after the Payne bill became a law the Canadian raised his price. I tell you, frankly, my friends, that the people of New York City have not received a particle of advantage from that reduction. Now, as to the further reduction under the Underwood bill. When I was home in New York last week I talked with several of these gentlemen and they advised me that they had made contracts for the fall, and that their arrangements with the Canadians provided that they shall divide the duty. The Canadian puts his price up one-half and the lumber merchant gets the other half. I am making contracts myself for lumber to be delivered this fall, and I have asked the same question and have been informed that the price to me will be the very same as it was this spring. Now, this is a situation I know myself. We are going to reduce the duty on lumber and convey the impression to the people that they are going to get cheaper homes. Can anything be more silly?

Take the sugar problem. The great sugar refiners of this country—and I know whereof I speak—are very much pleased at the prospect of reducing the duty on sugar. I know an officer of one of the great refineries. He is delighted at the prospect. I asked him whether he thought the consumer would get any benefit. He reminded me of the time previous to the Spanish War when the duty was placed on coffee. We bought it then at 28 cents a pound. The duty was taken off after the war, and we are now paying 35 cents for the same coffee. Sugar will be exactly the same. The duty will be divided between the foreign sugar planter and the refiner. The United States Treasury will lose the revenue, and the consumer will not get sugar cheaper but in some way will be compelled to make up the deficit in the Treasury caused by putting this commodity on the free list.

Let me refer to the ready-made clothing. I talked to a gentleman, who is the principal owner of one of the largest stores in New York, since this tariff bill was reported. I said to him: "Is it a fact that you will be able to sell your $10 suit of all-wool clothing for about $8?" He said, "No; it will sell for the same price, but we will give you better wool." "Do you not advertise at present that this $10 suit is of all wool?" "Yes," he replied, "but the new wool suit will be better grade." "Will it wear much longer?" "Well, maybe not, but it would be better." And so I talked to a prominent tailor in my city along the same lines. I asked him if the $25 suit of clothes he has been making a specialty of would be any cheaper. He said, "No"; but he thought it would be a better grade of goods, but did not expect it would be sold any cheaper. I talked to another of the leading tailors in New York City. I asked him if he was going to be able to sell his $35 suit of clothes and $40 overcoat cheaper. "No," he said, "but you will get a finer grade of wool." And so, on every hand there is the same excuse, showing the consumer will get nothing except the glad hand. They tell you of better material, but never any saving in price. They reduced the duty on cheap gloves. Did the people here benefit? No. The makers abroad raised the price.

I have made inquiry relative to the total valuation of imports and exports from the city of New York and from the United States from the days of the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill down to last year, and propose inserting the same in the RECORD.

Imports into and exports from New York and the total United States, respectively, with duties collected on imports during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1895, to 1912, inclusive.

Fiscal years, June 30.	Imports.				Exports.	
	New York.		Total United States.		New York.	Total United States.
	Value.	Duty.	Value.	Duty.	Value.	Value.
	Dollars.	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*
1895	477,741,128	101,750,165	731,162,090	147,901,218	325,580,062	807,538,165
1896	499,932,792	106,666,185	759,694,084	156,104,598	354,274,941	882,606,938
1897	480,603,580	118,365,076	789,251,030	171,779,194	391,679,907	1,050,993,556
1898	402,281,050	100,424,617	587,153,700	144,258,563	445,515,794	1,231,482,330
1899	465,559,650	134,071,173	685,441,892	200,873,429	459,444,217	1,227,023,302
1900	537,237,282	150,153,068	830,519,252	228,364,556	518,834,471	1,394,483,082
1901	527,259,906	150,330,669	807,763,301	232,641,499	529,592,978	1,487,764,991
1902	559,930,849	163,606,071	899,793,754	250,550,428	490,361,695	1,381,719,401
1903	618,705,662	178,852,021	1,007,960,110	279,779,587	505,829,694	1,420,141,679
1904	600,171,033	168,677,030	981,822,559	257,392,055	506,808,013	1,460,827,271
1905	679,629,256	170,570,029	1,087,118,133	257,898,130	524,726,005	1,518,561,666
1906	734,350,823	192,985,952	1,213,417,649	293,557,984	607,160,314	1,743,804,590
1907	853,696,952	217,127,610	1,415,402,285	329,121,659	627,949,857	1,880,851,078
1908	688,215,938	184,235,337	1,183,120,665	282,273,432	701,062,913	1,809,773,346
1909	779,308,944	195,008,723	1,281,641,735	294,377,360	607,239,481	1,663,011,104
1910	935,990,958	214,686,318	1,547,109,137	326,263,093	651,986,356	1,744,984,720
1911	881,592,689	200,818,397	1,527,945,652	309,581,944	772,552,449	2,049,320,199
1912	975,744,320	194,752,639	1,640,722,902	304,597,035	817,945,803	2,204,322,469

It will be observed that in the year 1895 the total value of imports into the United States was $731,000,000, and the duty collected on these imports was nearly $148,901,000, while the value of the exports was $807,538,000, in all over $76,000,000 more than the imports. Under the Payne tariff bill the imports last year were $1,614,722,000, and the duty paid thereon was $304,597,000. As against this the exports last year were $2,204,000,000. These figures show that the exports have increased during the past 17 years nearly 300 per cent, in amount equal to $1,400,000,000; and in the same period the imports have increased $900,000,000, and the duty on these imports under the Payne bill has more than doubled the amount paid under the Wilson-Gorman Act, proving conclusively that not only has the Payne Tariff Act been a revenue producer but it has invited foreign competition. To say that it is prohibitive and that it has restricted trade seems to me to be a statement that is not borne out by facts; and, furthermore, these figures show that 60 per cent of all these imports have come through the city of New York and that 40 per cent of the exports have passed through the same port.

I could discuss nearly every schedule submitted in almost the same way, and I have come to the conclusion that after all is said and done this bill in question will work disaster to that great metropolis, which is the pulse beat of the Nation. I have tried to discuss this with my colleagues. We are here 21 Members from Greater New York—my Bull Moose friend, Mr. CHANDLER, who, I am informed, will vote against this measure, and the 19 Democrats, who have apparently banded themselves together to vote for it despite the outcome. I have been waiting patiently to hear one of them get up in his place and defend the great manufacturing industries of their city, but up to this moment have failed to hear one of them say a word along these lines. I am enough of a patriot to express the hope that this measure will not work great disaster to our people; but if I am to judge by the views of nearly every man I meet when I return to my home they are viewing this whole problem with apprehension. I have conscientiously sought advice on the subject to get my bearings.

In this connection I wish to insert in the RECORD a number of communications I have received, particularly one from Mr. Julian D. Fairchild, president of the Kings County Trust Co., of Brooklyn, one of our leading citizens and a great student of business, and, besides, treasurer of the regular Democratic Party in Brooklyn.

KINGS COUNTY TRUST CO.,
Brooklyn, N. Y., April 17, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter is received, inclosing copy of the new tariff and income-tax bill, regarding which you ask my views.

While favoring a moderate reduction of import duties, I should be very sorry to see this bill become a law in its present shape. The old Wilson bill of 1893 was a radical one. Its effect on trade and commerce was so disastrous that it was repealed. The proposed bill is even more drastic and destructive.

This country is not now as well able to withstand unwise tariff legislation as it was in 1893. In 1890 the total population of the United States was about 63,000,000. In 1910 it was nearly 92,000,000. In 1890, 63 per cent of the population tilled the soil, worked the mines, and managed the ranches, and only 37 per cent lived in the cities as manufacturers, traders, and laborers. In 1910 only 45 per cent of the population were agriculturists, while 55 per cent were traders and consumers. The consequence of this tremendous shift of population within the short space of 20 years is not generally realized.

Modern immigration is rapidly changing us from a community of farmers, miners, and ranchmen to a nation of traders, clerks, and laborers. Is not the high cost of living due to this shift of population from the farm to the city rather than to the tariff, combinations of capital, or the increased production of gold?

And is it wise finance or good business on the part of Congress to sacrifice over fifty millions of certain revenue in order to give the public the uncertain benefit of free sugar? It does not follow that free sugar will result in cheaper sugar. The actual outlook seems to be that the inevitable closing down of many of our beet-sugar plants will enable not only the foreign producer but the remaining domestic producers to increase prices coincident with the decreased supply. Everyone knows that control of a product means control of its price.

The same objection, in principle, applies to free wool. With the duty off, the price of wool would promptly drop and gradually become lower and lower, until there would be no profit in raising domestic sheep. At the same time, because of the decreasing supply, the price of wool—and mutton, too—would steadily advance with the curtailment of the sheep ranches. This being so, it would seem that the only ultimate beneficiaries of free wool would be foreign sheep raisers and foreign woolen manufacturers, with their cheap labor.

We have already tried the kind of tariff proposed by this bill. The result was harmful. Why try it again? Such radical changes all down the list would certainly cause some industries to shut down, others to work on reduced time, and the consequence will be commercial failures, business depression, and widespread suffering for labor.

The bill concedes that the reduced duties would so largely decrease the Government's income that some other source of revenue must be found in order to make up the deficit. The framers of this bill—who are undoubtedly honest in their opinions—evidently believe that by taxing incomes of over $4,000 this deficiency burden would be cast upon those well able to bear it. That remains to be seen.

From my business experience I venture to predict that if this bill is enacted in its present form the Government will not only lose its sugar and wool revenues, but that the public will not receive the anticipated benefit from the reduction. Tariff duties should be reduced only on such merchandise and material as can plainly stand the reduction, and without appreciably lessening Federal revenues or unsettling general business.

Furthermore, it seems to me that the income tax may be resented as class legislation and found to be premature, expensive, and uncertain. Would it not have been wiser not to have brought this tax forward at this time, but to have reserved it for future requirements when found to be absolutely necessary? Any deficiency in revenue resulting from a just reduction of the tariff could be readily made up by a small stamp tax upon checks, legal and commercial documents, proprietary medicines, and like articles. Such a tax, equally, widely, and justly distributed, would produce the necessary deficiency revenue, be inexpensively collected, and be generally acquiesced in.

Respectfully, yours,

JULIAN D. FAIRCHILD.

This gentleman has always contributed largely to Democratic support and he believed in the candidacy of President Wilson last year and believed he was voting for a conservative tariff measure. His letter covers the ground fully and I would like every Member of the House to read it. I propose also to take advantage of the leave to print by inserting in the RECORD a number of letters from business men, manufacturers, and workingmen of the city of New York. In relation to this measure let me suggest to my colleagues from the metropolis, before it is too late, not to take the chance of plunging the great rank and file of the people into distress and disaster. There are men in this very room who will vote for this measure, but will do so with great misgiving. I know of several Members of this House from New York City who have said to me that, while they feel bound by their party caucus to support this bill, they are fearful of its outcome.

Mr. Chairman, I have just laid before the committee a short statement of the effect of the legislation upon the city of New York. I have tried to show how that great city has developed as a result of the prosperity of the country. I want to impress upon the House, in concluding, just the idea that the city of New York wants the whole country to know that it is exceedingly friendly, that our interests are common, that where you succeed it is our success, and that when we are prosperous and doing well we want you to be likewise. Perchance at times you may feel that some men and some interests have sought to make more than they are justly entitled to of the profits of the country. If there are any such men or interests, the good people of our city will join you in condemning them.

Let us go on together developing our great country with its great advantages and great mineral and agricultural wealth, and come again to our market place with your products. We will dispose of them and give you back the products of the mills and the skill and labor of the workingman.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank the House for the attention which it has given, and trust I have said something which has given some information on this important subject.

ROCKWOOD & CO.,
MANUFACTURERS OF COCOAS AND CHOCOLATES,
Brooklyn, N. Y., April 17, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: On the 15th instant we forwarded you a telegram, a copy of which we give herewith:

"It is impossible for the cocoa and chocolate industry in this country to prosper or even hold its own under the proposed new tariff. An examination of the facts will readily show this. Eight per cent duty is entirely inadequate when comparing American wages with foreign wages, to say nothing of many other factors."

May we have some expression of opinion from you as to the likelihood of the proposed tariff on chocolate and cocoa being carried into effect on the basis proposed; that is, 8 per cent on all manufactured chocolate and cocoa?

The industry in this country has been severely competitive for a good many years, and particularly so for the past few years. There is not the slightest evidence of any excess of prosperity, and there is every evidence that the public have been supplied with cocoa and chocolates upon a basis of extremely close margin.

If there were duty on raw material—that is, the cocoa bean—and that duty was taken off and, at the same time, the duty on the manufacture was also partly reduced, it would not be such a severe proposition, and, besides that, it would very probably effect a reduced cost to the consumer without injuring the industry in this country and without hurting the interests of the thousands of employees who derive their livelihood from work in this industry.

Almost everything that goes into the manufactured chocolate, excepting the cocoa bean, is brought into the country under a high tariff, and labor is to be paid for at about twice the rates paid in the countries in Europe where chocolate is largely manufactured. Even England, a practically free-trade country, has a duty of 4 cents per pound on manufactured cocoa, which is, on an average, not far from 20 to 25 per cent on the imported goods. Germany, France, Holland, and Spain, as well as Italy and Austria, all have higher rates of duty on chocolates and cocoas. It may therefore be said that the proposed reduction would in no way help the industry in this country to export goods to other countries, but would lay it open to unequal competition in this country. The foreign manufacturer gets a rebate from his Government, and with cheap labor and almost everything else cheap he will be able to ship goods to this country at a less price than they can be profitably produced here.

To our minds it is evident that such a tariff as is proposed will force the manufacturers in this country to lower the wages of their employees. In no sense could this be intended as a retaliation; it simply means that in order to keep their factories going and to compete in any sense with the foreigner their pay rolls would have to be largely lessened.

Aside from the regular competition with the foreign manufacturer, we have to contend also with the manufacturers who, finding business in their own country not sufficient to keep their factories going, will resort to the shipment of goods to the United States at even less than cost. We, in turn, could not resort to any such methods because of the high duties on the other side.

We believe it is not very well known that competition among the manufacturers in the United States on chocolates and cocoas has been so keen that only the very smallest margins of profit have been reaped in an industry that might expect a reasonable margin owing to the large investments necessary; in other words, the public have been buyers of cocoas and chocolates at an abnormally low rate, considering the expense of manufacturing in this country.

We do not believe that the administration would favor the carrying through of such a reduction in tariff as is proposed if the facts were really known.

We ask such assistance as you can give us consistent with bringing the actual facts before Congress and the President, so that a mistake will not be made which will be disastrous to the general chocolate and cocoa industry in this country.

Very respectfully,

ROCKWOOD & CO.,
WALLACE T. JONES,
President.

BROOKLYN, *April 25, 1913.*

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER,
Representative Sixth Congressional District,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As the Representative in Congress from the district in which I reside, I wish to call your attention to the effects which would follow the proposed reduction of the duty on manufactured cocoa and chocolate under the bill known as the Underwood bill now before the House.

The manufacturers now find it difficult to compete with the product of the foreign low-priced labor; and if the duty on manufactured cocoa and chocolate should be reduced from 2½ cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem to 8 per cent ad valorem as provided in Schedule G of the proposed bill, many of them will have to close down their plants and discharge their employees. I am employed by one such manufacturer, and on behalf of myself and others interested I ask you to oppose such change in the duty, to protect such employees against the loss of their positions which would result from such change.

Yours, respectfully,

DONALD B. WILSHEAR.

FOLLMER, CLOGG & CO.,
MANUFACTURERS OF UMBRELLAS, PARASOLS, AND CANES,
New York, N. Y., April 10, 1913.

Mr. WILLIAM M. CALDER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CALDER: Among the proposed tariff changes umbrellas and parasols are reduced from 50 per cent to 30 per cent, while the silks and unions pay 45 per cent. Now, it surely must have been an over-

sight to give a preference of 15 per cent to the foreign manufacturers and handicap the American makers by having the completed article 15 per cent lower than the component parts.

If this were passed, it would close up our factory.

Yours, truly,

L. J. ARATA.

C. J. TAGLIABUE MFG. CO.,
INSTRUMENTS FOR INDICATING, RECORDING, AND CONTROLLING TEMPERATURE AND PRESSURE,
Brooklyn, N. Y., April 22, 1913.

Hon. W. M. CALDER,
Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: Herewith we wish to express ourselves as opposed to any legislation that would be disastrous to the domestic beet and cane sugar industries.

Without doubt, free sugar will require your consideration shortly in the present tariff agitation, and we hope you will oppose the measure.

The domestic sugar companies at present expend some $75,000,000 annually, and free sugar would result, we believe, in at least materially cutting down such expenditure, if not wiping it out almost altogether. To offset this amount will only mean that more money originating with the American consumer will have to go to foreign countries for raw sugar.

Also our merchant marine would be injured by not having the present return cargoes of raw sugar from United States insular possessions.

Thanking you in advance for giving your earnest consideration to this protest, we are,

Yours, very truly,

C. J. TAGLIABUE MFG. CO.
C. J. TAGLIABUE, *President.*

D. SAUNDERS' SONS (INC.),
MANUFACTURERS OF PIPE THREADING AND CUTTING MACHINERY, ALSO HAND TOOLS,
Yonkers, N. Y., April 10, 1913.

Hon W. M. CALDER,
Congressman from New York, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We write to protest against the proposed lowering of the sugar tariff as affecting the beet-sugar industry of this country, which has grown from a small beginning to relatively large proportions, and if given proper protection would expand very much further. We accordingly urge that any action you may take in the matter of the tariff question as affecting this industry will be such as will be favorable to the continuance and development of the same.

Also, as manufacturers of machinery, we object to any reduction of tariff on machine tools, as certainly it can not be expected that the American workingman should be brought to the same standard of wages and living as the mechanics abroad, and this, we believe, would be the inevitable result of any material reduction in the tariff on machinery and machine tools at this time.

Feeling assured that you will find the sentiments as here expressed to be in keeping with the majority of those whom you may hear from on this subject, we remain,

Yours, respectfully,

D. SAUNDERS' SONS (INC.),
Per W. L. SAUNDERS,
Vice President.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 12, 1913.*

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a member of the Photo-Gelatine Workers' Union of America, and as one of the constituents of the seventeenth assembly district, of which you are the Representative, I respectfully ask you to use all means at your command to prevent the lowering of the tariff on imported pictures or any other goods produced by the photogelatine process.

The reasons for asking you to do so are many, and all are of equal importance to the welfare and further development of the photogelatine process in this country, an industry which, at its best, can only be considered as being in a state of infancy.

Furthermore, should the tariff be lowered on the goods as above mentioned, it would be impossible for our employers to compete with the foreign producers, and consequently they would be compelled either to abandon the industry or reduce our wages to such an extent as to almost deprive us of a decent livelihood, to which we as American citizens are justly entitled.

Any further information you may desire on this subject you will find in the printed testimony before the Ways and Means Committee under the title "Schedule M."

In conclusion, I respectfully urge you again to protect this infant American industry of ours, for by so doing you will not only protect our homes but assure us a prosperous and bright future.

With the assurance of my gratitude and high esteem, I remain,

Yours, very respectfully,

FRANK GREENQUIST.

THE MOEHLE LITHOGRAPHIC CO.,
Brooklyn, April 18, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In submitting herewith, for your kind consideration, a petition of our employees, to whom a full work week with American standard of wages is most essential, we beg to state, in our own behalf, that the American industry of lithography has not become rich and opulent and indolent behind a high "protective tariff wall."

For half a lifetime, to the writer's personal knowledge, it has been a struggle against an avalanche of importations from Europe, chiefly from Germany, and if anyone in the lithographic line has realized more than fair returns for his labor and other investments, he has been very fortunate.

The present Payne-Aldrich bill does not equalize the difference between the German and American standard of wages, cost of raw material, and overhead expenses, and in consequence German lithographed merchandise is being used in this country to a great extent, keeping many American presses idle.

The proposed Underwood tariff on lithography will simply flood the country with European importations. It will mean reduced time for our employees and possibly a decrease in wages. All in all, this feature of the Underwood bill apparently has not received careful and business-like consideration, and we appeal to you not to deprive us of the small legitimate returns we are entitled to for our labor and investment.

There should not be the slightest reduction from the present rate, and the duty, whatever it may be, should be specific instead of an ad valorem duty as proposed by Mr. UNDERWOOD, which duty has proved in the past to be the means of a great many intentional and unintentional undervaluations.

Respectfully,

THE MOEHLE LITHOGRAPHIC CO.,
C. E. MOEHLE, *President.*

Protest signed by over 500 employees.

BROOKLYN, *April 19, 1913.*

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER, M. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I am employed as a stipple artist in the Moehle Lithograph Co., of Flatbush, and am aware of the danger that the lithographic industry is put in by the proposed Underwood tariff bill. It will mean the destruction of the lithographic industry of our country if the bill is passed, and therefore ask of you to favor me by doing your utmost by protecting my trade, at which I have been working for over 20 years, and could not very well go at something else or leave my country to work in Germany, where the biggest part of the work will go. Even now, with the protection we have, almost $6,000 worth of lithographic work comes in daily from Europe. As an American and as a Republican brother I appeal to you to use all your influence in giving the lithographic industry protection, so that the many men and women employed therein will be able to make a living.

Thanking you for your favor in advance, and wishing you success, I am,

Very respectfully,

CONRAD F. KROMM.

BROOKLYN, *April 19, 1913.*

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER,
United States Congress.

DEAR SIR: As the tariff is to be taken up by Congress and revised, I beg to call your attention to lithography, as I am making a living by it.

If the tariff is reduced on cigar labels, cigar bands, and other lithographs it will put us out of work, because in Europe they work 54 to 60 hours per week, while we work 48 hours, and the wages paid in Europe is only one-half of what is paid in the United States. So you see how easy it would be for Europe to sell their lithographs here with a lower tariff, while we have nothing to do.

Trusting you will give this your careful consideration and do your utmost to protect us, I remain,

Sincerely, yours,

AUGUST S. BROWN.

HENRY F. BIRGEL, LITHOGRAPHER,
New York, April 22, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The present tariff on the lithographed products does not give sufficient protection against foreign competition. The lithographic industry, even with an adequate tariff protection, is not as profitable as other American industries.

The Underwood tariff revision would mean idle machinery, workmen thrown out of jobs, wages cut to almost nothing, longer hours. In short, it would be so disastrous that the American lithographer could not exist.

We therefore request that you exert your influence to protect with an adequate tariff the American lithographer.

Yours, respectfully,

HENRY F. BIRGEL.
THEODORE H. BIRGEL.

ALLIED PRINTING TRADES COUNCIL OF NEW YORK STATE,
New York, April 17, 1913.

Hon. W. M. CALDER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: The proposed tariff bill, after an extensive investigation by the Ways and Means Committee, is now under consideration.

Schedule M is the one affecting the printing industry and under which heading the following parts of the printing industry will be affected: Photo-engraving, electrotyping, stereotyping, composition, presswork, and bookbinding.

The paragraphs of the bill which will affect us are 337, 341, and paragraph 427 of the free list. As to paragraphs 337 and 341, we are opposed to any reduction. The rate at present is 25 per cent and it is proposed to reduce it to 15 per cent.

The competition with the improved American machinery which is being used on the other side, the longer hours, and lower wages is even a menace to-day to the printing interest of this State, and we hope that you will be able to use your influence in every way to prevent any reduction.

The printing industry is the second largest in this State, and you can therefore appreciate what this means in the event that a large number of our people are thrown out of employment. There are over 35,000 members of our unions in the State of New York, all of whom will be affected in the event the proposed reduction goes into effect. If a small percentage of these are thrown out of employment, it will mean that they will be competing with the others, with the result that we may not be able to continue to enjoy the conditions we have at present and can not take advantage of the lower cost of living in the future, which, at the best, is a very doubtful question as to how this will really affect the consumer.

Thanking you for your serious consideration to this question, I remain,

Yours, very truly,

DAVID A. WALSH,
Secretary-Treasurer.

E. B. MOORE & CO.,
DISTRIBUTORS OF TEXTILES,
New York, April 16, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CALDER: By way of introduction I would say that I live at 574 Fifth Street, Brooklyn, and have voted for you from this residence. I am also a nephew of Mr. Frederick W. Singleton and have had the pleasure of meeting you, though my name might have escaped your memory.

I have taken the liberty of writing you regarding the changes in the tariff proposed in Schedule K.

I am a member of the above firm, who are largely interested in mills making woolen cloths, which business will be greatly affected by the tariff changes.

The bill as introduced calls for a duty of 35 per cent on cloth, which I sincerely believe will not give us a fighting chance to compete with the low-priced labor of Europe, and I also believe that under a duty of 50 per cent the benefits to all of the people would be just as great as under the 35 per cent rate, and in addition to that it would mean a fighting chance for over a million of our citizens who are directly interested in the textile business.

There is another feature of the bill which as a business man you will appreciate. In the operation of our plants it is necessary for us to carry in raw material and goods in process of manufacture an amount equal to one-quarter of our yearly production. In addition to this it is necessary for us to arrange by contract for raw material 30 to 60 days ahead of its delivery.

Under these circumstances you can readily see that if the duties under the new tariff law on our raw material, wool, and our finished product, cloth, are made effective at the same time there will be a shrinkage in the value of goods in process equal to the reduction in duty. It is impossible for us to avoid this without running out the entire stock at the mill and starting afresh at the time that the duty becomes effective.

As I remember, the provision of the bill passed by the last Congress and vetoed by President Taft provided for a duty on the finished article to become effective on January 1, 1913, or five months after the signing of the bill, giving us time to work off our raw material purchased at high prices and to fill the machinery with material bought at a lower price.

I trust that this situation will appeal to your business judgment, and that you will use every effort to at least have the date of the duty on cloth put as becoming effective five months after the date of the signing of the bill.

I understand that a movement is already on foot in Congress along this line, and I sincerely hope that you will use your own efforts in favor of this change.

With best wishes,

Yours, truly,

LOUIS F. SINGLETON.

—

BAER BROTHERS,
MANUFACTURERS OF BRONZE POWDERS,
New York, April 22, 1913.

Hon. W. M. CALDER,
United States Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In our telegram of yesterday we pointed out to you that the bronze-powder trade in this country is evenly divided up. Germany at the present time supplies this market with one-half of this article, and the other half is made by the American bronze-powder factories.

The proposed revision from 12 cents per pound to 25 per cent ad valorem duty will positively give the entire bronze trade of this country to Germany and necessitate the closing up of the American factories.

We hardly believe that it is your desire to legislate us out of business.

Respectfully, yours,

BAER BROS.

—

J. LEE SMITH & CO.,
IMPORTERS AND MANUFACTURERS, DRY PAINTS,
New York, April 16, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CALDER: You have often written me that if at any time you could do anything for me in Washington you would be very glad to do so.

The proposed new tariff bill makes no discrimination in the ad valorem duty on ocher, umber, and sienna between the crude and powdered state. We believe that this was an oversight when framing the bill.

Our large plant in Brooklyn depends mostly upon the powdering of the crude goods, which we import in large quantities.

We have written direct to-day to our esteemed President and to Congressman UNDERWOOD, and we inclose you a copy of the letter. If you can bring this matter directly to the attention of Mr. UNDERWOOD and use any influence to cause a change or partial change in the duty as outlined in the inclosed letter, I shall appreciate it very much.

With kindest regards, I remain,

Very truly, yours,

SINCLAIR SMITH.

—

J. LEE SMITH & CO.,
IMPORTERS AND MANUFACTURERS,
New York, April 16, 1913.

Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,
Chairman of Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C..

SIR: In the proposed new tariff bill as reported in "Schedule A, chemicals, oils, and paints," the duty on ocher and ochery earths, sienna and sienna earths, and umber and umber earths is 5 per cent ad valorem in both the crude and powdered state. It costs abroad an average of 52 cents to powder a hundred pounds of these materials and in this country $1.06. This results that it costs 54 cents more to do the work here, on account of the high cost of labor, etc., than it does to do the work in Europe.

Your proposed tariff bill allows less than 3 cents per hundred pounds to compensate the manufacturer in this country for 54 cents increased cost. Unless the grinder here be protected by a greater ad valorem duty on the powdered material it will result that all these goods will be powdered abroad, thus causing the closing of all factories now depending upon this industry, with consequent loss to the laborer as well as the manufacturer.

To equalize the higher cost of manufacturing in this country there should be at least an ad valorem duty of 25 per cent on the powdered goods, if the crude goods are to pay an advalorem duty of 5 per cent.

The present tariff bill gives a protection of 25 cents per hundred, which is inadequate and has resulted for years past in the powdered goods being freely sold in this market. Bearing this fact in mind, how can the manufacturer here hope to compete with a protection of less than 3 cents per hundred pounds?

As one of the largest grinders of these goods in this country, we trust that you may see the justice of altering the proposed bill to a 5 per cent ad valorem duty on ocher and ochery earths, sienna and sienna earths, and umber and umber earths when crude or not powdered, washed, or pulverized, increasing the ad valorem duty to at least 25 per cent when powdered, washed, or pulverized.

As there are no umbers or siennas mined in this country that can favorably compete with those imported it is only reasonable that our manufacturing plants and workmen should receive the benefit of the powdering of the goods. We remain,

Very respectfully, yours,

J. LEE SMITH & CO.

—

JAMES CHIEVES & CO.,
IMPORTERS AND JOBBERS,
New York, April 18, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The writer, a former neighbor of yours in the old days of Thirteenth Street and who is still a resident of your district, takes the liberty to communicate with you in the matter pertaining to the tariff which is now before Congress.

We are importers of cereal products, and if the duty is reduced as contemplated and the tariff becomes a law the day after passage we would be heavy losers. Business has been at a standstill for several months and many of we importers have stock on hand. We should be entitled to a few months' time after the new tariff is ratified to dispose of our goods without severe loss. Consequently we are writing you to lend your effort in having Congress to give a reasonable time after the passage before the new duty goes into effect. This is nothing but fair to the business man, and we shall hope that our request is not far from your views.

With all best wishes for your success, we are,

Yours, very truly,

JAMES CHIEVES & CO.
J. A. PHILLIPS, *Vice President.*

—

C. H. PARSONS CO.,
BAG MANUFACTURERS,
New York, April 19, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a manufacturer of bags, under Schedule J, would call your attention to the grave error that has probably been made by the Ways and Means Committee when reporting these items of the bill, namely:

Page 72, lines 20 and 21, paragraph 292: Plain woven fabrics of single jute yarns, by whatever name known, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Page 73, lines 3, 4, and 5, paragraph 294: Bags or sacks made from plain woven fabrics, of single jute yarns, not dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or bleached, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Comparing the compound duty for paragraph 292 under the old rate (nine-sixteenths cent per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem) makes the ad valorem duty as now proposed higher than it was.

Paragraph 294 cuts us bag manufacturers off without any protection. We are sending you copies of briefs that were handed to the Ways and Means Committee, giving you our position, with statistics and available information regarding this industry. We call your attention particularly to the supplement, referring to points A, B, and C.

We most urgently ask you to recommend that the bill be amended by making paragraph 292 read 15 per cent ad valorem and leaving paragraph 294 as reported, 25 per cent ad valorem. That simply gives us 10 per cent duty protection against the pauper labor of India, rates for which you will note on the fourth page of statement dated January 17.

As no burlap cloth is made in this country, the 15 per cent would be revenue and the extra 10 per cent for bags would be a living protection only to the industry represented by burlap-bag manufacturers in 28 different States.

We most heartily and earnestly ask you to use your efforts in securing for our industry the means of livelihood since the present measure as proposed in paragraph 292 and 294 means almost certain death to our industry in this country. If the bill is passed as proposed, the manufacturing of burlap bags will be transferred to Calcutta, India.

No trust or combination exists among bag manufacturers; freest and fullest competition.

Summary: We earnestly recommend paragraph 292 to read, 15 per cent ad valorem; paragraph 294 to read, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Trusting you will see the simple justice of the above request, we remain,

Yours, very truly, E. S. FROST, *Vice President.*

—

JOHN MORGAN & SONS,
STAINED GLASS WINDOWS,
New York, April 10, 1913.

Hon. W. M. CALDER, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CALDER: I am in receipt of your valued favor of the 9th instant, and also the copy of the Underwood bill.

To my greatest astonishment and regret I see that stained-glass windows, when imported for churches, have been put on the free list under paragraph 659. As I already mentioned to you before, that if this becomes a law we shall be compelled to give up our business, and every firm in the country in my line will have to do the same. The whole thing has been played into the hands of foreign firms. They can send their windows here duty free and we can close our shops, thus depriving some eight or ten thousand workingmen in the United States of a livelihood.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, I believe, frequently expressed himself that the new tariff will not be enacted to cripple our industry here, but I see it is about to do worse; it will close us all up and permit the foreign makers of stained-glass windows to monopolize all of the business in this country. They pay their workingmen about one-third in wages of what we do here, and they have longer hours.

You ask me if you can serve us any further. Why, yes; you can by using all your power to wipe out the iniquitous paragraph (659) in the new tariff bill, or substitute the word "except" in place of "including" in the sixth line of this paragraph. If you do this, my dear Mr. CALDER, you will accomplish something that the wage earners of this country will be grateful to you for. This is not a question of politics, so why not see the President and put it up to him. It's a question of bread for our workingmen, and you know what this means, as you employ labor yourself, and I know you are happy when they are employed.

If you have anything to suggest and help us, please let me know.

I am,

Yours, sincerely, LOUIS TRUEG, *Manager.*

GLEASON-TIEBOUT GLASS CO.,
MANUFACTURERS OF GLASS FOR GAS AND ELECTRIC LIGHTING,
Brooklyn, N. Y., April 14, 1913.

The Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CALDER: Your attention is called to a provision of the proposed tariff in Schedule B, page 9, reducing the rate of duty on glassware.

As a member of the National Association of Manufacturers of Pressed and Blown Glassware, we ask you to use your influence, in so far as you consistently can, to retain the present rates. One thing is certain, that a great many articles of glassware which are now made in this country will either cease to be made, or that the wages will be reduced. Of course, even with the 45 per cent duty proposed certain expensive lines of ware will continue to be manufactured.

Yours, respectfully,

GLEASON-TIEBOUT GLASS CO.,
C. H. TIEBOUT, Jr., *Secretary.*

—

JOSEPH DIXON CRUCIBLE CO.,
MINERS, IMPORTERS, AND MANUFACTURERS OF
GRAPHITE, PLUMBAGO, BLACK LEAD.
Buffalo, N. Y., April 18, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: When Schedule N, paragraph No. 393, of the Underwood tariff bill receives your consideration, which I assume and earnestly entreat it may, will you please also consider the following conclusions derived from my point of view:

The alleged object of the revision of our present rates of import duties is the relief in the cost of living of the whole people. This it is sought to accomplish to some extent by the removal of a specific of 45 cents per gross on lead pencils, in the manufacture of which I am personally interested; but as 45 cents is not divisible by 144 (1 gross) no part of the reduction can ever reach the general consumer, who buys a single pencil as needed and who must therefore continue to pay 1, 2, or 5 cents for his pencil, as at present.

During the period of the lead-pencil industry in this country cedar lumber, which enters most largely into the manufacture of lead pencils, penholders, etc., has increased from 35 cents per cubic foot to 55 cents per cubic foot, and despite the fact that it propagates itself cedar wood suitable for lead pencils is now very scarce lumber. Competition, on the contrary, is very keen among the American manufacturers and prices are very low.

If the tariff is reduced, we are not only threatened by competition of the Germans, but the entire pencil industry of the world is now threatened by the invasion from Japan, where pencil factories are already in successful operation.

We have about 900 employees in our pencil factories, who are vitally interested in the outcome of the present controversy, and in their behalf, as well as my own, I beg you to give this subject the consideration it most certainly deserves.

Anything you can do in our defense in this unwarranted attack will be very much appreciated.

Very truly, yours,

J. A. CONDIT.

—

HANLON & GOODMAN CO.,
New York, April 12, 1913.

Hon. W. M. CALDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The brush industry of our country is seriously threatened by the proposed reduction of the tariff on brushes to 35 per cent ad valorem.

Since the enactment of the McKinley tariff bill the importations of brushes from Japan have increased 3,856 per cent; the English, French, and German importations have also increased to an alarming extent. These facts are indisputable and should convince you that our particular industry requires an increase and not a decrease of tariff.

The proposed duty is 35 per cent ad valorem. The present duty is 40 per cent.

We ask your help in making the new rate rate 50 per cent for the following reasons:

First. The tremendous increase in importations.

Second. The United States imports brushes to the value of $2,000,000 in round figures. The United States manufactures of the same kinds of brushes that are imported not over $6,000,000.

Third. Under the present tariff the Government received last year about $800,000 on the brushes imported, and in addition about $250,000 from the American brush manufacturers as a duty on the bristles they used. Surely this is too much revenue from an industry as small as ours.

An inspection of your personal brushes and of brushes displayed on the counters of department and drug stores will convince you of the large quantities of foreign-made brushes offered for sale.

Your efforts in behalf of the brush manufacturers and their employees will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

John L. Whiting-J. J. Adams Co., Boston, Mass.; J. C. Pushee & Sons, Boston, Mass.; A. & E. Burton Co., Boston, Mass.; Gerts Lumbard Co., Chicago, Ill.; Hanlon & Goodman Co., New York, N. Y.; United Brush Manufacturers, New York, N. Y.; Jas. Lowe Erskine Co., New York, N. Y.; F. W. DeVoe & C. T. Raynolds Co., New York, N. Y.; Miles Bros. & Co., New York, N. Y.; Kip Brush Co., New York, N. Y.; Ox Fiber Brush Co., New York, N. Y.; Rennious, Kleinle Co., Baltimore, Md.; Wm. A. Tottle & Co., Baltimore, Md.; Bigelow Brush Co., Baltimore, Md.; Owen Dennin Sons, Troy, N. Y.; A. L. Sonn Brush Co., Troy, N. Y.; Frederick M. Hoyt & Bro., Troy, N. Y.; The Bromwell Brush & Wire Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; The Wooster Brush Co., Wooster, Ohio; Rubberset Co., Newark, N. J.; Dixon & Ripple, Newark, N. J.; A. G. Jacobus Sons, Verona, N. J.; New Jersey Brush Co., Bloomfield, N. J.; Elder & Jenks, Philadelphia, Pa.; Earle Brush Co., Columbia, Pa.; Ames Bonner Co., Toledo, Ohio; Standard Brush Co., New Hartford, Conn.; Florence Manufacturing Co., Florence, Mass.

LEO H. HIRSCH & CO.,
MAKERS OF PEARL BUTTONS,
New York, April 10, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The tariff on pearl buttons in the new bill has been made 40 per cent ad valorem instead of 1½ cents per line and 15 per cent ad valorem.

If the tariff bill as published goes into effect, millions of dollars invested in the pearl-button industry in the United States will be worthless and thousands of people engaged in this industry will be out of work.

It is absolutely impossible to make pearl buttons in this country under a 40 per cent ad valorem duty. At least 1 per cent line and 15 per cent ad valorem should be left as the minimum tariff.

Pearl buttons are to a very large extent a luxury, as clothes can be buttoned just as well with bone, metal, glass, composition, or agate buttons. The largest item in cost of fresh-water pearl buttons is labor.

If this tariff bill goes into effect with the 40 per cent ad valorem duty, it will simply be handing the industry over to Japan, and all people employed in the pearl-button trade in the United States will be out of employment.

Trusting that you will give this matter your attention, we are,

Yours, very truly,

LEO H. HIRSCH & CO.

—

APRIL 17, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER, M. C.
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On August 1, 1910, the property of the Saratoga Victory Manufacturing Co., located at Victory Mills, Saratoga County, N. Y., consisting of a cotton bill of 47,000 spindles and 1,160 looms, with water power and tenements, was bought by people represented by the undersigned.

In the five months from August 1 to December 31, 1910, the mills lost $21,014.47. In the calendar year 1911, $106,060.83; in the calendar year 1912, $21,338.50. Total losses in 29 months, $148,413.80.

During the same period speculative profits on cotton exceeded speculative losses by $25,550, leaving net losses for mill operations and cotton trading $122,863.80. During the same period $137,733.64 was spent for improvements to the mills, tenements, and water power.

Nothing was charged off included in above losses for depreciation, which should have been allowed for at the rate of about $3,000 per month, or $87,000 in 29 months.

The goods manufactured averaged 40's yarns and were woven into sateens, twill cloths, and plain woven goods for converters. The labor cost exceeded 10 cents per pound, and the duties levied on similar goods if imported were fully protective, so that the competition causing these losses came only from manufacturers in this country.

I estimate the 12½ per cent duty on these cloths provided by the Underwood bill at 2½ cents per pound, or 25 per cent of our labor cost. We are paying about 300 per cent of European wages, with at least ten times European taxes.

If the 12½ per cent ad valorem rate becomes effective, this mill and all other mills manufacturing similar goods must necessarily close as soon as a sufficient amount of machinery is provided in England.

In view of the losses steadily incurred for three years past, there is no encouragement to sink additional money while waiting for a change in the political situation.

Yours, very truly,

J. B. UPRIGHT.

—

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 24, 1913.*

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As one employed in the printing and binding of Bibles, I respectfully ask you to come to our assistance at this critical period, when our livelihood is seriously threatened by the proposed placing of Bibles on the free list in the new tariff schedule. The removal of the 25 per cent duty can not be met except by a heavy cut in wages or the closing of our plant, and such a contingency means disaster to most of us, as our work consists of the printing and binding of Bibles exclusively.

We have no other publication.

We lost 75 per cent of our foreign work by the action of Congress placing Bibles in foreign languages on the free list and caused a reduction of 10 per cent in wages under the present tariff.

You will see that as we are mostly union people we can not work on a free-list scale when all other books have a duty of 15 per cent.

The length of service of a majority of our male and female workers varies from 20 to 50 years in one place, performing with little variation the same thing, a condition you will appreciate which practically unfits them for work in other places. We, therefore, ask you to give this matter your earnest consideration, feeling sure you will be guided by a sense of justice. If some concession must be made, the placing of the Bible on the list of printed books bearing a 15 per cent duty will, in a large measure, avert the distress which would follow the placing of the Bible on the free list.

Very respectfully,

MILTON L. MERRILL.

—

PERKINS, VAN BERGEN & CO.,
New York, April 24, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER, M. C.
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We desire to energetically protest against portions of the administrative clause of the proposed new tariff law known as the Underwood bill.

We have been importing dress goods for the last 40 years under high and low tariffs, but the present proposed methods of collecting the revenue will so annoy and harass us, together with other importers generally, that the business will suffer more than from the old high rates of duty. We protest particularly against paragraph J, page 173, copy of April 7, 1913; paragraph L, page 175, copy of April 7, 1913; paragraphs U, V, and W, pages 185–187, copy of April 7, 1913.

We maintain that duty should be assessed on the actual net cost of goods without regard to market value at time of exportation. All merchants of experience buy months ahead for later delivery, and value at exportation is seldom identical with contract price.

We maintain that neither the Secretary of the Treasury nor any other man should be given the power of keeping goods out of this country "in his discretion" as a penalty for refusal of the importer

or the foreign manufacturer to submit "any or all of his books, records, or accounts" to the inspection of an agent of the Government.

The whole administrative clause seems to us to have been drawn with the idea of restricting importations, and we respectfully request you to use your utmost influence to have it corrected.

Thanking you in advance, we are,

Yours, respectfully,

PERKINS, VAN BERGEN & CO.,
JNO. W. MCGUIRE, *Attorney.*

—

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 24, 1913.*

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER,
Congress, Washington.

SIR: I inclose copy of circular just issued by the New York Produce Exchange, of which I am a member.

Kindly use your full influence against the enactment of the proposed wheat and flour schedule.

Yours, very respectfully, and your neighbor,

RAMON G. CADIZ.

—

NEW YORK PRODUCE EXCHANGE,
New York, April 22, 1913.

To the Members of the New York Produce Exchange:

The proposed wheat and flour schedule in the Underwood tariff bill, if enacted into a law of the land, will result in the extinction of the flour-milling industry of the United States, and will transfer that industry to the mills of Canada and England.

There are 5,600 flour mills in the United States and as many more gristmills. The Northwestern Miller states that these 12,000 mills employ 66,000 persons and have a capital of $350,000,000, an expenditure of $827,000,000, and products valued at $883,000,000—the fifth great industry of our country.

And yet it is proposed to enact a law which will ultimately entirely destroy this great nation-wide enterprise.

President Aspegren sent to Senator LA FOLLETTE, of the Senate Finance Committee, the following telegram on the subject:

"NEW YORK, *April 14, 1913.*

"The millers, representatives of mills, and flour merchants, members of the New York Produce Exchange, deeply appreciate your opposition to the discrimination in the proposed tariff bill against American flour millers. Under the operation of this schedule Canada will, of course, promptly remove the present tax on flour. It is unfair and unscientific to tax Canadian wheat grain 10 cents per bushel and admit Canadian wheat flour free. It will encourage the immediate expansion of Canadian mills, which already are driving Americans out of the West Indian and other markets, and will discourage and destroy the immense milling business of this country. It will injure, also, the American farmer by restricting his market and reducing his price, while Canadian wheat growers are protected by our tariff. We believe the committee was not correctly informed on the subject or it would not have given its approval to the schedule, which will practically destroy the flour enterprise of this country while it builds up that of Canada and other nations. We count confidently on the success of your effectual influence and arguments against this result."

This telegram accurately states the matter at issue.

The flour business is in jeopardy.

It behooves every member of the exchange to exert now, without a day's delay, his influence to induce the Senate Finance Committee to change the proposed schedule by removing the duty on wheat entirely, or, failing that, to place an equal duty on flour of, say, 50 cents per barrel.

Write urgently your Congressmen and Senators on the subject.

Ask also your clients, customers, and correspondents to do the same.

It is a matter of life or death for this great historic American industry.

Very respectfully,

GEO. A. ZABRISKIE,
H. MYERS BOGERT,
R. A. CLAYBROOK,
EDWARD F. SINEY,
F. H. PRICE,
C. W. MCCUTCHEN,
Chairman.

—

NEW YORK SULPHUR REFINERY,
Brooklyn, N. Y., April 23, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER,
1648 Eleventh Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The writer has been engaged in the manufacturing of brimstone and sulphur at the above address for the past 20 years, and to be brief in my statements to you will say that I will be obliged to abandon the business entirely if refined sulphur, as proposed by the Ways and Means Committee, is to be admitted to this country free of duty.

The present tariff is $4 per ton, and even with this duty on it is imported into this country to quite a large extent. Last year the Government collected duties amounting to about $22,000 on the refined sulphur imported into this country, all of which will be lost to our Government if it is admitted free, and the only ones who will benefit from it will be the foreign manufacturers.

The foregoing are the principal reasons for getting refined sulphur on the dutiable list at $4 per ton, as at present, and I respectfully ask you to oppose the bill placing refined sulphur on the free list to the fullest extent.

Assuring you that I join with all your supporters in giving thanks to you for the many benefits the people of your district, as well as many others, have enjoyed by your efforts, I am,

Respectfully, yours,

JOHN A. STILL.

—

ELLISON & ELLISON,
New York, April 11, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am counsel for the Remington Typewriter Co., and I am just informed that it is the intention of the Government to place typewriters on the free list.

The cost of production of a typewriter in this country involves approximately 75 per cent for labor, if not more. The material is almost entirely of domestic manufacture, and the cost of which will not, I think, be reduced by the pending tariff bill. Thus the fact remains that the present intention to place the article on the free list will affect only the labor cost of the article, and I do not believe that this is an item that should be made a subject of such action.

May I not under these circumstances ask for your mature consideration of the matter?

I remain, faithfully yours,

WILLIAM B. ELLISON.

—

ELLISON & ELLISON,
New York, April 17, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Supplementing my former letter to you relative to placing typewriters on the free list, I beg leave to say that the Remington Typewriter Co., for which I am counsel, has been invited by the German Government to manufacture its product in Germany, where it can make a saving on the item of labor of approximately 40 per cent. As I before stated, the labor cost in the typewriter is about 75 per cent of the cost of the machine.

The Remington Co. employs about 5,000 people, and you can readily see what a very substantial reduction there would be in the cost of the production were we to accept the invitation referred to, and the loss that would be thereby occasioned to our American employees.

Under these circumstances are we not entitled to some consideration? And is not the placing of our product on the free list not only unwise but unfair?

I remain, faithfully yours,

WILLIAM B. ELLISON.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ].

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to one of the schedules of the pending bill, and under the existing parliamentary status shall have no option but to vote against the bill in its entirety. I shall do so, however, without hesitation or compunction, even though the bill and its—to me—objectionable features have the sanction of the caucus of the party to which I belong and are reputed to have the approval of the President whose nomination I welcomed, in whose election I rejoiced, and for whose successful administration I earnestly pray. Neither the seal of my party's caucus nor the imprimatur of my party's President can make for me politically sacrosanct that which violates my preelection pledges to my constituency and destroys the main industry of my State.

The Underwood free-sugar bill, against which I voted along with six of the seven Representatives from my State, passed the House March 15, 1912. In the ensuing June the democracy of Louisiana assembled at Baton Rouge to select delegates to the Baltimore convention. With the House action in favor of free sugar fresh in mind, that convention announced a platform, from which I quote:

We are in favor of a revision of the tariff which will meet the requirements of the National Treasury and will abate the protective system with the least possible unsettlement of our business fabric.

We hold that the tariff is a tax paid by the consumer, but in reducing it to a purely revenue basis we would not sanction the injustice of crudely remodeling the tariff schedules in such a way as to force any one industry previously dependent upon the tariff to sell in a free market and buy in a protected one; nor would we contemplate the turning of the American market over to manipulation by foreign tariffs and export bounties where the results would be the wiping out of an American industry by a temporary lowering of prices and a subsequent raising of prices under foreign control and foreign enrichment.

We espouse these principles, not solely because they would forbid the heavy and cruel blow proposed against Louisiana but because they are applicable to any industry in any State, because they are the necessary guides to all just men striving for a tariff reform which will destroy evils for the consumer without creating them for the producer.

Subsequently the Democracy of the Nation assembled at Baltimore and enunciated its program of beliefs and demands. Its declaration for a tariff for revenue only, with pledges against "any legislation that would injure or destroy legitimate industry," and its recognition of the fact that our system of tariff taxation is so intimately connected with the business of the country as to prevent radical attempts to remove its inequalities is too familiar to dwell upon. Its declaration along these lines met with my entire approval.

In announcing last August my candidacy for renomination in a Democratic primary, in which I had opposition, I used the following language:

I am in thorough accord with its—the Democratic platform—tariff plank, which demands a tariff for revenue only, with immediate reduction of existing high rates. I interpret the paragraph as a whole as meaning that in this downward revision the interests of the State of Louisiana will receive fair and just treatment, and that no discrimination or destruction thereof will be attempted. Reading it in that light, and in connection with the pronouncement of the recent convention of the Louisiana Democracy at Baton Rouge, I stand on and for the tariff plank of the Baltimore platform. If an attempt should be made in the future to depart from the course indicated above I shall, as in the past, resist same by vote and voice.

I reiterated these views throughout the campaign. Along with thousands of other Louisianians I accepted the Baltimore platform and the nominee's speech of acceptance at their face value. While I knew that the House had enacted a free-sugar bill, I also knew that the bill had never passed the Senate, and that the then Democratic minority was on record, by committee action and by individual utterances of distinguished Democratic

Senators, as differing widely from the House on the question of free sugar. I expected, of course, that when our party came into power sugar, along with other schedules in a tariff bill, would undergo revision downward, but I had no reason to believe that it would be put on the free list.

I was not prepared to be told that it is not a legitimate industry, but that as a "hothouse plant," an exotic in Louisiana, it was not covered by the platform promise against destruction.

Destruction, however, quick and cruel, is to be its fate, if my Democratic brethren can encompass it. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, with characteristic candor, blandly informs us that he realizes that the bill which bears his name sounds sugar's doom. We in Louisiana know that this is all too true. The Louisiana sugar crop of 1915, if sugar remains on the free list, will be the last in history. Were I by my silence to acquiesce in so brutal and unjustified a blow, or by my vote to assist in striking it, I would be faithless to my promises and untrue to my convictions of justice and fair dealing. My course is clear; I repeat, I shall vote against the bill.

I have no intention to discuss this measure in its general outline. Even though time permitted, inclination would be lacking on my part to expose such shortcomings as it may possess. These, if they exist, will soon come to light, and the party responsible for them will meet the fate which it deserves. As a Democrat, I do not care to put weapons in the hands of the enemies of that party, for future attack. As its free-sugar provision causes me to vote against the bill, I shall, therefore, limit myself to that schedule.

Sugar has from the beginning of our Government been regarded as the ideal revenue producer, and until the days of the new dispensation under which we are living, has been consistently utilized to raise a heavy percentage of the revenue necessary to defray governmental expenses. The large amount realized from its importation, the slight cost of customs collection, and the general diffusion among all the people of the resultant burden, have caused the tax on it to be regarded as one of the most equitable and least obnoxious that can be enacted by the sovereign. Small wonder is it, then, that so seasoned a statesman as the senior Senator from Mississippi was saying last July—alas for human prophecies—that—

> even though a Democratic President and a Democratic Senate and a Democratic House should come into power, there is not the slightest anticipation in the mind of any intelligent man that sugar would be placed on the free list.

Easy is it to understand how leading Democratic newspapers in all parts of the country, and notably in those parts of the country where no local interests can color or prejudice their judgment or views, have been urging the Ways and Means Committee to "go slow" with the sugar schedule, suggesting that except in so far as the protection accorded to the refiners through the Dutch standard and the differential is concerned, it required but little reduction. No surprise is it that that pioneer of customs revision, "Marse Henry," of the Louisville Courier-Journal, whose devotion to the "star-eyed goddess" of tariff reform dates back to a time when present-day tariff tinkerers were in their swaddling clothes, who, from Tilden to Cleveland and from Cleveland to Wilson has never wavered, has recently denounced the free listing of sugar.

But it seems that the old order changeth; that such antiquated notions do not comport with present-day conditions, and that the experience of a century in our own country and the experience of all the other civilized countries are to be discarded in the interests of the unknown god whom we are worshiping to-day, the ultimate consumer.

One might be inclined to think that the Governments of Great Britain, Germany, Russia, France, and the other powers, small and great, would evince some interest in this ultimate consumer, and yet we find all of them, whether they are sugar-producing countries or not, levying a duty on sugar and raising largely from that source the money necessary to maintain their Governments. Furthermore, these countries, far from seeking to destroy their internal production of sugar, as this bill unquestionably will do in Louisiana, and as the beet-sugar producers declare it will do in their section, are bending every effort, where it is possible to produce sugar, to foster in every way the home production, thereby rendering them and their people independent of outside supply. Yet, here we are in the United States, where, if not in cane sugar, unquestionably in beet-sugar production, has been witnessed in little more than a decade one of the most remarkable developments that the study of statistics discloses anywhere—here we are about to annihilate the industry in Louisiana, and beyond all question to restrict its present output and paralyze its extension in the beet-sugar States for another 10 or 20 years.

Why, again I ask, is such economic folly about to be attempted; why, to change the metaphor, is such an economic tragedy to be perpetrated? Again, the answer comes from our old familiar friend, the ultimate consumer—that elusive if not mythical entity. But the real answer comes from one not so difficult to locate, comes from Mr. Frank C. Lowry, self-styled secretary of the Wholesale Grocers' Association, who has been the leading propagandist of this free-sugar agitation. He is the man in front of the guns, the guns behind being the sugar-refining interests of this country—the Spreckels and Arbuckles and their ostensible rival, the American Sugar Refining Co. It is he and they who are laughing in their sleeves when they hear of the great boons portrayed to follow the free listing of sugar. It is he and they who are smiling out of the corners of their mouths when they contemplate the pleasant days that will follow the one or two or three years of reduced sugar which they will permit as a preliminary to the time when, having stifled all local competition, they will be able to fix the price of sugar at their own sweet, untrammeled will and snap their fingers at Mr. Ultimate Consumer. As sure as I stand here, Mr. Chairman, and to predict it requires no gift of prophecy, these conditions will come to pass. The only protection the American people have in the past had against the extortion of the refiners has been in the fact that the cane and beet sugar crops grown in this country have come upon our markets at stated season and served to check the rapacity of the refiners.

Can we learn nothing from our experience with other articles—from the Coffee Trust, which, with free coffee, serves it to us on our breakfast table at whatever cost it pleases; from the Tobacco Trust, which up to this good time charges the consumer with the cost of the increased duties levied on that article at the time of the Spanish-American War, though these war duties have long since been remitted. But gentlemen tell us that Cuba will grow enough cane and produce enough sugar to supply us, and that we need look no farther for the requirements of the United States. Do not gentlemen know that in anticipation of this glad day the Sugar Trust has fastened its grip on Cuba and will be in a position to juggle its output at pleasure? [Applause on the Republican side.]

In what way, after all, has the ultimate consumer so severely suffered at the hands of sugar? I heard on Wednesday last, in his keynote speech of this debate, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means quote certain figures showing the startling increase in the cost of American products that has largely brought about the added cost of living. These figures are all too true, unfortunately, and the list might be amplified.

Consider this statistical table of the relative percentages of increases in the cost of products used every day:

Potatoes	14.4
Beans	14.4
Prunes	19.7
Codfish	21.4
Onions	22.1
Bread	25.0
Sugar beets	26.8
Fresh beets	27.7
Rye flour	29.1
Milk	34.3
Cattle and sheep	34.4
Evaporated apples	35.9
Butter	36.7
Average of all	37.7
Cheese	39.4
Wheat flour	43.0
Herring	43.9
Timothy hay	49.3
Barley	49.5
Salt beef	49.7
Rye	50.2
Mutton	51.9
Corn meal	52.4
Corn	52.5
Wheat	55.9
Cotton	57.3
Hams	60.4
Eggs	64.8
Oats	69.8
Hogs	76.0
Bacon	77.1
Lard	81.6
Salt pork	89.8

And yet, how has the cost of sugar to the ultimate consumer varied in the last 12 years, since 1900, when every other article and every other necessity of life has been soaring skyward?

In 1900 the price of refined sugar was 5.32 cents per pound; last year it was 5.04 cents per pound, and in most of the intervening years it has been below 5 cents per pound. What does this show? Barring only one year, when there was a comparatively negligible shortage in the world's supply, a shortage which the refiners used to "boost" unjustifiably the price of sugar, and which "boost," by the way, suddenly gave way to a "slump," when the cane and beet sugar of the United States was put on the market, there has been only a fractional

variation in the price of sugar in the country. Sugar alone has preserved a stable barometer.

What is proposed to be saved the ultimate consumer by putting sugar on the free list? Conceding that he is to receive the full benefit of the removal of the existing duty, conceding that the benevolent refiner, when he gets the situation in hand, is to sell us sugar at the same price that he now doles it out, which I deny, then there will be a saving in the case of each man, woman, and child in the country, assuming that the consumption per capita is absolutely equal, which is, of course, an absurdity—there will be a saving to each man, woman, and child of one-eighth of a cent a day. Listen:

Suppose that the entire $115,000,000, now referred to as the "tax on the bellies of the American people," divided $50,000,000 to the Government and $65,000,000 alleged gross profit to the refiners and producers, went to the refiners and producers, waiving for the moment the Government's fifty millions, then, as among 95,000,000 people in the United States, the daily per capita burden would be only one-third of a cent, or an annual per capita burden of $1.30.

Suppose again that the entire $115,000,000 went to the refiners and producers, but take into consideration that only two-thirds of the sugar annually consumed in this country is used for household purposes and on the table, the other one-third being used for manufacturing purposes, then two-thirds of the burden—$77,000,000—as among 95,000,000 people, would be one-fifth of a cent per capita per day, or 80 cents per capita per annum.

But the actual burden on housewives is only two-thirds the amount that goes to refiners and producers, or $44,000,000, inasmuch as only two-thirds the sugar used in the United States is consumed on the table; and as among 95,000,000 people the actual burden is one-eighth of a cent per capita per day, or 45 cents per capita per annum.

To save this pittance the Louisiana sugar grower is to be decapitated, the beet-sugar producer is to be seriously if not mortally wounded, and the people as a whole are to be put at the mercy of the sugar refiners of the country.

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has iterated and reiterated that this bill has been drawn with the idea of raising the necessary revenue of the Government with a minimum of burden on those who can least afford to bear it. He explains that as the present income-tax provision is not sufficient to produce all of the revenue which such a bill must produce it is, of course, necessary to raise a certain amount of revenue at the customhouses. And that is his answer to all questions that are asked as to why certain articles are placed on the dutiable list. He nonchalantly casts aside the fifty to fifty-five millions that the sugar duty produces because sugar is a necessity of life, and then consistently proceeds to place a duty on cattle and sheep and on vegetables, beans, peas, cheese, eggs, citrous fruits, on woolen goods, on rubber goods, and on many other items that are as essential in the daily life of an ordinary man as sugar.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HELVERING). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DUPRÉ. May I have a minute more?

Mr. GARDNER. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. DUPRÉ. But a hue and cry has been raised for free sugar and men whose familiarity with economic problems should make them strong enough to resist the combination of the self-seeker and the demagogue and the ignorant are yielding to it. The sugar industry must go. According to some it needs no duty to flourish; according to others it is a "hothouse plant," an exotic. We in Louisiana are told that in so far as its production there is concerned one might as well attempt to grow oranges in Maine. One may not be able to grow oranges in Maine or coffee in New Jersey or truffles in Alabama, but I know of one agricultural feat that has passed beyond the stage of experiment. Its possibilities are not problematical and its development is not speculative. It has the sanction of Holy Writ, and I commend it to the consideration of my Democratic colleagues:

> For they have sown the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind.
> It hath no stalk: the bud shall yield no meal: if so be it yield, strangers shall swallow it up.

[Loud applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, we have just listened to a protest that ought to have been heard and heeded by the majority in the formation of this bill. Now, when a Member from a State whose delegation is solidly Democratic protests against the destruction by his party associates of the chief industry of his State, his plea is scarcely listened to with patience. Louisiana will vote the Democratic ticket, anyway, as long as the race issue exists, and so her people must sacrifice their one hundred millions invested in the production of sugar to carry out the ideas of theorists and doctrinaires.

The Democratic Party has missed a great opportunity. Reductions in the tariff schedules could have been made and should have been made which would not have destroyed our industries and brought disaster. The party could have fulfilled every pledge made by reasonable reductions that would not have ruined our industries and thrown our workmen out of employment. In fact, a reasonable, a moderate policy was just what was promised. In their campaign speeches the Democrats said to the country, "We expect to give you a tariff for revenue only, but the reductions will be moderate." In their platform they said, "What we propose to do is to reduce the tariff, but not to destroy any legitimate industry." Are the farmers of Louisiana who are raising cane for sugar, and the farmers of Michigan, Colorado, and California, who are raising beets for sugar, engaged in a business which is not legitimate? Are the millers of the country engaged in a legitimate industry? Are the hundreds of small industries which can not operate under the present bill legitimate industries?

The leader of the majority, Mr. UNDERWOOD, says that this bill is a change in the fiscal policy of the Government, and so it is. It is a change which the country has been slow to understand, a change which was not avowed by its present advocates during the campaign which placed them in power. Whenever a declaration was made for a tariff for revenue only it was accompanied by elaborate qualifications to the effect that as no diminution of tariff revenue was possible, slight changes only were contemplated. Inequalities were to be corrected, "jokers" were to be eliminated, extortion was to be prevented, and that was to be the limit of change. Nothing was said about a revolution of the fiscal policy of the Government. But now we have the open declaration of a complete, a revolutionary, change in our fiscal policy, accompanied by its concrete expression in this bill. Accordingly, we are to abandon the American protective policy which has been distinctively ours through most of the years of our history, and to adopt the English free-trade system, which, if it does not realize the ideal of absolute free trade, always endeavors to approximate it as nearly as existing conditions will permit.

As there is but one great nation where this system now exists, it may be worth while to give at least brief consideration to that instance. Especially interesting to us should be the conditions existing in England when the change was made, the reasons which brought it about, and its effect on the country. Because of its importance I shall call especial attention to the effect of the adoption and continuance of a free-trade policy in Great Britain on her agricultural interests.

"THE WEALTH OF NATIONS."

When Adam Smith published his great work, The Wealth of Nations, a real contribution was made to the world's knowledge. The theory at that time generally accepted that wealth is money was completely overthrown and in its place the principle was established that labor is the true basis and measure of value. As a corollary of that principle it was attempted to prove that when a nation exchanged its gold for products of equal value it lost nothing, that in fact it profited by the transaction if it needed the products more than the gold. It was then argued that it logically followed that all restraints, such as tariffs, upon the free interchange of products between nations were wrongful and injurious. It might be presumed, it was claimed, that each nation could produce some particular thing more cheaply than other nations. A wise economic policy, then, would demand the abandonment by any nation of the effort to produce that which another nation could produce more cheaply. A nation, it was said, should encourage those industries only in which it excelled, and then, by free interchange, sell those products in the world's dearest market and buy what else it needed in the world's cheapest market. In this, as in many other cases, a true fundamental principle was made to give credit to theories that are unsound and sustain policies that are unwise.

REPEAL OF THE CORN LAWS.

Although the publication of Adam Smith's great work made a profound impression, it was many years before anything was done to embody its principles into legislation. It was published in 1776, and it was not until 1846, or 70 years later, that the repeal of the corn laws, under Sir Robert Peel, began the free-trade era of England's history.

This action was the result of causes which, while they do not justify, at least explain the change of policy. There had been a period of hard times in England. The terrible burden of the Napoleonic wars lessened but slowly. Strikes were fre-

quent among the workingmen. There was much distress and suffering, and a general feeling of discontent prevailed throughout the land. Then came the famine in Ireland. A vast majority of the working population of Ireland depended entirely on the potato for subsistence. In 1845 the potato rot began and for two years destroyed the crop. Thousands died from starvation. The distress and suffering were terrible. It is doubtful if in another instance in modern times a whole people have been so sorely afflicted.

The demand which was then made to repeal the corn laws and give the starving people cheaper food was irresistible. As Mr. Bright, the most eloquent advocate of the repeal, said, "Famine itself, against which we had warred, joined us."

But the results did not fulfill the promises of the reformers. Bread was dearer for the 10 years following the repeal than it had been at any time during the 23 years which preceded it. This was what happened. Whenever thereafter in any land there was an excessive wheat crop England's grain dealers bought it cheap, stored and held it, and controlled the market with it and drove the English farmer out of business. The people did not profit by it, agriculture was destroyed in the United Kingdom, and the policy of free trade appropriately inaugurated.

We have no hard times now in the United States. There is no general distress; there is no famine. But there is widespread discontent, most of which is artificially stimulated and most of which is groundless. Now, as then, the people are demanding cheaper food, and now, as then, it is proposed to satisfy that demand by sacrificing the agricultural interests of the country just as the agricultural interests of Great Britain were sacrificed something more than half a century ago.

DESTRUCTION OF AGRICULTURE IN ENGLAND.

During the corn laws agitation Cobden declared that not a single acre of land would go out of cultivation. Instead an area has gone out of cultivation larger than the entire area now under cultivation. There are 48,000,000 acres of land capable of cultivation in Great Britain. Twenty-eight of the forty-eight millions have gone out of cultivation into permanent pasture, much of it grown to rank grass and weeds. Less than 20,000,000 acres are now in crops. Ten years ago there were 23,000,000 acres and 25 years ago there were 26,000,000 acres. With the agricultural methods of the Belgians or Danes England could feed all her people, if the 6,000,000 acres which she lost in 25 years were added to her land actually in cultivation. In France 42 per cent of the land is in crops, in Germany 43 per cent, while in England there is less than 20 per cent. In 25 years the value of the land in Great Britain has decreased more than $500,000,000 and the farmers' capital nearly $100,000,000.

England's agricultural population is now decreasing at the rate of 13 per cent every decade. With a population of 16,000,000 in 1841 she had 2,300,000 engaged in agriculture. In 1901 with a population of 32,000,000 she had but 988,000. In Austria 31 per cent of the population is engaged in agriculture, in France 21 per cent, in Germany and the United States 15 per cent, while in England there is but 5 per cent. More men in England are now engaged in transportation alone than in agriculture, more in the metal industries, and almost as many in the building trades. There are more females in domestic service than all those engaged in agriculture, and the population of London alone is seven times all those engaged in agriculture in England.

England's policy of free trade has driven her agricultural population to the slums of the cities or to emigration. Her policy has made her dependent on foreign harvests for food. She has discarded protection because she believed it unduly taxed her people, yet she taxes her people to maintain the most expensive navy in the world to keep the seas clear so she can obtain from others the food and clothing her own people could provide on her own fertile lands. Besides she heavily subsidizes her merchant marine. Each year she imports foodstuffs in excess of $800,000,000 and the amount is continually increasing.

Kipling well pictures the situation in his Big Steamers:

"Oh, where are you going to, all you Big Steamers,
With England's own coal up and down the salt seas?"
"We're going to fetch you your bread and your butter,
Your beef, pork, and mutton, eggs, apples, and cheese."
"And where will you fetch it from all you Big Steamers?
And where shall I write you when you are away?"
"We fetch it from Melbourne, Quebec, and Vancouver,
Address us at Hobart, Hongkong, and Bombay."
"But if anything happened to all you Big Steamers,
And suppose you were wrecked up and down the salt sea?"
"Why, you'd have no coffee or bacon for breakfast,
And you'd have no muffins or toast for your tea."

* * * * * * *

"Then what can I do for you, all you Big Steamers,
Oh, what can I do for your comfort and good?"
"Send out your big warships to watch your big waters,
That no one may stop us from bringing your food.
For the bread that you eat and the biscuits you nibble,
The sweets that you suck and the joints that you carve,
They are brought to you daily by all the Big Steamers,
And if anyone hinders our coming—*you'll starve!*"

There is no fairer land in the world than rural England. But it is fair only exteriorly. It is but the beautiful setting of a tragedy. A royal commission was appointed to investigate agricultural conditions a few years ago. It reported that lands had fallen to an almost nominal value, that rents had fallen more than one-half, and that the farmers were "steadily going into bankruptcy and ruin." Commenting on these conditions the London Spectator says: "It means the constant presence of blackest care in tens of thousands of households, the actual ruin and despair of thousands, the disintegration and collapse of the whole social fabric."

FREE-TRADE FALLACIES.

It is the boast of free traders that theirs is the true humanitarian principle; that by removing barriers they remove burdens, and that thereby all are benefited. But how far from this is the truth! In fact it builds up one class at the expense of another. It destroys one industry to establish another. It is a narrow, a selfish, a class policy. It is not wise to concentrate a nation's energies or interests, but to diversify them. A small country may thrive on a particular industry for which it is peculiarly adapted, but a great nation can not. And so it is that all the great nations of the world, with the lamentable exception we have been considering, build up and protect their diversified industries by aiding the weak to become strong, by protecting them from foreign rapacity, by equalizing conditions so that growth and development will follow.

There are certain interests so important, so essential to a nation's growth and development, so requisite to its general welfare that they must be considered or disaster is sure to follow. If England's commercial interests have prospered, it has been at the expense of her agricultural interests. In fact, England would have been vastly greater and better if she had adopted a broader policy. No great nation can build a permanent prosperity by the sacrifice of its farming interests and its rural life.

It was the dream of the Cobdenites to make England the factory of the world. To her the nations were to come and pour out their raw material to be manufactured and sold by Englishmen. Thus English manufacturers would fix the price of the world's products and English merchants would reap the profits of the world's sales, and everybody would thus contribute to England's profit and work for England's glory.

It was an ambitious project, and to secure it England's rulers deliberately sacrificed her agricultural interests. But the plan did not work well. The other nations concluded they would not adopt free trade. They believed it would be advisable to control their own markets for their own advantage rather than have England exploit them to her own upbuilding. They concluded they would prefer to have work for their own workingmen rather than furnish work for England's. And so England is very far from being the factory of the world. England's manufacturing establishments no longer lead. Many of her industries are dropping out, others are falling behind, and she is making a desperate struggle to maintain a place in the markets of the world. France has displaced her in some lines, the United States in others, Germany in still more; and all these are protected nations. England used to have first place in industrial progress. She is now in third place.

EFFECTS ON MANUFACTURES AND LABOR.

The ruin of her agricultural interests has involved and hindered her manufacturing interests. Labor conditions and the condition of the poor in England are not only bad, they are alarming. Mr. Lloyd-George, the present leader of the Liberal Party, in a recent statement says:

There are hundreds of thousands if not millions of men, women, and children living under conditions with regard to wages, housing, and the rest of labor conditions which ought to make this great Empire hang its head with shame.

There are in England alone more than 833,000 officially declared paupers. In one county alone—Yorkshire—there are 78,000. The whole number in the United States is only 64,000. Our population is nearly three times England's, while her paupers number more than 10 times ours. One county alone has 14,000 more than there are in this entire Republic. According to the report of the royal commission indoor paupers have increased 75 per cent since 1872. The report says:

The most disquieting index of urban pauperism is the increasing proportion of able-bodied men in health who are dependent on the poor rates and the growing percentages of persons applying for relief under the unemployed workmen's act.

Two hundred and thirty-four thousand children receive outdoor relief in the United Kingdom, and the report says that 600,000 children are—

Chronically underfed, insufficiently clothed, badly housed, and in literally thousands of cases actually being brought up at public expense in drunken homes.

According to Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, one of the leaders of the Conservatives, there are now twelve or thirteen millions of her population, or nearly one-third of it, who live continually on the margin line of want. He says they must no longer speak of a submerged tenth, but of a submerged third.

England boasts of her industrial exports, but she does not boast of the fact that every decade she exports more than a million of her sons and daughters, who leave her free-trade shores to better their condition in her protected colonies or in protected foreign countries. By the assistance of charitable funds or municipal aid the unemployed are seeking lands where the blight of free trade does not bar work from willing hands. It is a singular fact that while Great Britain is exporting Germany is importing labor. Mr. Gompers, who investigated the conditions of labor in England in 1910, said that—

Unemployment, varying as to the individuals involved, is now so bad as to be spoken of as a settled national feature in industry.

Mr. Booker T. Washington also made a personal investigation of the condition of the laboring man in Europe, and published the results in an interesting volume, The Man Farthest Down. He found him in England. Speaking of the London poor, he says:

In the course of my journey across Europe I saw much poverty, but I do not think I saw anything quite so hopeless and wretched.

He found them, he says, everywhere—

Not only men, but women also * * * on rainy nights crouching in doorways or huddled away in dark corners where an arch or a wall protected them from the cold * * *. In the early morning hours digging with their hands in the garbage boxes.
I know of no class—

He concludes—

among the negroes in America with whom I could compare the man at the bottom in England.

A colored man in London who went there from this country wrote him for help to get back. He had been 14 months without work and was nearly starved. In his letter he said:

The winter is coming on, and I would like to get home to shuck corn * * *. It is a long time since I had watermelon, pigs' feet, and corn. I can see the pork chops and the corn bread and the hot biscuits calling me to come over and get some, and many times I have tried but failed.

THE AMERICAN FARMER.

We have considered the decline and fall of agriculture in England under free trade. Let us now consider its history in the United States under protection.

In America the farmer has been the Nation Builder. By him colonies were founded. For him States were framed. Through his efforts the Union came. The pioneer farmer conquered the continent. Sweeping westward with slow but irresistible progress, he has transformed the wilderness into a garden. Trade has followed in his footsteps, cities have sprung up behind him, steel highways now mark the paths he blazed.

From colonial days to the present the interest and influence of the farmer has been in the forefront, shaping our policy and controlling our destiny. The progress of the Nation could be determined by his progress, and in the measure his interests were regarded, so has the Nation prospered. There has never been a year of our history when the farmer has done well that the Nation has not done well. In these later years when our material progress and well-being have made this era the most wonderful of all our history, the progress of the farmer of America has likewise been unprecedented.

The number of farms increased from 4,564,000 in 1890 to 6,361,000 in 1910. The acreage increased from 623,000,000 to 878,000,000. Farm values increased from $16,000,000,000 to $29,000,000,000. The value of their annual product increased from two to nine billions. Compare that record of progress and prosperity with England's record of ruin and decay. With a soil as fertile, with better transportation facilities, and closer markets, the continued decline and ultimate extinction of her agricultural interests seems certain. It would hardly appear that such a free-trade example would justify emulation.

OUR PROTECTIVE POLICY.

Under protection we have tried to build up all our industries together. We have endeavored to follow the advice of Thomas Jefferson, who said, "We must now place our manufacturers by the side of the agriculturist." We believe their relation should be reciprocal. The farmer buys from the manufacturer and the manufacturer from the farmer. Neither prospers if the other does not. Success in agriculture is the initial factor. It is the fundamental fact. A prosperous condition of agriculture is the center and the source of "good times." Bountiful harvests and good prices inspire larger industrial activities. The manufacturer increases his output, the railways enlarge their facilities, the merchant buys heavily. In this way success in agriculture touches all our people. It means increased demands and greater activities in all departments of life.

It is because of these facts and by these means that we have built up the largest home market of the world. Ninety-two per cent of our agricultural products are consumed at home. A still larger per cent of our manufactures are purchased by our own people. Our demands are greater and our means are greater than anywhere else in the world. The American workingman lives better, receives better wages, and buys more than any other of his class. Likewise the American farmer buys as well as sells. He does not hoard his money; he spends it. Prosperity means to him better houses, larger barns, better stock, implements, clothing, education for his children, automobiles, pianos, vacations, and amusements. The prosperity of the American farmer is essential to industrial activity. It is synonymous with national prosperity.

GERMANY IN CONTRAST WITH ENGLAND.

I shall now ask your attention to the experience of Germany as a further contrast to that of England.

German unity followed the Franco-German war. The victory of Sedan gave Bismarck the opportunity of consolidating the German States, which had united in the overthrow of France, and thus the German Empire came into being. The formation of this great federal union gave Bismarck the further opportunity of formulating a fiscal policy. Without hesitation he adopted the policy of protection. Frankly he advocated it, because of the great success which had attended its institution in America. In his speech to the Reichstag he said:

The success of the United States in material development is the most illustrious of modern times. * * * Because it is my deliberate judgment that the prosperity of America is mainly due to its system of protective laws, I urge that Germany has now reached that point where it is necessary to imitate the tariff system of the United States.

As shown by results, the wisdom of that action can not be questioned. The protective system which was then adopted has since been steadfastly maintained and strengthened. Under it Germany has made such progress as to rival even America. Under it she has passed all her continental rivals in trade and commerce.

Germany's foreign trade has grown faster than that of any nation in all the world's history. In 25 years her shipping has increased more than sevenfold. The "commercial fleet" increases each year as fast as vessels can be built or bought. It is a most significant fact that there are now more German than English vessels going through the Suez Canal, while Germany's each year increases and England's each year declines. The Germans have planted their trade outposts in Ceylon, India, and the Malay States, have established centers in China and Japan, and almost control the trade of South America. There is not a port from pole to pole where the German flag is not seen and where German trade is not pressing for place.

Germany's population is now 65,000,000, and is increasing at the rate of more than a million a year.

Great Britain's has increased but 11,000,000 in 30 years.

When protection was adopted the emigration from Germany was more than 200,000 each year. It is now less than 20,000, while that from Great Britain exceeds 100,000 annually.

Germany has increased her exports nearly 100 per cent in 15 years.

During the same period Great Britain increased hers but 17 per cent.

Germany finds employment for all her people at continually increasing wages.

In England there is a constantly increasing number of unemployed and a nearly stationary wage scale.

In order that workingmen may see the contrast between protection and free-trade countries the wage scales during recent years may be instructively studied. In the United States the increase from 1900 to 1907 was—for bricklayers, 25.1 per cent; for carpenters, 42.5 per cent; for plumbers, 46.5 per cent.

In Germany the increases were almost as large—for bricklayers, 23 per cent; for carpenters, 28.7 per cent; for plumbers, 33.6 per cent.

In England the increases were in marked contrast to these—for bricklayers, four-tenths of 1 per cent; for carpenters, five-tenths of 1 per cent; for plumbers, eight-tenths of 1 per cent.

AGRICULTURE UNDER PROTECTION IN GERMANY.

Especially marked is the contrast between the destruction of agriculture in England by free trade and the upbuilding of agriculture in Germany under protection.

Compared with Great Britain, Germany possesses a poor soil, an unfavorable geographical position, and an inferior climate. Her transportation facilities have been inferior, and her imple-

ments and methods greatly so. A century ago her peasants were serfs, and serfdom lingered until the middle of the nineteenth century. Since protection was adopted the farmers' interests have been most carefully guarded. In 1906 Germany made a new tariff. In preparation for it a tariff commission was appointed. For five years they worked. More than 2,000 experts were employed. They worked with characteristic German deliberation and thoroughness. They studied carefully all the weak and strong points of their trade rivals. With scientific care they measured each of their own manifold interests. Carefully they guarded against disturbing the stability of existing business conditions. Whenever a German industry could be developed they fostered it; whenever an interest seemed imperiled they protected it. Especially did they guard their agricultural interests. There was not an article in the schedule that could be produced at home on which the tariff was not increased. The duty on wheat was increased 114 per cent; on corn, 212 per cent; on flour, 156 per cent; potatoes, vegetables, and fruit were taken from the free list and put on the dutiable list.

Under protection agriculture in Germany has greatly prospered. Her area under cultivation has increased until it is practically all in crops. Her stock and crops have more than doubled in amount and value. The German farmer has a continually rising scale of prices for his products, with cheaper transportation rates and better marketing facilities. Under protection Germany has developed the beet-sugar industry until she not only supplies all her home demand, but exports thousands of tons annually. This has not only given a new industry to her farmers, but the indirect benefit of the enrichment of her soil has been great. Within a few years German farmers have doubled the yield per acre of their grain crops, a large proportion of the increase being attributable to raising beets as a rotation crop.

Under this careful conservation of German resources, this intelligent and scientific development of German industries, this systematic and strenuous policy of German progress in every possible outlet for its exercise has developed a passionate patriotism, a love for and devotion to the Fatherland and its every interest that is nothing short of wonderful in this age of cynical indifference. It would seem that every German loves Germany supremely, devotedly; works for her, fights for her, and is ready to die for her. "Deutschland über alles" is their motto—"Germany over all." There is such a thing perhaps as an excess of patriotism, but it would seem as if an infusion of some of this spirit would be beneficial to those who are so ready to sacrifice every American interest on the altar of cheapness.

CONSUMER V. PRODUCER.

It has been impossible for the majority to comprehend that in the establishment of a national policy they should take a national view—should consider the question in its larger aspects. The majority leader declares that this bill is formulated from the consumer's standpoint. That means that everything is to be sacrificed for cheapness. It apparently means nothing to him and his associates that in the endeavor to secure cheapness by free trade we are adopting a discredited policy, one abandoned by all the great nations save England alone; that in this instance free trade has been a bane and not a blessing; that while other nations are prospering and building up their industries through protection, she is sacrificing hers and retrograding under free trade. It is apparently not singular to them that having acquired unmeasured prosperity under protection we should abandon it in the height of our success. It does not seem at all strange to them that we should sacrifice our agricultural interests, as England did hers, in a fruitless endeavor to benefit the consumer at the expense of the producer. It does not appear unpatriotic to surrender our market, the richest prize ever possessed by a great nation, to our trade enemies without a struggle in its behalf.

ATTACK ON FARMERS.

A reckless disregard of the farmer's interest is repeatedly shown in the provisions of this bill. At every point, in every particular, on every item the farmer is stricken.

The bill places on the free list bagging for cotton, but not for wheat; beeswax; bran and wheat screenings; broom corn; buckwheat and buckwheat flour; corn and corn meal; cotton; horsehair; hides and hoofs and horns of cattle; lard; leather; all meats, fresh or prepared; milk and cream; oatmeal; oil cake; oils; oleo stearin; potatoes; rye and rye flour; seeds; skins of sheep, goats, and so forth; swine; tallow; wheat flour; wood; logs, timbers, and so forth; wool and wool wastes; and sugar after three years. Reductions have been made on practically everything else the farmer produces.

The small amount of protection left on some of these articles is valueless or worse. Of what value is the 10 per cent left on cattle and sheep when meats are admitted free? Indeed, it would have been better to have admitted cattle and sheep free, for then the farmer could have purchased his stock for feeding a little cheaper. Of what benefit will it be to the farmer to retain 10 cents per bushel on wheat when flour, bran, and screenings are admitted free? It might have been as well to have admitted wheat free, for then our milling industry might not have been destroyed. Butter carries a small duty, but milk and cream are admitted free. Farm implements are free; but that is no concession, for they are now on the free list from any country granting us like privilege. We have free farm implements now from England, which is the largest foreign producer. But our farmers do not want foreign implements; they want the best, and the best are manufactured in America, and at the cheapest prices.

HIGH PRICES OF FOOD PRODUCTS.

If this assault on the farmer was caused by resentment, it would have no foundation. The belief has been fostered that the farmer is almost the sole cause of the high price of food products. This is far from the truth. The increase he has received has been but the world-wide increase which has marked the course of prices in recent years. Indeed, the farmer has received but a small part of the increase paid by the consumer. The Secretary of Agriculture made an elaborate and most careful investigation of the prices for farm products paid to the farmer and by the consumer a short time ago. The result showed that the consumer was paying on an average 100 per cent more than the farmer received. In other words, one-half of the price paid by the consumer went to the farmer, and the balance went for transportation, distribution, and profits. For example, out of every dollar paid by the consumer for poultry the farmer gets but 50 cents; for every dollar's worth of eggs the farmer receives 69 cents; butter, 87 cents; milk, 50 cents; apples, 56 cents; onions, 28 cents; potatoes, 59 cents, and so forth. Referring to these reports, Secretary Wilson said:

From the details that have been presented with regard to the increase of prices of farm products between farmer and consumer the conclusion is inevitable that the consumer has no well-grounded complaint against the farmer for the prices that he pays.

In view of these facts, which have not been and can not be questioned, what is the justification for this attack on the farmer? It should be understood that it is an easy matter to destroy the farmer's prosperity without benefiting the consumer. There is as large an opening for transportation charges, costs of distribution, and middleman's profits between the importer and the consumer as between the farmer and the consumer.

In the course of this debate it has been frankly stated that it was proposed by this bill to call in the cheaper food products from Canada, Mexico, Argentina, and Australia to displace the products of our own farms. Mr. James B. Burns, president of the Boston market, says:

Free meat and free cattle is the only solution to the present high cost of meat. * * * Our only hope is to import beef, cheap, grass-fed beef and cattle, from the ranges of Australia and those of the Argentine Republic. These countries are now the natural and logical sources of supply.

But who will import and who will handle these supplies? Is it likely that the Beef Trust which controls importations will be any easier to control than the Beef Trust in America? We are now striving with a fair prospect of success to control our domestic trusts, but no man has yet suggested a method to control foreign and international trusts. A wiser statesmanship would apply itself to reducing transportation rates and costs of distribution; to controlling domestic trusts and combinations; and thus with fair prospect of success endeavor to reduce the cost of food products to the consumer. But worse than futile will be the endeavor to aid the consumer by striking the farmer.

USELESSNESS OF PROTESTS.

I suppose there is little use to voice these protests. Argument and appeal alike are in vain. This bill must be passed, for such is the President's wish and the caucus decree. Nothing but another trial and nothing but another disaster will force upon the majority the lesson of their folly. Theirs is a serious responsibility. A Republican administration has transferred to them a Nation at the high tide of its prosperity.

Bradstreet's, in their January review of 1912, said:

Nineteen hundred and twelve was a year of remarkable achievement in agriculture, in trade, and in industry. It saw set up many new records of crop yield, of commodity price movement, and of manufacture. * * * Briefly stated, it was a period of peaceful progress and plenteous production.

Dun's said:

The new year opens with all the gains and advantages achieved during the last half of 1912. The new year takes over from the old the

increased agricultural wealth resulting from big crops, the great activity in the largest industries, the augmented confidence in branches of domestic trade, the record-breaking foreign commerce, and the full employment of labor at high wages, insuring large buying power. With this legacy from 1912 the maintenance of a satisfactory volume of business apparently is assured.

This is the fruitage of protection. Republicans believe that only by its maintenance can the continuance of such conditions be assured. In the language of President McKinley:

We stand for a protective tariff because it represents the American home, the American fireside, the American family, the American girl and the American boy, and the highest possibilities of American citizenship.

With this in view it will be our duty to oppose and to vote against this bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CONNELLY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CONNELLY] is recognized.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, it may be presumptuous for one who has been here only since the beginning of the present session of Congress to speak at this time after listening to men who have grown gray in the service here. Were it a contest in eloquence and oratory I might well shrink from the task. But I am here representing one of the great agricultural districts of this country. Out in my State and district nature and a race of pioneers have combined to make a country great in resource, rich in material wealth, splendid in civic pride, and righteous. I speak that they may have representation here; that they may have a voice in this new era when honest and patriotic men are concerned that the burdens of government may be placed upon the shoulders of those who are best able to bear them. I speak that they may be allowed to give approval to the Democratic teachings of the Master of men, when He taught that those should be held accountable for much who possessed much. I voice their sentiments when I disapprove of the application to our governmental life of the idea that He never intended should be applied to the material things of this life when He said:

He that hath shall be added unto, while he that hath not, that which he hath shall be taken away.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that we are not here to contend for personal or physical supremacy, as was the case in ages gone by, but that we are here trying to champion an ideal and fighting for the supremacy of an idea. I am not surprised that men who are here representing different communities and different interests should honestly hold ideas widely divergent as to what is the proper way to proceed to make tariff schedules. I grant every man here on both sides of the House a right to his opinion, and it is no part of my purpose to indulge in criminations or recriminations because gentlemen on the other side of the House hold opinions that are widely different from my own.

I find as I get more acquainted with them that they are clever and courteous gentlemen, who would much rather help than harm their neighbor, but who have been sent here by constituencies that believe that privilege long permitted becomes a vested right, and so long as they continue to believe in that doctrine I will find myself at variance with them; but I grant them the right to represent their people. From their speeches delivered here I infer that they are amazed at the audacity of a Democratic Congress which wants to wean some of the overgrown industries and place them on the same basis as that occupied by the farmer, the laborer, and the artisan, who, when they come asking for special privileges, are invariably pointed to the motto on the wall which reads, "Paddle your own canoe."

The real difficulty with the revision of the tariff is that it is usually revised with an eye to the welfare of selfish interests instead of in the interests of the whole people. In recent years it has been revised on the basis of a division of the spoils instead of with the idea of stopping the crime of taking the goods. I come from an agricultural district, and if there have ever been a people on the face of the earth that have been misled by the sophistries of a protective tariff it is the people who live on the farm. They have heard the protectionist insist that the tariff on an article represents the difference in the price at home and abroad, when it was selling for the same price in London and New York, with a tariff on it equal to the selling price in either place. They have seen a tariff of 25 cents a bushel on corn while they were selling it over the scales at 13 cents per bushel. They have seen a tariff of 25 cents a bushel on wheat, which had only the effect of increasing the price to them of the seed they were compelled to ship in from other countries in order that they might keep their yield to the maximum. They have been compelled to pay an artificial price for their farm machinery, harness, wagons, and carriages. They have been forced to buy all of their supplies in a protected market while they have had to sell in the open markets of the world.

I have heard some gentlemen proclaim that the farmer was arrogant and prosperous, but I know that if you allow for the natural increase of the farm lands that he has owned you will find but very few who have tilled the soil have made more than an existence, and statistics tell us that year by year more of them are working rented and mortgaged farms and the ownership is fast passing out of the hands of the men who live on them and work them. The protectionists are not sparing with their criticisms and the prophecy that the present tariff law will not work and will bring disaster to the country. They apparently forget that their high schedules have almost invariably failed to produce expected results and that every financial depression that has occurred for 50 years has come under high duties enacted by Republican Congresses.

If we have a criticism of the present law it is that the duties on manufactured goods are still too high, although they have been reduced greatly from the schedules that have prevailed under Republican rule. We believe that as we reach or approach the ideal in government that tariffs will gradually go to the scrap heap as a means of raising revenues and that these funds will be raised by a direct tax the same as the taxes that are now raised for State and municipal expense. If every man was compelled to go to the taxgatherer and pay his full tax at the end of the year it would put an end to the extravagance that is noticeable upon every hand in the National Capital and wherever the Government now appropriates money. If taxes were paid direct and the people really knew how much money was wasted by those who administer the law, there would be such an uprising and protest against the waste of Government funds that the "pork barrel" would soon resemble a cracker jar, and the Congressman who now measures his usefulness by the number of Government buildings that he gets for his district would have a different standard by which he would measure his stewardship.

Those who have taught the principles of Jefferson least in days gone by have had much to say about them during this debate because he in the early history of the Nation's life gave sanction to the laying of low tariff rates. They apparently forget that conditions to-day and conditions then are vastly different. That Jefferson did approve of this means of raising revenue, with its incidental protection, but he lived and spoke for an age when many of these industries were indeed in their infancy and at a time when there was no real division over the tariff question. But while they are reveling in the teachings of Jefferson they should reflect that he never approved a measure with rates as high as is now shown by this measure proposed by the present majority, which is spoken of with contempt as a free-trade measure.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen contend that their party have been thrown from power without any just cause and insist that when the people get their bearings again they will return the Republican Party to power in this great country. No one can do more than to prophesy what the future holds in store for us, but if the last part of their contention has not more of the essence of facts in it than the other part, which contends that there was no reason for their overthrow, then the future should hold dread for no one save those who hope for the coming of the evil hour.

You who come with your lamentations, forebodings, and prophecies, telling of the evil that will follow in the wake of this enactment, should remember that as doctrinarians you are not strangers to error or as prophets that you have not always been a success. You have come to us in other days and told us that no matter how high we placed the duty, that it was not our concern, for you were sure that the joke was on the foreigner and that he was the fellow who paid the tariff. You came to us and said that you were interested in the weal of the workman and your hearts yearned that he be shielded from a competition with the pauper labor of other lands, while you have for 50 years watched with complacent eye monster ships laden with human cargo shipped from southern Europe to take their place beside the American laborer without let or hindrance.

In all your love for the laboring man he now awakens to the fact that after enjoying your protection for all of these years that there stands between him and the lowest-paid labor of all the earth only the price of the steerage fare on the cheapest steamship that rides the wave. The only real protection that he has, and he knows it, is the efficiency that lies in his own

brawn and brain, and he holds in contempt your expressed fears and forebodings that he can not compete with any people in all the world who can make a full-dress suit out of 6 cents' worth of calico.

You stood on the political hustings for many years and denied that there was such a thing as a trust, and when your position was proven to be wrong, you said through the mouthpiece of your prophet and leader that if there was such a thing that it was a good thing for the country and it should be encouraged and fostered.

When the people again found that you were wrong you said they should be reproved and reprimanded, but that the weapons with which they wrung from the laborer and the consumer an unjust share of the wealth of the country should not be wrested from their hands for fear in so doing that some innocent bystander should suffer in the melee.

And so, my Republican friends, if in the final analysis it should appear that the present bill should not give all the relief that is claimed for it by those who have framed it and believe in it, you should be charitable in your criticisms, for it is not becoming in you to refuse to allow us to be wrong once, when you have been wrong so many times.

I have been amused and entertained at the position of the members of the Progressive Party on the tariff question. I was at one time in my State a member of the old-time Populist Party, and I have never apologized for the things that they taught. I find in the Progressive Party a good many of the ideas that we as Populists were abused and despised for promulgating a score of years ago, and I am not persuaded that they are any the less potent for what I believe is for the good of the country, because they have just attracted the attention of some very worthy gentlemen who were loud in condemning them in the days past, but on the tariff question I find this new party a little difficult to understand.

Ninety-five per cent of those who constitute the Progressive Party are men who have only recently gone up and down the country as Republicans, pleading the cause of high protection; and if they are different now from what they were before this great light of progress dawned upon them, that fact is not noticeable from the discussions that I have listened to here on the floor by the gentlemen who have spoken for that party. They appear to take the middle ground that would revise the schedules in such a way that the revision would help no one and would harm no one.

They appear to be in the same frame of mind as the old Irishman who supposed that he was reaching the time of dissolution. His spiritual adviser came to him and said, "Pat, do you renounce the devil and all of his works?" Pat rolled his eyes and said, "Father, I am not sure which country I am going to, and I don't think it is a good idea to make any enemies unnecessarily." [Laughter.]

The Progressives who have spoken do not agree with the stand-pat element of the party from which they have so recently seceded, and they apparently have some misgivings as to the bill under consideration and want to keep themselves in shape so that they can jump with the cat when it is released and be on the popular side in any event.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a good deal in recent years about nonpolitical and nonpartisan boards who are going to point out the way on these various questions. I do not know exactly what kind of a board a nonpolitical board would be, unless it would be a board composed of men with no political beliefs or convictions, and if that is the idea, I have some misgivings as to their work, for in my range of acquaintances I do not know of any man who has no political opinions and convictions that I would be ready to follow far in the matter of revising the tariff or upon any other proposition. I would rather intrust the making of these laws to the most rabid standpatter in my district than to intrust them to any coterie of men that I know of who have no politics at all.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I shall not flatter myself that this or any bill that shall be written by the hands of men is perfect in all of its details or will be above criticism by those who honestly differ in opinions with the men responsible for it. I realize that no bill can be written that is or can be free from criticism by those who want to see evil come. If you put cattle on the free list, they will go to the farmer and tell him that the Democrats have removed all protection from the cattle he raises. If you put duty on them the same fellows will go to the farmer and tell him that the Democrats make him pay a penalty for feeders that he wants to ship in to feed up his surplus crops. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the committee that framed this bill occupied higher grounds and their scope of vision encompassed a greater range of humanity and humanity's needs than any like committee that has sat in this country for 50 years. I shall support this measure gladly, not because all of its schedules are just what I would have made them, nor because it is a perfect bill, but because it is an honest effort on the part of its framers to fulfill the pledges made by the Democratic Party to the people of the country. I believe it will not be a disappointment to the people as is so freely predicted by those who to-day sit in the wailing places. I believe when it goes to the country, along with the other laws that this Congress will enact, that it will start anew the lifeblood of commerce, bring prosperity to the land in general, and meet the approval of a great people who deserve much at the hands of this body. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to go into a detailed discussion of the tariff question in all its phases, but I do desire to invite attention to some conditions which have intruded themselves into this debate and discuss in a general way some of the most important features of the bill. It is conceded that there is a necessity for tariff revision, and that the revision should be downward is admitted by everybody except the pet industries which have enjoyed special privilege so long that they look upon protection as a divine right, and resent any interference with their assumed prerogative as a violation of and an infringement upon what they seem to regard not only a sacred but a vested right. As the result of the issues of the last campaign, the tariff is to be revised, and that revision is to be downward. The Democratic Party is charged with the responsibility, and in keeping with its platform pledges and campaign promises is now engaged in a good-faith effort to comply with the mandate of the American people expressed at the polls. The Democratic Party has always stood for a tariff for revenue only, and insists that there is no constitutional authority to impose taxes upon the people for any other purpose. We are opposed to a protective tariff—that is, to a tariff tax levied for the purpose of fostering and enriching favored industries. We are opposed to anything that smacks of special privilege. A tax is burdensome at best, but when that burden is increased beyond the necessities of the Government economically administered for no other purpose than to enrich a few at the expense of the taxpayer it becomes intolerable and can not be justified, either legally or morally. The opposition to this bill have not seriously contended that it does not provide for sufficient revenue, but it is urged that it will remove the props from under the protective system and materially affect the profits of manufacturers. At the same time and almost in the same breath it is urged that it will not reduce the cost of living and the price of necessaries in the homes of our people. Just how these two arguments can be reconciled is beyond my understanding. I believe it to be a fact, as stated by an eminent authority, that the tariff is the mother of trusts; that we have protected American industries in such excessive profits and against foreign competition to such an extent that we have piled up in this country in the hands of the beneficiaries of the protective system the colossal fortunes that are a menace to our institutions.

A trust consists of an aggregation of capital for the control of trade, and as a result of the enormous wealth accumulated in the hands of tariff barons not only have the prices of products been arbitrarily fixed and the markets controlled, but during the Republican period of ascendency those who possess this accumulated wealth have controlled the policies of the Republican Party and shaped the legislation of the country. We propose by this bill to limit taxation to a revenue basis. We are opposed to any system that filches money from the pocket of one citizen and transfers it to that of another. We are opposed to any system of taxation that has for its purpose the robbery of one man for the enrichment of another. I fully agree with the theory of this bill. It may not be perfect; no assessment ever was. There are under any system or scheme of taxation inequalities, unfair valuations, and an unequal distribution of the burdens of government—local, State, and national—which can not be avoided. But I believe that this bill approaches nearer to exact justice and to the equal distribution of the burdens of government than any tariff measure devised since the Walker tariff. And I further believe that within six months from the date of its enactment business will have adjusted itself to new conditions and to new rates, and that universal prosperity will prevail. But whatever may be the result

of the bill, there is no escaping a substantial and material reduction of tariff rates; the people have demanded it; that was the issue which disrupted the Republican Party, and the Democratic Party would be derelict in its duty, unmindful of its obligations, and unfaithful to every trust if it did not enact into law a tariff measure limiting taxation to a revenue basis and eliminating the whole policy and system of protection, except in so far as incidental protection results from a revenue tariff. If I understand the will of the people, this bill is exactly what they want. It is the declared purpose of the people to test out to the fullest measure the Democratic tariff policy, and, with confidence in the Democratic Party, the people hail with hope and confidence the efforts of this administration in the direction of tariff revision.

That which has amused me—and, I may say, surprised me—most is that gentlemen upon that side of the House, whose tariff policies have been repudiated and found to be a failure, now come here and assume to advise the Democratic Party, which holds a commission from the people to revise the tariff—these repudiated Republicans come here to advise us how to do it. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] If a party and its tariff policies ever have been repudiated, the Republican Party and the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill have been. Yet we witness the spectacle on this floor of the author of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill telling us how to do it. After we have revised the tariff, if we make as complete and lamentable a failure as did our Republican friends, then I am willing to surrender back into their hands, but not until then, the power to deal with this great question.

I believe I have heard here as many good and well-prepared speeches upon the tariff question as I have before heard in all my life; as many well-considered, well-thought-out discourses; and what is unusual, I have witnessed many of them delivered in the shape of addresses prepared and read to this body.

I do not come with a prepared speech of that character and do not care at this time to say more on the Democratic theory of tariff legislation, but I do want to invite the attention of our Republican friends to some things in their platform, and incidentally I want to say a word to our Progressive friends. I regret that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CHANDLER], who made such a splendid effort this afternoon in defense of Mr. Roosevelt, is not here to-night, because I wanted to say something to him in answer to what he said in defense of that distinguished character.

But first I want to call the attention of my Republican friends to some things in their platform. I say you made a failure when you attempted to revise the tariff, and the people have repudiated you, and I say you admitted your failure in your platform. Let me read it. Perhaps this will be familiar to some of you, and to some of you it may not.

The Payne-Aldrich bill had only been in operation three years, or less than three years, when your Chicago platform of last year was framed, and you say in that platform:

> Some of the existing import duties are too high and should be reduced. Readjustments should be made from time to time to conform to changed conditions and to reduce excessive rates, but without injury to any American industry.

A confession that rates in a bill which had been enacted less than three years before were too high; a confession that when you promised the American people in the campaign of 1908 that you would revise the tariff downward that you had failed to redeem your platform pledge to the American people. And yet you went to the people in 1912, with this confession upon your lips, again pledging a revision of the tariff downward and a readjustment of its inequalities. You come here now when a bill has been prepared and submitted to you for your consideration and your votes and criticize and condemn it, and say to us that we are inexperienced in tariff legislation; that we are tinkering with this question; that we are not acting in good faith; that we resort to subterfuges, deception, and fraud; and you assume to tell us how to do that which you failed to do. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want to call your attention to another thing in your platform. Here is the justification and excuse for the whole protective policy. Listen:

> The protective tariff is so woven into the fabric of our industrial life that to substitute for it a tariff for revenue only would destroy many industries.

Now, there is the keynote, there is the whole argument in a nutshell that our friends resort to in defense of the protective tariff system; because they say by maintaining it so long, by giving artificial support for so many years to the various protected industries, these industries instead of becoming self-reliant have become dependent upon the bounty of the Government and the privileges extended to them, so that it is said we can not withdraw that support with safety, without endangering the business interests of the country. If that is true, if we have become so entangled in the meshes of protection, so helpless in the hands of these protected industries that we can not withdraw Government aid without endangering the business interests of the country, the sooner we commence to wean this calf the better off we will be in the end and the safer will become every legitimate industry in the land. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We do not wish to destroy industries, especially any legitimate industry, but we do say that we have pledged the American people a substantial reduction in tariff rates, and we come here proposing this bill, and intend to redeem our pledge. We say more. We have pledged the people an income tax, and the people, by three-fourths of the State legislatures, have ratified the constitutional amendment providing for an income tax. And yet our friends across the aisle stand here to a man opposed to an income tax, and are proposing to vote against it when it comes to a vote on this bill.

The Democratic Party has demanded for years that wealth shall contribute its just share to the burdens of Government, and to that end has favored an income tax. The Supreme Court held the last income-tax law unconstitutional. For years the Democratic Party has sought a constitutional amendment authorizing this method of taxation. Of course the men enjoying great incomes have, through the instrumentality of the Republican Party, opposed such an amendment, and it was not until we secured a Democratic House and a Senate anti-Republican that we were able to force to the submission of the people a proposition for such an amendment to the Constitution. We expect that the reduction in tariff rates will materially reduce the revenue derived from tariff taxation, and we have provided in this bill for an income tax to make up the difference. It is said in opposition to this provision in the bill that those enjoying an income less than $4,000 will escape their fair share of taxation and that the burden will fall on those who enjoy a larger income. That is true, but who can better afford it? It must not be forgotten that under the tariff system those enjoying a mere living income and who spend it in the support and education of their families contribute to the expenses of the Government out of all proportion to those possessing great fortunes, because there is a limit to every man's necessities and a corresponding limit to legitimate expenditures, and the necessities of a family in moderate circumstances are as great as those who possess great wealth; and as a result the man with an income of $2,000, $3,000, or $4,000 who expends it on his family contributes as much toward the support of the Government as does the man of a much larger income who expends only a portion for the maintenance of his household. Yet the man with large property interests and the great corporate concerns throughout the country require expenditures for the protection of their property and enforcement of their rights far beyond that which the man or concern of moderate means requires for the same purpose. Why should not the man of means or the corporation of extensive operations pay toward the support of the Government which protects them in their business and property rights in proportion to the benefits received? The only way by which these burdens can be equalized and the large incomes and great property interests be compelled to contribute in proportion to the benefits received is by means of a well-adjusted income tax.

In this way, and only in this way, can burdens of taxation be at all equalized and approach exact and equal justice to all men. I favor the income-tax provisions of this bill. I am not surprised that the Republicans in this House intend to vote against it. To be consistent they must do so. They have opposed a constitutional amendment making such a tax possible, and why should they not vote against an income-tax law? The fact that the people have demanded it, have ratified the constitutional amendment, and elected to power a party which stands pledged to it, ought not to deter a party which has defied public sentiment and yielded to the demands of the selfish interests so long. I am surprised, however, that members of the Progressive Party on this floor intend to vote against this bill. But I find that their consistency is not greater than that of their chieftain; and who will be heard to say that Roosevelt knows the meaning of the term?

And I want to say a word to our Progressive friends as to their defense of Roosevelt to-day. It was amusing to hear it said that Roosevelt was a great trust buster, and an editorial was read in which it was proclaimed what he at one time

intended to do. Rooseveltian like, it was full of threats of what he was going to do, and I was inclined to ask the gentleman whether it was all bluff or whether he really meant it.

I have an authority from which I desire to read a few words in regard to the Roosevelt administration as a trust buster. It is eminent Progressive authority, and you will probably recognize the author when I read the language.

In the Senate of the United States, August 16, 1912, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, a Republican Progressive, said:

> On the day that Theodore Roosevelt was made President of the United States there were 149 trusts and combinations in the United States. When he turned this Government over to William H. Taft there were 10,020.
>
> When Theodore Roosevelt entered the White House the trusts and combinations had a capitalization of $3,784,000,000. On the day that he turned the administration over to Taft it was $31,672,000,000, about. More than 70 per cent of it was watered. Its power has grown and is spreading.
>
> The number of trusts and monopolies is multiplying. There has been no diminishing under the present administration. The present administration has sought to apply more vigorously than any administration that preceded the Sherman antitrust law. But the time to apply the law effectively was when the gigantic trusts and monopolies were in their infancy.
>
> I do not believe the man who was President of the United States for seven years while the greatest trust growth in this country occurred, at the very time of all times in the history of the Sherman law when it could have been made productive in destroying trust organization, that destroys competition and places the American people in the powers of the combinations—I do not believe that the man who was President during that time is the man to find the way out now.

I have not heard from any source these figures questioned, although they were extensively used during last campaign. It was, however, contended by the Republicans that many unsuccessful suits against the trusts had been prosecuted.

It is a lamentable fact that with Taft the President but few months ago hardly a voice is heard on his side of the House in defense of him, or in defense of his administration, or in defense of his tariff policies. Bolder and more courageous are our Progressive friends; they do come to the rescue of Roosevelt; and they do come here and defend his policies and show what he threatened to do, although they fail to show what he accomplished.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman yield? What book is he reading from?

Mr. WILLIAMS. From Democratic authority—the best in the world.

Mr. BRYAN. Does it contain anything showing the trusts that Grover Cleveland broke up while he was in power for eight years? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. I assume that there is nothing in the campaign book of 1912 relating to Mr. Cleveland's administration, but I also assume that the trusts were then in their mere infancy and hardly recognized as a menace to the country. These things have come in the last 16 years, and during the 7½ years of Roosevelt's administration they climbed from 149 to 10,020. How many there were when Cleveland was President I can not say, but the number was less than 149. If you want to go into ancient history we would be glad to have you, but I want to say to you that it was the Republican Party, it was your administration of affairs under President Harrison that precipitated this country into the worst panic known for 50 years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I want to say more, that every panic we have had in this country for over 50 years has come under a Republican administration and under Republican protective tariff laws. The panic of 1873 was when President Grant was in the chair and you had a high protective tariff. The panic of 1883 came under a Republican administration and a Republican tariff law. Aye, gentlemen, the panic of 1891–1893 came under the McKinley bill and while it was in full operation.

The Democratic Party has been accused of responsibility for the hard times during the Cleveland administration, but every intelligent man knows, and every fair-minded man will admit, the panic then prevailing was the result of the policies of the previous administration. The Homestead riots occurred prior to the election of 1892, and were an issue in that campaign. Strikes, lockouts, riot, and bloodshed were the order of the day for a period of 18 months before Cleveland's inauguration. The necessity for the issuing of bonds to meet the deficiency in the revenues which arose under the Harrison administration was apparent many months before the election of 1892 and the plates prepared for the printing of bonds while Mr. Harrison yet remained in the presidential chair.

And let me say to my Progessive friends that the panic of 1907, without apparent cause, when conditions were never more prosperous, came under a Republican tariff law and a Republican administration while Theodore Roosevelt was administering the affairs of the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman tell us something about the panic of 1837? He surely does not blame that on the Republican Party. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was some time before my day.

Mr. SLOAN. Oh, we do not blame you for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman relieves me from any blame or responsibility for it, but I will say that it is not traceable to the Democratic policy of a tariff for revenue only. If we had a panic then, as the gentleman seems to imply, it was the result of throttling the United States Bank, and was precipitated by an attempt on the part of the money power to resent interference with their pet institution, and it was in no wise traceable to the tariff question.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I would like, for information, to have the gentleman's explanation of President Buchanan's awful indictment against his party in 1860 as the result of the tariff act in 1857.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, while I was born that year, I hope the gentleman will attach no blame to me.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. The gentleman said he was willing to go back into history.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The history that the gentleman [Mr. BRYAN] and I were discussing was the history as recent as Mr. Cleveland's days. I do not recall that Mr. Buchanan criticized the Democratic Party or its tariff policies, but I do recall the fact that he turned the power of his administration against the best Democrat of his day, and was one of the men responsible for the disruption of the Democratic Party. I know that.

Mr. FORDNEY. He did a good thing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan says that Mr. Buchanan did a good thing. I might retort by saying that Mr. Roosevelt did a good thing when last year he disrupted the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But I did not come here in the discussion of this bill to criticize our Progressive friends. I would rather praise the bridge that carried us safely over.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Sure you do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And I leave it with you gentlemen to settle your differences in your own party. My time is fast expiring, and in conclusion I reiterate that I challenge gentlemen upon the Republican side of the Chamber in any reply they make to point to a panic in all the history of this country, whether it be the the panic of 1837, the panic of 1857, or any other that is traceable to Democratic reform policies. I assert on the other hand, as I said before, that every panic that has occurred in this country since the advent of the Republican Party to power has been directly traceable to Republican rule and Republican policies. Will gentlemen challenge that proposition?

I wish to say in conclusion that the gentlemen upon the other side of this House who come here and predict financial disaster, business depression, and panic as the result of this measure if it shall become a law do not come here as patriotic citizens and make such predictions in good faith. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You are so driven by necessity for some means by which to put new life in your party, hoping that future disaster may follow from some cause—tariff legislation or other—that you are willing here to threaten business, to disturb business industry, by making declarations and threats upon the floor of this House which are more calculated to breed a panic than are all of the tariff bills that could be enacted. Panics are the result of mental conditions—of a scare—and yet you gentlemen come here and you publish to the world that a panic will follow the enactment of this bill into law; and I say to you that when you do that, when you purposely and deliberately frighten business, you are not sincere; you are not acting in good faith; but for party gain would frighten the country into a panic, and when you do that you are not acting the part of patriotic American citizens. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am glad of an opportunity to express my appreciation of the remarks of the magnetic Member from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON]. I wish to indorse many of his statements in regard to the alien ownership of land and to call the attention of the Democratic ma-

jority to the fact that all of his statements apply with great force to the situation that confronts us with the passage of the Underwood free-trade bill.

If the United States yields to Japan—

Says Mr. SISSON—

it will have to yield to China, and China will have the right to send her hordes into this country. They will force the wage earner and the farmer out.

A Chinaman can live on what a farmer throws away—

declares the gentleman from Mississippi.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want Mr. SISSON and every Democrat in this House to know that Chinese immigrants are and have been for some time pouring into British Columbia a thousand a month. Not many, you of the East think; but too many for our sparsely settled West. Until now a protective-tariff wall has kept our people of the great Pacific Northwest from too close competition with these oriental offscourings. The Underwood free-trade bill tears down the tariff wall. From now on we of the West must compete with the Chinese and the Japanese. Not alone in the lumber and shingle industry—our mills versus the mills of British Columbia—but this country will receive its shoes from Japan, made by women who earn 9 cents a day, and chinaware and notions will come in; yes, cotton goods, prints, and all other articles that we have taught these people to make and sold them the machinery with which to work.

I know that the gentleman from Mississippi will agree with me in the statement that with the 50-cent tariff stricken from shingles the Chinese now pouring into British Columbia might just as well be located in the State of Washington. Do you wonder that the people of California oppose the Japanese ownership of land in that State? Our western gardeners freely acknowledge that they can not compete with the Japanese gardeners, and I ask you in all fairness, What chance has a good well-paid Northwestern shingle weaver to compete against the cheap coolie or the low-cast Hindu from India? Remember that there are 900,000,000 of them. We of the Pacific coast know what this means.

I hope and pray that this free-trade bill now under consideration will not put the laborer of our Southern States in extensive competition with the peons of Mexico and the half-breeds of Brazil.

You strike off our protective tariff on lumber and shingles. How long must we wait for you to lift the embargo against foreign ships?

That embargo is for the benfit of American shipbuilders and American sailors. Why protect them if you will not protect our manufacturers and workers?

After a few weeks the red cedar shingles made by coolies in British Columbia will travel around the coast in the ships of foreign countries, manned by sailors at $10 a month, who are fed by cooks who receive $15 a month, and sell in any market against our American shingles, made by full-fledged, red-blooded men whose battle cry is "a fair day's wage for a full day's labor." These handicapped shingles will be transported in our little fleet of American ships, paying sailors and cooks $50 and $60 a month, and no protective tariff to help either the manufacturer or the wage earner.

Already three gigantic companies are forming—two in Washington State and one in Oregon—to extend the lumber industry in British Columbia. One, with headquarters at Bellingham, is actually in the field with a capital of three and a half million dollars. This company has leased British Columbia Crown lands for 20 years at 50 cents a thousand feet stumpage, payable when the timber is cut, and a light annual tax. This tract contains fifteen hundred million feet of timber, and that timber will be cut and sold against our timber that has been paid for at an average price of $2.50 a thousand stumpage, and which must pay heavy taxes and interest every year until cut.

Now, then, notice what we are already up against:

(1) Oriental labor.

(2) Inability to use foreign-built ships for coastwise trade.

(3) American-owned timberland paying taxes, as against Crown land leases of British Columbia.

And now, to cap the climax, you, willy-nilly, strike off the little protection we have had and make, as a fourth obstacle, absolute free trade in the lumber industry. Perhaps lumber can stand it; but 30,000 shingle weavers and knee-bolters will be idle in the State of Washington within 90 days after the passage of this bill.

Do you wonder that Democrats, Republicans, Progressives, and all the people of the Northwest are up in arms? What applies to lumber applies to flour, except in that case you have added insult to injury by letting flour in free and putting a 10-cent tax on wheat.

I wish that opportunities had been given for hearings with regard to a tariff on shingles. The people of the Northwest would have accepted a sliding scale downward, stopping somewhere near the 30-cent figure of the old Wilson bill.

But we have had no hearings and must sit supinely by while the majority throws our markets open to the very workmen in other countries whose coming to the United States in recent years amounts almost to a great immigrant invasion.

What difference does it make whether you let the Japanese, the Chinese, the Hindu, the Greek, and the Turk make his goods for us at home and ship them here free, or whether you let him and all of his relatives pour in 6,000 a day to cut the throats with those now here for jobs in the cotton mills, the woolen mills?

In my opinion, a thousand Chinese a month pouring into sparsely settled British Columbia to cut timber and saw lumber to compete with the products of our sturdy men of the woods is fully as bad as the present inpouring of 6,000 immigrants per day into thickly settled New York.

I hope that the United States will soon return to a tariff wall—a reasonable, rational, expert tariff wall—high enough to guarantee protection, and then I hope that we will reenforce that wall with another protective wall against undesirable immigration.

With the first wall you protect the man who invests his capital, makes the goods, or grows the product, and provides the American standard of living. With the other wall, you protect the man who is on the job—you take care of the foreigners who are here, and you cut down the influx of undesirables from the south of Europe, against whom we have "conserved" all that we used to offer freely to the people from the north of Europe.

Why are we surprised that they begin to hate this country before they can find any reason to love it? Is it any wonder that these serf-born hordes quickly become the dupes and disciples of such vicious agitators as Bill Haywood and his platform of the Industrial Workers of the World—"no concern as to questions of right and wrong; no terms with employers; destruction and bloody revolution"? It will take not only our tariff wall and an immigration wall, but a penitentiary wall to stop this kind of treason.

Why are we surprised? How can we be surprised at the red-flag movement when Vice President Marshall, in an address at New York, undertakes to warn the rich, and only succeeds in striking a note that gives the Socialists more sympathy than they have had since their prophet "Old Hoss" Wayland, of the Appeal to Reason, ran afoul of the Mann law and committed suicide, and more good cheer than they ever enjoyed since their disciple, Victor Berger, left Congress and expatriated himself in their eyes by purchasing an upholstered mahogany-finished motor boat.

Roosevelt did not stand at Armageddon. He stood at Chicago and preached near-socialism, almost revolution, contempt for law, and doctrines that lead to destruction.

Haywood waves the red flag at Paterson, N. J., and preaches anarchy and sabotage. Ettor advises the striking waiters to poison the food of the rich. Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania wants pensions for everybody. All are preaching the universal brotherhood of man. All have different motives. In trying to save the country they are doing much to destroy it. They are teaching employees to actually hate those who employ them. They seem to have forgotten that the universal brotherhood must include the 900,000,000 people of China, Japan, and India. In this great progressive wave, will these seething hordes come up to our level or will our 100,000,000 drop to theirs, and when?

My friend, Mr. SISSON, of Mississippi, sees the peril, as his address of this forenoon clearly shows. He speaks his convictions, but I dare, in my weak and humble way, to warn not only the gentleman from Mississippi, but the honorable the Vice President of the United States and the honorable the President of the United States—who by coming on this floor has expressed a desire to take part in this debate—that every time an industry of this country is slaughtered or an American citizen is made to compete with a 9-cent Japanese, that sad day is hastened, for, my friends, the great international brotherhood with its international red flag, with its fatherless and churchless children, with its collectiveism and its 57 varieties of impossible dreams, will drag us down ten thousand degrees before it can lift us one tittle. For your attention, I thank you, gentlemen. [Loud applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have been as a new Member very much interested in watching the course

of legislation with reference to this great subject of revenue and tariff. I have learned much since I came to Congress. Much about legislation and its methods and very much more about the great diversity of opinion that seems to exist in the minds of so many people concerning this subject. To me, born and raised in the city of Philadelphia, with all its traditions of protection, its great manufacturing industries, it is indeed a revelation; but, believing as I do most firmly, as a matter of conviction and duty, based upon somewhat of a study of this question before coming here, that protection is a great national policy and not a local issue, but applied locally wherever needed to develop the industries of my country, I accept of the courtesy extended to me of making a few remarks on this occasion and voicing my protest against this bill, which I consider to be unequal and unjust, and, also, against the circumstances attending upon its conception and passage. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Arguments have been advanced here, in favor of and against this measure, by older men in the art of legislation and the science of government, to whom I have cheerfully given priority, because I am a new Member. From the surrounding circumstances I do not believe, however, that these arguments will change a single vote in this House. Nevertheless, they will go into the legislative record and be scattered, in many instances, among the people, where they will, I hope, have an elucidating and educative effect. This, however, may be only indulging a pleasing hope, but, after all, the citizens of the country will learn more from the object lessons of the tariff than in any other way. Experience is sometimes a costly teacher, but usually an effective one. I pray that the prophecy of the advocates of this measure may be found to be faithful prophecy, and born of wisdom, and not of a blind policy. As a patriot, burying my party zeal, I devoutly desire this result. I hope I may be disappointed in my own views as to its effects. For the good of my country and the welfare of the people I hope this may be true. But, alas! I can only see loss and suffering in the future as the logical result of the enactment of this tariff bill into a law of the land.

Protection is too old to need to-day any demonstration of its value in speech or argument. This exists in the history of the country. Where no industries existed before, or feeble ones struggled for life, new ones have been developed and the weak ones have grown strong. The benefits have not been confined to the industry protected, but have been felt all about it. You can not create or foster one without incidentally benefiting every part of the business life of the Nation. Drop a stone into a lake, and philosophers tell us every atom of water in the lake will feel the effect of the plunge. You can not lay your hand upon a single industry, either to foster or destroy it, but what the whole commercial life will feel the effect. As an illustration, What industry in steel rails had we in this country before the tariff of 1861 became a law? Through that and subsequent legislation the great furnaces, rolling mills, and plants grew up. With them came employment for tens of thousands of men, and the building of a multitude of homes, with large additions of families and citizens in many communities, all of which in turn gave work in collateral occupations to artisans and mechanics without number, besides creating a market for the products of the grocer, the tailor, the butcher, the baker, and a host of other persons engaged in commerce. It also gave a valuable home market to the farmer for his products. These benefits can not be denied. While protected from outside attack by the tariff, competition grew at home, until the price of steel rails fell to a marvelously low rate. The inventive genius of our people created new conditions, facilitating the making of steel and promoting the development of the industry to the highest degree of efficiency. The continent was girdled with rails of home manufacture. Every thoughtful American must recognize the wonderful development of our country under protection. The resources of the country have been utilized as they could not have been without it.

It is true that with this mighty and phenomenal growth there has arisen great corporations in various lines, controlling vast aggregations of capital. The enemies of protection point to the so-called "trusts" or "monopolies" and cry out, "These are the evil results of protection." Now, great corporations are not the children solely of the tariff, they are the natural evolution of business which has gone through the various stages from the single individual in business to the firm, the limited partnership, the corporation, and, finally, the consolidation of corporations or the trust.

But this evolution is not in its results wholly an evil. Without these great aggregations of capital some of the greatest achievements of the past century could not have been attained. If they created monopolies, destroying the wholesome home competition, then the remedy is not in destroying the system of tariff protection, but in controlling and regulating these great organizations. Germany has wisely set the world an example in this respect. History in recent years has shown that the strongest of these outgrowths must bow in submission to the strong arm of the Government, which is the people in action. Let us regulate and not destroy. Besides, there are a host of industries, healthy and legitimate, that do not fall into this class and need no condemnation. Do not wipe them out and take away the employment of a multitude of our citizens.

Our work people are better fed, better clothed, and better housed than the work people of any other nation in the world. That is why thousands of workmen annually seek our shores to enjoy a part of our prosperity.

To continue this state of affairs we must have a protection that will at least equalize the difference between wages at home and abroad. To create competitive conditions is the objective in the minds of the authors of the present bill. Foreign manufacturers, with the decided advantage of cheap European and Asiatic labor, are to be permitted to compete for our home market with our manufacturers and our higher wages. Healthy home competition is wholesome, but such an unequal commercial conflict could only be destructive. The tax levied must be sufficient to accomplish the purpose, being neither too high nor too low, and when no longer needed should be repealed.

It is no argument to say that the workmen of America through organization have secured the rate of wages they now enjoy, and that therefore they owe nothing to the tariff. Organization has been an effective weapon in their hands. It is a needed one to enable them to resist the selfishness of men who would grind them down to the last farthing. But of what avail would organization be if there were no employment? The tariff has multiplied the opportunities for employment and thus made their efforts effective. Every reduction in the tariff that curtails home manufacture takes so much of the opportunity of the workingman away from this country and gives it to the men of other countries. He is worse than an infidel who does not take care of his own household.

This present tariff will curtail manufactures here; it will drive some of our people out of business and leave many men without work, and, in my judgment, create distress and suffering. The responsibility for this will rest upon the Democratic Party. I hope it may not be so, but I fear the worst. A bushel of letters giving instances have been received by me, of which, if the half be true, the outlook is dark indeed.

The tariff is not a trust creator, for trusts have grown up in products not protected, and exist in free-trade England.

In connection with this bill I deplore the transgression of the fundamental division of our Government into three parts—legislative, executive, and judicial. An Executive has dictated this tariff and is using his influence to make it a law. The law itself was framed in secret and is being driven through this House under the lash of party caucus.

No amendment is to be allowed, and the minority is helpless. Debate in the House has lost its usefulness; it really is no longer needed. A great question which should be treated in a nonpartisan way is made the football of politics. There is no more vital question than this to engage our attention, yet the uselessness of argument or appeal is so apparent that, even if the division of time had permitted, I would have refrained from attempting it on the floor of this House. In addition, the quotations of statistics and the marshaling of facts to a new Member is attended with so much uncertainty and doubt that one sits perplexed in the presence of older Members whose quotations and statements, though made by experienced gentlemen, contain the most startling contradictions. These considerations have led me to regard the policy so often declared by our late President, Mr. Taft, as the only wise and practical one, viz, to establish a nonpartisan tariff commission, whose duty it shall be to gather—and keep gathering—information and make findings of facts which would be regarded as authoritative, and thus enable legislation to be formulated upon a reliable basis. This commission is the crying-out need of the hour.

No sane man can doubt the benefits flowing from protection as established in our history. No one can doubt that the wise treatment of any evils which have grown up incidentally is to eradicate those evils, and not deliver over our magnificent and unequaled home market to others. If a garden of beautiful flowers has been produced by protecting care, and some weeds appear among the flowers, do not enter with a scythe and mow the whole garden, but carefully eradicate the weeds and save the flowers.

The policy of protection is fully capable of vindication. In the light of history and the irrefutable logic of facts it needs no defense. The one great need is to have the protective policy administered wisely and scientifically and as soon as possible upon findings of fact found by a tariff commission. A protective duty should be laid that will preserve the great American market for our own use, and in so doing multiply the opportunities for work for all our people by preserving and retaining our manufactures within our own borders. To try and obtain cheaper products for our people will avail but little if the avenues of employment are lessened, the ability to earn the money to buy is removed, and the closed factory and open soup house become the substitutes for the hum of prosperous industries and the well-filled dinner pail.

My own State, I fear, will suffer greatly by the passage of this law, with its unscientific, unequal, and unjust provisions. The great manufacturing industries of my native city will be greatly harmed, and therefore I shall vote against this bill.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, if business in general is adversely influenced by this tariff measure, then every legitimate industry will suffer. A receiver in bankruptcy may have a great deal more to do, and possibly accumulate much more in fees without really improving his condition. But if anyone profits it will be such a person, and perhaps pawnbrokers and others whose financial success depends on the losses suffered by the great majority. The farmers in my district will be greatly injured. Manufacturers will suffer in like manner. Merchants can not prosper when their customers are losing, and that the workmen will endure great hardship is self-evident. Professional men can not evade their share of the general loss.

We know from sad experience what followed the last Democratic attempt to enforce free-trade theories, when 3,000,000 persons were thrown out of employment and distress prevailed on all sides. What reason is there now to look for any different result? This is a much worse measure than was the Wilson law under the Cleveland administration. It makes greater reductions in duties and places many finished products on the free list, while imposing duties on the raw materials necessary to produce them, thus discriminating against American workmen and manufacturers. The highest value of imports for a fiscal year under the Wilson law was $86,000,000 less than those under a Republican law in force six years earlier. In no year of the Wilson law were the imports nearly as great as under the McKinley law, and yet rates were greatly reduced. The reason for that decline in imports was the distress brought upon the Nation by throwing millions of workmen out of employment and making it impossible to produce many articles in competition with those imported. While they could be brought into the country at less cost than they could be produced here, they could not be sold to the same extent as under the McKinley law, because the people did not have the money to pay for them. The revenue from imports was so small that the Government had to issue bonds to pay current expenses.

PROSPERITY CHANGED TO ADVERSITY.

Although the McKinley law was not long in force, great prosperity prevailed. In the same way great advancement has followed under the existing law. The Nation never before made such progress. There are defects in the law, and there always will be defects in any tariff law, because they are necessarily compromises. But the prosperity that prevails under a tariff law is the test of its efficiency, and the Payne law well stands that test. It is to be superseded by this monstrous free-trade conception, and already business begins to suffer. The prices of securities have been declining since the Democratic Party, by division in the Republican ranks, managed to get control of the Government. That party lacked 2,000,000 votes of a majority. But it is in control and will carry out its free-trade policy. Business is halting in fear of the results. Manufacturers should, at least, be allowed time to prepare for such a change. Many of them must produce goods far in advance for future delivery. Take the woolen mills as an illustration. They must purchase raw material at present rates, and manufacture it for sale next autumn and winter. There is no escape from that unless they close their mills and throw their workmen out of employment. But it is proposed by this bill to abolish the duties on the raw material and reduce the rates on fine goods two-thirds. What, then, is to become of the manufacturer with his goods on hand, on which he had to pay duties for his raw material? Embarrassment and undeserved loss must necessarily follow. These producers were assured by the President and the Democratic Party that no injury would be done to any legitimate American business. And yet this vast loss will be inflicted on them without excuse. They are refused any time to use up their material on hand and get ready for the slaughter of rates.

DIFFERENT TREATMENT OF SUGAR PRODUCERS.

The Louisiana sugar producers, however, are given three years to prepare for free sugar. Germany and France, in their last tariff revisions, gave their manufacturers a year to get ready for the change. The Republicans have never made a disastrous alteration in rates that required long notice to producers to save them from calamitous results. But the free traders refuse to listen to the just request of these men for time to prepare for this sweeping change. Necessarily they must curtail their output as much as possible. At a meeting of the manufacturers in Philadelphia on Thursday night it was stated that many industrial establishments were producing less than 50 per cent of their normal output, which will give some idea of what this legislation means. It would be only a matter of ordinary justice to allow time for manufacturers to dispose of goods now on hand and in process of manufacture before compelling them to meet the competition of similar products which have the advantage of cheaper raw material and wages less than one-half those paid in this country. It is a denial of justice not to do so and a direct violation of the campaign promises made by the President and other Democratic leaders in the last canvass.

The sacrifice of the interests of the farmers in this tariff measure is not matched anywhere outside of free-trade England, in which country, notwithstanding the necessity of importing the largest percentage of its food supplies, several million acres of land have ceased to be cultivated in recent years, and the number of persons employed in agriculture is much less than was the case over half a century ago under protection. The Democrats are preparing the same kind of a bed for the American farmers to lie on. The Hon. William R. Hearst, an eminent Democrat, though he has cattle ranches in Mexico, is opposed to admitting beef free from countries that impose taxes on American beef and other products; and in the same way, though a large purchaser of white paper, he is opposed to admitting such paper free from Canada and elsewhere while those countries impose duties on American paper. Mr. Hearst believes in honest reciprocity and not in the humbug variety contained in the Underwood tariff bill.

SEEKING TO DECEIVE THE FARMERS.

This bill admits flour free of duty and bran and wheat screenings, but it puts a duty of 10 cents a bushel on wheat, though it allows a drawback of the duty if used to make flour for export. This is a pretense of protecting wheat to the extent of 10 cents a bushel, but it is a transparent humbug. If flour can come in free, there will be no need to send wheat here. Mr. Fisher, the former secretary of agriculture in Canada, estimates that if a market is found for its wheat that country will soon produce 1,000,000,000 bushels. It has been developed rapidly with immigrants from the United States and elsewhere. The market that it needs is given to it by the Underwood tariff bill without any return. The average normal price of wheat in Winnipeg is 10 cents a bushel less than in Minneapolis, and the wheat is of the best variety. Transportation rates are as low as on this side. The greater part of the wheat produced in the United States is less acceptable to the millers than the hard wheat produced in Canada, and anyone can see the detrimental effect on the farmers of this provision to admit Canadian flour without any return. Canada can remove her duty on American flour without fear that any will be exported to that country. Argentina and other countries will be helped by this provision. Canadian land in the northwest yields an average of 4 bushels more an acre than is harvested in Minnesota and the Dakotas. No country in the world now admits flour free and imposes a duty on wheat. The United States produces some 621,000,000 bushels of wheat which will suffer as a result of this unfair legislation.

KILLING BEET SUGAR TO HELP THE TRUST.

If protection were not removed from beet sugar this country would soon enormously increase its production of wheat and other farm products. The cultivation of sugar beets in Germany has so added to the productivity of the soil as to increase the yield of five other crops to the value of $900,000,000 a year without increasing the acreage. A similar increase here would add $1,400,000,000 a year to the value of those crops, or four times the total value of our entire sugar consumption at 5 cents a pound. When they began to produce beet sugar in Germany the soil was not as productive as that of the United States is to-day. But under the influence of the sugar-beet culture Germany now produces 30 bushels of wheat to the acre to our 15, 59 bushels of oats to our 30, 208 bushels of potatoes to our 106, 39 bushels

of barley to our 24, and 29 bushels of rye to our 16 bushels. Throughout the beet-sugar countries of Europe, Germany's experience has been duplicated.

The same thing is taking place here, and only time is required to produce the same results. A farm at Chaska, Minn., alternated with beet culture, produced an average of 32 bushels of wheat to the acre, while the average wheat yield in that State in that year was 13.4 bushels. There is abundant evidence of the great value of the beet-sugar industry, aside from its saving of over $100,000,000 a year sent abroad to pay for sugar. Its production has increased 1,800 per cent in 13 years despite the Cuban reciprocity, and the increase in the production of cane sugar in Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands. Sugar is lower now than at any time in many years. Why, then, abolish the duty so as to admit free the product of the half-civilized labor of Java and other countries which buy nothing of us in return? The answer is found in the requirements of the Sugar Trust and the refiners found guilty of defrauding the Government of millions of dollars. The beet sugar, while on the market, forces down the price of the refined cane sugar, hence the trust and its associate refiners have been expending large sums in conducting an agitation for the removal of the duty on raw sugar, so as to kill the beet industry. The Democratic Party succumbs to trust influences. We have more soil suitable to the production of beets than any other nation, and yet our farmers are not to be permitted to carry on the industry at a profit, because the cane-sugar refiners object.

FARM PRODUCTS ADMITTED FREE.

Not only is the farmer discriminated against by the admission of flour free of duty, but many of his products are put on the free list for the benefit of Canada, Mexico, and other countries. Among such products are broom corn, buckwheat and buckwheat flour, corn, corn meal, flax straw, berries, lard, meats of all kinds, including fresh beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, bacon, and hams; milk and cream, including preserved or condensed milk; potatoes, rye, and rye flour; skins of goats and sheep; swine, tallow, flour, and semolina. A duty of 10 cents a bushel is imposed on oats, which are produced to a large extent in this country, but oatmeal, rolled oats, and oat hulls are admitted free. The largest manufacturer of rolled oats and oatmeal in the United States, and said to be the largest in the world, has two mills in Canada and will be greatly benefited by this provision for the free admission of his products. Then there is an oatmeal trust in Canada, controlling about a dozen mills, which will also have the advantage of our market. Oats are produced to a large extent in Canada and are cheaper there than in the United States. It takes 10 bushels to make a barrel of rolled oats or oatmeal, and with those articles on the free list, with a duty on oats, the American manufacturers are discriminated against.

Hay is made dutiable at $2 a ton, a reduction of 50 per cent, though nearly 700,000 tons of it were imported last year. It certainly looks as though that was competition enough, but the estimate is that 1,200,000 tons will be imported next year. Canada imposes a duty of 12½ cents a bushel on apples, but the Democrats are to admit Canadian apples at 10 cents a bushel. Canada has been exporting, in one form or another, some 8,000,000 bushels of apples. With a 10-cent rate, they will send their apples to the United States, as they will have easy transportation facilities and are less troubled with fungus and insect pests than are the growers farther south.

Rye is dutiable, but rye flour is free. There appears to have been a great lack of regard for the interests of producers, even from a free-trade point of view, in drafting the bill. The duty on burlap bags and cloth is the same. No burlap is made in this country, and imposing the same duty on the raw material as on the finished article necessarily prevents its manufacture in this country. Burlap bran bags to millers and wheat sacks to farmers will be increased greatly in price, as the result of the change in this bill, but covering for cotton is free. Burlap is used to make floor cloth, and putting a duty on the raw material and reducing the duty on the floor cloth over one-half will necessarily prevent its production in this country.

HOW A TEXAS PRODUCT IS PROTECTED.

Wool is put on the free list, but the hair of the Angora goat is made dutiable at 20 per cent. They have always heretofore been included in the same paragraph. There are 600,000 woolgrowers in the United States and perhaps half a dozen persons rearing Angora goats for the hair on them, but the 600,000 woolgrowers are robbed of all protection, while the few men in Texas owning Angora goats are protected. In the same way yarns of wool are made dutiable at 20 per cent, while yarns of goats' hair are made dutiable at 30 per cent. Chairman Underwood has stated that mohair made from the hair of Angora goats is fast becoming a necessity, and yet his committee imposes this duty on that product, while putting wool on the free list. Peanuts are made dutiable with only a reduction of one-eighth of a cent a pound, and on shelled peanuts a reduction of one-fourth of a cent a pound. But peanuts are grown in the South, while corn, buckwheat, potatoes, and other such articles put on the free list are products of the North. Bone char, an article used by the Sugar Trust, is put on the free list, and ferromanganese, an article produced solely by the Steel Trust in the United States, is made dutiable. The explanation of this duty is that it is imposed for revenue purposes, but many articles are put on the free list which would produce 10 times the revenue that will be derived from ferromanganese at the expense of the steel manufacturers of the United States.

HITTING AMERICAN WORKMEN.

Shingles are put on the free list. There are 15,000 men engaged in that industry in the State of Washington alone. Across the border, in British Columbia, 75 per cent of the labor engaged in manufacturing shingles is composed of Chinese, Hindus, and Japanese. While we exclude Chinese labor, we are going to admit free products of that labor made in competition with American labor. A small duty retained on shingles would produce far greater revenue than will come from ferromanganese, the duty on which article will benefit the Steel Trust. About every article purchased by the manufacturers of shingles and required in their production is dutiable. Still, they must forego protection and compete with the Asiatic labor employed in British Columbia.

Cigars and tobacco from the Philippines are to be admitted free without limit. There is a vast army of men employed in the production of these articles in the United States, which are in the nature of luxuries, and it is unfair and unjust to compel those workers to submit to the unlimited competition of Malays in the Philippine Islands. Rice, which is produced in the South, and which is the food of the workmen, is retained on the dutiable list, but flour and various products of the North are put on the free list. Fish are put on the free list for the benefit of our Canadian friends, who give nothing in return. The duty on live stock, such as cows and sheep, is farcial, for the reason that beef, mutton, wool, hides, and so forth, are admitted free. The admission of dressed meats free while levying a duty on live stock places a tremendous handicap on the packing industry of the United States. Indigo, not produced in the United States and used by textile manufacturers generally, is taken from the free list and made dutiable. It is one of many things done to hamper the textile industries. The reduction of the duty on olive oil to a non-protective point is another blow at agriculturalists. It will not secure cheap olive oil, but it will stop the growth of the industry in California for the benefit of the Italian and other producers in Europe, who impose heavy duties on cottonseed oil. There are 375,000 acres available for olive-oil production in California, and 6,000 acres have been planted in olives since 1908. If the protective duty were left alone it would not be long until this country produced all the olive oil it consumed. Clean methods are used in California for the production of this oil, but in Italy and elsewhere feet and hands are used to a large extent, while the average pay is three times as much in California as it is in Europe.

TRYING TO DECEIVE THE FARMERS.

It may well be asked what advantage is offered to the farmers for the slaughter of rates on their products. The only thing promised that appears to be for their exclusive benefit is free agricultural machinery. No agricultural machinery of any value is now imported, and it is now admitted free when coming from any country that admits agricultural machinery produced in the United States free. That is what might be called true reciprocity. But the admission of agricultural machinery of other countries free of duty without any return on their part is not just. However, it will not amount to anything. The best agricultural machinery in the world is manufactured in the United States, and the capitalists engaged in that industry are largely responsible for the legislation which the Democratic Party is now putting on the statute books. These men have been agitating for lower tariff or free trade for years, and it remains to be seen whether or not they will derive any benefit from this slaughter of rates. I have no doubt that they will appreciate their mistake before long. There are about 7,000,000 farmers in the United States, and to sacrifice their interests under the pretense of reducing the cost of living is a great wrong.

PRICES NOT TO BE REDUCED.

It is worthy of mention that the Democratic leaders have practically abandoned the talk about reducing prices as a result of this free-trade measure. President Wilson made the reduc-

tion in the cost of living a prominent feature of his campaign addresses. Other Democratic leaders took the same ground. Now that they are to face the test, the President, as well as Mr. UNDERWOOD and others, say that they do not expect any particular fall in prices soon after the passage of this bill. In that case they are wise, but when depression has settled on the country and workmen are out of employment without money to buy with prices may decline, as they did under the last Democratic administration, without any increase in imports because of the disastrous business situation in the country. It is recognized by every one who has looked carefully into the matter that the increase in prices is not due to the tariff. If it were, prices would not have increased in Great Britain and in every other country at the same time as in the United States.

Much has been said about cheaper clothing as a result of putting wool on the free list. But there is not over $2.10 in value of wool in a suit of clothes made for almost anyone. The largest saving made by the removal of the duties could not exceed 80 cents on the suit, and the consumer will never get any benefit from that small saving. It will go to the wholesaler and retailer and other persons handling the goods. There is no pretense of furnishing new employments by this free-trade measure, and if we import one-third more in value of goods we must necessarily throw that many persons out of employment who are now engaged in the production of such goods in the United States, and if there is not a large increase in imports there must necessarily be a large decrease in the revenues of the Government which will have to be made up by an increase in the income tax. A vast sum is now derived from the tax on the incomes of corporations. To tax life-insurance policies, as is proposed by this Democratic measure, is a great shame, as it will take money needed by the widow and orphan. An income tax imposed on rich persons meets with general approval, though no sensible man would defend reducing the wages of workmen by imports brought about by free trade, in order to produce a deficit to be made up by an income tax.

STRIKING AT THE PAPER MANUFACTURERS.

The farmers are not the only ones who will suffer from this unjust tariff law. There are large paper manufacturers in my district, and every one of them will have to meet competition from Canada and other countries in a manner that is altogether unjust. Duties are maintained on raw materials used by these paper manufacturers, in some cases as high as 35 per cent, while they will be compelled to meet the competition of paper produced in countries having not only free raw materials but wages much less than half those paid in the United States. Canada imposes duties on all papers coming from the United States. That country even prohibits the export of wood pulp from Crown lands, but paper manufacturers in Canada use indiscriminately wood cut on both free and Crown lands and export their paper to the United States. There is no way our officials can tell whether that paper is made from wood cut on Crown lands or free lands. It would take a corps of surveyors and practical woodsmen to every mill to find out. The Canadian manufacturer alone has access to the wood on Crown lands. He has no competition from us on that wood, but the price of the wood on free land is increased by such competition. Spruce wood that can be purchased at the Canadian mill at $6 a cord costs about $11 at the American mill; then the Canadian manufacturer has alum, china clay, and other things free, while his American competitor pays duties, and the Canadians have lower rates on wire screens, wood felts, and so forth. The Canadian mills are in many cases nearer to consuming centers than many mills in the United States. But we are not only to have this Canadian competition, but that of Scandinavia and all other countries in which labor is paid less than one-half as much as is paid at the mills in the United States, and all these countries impose duties on our paper products.

Then, to make matters worse, the Democrats impose ad valorem instead of specific duties. That system of duties has been followed all through this bill. It contributes to undervaluation frauds and imposes the lowest rates when prices are the lowest and protection the most needed and the highest rates when prices are the highest and protection is least needed. Every nation on earth imposes specific duties that has a protective tariff, and the United Kingdom is the only nation that does not have one. These ad valorem rates are indefensible, and their purpose, apparently, is to help break down the protective tariff. The increase in the imports of wall papers has been 330 per cent in 10 years.

The rates were reduced under the existing tariff law, and four mills have been closed, with no new ones started. The pay in the wall-paper mills in the United States runs from $24 to $27 a week for labor that costs $7.80 to $9.20 in Europe, but the rates are reduced under this bill so that the finished product has only half as much duty as some of the raw materials. That is another illustration of how the bill has been made up. We gave Canada, last year, over $600,000 in the way of remission of duties on print paper, but we did not get the paper one cent less on that account. Twenty-two new mills are under way in Canada as a result of this admission of paper free of duty, and several have been closed in the United States.

DUTIES AND PRICES.

The Payne law increased the duty on hosiery, but prices declined owing to the home competition. Hides and other things that were put on the free list increased rather than decreased in price, all of which goes to show the folly of contending that higher prices are due to the tariff. The world knows how the tin-plate industry has been built up in the United States altogether as a result of the tariff. There was none produced in the United States at the time a protective duty was imposed by the McKinley law; now we produce all that we consume and export a considerable quantity. The duties were lowered by the existing law, but the manufacturers have kept on increasing their business. Now it is proposed to reduce the rates below the protective point, and a dispatch from Swansea, Wales, the other day, announced that an order had been received there for 75,000 boxes of tin plate for an American house, dependent on the passage of this bill. That shows what will follow to the tin-plate industry from the reduction of the duties below the protective point. Iron and steel duties were cut about 50 per cent by the Payne law, and now it is proposed to cut them another 50 per cent, while putting steel rails and many other highly finished products on the free list. Some $250,000,000 are invested in iron mines and transporting materials in the United States. There should be some protection for that large investment, but there is none under this bill. Foreigners will have the advantage of lower freight rates on the coast, and wages in Cuba, Spain, and elsewhere average only one-third as much as is paid in the mines in the United States. Some 800,000 tons of tin plate are now produced in a year as a result of the tariff, but either wages must be cut one-half, or the industry will be paralyzed under this act.

SACRIFICING THE GLOVE WORKERS.

The glove industry, which is of considerable importance in New York State, is one that will suffer severely under the proposed law. There are 50,000 persons in one county dependent on that industry for a living. They recognize what is in store for them and have protested in a great mass meeting and at the same time sent two clergymen from Gloversville, N. Y., to try and induce the President to prevent or mitigate the disaster that will come upon them as the result of this legislation; but they got no satisfaction. They, like many others, think that the Democratic platform utterance that no legitimate industry would be injured should be a protection to them. But such platform utterances were not intended to be carried into effect. There are over 200 separate and independent concerns in that one county engaged in the production of gloves. No leather gloves of domestic manufacture are exported. Competition is fierce. Over 80 per cent of the workers in that industry in Fulton County own a substantial equity in their homes, which proves that they are paid good wages. Both men and women's leather gloves are manufactured in the same establishments by the same operators at practically the same cost. There is no reason for different tariff rates, but the rates on women's gloves are now considerably lower than those imposed on men's gloves. Hence it has not been possible to develop any substantial business in women's gloves under existing rates. A rate of $3.30 is the lowest rate that the manufacturers can do any business under; but the Underwood bill proposes $2 for both men's and women's gloves per dozen pairs, which means a destruction of the industry. These facts refer to fine leather gloves and not to the cheaper gloves. The cheaper grades of men's gloves, known to the trade as "Schmaschen," have been made dutiable at $1 per dozen pairs, while the heavy work gloves for men have been placed on the free list. Only one-twentieth of the fine leather gloves now used are made in the United States, and under this great reduction in duty there will have to be a cut of at least 50 per cent in wages if any are made here.

WILL MAKE 2,500,000 MEN IDLE.

Mr. J. E. Wood, of Gloversville, N. Y., tells of traveling over 100,000 miles through different countries in behalf of the glove industry, and he found in England over 1,500,000 people out of work, with wages 60 per cent lower than in the United States.

In Germany the wages were 50 per cent lower and in Austria 75 per cent lower. He wanted to know how it was possible for an American manufacturer to compete with such wages. His leather company has not been able to pay a dividend for five years, because they had to pay more than twice as much in

wages as were paid for similar work in Europe. But under this bill the protective duty is cut one-half. As a result, he says, they have cabled their foreign agencies to stop buying raw material, and if this bill becomes a law they will ship their machinery to Austria, where they can get all the men they want for $4 a week. Mr. Wood says that the passage of this bill will throw 2,500,000 men out of employment inside of two years. That is probably a low estimate, if we are to judge from what took place under the last Democratic tariff bill, when the rates were much higher than those in this measure.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER REDUCTIONS.

There is a provision in the bill which authorizes the President to negotiate reciprocity conventions, and which clause he has stated he will proceed to put into effect as early as possible. That provision is meaningless, excepting to show the intent of our Democratic friends. The President has all the authority now that that provision gives him. The opportunities for reciprocity, as Gov. Foss, of Massachusetts, Mr. Hearst, and other eminent Democrats have pointed out, are thrown away by putting various things on the free list and reducing duties below the protective point on other articles. But to add to the trouble of American producers, two such conspicuous free traders as the President and Secretary Bryan promise to bring about further reductions in duty by alleged reciprocity treaties. Hence, where there is a duty provided for now, under which a factory can continue to exist, it will be in danger of annihilation by further reductions, to which there is no limit under this free-trade administration.

Another provision of the bill admits imports brought in American ships at a cut of 5 per cent from the rates provided by this bill. We have 32 treaties now, comprising all of the nations of any importance, which forbid any such reduction as that mentioned. But if these treaties were nullified and the 5 per cent reduction carried into effect, it would only mean that much nearer progress toward free trade. It is not for the purpose of helping American ships that that provision is inserted in the bill, but for the purpose of promoting free trade. As we have few ships in the foreign trade, should other nations retaliate by imposing higher rates on goods brought to them by American ships, we might not suffer a great deal, but it is a useless provision.

CONDEMNED BY SOUTHERN COTTON MANUFACTURERS.

Mr. Stuart W. Cramer, president of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, which is made up almost altogether of southern cotton men, says that the Underwood tariff bill will cripple the whole cotton industry of the United States. This is the view that is held not only by the persons interested in the cotton-manufacturing industry but by those in every other industry. The bill imposes the same rates on single yarns in the gray as on the most highly processed and finished yarns advanced in manufacture. The same criticism may be made of the cloth rates. Only 2½ per cent extra is allowed over rates on the simplest and plainest weaves for the most elaborate and complex constructions of the highly finished yarns. But these highly finished goods are made almost altogether in the northern mills, while the cheaper grades are made in the South. That will explain why no additional protection is given to these highly finished goods, the production of which has greatly increased under the existing law. It is to the credit of the Southern Cotton Manufacturers' Association that they unanimously condemned this proposed law, which they say would not only cripple the northern mills but also those in the South.

HELPING THE BEEF TRUST—MANUFACTURING COST IN GERMANY AND THE UNITED STATES.

The Texas cattlemen have protested that free meats would simply aid the Beef Trust, because it controls the refrigerating lines to Argentina, and can force cattlemen to take lower prices. A great deal of misrepresentation has been made in regard to the increase in price of beef. There were 9,000,000 less cattle in the United States last year than there were 10 years previously, although the population of the country had increased about 15,000,000 in that time. With this enormous increase in population and the largely decreased supply of cattle, it can easily be appreciated why beef is higher, and it is higher not only in this country but in every other country. Corn per capita decreased in supply in the 10 years over 20 per cent, which means that much less for feeding live stock. Wheat, oats, rye, and so forth, also declined per capita, and that prices should advance under such circumstances in this country and elsewhere is not an excuse for tariff misrepresentation.

Julius Forstmann, president of a large manufactory in Passaic, N. J., who also has a factory in Germany and who was a member of the German tariff commission which prepared the tariff now in force in that country, says that the productive cost for cheap woolen goods in his mill in Passaic, which is a new one and one of the best equipped in the United States, is 49 per cent greater for cheap goods to 76 per cent greater in fine goods than the cost in Germany. Fine yarns and fabrics are a comparatively new industry here, the imports of which now amount to 30 per cent of domestic consumption. The development of this industry must, he says, cease in the United States under this proposed measure. That is the testimony of an experienced European manufacturer with an American branch.

ENDING THE CUBAN RECIPROCITY TREATY—PORTO RICO AND HAWAII SUFFER.

The abolition of the duty on sugar means an end of the Cuban reciprocity treaty. The reduction of the duty to 1 cent a pound for the next three years, with a 20 per cent reduction on that rate to Cuba, leaves practically little or no protection to American producers. Then free sugar will come into effect and the treaty will end. Under that convention we are now exporting to Cuba some $60,000,000 of products, and that country is in a fairly prosperous condition, which will end with the abrogation of the treaty. We will then be compelled, at great expense, to exercise a protettorate over Cuba, or else we may look for revolutions there, such as have been almost constant in Central American countries. Porto Rico and Hawaii will also suffer in the same way as Cuba, because they can not compete with the half-civilized labor of Java and other oriental countries.

FALSE ASSERTIONS ABOUT THE FARMERS.

Democrats assert that the farmers get no benefit from protection and that the prices of their products are fixed in the world's markets, yet they assert that farm products increased in price from 1897 to 1910, 93 per cent, the highest percentage of any class of products, or double the average of all commodities as given by them. Clearly, if the farmers' prices were fixed in the world's markets, as the Democrats assert, the tariff is not responsible for that increase; and if it is responsible, then the Democratic contention that the farmer is not benefited is ridiculous. When farm products from Canada, Mexico, and elsewhere come pouring into the country under the Democratic tariff law there will soon be less heard about the farmers receiving no benefit from the tariff.

If they were given some advantage or new markets to make up for this tremendous loss to which they will be subjected, they might view the outlook with less alarm. But they are not given a solitary compensation for the losses inflicted upon them. Not a single country will offer anything in return for opening our markets to their products. Canadian producers along 4,000 miles of our northern frontier will in many cases have advantages in transportation rates, which will give them control of our markets. Canadian producers will be protected in their own markets, but they can send their surplus products over the border. A similar condition will be true of other nations.

HELPING THE SUGAR TRUST.

Sugar, for instance, produced in Java by half-civilized laborers, living on rice and dressed in cheap cotton cloths, will take the place of the sugar produced in this country by well-fed, well-dressed, and educated Americans, receiving $1 in pay to every 10 cents paid in Java. The workman of the latter country will not consume a dollar's worth of American products in a year. The American workman spends all of his wages in the United States for home products. Under this bill his employment will be taken from him and there will not even be cheap sugar as a result. The colossal Sugar Trust, with its associates, will operate to control the market in the future, the same as they have done in the past, except for a few months in recent years when the price of sugar has been forced down by the beet-sugar producers. What is true of sugar is true of other products. This bill jeopardizes the paper industry, with an investment of nearly $450,000,000 and giving employment to 81,000 persons. But paper has not been a particle cheaper because of the free importation of the Canadian product. We admitted Canadian coal for a year free of duty without the price being reduced in the least degree. Now we propose to remove the duty altogether, while that country retains its 53-cent duty on American bituminous coal. We will gain nothing and will lose the revenue and subject our producers to unfair competition.

A Treasury computation shows that the existing law has reduced the average rate of duty on all products to 18.58 per cent, as compared with 23.88 per cent in 1908 and 29.48 per cent in 1899. The average of rates now is on all imports 2.09 per cent lower than the average in 1896, under the last Democratic tariff law, when this country was under such a disastrous condition that bonds had to be issued to pay current expenses. That will give some idea of what is in store for us now.

DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE TARIFF.

Under a protective tariff this country has developed so rapidly that it now has one-half the railroad mileage of the world and produces one-half of the mineral wealth, one-third of the agricultural wealth, and one-third of the manufactured

products, in value. Thirteen revisions of the tariff since France established the beet-sugar industry have retarded development in the United States, for the reason that when the Democrats get a chance they reduce as far as possible to a free-trade basis, and the damage is only retrieved by the Republicans coming into power and reestablishing the protective tariff. But these fluctuations are a great detriment to the development of the Nation. They should be avoided, and might be avoided by the creation of a nonpartisan tariff commission to pass on such questions. We had such a commission under the last administration, with two conspicuous free traders as members of it. But the findings of that commission have been ruthlessly set aside by the Democratic Party, the mistakes of which will sooner or later appear to the voters, who, I feel certain, will return the Republican Party to power at the first opportunity.

There was an increase of $250,000,000 in the net earnings of corporations subject to tax in 1912 over 1911, which goes to show what prosperity has existed under the present tariff and how indefensible is this proposed law to reduce it. American consumers earned so much money from 1908 to 1912 that they were able to save and put away in the savings banks, above all cost of living, nearly $800,000,000, but under the last Democratic administration the savings banks deposits decreased $40,000,000 in a single year, and that with a population very much less than at the present time. That is another illustration of the difference between protection and free trade.

THE EFFECT OF FREE TRADE IN ENGLAND.

The Hon. William R. Hearst, an eminent Democrat, says that President Wilson is a believer in English free trade; that is, the system as enforced in Great Britain. That is what the Democratic Party is leading us to in preparing the bill now before the House; hence, it may be well to look at the condition of affairs in the United Kingdom in order that we may appreciate what this policy will bring upon the United States. The British Government in 1906 appointed a royal commission on poor laws and relief of distress, which commission was composed of eminent persons and made a very thorough investigation of the entire question, submitting a report in 1909 which filled many thousand pages. The following is an abstract of a portion of that report:

Omitting insane and casual paupers, 1 out of 47 persons in England was a pauper on July 1, 1907, and 1 out of 44 on January 1, 1908. The number of persons relieved, excluding lunatics in asylums and casual paupers under the care of the guardians of the poor, in the year ending September 30, 1907, was 1,709,436. At one time or another during the year the guardians have under their care a population equal to that of the three largest provincial cities, Liverpool, Manchester, and Birmingham. The official reports that are made of pauperism give the number of persons relieved on a certain day, taking two days six months apart in the year. But the rate of pauperism in 1907 was twice as great as shown by these day counts. Of the 1,709,436 persons relieved in England and Wales 526,449 were men, over 47 per cent of the total. The number of persons relieved in the last 10 years, despite legislation calculated to diminished pauperism, has largely increased. Between 1901 and 1906 every age group shows an increase which is proportionately greatest at the ages from 15 to 65. Over 73 per cent of unmarried women between the ages of 20 and 25 years are engaged in occupations to earn their living. Of every thousand persons over 85 years old over 353 receive pauper relief. The highest rate of male pauperism in regular employments was that in the fishing industry, in which over 40 men out of every 1,000 were relieved, and over 39 persons out of every 1,000 in the agricultural industry. But of general and undefined workers and dealers 84.9 per cent of every 1,000 were relieved. Boot and shoe makers, owing to alien importation, the introduction of machinery, and insanitary conditions of employment, are a fruitful source of pauperism.

BOOT AND SHOE WORKMEN AS PAUPERS.

It might be well to bear in mind that this Democratic tariff bill puts boots and shoes on the free list, thus compelling American workmen to compete with this British industry, which, as this Royal commission says, is "a fruitful source of pauperism" in England.

"Metals, machines, implements, and conveyances" is a British industry that has a rate of 14 per 1,000 of paupers; and of workers and dealers in wood, furniture, and decorations, 19 out of 1,000 are paupers. The British Government not long ago passed a law providing for old-age pensions, under which every person over 70 years old who is unable to maintain himself gets a pension of 5 shillings a week ($1.25), and from that rate down to a small sum for all concerned; and yet, notwithstanding the enormous expenditure under this law for pensions the number of paupers has greatly increased. The greatest increase in expenditures for paupers has been since 1890, when the McKinley tariff law was passed in the United States. Indoor paupers have increased in England and Wales nearly 75 per cent since 1872. They have what they call "unions" in England for the relief of the poor. The union embraces a certain territory. Over 73 persons out of every 1,000 are paupers in the Strand Union in London, and two other unions in London have a rate of 56 per 1,000. The number of persons with no settled homes and no visible means of support in England is as high as 80,000, as stated by this royal commission; that is, the number outside of poorhouses and other such places. This royal commission says in its report:

We still have a vast army of persons quartered upon us unable to support themselves; an army which in numbers has recently shown signs of increase. To what is the retrogression due? It can not be attributed to lack of expenditure.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FREE TRADE AND PROTECTION.

The explanation can easily be found in the two words "free trade." There is no such a situation in Germany and France, which have protective tariffs.

England formerly had a large sugar-refining industry, but under the free-trade policy that has nearly all vanished. She had at one time a large silk industry when there was practically no silk manufactured in the United States. The industry in England has declined to a very large extent, while in this country we now practically manufacture all the silk we consume. That is the difference between protection and free trade, and the same thing could be said of many other industries. The assessment of land in Great Britain was $95,000,000 less in 1908, according to this royal commission, than in the "early seventies." Four million acres of land have ceased to be cultivated since 1871.

There has been a decline of 20 per cent in the agricultural laborers employed in Great Britain in 10 years. That is the kind of a feast the Democrats are preparing for the agricultural interests in the United States by this free-trade measure. These statistics do not include Scotland and Ireland. Dr. Downes, a member of this royal commission, in his report says:

The most disquieting index of urban pauperism is the increasing proportion of able-bodied men in health who are dependent on the poor rates, and the growing percentages of persons applying for relief under the unemployed workmen act.

In Germany and France the opposite of these facts is the case.

INCREASING PAUPERISM IN ENGLAND.

This commission says that in England and Wales there has been an increase of 50 per cent in the number of able-bodied men in health in receipt of outdoor relief in 10 years, and the increase of the number receiving indoor relief was 21 per cent. Over 234,000 children receive outdoor relief in the United Kingdom, and this royal commission says that there are as many as 600,000 children "chronically underfed, insufficiently clothed, badly housed, and in literally thousands of cases actually being brought up at public expense in drunken homes."

The commission, in speaking of the unemployed in Great Britain, the number of which is given in an official publication every month, says as follows:

The percentage of trade-unionists unemployed regularly published by the board of trade relates only to about 600,000 men out of 2,000,000 trade-unionists and 12,000,000 adult wage earners, being those entitled to ordinary "out-of-work pay," and there is reason to assume that this small class entitled to "out-of-work pay" includes an altogether exaggerated proportion, especially among the shipbuilding and engineering trades, liable to great fluctuations of employment. Of this relatively small group of highly organized trade-unionists, in good years about 4 men out of 5 get almost constant employment and in bad years about 3 out of 5, while the majority who are unemployed suffer severely, even to being out of work for months at a time. The insufficient data tell us nothing, really, as to the condition of the mass of wage earners. There are no statistics available which enable us to compute even within hundreds of thousands how many persons are at one time simultaneously in distress from unemployment. The Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners, an old and highly organized trade-union, paying unemployed benefit funds, finds it an increasingly heavy burden, amounting to 4s. 6d. ($1.08) a week for each member in 1908, irrespective of sickness, superannuation, burial, and strike pay.

That tells a story as to the effects of free trade which the people of the United States should heed. [Loud applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

[Mr. CAMPBELL addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, how does the time stand now between the affirmative and negative sides?

The CHAIRMAN. In just a moment. The gentleman from Massachusetts has used 18 hours and 38 minutes and the gentleman from Alabama has used 19 hours and 54 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

[Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Republican side of the House, I wish to thank the young ladies of Holyoke, Mass., for the beautiful flowers which they have sent us. These flowers are indeed fresh and attractive, but in those respects they can not compare with the young ladies themselves. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] is recognized.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, although it has been decreed by a secret Democratic caucus that this tariff bill is to be enacted without any material change I feel it my duty as a Representative to briefly register my objections to it.

This bill in many respects violates the very cardinal principles of the Democratic Party which we had the right to expect they would carry out in legislation. We did not expect a Republican tariff, but we had a right to expect a consistent Democratic bill, and in this I think we have good reason to be disappointed.

I desire to be perfectly fair and to criticize where I think criticism is deserved. I have done the same thing with my own party. I was disappointed with my own party's performance in 1909, and I did what I could to secure a different bill than the then pending bill and voted against the conference report upon that measure. Whatever may have been fairly said against the revision of 1909 it is now demonstrated by official figures that that revision was an actual revision downward, a good revenue producer, so as to leave us with a substantial surplus in the Treasury. Under it we have enjoyed a high degree of prosperity. I believed then that the revision should have gone further and that it should have been based upon a scientific investigation by a tariff commission. As early as January, 1907, I introduced a tariff-commission bill and urged its adoption before any revision was undertaken, but mine was a voice crying out in the wilderness at that time, while now the Republicans as well as the Progressive Party are committed to that view. But my disappointment at the revision of 1909 was mild compared with the utter disappointment at the action of my own party, fortified and aided by the Democrats, in inflicting upon us the Canadian reciprocity pact of 1911. That was a base betrayal of the farmers who had trusted them by the Republicans, and it was only defended by the Democrats on the theory that it should be followed up by free listing everything that the farmer had to buy. I denounced that proposition as often and as vigorously as I could, and I have lived to see the Republicans in both Houses retrace their steps and vote for its repeal. The Democrats, however, refused to repeal reciprocity, and in their campaign textbook, referring to that measure, state that—

This measure was supported by the Democrats because it was in accord with the Democratic principle of reducing the duty on food products and made a breach in the high protective tariff wall of the Republican Party. It was therefore an advance from a protective policy to the Democratic competitive policy.

The vice and injustice of the proposed reciprocity was in the fact that it was trading off the advantages of the farmer under the tariff for the benefit of the manufacturing and commercial classes, without any prospect whatever of the change reducing the cost of living to the masses of the people. It would have increased the profits of the middleman, but not reduced the price to the ultimate consumer. The present tariff bill is based largely upon the same principle. Professedly it is an attempt to reduce the cost of living by free listing everything that the farmer produces, while the things that he has to buy are still more or less protected by a so-called "revenue duty," which in many instances amounts to more than 50 per cent ad valorem. The duty of 10 cents a bushel on wheat, while flour is free, or the duty of 10 per cent ad valorem on cattle, while meat is free, is a transparent fraud upon the farmer, for certainly the duty on the raw material can not afford him any advantage if the finished product comes in free.

This bill is not a fulfillment of Democratic promises. Did the Democratic Party ever espouse the doctrine of taxation of raw materials and putting the finished produce on the free list? Did you ever see that in a Democratic platform? Or hear of it from any Democratic stump? No; certainly not. On the contrary, they have long advocated the extension of our foreign trade by admitting raw materials free, and they have carried out this doctrine even further than the Republicans. Yet here is one of the largest manufacturing industries in the country—the flour industry—producing hundreds of millions of dollars worth of products which are to be placed under this handicap. The same thing is true of oats, which are dutiable at 10 cents per bushel, and rolled oats and oatmeal are free. Cattle and sheep are dutiable, but mutton and meats of all kinds and wool are admitted free. Swine, however, are on the free list, as are also the finished products thereof, such as ham and bacon, etc. My colleague [Mr. HAMMOND], member of the Committee on Ways and Means, sought to show that under this proposed arrangement of a duty on wheat, with free flour, the American miller would still be able to compete in the export flour business, because, as he contended, he could import wheat, and by exporting the flour he could get the drawback of 99 per cent of the whole duty, and could dispose of the screenings, bran, and shorts, without payment of duty; whereas, under the present law a drawback is only allowed on 70 per cent if the by-product is retained. This, no doubt, is a great advantage to the miller who grinds for export, but where does the American farmer come in on this deal? This arrangement simply proposes to offer a market for imported wheat, and to take the by-products, such as screenings, bran, and shorts, and sell them here in competition with the farmer who produces feed barley, oats, and corn.

These feedstuffs, the by-products of the millers, all can be sold at a lower price than the farmer can produce them, and it will naturally tend to depress the price of the farmers' products; so that we have here a proposition to aid the export milling business wholly and entirely at the expense of the farmer. It thus appears that the farmer is to be the draft horse that is to carry the whole load in the reduction of the cost of living proposed by the Democratic Party.

But this is not all. He is also the subject of a new form of revenue duty upon his fur coat, fur cap, fur mittens, and fur robes, necessary to keep him warm. The Democratic majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, hailing as they do from the South, where it is warm, and where furs are chiefly worn by the rich for display, have conceived the idea that furs are luxuries and must all be taxed for revenue purposes. Under existing law fur skins of all kinds, not dressed, come in free, but under the proposed bill they are taxed at the rate of 10 per cent ad valorem, and correspondingly increases are made in manufactures of furs, so that the farmer who lives in the Northern States will be taxed an additional 10 per cent at least upon every fur garment or fur robe that he wears. In the first draft of the bill coon skin was on the free list, but for some reason it has been omitted in the last draft of the bill. In their report on the bill the Committee on Ways and Means says:

In its tariff-revision work the committee has kept in mind the distinction between the necessities and the luxuries of life, reducing the tariff burdens on the necessities to the lowest possible points commensurate with revenue requirements and making luxuries of life bear their proper portion of the tariff responsibilities.

Upon this theory that fur is a luxury the fur clothing and robes of the farmers in my district are taxed up to 50 per cent ad valorem. Fur clothing is absolutely necessary in that climate, and is worn from the early fall, when the teaming to market begins, until late in the spring.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. STEENERSON. Certainly.

Mr. HAMMOND. Will you state what of the furs that your constituents and my constituents, the farmers of Minnesota, wear are imported?

Mr. STEENERSON. Muskrat, coon skin, wolfskin, and bearskin are imported from Canada into my district, and the prices will increase under your bill.

Mr. HAMMOND. Will the gentleman state——

Mr. STEENERSON. If the gentleman will give me five minutes I shall be delighted to expatiate upon that point.

Mr. HAMMOND. You know, of course, that sheepskins that are imported are on the free list in this bill.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; I know that. I do not see how you could put a duty on sheepskins as long as you have admitted the wool free. [Applause on the Republican side.] But I can not yield any further. I will say, however, that the Committee on Ways and Means, hailing most of them on that side from the South, have put palm-leaf fans upon the free list. They are a necessity in Alabama, I presume, but they regard fur coats as a luxury. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But there is another article of popular use in the Northern States that is put upon the free list—curling stones, or quoits, and curling-stone handles. Curling is a very popular sport upon the ice both in Canada and in the northern part of this country, and curling stones and curling-stone handles are made in the most finished and expensive manner. Under the Democratic view these expensive articles used in sport by the rich come in free, but the poor farmer who needs a fur coat, fur cap, and fur robe has to pay an exorbitant tariff tax upon it.

One would have supposed that this expressed idea of raising the duty on luxuries would have been carried out in the whole bill, but, on the contrary, it will be found in many instances that the duty on luxuries has been lowered instead of raised; as, for instance, perfumed toilet soap is reduced from 50 per cent in the present law to 40 per cent; manufactures of marble, onyx, and alabaster from 50 per cent to 45 per cent; manufactures of ornamental glass from 60 per cent to 45 per cent; shotguns valued at over $10 each are reduced from 43 per cent

to 35 per cent; aeroplanes from 45 per cent to 25 per cent; brier root and brierwood from 15 per cent to 10 per cent; bamboo porch or window blinds, dyed or polished, reduced from 40 per cent to 25 per cent; fancy cakes from 50 per cent to 25 per cent; comfits and fruit preserves containing over 10 per cent alcohol are reduced from 91 per cent to 70 per cent; hemstitched handkerchiefs and mufflers are reduced from 60 per cent to 50 per cent; firecrackers from 125 per cent to 98 per cent; laces and embroideries from 62 per cent to 60 per cent.

It will thus be seen that the rule of raising the duty on luxuries has not been followed out very consistently.

This is revision of the tariff downward for the manufacturer and free trade for the farmer. Why is it that the farmer has been singled out above all as the one upon whom the experiment of free trade is to be tried? It must be because he furnishes the food, or the material out of which the food of the people is prepared, and therefore by reducing his prices by foreign competition it is believed that the cost of living can be materially reduced. The theory looks all right at first glance, but when put to the test it will be found to utterly fail. It will fail because the farmer is not responsible, except in an infinitesimal degree, for the prices paid by the ultimate consumer. It has been demonstrated over and over again by official and unofficial inquiries that the prices that the farmer receives for his products upon the farm are not excessive, and that they constitute on the average less than half and in some instances less than one-tenth the prices paid by the consumer. As has been frequently pointed out, a reduction of 10 or even 25 cents per bushel in wheat on the farm will not reduce the price of bread in the city.

The profit, as in most cases, is all absorbed by the middleman. It is a very superficial view that attributes the high cost of living to the high prices of farm products. There has been a general rise in prices of the products of the farm in late years, but it has been a general movement all over the world, and is no doubt due to the rapid increase in the urban as compared with rural population. This general rise in prices of farm products has been gradual and a natural result of the laws of supply and demand. While this rise has been going on, however, there has been another cause at work that has gradually increased the spread between the farm prices and the prices to the consumer, until in some instances the former is but an insignificant fraction of the latter. This change has taken place because of the constantly increasing power and influence of the middleman. The farmer does not supply the consumer directly, but sells in the market, where he deals with the elevator, which supplies the miller, who supplies the jobber, who supplies the baker or possibly the housewife, if she bakes her own bread, which few of them do in the cities, or he sells his cattle to the buyer, who sells to the packers, who sell to the grocers or retail butchers, who sell to the hotel or restaurant or householder, who sells to the consumer.

Now, we have so many manufactured foods, such as canned meats, vegetables, fruit, and cereals, cookies, gingersnaps and crackers, and bread of all kinds, that we are entirely dependent upon these products, and could not for a day do without them. There are only a few things, like eggs, poultry, and potatoes, that come directly from the farm, and even these generally pass through middlemen, who very largely determine the price to the consumer. Now, all of these middlemen, whether mere dealers, like grocers, or partly manufacturers also, like the meat packers, are all organized so as to secure a concert of action amongst them entirely unknown a few years ago. Add to these the organizations of the jobbers or wholesale dealers in every line, and you have a power that the single unorganized consumer can not resist. Prices have by these means been fixed, not according to the natural laws of supply and demand, but arbitrarily and to some extent in defiance of those laws. This is the real cause of the high cost of living. The farmer's price has but little to do with it. Take breakfast foods selling for 15 cents per pound; the farmer's grain from which it was made was sold for 1¼ cents or 1½ cents. Supposing the manufacturer actually got it for nothing, do you suppose he would sell the pound package for 13¾ cents? Not at all. It would be 15 cents just the same. Certainly, the difference in the price of grain of 10 or 20 cents per bushel is never reflected in the price of cereal prepared foods, crackers, or even bread.

The steer sold to the packer for 7 cents per pound live weight is retailed at from 15 to 35 cents dressed, and assuming the price to the farmer could be lowered seven-tenths of a cent to 6⅗ cents, it would not be reflected in the price to the consumer.

The result of the proposed revision will be to reduce the farm prices of many of the products of the farm without any corresponding benefit to the ultimate consumer of food. It will cripple the farmers' purchasing power and help to cause a general depression and hard times all around. [Applause.]

I insert an extract from an editorial in the Northwestern Agriculturist, a leading farm paper in my State, and also several of the many letters I have received from millers on the subject of flour:

[Editorial from the Northwestern Agriculturist, Minneapolis, Minn., Apr. 26, 1913.]

MORTGAGING FARM PROPERTY.

It is difficult to speak with patience and moderation of the outrageous attack on farm prosperity made by the Wilson-Underwood tariff bill, now under consideration in Congress. The proposals affect grain raising even more seriously than did the Taft reciprocity pact, and President Wilson's statements in connection with the subject indicate that he is hopelessly ignorant of actual agricultural conditions. For example, he says:

"The farmers in the United States have never been protected, for the very reason that they never needed to be protected."

Is that so?

There has been for several years a tariff protection on all the staple grains—wheat, flax, oats, barley, etc.—and as a direct result of this protection of our home market for our farmers all these grains have sold in the United States at a very much higher price than they did in Canada.

In the reciprocity discussion of 1911–12 it was indisputably demonstrated that the price on wheat, for example, had averaged for years 12 cents a bushel higher in Duluth than the same or better grade did at Port Arthur, the Canadian port on Lake Superior corresponding to Duluth for the United States shipping port. Does that indicate that President Wilson knew facts when he declared:

"The farmers in the United States have never been protected for the very good reason that they never needed protection?"

This 12 cents a bushel average excess received by American farmers was the exact measure of the result secured to them by reason of the fact that they were protected in their home market against Canadian competition. On the ordinary crop of hard wheat produced by Minnesota and the Dakotas alone—say, 230,000,000 bushels a year—this protection on wheat alone brought to the farmers of these three States $27,000,000 average per year in excess of the export price.

There were in the three States in 1910, according to the Government census, a total of 308,131 farms, and this excess of $27,600,000 for their wheat gave an average of $89.57 per farm every year. That sum would pay 6 per cent interest on a mortgage of $1,492.83; hence theory No. 1 of the New Jersey theorist, measured only by its cost to wheat raisers, is equivalent to putting a mortgage of $1,492.83 on every farm in Minnesota and the Dakotas.

* * * * * * *

And it must be remembered that this is the measure only of the cost of free wheat competition with Canada. In addition, there is to be free barley, free oats, free flax, and various other items of competition with American farmers.

Yet President Wilson sneers at the benefit ever derived by farmers from direct protection on their own products, which simply indicates that the New Jersey college professor is not in touch with agriculture, and with all the power of his great office he and the Democratic Congress threaten to take away all protection against foreign competition with American farms.

The chief point of attack by the free traders is foodstuffs—farm products.

It is truly a condition as well as a dangerous theory that confronts farming.

Mr. Farmer—you—did you vote last November for this $1,492 mortgage to be put on your farm, or for this Government confiscation of the value out of your profits of a quarter of your farm? Are you one of that class that thinks all that is necessary for a farmer to do is to keep on working hard on his own farm and let the statesmen run the Government? It is up to you to let your Representative and Senator in Washington hear from you. You can not change the theories of President Wilson by writing directly to him, but you should register your protest through your Representatives in Congress.

Do it now!

BIG DIAMOND MILLS CO.,
FLOUR EXCHANGE,
Minneapolis, Minn., April 23, 1913.

Representative HALVOR STEENERSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Every thinking person conversant with the flour trade is astounded at the proposition to retain a duty on wheat and, in the face of actual practice and of all the theories of economics, allow the manufactured article to come in free.

There are no possible arguments for this procedure. The arguments against it are surely convincing. We wish to emphasize the fact that this blow is aimed against the fifth largest industry in the United States, and one that has steadily refused all trust propositions and price agreements, and which is the one great industry, perhaps the only one, which remains on an absolute competitive basis. It deserves better treatment from its Democratic friends than the annihilation of its business.

It is the milling industry which has maintained the price of wheat five-sixths of the time in the past 20 years above that of all other countries, freight considered. Destroy that business and wheat prices will be continually on the level of the product of the ryot of India and the peasant of Russia. Our wheat-growing land will be brought to the value of the cheaper Canadian land.

Cheaper wheat will benefit principally the baking industry, for the price of bread is always the same, 5 cents per loaf, whether flour sells at $4 per barrel or $7, both prices having been in effect in very recent years with the price of bread unchanged. The irony in the situation is evident when it is proposed to assist the baking industry, rapidly growing in the East and Middle West into one of the strongest trusts we have.

Our mills are already struggling under the handicap of cheaper water rates for wheat than flour. Wheat is taken from Port Arthur at 2 to 3 cents per bushel, while flour takes lake and rail rate of 15 cents per hundredweight from Minneapolis to Buffalo.

Allow the Canadian, English, and Argentine mills the free entry to our great market and tie us hand and foot against the raw material, and our ruin is swift and certain. It would be idle to point out to you

facts you are more familiar with than ourselves, the influence upon other industries, foundries, bagging, cooperage, etc., but it is our duty to state to you our honest conviction that if this tariff clause goes through in its present form the milling business will be annihilated. We ask for no protection on flour if we can have access to the same raw material our competitors have. We want simply a square deal, justice, and nothing more. Place a duty on both flour and wheat or allow both free entry.

May we urge you to make the fight of your life against this great wrong?

Yours, very truly,

BIG DIAMOND MILLS COMPANY,
B. B. SHEFFIELD, *Vice President.*

THE BUFFALO NEWS, WASHINGTON BUREAU,
April 26, 1913.

Hon. HALVOR STEENERSON,
House of Representatives, City.

DEAR SIR: The city of Buffalo is up in arms over the provisions in the tariff bill now under consideration relating to meats and flour, cattle and wheat. At a nonpartisan mass meeting Wednesday night, called by the Chamber of Commerce, attended by 2,500 men, and addressed by some of the leading men of Buffalo, regardless of party affiliations, the following resolutions were adopted:

"Whereas we, the citizens of Buffalo, in a mass meeting assembled this 23d day of April, 1913, upon consideration of the proposed changes in tariff schedules now pending in Congress as affecting wheat, oats, wheat flour, cereals, live stock, and dressed meats, by which all raw materials in each case would be left subject to a substantial tax, while the finished products of such materials would be admitted to this country free of duty; and

"Whereas we are advised and believe that the certain effect of such legislation would be to destroy live-stock, milling, and packing industries in this city and elsewhere now engaging vast amounts of capital and employing thousands of workmen; and

"Whereas we believe that the Congress of the United States would not wittingly enact such disastrous legislation, if the situation were thoroughly understood: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That if flour, cereals, and meats are admitted free, then the raw materials—wheat, oats, and live stock—should also be admitted free; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we do earnestly protest against legislation that imposes a duty on wheat, oats, and live stock, while permitting free entry to this country of wheat flour, cereals, and dressed meat, and we beseech Congress to give further serious consideration to the far-reaching effects of such legislation and not to pass a tariff bill containing such unjustifiable and disastrous measures."

I am directed by Mr. Butler, editor and proprietor of the News, to invite your attention to these resolutions and to say that the News will be pleased to present to the people of Buffalo through its columns any reply you may care to make to the resolutions.

If you favor the News with your views please send them to this bureau, suite 617 Southern Building, in brief form for telegraphing.

Very truly, yours,

WM. WOLFF SMITH,
Correspondent in Charge
Washington Bureau of the Buffalo News.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to my colleague from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, nearly all the gentlemen whom I have heard speak on the other side have prated about the woes of the laboring man and the great desire they have to prevent the passage of this tariff iniquity, as they call it, because of the troubles it will bring upon him. Two gentlemen to-night—the gentleman from the Pacific coast [Mr. JOHNSON of Washington] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]—have dwelt specially upon that phase of the question. I have heard a number of others. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] can never make a speech without having something to say about the poor workingman. Yet no man and no party have ever driven the knife deeper into the vitals of labor than the man who has just gone out of the President's chair and the man who was his immediate predecessor. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In 1906 Mr. Roosevelt with one word could have secured the passage of the Gardner bill, which would have protected the laborers of America, not from imported goods made on the other side, but from the men themselves imported to this side for the purpose of beating down the price of labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Yet Mr. Roosevelt never raised his voice in favor of that bill, although he had previously sent a message to Congress in favor of restriction by the illiteracy test.

At the last session of Congress, gentlemen of the Republican Party, your President was the man who again drove the dagger into the heart of labor by vetoing a bill that a Republican Senate and a Democratic House had passed overwhelmingly.

In order to show what great friends the Republicans are to labor I want to call attention to a brief telegraphic report of the proceedings of the vice commission of Illinois, which shows that your party is not only in partnership with the trusts, but that it is in partnership with the white-slave traders and with vice itself. Here is what they say:

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *April 25.*

After to-day's session of the senate "white-slave" commission, Lieut. Gov. O'Hara sent a telegram to President Wilson and another to Lieut. Gov. Paynter, of Missouri, calling their attention to the disclosures made here. The telegram to President Wilson follows:

"At a hearing of the Illinois Senate vice commission here to-day it appeared that the conditions surrounding the employment of girls at the Springfield factory of the International Shoe Co. apparently were the most open to criticism of any so far discovered by this commission. The revelations were so astounding that Senator Nells Juul, a Republican, and the dean of our State senate, openly and bitterly denounced this corporation.

"As I have been informed that this corporation is supporting a lobby at Washington in opposition to your proposed tariff law on the grounds that if certain duties are removed the girl workers in their factories will be brought into competition with the cheap labor of Europe, I believe your attention should be called to the testimony given here to-day."

SENDS TELEGRAM.

Lieut. Gov. O'Hara's telegram to the lieutenant governor of Missouri was as follows:

"At a meeting of the Illinois Senate vice commission to-day it developed that the girls employed in a Springfield factory of the International Shoe Co. are the victims of the worst industrial conditions that have yet come before this commission. Mr. Derby, the superintendent of the Springfield factory, stated under oath that the International Shoe Co. is a $25,000,000 corporation and that its executive officers are residents of Missouri.

"On behalf of Senators Juul, Tossey, Woodard, and Beall, as well as of myself, constituting the full membership of our commission, I respectfully invite the cooperation of your Missouri Senate vice commission in a thorough and complete investigation of the methods of this corporation."

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] told us a few moments ago of the woes that would be brought upon labor by this tariff bill, and yet he was one of those who added his vote to prevent the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto.

He must not pose here as the friend of labor when he boldly votes to permit the cheap labor of Europe to come in unrestricted numbers to compete with men and women of his own race.

He must not proclaim himself the champion of the workingman when in his own State the railroads are importing thousands from Mexico to beat down the wages of the honest American, and he votes against a bill which the American Federation of Labor has prayed in vain for the American Congress to pass. That organization of millions of toilers has never memorialized Congress to defeat tariff legislation, yet at its annual meetings it has asked us to pass the illiteracy-test bill for checking the alien influx of cheap labor. How can you self-styled friends of labor square the windy speeches that you are making now with the votes you cast against the Burnett-Dillingham immigration bill that would have given labor some genuine protection? I hope every laboring man in your districts will compare your loud-mouthed protestations now with the votes you cast last February on that bill. If they want the record and will call on me, I will see that they get it.

Hear what Mr. Frank Morrison, the distinguished secretary of the American Federation of Labor, says about it, and then you false friends of labor hide your heads in shame:

Argument of Mr. Frank Morrison, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, before President Taft, February 6, 1913, in favor of the presidential approval of the immigration bill, S. 3175:

Mr. PRESIDENT: I realize that the proposition to prohibit the immigration to the United States of able-bodied men and women because they can not read is, from a sympathetic viewpoint, subject to criticism; yet, notwithstanding such a viewpoint the American Federation of Labor, which represents organized labor in its entirety and is the only organization which can with any show of reason represent the unorganized workers, has declared by resolution in two conventions that "the illiteracy test is the most practical means of restricting the present immigration of cheap labor whose competition is so ruinous to the workers already here, whether native or foreign," and instructed the officers of the federation to earnestly petition Congress to enact the illiteracy test into law.

There has been a great deal said and published in favor of the necessity of inciting immigration for the purpose of securing agricultural workers. There is no question in my mind but that such agitation has for its purpose the enticing of immigrants to our country to be hired by the great manufacturing concerns, coal companies, and railroads for their repair shops at a much less wage than those who are born here.

The argument that the opponents of this test make is that common labor, or coarse labor as some call it, would be the class that could not pass the illiteracy test, and this country is very much in need of that particular kind of coarse labor.

So that there will be no misunderstanding on your part in regard to what the farmers think about using immigrants for farm hands, their representative in his statement to you to-day has clearly placed the farmers' organization on record as opposed to the proposition of bringing immigrants into this country to do agricultural work.

The fact is that the immigrants who come here have been exploited to such an extent that the American born can not compete with them.

The wage earners believe in an effective regulation of immigration, because they desire to retain a high standard of living. The standard of wages for both skilled and unskilled labor of this country is the result of many years effort. When an immigrant accepts work at less than the standard, he not only takes the place of a man working at a higher rate but he assists in destroying the prevailing rate of wages in that industry, and that carries with it a corresponding reduction in the physical as well as moral and intellectual well being.

Mr. President, it is now an undisputed fact that in many industries the immigrants who come here are working for such low wages that the American born can not compete with them. They can not live on the wages paid, and support a family.

In support of the position that the American born can not compete with foreigners and live on the wages paid to them and support a family I refer you to the investigation of the Bethlehem Steel Works

made by a committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, and the investigation made by Commissioner Neill, of the Bureau of Labor, as to wages and conditions in the steel industry.

We ask for this legislation for the purpose of giving the wage workers of this country an opportunity for self-improvement, an opportunity for a breathing spell, so they can secure improved conditions both as to hours and wages.

In passing I will call your attention to the fact that industry is protected by a tariff, but labor is not. The products of labor are protected, but we have a free flow of labor coming to these shores all the time. The manufacturers have protection against products manufactured by cheap labor in foreign countries, but labor has no protection against the importation of cheap labor.

The opponents of this measure will say that if the products of labor are protected, then labor itself must be benefited, because the manufacturer can sell the product at a much higher rate than can be obtained in other countries, and will thus be in a position to pay higher wages to his employees. The first contention is well founded. The manufacturer does receive a higher rate than the products can be purchased in other countries, and the second contention, "that they can pay higher wages to their employees," is also true; but the fact is they do not pay higher wages. They pay lower wages. We find that in the highest protected industries, particularly in the industries that are now controlled by trusts, such as the Steel Trust, Rubber Trust, Sugar Trust, packing-house employees, and textile industry, the lowest wage in the country is paid to their employees, and in some of them less than a living wage for a family.

Hear what President Gompers said before the House Committee on Immigration in support of the Burnett bill:

We are going to live here. All that we have is here. Our families are here, our children and our grandchildren; and we expect to end our lives here, and we expect that our children will end their lives here. And with all this great complexity of peoples, with this constantly increasing immigration, there can not be an improvement of the Republic of the United States. If we are going to maintain the Republic, based upon the sovereignty of the manhood and the womanhood and the childhood of the United States, we have got to see to it that such a condition of affairs as now exists, and now particularly threatens, is removed—very materially removed.

I express the views of the men of labor of America, without regard to nationality and without regard to nativity. The men of labor want more and better regulations and a much stronger limitation of immigration than now exists. I know that I am, perhaps, an altruist; I do not think I am bereft of humanitarianism; but you can not be neglectful of the interests of the people now in America. Indeed, I believe that one of the great causes of backwardness in the improvement of material conditions of the people of Europe is the outlet to America. If the people of Europe, and particularly of southern Europe, were by some of our legislation required to stay at home, they would compel these obsolete monarchies, except in so far as their titular existence is concerned, to institute social reform and a larger degree of liberty among the people in their own countries. Emigration is the avenue of escape from dangerous conditions in their countries, which affords a constantly new lease of life to many of these monarchies abroad.

In the interests of these people, as well as the interests of our own people, I think the Congress of the United States should give its early attention to providing the relief which is so necessary.

The gentleman from Kansas has resented the insinuation by his colleague that there is foreign labor employed in his district, brought in in violation of the contract-labor law, and yet only last year I saw the statement in one of the Topeka papers that more than a thousand Mexicans were brought in at one time to work on one of the railroads of that State. Can anyone doubt that this motley horde came in violation of the contract-labor law?

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and every other member of the Kansas congressional delegation received, when the immigration bill was under consideration in this body last January, the following letter, which alone ought to have moved him to vote for that bill in the interest of "protecting" the American workingman:

THE ATCHISON, TOPEKA & SANTA FE RAILWAY CO.,
LAW DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF SOLICITOR FOR KANSAS,
Topeka, Kans., January 3, 1913.

DEAR SIR: There is a bill pending before Congress known as the Dillingham-Burnett bill which restricts immigration through the imposition of an educational test.

I have not read the provisions of the bill, but am informed that its passage will prevent the immigration of Mexican laborers, now relied on almost entirely by the railway companies in Kansas and the Southwest.

Without this Mexican labor it will be impossible for the railway companies to secure men enough to keep their tracks in proper condition for effective service.

Ninety-nine per cent of these Mexican laborers can not read or write, but after they have been in this country for a few years they adapt themselves to our ways, and those with families send their children to school.

All the railways in the territory mentioned would be greatly crippled should this Mexican labor be excluded.

I shall thank you to give attention to this feature of the Dillingham-Burnett bill, and anything you can do in the matter will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully, WM. R. SMITH.

Many good Republicans voted to pass the bill over the President's veto, but it was a Republican President who struck the fatal blow. Gentlemen, your President and the President who preceded him are responsible for the conditions. Gentlemen tell you that Mr. Cleveland in 1897 vetoed a bill of a similar character to that we passed through the House and Senate at the last session. But they forget to tell you also that at that time there were fewer people coming from all Europe than come to-day from Italy alone. In 1897 only 230,832 came, whereas now, with the tide rising higher, over a million come every year. Can anyone say that such an influx does not affect wages and conditions of employment adversely?

Gentlemen speak about the good conditions of labor all over the country, and yet almost every day we hear of another labor strike because wages received will not enable those who toil to feed and clothe their families on account of the high cost of living and the ruinous competition of the low-priced workers that come from Europe in such large numbers to compete. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] said that we maintain a higher standard of living in the cotton industry and pay considerable higher wages than the wages paid by competitors abroad. He said the English rate of wages is practically 60 per cent of those paid in Massachusetts, and those of France and Germany 50 per cent, and those of Italy 33 per cent, and so on. I do not vouch for his figures. He is arguing for a protective tariff in order to get the American workinman higher wages, he says.

He tells us that in free-trade England wages are lower than in this country, and yet the declaration made by the gentleman from Massachusetts is that in free-trade England wages are 60 per cent of those in Massachusetts, and in protected Germany they are 50 per cent, and in protected Italy only 33 per cent. How is it, please explain, that wages are so much lower in free-trade England than in protected Italy? If he really wants to "protect" the American workingman, let him urge a duty on aliens—on the foreign pauper labor itself.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen do not deal fairly with the workingman of the country when with one vote they try to raise the price of everything he buys and with another vote they bring in those who compete with his labor, the only thing he has to sell. They are willing to have the products of labor protected in the interest of the employers and the great industrial plants of the country, thus making labor buy in a protected market, and yet have free trade in labor itself, making labor sell its product—labor—in a free-trade market. Why not a duty on aliens, my Republican friends, if you really want to protect our working people by means of a tariff—a duty on the pauper labor itself?

Lest the Progressives may say that they are not in favor of that kind of a deal I want to read from their platform. Mr. Roosevelt declines to make a declaration, as he did a few years ago in the message sent in, in favor of it, but his platform of 1912 says:

We denounce the fatal policy of indifference and neglect which has left our enormous immigrant population to become the prey of chance and cupidity.

Now here comes the iniquitous part of it:

We favor governmental action to encourage the distribution of immigrants away from the congested cities, to rigidly supervise all private agencies dealing with them, and to promote their assimilation, education, and advancement.

Who is to pay for distribution? If the cities want them, and most of the Democrats and Republicans from the large cities generally stand here for wide-open gates, let them stay in the congested cities so long as they come; but the policy of the Progressive Party is that they should be distributed at the expense of the Government and sent to compete with laborers in sections whose people do not want them. It wants a Federal employment bureau to find opportunities, work, and employment for aliens, while our own are left to shift for themselves. There is the declaration of the Progressive policy that you sent to the people all over the country. [Applause.] Was it buncombe or do you really propose to bring in "strike breakers"?

Now, in regard to the class of people brought. A few years ago those who came were your ancestors and mine. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] refers to the high wages of those who work in the mills of his State, and yet the committee, of which the present chairman was an honored member, that investigated the Lawrence strike found such a deplorable condition of wages there that workmen from northern and western Europe would not compete with them. Ninety-two per cent of the employees were foreign born. The wages and conditions were such that the foreigners even struck for better wages and better conditions. The native had been driven out. He did not desire that his family, his wife, and his children should be brought up in the midst of the awful conditions there. Why is it that so many thousands of them are leaving these industries all over the country and seeking other avocations? Why did over 125,000 good Americans cross into Canada last year? Men say that the American will not do the work that these people do. They did it until subjected to this ruinous competition from abroad complained of annually by organized labor. Why do they not now? Because in the congested centers, Mr. Chairman, they can not stand the conditions of the people that do that work. Go with me to the West and

the South and the Middle West and you will find hundreds and thousands of honest, earnest white men, Americans and northwestern Europeans, doing the same work that these people are doing, and it is not thought belittling to them or their children to perform this work.

Go with me, Mr. Chairman, to the cotton factories of my own State, and you will find the mountain girls there in their calico dresses doing this work, and they are just as respectable as are the girls that are stenographers or cashiers in the banks. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This cry that Americans will not do the work is untrue. They did do it everywhere until driven out by the swarms of those who come from the dirty haunts of poverty and vice along the borders of the Mediterranean.

The veto of President Taft was heard with sorrow by the real friends of labor everywhere. It was a sad disappointment to almost everyone who loves the higher standards of living and of morals which American workingmen everywhere wish to maintain. Permit me to insert a few extracts from the press of the country along this line.

[Editorial from Boston (Mass.) Evening Transcript, Feb. 15, 1913.]

AN UNWISE VETO.

At the eleventh hour President Taft has vetoed the Burnett-Dillingham immigration bill, founding his disapproval upon the provision which imposes a literacy test upon immigrants 16 years of age and over. The President gave extended hearings upon the bill and availed himself of practically the full period allowed him for consideration before reaching a decision. He does not attempt in his message of transmittal to elaborate upon the objections to the legislation raised by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, who has consistently opposed the introduction of any literacy test into our immigration laws.

A determined effort will be made in both Houses of Congress to pass the bill over the President's veto, and with this effort we confess our unqualified sympathy. The President's broad sympathies for the unfortunate in other lands appear to have for the moment blinded him to the burdens already placed upon this country by an excess of undesirable immigration. The literacy test may not be ideal, but it was the most workable safeguard Congress found it possible to devise, and in view of his declared approval of the purpose of those who advocate a restriction of immigration it would seem that Mr. Taft should have at least endeavored to offer a substitute and not merely contented himself with vetoing a bill which, while it might in occasional cases deprive this country of a few desirable immigrants, would unquestionably have operated to keep out thousands of undesirables. The veto sacrifices, it seems to us, the interests of the country at large to serve a very small number in other lands who might desire to seek the opportunities of education in this country which had been denied them at home.

[Editorial from the Journal (Progressive-Republican), Boston, Mass., Feb. 15, 1913.]

A NAGEL VETO.

Mr. Taft has allowed Secretary Nagel to veto the most thorough and comprehensive immigration restriction bill which has ever been drafted. Because of the literacy test which it contains, which is drawn so as to deny admission only to adults unable to read or write in their own language, the President has permitted the active antagonism of the Secretary of Commerce to set aside a bill which had 246 votes in the House and which passed the Senate by a vote of 58 to 9.

Instead of a comprehensive view of the regulation of immigration he he has adopted a narrow one. He has disapproved a measure which represents the most thorough and complete study of the alien influx, and which was most ably framed to purify the stream of 1,000,000 a year foreigners that come to our gates. It established the most thorough system of immigrant inspection which has been devised. It afforded means for detecting and excluding the imbecile, the defective, the unfit, the stowaway, and the tuberculous. It took into account the enormous load of alien insane, the burden of whose care the Federal Government is forcing upon the States. It paid heed to the millions now spent in the fight on tuberculosis. It recognized the saturation of cheap labor which the country faces to-day. All these things it dealt with wisely and with the fruits of bitter experience.

The effect of the literacy test fixed in the bill has been immensely exaggerated in the Nagel veto. It is most important to the United States to-day that, in admitting aliens, it gets those who can enter with a reasonable certainty of keeping up the level of citizenship. The nation which finds the problem of the immigrant, what it is to the United States to-day, will fail in its duty if it does not minimize its work at the beginning. The immigration question should be dealt with from the standpoint of this country and its inhabitants, not from that of the Europeans who wish to come.

That was the principle of the bill passed by so great a majority in both Houses, which may well be passed over the veto. If the previous votes are any criterion this will be done, and the want of confidence in Taft and Taft's judgment will stand.

[Editorial in the Camp News (Independent), Philadelphia, Pa., Mar. 1, 1913.]

HIS INGLORIOUS RETIREMENT.

Ex-President William Howard Taft is in some ways a large man, in other ways he is quite as small as he is large in others.

The fact that he was a President of the United States precludes the use of stronger terms in his behalf, and behooves us to use such courtesy as is due the office he once occupied.

Mr. Taft has suffered with effasia in vision for sometime, and the little reminder he received last November, it seems, failed to effect a cure or even a slight improvement in his malady.

He has failed to perceive the handwriting on the wall, and he has continued on in his arbitrary conduct until he, even in his last months of administration, conducts himself more as a spoiled boy than as a great man above the little petty retaliations of personalities.

One last great act to his discredit is the veto of a bill that has been before the American people for a quarter of a century or over; not an agitated question, but one that has been treated from a scientific standpoint, and which has cost the Government millions of money to so treat. And after a long discussion in order that everybody might act with intelligence, and a long fight against the corrupt interests that have reaped a harvest of dollars from these poor people, while the country has reaped its harvest of ignorance, vice and anarchy, cheap labor, unfair competition to the laboring man, full prisons and almshouses. After Congress had complied with the voice of the people in the passage of a bill so long sought to relieve these conditions this one fat man, sitting in an easy chair, who never did see or feel a throb of the heart of the Nation that has honored him above all that he ever deserved, says that the people, and incidentally the 72 United States Senators who voted for the passage of a sensible bill that promised to restrict immigration, in his veto, "that they either lack wisdom or intelligence."

Why this arbitrary stand against this bill that the people have demanded so long anyway? The public press reports that Mr. Taft called one or two gentlemen in private conference before he acted, and then he expressed his feelings toward labor organizations in no very fitting language for a gentleman in his position. We infer from what has been reported that he said some things about patriotic orders that were no more favorable than what he is reported to have said of the others.

However, Mr. Taft is one of those large bodies that move slowly, and we hope that his movements will never again concern a question relating to this Government, so we dispose of him and take up important things that concern us as a people. The lower House, it appears, failed to muster up enough hardy Americans to pass the bill over the Executive veto. So the great struggle seems lost at the very threshold of victory; but not so, brothers. That struggle shall only be renewed with greater energy than ever before, and if we have underestimated the strength of the foe, we have learned a lesson that will increase our vigilance and power, and call forth all that is in us for the next conflict.

Fortunately another Executive is now at the helm, and we believe that Mr. Wilson is a man of sincere intelligence, who is not unduly influenced by any corporation or foreign power, and a man who has felt the pulse of the Nation, and knows the burden of the toilers. We hope much from this comparatively poor man in the Presidential chair, and when that bill is again passed by both Houses may every son of America and patriotic citizen write a personal letter to the President urging him to sign the bill; flood the White House so that it will create such a look that an additional clerk will be necessary to examine the mail, and in that way some of it at least may reach the President.

[Extract from the Knights of Labor Journal, Washington, D. C., March, 1913.]

A VETO TO BE ASHAMED OF.

The most important measure attempted to be made into law by the Sixty-second Congress in all its career has failed at the last moment—that is the attempt to restrict immigration has come to naught. For years the evils of undesirable immigration have been apparent everywhere in this country and have been voiced by protests of the wageworkers, agriculturists, and vast masses of the people, organized and unorganized. * * *

Opposed to this demand has been the desire and effort of foreign steamship corporations and of great industrial monopolies, the one desiring to make profits by the bringing of immigrants here, the other to make profits off from the cheap labor which would thus be furnished for their exploitation here. * * *

Withholding any expression of approval or disapproval meanwhile, President Taft on the tenth day after the passage of the bill sent to Congress his veto. The President presented no forceful argument whatever, but grounded the veto very largely upon the letter by Secretary Nagel. Secretary Nagel did what everybody expected he would do if he had a chance—stabbed the bill to death with treacherous and un-American hand. Over two years ago, in a speech made in New York City, he declared himself opposed to any such measure of restriction. His official course, in his rulings and decisions as Secretary, has shown that he really favors unrestricted immigration—and he very generally has stood for the interests of the great steamship companies rather than for the wage workers and masses of the American people. The objections by Secretary Nagel are worthy of but slight consideration. It was a special plea drawn to help out the interests of the masters whom he delights to serve.

Why President Taft should rely upon Secretary Nagel is unexplainable—except upon the supposition that he was unable to think of or to give any other reason for his disapproval of the bill. Certainly President Taft himself advanced no sufficient cause why he should by executive act declare null and void this long-considered and well-indorsed bill.

In the exercise of this veto power President Taft deliberately set at naught the entire body and purpose of the bill, shaped as it was and denied by none so as to conserve the safety of the Republic and the interests of the people from dangerous and undesirable immigration. By this veto the President leaves the American people to the continued influx of such dangerous and undesirable immigration indefinitely. The veto is a thing of which President Taft himself ought to be ashamed—and if he is not already in that frame of mind he will come to it some day in the future no doubt. * * *

Another Congress and another President will have this great question before them. Our contention is right, and "right is right, as God is God." It must and will prevail.

Truth crush'd to earth will rise again:
The eternal years of God are hers;
While Error, wounded, writhes with pain,
And dies among his worshipers.

Many new faces are here, and a large majority of them, I am glad to know, are with us on this the most important question that confronts the American people. The emissaries of the steamship companies and of those who in their greed would weigh down the backs of labor with this foreign burden will sing their siren notes in your ears, my new friends. They will besiege you with their telegrams, with their appeals, and their threats; but the man who by the sweat of his face eats his daily bread is behind you and looks to you to right his wrongs. The absentees defeated this bill before. Let no man shirk his duty or sulk in his tent or be away from his post when the fight comes on. Let American standards of living

and of morals be preserved by those whom the people have placed on the watchtowers of our Nation. The following facts will be of interest to all who will study them:

Of the 213 Members of the House that voted in favor of passing the immigration bill over the veto, February 19, 1913, almost two-thirds—that is, 136—were Democrats. Of those 136 Democrats 125 are Members of the present House. Of the 76 Republicans voting "aye"—that is, in favor of the bill—45 are Members of this House; that is, of the 213 voting "aye" 170 are Members of this House, and of those 170 almost three-fourths are Democrats.

Of the 114 that voted "nay"—that is, against the bill—less than one-half—that is, 53—were Democrats, 60 being Republicans, and 1 Socialist. Of that 114, 81 are Members of this House, 45, or approximately one-half, being Democrats.

Of the 157 new Members 71 declared for the literacy test and the bill during the last campaign, and only 15 are known by the friends of the measure to have declared against it. Forty-two of the other 71 new Members are reported as in favor of it.

It is interesting to note from these figures that a much larger proportion of Republicans than of Democrats voted against passing the bill over the President's veto, thus showing that the real friends of labor are those who follow the standard of Democracy. An analysis of the vote will show further that those who in this debate most loudly vaunt themselves the friends of labor are the ones who gave the workingman the Joab thrust when he most needed their aid.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, it had not been my original idea to discuss the tariff bill now before the House. It has seemed to me that much of the discussion indulged in was of little avail. My observation has been that very few votes are changed in this House by the discussion in general debate. Most of us have had our minds pretty thoroughly made up as to how we are going to vote, and I presume, at this moment, practically every man in this House has determined in his own mind whether he will vote for or against this bill. That being the case, it seems to me that the time indulged in in this particular form of discussion is of little practical value. To my mind it is unfortunate for the country that a tariff discussion seems necessarily to follow partisan lines. The tariff is a big, complicated, economic proposition. It is so broad and big and touches the life and the energy of the people of the Nation in so many places that it seems to me it ought to be considered in its purely economical aspect, aside from partisan bias or prejudice. However, it seems impossible to divorce the tariff from politics. The political parties of to-day have arranged themselves, as they have for a hundred years in the past, largely upon the tariff proposition, and political alignments are largely based upon the views which the individual holds with respect to the tariff. That being the case, it is perhaps not so surprising that we find in this House to-day men who heretofore have expressed decided opinions upon various phases of the revision of the tariff, saying now that they will vote against this bill, because perchance there are some things about it which they do not approve.

I desire to say to those who have heretofore expressed themselves in favor of a reduction of the tariff that the issue which they must meet when the roll is called upon the provisions of the Underwood tariff bill amounts in substance to this: A vote "aye" means a vote in favor of the Underwood bill; a vote "no" means a vote in favor of the Payne-Aldrich bill. There can be no other issue, it seems to me, because everyone knows that if the Underwood bill does not become a law, it means that we shall be forced to continue under the exactions of the present Payne-Aldrich law.

Those of you who have condemned the Payne-Aldrich law as a burden upon the American people, as a bill that has been framed largely in the interest of the enormous trusts and protected interests, as a bill that disregards the interests of the great consuming public of the land, as a bill that extorts millions upon millions from the laboring people of this land every year in unjust and extortionate taxation. If you vote "no" upon the roll call, you are taking back all that you have said about the bill and are willing that it shall remain as it is for the future.

Everyone realizes how difficult it is to write a tariff bill. I suppose there is nothing that is more difficult in the way of legislation. It involves such a mass of detail and requires such a wonderful amount of investigation that it is, indeed, a tremendous task for a body of men to undertake. And yet I venture to say that those who have examined this bill with care will say, in candor, that the Ways and Means Committee of this House have brought forth a bill that is well calculated to produce the necessary amount of revenue for the Government and is framed along honest and sensible lines.

Each of us may differ as to the individual or particular schedule, but take it all in all, I think that we can say that it is a good bill. It is a fulfillment of the promises of the Democratic Party to revise the tariff and reduce the tariff. It bears no evidence of the influence of special interests or the favoring of one class above another. It is calculated to relieve the American people from the heavy burden of the tariff taxation that has been placed upon them for these many years.

Four years ago, the Republican Party faced the same situation which the Democratic Party faces to-day. They had gone before the people in the fall of 1908 with the promise to reduce the tariff burdens then resting upon the American people. Mr. Taft, the candidate for President on the Republican ticket, in numerous speeches, pledged himself to give the people this relief. There can be no question but that the people relied largely upon his promise, in returning the Republican Party to power that year. Following Mr. Taft's inauguration, with a Republican majority in the House, and the Senate having a Republican majority, the President called Congress together in extra session to reduce the tariff. It is unnecessary for me to go into the details of the failure of the Republican Party to keep that promise. It is a matter of history that their record in this particular was condemned by the American people as a breach of faith and as a broken pledge to the voters who had given them their support.

The election of 1910 demonstrated that the American people were dissatisfied with the result of that work. They repudiated the action of the Republican Party in enacting the Payne-Aldrich law, and the Democratic House was sent here as a stern rebuke to a party that had failed to keep faith with the people.

The Democratic House elected in 1910 endeavored to carry out their promise to the American people. They passed a number of tariff bills containing real and substantial reduction of tariff taxation. These bills were so good, so equitable that many on the Republican side of the aisle joined in helping pass them through the House. They were so good that a sufficient number of Republicans in the Senate joined with the Democrats and passed them there. And yet, notwithstanding this, the President of the United States, in defiance of public opinion and the judgment of Congress, vetoed these bills.

In the election of 1912 President Taft went before the American people upon his record. The Democratic Party went before the people upon their record in the House of Representatives; the result is such as to leave no doubt in anyone's mind.

The Democratic Party is here to-day in control of every branch of the Government, largely because of the failure of the Republican Party to keep their promise to the American people in reducing the tariff taxation. And, gentlemen, we are going to keep our promise to the American people; we are going to do so honestly and fearlessly.

In the campaign of 1912 the Democratic platform included the following statement:

> We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government under the Constitution has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of government honestly and economically administered.
>
> The high Republican tariff is the principal cause of the unequal distribution of wealth; it is a system of taxation which makes the rich richer and the poor poorer; under its operations the American farmer and laboring man are the chief sufferers; it raises the cost of necessaries of life to them, but does not protect their product or wages. The farmer sells largely in free markets and buys almost entirely in the protected markets. In the most highly protected industries, such as cotton and wool, steel and iron, the wages of the laborers are the lowest paid in any of our industries. We denounce the Republican pretense on that subject and assert that American wages are established by competitive conditions and not by the tariff.
>
> We favor the immediate downward revision of the existing high and, in many cases, prohibitive tariff duties, insisting that material reductions be speedily made upon the necessaries of life. Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products and articles of American manufacture which are sold abroad more cheaply than at home should be put upon the free list.
>
> We recognize that our system of tariff taxation is intimately connected with the business of the country, and we favor the ultimate attainment of the principles we advocate by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry.
>
> We denounce the action of President Taft in vetoing the bills to reduce the tariff in the cotton, woolen, metals, and chemical schedules, and the farmers' free-list bills, all of which were designed to give immediate relief to the masses from the exactions of the trusts.
>
> The Republican Party, while promising tariff revision, has shown by its tariff legislation that such revision is not to be in the people's interest; and having been faithless to its pledges in 1908, it should no longer enjoy the confidence of the Nation. We appeal to the American people to support us in our demand for a tariff for revenue only.

This pledge contained two essential ideas: First, the establishment of duty designed primarily to produce revenue for the

Government; second, the attainment of this and by legislation that will not injure or destroy any legitimate industry.

In the report of the Ways and Means Committee, accompanying this bill, we find this significant statement:

> The dividing line between the positions of the two great parties on this question is very clear and easily ascertained in theory. Where the tariff rates balance the difference in cost at home and abroad, including an allowance for the difference in freight rates, the tariff must be competitive, and from that point downward to the lowest tariff that can be levied it will continue to be competitive to a great or less extent. Where competition is not interfered with by levying the tax above the highest competitive point, the profits of the manufacturer are not protected. On the other hand, when the duties levied at the custom-house are high enough to allow the American manufacturer to make a profit before his competitor can enter the field, we have invaded the domain of the protection of profits. In our judgment the protection of any profit must of necessity have a tendency to destroy competition and create monopoly, whether the profit protected is reasonable or unreasonable.

I want to say to those progressive Republicans who sit in this Chamber, and in the body at the other end of the Capitol, that the issue which they will have to meet is clear and unmistakable.

For years they have been joining with us in the condemnation of the Payne-Aldrich law. They have won favor with the people largely because they have promised to favor a real and substantial reduction of the tariff rate.

The opportunity is now presented to them to show their good faith. It will not do for them to hide behind captious objections to particular schedules. Such tactics will play into the hands of the standpat Republicans, who, above all things, want the rate to remain unchanged.

I want to say to you low-tariff Republicans it is up to you now to demonstrate to the country whether or not you were sincere in your protestations or not.

Some of you who are going to vote against this bill will try to justify your vote by saying "I am in favor of lower duties, but this particular bill is not just to my liking." Such an excuse is worse than absurd; it is dishonest.

Is there a Progressive or a progressive Republican in the United States who honestly believes that if his party were in power a tariff bill would be framed which would meet the individual views of any one of their number?

Every man who knows anything knows that if he were to live to be as old as Methuselah, and were to become as wise as Solomon, and should attain the statesmanship of Daniel Webster, and were to remain in Congress as long as Joe Cannon he would never have an opportunity to vote for a tariff bill which suited him in every particular.

A tariff bill of necessity can not represent the individual views of any one man. It is bound to be so framed as to meet the composite views of a large number of men.

So what is the use of trying to fool the people about this matter. You are either for the people or against them in this fight. Every high protectionist, every standpatter will vote against this bill, and he will do so because he favors the Payne-Aldrich law and wants it to remain on the statute books. If you Progressives and progressive Republicans want to join with them and desert your previous colors you are of course at liberty to do so, but the issue thus formed must be met and no one will be permitted to evade it.

No Democrat is at all underestimating the responsibility now resting upon his party. A reduction in tariff exactions always brings on protests and criticisms. We realize fully the character of attacks that will be made upon us and upon this bill.

But we are strengthened by the consciousness that the people are alive to the real situation, and are fully capable of analyzing the motives which will inspire them.

We have been commissioned to perform an arduous and difficult task.

We propose to carry out our pledges to the American people faithfully and honestly, and we will do so in full confidence that upon our work the American people will place the seal of their approval. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I will ask how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has used 19 hours and 55½ minutes. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has used 20 hours and 14 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. That would take 18½ minutes on our side to even up.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. Do I understand it is satisfactory to the gentleman from Alabama to continue in session after we have evened up and then divide the remaining time—an hour and a half—equally between the majority and the minority, which would bring us until a quarter past 11?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That would be satisfactory, if we adjourn at a quarter past 11.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN]. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, this tariff bill, characterized by its two most important features, is an act to provide penalties for producers and subsidies for importers.

Fairness to the majority demands a plain statement of its point of view. "The revision is in the interest of the consumers," said Chairman UNDERWOOD in his opening speech on April 23, 1913. The interest of the consumer is our first concern, said President Wilson April 21, 1913. "The tariff duties are laid for revenue only, all elements of protection being eliminated," says the report of the Ways and Means Committee accompanying the bill.

"The future growth of our great industries will be found beyond the seas," says the report on page 18. In practically every speech supporting the bill the consumers' interests are held paramount. In one noteworthy exception, when Congressman DONOVAN, of Connecticut, a Democrat, asked Chairman UNDERWOOD why, in the laying of duties, wages in this country and those abroad had not been ascertained or considered, he was told by the chairman that that kind of reasoning belonged on the Republican side of the House.

So that wage earner and farmer, constituting the distinctive producers of this country, were directed to waive their claims to steady employment and good wages by the one and their right to fair prices for their farm products by the other. These are to be held secondary to the importer, who should have an opportunity to minister unto the consumers at prices having no regard to wages or crop prices in this country. Of course all men are consumers, but the clamor for reduction of wages and prices do not come from those constituting the consuming producers. The express demand for reduction of prices and the necessarily implied demand for reduction of wages come from—

First. The idle rich.

Second. Those who have their means invested in interest-bearing securities.

Third. Salaried class, who, from their official position or their relations to various avenues of public information, have raised a mighty clamor against what is called the "high cost of living."

Of these it should be said, while they are not so numerous as the wage earner or the farmer, they have been most active and emphatic. This activity and emphasis constitute the basis for this present tariff bill.

With this viewpoint it is not difficult to understand the force of the Ways and Means Committee's statement, on page 18 of its report, that "it is our deliberate judgment that the future success of our great industries will be found beyond the seas." For more than a century and a quarter we have been taught that it is better for America to see that her industries prospered within her borders than to see them prosper in foreign countries, whether they were there run by American or foreign capital. American production in America sold to Americans keeps Americans here, production here, and the money paid for that production here. This view is distinctly and frankly challenged and repudiated in the new bill.

As Chairman UNDERWOOD well said, "This bill marks the beginning of a new era in this country." He will probably pardon us if the public sees newness as the only quality to recommend the novel tariff system.

In harmony with the beginning of important new legislation, the Ways and Means Committee call attention to conditions alleged to be undesirable, point out principal offenders, and then propose and state the remedy. "High prices" is the distinctive evil sought to be overcome. To direct the public mind to the principal offenders the Ways and Means Committee in its report sets out its first table of figures. This table shows values since 1897, the year when the Dingley law was passed. The following is a copy of that table:

Relative wholesale prices and per cent of increase over 1897.

Commodity.	Price, 1897.	Price, 1900.	Increase over 1897.	Price, 1910.	Increase over 1897.
			Per ct.		*Per ct.*
Farm products	85.2	109.5	28.5	164.6	93.2
Food	87.7	104.2	18.8	128.7	46.7
Clothing	91.1	106.8	17.2	123.7	35.8
Metals and implements	86.6	120.5	39.1	128.5	48.2
Drugs and chemicals	94.4	115.7	22.5	117.0	23.9
House-furnishing goods	98.8	106.1	18.1	111.6	24.2
Miscellaneous	92.1	109.8	19.2	133.1	44.5
All commodities	89.7	110.5	23.1	131.6	46.7

Again, on page 23, in the same report, speaking of agricultural products, the report says:

In the effort to relieve the consumer and to mitigate the high and rising cost of living Schedule G, which deals with agricultural products, has been thoroughly revised, and important reductions have been made.

As further emphasis to offending Schedule G, which is the agricultural schedule, Chairman UNDERWOOD, on the 23d of April, 1913, in the opening paragraphs of his first speech in support of the tariff bill, emphasized the assault on Schedule G in the following language:

So far as the people were concerned, the main reason why a revision of the customs laws was both demanded and expected was because of the increased cost of living since the enactment of the Dingley bill in 1897. During that period I find from statistics that the value of farm products had increased 93 per cent; food, 47 per cent; clothing, 36 per cent; metals and implements, 48 per cent; drugs and chemicals, 24 per cent; house-furnishing goods, 24 per cent.

My discussion will relate largely to the agricultural schedule for the following reasons:

First. It is the primary and greatest of all industries, involving the direct interests of 35,000,000 people and an annual production of more than $9,000,000,000 of value.

Second. It is the principal industry of the great Northwest—dominant in my State and overshadowing in my district.

Third. It is the industry whose products are most drastically assailed in the Underwood bill.

Fourth. It is the industry with whose "growth beyond the seas" I am much less concerned than its growth and development within our own borders. It is the industry where the best opportunities, physically, socially, and morally, for our own people are, and which should be made attractive for those now living there to remain and to which those now living in congested cities should be effectively invited.

In the discussion of this question I assume that the drastic reduction of duties on farm products will reduce prices of farm products. In the first place, that is the expressed purpose of the supporters of the bill.

Second, reduction of duties is an invitation for importation. Increased importations of farm products at the great consuming centers of our country can not fail to hammer down prices. Moreover, it is claimed by those engaged in indoor manufacturing and admitted by the sponsors of this bill that the even moderate reductions of duties on their products will reduce their selling prices. So that having arrived at a period in our agricultural history and development when, even with the present duties, we have competition between our farm products and similar imported products, it is apparent to all that to radically reduce or remove duties will multiply that importation and competition, with a resultant of decreased prices for farm products.

Schedule G, speaking historically, appeared in the McKinley bill. It was first drafted by Mr. LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, now Senator, but then, in 1890, a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. It was repealed when the Wilson bill was enacted, but was reenacted in the Dingley law, and has been substantially retained in the present tariff law. At the time of its first enactment and until recent years its value to the farmer was not regarded as important. It is a wise statesmanship which plans legislation not for the day or perhaps the year, but for that condition which a clear foresight sees coming. It was believed that the time was approaching when production of farm products and consumption by the people of this country would approximate each other. That time has arrived. This our diminishing exports of farm products and expanding imports for the last few years clearly demonstrate.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SLOAN. I would yield half my kingdom to him, but I can not yield my time. [Laughter.]

This bill would aid the importer by causing agriculture's "great growth beyond the seas." Let us look to those lands where agriculture may prosper upon its opportunity to freely import into this country. The reduction or removal of duties, we must understand, is an invitation for this foreign agriculture to intensify everywhere possible on the globe, because America's pockets have been for years the fullest of the world, America's palate the most exacting, and its hand most lavish. Let me call attention to the leading locations for this growth of the agricultural industry "beyond the seas."

First. Canada, beyond the "unsalted seas," has boundless acreage of new and virgin soil made accessible by liberal homestead laws and easy terms of purchase to her citizens, and to a citizenship invited from the world.

Her products, with few exceptions, compete with all the products of the Northwest. Our neighbor, Mexico, has the greatest coast line, perhaps, of nearly all the noninsular countries compared with its area. Note its unusual and undeveloped resources, especially in the agricultural and pastoral lands. Australasia lying largely in similar latitude to ours, washed by the waves and fanned by the breezes of the South Sea, has almost immeasurable opportunity for cereal and meat production. It has but recently found ocean paths to our ports, bringing in millions of meat and cereal products to compete with our own; this notwithstanding our strong tariff discrimination. South America, with its mighty stretches of pastoral and arable lands in its great river valleys and moderately elevated tablelands, presents opportunity for cereal and meat production to feed the world. Principal among South American countries, of course, as a competitor is Argentina. It is about two-fifths the area of the United States, in the South Temperate Zone, with a long Atlantic coast line and a general slope from the Andean region to the ocean. It is traversed by rivers along whose valleys and intervening elevations are lands which favorably compare with the most productive of our own country and which produce everything upon which we rely in the great Northwest. This land raises corn, wheat, oats, rye, alfalfa. Liberal laws invite citizenship, and easy homesteading is provided. Its lands, which surpass ours for grazing and rival them for cereal production, sell from one-fourth to a third of what ours do. Its plains are covered with herds looked after for less than one-half of our labor cost. More than this, so much of her territory so neighbors the sea she can carry her products to New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore cheaper than can we transport our grains and meats from the great West to those seaports.

This can be readily seen from the following coast-line table of the United States compared with the other countries considered, the rule being that distance to port varies inversely with the length of the coast line.

Area and coast line.

	Area, square miles.	Coast line, nautical miles.
United States	2,974,159	4,330
Brazil	3,291,416	3,700
Argentina	1,139,196	2,140
Chile	292,743	3,043
Uruguay	72,172	330
Paraguay	97,722	None.
Australia	2,974,580	7,809
New Zealand	104,750	2,273
Mexico	767,323	3,160
Canada	3,729,665	3,025
Total outside of United States	12,469,567	25,453

This gives to the United States 692 square miles of area to each nautical mile of coast line, while the average of the other countries is 489 square miles to each nautical mile of coast line. Considering the above and the varying form of coast lines, the distance to port in the United States would be approximately one and one-half times what it averages in these other countries.

It is this competition which the new tariff bill asks the farmers of the Northwest to battle with for the markets of the East—these markets they have done so much in the last 50 years to upbuild. They were led to believe that these markets were secured to them, at least to such an extent that the tariff barrier would represent the difference between our cost of production and the cost of production abroad. It is against this competition which President Wilson in his speech to Congress invited the American farmers to "sharpen their wits," as he was about to remove their shield.

To drive the Northwest into this unfair competition and make it the special sufferer under this bill a few significant facts should be stated.

First. A recent change in the rules of the House of Representatives gave the Ways and Means Committee power to appoint all standing committees and, therefore, control all the legislation of the House in its every department, division, and ramification. This appointment is carried out by the 14 majority members of the Ways and Means Committee to the exclusion of the 7 minority members.

Second. Up to the time of the passage of this act no standing committee appointments have been made save and except the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Rules. So that every member of the majority awaits his effectiveness in legislation until he delivers his support and vote on this measure. This explains in part why no member of the majority side, save members of the Ways and Means Committee, dared suggest an amendment or vote for one proposed by anyone else.

Third. In the drafting of this bill the seven minority members were entirely unconsulted and excluded.

Fourth. Of the 14 majority members the Ohio member, Mr. ANSBERRY, through illness, has been practically unable to appear in drafting or otherwise being concerned in the bill. Of the other 13, 7 are distinctly southern in residence and political beliefs and prejudice. The eighth member, Mr. HARRISON of New York, is professedly a free trader and, by more than ordinary affiliation through ancestral conditions, southern in prejudice. The ninth, Mr. PETERS, of Boston, comes from that city which recently elected a Democratic Congressman on the issue of cheap food products and free wool. The tenth member, Mr. PALMER, of Pennsylvania, comes from the Schwab iron district of Pennsylvania, and his interest in the welfare of the farmers and wage earners of the country has not been apparent to the unaided human perception. It will be further noted that all the members drafting this bill reside in the eastern two-fifths of the United States. If you draw a line from Canada to St. James, Minn., from there to Jefferson City, Mo., and from there to Uvalde, Tex., thence to the Mexican line, you will leave to the West 60 per cent of the area of the United States entirely unrepresented by any member who participated in drafting this bill.

Fifth. In this 60 per cent of the area of the United States there reside 18,000,000 people. There is there produced 64 per cent of the wheat raised in the United States, 40 per cent of the oats, 30 per cent of the corn, 70 per cent of the barley, 46 per cent of the hay, 45 per cent of the horses, 31 per cent of the swine, 63 per cent of the sheep, 67 per cent of the wool.

I mention these facts because it is difficult for a party unrepresented at court to obtain his full due, and this 60 per cent of the United States, so far as this bill is concerned, is treated like an alien producing province, and given most severe and undeserved punishment.

It should be, perhaps, mentioned that a large number of the Democratic Members from the Northwest made a futile effort to have a representative on the Ways and Means Committee in the person of Hon. EDWARD TAYLOR, of Colorado, but he received less than 10 per cent of the caucus vote.

Perhaps no single fact would more pointedly illustrate the lack of sympathy and knowledge of the great Northwest possessed by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee than the statement made by one of its members, Mr. PALMER, of Pennsylvania, when he spoke of Denver as being in the heart of the great lumber and forest section of the West. This is entertaining to those of us who live on the plains of the Dakotas, Nebraska, Wyoming, Kansas, Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexoco, which more than one-half surrounds Denver.

The foregoing figures, indicating the noncongested population and the very large farm production, will readily show that this section is the one which furnishes the surplus not consumed in the vicinity of its production, but which is sold to the consuming centers.

With these facts in view, however unjust it may have been, it was not wholly unnatural, perhaps, that the following severe and merciless discrimination should have been made against this section.

The following table shows the change from the present law as affecting the important northwestern agricultural products:

	Per cent reduction.
Meats, free list	100
Flour, free list	100
Swine, free list	100
Cattle	66
Horses	60
Raw wool, free list	100
Hay	50
Wheat	60
Dairy products and eggs	50
Poultry	63

Figuring the reductions and removals of duty, together with the relative amounts of value affected thereby in the northwestern section, it can be fairly estimated that the average reduction amounts to from 80 per cent to 85 per cent of the former duties, while the reductions of the former duties on the products coming from the East and South amounts to only from 35 per cent to 40 per cent. In other words, the cuts in farm-product duties are more than double what they are collectively on the manufactures in the several schedules, including:

A. Chemicals, oils, and paints.
B. Earths, earthen ware, and glassware.
C. Metals and manufactures.
D. Wood.
E. Sugar, molasses, etc.
F. Tobaccos.
H. Spirits, wines, etc.
I. Cotton.
J. Flax, hemp, and jute.
K. Manufactured woolen.
L. Silks.
M. Pulp, papers, and books.
N. Sundries.

Or, to state it in another way, the discriminating duties on articles largely produced in the East and South are cut less than one-half as much as on agricultural products. Again, only about 15 per cent of the Payne tariff-law protection remains on Schedule G, and including raw wool, while on the other articles 60 per cent of the Payne protection is retained.

At this time it would be proper to state that during the last few years the importations and duties collected on farm products have been increasing more rapidly than in the other schedules, so that if this bill was really for revenue only, the duties should remain as a source of expanding revenue.

Of this, however, more hereafter.

To estimate the effect upon competition at our ports, under reduced or removed duties, we first note the course of importation in recent years under the old law; second, the export record of our rivals in the same class of articles, for the reduction or removal of the duty is either the increase or creation of our rivals' opportunity. Under the proposed law, cattle duties are reduced about 66 per cent. The following table shows our increasing imports and our decreasing exports. It will further show the increasing exports of our three rivals in this line—Argentina, Australia, and Mexico. It requires no great commercial wisdom to see that increasing export headed toward our ports.

Exports and imports of United States in cattle for certain years and exports of cattle for same years from Argentina, Mexico, and Australia.

	United States.		Argentina.	Mexico.	Australia.
	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.	Exports.	Exports.
	Number.	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*
1905	567,806	27,855	.....	.....	.....
1906	584,239	29,619	.....	.....	.....
1907	423,051	32,402	.....	.....	.....
1908	349,210	92,356	.....	.....	.....
1909	207,542	129,184	132,450	136,051	955
1910	139,430	195,938	89,733	193,326	3,745
1911	150,100	182,923	184,112	136,051	9,964
1912	105,506	318,372	261,416	(1)	(2)

[1] No data.
[2] Number of cattle not given, but value of export for 1912 of cattle over 5 times value of 1911.

Applying the same rule for packing-house products we find decreasing export, increasing imports, and expansion of our rivals' exports.

Exports and imports of the United States in packing-house products for certain years and exports of packing-house products for same years from Argentina, Australia, and New Zealand.

	United States.		Argentina.	Australia.	New Zealand.
	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.	Exports.	Exports.
1900	$179,898,782	$1,214,585	$11,702,000	$16,496,000	$12,589,000
1905	170,308,231	75,798,841	30,621,000	13,148,000	14,872,000
1910	113,128,937	127,975,068	33,308,753	20,101,416	19,009,013
1911	131,056,795	86,078,298	40,211,439	28,902,804	17,820,599
1912	137,554,077	117,270,572	45,210,938	(1)	(1)

[1] No data.

United States exports from 1900 to 1912 decreased 24 per cent. Argentina exports from 1900 to 1912 increased 286 per cent. Australian exports from 1900 to 1911 increased 76 per cent.

Perhaps its effect can be most forcibly stated in the following table:

Exports of beef from United States and Argentina to the United Kingdom for certain years.

	United States.	Argentina.
	Hundredweight.	*Hundredweight.*
1901	3,180,291	771,929
1902	2,290,465	923,748
1903	2,693,920	1,152,211
1904	2,395,836	1,675,271
1905	2,232,206	2,580,152
1906	2,426,344	2,795,913
1907	2,417,604	2,756,965
1908	1,432,142	3,706,245
1909	856,805	4,336,079
1910	477,147	5,041,138
1911	174,350	6,176,503
1912	6,111	6,813,578

This table shows what became of our export beef trade placed in competition with Argentina's beef trade in the markets of the United Kingdom. These ports are free and open to the world, just as the Underwood bill would make the markets of San Francisco, Seattle, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. The pathways of the sea require no right of way to be purchased, no track to be laid. Sea freight is notoriously cheap. Its cheapness is not subject to the control of any commission enabled to prevent discriminations. So all the advantages lie with the great shipper against the small. We note that Australia can ship her meat products to our ports cheaper than we of the West can send them over the iron tracks. How the American, with his high-priced land, high-priced labor, and expensive transportation can so "sharpen his wits" to meet these adverse conditions might constitute a good basis for a new chapter on political revelations.

Cattle on the dutiable list and meat on the free list, is a reversal of the rule announced by Chairman UNDERWOOD of a low duty on the so-called raw materials, a higher duty on the finished product. It is a distinctive blow against the farmer who would desire to feed cattle, as to some extent under this bill he must buy his feeders in a market slightly protected, but he must sell the finished product of his industry in a free-trade market. They say an ingenious Canadian is watching this bill with a great deal of interest. He has constructed an elevated platform just across the line in Canada, where he will kill the cattle in Canada, and they will fall from the trap into the United States as beef, avoiding the duty. This is but a crude statement of what the large and powerful packing interests would, in effect, do; their abattoirs would be close to the American line in Canada or Mexico; their live stock would become meat in the foreign country; it being shipped free would escape the duty.

Many have wondered why cattle are to receive the slight protection and beef be denied it altogether. My own construction of this is that when the Mexican longhorns were being politically started across the Rio Grande, they found "GARNER at the gates." That he did the best he could to slug the marauders of his own industrial household is apparent. I only regret that his protective vision was not broader and more general. Still, I admire his Americanism in insisting that a Texas ranger is at least 10 per cent better than a Mexican greaser.

Of meats generally, as will be seen from the table, our imports show an increase, while our exports show a decrease. On the other hand, our rivals show an increase of exports of meats.

Another important reason why we should not have free meats from all the world is that none of our rivals require the severe tests of inspection with right and power of condemnation that is required under our pure-food law of our own meat producers. The Ways and Means Committee in charge of this bill rejected a proper amendment submitted from this side of the House to at least not further grant a premium to the advantage of the foreign producer, enabling him to flood our shores with meats of bad or, at least, doubtful quality.

It is passing strange throughout this whole bill what an aristocrat the importer becomes. He pays no taxes to America, is under no obligation to its Government or subdivisions. He may be its most inveterate enemy, but is given the advantage in numerous ways over the home producer in the preparation of his article of commerce and is welcomed at our ports, while handicap after handicap, legal and otherwise, is imposed and enforced upon the home producer. What manner of men are these of the Ways and Means Committee, who rail at special privilege to American citizens and make speed to grant them to the foreign producer, who lives on a foreign shore, employs labor of his own kind, drains America of its money, deprives the laborer of his job, and the American producer of his opportunity? They then threaten the American producer with special governmental investigation, to be followed with severe punishment should he perchance see fit to slacken his business, close up his doors, or seek perchance to reestablish his industry on a foreign shore, there to obtain equal opportunity. Is that threat because they do not want our American producer under the new régime to be on equal terms "beyond the seas" with the foreign producer?

It might be interesting for our cattle raisers to know the most important piece of evidence which seemed to influence the Ways and Means Committee in its reduction of cattle duties and removal of duties on meat. Able and clear evidence was given in opposition to free meats and the reduction of duties on cattle by Judge Cowan, the attorney for the National Live Stock Association, and others, which would seem convincing to anybody who either resided in the Northwest or was conversant with its conditions. But the testimony which seemed to have swayed the committee was that of one Daniel J. Haley, of the United Master Butchers' Association of America. Quoting from his testimony, on page 2598 of the hearings will be very interesting to cattle raisers and meat producers. He said:

> The present tariff rate on food animals is practically prohibitive and the teeming hordes of cattle from Mexico, at our very door, and the vast plains of northern South America are barred from entering. Those cattle—reports to the contrary—compare favorably with the home supply. The removal of the tariff on meats and food animals would not materially affect the American farmers, for as a class they are not in the cattle-raising business.

Of course, Mr. Haley should have known the incorrectness of that statement. Most of the farmers of the United States are engaged in the cattle business, and it is further known by every intelligent farmer that if he does not to some extent engage in the cattle business he can not long continue in the farm business, because its fertility will have vanished. Although our prices for cattle are quite satisfactory, the margin of profit has not been large; in fact, very close, if we did not consider the keeping of cattle on the farm as the principal means of retaining its fertility. Yet this man's word was given great weight by the Ways and Means Committee.

Wheat duty is reduced by the bill from 25 cents per bushel to 10 cents, while flour, assuming that Canada will take off her duty, will be admitted free. This is on a par with dutiable cattle and free-trade beef, another reversal of the raw-material theory announced by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, a reversal made in the Northwest, not, however, made in any important particular in the industries of the East and South.

During recent years wheat in Canada has uniformly ranged lower in price than similar wheat within the United States, other conditions being approximately equal. This being true, we must say of this bill as applied to wheat and flour "it passeth all human understanding." Under this arrangement wheat of course would not come in from Canada, nor would very much flour fail to come in. This must be obvious to anyone whose brain is not in pawn to a caucus. It looks like a specious concession to the member of the Ways and Means Committee from Minnesota to apparently save his farmers' wheat. It looks like old Bill Jones's dam, which Smith agreed to build across a small stream in my State. Smith guaranteed that the water would not run over the dam. He set the bank posts and fastened longitudinal planks from top down to low-water mark. He then claimed he had completed his contract. Jones could not see that the water lowered above or below, but Smith showed him that the water would not run over it. "I did not agree to keep the stream from running under it." I fear the farmers of the North will be dissatisfied with HAMMOND'S dam. It will check the wheat, but will not interfere with the flow of flour. It will amount to a mere device to remove the milling activities over into our rival's territory and will be a distinct case in point where the growth of our industries will lie "beyond the unsalted seas." That this will be true can be readily seen when we note the growth of flour exports from Canada and the practical lack of growth of its wheat exports.

United States and Canada exports of wheat and wheat flour.

	1909	1910	1911	1912
United States: Wheat....bushels..	66,923,244	46,679,876	23,729,302	30,160,212
Canada: Wheat.....do....	49,137,449	60,431,253	49,896,924	66,541,022
United States: Flour.....barrels..	10,521,161	9,040,987	10,129,435	11,006,487
Canada: Flour.....do....	1,738,038	3,064,161	13,854,869	3,739,719

United States export of wheat for years 1911–12 (average) was 52 per cent less than for 1909–10 (average).

Canada export of wheat for years 1911–12 (average) was 6 per cent more than for 1909–10 (average).

United States export of flour for years 1911–12 (average) was 8 per cent more than for 1909–10 (average).

Canada export of flour for years 1911–12 (average) was 266 per cent more than for 1909–10 (average).

The admission of free flour from Canada will, perhaps, as seriously affect the milling interest of my State as the border States, because we will have to meet not only the competition of the border States within our competitive territory, but that swollen competition resulting from the Canadian imports. The products of our mills, not being up to the standard of excellence of the northern product, must necessarily suffer from that competition.

It will probably cause a repeal of the old rule which we learned in youth, that 10 mills made a cent. Under this new tariff arrangement 10 mills can not make a cent. [Applause.] In many of our towns the most effective competition in the purchase of grain arises out of the local miller's demand. If his mill is closed the grain farmer must of necessity suffer.

The following table shows the course of cereal exports of the United States, Argentina, Australia, and Canada.

Quantity of cereals exported, in bushels, from certain countries.

	1900	1905	1910	1911	1912
United States	448,303,196	285,054,567	138,778,137	146,358,645	124,010,673
Argentina	92,460,623	203,468,125	188,772,957	130,421,795	356,450,899
Chile	1,640,500	3,376,000	6,087,624	2,796,410	(1)
Uruguay	2,402,000	2,266,000	3,681,774	[2] 4,000,000	(1)
Australia	16,843,500	33,459,500	38,392,730	63,865,255	(1)
New Zealand	7,929,000	2,093,000	1,782,780	1,433,263	(1)
Mexico	20,000	141,000	7,705	91,194	(1)
Canada	29,386,000	24,052,500	55,298,917	118,132,837	103,564,924
Total outside of United States	150,681,623	268,856,125	294,024,487	320,740,754	.....

[1] No data. [2] Estimate.

United States exports of cereals from 1900 to 1910 decreased 69 per cent.
United States exports of cereals from 1900 to 1911 decreased 67 per cent.
United States exports of cereals from 1900 to 1912 decreased 72 per cent.
Argentina exports of cereals from 1900 to 1910 increased 104 per cent.
Argentina exports of cereals from 1900 to 1911 increased 41 per cent.
Argentina exports of cereals from 1900 to 1912 increased 285 per cent, and in 1912 Argentina exported two and five-sixth times as much cereals as did the United States.
Australia exports of cereals from 1900 to 1910 increased 127 per cent.
Australia exports of cereals from 1900 to 1911 increased 284 per cent.
Canada exports of cereals from 1900 to 1910 increased 88 per cent.
Canada exports of cereals from 1900 to 1911 increased 305 per cent.
Canada exports of cereals from 1900 to 1912 increased 252 per cent.
Exports from all countries discussed—Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Australia, New Zealand, Mexico, and Canada—from 1900 to 1910 increased 95 per cent; from 1900 to 1911 increased 112 per cent.

It will be noted that the United States export of cereals from 1900 to 1912 decreased 72 per cent. Argentina increased 285 per cent, that country exporting 2⅞ times as much cereals as the United States. Australian exports increased 284 per cent between 1900 and 1911, 1912 figures not being available. Canada's export of cereals in 1912 increased 252 per cent.

Rice grain is retained on the dutiable list. Rice flour also remains on the dutiable list. Having noted dutiable cattle and wheat and free flour and meats their more finished products on the free list, one naturally wonders at the system of logic followed by the committee on rice. There is but one answer. It was the question which interested Commander Peary in the north and Capt. Amundsen in the south—purely a question of latitude. [Applause.]

If we turn to sheep we find that the wool is on the free list, but the woolens manufactured in the East bear a heavy duty. That question can only be explained as a matter of longitude between east and west. If we examine the sugar question we find that the committee wanted it free; another authority decreed that the duty should remain for three years. So this seems to have been determined on the question of time. We find the great committee disposing of these northwestern products on the old maritime conditions of latitude, longitude, and time. Well did Hancock, in his political extremity, say the tariff was a local issue. But we find on the plains of Texas the Angora goat, upon the hair of which there is retained a protective duty. This does not seem to be explained from any of the standpoints. It is said that when the matter was presented to the eminent tariff censor he said, "It can not be allowed on latitude, longitude, or time, but let us see if it will pass the literary test. I find it has alliteration in 'GARNER'S goats,' let it pass." [Laughter and applause.]

In poultry, dead poultry carries twice the duty that does live poultry, reversing the meat and cattle rule. More alive the material the less the duty. In cattle the deader the material the less the duty. The difference between flesh and fowl, of which we have read so often, seems to have been solved in the Underwood bill. I thought of saying something about peanuts, where the present high duties have been but slightly reduced. But that seems to be a shell game any way; their production is confined largely to Virginia and North Carolina. [Laughter.]

Corn is placed on the free list. Under the present law it bore a duty of 15 cents per bushel. Notwithstanding that duty our import of corn increased from 1905 to 1910 from 15,436 bushels to 117,950 bushels. The duty paid the Government the latter year was $17,692.10. Our export of corn for the year 1912 was only 40,000,000 bushels, while Argentina exported 390,000,000 bushels, being nearly five times that of ours, our own export having decreased in the last 10 years 80 per cent. Our imports of meats and cereals generally are expanding rapidly. Imports, 1911, value $2,552,776, duties $580,071; 1912, value $19,579,450, duties $5,258,763; 1913, value $40,601,290, duties $9,268,750—1913 is arrived at by doubling the actually ascertained importations of the first half of the 1913 fiscal year.

If we import, under the new law, sufficient meats and cereals to collect as much revenue as we did on those articles in 1913, it will require the importation of over $200,000,000 worth of meats and cereals. That in itself will do away with a large part of our national balance of trade. This bill was well described by a Democrat as "the harmony of 4,000 discords," and I note that it was way down in "G." Schedule G is made up of a combination of exceptions and apparently all rules barred. It seems that the committee would reverse or violate any rule in order to give the Northwest the worst of it. Every rule of equity in the adjustment of tariff duties observed heretofore by either of the political parties have been brushed aside. In fact, the leading rules claimed to have been followed in the make-up of this bill as fundamental have been violated in adjusting the tariffs affecting the Northwest.

First. Raw material is, in certain cases, slightly protected, while finished products are free; thus, cattle slightly protected, beef free; wheat slightly protected, flour free. Chairman UNDERWOOD claimed for his bill to give free or low duty raw material and higher duty on finished product.

Second. There is a pledge not to injure any legitimate industry. Mr. UNDERWOOD, in his estimate of the effect of free meats and cereals, has submitted figures showing that meats will be reduced in price 11 per cent and cereals 12 per cent. That that will injure the agricultural industry must be patent. The committee seems to question its being a legitimate industry. When I first came to Congress I heard numerous gentlemen on that side of the House excoriate the robber tariff and verbally skin the tariff barons. I thought they were directing their anathemas at Pittsburgh and Wall Street, but after the drafting and presentation of this bill it seems that they meant all the time the farmers of the Northwest.

Third. They said that radical reductions and removals of duties were to be made when articles were of trust production, yet the greatest reduction and removals are on farm products where there are no trusts. In the tariff-bill report there are mentioned 235 so-called trusts, but none of them are located in the "producing province." In the bill slight reductions are made on the articles alleged to be made by the trusts. Heavy reductions or removals are made on those articles the farmers have to sell. The force of this is further seen when we recall that the farmers sell more than they buy. They would even reverse the decrees of Holy Writ to accomplish their purpose. The inspired Matthew in describing the great day when rewards and punishments are to be meted out declared that upon the left hand should be placed the goats, the type of perversity, there to receive their punishment, while the sheep, long the living emblem of innocence and purity, should be gathered on the right hand for reward and protection. The Ways and Means Committee reversed the final judgment, placed the goats upon the right hand, saying, be ye blessed and protected, while the sheep, relegated to the left, are told, depart ye cursed into everlasting free trade, prepared by the majority and its committee. [Laughter and applause.]

This bill will aid the expansion of commerce of every nation on the globe except our own, because it throws open our ports, uncovering the greatest markets of the world to the foreign tradesmen, but does not open a single market in any nation of the world to us. More than this, it will violate many trade agreements we already have and place new barriers to the foreign trade we now have.

Every civilized nation on earth, save the insular United Kingdom alone, have discriminating duties in favor of their own producers, as the following table will show:

Import duties on meats and cereals.

Country.	Fresh meat per pound (about).	Cured or simply prepared meats per pound (about).	Average of cereals per bushel (about).
Austria-Hungary	$0.03	$0.03	$0.211
France	.024	.032	.177
Germany	.035	.039	.245
Belgium	.019	Free.	Free.
Russia	Free.	.021	Free.
Greece	.020	.014	.162
Italy	.010	.022	.196
Spain	.012	.044	.221
Sweden	.009	.064	.198
Canada	.030	.020	.094
Mexico	.022	.033	.229
Argentina	Free.	.109	.195
Brazil	.023	.192	.177
Australia	.040	.060	.194

To further show that reduction of duties on farm products will reduce prices, the Ways and Means Committee submits average prices on different articles in 1896 under the Wilson bill and average prices in 1912 under the present law. It shows relative values of the several article units at the two periods:

	1896	1912
Horses	$46.44	$90.49
Mules	9.45	46.05
Cattle	6.85	14.20
Swine	6.47	10.84
Sheep	2.54	5.85
Beef	.043	.095
Butter	.16	.25
Pork	.16	.189
Poultry	.096	.229
Wheat	.352	.80
Oats	.341	.387
Wool	.14	.171

I hope no one will discredit the Ways and Means Committee by saying that they are not convinced of the probable workings of its bill. A pertinent inquiry based upon the above table might be made as to whether this is the "restoration" referred to in the recent inaugural.

In the readjustment of the tariff the farmer finds himself in the position of Smith, who, in 1895, gave a $50 mortgage on an $80 horse. It was a good horse, too. At maturity, Smith could not pay the money and wanted to sell the horse to Jones, the mortgagee. They agreed on the value of the horse, and of course knew the amount of the note. Jones said he would buy the horse, but he would require discount of the price. Smith said, "I will discount if you give me a proper discount on the note." Jones arranged the discounts. The horse was to be discounted 50 per cent, the note 20 per cent, making the new basis of value—horse $40, note $40. Said Smith, "I see your system. Under the circumstances you have the majority vote." The exchange is made. "But do me the honor to acknowledge that I see through your system."

I should not object; in fact, I favored a reasonable downward revision of the tariff with no favorites played. In the revision vigorous pruning would not have been objected to, but no felling of the tree was contemplated. You were expected to prescribe a healing potion to the alleged tariff patient, not to administer a deadly poison.

A year ago in a speech on the floor of this House I asked the following question:

> Since when in American history has the man who rises before the dawn, subdues the forest and the sod, risks all against the chance of drought, flood, frost, or pestilence; who, through the long day, under burning sun, in drenching rain, and blinding storm, becomes entitled to less consideration than the man whose hours are short, shelter is sure, and the periodical payment certain in mill or factory?

I have my answer from the Ways and Means Committee in the report and debate on this bill. "As soon as the Underwood tariff bill passes."

This bill under a fair analysis is un-American, reactionary, sectional, and class legislation.

It is un-American. It distinctly repudiates the doctrine of protection which was proposed by the great Hamilton, defended in and out of the Constitutional Convention by Madison, the Democratic father of the Constitution; approved by Washington; favored by Adams; advocated by Jackson; followed by Van Buren; emphasized by Lincoln; supported by Garfield; and perfected by McKinley, while the doctrines as exemplified in this bill were never favored even by Jefferson or Cleveland.

No argument is submitted for the prosperity of our industries or the maintenance of American high wages. Nearly every argument favorable to the bill is based upon the United Kingdom's industrial conditions. It seems so intensely English that our Celtic reading clerk had difficulty in refraining from dropping his h's while reading the bill. [Laughter.]

We can not follow Great Britain, because Great Britain is a nonproducing country and may be classified as a consuming country, with fixed incomes very largely in the hands of those who control its politics. Besides, England is practically one great city with numerous suburban settlements. England as a unit is more thickly settled than any of the counties containing State capitals in the United States, except those of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Georgia, Louisiana, Indiana, Minnesota, and Colorado, and is more thickly settled than any of the counties in any of the States, save and except those having cities containing 200,000 or more inhabitants.

Further, Great Britain is the home and birthplace of the great trust and combination systems, both in capital and labor, and which are used as defensive means in her industrial and commercial systems. Here in America our statutes, National and State, buttressed by numerous decisions of our highest courts, not only prohibit the organization of these bodies, but punish severely those engaged in their organization calculated to monopolize, control, and restrain trade.

That the English system has not succeeded is shown in the following commanding facts: British wages are, on an average, not more than one-half that of ours. The average postal and savings bank deposit per inhabitant of the United Kingdom is $24.27, while that of the United States is $46.96. In the United Kingdom the average amount of each savings bank deposit is $139.58, while in the savings banks of the United States it is $444.72. While England has 245 paupers out of every 10,000 population, the United States has only 7 out of every 10,000.

But the most forceful reason is the United Kingdom's own condemnation of its own system as applied to producing countries. She will not permit any of her producing colonies to adopt her system, but causes them to follow the lead of the United States. This is proven in the high protective tariffs of Canada and Australia.

The bill is reactionary. In a general tariff bill one schedule is played, traded, and log-rolled against each of the others until principle is abandoned, fairness lost sight of, and justice denied. This is exhibited in the present bill. The pledge made by the majority at the great Baltimore banquet in 1911, and followed in the Sixty-second Congress, was an earnest to the people that revision schedule by schedule should be followed. This is abandoned and repudiated in the present bill. Again, the best thought of fair men of all political parties is that a tariff commission should be organized to investigate and find pertinent facts relative to the laying of duties and kindred subjects, such as wages and cost of material here and elsewhere. This will be valuable, whether tariff should be for revenue only or for revenue and protection. The time is coming when such an organization will be effected.

The bill is sectional. The great producing Northwest is the special object of attack, and its lack of adequate representation in the majority of the Ways and Means Committee is largely responsible for the iniquities of this bill. Permit me to say at this time that what I have said about the members of the committee from the great cities of the East, and especially of the South, is not designed to impugn their honesty or sincerity. If we of the West were to be adjudged by their courtesy or informed judgment, we would be content. We do object most emphatically to have our industries adjudged and sentenced by their uninformed prejudice. Of course, I recognize their point of view. The large part of the farm work, of which they are cognizant no doubt, is performed by black men who do not vote, while the actual farm and live-stock work in our section is performed by intelligent white men, constituting the best citizenship under the flag.

The bill is class legislation. It attempts to establish an aristocracy of consumers, while it makes plebeians of producers. It seeks to return to the system of earlier days when men who tilled the soil and herded the cattle were regarded as inferior to those who lived at ease. That was a time when taste was honored above toil, and the sensitive palate more considered than the horny hand. It unduly exalts the alimentary canal over the brain which conceives and the hand that toils. It is a distinction that favors the gadfly rather than the laboring horse. To make you on that side better understand, it prefers the southern cattle tick to the Texas steer. It is a doctrine which would favor the habitues of Newport, Saratoga, and Atlantic City to the miner, herdsman, and farmer. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Out in my State a short time ago two typical consumers were traveling on an east-bound train. They were coming from Los Angeles to their home, there to stay a short time, and then on to Atlantic City. They had just finished a dinner on the diner and had come back to the Pullman. They had smuggled another one past the tipped or sleeping porter. It had a silken coat and was otherwise faultlessly groomed. They looked through the window on a typical pastoral scene. They saw a man coming from the field as the sun was setting. A stalwart youth of 19 years was with him. They wore the conventional overalls, blue shirt, and straw hat. Perspiration and dust of the day's toil were upon them yet. Their teams were large, well bred, and well kept. In the pasture was a herd of young cattle and horses. A small band of sheep was in an inclosure back of a well-pruned, fruitful orchard. In the yard surrounding the great red barn, the younger children, home from school, had brought up the cows and were exercising an art deemed honorable among producers, however vulgar it may seem to the sensitive consumer. Upon the porch of the commodious home appeared a Nebraska matron. She with her daughter's aid had just prepared a meal more wholesome than the chef of the Raleigh, Shoreham, or Willard could produce. She waved in our western way a salute to the passing train and awaited the

coming of the hungry toilers. This man had come from northern Europe a quarter of a century ago. He had found no charms within the metropolis that fronts on Castle Garden and so went west, to work on railroad and farm until his savings enabled him to establish a home and send for the girl he had left behind. She came and is now the mother of a large, bright, healthy family, a type of the most important factor in the American home, our Nation, and modern civilization. All this passed before the visions of our passengers, wholly oblivious to its interest and charm. One, however, grasped the third, and holding it up to the window said: "Here, Fido, are those horrid producers who raise our 'cost of living,' but be reassured, both John and you, it will not always be thus. The new tariff law's first concern is for us, the consumers." [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield the gentleman one minute additional.

Mr. SLOAN. Yield me five minutes, and I will forgive all Massachusetts has done from Bunker Hill until now.

The scene I have feebly depicted is not an unusual one in my State and district, filled with the best blood from the Eastern States, United Kingdom, Scandinavia, Bohemia, and Germany. They came, they subdued the soil, withstood drought, famine, and pestilence, established homes, supported the Government in peace and war, glad to purchase the products of the East and South, preferring them to those of the fatherland. They have only in the last few years been having their innings long deferred. Think not that they do not see and understand the purpose of this committee.

Gentlemen, pass this bill and the American people will hold you responsible for results. Remember that prosperity, like a great structure, is easier to injure than to adorn, easier to destroy than to build. Forty-eight States have industrial peace and satisfactory commercial conditions, save the hesitancy of the last six months. The banks are strongly buttressed with the obligations of solvent men and institutions, both as investors and borrowers. The mines yield their profitable increase. Great transportation systems are straining under their burdens. Farm and ranch are profitable. Cities and towns grow and improve. Labor, the basis of all this, is continuously employed, well and promptly paid. The people, well fed, well clad, and regularly schooled, are enjoying the comforts and luxuries a few decades ago not had by royalty. The future, based upon 16 years of the American fiscal and commercial system, is promising in the extreme. There are no internal difficulties, no foreign complications. This proposed revolutionary change carries with it terror to the investor, doubt to the present producer, fear to the purchaser, concern to the toiler, and complications in the world of trade. There should be no great change unless it be clear that it must be for the better. Have you considered well what lack of employment or reduction of wages mean? Have you considered what the dissipation of a large portion of that four and one-half billions of savings deposits may mean? Have you counted upon the real effect of a fall in crop prices? If you have, do not lean too strongly upon the broken reed of a Commerce Department investigation to keep our industries going. You must remember your solemn statement made in your report, "In our judgment the future growth of our great industries lies beyond the seas."

Gentlemen, one minute more, for which I thank you, and I am done. The other day, in this House, I heard a cruel speech. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] charged the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee with being the author of this bill and then nominated him for the Presidency. Think of a man throwing a bag of sand upon his friend's shoulders and, so handicapped, telling him to go out and beat a trained sprinter on the cinder path. I desire to nominate that gentleman for an office to which he can be elected. Assuming that Hon. CHAMP CLARK, "the noblest Roman of them all," will not desire it, I nominate the princely UNDERWOOD, from the sovereign State of Alabama, minority leader of the next House of Representatives. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Let him then direct his battered galleons and lead his shattered legions against a scheduled series of tariff bills, drawn by this side of the House, based upon the findings of fact by an expert nonpartisan tariff commission. When these bills, containing moderate protection to all American labor and American industry, are passed, American ideal tariff legislation will have been accomplished. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

[Mr. FARR addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] is recognized.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, permit me to join my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] in felicitating the young ladies of Holyoke, Mass., who were so thoughtful as to send, at this critical moment, flowers to the Republican Party. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] The rare appropriateness of their gift at this juncture can not well be denied. Flowers are always in order at weddings and at funerals, and certainly this is no wedding celebration for the Republican Party. [Renewed laughter on the Democratic side.]

It seems to me that the Democratic Party in this Chamber and throughout the country is to be congratulated on one great fact that stands out in this entire debate. Whatever our political opponents and our critics may say about this bill, however much they may inveigh against some of its provisions, however critical they may be as to particular items, they have, one and all, accorded to us the supreme accolade of political knighthood in that they all concede that this bill is really a substantial revision of the tariff downward and is in accordance with our plighted faith to the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let me suggest that if four years ago our Republican friends had kept their plighted faith with the American people and revised the tariff substantially downward as they promised in the election of 1908 it is my judgment that the Democratic Party would not be presenting this bill to-night, and that in all probability the Republican Party would still be in power in this Chamber and in every branch of the Government. It is especially gratifying, then, for us to realize that our political opponents have conceded to the Democratic Party in presenting this bill the courage of its convictions and have admitted that in presenting it we are carrying out our plighted faith to the American people, and in doing so they have paid us the highest compliment that one political party may pay to another. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Whether this bill shall work weal or woe for the American people, whether it shall mean a long and uninterrupted lease of power for our party or a speedy return to power of the other party are matters about which it is idle and futile to prophesy. The question is to be determined by what actually occurs and not by what any gentleman may think or may venture to prophesy about it. So far as I am concerned, it is a source of profound gratification to me to see that the party to which I belong is dealing fairly with the American people, is carrying out its pledges, is determined to try the fiscal system to which it stands committed, and to do its best, however faulty that best may be, to work out equal and exact justice to all of the American people without favor or special privilege of any sort whatsoever. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

For many long years tariff bills in this country have been framed with an eye single to the interests of the American manufacturer and to the American producer, and with utter and absolute indifference to the interest of the American consumer. At last our party presents a bill which, although not perfect—as the work of man never is—is, after all, the fairest and most just bill on the tariff that has been presented to the American people in a hundred years, and on that bill we stand as the authoritative and definite expression of our party on this great question of taxation. Of course, this bill does not suit any political party that believes that special advantage ought to be given to some of our people at the expense of the rest of our people. Of course, it does not accord with the views of those who insist that the sovereign powers of taxation should be used to enrich some of the people at the expense of the balance. For that matter, many of its details are not in accordance with the judgment of many gentlemen on this side of the Chamber, for no tariff bill that has ever yet been written, or that can be written, would express the exact views and preferences of every Member who supports it. But on the whole, when the account is fully and accurately cast up, what do we find? We find a tariff law in force that levies an ad valorem rate, when its prohibitive duties are considered, of about 47 per cent, and we replace that law with a bill that carries an average ad valorem rate of 24.1 per cent, justifying that statement on both sides of the Chamber that we have undoubtedly redeemed our pledge in the recent election to reduce the tariff downward, substantially and without delay, in the interests of the American consumer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

My friend from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] ventured to remark during this debate that certain words of President Wilson in his opening address to Congress at the present session were unwittingly prophetic. The gentleman from Michigan called attention to the fact that the President of the United States stated that the American people would have to whet up their wits, and thereupon the gentleman from Michigan ventured to remark that the American people would whet up their wits and

would whet them up on this tariff bill. It amused me to hear my friend from Michigan make that remark, because he has just come out of a great political cataclysm in which the American people have whetted up their wits on the Payne tariff bill, and whetted them up to such good effect and purpose that the Democratic Party has the greatest majority in this House that any party has had here for many decades. [Applause on the Democratic side.] So when it comes to the propensity of the American people to whet up their wits on tariff bills, my friend from Michigan and his party associates know full well whereof they speak and can qualify as expert witnesses.

I next wish to invite your attention to another argument advanced during this debate, and advanced by a gentleman who has had enough experience in public affairs, and who ought to have had enough acquaintance with public questions, to have refrained from presenting such an utterly discredited and shopworn argument. I refer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR]. The gentleman insisted that protection was necessary and had been maintained by the Republican Party in the interest of American labor. He seems to forget that the American laborer is not only a producer but a consumer. He seems to forget that, according to the bulletin issued by the Bureau of Labor, No. 79, March, 1907, the wages of the American laborer had risen in the 10 years immediately following the passage of the Dingley bill only 19.2 per cent, while according to Bulletin No. 69 of the same bureau, issued the same month and year, and according to the figures given by that eminent American statistician, Mr. Byron W. Holt, American prices on everything that the American laborer had to buy rose, on the whole, 55 per cent, so that with one hand your artificial protection gave him a slight increase in his wage; on the other hand it took from him almost three times as much as the deceptive largess it had bestowed. Gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are fond of comparing the wages paid to laborers in this country and abroad. They seem especially fond of comparisons between this country on the one hand, and Great Britain, Germany, and France on the other. In the first place, my friends, let me suggest to you such a comparison is manifestly unsound and entirely unfair. Why? Because these great countries of Europe, Germany, France, Great Britain, and others, are old countries. They represent the finished product of many centuries of civilization. Their great natural resources have been exhausted, or have to be most carefully conserved in order to prevent exhaustion. Prices as a rule are low, and labor, like all other commodities, is also low. Countries of this character are fairly comparable only to each other. When you come to compare a great, undeveloped, growing country like the United States, with its great natural resources almost untouched, with nature's bounteous gifts scattered in profusion everywhere, with the demand for labor that the development of a new country requires, you can only compare it with countries of a similar character, like Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, and if you will compare the wage of the American laborer with the wage of the laborer in Canada, New Zealand, and all of these new countries, you will never again boast of what protection has done for the wages of the American laborer.

For in all of these new countries, maintaining tariff duties infinitely lower than our tariff duties, labor is as well paid and, in many instances, better paid than it is here. In addition to that, suppose you next take these great European countries that you are so fond of comparing with the United States and compare them with each other, and the latter comparison is absolutely fair and just because conditions in these great European countries are practically the same and they are fairly comparable to each other. Make the comparison and what do you find? You find, if we may believe the reports of the British Board of Trade of 1904 (Vol. I, p. 289), that if 100 shillings be taken as the average wage paid to the English workingman in London, for the same work the French workingman in Paris only gets 86 shillings and the German workingman in Berlin only gets 57 shillings. We find also that if 100 shillings be taken as the average wage received by the British laborer outside of London, then the French laborer outside of Paris only gets 63 shillings and the German laborer outside of Berlin only gets 63 shillings. So it seems from this great authority, probably the most accurate on earth, that the protective tax imposed by Germany and by France, does not give the German nor the French laborer any great advantage over the British laborer who has no tariff. On the other hand, the British laborer gets nearly twice as much as the German and French laborer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. With pleasure, for a question.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Is the gentleman aware that the statistics show that in 1909 the amount of wages paid to 7,000,000 men working in the manufacturing establishments of this country increased 70 per cent?

Mr. HARDWICK. No; I am not aware of any such thing. I challenge the accuracy of the gentleman's statement. On the contrary, let me read to the gentlemen some statistics on this question. I read from Volume I, page 275, of the report of the British Board of Trade, from which report I have already quoted at some length. On the particular question raised by the gentleman from Oklahoma it appears that in the decade between 1881 and 1900 the following has been the rate of increase in wages in each of the countries named below during that period:

	Per cent.
Great Britain	20.3
Germany	22.8
France	17.6
Italy	16.2
United States	13.4

From this table—and I do not apprehend that either its fairness or its accuracy can be questioned, for it is both impartial and official—it would seem that in the matter of money wages our American wage earner, even with the alleged aid of the McKinley and Dingley bills, has not advanced upward in increase of wage as rapidly as his brother laborer in Germany, Great Britain, France, or even in poverty-stricken Italy. [Applause.]

In the next place, Mr. Chairman, we reply that the tariff has been a positive disadvantage to the American wage earner, for it has increased the cost of living to him at a much more rapid rate than his wages have risen. The figures that I have already given on the rise of prices show an increase of 55 per cent since 1897. During that same period wages have not risen but 19.2 per cent, even according to the high estimate given by the Bureau of Labor in Bulletin No. 79, page 7 (March, 1907). What folly for the workingman to believe that the Republican Party or any other party that undertakes to create industries and fix values by law will not take more from him with the left hand in the shape of increased prices for what he must buy than it will or can give to him with the right hand in the shape of tariff protection and increased wages for his labor.

In the next place, we reply that the American laborer does not get the high wages because of tariff favoritism, but because he earns it and is entitled to it by reason of his greater efficiency and larger productive power. Although most highly paid, when its productiveness and the labor cost to the employer is considered, American labor is the cheapest on earth. [Applause.]

In this connection let me call your attention to a part of the report of the British Board of Trade on this subject (1904, Vol. I, p. 280):

> At the outset it should be understood that the problem of comparing the average level of wages of the different countries is a very difficult and complex one, not only because of the defects of the data, but also because of the essential ambiguity of the problem itself.
>
> 1. We may approach the question of comparative wages from two entirely different points of view, leading to divergent and sometimes even to opposite conclusions. We may either seek to compare the material well-being of the wage earners or the wages cost of a given amount of work.
>
> From the former point of view we are mainly interested in the average money income of the wage-earning population, modified, of course, by differences in cost of living, but irrespective of differences in the efficiency of labor. If a bricklayer in France earns half the wages of a bricklayer in America, we should say his money wages were half as great, although conceivably the American might lay so many more bricks per hour that his labor might be even cheaper to his employer.
>
> From the second point of view we are interested, not in the weekly income of the laborer, but in his wages regarded as an item in the cost of production, i. e., the wages cost of hewing a ton of coal, spinning a pound of yarn, or laying a hundred bricks, of course under identical conditions.
>
> How entirely divergent are the above two methods of comparison will be realized from the fact that competent American economists are of the opinion that in the United States the average "labor cost" of a given volume of production is at least as low in Europe, if not lower, while the average income of the working classes is certainly higher in America than in any European country. However this may be, it is clear that the real cost of labor varies much less from country to country than the level of weekly wages or of yearly earnings, and that a high labor cost is compatible with low wages, and vice versa, owing to the variations in the efficiency of labor.

I invite your attention also to the following statement as to the relative productive capacity of the British and American laborer, from our census report on manufactures (1902), part 1, page lxi:

> He (Mulhall) estimated £107, or about $500, for Great Britain in 1894 and £270, or about $1,300, for the United States, the latter being nearly three times the English average. In 1900 the census shows an average product per wage earner of $2,450, nearly five times Mr. Mulhall's estimate for Great Britain.

Mr. Chairman, whatever proportion of the wealth created by capital and labor falls to the American wage earner comes to him by reason of no tariff favoritism, of no Republican bounty.

[Applause.] It comes to him, whether it be great or small, a fair or an unfair proportion of the wealth he has helped to create, as the reward of his sweat and toil, of his brain and brawn. He never gets more than his fair share, oftener he gets less, and to teach him that for what he does get he ought to be largely thankful to the Republican Party and to the Dingley and Payne tariff laws is so monstrous a heresy that I have often wondered if any sensible, thoughtful American workingman could really be deceived by it. It is a heresy, unfounded in truth, insulting to his manhood, and destructive to his self-respect.

The American workingman leads the world, sir, to-day, just as he has done for more than 100 years, in efficiency and productive capacity. He is in no sense an object of charity and in no way requires a governmental subsidy to enable him to make his living. "In the sweat of his brow" doth he "eat bread," and for that bread he is beholden to no tariff, to no political party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. HARDWICK. With pleasure.

Mr. FORDNEY. Is the gentleman aware that there are 83,000 paupers in the United States, and 885,000 paupers in England alone, with 40 per cent of the population of the United States?

Mr. HARDWICK. However that may be, I do not believe that it came from any difference in our tariff systems, but I do believe that if we had kept up the destructive system of taxation advocated by the Republican Party, as it has been levied upon us through all these recent years, it would not be very long before we would have a few very rich men and about 85,000,000 paupers in this country. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. We had 3,000,000 unemployed laboring men under the Wilson-Gorman bill in 1892.

Mr. HARDWICK. I suppose that was in anticipation of the tariff of 1897. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, all this talk about panics has amused me a great deal. It seems to me that our Republican friends argue in a circle whenever they touch this question of panics. When the question is carefully considered, it will be recalled that three of the great panics of this country, the last experienced, occurred in 1873, in 1893, and 1907, and it can not be disputed that during all of these years we had Republican tariff laws in force when the panic in question came. Of course we know full well that in many cases panics have occurred in this country for reasons entirely and utterly disconnected with the tariff; indeed, I think it would be more accurate to say that such has been the case in most instances. Our Republican friends do not concede the correctness of that contention, and put themselves in the remarkable position of asserting that the panic of 1893 was caused by a Democratic tariff law which did not go into effect until August, 1894, and in the next breath assert that the panic of 1873 should not be charged to the tariff law, although we had then and had had for many years a Republican tariff. This may be sound logic; but if so, I fail to see it. I can not refrain from asking them whether the Dingley law caused the panic of 1907?

Mr. FORDNEY. Ask Teddy.

Mr. HARDWICK. Since my friend from Michigan suggests it, I will say something about the panic of 1907 and Roosevelt's connection therewith. I recall that when I first came to this House as a young, enthusiastic, and somewhat verdant Member from the State of Georgia Mr. Roosevelt was beginning that spectacular career that soon attracted the attention of the world. In common with the body of American youth—indeed, I might say the American people generally—I was much attracted by him. He captivated the imagination and attracted enthusiastic support from the populace. He was undoubtedly a most remarkable man, and it looked to me like at that time that he was about the biggest man the Lord ever did make, if the Lord did make him. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. He did not deliver his message from the altar.

Mr. HARDWICK. No; and I will tell you a secret: I believe that ever since President Wilson did that Roosevelt has been powerful sorry that he did not think of it first. [Laughter.]

Undoubtedly, at the time my service in this body began Mr. Roosevelt was the popular idol of the country, and I must admit that for quite a while I shared in the general feeling of admiration that was felt for him; but at last the scales dropped from my eyes, and I will tell you how and why. From the time he succeeded Mr. McKinley as President up to the winter of 1907 he certainly accomplished many important reforms, and he certainly achieved many substantial triumphs for popular rights. He curbed many of the great trusts and seemed inclined to stand strongly for the rights of the people. It seemed to me that he was right on every question that came up, or earnestly tried to be, and I felt a strong sympathy for his administration as well as a deep admiration for the man. I could not overlook the fact that he had been guilty of some gross inconsistencies and had failed to measure up more than once to the mark he had set for himself. I could not forget that instead of sending the trust magnates to jail he had put Paul Morton in his Cabinet, although the latter was fresh from the commission of admitted violations of the antitrust law at the time he was so honored by our whilom trust buster. I could not forget the fact that he had tricked the railroad interests of this country, pretending to them before the election of 1904 that he was friendly to their interests and would consult with them as to the policy of his administration, and that after the election, in utter disregard of his implied promises, he advocated the strongest legislation for their just and proper regulation.

I could not forget that he had sent for "My Dear Harriman" to come to the White House via the back door, and had such a satisfactory conference with him that Harriman returned to New York and raised the money which materially assisted in the Republican victory in New York in the election of 1904. But while I remembered all of these things, it seemed to me that upon the whole if the account between this man and the public was accurately cast up and impartially balanced, the net result would show that the American people were vastly in his debt up to the fall of 1907. What happened in the fall of 1907? A panic came. A panic with the highest protective tariff that this country ever had in uninterrupted force for more than 10 years, with wheat $1 a bushel and cotton 10 cents a pound—a panic that sprang from stockjobbing and money juggling in Wall Street. A panic that rendered it impossible for the people in the West and in the South to get the money back they had deposited in New York, because the banks in New York had lent that money to the stock gamblers who speculated on Wall Street. This marvelous prosperity panic seemed to completely upset the nerve of Mr. Roosevelt. He knew that as a rule the great trust magnates of the country hated him and wished to discredit him. He knew that they were infuriated at the prosecutions he had inaugurated against them and were deeply alarmed at other prosecutions that were threatened. At first when the artificially induced panic came his heart was filled with indignation, and he denounced the men whom he believed were responsible for it in a message to Congress that is one of the most remarkable public documents in the history of our Government. He exhausted the vocabulary of invective and vituperation in the scathing indictment that he framed against them. On sober second thought, however, he came to remember the many disingenuous but fearfully effective panic arguments he had himself in the past hurled upon the devoted and undeserving heads of the Democrats, and his courage oozed out of him as rapidly as did that of Bob Acres, and from denunciation and vituperation he rapidly shifted to terms of conciliation and compromise, hoisting the white flag of surrender to the great trusts of this country, as he said to them, forgetful of the high obligation of his office and assuming a responsibility that even a czar would have hesitated to assume, "Yes; take the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co., law or no law, right or no right. If it be in violation of the law, you shall not be prosecuted." From that day his surrender to the trusts was abject, complete, and continuous, and the American people sadly realized at last that another one of its idols had feet of clay.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to deal in harsh criticism of either Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Taft. So far as I am concerned, I believe the Democratic Party is greatly indebted to each of them and that the country is likewise so indebted, because when they did fall out with each other and began to tell the truth about each other the people were so badly disgusted with both of them that the triumph of the Democratic Party was not only certain but easy.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said during this debate on the subject of the minority and the minority parties. It has been asserted that because the Democratic Party, although receiving an overwhelming majority of the electoral votes of the States, did not receive a majority of the total popular votes cast in the recent election, it is therefore a minority party. I deny it. I wish to say that, in my judgment, if President Wilson had been confronted by either one of the two candidates instead of both. I firmly believe that his popular majority over either of them would have been greater than the plurality of popular votes that he did receive over the highest of them. The country has accepted this election as placing full power and also full responsibility upon the Democratic Party. We necessarily assume one with the other. We could not avoid the responsi-

bility if we would, and we would not if we could, if I know my party associates on this floor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Our opponents sometimes speak of Representatives in this Chamber elected here by a minority of the total popular vote cast in their districts. Let us see exactly what we find on this subject. I take the facts that I now give you from the records of the Clerk of the House. There are 185 Democratic Members of this House who hold their seats in this Chamber by virtue of an absolute majority of all the votes cast in their respective districts. On the other side of the Chamber what do we find? We find that the total number of both Republicans and Progressives who hold seats on this floor by a majority of the total votes cast in their respective districts is but 47. The record speaks for itself. Figure out for yourself the proper number of the "majority" Representatives on the two sides of the Chamber. It seems to me that if there ever was a party in the history of American politics charged not only with the full power, but also with the solemn responsibility and imperative duty of enacting the legislation carried in this bill, it is the Democratic Party, and, Mr. Chairman, I wish to repeat the statement that if I know my party associates on this floor, we have the courage to face the issue and to meet it like men. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

THE SUGAR SCHEDULE.

It is not my intention, Mr. Chairman, to make to-night anything like a general political speech, and I have already indulged in more general observations than I had intended. It is my purpose to enter into a somewhat extended discussion of the sugar schedule, and I hope to show the committee exactly what the facts are in reference to this schedule, and I hope to demonstrate as a matter of simple justice to the American people as a whole that we ought to allow the 25 per cent reduction on sugar duties that will be carried in this bill for the next three years, with free sugar at the end of that period. I hope to be able to demonstrate that as a business proposition it would be utterly unreasonable and unsound and commit us to a policy that no private person would adopt in his own business affairs, to continue to tax the American people from $125,000,000 to $140,000,000 per year, only $50,000,000 of which goes into the Treasury of the United States, in order to maintain an industry at the expense of all the people, the total investment in which is as much as the annual burden that its existence imposes upon our people continuously, year after year. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The consumption of sugar in the United States during the calendar year 1912 was 3,504,182 tons (long). It must be remembered that practically all of the refined sugar used in this country was manufactured or refined in this country, less than 2,000 tons of refined sugar having been imported. The sugar that we consume came from the following sources:

	Tons.
Louisiana (raw)	160,000
Texas (raw)	10,000
Domestic beet (refined)	604,045
Maple and molasses sugar (raw)	15,155
Total continental United States	789,200
From Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the Philippines (raw)	943,769
From Cuba (raw)	1,664,863
From other foreign sugar paying full duties (mostly raw)	106,350

So that it will be seen that continental United States produces a little less than one-quarter of our consumption, our insular possessions a little more than one-quarter of the consumption, and Cuba almost one-half of our consumption.

The greatest sugar statistician in the United States, Mr. Wallace P. Willet, of Willet & Gray, has recently estimated from actual invoices that during the past seven years the importers of raw sugar have paid an average of 1.6 cents per pound in the way of duty on each pound of sugar imported into this country and that this amount has in every case been added to the cost of refined sugar before it reached the consumer. On this basis it appears that the duty on the sugar we consumed during the calendar year 1912 had the effect of enhancing the cost of sugar to the American consumer to the extent of $125,598.88.

But it must be remembered that the duty on refined sugar is 1.9 cents per pound, and that if the refiners take the same benefit of this duty that our manufacturers take in every other line of industry, then the full duty on refined sugar, or 1.9 cents per pound, is the real measure of burden resting on American consumption because of the sugar tariff. Measured by this test, the real burden, the cost of the sugar tariff in 1912 is $142,000,000, in round numbers. It must also be recalled that of this amount only about $52,000,000 found its way into the Treasury of the United States, the balance of it being a clear bonus to our domestic producers in continental United States and in Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the Philippines. I give the committee these facts at the beginning of my argument so that we may realize the exact amount of the burden imposed on the American consumer by the sugar duty.

CANE SUGAR.

Mr. Chairman, I now wish to invite the attention of the committee to the consideration of this question from the standpoint of the cane producer. I wish the committee to weigh in the scales of justice this claim that we ought to continue to burden the American consumer by making him pay a higher price for sugar in order to keep the cane-sugar people in business.

The cost of producing a pound of cane sugar (raw) in Louisiana is 3.75 cents per pound. The cost of producing a pound of raw cane sugar in Java is 1.5 cents per pound. In the Philippines it is 1.75 cents per pound, and in Porto Rico, Cuba, and Hawaii about 2 cents per pound. There is no dispute whatever about these facts, as will be seen on examination of the evidence submitted to the special committee on sugar and from the report of that committee (p. 23) and from the recent hearings before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. (Hearings, Schedule E, p. 2268.) From the above figures it is perfectly apparent that so far as the production of cane sugar in Louisiana is concerned it is nothing more or less than a hot-house proposition. The cost of production is being gradually but surely lowered in Cuba, the Philippines, Porto Rico, Java, and, I think, in Hawaii. In Louisiana I do not believe that it is being lowered at all, but, if anything, is increasing. It is my judgment that the Louisiana sugar-cane industry can not and will not long survive free sugar. Indeed, I do not believe, as I have stated more than once, that the industry can continue and prosper in Louisiana even under our present rate of duty, and that it is practically certain that its doom is already decreed by the fixed and unalterable laws of nature. Let me state some of the reasons for this opinion. In Louisiana the sucrose in the cane is from 6 per cent to 7 per cent. In Hawaii it is from 14 per cent to 15 per cent; in Cuba from 10 per cent to 11 per cent, occasionally 14 per cent. (Hearings, Schedule E, pp. 2268–2269.) In Cuba the cane is only planted once in every 10 years, and in Louisiana it must be replanted, or practically replanted, every year. In Cuba frost never interferes with the maturing of the crop, whereas in Louisiana the cane has to be cut early in October; hence its sucrose contents are low, as I have already shown. It seems to me that for these reasons it is perfectly apparent why Louisiana can not profitably continue to produce cane sugar in competition with tropical countries; and if she is driven out of the sugar business, it will not be the unkindness of the Democratic Party that accomplishes this result, but the stern decree of the God of nature, for sugar cane is the natural product of a strictly tropical country, and Louisiana is located too far to the north for its successful cultivation in competition with tropical countries. Great and insuperable as are these natural disadvantages, Louisiana labors under certain other disadvantages growing out of inefficiency, which contributes to the high cost of production in that State. Antiquated machinery and open-kettle mills might be mentioned in this category, for as a whole the industry in Louisiana is inefficiently organized, nor is it well equipped. This will be readily seen when it is remembered that in Louisiana 210 mills produce an annual average of 330,000 tons, whereas in Cuba 174 mills produce annually 2,328,000 tons. The labor cost in factories in Cuba and Louisiana is practically the same, and for field labor Louisiana pays hardly as much as is paid in Cuba. It appeared in the sworn testimony before the special committee that in Louisiana the sugar planters pay the following rates for field labor: Seventy-five to 80 cents to men per day, 75 cents per day to women, and $1 per day in harvesting time; whereas in Cuba for the same class of labor the planters are paying from $1 to $1.25 per day, and in Cuba the women do not work in the fields. So it seems to me that the equalization of labor cost is not involved in this proposition.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal of talk about destroying the many millions of dollars invested in the production of cane sugar in Louisiana. Let us see what the exact facts are about the amount of this investment. On November 12, 1912, a mass meeting of Louisiana sugar planters was held in the city of New Orleans, and in the resolutions adopted by that mass meeting there was a statement of the capital invested in the industry in that State, and to some extent an attempt was made to itemize this capital. The statement was that $70,000,000 was invested in land, $10,000,000 in mules, $35,000,000 in sugar factories, $2,000,000 in farm implements, and $2,000,000 in plantation railroads. Now, let us consider that statement for just a moment. Of course, we do not propose to confiscate either their lands or mules, and this legisla-

tion will not affect the value of either. On the contrary, it seems to me that it is our bounden duty to save our Louisiana friends both politically and industrially from the serious and fundamental mistake they have made, and let us hope that they will soon turn their energies to other industries better adapted to their splendid soil, and therefore more profitable to themselves. They tell us that if they were to plant cotton on this land the stalks would grow so high that they would have to use stepladders to pick the cotton. They admit that they could raise vegetables, grain, cotton, or almost anything, and it is my judgment they ought to raise something better adapted to the climate and soil instead of attempting to raise a tropical product which they can not produce on even terms with other countries better adapted by nature to its cultivation. So, then, from this bill of particulars which they give us we can subtract the items of lands and mules—a total of $80,000,000. What, then, does this leave of their investment? Thirty-five million dollars for sugar factories, $2,000,000 for farm implements for sugar cultivation, and $2,000,000 for plantation railroads. I have no doubt that the plantation railroads could be utilized in moving whatever crops they cultivate, and it is undoubtedly true that, so far as their sugar-factory machinery and farm implements are efficient and modern, they will readily demand a fair value for use in other countries. So that it seems to me that the total amount of loss of actual capital invested that would probably result from the suspension of this industry in Louisiana is certainly not over $30,000,000, and probably far under that amount, and that for this amount, and in order to produce a crop of the annual gross value of $25,000,000, our Louisiana friends insist that we ought to continue a system of taxation that costs the American people practically $140,000,000 in the increased price they are forced to pay for their sugar. It is undemocratic; it is unfair; it is unrighteous; and, so far as I am concerned, I will never stand for a continuance of this policy to keep a duty on this great necessity of life, which can not possibly be produced in Louisiana one-half as cheaply as it can in the balance of the world.

Mr. Chairman, before I have passed the discussion of this question to beet-sugar production I wish to submit a few observations concerning the situation in Hawaii and Porto Rico and the effect of this legislation upon these islands, for we have heard a great many cries of distress, mostly inspired, on this subject. In the first place, let me submit that, according to my conception of Democratic principles and policies, it has never been our plan to tax the American consumer in order that the inhabitants of these insular possessions might obtain a higher price from us for their products, nor do I believe that in the case of sugar that it is at all necessary that we should do so. For a good many years under the Republican policy we have suffered from that very thing, and the sacrifice has been entirely unnecessary, in my judgment. Let us take the case of Hawaii first. It is to be remembered that we import most of our sugar from Cuba and that the protection that Hawaii now enjoys is really against Cuban sugar. Let us see whether that protection is necessary to the Hawaiian producer, even if the interest of the consumer be ignored. In the first place, the cost of production is not materially different in Cuba and Hawaii. According to the testimony of the representatives of the sugar interest of Hawaii, in the past Hawaii has been able to produce raw sugar at around 2 cents per pound, which is about the Cuban figure, and there is no doubt that they can do so again. Indeed, it is admitted and boasted that the industry is most highly organized in Hawaii, controlling through its cooperative associations the large bulk of the sugar plantations, great steamship lines, warehousing facilities, and so forth, and having strong connections with the refiners in San Francisco and New York. Indeed, it is perfectly apparent that the Hawaiian planters maintain the most amicable relations with the trust, for the Hawaiian Planters' Association sells all of its product that is not handled through its San Francisco refinery to the trust in New York, making three-year contracts with the trust for the trust to handle all of their product except the comparatively small amount that is sent to their own refinery in San Francisco. So profitable is this arrangement and so admirable, from the standpoint of the Hawaiian planter, is this adjustment that in the year 1911 it is currently reported and not denied that they sold their crop for $52,000,000, with a net profit of $20,000,000, and under date of November 21, 1912, the Kekahala mill declared a dividend of 87½ per cent. Besides, there are no reasons why Hawaii needs any protection whatever against Cuba, which, of course, would be its real competitor under free sugar. On the contrary, the natural advantages seem to be with Hawaii and against Cuba. According to the Crop Reporter of the United States, February, 1913, the average yield of cane per acre in Hawaii for the year 1910–11 was 41.3 tons; in 1911–12, 42.3 tons. The average yield of cane per acre in Cuba is 25 to 30 tons. The average sugar contents of a ton of cane in Hawaii is 13.16 per cent; in Cuba, 11 per cent. The average extraction per ton of a cane in Hawaii is 238 pounds, for 1910–11, and 248 pounds for 1911–12, against an average in Cuba of 230 pounds. So that it appears that an acre produces more cane in Hawaii than it does in Cuba, and that a ton of Hawaiian sugar cane contains more sugar than a ton of Cuban sugar cane, and that the yield of the mills in Hawaii is more than the yield of the mills in Cuba. The natural conditions in Porto Rico are very similar to those in Cuba, the islands being located within about 150 miles of each other. In the past Porto Rico has produced sugar successfully without tariff protection and unquestionably can do so again if the cultivation of sugar cane is confined to the lands that are suitable. The high tariff under which the island has been working has encouraged to some extent the cultivation of sugar on unsuitable lands, and the tendency recently has been to climb the mountains to extend the cultivation of cane. Such a condition is, of course, an unnatural one and does not serve as a proper excuse for heavily taxing the American people.

In the case of both Hawaii and Porto Rico all of the available lands are now under cultivation of sugar cane, so that if any protection of the industry was ever needed it has been given, and the American people have done so much for our insular possessions that it is now time that these islands did something for the American people in the way of supplying them with sugar at a low price, based on legitimate cost of production, and still leaving them a large profit.

BEET SUGAR.

Mr. Chairman, I next propose to discuss this subject from the standpoint of the beet-sugar industry of this country, and in doing so I wish to discuss it, first, from the standpoint of the beet-sugar factories and, secondly, from the standpoint of the farmers engaged in the cultivation of sugar beets, for I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that these two interests are not so necessarily connected as the proponents of continued protection would have us believe.

BEET-SUGAR FACTORIES.

According to the last statement issued by Mr. Truman G. Palmer, representing the beet-sugar factories, it appears that there are now located in the United States 76 factories engaged in the production of beet sugar. These factories are located in the following States: Colorado, 17; Michigan, 16; California, 13; Utah, 6; Idaho, 5; Wisconsin, 4; Nebraska, 2; Montana, 1; Minnesota, 1; Kansas, 1; Iowa, 1; Illinois, 1; Indiana, 1; and Arizona, 1. From the reports of Bradstreet's Commercial Agency it appears that the total capitalization of these 76 factories is $141,410,000, and according to their own statements their combined capacity for slicing beets in tons per day is 63,550 tons.

These figures demonstrate beyond all question the extent of overcapitalization of the companies that operate these factories.

Why? Let us see what the beet-sugar men have themselves sworn before the several of the House committees. In the hearings on the Payne tariff bill before the House committee (hearings, p. 3292) Mr. F. R. Hathaway, secretary and treasurer of the Michigan Sugar Co., estimated the cost of a beet-sugar factory to be $1,000 per ton of daily beet-slicing capacity. At the hearings before the special committee on sugar during the last Congress, Mr. Henry T. Oxnard, of the American Beet Sugar Co., made exactly the same estimate (hearings, p. 376), as did Mr. Charles W. Nibley, of the Amalgamated Sugar Co. of Utah (hearings, p. 1090). While Mr. Oxnard at a subsequent time did seek to raise his figures and while some others testified to a slightly higher figure than $1,000 per ton, yet other witnesses swore to even lower figures, notably Mr. E. N. Combs, of Colorado, fixing the figure at $600 (hearings, p. 3285).

On the whole, therefore, I believe we may safely take $1,000 per ton of daily slicing capacity as the true basis of cost and the real value of a beet-sugar factory. On that basis the true value of all the beet-sugar factories in the United States does not exceed $63,550,000. Indeed, according to the unanimous report of the special committee of the House on sugar during the last Congress, we estimated the amount of this investment at a somewhat smaller figure, $60,112,500 (Rept., p. 26), and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] agreed to that figure, along with his other Republican colleagues on the committee. So that it appears the beet-sugar factories of this country as a whole are capitalized at from two to two and one-half times their actual value. While we are considering this question of the overcapitalization of the beet-sugar factories, it might be as well to call the attention of the committee to the

facts about the three largest of the beet-sugar companies and to see exactly to what extent this mania for overcapitalization has affected them.

First, let us take the Great Western Sugar Co., a Colorado concern, but chartered "under the laws of New Jersey"; but that charter, Mr. Chairman, was granted before the days of New Jersey's regeneration. [Laughter and applause.]

It was capitalized at $30,000,000, one-half preferred and the other half common stock, but of this stock only about $24,000,000 was issued. Its nine factories, all located in Colorado, have, according to its last statement, a total daily beet-slicing capacity of 10,600 tons, which ought to represent a real value of approximately $10,600,000—on the basis of $1,000 per ton. So that its stock is more than one-half water, except so far as it may, perhaps, now represent accumulated and undistributed earnings. Under oath the company returned its property for taxation in the State of Colorado at $2,500,000 as late as 1910 or 1911. Although its stock, under its New Jersey charter, was originally more than half water, yet it manages to pay 7 per cent interest per annum on its preferred stock, or $1,050,000, and 5 per cent interest per annum on its common stock, or $750,000. This means a total annual dividend of $1,800,000 on a real investment of $10,600,000, as already explained, or about 17 per cent dividend on the actual investment. Nor do these dividends represent anything like the total net earnings of this largest and greatest of the beet-sugar factories, as I will now proceed to show the committee. It must be recalled that the American Sugar Refining Co., commonly known as the Sugar Trust, owns 26 per cent of the common stock and 38 per cent of the preferred stock of the Great Western (report of special committee, p. 13), according to the admissions of both the Great Western and the trust.

During the recent investigation of the Sugar Trust in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, among the letters of the Sugar Trust was discovered a most interesting letter from Mr. Chester S. Morey, of Denver, Colo., president of the Great Western Sugar Co., to Mr. Washington B. Thomas, then president of the American Sugar Refining Co. This letter was dated March 19, 1910, and read as follows:

MY DEAR MR. THOMAS: Inclosed herewith I hand you copy of the financial exhibit and income statement. This is the form in which we expect to publish these statements, and they will also be used when we make application to list our stock on the New York Exchange.

You will notice that this year, in addition to the regular 2½ per cent depreciation which we have been deducting for the last three years, we have set up $1,000,000 in depreciation reserve. I do not want this year's earnings to appear as large as they would if we had not made this entry. Of course this can be changed if the board of directors does not approve of it.

You will note that our total surplus is shown by these statements as a little over $5,000,000. This does not include any surplus from the Billings Co., the Great Western Railway Co., and other corporations, which really add nearly $2,000,000.

Our sugar is invoiced at 4 cents, and judging from present market indications there is at least $1,000,000 profit that will show up in next year's business. The value of our real estate and railroads over and above the amount at which they are carried is at least $5,000,000, so that the actual surplus is nearer $9,000,000 than $5,000,000.

Am pleased to say that at some of our factories the farmers are signing up acreage and feel more encouraged than I did a week ago.

The details of these statements I will bring with me when I come to the stockholders' meeting.

When it is recalled this company was chartered in 1905 and it is seen by the above letter than in five years, by 1910, it had accumulated a surplus of $9,000,000, besides paying dividends for fully that amount, as I have already shown, and also allowing the regular 2½ per cent for depreciation, it will be seen that this company's annual net profit on its real investment during these five years was 36½ per cent—17 per cent for dividends, 17 per cent for surplus, and 2½ per cent for regular depreciation. It thus appears that in the short space of five years it made a total of 182½ per cent on the actual capital invested. No wonder that its president, Mr. Morey, juggled the entries, according to his own letter; no wonder that he said, never expecting his letter to become public, "I do not want this year's earnings to appear as large as they would if we had made this entry."

Let us next look into the American Beet Sugar Co., a concern operating six factories, two in California, three in Colorado, and one in Nebraska, with a total beet-slicing capacity of 5,300 tons per day. According to the standard of $1,000 per ton of daily beet-slicing capacity, the factories of this corporation represent a real value of $5,300,000, and yet we find this company, with the water injected into it somewhat more freely than usual, capitalized at $20,000,000—$5,000,000 preferred stock and $15,000,000 common stock. And it appears that in seven years from the time of its organization it had paid annually 6 per cent interest on the actual investment and had cleared seven and one-half millions besides, for at the end of that time its common stock, which had no value whatever in the beginning, was selling at $50 per share, while its preferred stock, with a guaranteed dividend of 6 per cent, was selling above par. In seven years it paid $2,100,000 in interest on its preferred stock, and its earnings created a value of 50 cents on the dollar for its common stock—pure water—or $7,500,000. This is a total of $9,600,000 on the investment of $5,000,000 in seven years, or a little over 190 per cent, or 24.3 per cent per annum on the actual investment. It must be remembered also that we have not been able to learn the whole truth about the profits of this company in any such way as we discovered it in Mr. Morey's case. Personally I do not doubt that their profits have been fully as great as those of the Great Western, if we could find out just how they have kept their books, as we did in the other case, but it seems to me that the showing is strong enough as it is.

In reference to the earnings of this company, I next invite your attention to an article in the Beet Sugar Journal of April, 1911, as follows:

"American Beet Sugar Co. sets new high record. The report of the American Sugar Co. for the year ended March 31, 1911, shows total income of $8,357,012, an increase of $1,347,368 over the previous year, and a surplus, after preferred-stock dividends, of $1,643,659, equal to 10.95 per cent earned on the $15,000,000 of common stock, compared with $1,097,252, or 7.31 per cent, earned in the previous year. The common stock has not yet paid any dividends. The preferred pays 6 per cent. Comparative results for the past three years follow."

Then are given the figures for 1911, 1910, and 1909. For 1909 the gross receipts were $7,135,326; total income, $7,156,855; expenses, interest, tax, etc., $5,863,713; balance, $1,293,143. Well, now, we will take 1910: Gross receipts, $6,983,772; total income, $7,009,644; expenses, tax, interest, etc., $5,612,391; balance, $1,397,252. For 1911: Gross receipts, $8,344,792; total income, $8,357,012; expenses, interest, tax, etc., $6,413,353; balance, $1,943,659. Preferred dividends, $300,000 in each of the years 1911 and 1910 and $245,400 in the year 1909, leaving a surplus of $1,643,659 in the year 1911, $1,097,525 in the year 1910, and $1,047,743 in the year 1909. "The general balance sheet as of March 31 shows total assets of $22,577,371."

"The reserve for working capital is $1,825,637, against $832,151 a year ago, and there is a reserve for betterments and improvements of $377,246, a new item. Bills payable to the amount of $1,266,000, which appeared in the previous balance sheet, have been paid off. H. E. Duval, president, says: 'The surplus has been applied to working capital, which is now adequate for ordinary operations. The company is now free of all debt. There was an increased production of 196,741 bags, exceeding that of any former year. The increase was principally due to California, though Grand Island increased 31,704 bags. In Colorado the decrease was 88,324 bags. Due largely to increased efficiency of the plants, the cost of making sugar, as compared with previous campaigns, was somewhat diminished. Taxes increased $30,989, of which $25,560 was the Federal corporation income tax. Depreciation and maintenance cost $344,842—was $13,119 less than last year.' The design of this expenditure (included in the above statement in expenses) is to keep the plants up to their original condition."

It appears from the above that during the year 1911 the American Beet Sugar Co., after paying its preferential dividend of 6 per cent on its preferred stock (real value) earned 10.91 per cent on $15,000,000 of common stock—water. This represents in all an earning of $300,000 (interest on preferred stock) plus $1,643,659 (surplus), or $1,943,659, which, in turn, is almost 39 per cent profit during the year ending March 31, 1911, on the real investment.

I next invite your attention to a statement in the American Sugar Industry of March, 1912, in reference to the profits of this same company—the American Beet Sugar Co.—for the year ending March 30, 1912:

The net earnings of the American Beet Sugar Co. for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1912, will probably not exceed 12 per cent, instead of the 15 per cent estimated last December. The reason assigned for this is that the company began to sell its 1911 crop too early. Sales were made in advance of production in order to take advantage of what seemed a very flattering profit. Sugar prices advanced and it is estimated the difference to the company amounted to between $300,000 and $500,000. The company then went to the other extreme and held back the remainder of the 1911 crop on a declining market.

As the dividends on the preferred stock are fixed at 6 per cent and are paid before any other dividend and before any surplus is laid aside it is quite evident that the 12 per cent "net earnings" refers to the amount of surplus set aside, which is figured from the basis of the amount of the common stock, so that it appears that for the year ending March 31, 1912, the American Beet Sugar Co. earned $300,000, interest at 6 per cent on its preferred stock, plus $1,800,000, surplus, the equivalent of 12 per cent on $15,000,000 worth of common stock, or $2,100,000, which is a little more than 40 per cent on its real investment.

One more illustration of this mania for overcapitalization among the beet-sugar factories and of the excessive profits they hope to conceal by this operation, and I shall pass on. We will next take the Michigan Sugar Co., from the State of my friend Mr. FORDNEY.

The present capitalization of the Michigan Sugar Co. consists of $3,703,500 preferred stock and $7,471,107 common stock, a total of some more than eleven millions. Here, again, we find "the trail of the serpent," for it appears from its own statement that "the trust"—the American Sugar Refining Co.—

owns 35 per cent of all the common stock and 55 per cent of all the preferred stock of the Michigan Sugar Co. This company operates six factories, all located in the State of Michigan, with a total beet-slicing capacity of 5,450 tons per day. This represents, according to the rule laid down by Mr. Hathaway, its own secretary, an investment of approximately $5,450,000, and yet, as we have already seen, its present capitalization is more than double that amount. It was chartered in 1906, with an authorized capital of $9,000,000, one-half preferred and one-half common stock, not all of which was issued. It simply represented at the time of its charter an attempt to form a small local beet-sugar trust among a number of Michigan factories that had been previously independents and competitors of each other. It was simply a Michigan manifestation of the prevailing "trust-organizing" mania with which the country was then mad, and was attended by the one invariable sympton of the disease, to wit, overcapitalization.

Let me now call your attention to certain reliable trade reports in friendly journals touching the profits this company has made.

I quote, first, from the Beet Sugar Journal of May, 1910:

The Michigan Sugar Co. reports a profitable year. The regular annual meeting of stockholders of the Michigan Sugar Co. was held at the Eddy Building, Detroit, Mich., Wednesday afternoon, May 25, 1910. There was a representative attendance to hear the statement of the officers as to the year's business. The year was a profitable one, the company being able to show a surplus of $3,025,000 after expending $3,500,000 for labor and beets, and also paying regular dividends, not only on the preferred, but on the common stock as well. As the Wednesday meeting was the regular annual meeting, no dividend was declared.

I next invite your attention to an extract from the Beet Sugar Journal of July 6, 1910:

Offers of 121 for stock in the Michigan Sugar Co. have been made within the last month, and the stock is now considered one of the best on the Detroit or, for that matter, any market. The enormous profits, coupled with the favorable prospects, are the causes for the increase in interest and price in stock. The net profits of the Michigan Sugar Co. in 1909 exceeded $1,500,000, and the financial statement submitted at the annual meeting last month showed a surplus of $3,000,000. By a person in close touch with the workings of the company it is stated that the earnings from the sale of the by-products is almost enough to meet the dividend payments. The stock has trebled in value in little more than a year.

"Michigan sugar stock is now one of the best investments possible," says a local broker who has been prominent in handling the stock; "there are more buyers for it than there is stock for sale, and probabilities are an even higher mark than already touched will be reached before the break comes. All Michigan sugar companies are prospering. When the 'trust' came into the State some years ago it smashed many independent companies, but in recent years, due to the improved methods of growing and manufacturing, which permits large profits to the farmer and extraordinary profits to the factory, several independent companies have been rehabilitated and are now sharing in the general prosperity."

It appears from the above that from 1906 to 1910 the Michigan Sugar Co., besides paying 6 per cent on its preferred stock, made three millions in profits, "trebled the value of its stock in little more than a year," and made almost enough money from its by-products to pay its dividends. In four short years it paid back every dollar of real money invested in it, or fully 25 per cent per annum.

But, Mr. Chairman, why continue on this line? Is not the demonstration complete? These, forsooth, are the lusty "infants" that cry aloud against being weaned; these are poor foundlings who can not stand on their own legs and therefore urge that the public be forced to support them in order that they may be allowed to continue to pay ever-swelling dividends on watered stocks, in order that they may continue to grow richer and to reap where they have not sown.

But they insist that, even if they have prospered marvelously under the Dingley and Payne rates, this does not prove that they can stand alone without any aid whatsoever, and they further insist that after three years, when this great necessity of life shall be untaxed, that they will perish beneath an avalanche of German and Cuban sugar. Let us look into that a little. In the first place, let me call your attention to the fact that our American beet-sugar factories have one great advantage over their foreign beet competitors in that while our factories produce refined sugar, ready for table and trade uses without further process of manufacture, that is not true of the German or any other foreign beet factories. In foreign factories the manufacture is not carried so far, and the sugar produced by them has to go through a process of refining, as our cane sugar does, before it is ready for table and trade uses. This process of refining costs the foreign beet-sugar man fully 0.4 cent per pound.

Nor is the difference in the cost of factory labor, if any, a serious handicap to the American factory, as the total labor cost of manufacturing does not exceed 14 cents per 100 pounds.

Fuel, relatively a far more important item of expense, is more abundant here than abroad and is much cheaper, especially in the West, where this industry is located, and oil is largely used as fuel.

Besides these considerations it must be remembered that the difference in geographical extent between this country and Germany gives to our domestic sugar factories a natural protection growing out of freight rates, which is most important and to which I will advert later. All of those considerations doubtless contributed to the very thoughtful view of Prof. Taussig, professor of economics of Harvard University. Let me quote briefly from his article on "Beet sugar and the tariff," published in the Quarterly Journal of Economics, Harvard University, February, 1912:

A question in some respects different is presented by the beet-sugar factory, which buys the beets from the farmers and makes the sugar. Here there is what the business world calls a "straight manufacturing proposition." Whether the manufacturing of sugar can be done to advantage in the United States depends on the same conditions as in other manufactures. It is much affected by the opportunities for using machinery and for the exercise of American inventive and engineering capacity in improving machinery. Such evidence as I can get indicates that, so far as this branch of the industry is concerned, the conditions are not unfavorable to its successful prosecution, with little need, if any, of tariff support. When the first factories were built in California the machinery was imported from Germany. "The Yankee inventive genius of machinery men at once took hold of the matter, making so valuable improvements that both the above-mentioned factories (at Watsonville and at Chino) were shortly refitted with machines of American make, and every factory in this country in the last few years has purchased American machines." So in the Department of Agriculture pamphlet on the industry it is stated that "in the early days of the beet-sugar industry in this country Europe was called on to furnish all machinery. Now very little is imported, and, in fact, some of the foreign factories are using American-made machinery." The domestic making of machinery, the breaking loose from European tutelage, the introduction of technical improvements—these are significant indications of the successful adaptation of a new industry to American conditions and of ability to meet foreign competition unaided. It should be borne in mind, moreover, that the factory managers take an active part in directing and supervising the agricultural operations. In this regard there seems to be abundant and successful enterprise. The managers of the beet-sugar factories have been chiefly instrumental in bringing the indispensable labor supply to the farms. Through traction engines and the like they have grappled with the difficulties of transporting the beets from the field to the factory. They have selected the seeds and have assiduously spread information among the farmers on the best ways of getting a large tonnage of beets and a large content of sugar. In the far West especially all this activity has been carried on with industrial and pecuniary success. Neither in the factory itself nor in the problems of organization arising from the interdependence of farm and factory has there been a lack of skill or energy.

Now, let us consider the freight-rate question briefly, and then I shall pass to a discussion of the question from the standpoint of the producer of the sugar beets, the farmer, if you please. When the Brussels convention, after agreeing on everything that affected the production, importation, and exportation of sugar as in and between the various European countries that were the powers signatory, came to consider the protection that their beet sugar needed against tropical cane sugar the sugar scientists of the world agreed that a tariff duty of one-half cent a pound, or, to be exact, 0.47 cent per pound on raw sugar and 0.53 cent per pound on refined sugar was sufficient. This decision was made after the most careful estimates as to the cost of production of beet sugar in Europe and of cane sugar in the various tropical countries and after carefully considering the cost of transporting the cane sugar across the seas and finally to the consuming centers of the various European countries.

Now, so far as the latter element, namely, the cost of transportation, is concerned we must remember that it is practically negligible when compared to similar cost of transportation in our great country. So highly developed are these European countries in the matter of transportation that canals and water routes of all kinds intersect and traverse every part of the more important of them. On these canals the rates on heavy freight, like sugar, are so low that they are almost a negligible factor. As a result, German beet sugar has very little, if any, more protection over tropical cane than the amount of the duty—one-half cent per pound. On the other hand, even after foreign sugar, cane or beet, reaches our coast there are large parts of our great territory that it can not reach at all without paying a far greater freight rate than the differential that the Brussels convention has fixed between European beet and tropical cane sugar. The territory which this freight-rate protection would preserve to the beet factories is far greater than they can possibly supply with sugar if they will supply all of the territory in which a reasonable profit on actual investments will enable them to sell.

There are great regions of the country in the very vicinity of many of these factories where the freight rate on sugar is from 70 to 80 cents per hundred pounds, and this is the natural territory in which these factories can best operate and sell their product at a reasonable profit on the actual investment and yet as cheaply as the consumer could buy it from anyone else.

Now, let us see how German beet or Cuban cane could drive the American beet factory out of business, provided the American beet factory is willing to content itself with a fair and reasonable profit on the actual investment. Let us first take German beet sugar. Its cost of production, refined, is 2.415 cents per pound. The cost of ocean freight, Hamburg to New York, and insurance is 0.12 cent per pound. This would make a cost of laying it down at New York, duty free, 2.535 cents per pound.

To this figure, according to the sugar experts, should be added 0.18 cent per pound to make up the difference in grade between the Hamburg sugar and our beet sugar. This makes a total cost of 2.715 cents per pound delivered in New York. Now, take our beet sugar. The Spreckels Sugar Co. (beet), of California, admits that it is producing it at a cost of 2.70 cents per pound. The Oxnard (Cal.) factory of the American Beet Sugar Co. is admittedly producing it at a cost of 2.81 cents per pound, and according to the testimony of Mr. E. U. Combs, of Colorado, the Great Western Sugar Co. has produced it at a cost of 2.59 cents per pound.

Most of these figures can be verified by consulting page 23 of the report of the sugar committee. Mr. Combs's figures can be verified from the testimony taken by the committee. Now, let us go one step further. The report of the sugar committee, taking the figures submitted by the beet factories themselves, found the average American cost of production to be 3.54 cents per pound. The difference between that figure and the German cost, laid down at New York, is only 0.735 cent per pound, and I submit that even this difference is more than equalized by advantages in freight rates that our domestic producers will have in a territory far greater than they can supply. Besides, in considering these questions, we must remember that the cost figures I have given to-day are simply the ex parte statements of the beet-factory people, made while they were battling to uphold the tariff, made while they were urging that there was a large difference in the cost of production here and abroad, and hence, from their standpoint, an absolute necessity to maintain the protective duties. Under these circumstances, I insist that, without reflection on any of these gentlemen, we are bound to take their statements with at least one grain of salt, to construe their evidence most strongly against themselves, to accept the lowest rather than the highest or even the average figures they gave us. This is especially true because the special committee, although it labored many months on this investigation, had neither the time nor the money at its disposal to make an examination of the books of these factories, and did not do so, merely taking the statements of witnesses as to what the books showed; and even then in more than one instance we discovered, on cross-examination, that to the actual cost of producing a pound of sugar brokerage charges and even freight rates to competitive points had been added, thus increasing the apparent cost of production. But our domestic beet factories insist that even if they could survive the competition of German beet sugar, they can not survive that of tropical cane sugar, if the same is admitted free of duty. Let us look into that for a moment. The cost of producing a pound of raw cane sugar in Cuba is around 2 cents (report sugar committee, p. 230). This is raw sugar, and to it should be added 0.5 cent per pound, cost of refining (report, p. 23), also approximately 0.12 cent per pound, cost of freight and insurance to New York, or a total of 2.62 cents per pound, not materially or substantially different from the figure at which German sugar can be laid down at New York, and there is therefore no more danger that Cuban competition will overwhelm any properly located, honestly managed, fairly capitalized American factory than that German competition will do so. Indeed, if the American cost of production is what I firmly believe it is, somewhere around 2.75 cents per pound, the difference in cost of production between American beet sugar on the one hand and German beet and Cuban cane on the other is so small as to be almost if not wholly negligible.

BEET FARMERS.

But our beet-sugar factories insist that even if it be granted that fuel is cheaper here than abroad, and that their machinery is better than that of their foreign competitors, and that the factory labor cost is so small a proportion of the total cost of producing a pound of sugar as to be almost negligible, and therefore that any difference in factory wages is not an important factor, that still there is one overwhelming and unanswerable reason why they should have a protective tariff on sugar, and that reason is to enable them to pay the American farmer a higher price for his beets than he could otherwise get or than the farmer of any other country gets for his beets. It is therefore insisted that, after all, the man the duty protects is the American farmer, and in his name the beneficiaries of the duty attempt to call a halt on this movement to untax one of the great necessities of life. Let us look into this question and weigh it carefully. Mr. Chairman, I sometimes think that there are more appeals to ignorance, to passion, to prejudice, in the name of the American farmer than of any other name that I can think of, unless it be possibly that of the American laborer. Why the intelligence and honesty of both of them should be so often affronted is more than I can comprehend, and yet it does seem to me that this particular appeal "in the name of the American farmer" is the most unjust and unjustifiable one that I have ever heard, and I protest against it as emphatically as I can in behalf of the great masses of the American farmers throughout the country, who constitute the very backbone of its prosperity and well-being, and who demand no more than a square deal and an even chance to earn their living in the sunshine of the Almighty, unhampered by unnecessary burdens and unfair discriminations against them, and demanding neither discriminations in their favor against other people, nor special privileges of any kind whatsoever.

In the first place, take the whole body of American farmers everywhere. Have you no regard for their rights and their interests? Do you propose to make fish out of one kind of farmers and fowl out of another kind? I do not believe as I will undertake to show you later, that the removal of this duty will make it necessary for the factories to pay the farmer any smaller price for sugar beets, nor do I believe the beet factories will be able to get the beets at a lower price, nor that the farmers will stand for such unnecessary reduction in price, but even if it did mean that the farmer must take a lower price for his sugar beets, which I utterly dispute, what then? It appeared from the testimony of many witnesses who were sworn by the sugar committee and were engaged as farmers in the production of sugar beets in the various Western States that the net profits per acre of the sugar-beet farmers varied from $19.20 to $76. Taking the average of the figures given by the first 14 witnesses on this subject, it would appear that the average net profit per acre of the sugar-beet farmer throughout the West was about $43.37 in the year 1911. According to the figures of the Department of Agriculture, the average net profit of the American farmer in the production of wheat was $3.07 per acre, and the average net profit of the American farmer engaged in the production of corn was $8.15 per acre. The above averages do not include any allowances whatever for rent of land. These are given by the department for the year 1909, but I do not believe that the figures of 1911 or 1912 will materially vary from them. The estimate of the average net profit of the American farmer engaged in the production of cotton is not above $6 per acre. It is often much less, but certainly never much larger. Now, is the American farmer who makes $3.07 on his acre of wheat, or $6 on his acre of cotton, or $8.15 on his acre of corn, to be taxed in order that other American farmers, infinitely smaller in number, shall be allowed to make $43.37 on an acre of beets? Such a contention does not appeal to my sense of justice, nor do I believe that it will ever be indorsed by the people of America, if any party should have the temerity to present it.

As I have already stated, I firmly believe that sugar can be put on the free list without a cent's reduction to the farmer who raises sugar beets, if the beet-sugar factories will simply be content to accept a fair and reasonable return on their actual and legitimate investment; but in any event, I am unwilling to tax all of the American people in order to give a few thousand American farmers a better price for their sugar beets.

But let us see to what extent our Republican friends have really been engaged in the business of protecting the beet farmer and to what extent, if any, they have aided him.

Let me suggest that the real measure of "protection" that they have given him can be found in the duty of 10 per cent ad valorem that the Payne bill imposed on sugar beets that come in direct competition with his product and are imported and sold in rivalry with it. It will not do for our Republican friends to reply that this amounted to nothing because there were no foreign beets to compete with his beets. The fact is that in 1909 we imported 37,731 tons of sugar beets from Canada, and in 1910 57,950 tons of sugar beets from the same country, which were sold to the Michigan Sugar Co. and to the Mount Clemens Sugar Co. in competition with beets raised by the Michigan farmer. These beets only bore a 10 per cent duty, and yet when they were manufactured into sugar the farmer who bought the sugar had to pay a duty eight times as high in the additional cost of the sugar that went on his table.

Now let us compare the prices paid for our beets under a sugar tariff almost four times as high as the German sugar tariff—1.90 cents against 0.53 cent. In the United States, according to the testimony given to the special committee by

the beet-factory representatives, the following prices were paid for beets (Rept., p. 20):

In California the price of beets in 1911 was $5.30 per ton of beets grading 16 per cent, and a contract has been made for an increase of 75 cents per ton for the year 1912. (Hearings, p. 3873.)

In Utah and Idaho the ruling price is $5 per ton and freight, which makes the beets cost, delivered at the factory, over $5.60 to $5.65 per ton. (Hearings, p. 797.)

In Colorado and Nebraska the price averages from $5.50 per ton to $6.50 per ton. (Hearings, pp. 400, 888.)

In Michigan and Ohio the customary contract calls for a payment by the factory of $4.50 per ton for beets testing 12 per cent sugar with 33⅓ cents per ton for each additional per cent of sugar in the beets, with a minimum guaranty of $5 per ton. (Hearings, p. 719.)

Compare these prices with the prices paid in Europe. Mr. Czarnikaw, of London, one of the most eminent authorities on sugar conditions in the whole world, states that the usual price paid for beets in countries that are parties to the Brussels convention—and that includes most of the beet-sugar producing countries in Europe—was $5.11 to $5.48 per ton. Messrs. L. Behrens & Son, of Hamburg, fix the price at from $5.32 to $6.70 per ton. Messrs. H. J. Merck & Co., of Hamburg, reporting for the district of Stettin, fix the average price at $5.78 per ton. In Posen the price varied from $5.59 to $6.49, the average being $6.27 per ton. In Belgium and Holland the average in 1911 was $5.79 per ton.

It will be noted that the American figures I first gave were those of the beet-sugar factory people and that it is difficult if not impossible to find the average price paid throughout the country from those figures. I therefore call your attention to the last annual report of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, in which it is stated that the average price paid to the farmers of the United States for sugar beets for the year 1911–12 was $5.50 per short ton, and for the three previous years $5.35 per short ton.

As against this price paid to the American farmer, the German farmer received for his beets during the same year (1911–12) $6.07, according to the last quarterly book of statistics—official—of the German Empire. Besides, in Germany, the farmer is furnished beet seed free by the factories. In the United States the farmer buys his beet seed from the factory. In Germany, according to the great sugar expert, Mr. F. O. Licht, the farmers "receive allowances for freight and get 40 per cent to 60 per cent of the pulp returned to them without charge." The farmer gets neither of these things in the United States. So that in Germany, with a tariff only one-fourth as high as our tariff, the German farmer gets considerably more for his beets, although the sugar content of our beets is fully as good as that of the German beets. Now, if the German factory, with a tariff duty only one-fourth as high as the duty carried in our present law, can and does pay the German farmer considerably more for his beets than our farmers are paid, then I wish to ask the beet farmers if they feel they have received their fair share of the protection that has gone to enrich a few factory owners and to pay millions of dividends on watered stock and to create value out of nothing at the expense of consumers everywhere, and if they do not believe the beet factories, even under free sugar, can and ought to be able to even up things with them, and maintain the price of beets, especially since they will be able to do so if only they will be content to accept a fair and reasonable profit on the actual capital that is invested in the factories.

That the beet-sugar industry can survive and can pay the farmer just as much as it now pays him for sugar beets, under free sugar, is, I believe, certain. It may not be able to continue to pile up a huge surplus after paying good dividends on actual investments. It may not be able to continue to make huge dividends on vast issues of watered stock, but surely that is not so desirable that the American people ought to be taxed in order that it may continue.

THE CONSUMER'S STANDPOINT.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to next invite the attention of the committee to the consideration of this question from the viewpoint of the consumer. I am quite aware that in doing so I am invoking a doctrine long in disuse, utterly disregarded by our Republican friends in the preparation of tariff bills, and, apparently, almost distasteful to them. But, sir, from the Democratic standpoint this is the most important angle from which this great question can be considered, for, after all, in it is involved the interest of all the people, which is, or ought to be, of more importance to Congress than the interest of any part of the people.

In discussing this question from that standpoint I shall undertake to show to what extent our tariff duties on sugar have increased the burdens of the American consumer and to what extent he may hope to obtain relief and lower prices by the removal of the duty. First, then, to what extent has our duty on sugar been a burden on the American consumer? I wish to invite your attention to a table showing a comparison of the export price of sugar at Hamburg with the wholesale price at New York for the years 1890 to 1911, inclusive:

Comparison of export price of sugar at Hamburg and wholesale price of same at New York, 1900 to 1911.

[Cents per pound.]

Year.	Raw sugar.			Granulated sugar.		
	Export price, Hamburg.	Wholesale price, New York.	Difference between export price at Hamburg and wholesale price at New York.	Export price, Hamburg.	Wholesale price, New York.	Difference between export price at Hamburg and wholesale price at New York.
1900	2.24	4.56	2.32	2.64	5.32	2.68
1901	1.88	4.04	2.16	2.29	5.05	2.76
1902	1.43	3.54	2.11	1.79	4.45	2.66
1903	1.81	3.72	1.91	2.11	4.63	2.52
1904	2.14	3.97	1.83	2.55	4.77	2.22
1905	2.55	4.27	1.72	3.00	5.25	2.25
1906	1.87	3.68	1.81	2.31	4.51	2.20
1907	2.05	3.75	1.70	2.40	4.65	2.25
1908	2.29	4.07	1.78	2.63	4.95	2.32
1909	2.35	4.00	1.65	2.78	4.76	1.98
1910	2.74	4.18	1.44	3.22	4.97	1.75
1911	2.82	4.45	1.63	3.20	5.34	2.14
Average	2.18	4.02	1.84	2.58	4.89	2.32

The figures contained in the above report can not be questioned. They are taken from the statements, before the special committee, of Mr. E. F. Atkins, vice president of the American Sugar Refining Co., and of Mr. Truman G. Palmer, secretary of an association of American beet-sugar factories. The figures presented by these gentlemen are from authoritative and unquestioned sources—the records of the standard trades journals of the sugar industry. They show that during the 12 years for which the figures are given the average difference between the export price of raw sugar at Hamburg and the New York wholesale price of raw sugar averaged 1.84 cents per pound, whereas the tariff on raw sugar was 1.685 cents per pound, and the insurance and freight from Hamburg to New York 1.2 cents per pound, a total of 1.805 cents per pound. They also show that during this same period of years the average difference between the export price of granulated sugar at Hamburg and the wholesale price of granulated sugar at New York was 2.32 cents per pound, whereas the tariff during three-fourths of this period was 1.95 cents per pound—and during the last three years 1.90 cents per pound—and the cost of insurance and freight from Hamburg to New York 0.12 cent per pound, to which should be added 0.18 cent per pound for difference in grade, making a total of 2.25 cents per pound. In other words, the table demonstrates conclusively that during the 12 years that it covers the American consumer paid every penny of the duty on sugar and could have bought his sugar almost 2 cents per pound cheaper but for the existence of the tariff tax.

From 1897 to 1912, inclusive, the people of the United States consumed 43,274,605 tons (long) of refined sugar. During the above period, 12 years of this time the Dingley rate of 1.95 cents per pound on refined sugar has been in force, and during the last 4 years the Payne rate of 1.90 cents per pound. The Dingley rate was equivalent to $43.68 per long ton. The Payne rate was equivalent to $42.56 per ton. So that since the passage of the Dingley bill up to January 1, 1913, this sugar duty had cost the American consumer the enormous sum of fully two thousand million dollars, of which amount only eight hundred million has gone into the Treasury as taxes, the other twelve hundred million being a bonus, pure and simple, to the domestic sugar producer. The briefs for the sugar people are full of two specious replies when the attention is called to this great burden on consumption. They reply, first, that the burden is infinitesimal when it is considered just what it costs each person per year. They first attempt to deduct the amount that goes into the Treasury from the total and then to deduct the amount of sugar that is indirectly consumed in candies, confectioneries, soda water, and so forth, and then to figure the burden on the basis of the sugar directly consumed in table use. In this way they manage to present some very ingenious and amusing figures. The fallacy of this argument is perfectly apparent. In the first place, the refined sugar consumed in every way in the United States in 1912 cost the American consumer about $142,000,000 more than it would have cost but for the duty.

This is no opinion, but is history, as is demonstrable from a comparison of the world's export price at Hamburg with both the wholesale and retail price of sugar in the United States. This enormous yearly charge represents an annual burden of about $1.50 per capita on every man, on every woman and child in our country, or a tax of $7.50 per average family of five persons, and every ounce of that burden is borne by the people, regardless of the amount of taxes that are collected out of it, for on this proposition there can be no dispute but that the consumer pays the tax. Nor is there any doubt where the sugar is used in the trade for canning, preserving, and so forth, that the consumer of the articles thereby produced in every case pays for the sugar used either in the quality or quantity of the product he buys. Nor is the answer that this is, after all, even on this basis, a very small burden, because so generally distributed, a good one, in my judgment. To that argument we rejoin that this tax on a great necessity of life falls on the poor man least able to bear it just as heavily as on the rich man most able to bear it, and for that reason this bill the Democratic Party presents undertakes to remove the tax upon a food product that the poor as well as the rich must eat and to place it on something else, namely, the incomes of men who are abundantly able and ought to be abundantly willing to bear the burden.

The sugar producers next contend that it is unwise and unnecessary to make this change because sugar is now cheaper in this country than in any other country on earth except perhaps Great Britain. While true in a way this statement is most misleading and unfair. In most of the European countries, in order to maintain large and expensive military establishments and to meet other expenses that this country does not have to meet, not only is a moderate tariff duty levied on imported sugar but heavy consumption taxes of all kinds on all the sugar, both foreign and domestic, that is consumed. In order to make any fair comparison in the real cost of sugar in the several countries of the world it is necessary to deduct from the selling price of sugar these various taxes before any fair comparison can be made. Even then differences in grade of sugar and peculiarities of the local market must be allowed for to some extent.

The table I next present gives the average American retail price and the average retail price in many foreign cities and the taxes collected on sugar in each, thus giving us the price of sugar in each of these cities after such taxes have been deducted therefrom.

European and American retail prices for sugar during July, 1911.

	Retail price per pound.	Import and internal revenue taxes levied per pound.	Retail price less taxes levied per pound.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
Average American	5.69	1.90	3.79
London	4.00	.40	3.60
Liverpool	4.00	.40	3.60
Manchester	3.80	.40	3.40
Berlin	4.90	2.03	2.87
Hamburg	5.90	2.03	3.87
Magdeburg	4.90	2.03	2.87
Cologne	4.70	2.03	2.67
Paris	5.90	2.89	3.01
Marseille	6.10	2.89	3.21
Bordeaux	6.80	2.89	3.91
Lyons	6.50	2.89	3.61
Rome	14.00	8.67	5.33
Vienna	6.50	4.02	2.48
Budapest	6.80	4.02	2.78
Geneva	4.40	.79	3.61
Zurich (loaf)	5.10	.79	4.31
Berne	4.20	.79	3.41
Rotterdam	8.20	4.92	3.28
Amsterdam	8.70	4.92	3.78
Brussels	5.40	2.27	3.13
Liege	4.80	2.27	2.53
Copenhagen	5.00	1.71	3.29
Madrid (loaf)	12.20	7.00	5.20
Stockholm	8.00	3.70	4.30
Gothenberg	7.70	3.70	4.00
Constantinople (loaf)	5.10	.25	4.85
Lisbon	10.30	7.40	2.90
Athens (loaf)	11.40	7.90	2.50
Bucharest	10.10	6.56	3.45
Belgrade	8.70	5.26	3.44
Christiana	6.30	2.43	3.87
Sofia (loaf)	7.20	4.69	2.51
United States (Lowry)	6.35	1.60	4.75
United States (Willett)	6.35	1.44	4.91

The foreign prices in the above table were compiled in July, 1911, by the Bureau of Trade Relations, Department of State of the United States, from consular reports made in pursuance of a special investigation of the foreign prices of sugar by our State Department at the special request of the sugar committee. The American figure, the first given, is arrived at by taking the figures of Mr. Truman G. Palmer, the beet-sugar expert, who fixes the average American retail price of beet sugar at 5.69 cents per pound in July, 1911, and the American figure in the third column is arrived at by subtracting from 5.69 cents the sum of 1.90 cents, which is our duty on a pound of refined sugar. I believe that even a casual investigation of the above table will convince any thoughtful person that the American consumer is not indebted to our domestic producer of sugar for any decrease in price during comparatively recent years. In the first place, such decrease is world-wide, due to improvement in processes of manufacture and ever-cheapening cost of production throughout the world, and in some countries is considerably more marked than our own, as the above table clearly shows. In the next place, it is most important to remember that years ago, when our sugar was so much higher in price than it is now, our tariff duties on sugar were much higher than they are now, and this is a most important factor in the equation. In this connection it is well to bear in mind we have at various times since the foundation of our Government levied the following tariff duties on sugar:

The act of 1789 carried a sugar tax of 3 cents per pound and in 1790 the tariff was 5 cents per pound; in 1794, 4 cents per pound; in 1816, 3 cents per pound on brown or raw sugar, 4 cents per pound on white or refined sugar, 10 cents per pound on lump sugar, and 12 cents per pound on loaf sugar. In 1832 the tax was 2½ cents per pound on brown sugar and 3½ on refined sugar; in 1842 it was 2½ cents per pound on brown sugar and 6 cents per pound on refined sugar; in 1846, three-fourths of a cent per pound on raw sugar and 2 cents per pound on refined sugar; in 1861, 2 cents per pound; in 1862, 2½ cents per pound; in 1864, 3 cents per pound; in 1870, 4 cents per pound; in 1883, 2.24 cents per pound on raw sugar and 3½ cents per pound on refined sugar; in 1890, five-tenths of a cent per pound on refined sugar; and all other sugar under 16 Dutch standard in color, free, with a bounty of 2 cents per pound on domestic production; in 1894, 40 cents ad valorem and an additional tax of one-eighth of a cent per pound on refined sugar; in 1897, 1.685 cents per pound on raw sugar and 1.95 cents per pound on refined sugar; in 1909, 1.685 cents per pound on raw sugar and 1.90 cents per pound on refined sugar.

In weighing the present contention of our beet and cane sugar producers that their product has caused a decrease in the price to the American consumer, it is just as well for us to recall a significant paragraph in the unanimous report of the sugar committee (p. 17) when a somewhat similar contention was made in behalf of the Sugar Trust:

> The contention of the American Sugar Refining Co., that because sugar costs the consumer less to-day than it did when that corporation was organized, therefore the existence and operation of the corporation has benefited rather than injured the consumer, we regard as unsound. Such a contention entirely ignores most important considerations, such as improvement in the processes and reduction in the cost of refining and manufacturing during that period of time; the greater supply of raw material; improved methods of cultivating sugar cane and sugar beets; and a perfect host of conditions that are entirely independent of the existence of the American or any other sugar refining or manufacturing company.
>
> Besides, in the last 20 years the reduction in price has been world-wide, embracing in its scope all the countries of the earth, from the most enlightened to the most barbarous; and surely no American corporation can claim that it accomplished this result in countries where it has no business and where its very name is practically unknown. In the opinion of your committee, the reduction in the price of sugar in the last 20 years to the American consumer did not come because of the organization and operation of the American Sugar Refining Co.

It is contended, however, that even if the duty is reduced or entirely removed the consumer will not get the benefit of such reduction of removal of duty. This I deny. I deny it in the light of history. I deny it on the sworn testimony of every sugar man who has testified on the subject, including the sugar manufacturers and refiners themselves. The contention is utterly disproved by the comparison I have already made, through a long period of years, between export prices at Hamburg and wholesale prices at New York. In every one of the years that the duty has been enforced the New York price has exceeded the Hamburg export price by the full amount of the duty.

When the sugar schedule of the McKinley bill went into operation, on April 1, 1891, the effect of the removal of the duty on sugar was made instantaneously apparent. Granulated was quoted in New York on March 26, 1891, at 6¼ cents per pound, and on April 2, 1891, the day after the tariff change went into effect, it fell from 6¼ to 4½ cents per pound, and by May 14, 1891, it had fallen to 4¼ cents per pound.

In this connection I invite your attention to the tables furnished the special committee by Mr. Wallace P. Willett, of the firm of Willett & Gray, the greatest sugar statistician in America, and one of the very greatest in the world. Mr. Willett furnished the special committee with a number of tables

in proof of his statement to the committee that every one of our tariff changes in sugar have been followed by a corresponding change in the price of sugar to the American consumer. He contended that, other conditions being equal, such as crop conditions and the world-wide law of supply and demand, that any increase in duty necessarily increased the price of sugar to the consumer by the amount of such increase, and any decrease in duty, with the same qualification, necessarily decreased the price of sugar to the consumer. These tables will be found on pages 3548 to 3552 of the hearings before the special committee, and they show some very interesting facts. For instance, Mr. Willett states that, comparing the three years and three months preceding free sugar—January 1, 1888, to April 1, 1891—with the three years and five months of free sugar—April 1, 1891, to August 1, 1894—the consumer paid 2.512 cents per pound less for his sugar in the last period of time, when there was no duty, than in the first period, when there was a duty of 2.24 cents per pound.

Next, Mr. Willett shows, in Table No. 4, on page 3548 of the hearings before the special committee, that the effect of the imposition of the 40 per cent ad valorem duty on sugar carried in the Wilson bill, which he says was equivalent to a duty of 0.979 cent per pound, was to raise the price of refined sugar 0.834 cent per pound, and that the effect of the Dingley law of 1897, which still further increased the Wilson duty by 0.824 cent per pound, was to increase the price of sugar to the consumer 0.586 cent per pound, and he accounts for the fact that the price did not increase to the full extent of the increase in duty, in these periods, by stating that it did not so increase "because of the lower range of prices for raws, owing to overproduction of supplies." Of course, Mr. Chairman, the committee will understand that as to sugar, and as to all other commodities, prices are affected by causes that are entirely independent of changes in the tariff. For instance, in September, 1911, our price of sugar advanced about 2 cents per pound because of a reported, though possibly somewhat exaggerated, shortage of more than a million tons in the German beet crop, and this advance occurred without any tariff change whatever, but the point is that whatever change is made in the price because of crop conditions, and in obedience to the law of supply and demand, we pay the tariff tax just the same, whether the crop is short and price rises or whether the crop is long and the price falls. In other words, while sugar went up 2 cents a pound in September, 1911, entirely independent of the tariff, yet even then we would have gotten our sugar at 2 cents a pound cheaper than we did get it if it had not been for the duty on sugar, and since then it has gone down more than 2 cents, with the tariff still unchanged, and we would now get it 2 cents a pound cheaper than we do but for the tariff.

After analyzing the changes in our tariff laws on sugar to which I have just referred, Mr. Willett summed up the situation in the following striking and significant statement:

> The chairman remarked (p. 3072, at bottom of page), "and the less will be the worth of the sugar lost in refining." All the analyses of changing from duty to free sugar show that whenever duty is taken off the cost of refining decreases and when duty is added the cost of refining increases, but these analyses also show that whenever duty is taken off the consumer gets the full benefit of the amount of duty taken off and also a part of the lower cost of refining.

Mr. Henry C. Mott, buyer of raw sugar for the American Sugar Refining Co., testified (Hearings, pp. 2451, 2452) that the amount of duty is always charged to the consumer.

Mr. C. A. Spreckels, president of the Federal Sugar Refining Co., testified (hearings, pp. 2245, 2246) that to place sugar on the free list would reduce the price of sugar to the consumer—

> by the amount of the duty, approximately 2 cents a pound.

Mr. Edwin F. Atkins, vice president of the American Sugar Refining Co., testified (hearings, p. 142) that if we reduce the tariff on sugar the effect would be to reduce the price of refined sugar—

> practically by the amount of the reduction, always subject to the fluctuations of supply and demand for raw sugar.

Mr. Frank C. Lowry, when asked the question (hearings, p. 1721) as to whether or not the removal of the duty on sugar would guarantee to the consumer the full benefit of such removal, replied:

> Exactly, because then there would be no combination of dealers in this country, because they would have to compete with the dealers in other countries, and you can not get the dealers in the entire world into a combination.

Mr. Henry T. Oxnard, of the American Beet-Sugar Refining Co., testified (hearings, p. 406) that by admitting Hawaiian and Philippine sugar free the advantage was given to the Hawaiians and Filipinos rather than to anyone in the United States, because the sugar people in Hawaii and the Philippines had simply "increased their price just the amount of duty removed," and following that statement he had a very interesting colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], who preceded me in this debate, to which I wish to invite special attention:

> Mr. FORDNEY. Would not Europe do that to-day if we were to take the duty off of European sugar, and Cuba?
> Mr. OXNARD. They would to a certain extent; but they could not, because they would be competing against the world.
> Mr. FORDNEY. Suppose the duty was removed to the whole world. Suppose we removed the duty on all imported sugar from all countries of the world; would they not take advantage of it?
> Mr. OXNARD. They would compete with the other countries.

So, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me to be both demonstrated by history and proven by the testimony, without conflict or dispute, that the removal of duty will reduce the price of sugar by the amount of the duty, and we present this bill to the American people, to the overburdened American consumer, with the confident hope that we have demonstrated the contention and that the enactment of the bill into law will reduce the price of every pound of sugar consumed in this country to the extent of nearly 2 cents at the end of three years, when the entire duty is removed.

Mr. Chairman, the remarkable and entirely unfounded contention has been made on this floor and throughout the country that the American Sugar Refining Co., commonly called the Sugar Trust, is for free sugar. The fact is precisely otherwise, and during this very debate I have been simply astounded to hear gentlemen, who must and do know better, try to convey the impression that such is the case. To set this matter at rest forever, I will here quote from the testimony of Mr. Edward F. Atkins, the vice president and executive head of the American Sugar Refining Co., given to the Ways and Means Committee on January 15, 1913. (Hearings, Schedule E, pp. 2382–2383.)

> Mr. HARRISON. I would like to ask the witness a question. Mr. Atkins, you are the vice president of the American Sugar Refining Co., which is popularly known as the Sugar Trust?
> Mr. ATKINS. It is sometimes referred to as that.
> Mr. HARRISON. Do you appear here representing the sentiment of the directors of that company?
> Mr. ATKINS. Yes, sir; with their authority.
> Mr. HARRISON. Are you in favor of free sugar?
> Mr. ATKINS. I am not, and our company is not.
> Mr. HARRISON. I wish to ask you further whether you know of the campaign which has been conducted by Mr. Frank C. Lowrey, as secretary of the Wholesale Grocers' Association, in favor of a reduction in the duty on sugar?
> Mr. ATKINS. I have occasionally received a pamphlet expressing Mr. Lowrey's views on the subject.
> Mr. HARRISON. It has been suggested, also, that the campaign conducted by Mr. Lowrey was at the instigation of the American Sugar Refining Co.; is that true?
> Mr. ATKINS. It is untrue. One reason why I appear before this committee is to clear that matter up, not only with your committee, but with the whole country. We are opposed to free sugar, for the reasons that are given here. We are, however, desirous of a reduction in the tariff.
> Mr. HARRISON. What is the extent of the interest of the American Sugar Refining Co. in the beet-sugar plants of the United States?
> Mr. ATKINS. We hold not so much as we had at one time. At present I think it is——
> Mr. ATKINS'S SECRETARY. It is given at page 100 of the hearing before the Hardwick committee. Would you like to have it?
> Mr. HARRISON. No; I will not trouble you for that.
> Mr. ATKINS. It was $23,000,000, the par value. It is since somewhat reduced. It is approximately $22,000,000, the par value now. We have disposed of some holdings.

Nor ought it to be overlooked that many years ago the colossal architect of the Sugar Trust, the late Henry O. Havemeyer, testifying before the industrial commission, truly characterized the protective tariff as "the mother of trusts." What position do the various cane refiners take in reference to free sugar? The American or "the trust," controlling 62.39 per cent of the total sugar-refining business (report of sugar committee, p. 16), is opposed to free sugar, undoubtedly largely because of its $22,000,000 interest in the beet-sugar factories. The next largest refiner, the National, producing 10 per cent of the total product (report of sugar committee, p. 15), also opposes free sugar as is evidenced by the statement of its president, James H. Post, to the Ways and Means Committee on January 15, 1913. The reason for the position of the National is quite easy to understand when we recall that it is completely under the control of the trust, since the common stock of the National was declared invalid by the courts (report of sugar committee, p. 15), for the trust now owns a majority of the National's stock. The only two refiners of any size who are independent of the trust, namely, Arbuckle Bros. and the Federal, favor free sugar, Arbuckle Bros. producing 8.7 per cent of the total output of refined sugar, and the Federal, of which Mr. C. A. Spreckels is president, controlling only 6.3 per cent of that output (report of sugar committee, p. 14).

When the exact facts are understood and the comparative size of the great interests who oppose free sugar and of those independents who favor it is realized, all sensible men must and will be disgusted at all this silly twaddle that free sugar is proposed by the Democratic Party in the interest of the trust and of the great refiners of the country. It is the veriest of

nonsense, and the fact that gentlemen who oppose free sugar indulge in it is the strongest possible proof of how hard put they are for real arguments. Before I pass from this question let me say just a few words as a matter of simple justice to two gentlemen who have been most unjustly assailed in this debate and who for some years past have been conspicuous targets for the abuse of almost every man who wishes to keep a protective duty on sugar. I refer to Mr. C. A. Spreckels and to Mr. Frank C. Lowrey, of the Federal Sugar Refining Co. These gentlemen are both strong and forceful advocates of free sugar. They have conducted an open, an aggressive, able propaganda in support of that cause. So far as I have ever heard it suggested by anyone, they have been honorable and open in their methods and have conducted a clean fight, if a hard one. And yet there are gentlemen in this country, and even in this House, who seem to think that while it is perfectly proper for Messrs. Oxnard, Hathaway, Warren, Atkins, Truman Palmer, Ballou, and a host of other gentlemen to conduct as strong a fight as can be made to retain the protective duty on sugar, to their own enrichment, that it is hardly short of crime for Spreckels and Lowrey to contend for free sugar. I can not understand the fairness of such a view. It does not appeal to me. Whatever other gentlemen may say or think, I believe that Mr. Spreckels and Mr. Lowrey have earned and are justly entitled to the gratitude and good will of every American consumer who eats sugar and has a grocery bill to pay.

But, Mr. Chairman, let me attempt to reply to just one or two more of the so-called arguments that are made against free sugar. Its opponents insist that as soon as sugar is put on the free list the refiners will all combine and the domestic beet and cane product having been destroyed will proceed to raise the price of refined sugar to the American consumer. Let us examine this argument. In the first place, as I have already explained, the Louisiana sugar people produce raw sugar, which they sell to the refiners, and are in no competition with the refiners, hence there can be no lessening of competition from that quarter. In the next place, I do not believe that free sugar will have the effect of either destroying or substantially curtailing the production of domestic beet sugar, but if, for the sake of the argument, we assume that it should do so, what rational human being can believe that there is more danger of combination among American refiners when they are subjected to the competition of the refined sugar of the entire world, a total of almost 18,000,000 tons per year, than when they are protected from world competition by a high duty, as now, and have a domestic competitor (in which the largest of the refiners, the trust, has an enormous interest) that produces only a little over half a million tons? Have they more or less inducement and opportunity to combine now or then? I have heard great Republican statesmen concede that one of the dangers of a protective system is a tendency and a temptation for domestic producers to combine to raise prices behind the shelter of a tariff wall, but it has remained for latter-day, and I fear decadent, Republican statesmanship to suggest that one of the tendencies of free trade is to invite a combination among domestic manufacturers. It is too ridiculous a contention to merit further reply.

Mr. Chairman, almost two years ago, while testifying before the House committee on sugar, the head of the Sugar Trust, Mr. Edward F. Atkins, ventured this observation (hearing, p. 167):

> They have never been able to get a reduction of the duties on sugar for this reason. There are 17 States in the Union producing beet sugar. Every one of these States has two Senators. There are 34 Senators, and every one of these Senators is a Republican. * * * They have never had an opportunity to get that reduction down. The probability is that they can not get any reduction now (1911) in the face of such strong opposition as that is.

So, according to the head of the Sugar Trust, in 1911 there were 34 practical reasons why the American people could get no relief from the tax on sugar—just 34. Thanks to a merciful Providence many of these "reasons" have been removed since the day of Mr. Atkins's significant and truthful observation, and I believe that at the other end of the Capitol as well as here we may now hope and believe that the general interests of all the American people are to prevail over the selfish greed of a few large corporations that would like to retain a perpetual license to continue to make huge dividends on watered stocks out of the pockets of the people.

Mr. Chairman, in concluding my remarks, I wish to say that the proposition that the Democratic Party presents to-day is neither new nor novel in this body. In the last Democratic House that ever sat in this Chamber before the Sixty-second Congress the Wilson bill left that door, on its way across this Capitol, with free sugar written in it. It was in the Senate of the United States that the will of the people was defeated and the American consumer denied the relief to which he was so justly entitled.

In the last House of Representatives, the first we had controlled in 16 years, we again sent a free-sugar bill to a Republican Senate only to meet in that body an untimely but not unexpected death. Mr. Atkins's 34 "reasons" were still there.

Before many more days shall elapse this great bill with free sugar written in it will cross to the other side of the Capitol in its triumphant march to passage and approval, and I believe that nowhere in all its schedules is there carried any single reduction or removal of duty in the interest of the American consumer that is more righteous, just, and necessary than in its sugar schedule. Nor has it been very long ago since the great leaders of the Republican Party were proclaiming exactly the same faith that I proclaim to-day. Let me refer you to several instances in which our political adversaries have advocated free sugar.

I read first from the speech of William McKinley, delivered on this floor on May 20, 1890, when that distinguished gentleman presented the McKinley bill:

> I would have preferred, Mr. Chairman, if the article of sugar could have been left in the tariff schedule upon the dutiable list. This, however, was not practicable in the presence of an almost universal sentiment in favor of the removal of the entire duties upon this article of universal family use.

Again, hear the Hon. Nelson Dingley during the same debate on May 10, 1890:

> The duty collected on sugar and molasses the last fiscal year was $55,975,610, or nearly 2 cents per pound. Adding to this the increased cost of 275,000,000 pounds of sugar produced in this country, equivalent to the duty of 2 cents per pound, and the duty imposed on these articles was practically a tax of $63,500,000, or $1 per head, on the people of this country.
>
> Inasmuch as there is scarcely another article of common use not now on the free list which can not be promptly produced or made here nearly or substantially to the extent of our wants, the transfer of sugar and molasses to the free list will afford conspicuous relief to the people of this country.

I next read you from a speech of another distinguished gentleman who had a long and illustrious career in this House. I refer to the Hon. Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois, who on May 20, 1890, said:

> Mr. Chairman, the placing of sugar on the free list will relieve each inhabitant, rich and poor, of $1 per annum of tax, and at least 50 cents of extortion levied by the sugar refiners.
>
> The gentleman from California asks, Why give a bounty to the producers of sugar in the United States? Well, I answer my friend, I am not anxious to give a bounty if you do not want it. My principal anxiety is to place sugar on the free list and relieve the people from this great burden of taxation.

In 1894, when the Senate amended the Wilson bill, the late Senator William B. Allison of Iowa said on June 8, 1894: "If I had my way, I would strike from this bill every vestige which provides a duty on sugar." And yet Republicans of to-day, the few that are left, first at this end of the Capitol and a little later, I suppose, at the other end of the Capitol, denounce this bill as radical, unjust, and indefensible, and assert that in presenting it the Democratic Party is "destroying a great American industry." Like the French Bourbons, these gentlemen seem alike unable to forget anything and to learn anything. Forgetful now, as always, heedless now as always, of the interest of the whole people, they seem utterly unable to comprehend that the days of their power have passed to return no more, because the country sees that they can never learn the meaning of the first test of true statesmanship—"the greatest good to the greatest number."

Mr. Chairman, it is my deliberate judgment after some study of the question that the sugar schedule carried in this bill is a splendid redemption of our election pledge, that so far as it can be done by tariff legislation the Democratic Party will reduce the cost of living, and I believe that in giving this relief to the consumer the Democratic Party plants itself on impregnable ground, as it asserts it will not continue this burdensome tax on one of the great necessities of life.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will ask how the time stands on the two sides?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HEFLIN). There are 30 minutes now due to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] in order to even up the time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to even the time now.

Mr. GARDNER. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand that there are 30 minutes due on that side of the House to make the time even, and I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to use that much time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] used 34 minutes of the 35 minutes allotted to him.

Mr. GARDNER. Before we begin further discussion on the Republican side of the House, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] for his remarks about these

flowers, and I also wish to thank him for his "supreme accolade," as he says was accorded him and his colleagues in the support of this bill. I read in the dictionary that an accolade is a "ceremony or salutation consisting of an embrace or a kiss." I will accept the invitation of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] later in the evening. [Laughter.]

I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I have been interested in the proceedings of the last three or four days, and one thing that I have noted is the calm, placid demeanor and the smiling face of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. He has sat here secure in the thought that no amount of fervid oratory or argument, answerable or unanswerable, could pry from him a single vote, and with this knowledge it is idle for me to voice my protest against this bill, as idle as it was for me to file the several thousand protests against the proposed reduction in the sugar tariff from the farmers that you gentleman on that side of the House love so well, and whom you are protecting and caring for so carefully—protests from the beet growers, from the mechanics who work in and about the factories—the factories not owned and controlled by the Refining Trust—and from the men who make and repair the agricultural implements that are used by the beet farmers; from the small merchants who furnish supplies to the thousands of white laborers—well-paid white laborers—engaged in this industry; and last, but not least, from the home keepers and the housewives in my State who, by grace of the chivalry, the sense of justice, and the intelligence of the men of California, are voters as well as taxpayers. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I realize that these debates, so called, have no bearing whatever on the fate of this tariff bill. The bill was passed, in so far as this House is concerned, when the gavel fell for the last time behind the closed and locked doors of the Democratic secret caucus room.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] said in a very ingenuous way, at the beginning of his well-delivered address the other day, that he did not expect to change a single vote. Why, of course he did not. The gentleman sat in this same secret Democratic caucus, and of course he knew that no vote would be changed. But I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that there was a time in the history of this Nation when within these very walls, and before the days of Cannonism or its successor, the Democratic caucus, men voted their convictions and statesmen by arguments may have changed some votes on measures in this House. But that was long ago. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS], in his speech, read a plank from the Democratic platform, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRINGER] also spoke of a platform pledge of the Progressive Party. The reading of platform pledges seems to be a popular thing, and I want to reread this section from the Democratic Baltimore platform:

> We recognize that our system of tariff taxation is intimately connected with the business of the country, and we favor the ultimate attainment of the principles we advocate by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate business.

THE BEET-SUGAR INDUSTRY.

I wonder if the gentlemen who framed this bill considered the growing of sugar beets a legitimate business.

Is it a legitimate industry in which thousands of laborers find employment during the season in plowing, seeding, thinning, cultivating, irrigating, and harvesting a crop that pays about $2,000,000 for field labor in California annually? There is no other crop grown in a large way that pays so large a per cent of the gross income to the labor that produces it. The proposed reduction of the tariff means, of course, a lower price for the beet grower. It can mean nothing else, but there is absolutely no way by which the grower can reduce the cost of production, which is almost entirely labor. Because of our high percentage of sugar, California could compete with the world if it were not for the high cost of labor. We pay three or four times as much for labor as they do in Germany and France. Beet culture has been a great factor in the reclamation of alkaline lands, and California has thousands of acres of such lands that can be utilized for the growing of sugar beets but are of very little value for other crops. After beets have been grown in such soil for a number of years the alkali is eliminated and the soil is suited for any agricultural purpose. This has been amply demonstrated in many sections of my State.

The citrus-fruit growers of California, many of whom are sturdy pioneers who, in the face of almost insurmountable difficulties, have spent years of toil in reclaiming lands supposed to be arid and valueless; who have spent time and money in bringing from the mountains water that would otherwise run uselessly to the sea; and who by their thrift and pluck have made that portion of America the beauty spot of the world—they believe they are engaged in a legitimate industry.

And yet you gentlemen in your platform promised the people of this Nation not to injure or destroy legitimate business.

I have listened to the debates on both sides of this Chamber, but I want to say that outside of the locked caucus room of the Democratic Party and beyond the walls of this House there is a waiting, expectant audience—the people of this Nation. And they are not waiting to read the academic arguments that are presented here; they are not waiting to hear the well-rounded sentences of these carefully prepared addresses. They are watching and waiting to see the result and the practical effects of this new tariff bill. They are waiting for the redemption of your promise to make lower the cost of living. And let me say to you, gentlemen, that they will not be brushed aside by the hedging statement made on this floor that, of course, they must not expect the benefits of this bill to accrue to them at once. Oh, no; they must not expect that, and they must wait until the big wholesaler, as has been stated on this floor, has unloaded his well-filled warehouses into the smaller warehouses of the retailer, and he in turn has dumped these goods into the homes of the ultimate taxpaying consumers; and then, perhaps, after that time, there may be another excuse offered. And let me say to you that they will not be content to wait one, two, or three years. Your orators and your candidates have gone up and down the length and breadth of this land promising an immediate reduction in the cost of living, and these people are looking to you for the promised relief, and woe betide the party, as your Members have so eloquently said, that fails to keep its promises. [Applause on the Republican side.]

THE CITRUS FRUIT INDUSTRY.

The world's supply of lemons is produced in southern Italy and in California; and Italy has a monopoly in supplying this product to all the countries in Europe, a monopoly in eastern Canada, and until recently it had a complete monopoly in the United States. But when the frost last winter destroyed the greater part of the crop in California the fruit importers' trust in New York took advantage of California's disaster and misfortune and raised the price of lemons immediately a dollar a box. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The duty on citrus fruits has been lowered, apparently, on the theory that the reduction will give the eastern consumer cheaper lemons; at least that is the plea made by the lemon importer and the foreign exporter and those who have been retained by both to secure a reduction in the duty. It is not a difficult task to show the fallacy of this assumption, but the citrus item has a far subtler influence behind it than a reduction in the retail price of lemons. This citrus item has been systematically kept before the eastern people since 1910 by those who have been retained to convince the people that a lower duty means cheaper lemons to the consumer. It has appealed to the voter who formerly lived in Italy. Does any Member of Congress think that the importers of lemons in New York and the exporters of lemons in Palermo are running a charitable institution in the interest of the eastern consumer? The Fruit Importers' Union of New York and the foreign exporters are not institutions of that kind. They are business men who want to be relieved of paying the duty, so that it may not act as a fixed charge against the wholesale price of the fruit. That is the only reason why the importer has been willing to bear the burden of such a campaign. Eleven importers control more than one-half of the lemons imported into the United States, or one-fourth of all the lemons consumed in the United States.

The orange industry in California represents an investment of $150,000,000. Ten thousand farmers are engaged in the culture of the fruit. Twenty thousand laborers are employed directly in the industry. One hundred and twenty-five thousand people depend upon it, directly and indirectly, for a livelihood, and, together with the lemon industry, it is the basis of the stability of the banks, schools, churches, and other institutions in the citrus districts of California. The California orange is the only article of food of general consumption that has decreased in price to the consumer in the last 20 years. The citrus-fruit growers of California ask only that the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad be equalized. They do not ask that the great difference in the cost of transportation be equalized.

A TARIFF COMMISSION.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of a proper downward revision of the tariff that will equalize conditions of competition between the United States and foreign countries, both for the farmer and

the manufacturer, and which shall maintain for labor an adequate standard of living.

I regret that no opportunity will be afforded me to vote upon the separate schedules of the present tariff bill. I believe in the principle of an income tax, but no opportunity will be given me to vote upon this proposition separately, and the ills that will flow from this proposed revision of the tariff will, in my opinion, far outweigh the benefits of an income tax.

I believe that a tariff bill should be based upon scientific principles rather than on the exigencies of a political party that is endeavoring to perpetuate itself as the dominant party in American politics. The Democratic principle of a tariff for revenue only is a theory that would destroy the protective system of this country.

Together with other members of the Progressive Party, I believe that in the drafting of a tariff bill the problem undertaken to be solved should be first understood; that no tariff bill should be framed solely upon the political beliefs or theories of any party, but upon the recommendation after investigation and information of a scientific nonpartisan tariff commission, whose sole duty it should be to best conserve the interests of America as against the world. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I realize how difficult it is to make remarks that may be of any interest at this hour of the night, after you have listened to so many distinguished men; but being a son of parents who crossed the Plains in 1849 and located upon the great Western Plateau, I stand before you to-night to voice my protest as best I can, in my humble way, against the measure which you intend to place upon your statute books and which I believe will destroy practically every industry of the great State of Nevada.

Nevada to-day forms the greatest district, from a congressional standpoint, that there is in this Union. I do not say so with reference to population, but I do say so with reference to area, with reference to possibilities, and especially with reference to infant industries.

What do you propose to do with the wool industry of the great West—practically 2,000,000 sheep? What do you propose to do with our beet-sugar industry of the great Carson-Truckee project, amounting to almost $3,000,000? You propose to destroy it at one fell stroke.

What do you propose to do with the lead mines of the State I have the honor to represent and which came to the front when this Nation was in peril? Ah, you propose to let in the lead from Mexico and South America and to drive the laboring men from the State of Nevada out of work and employment.

What do you propose to do with our zinc mines in that State, I ask you—an infant industry which to-day bids fair to become one of the best there is upon the Pacific coast?

What do you propose to do with our cattlemen? What do you intend to do with our farmers and those people for whom this Government is expending millions of dollars in order to irrigate their lands? Ah, I want to tell you, my friends, that you are striking a deathblow at the very industries in which they are engaged.

I want to say that I know something about the West. I may be uncouth and to some extent unlearned, but I know something of the circumstances that exist there. I see a number of laboring men upon this floor who have come forward on various occasions and at important times in behalf of organized labor. I want to tell you gentlemen that every wind that is wafted eastward across the Pacific Ocean from China and Japan brings to our shores the hum of industry of the Japanese and the Chinese of those countries who are only seeking an opportunity of coming into closer competition with the American workingmen of this country, the American farmers, and the American miners. You know you can not buy a potato to-day—and the gentleman from California who has just preceded me can substantiate this—you can not buy a potato for your little children the price of which is not fixed by the Japanese potato king at Berkeley, in that great educational center. I know whereof I speak, and that is a fact. In the place where I was born and where I played as a boy the cherry trees to-day are in the hands of the little brown men. I do not believe in violating any of our treaties, and I do not mean to inject this as a piece of jingoism, but I do as a warning say to you that I have great admiration for the South, for the manner in which they have been able to uphold the virtue and womanhood of this country and the dignity of the Caucasian race. I am proud of them in that respect; but I want to tell you that I, as an American citizen, am proud that the Republican Party, to which I belong, has ever stood not only to protect the races of one country who have come here, but the races of all countries, but especially the Caucasian race.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. The gentleman can ask all the questions he wants to, but I do not know whether I can answer them or not.

Mr. GORDON. Does the gentleman think the tariff law affects the divorce industry in Nevada?

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. I do not know from what State the gentleman comes. I have been here two years, and I never met the gentleman before. The gentleman has injected himself into several speeches on the floor and perhaps he wants to inject himself into my speech because it will be sent to every voter in my district. I will say that so far as the divorce industry in my State is concerned I have nothing to say against it other than this, that the State of Nevada stands to-day on a par with the State that the gentleman comes from or any State in this Union. I am proud of it. It takes one year to get a divorce in Nevada, and I do not know whether it takes any less in the State the gentleman comes from or not. However, I will venture to say that there are a goodly number of the gentleman's own constituents who have been out there for the purpose of divorce in the past. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, gentlemen, I have got to inject some things into this speech, and I have only a few moments left. I am one of the newcomers and you know we have to beg for time.

Mr. Chairman, of late we have heard so much from the three parties represented upon the floor of this House concerning their ideas on tariff measures that I desire to briefly give my own views, without regard to where the "chips may fall." I am no "hidebound" partisan, as my record shows, but am a protectionist in all that the term implies. I have voiced my sentiments here upon the questions involved on several occasions, and I defy any man of any party to be a stronger protectionist than myself. I am a stronger protectionist to-day than I ever was, and I am proud of it. Some of my esteemed colleagues, longer in service than myself and representing constituents whose very all depends upon the fundamental principles of protection, have practically abandoned those principles because of political expediency and are to-day "dillydallying" with the free traders and the Socialists. Some of them occupy high committee assignments, and their positions demand more of them than mere criticism of those principles which brought them from obscurity into positions of prominence before the American people. The question before the American people to-day is protection or free trade. There can be no halfway ground. I have more regard for an out-and-out free trader than I have for one who would clothe his honest convictions in academic verbiage and "beat around the bush" about a "competitive tariff" and reciprocal talk, which means nothing but an abandonment of the very principles upon which the greatness of our country is based. I like the sound, honest, commonsense judgment of such men as "Uncle JOE FORDNEY," the gentleman from Michigan, clothed in the language of the layman rather than the "high-flown" rhetorical phrases of some of our colleagues, who talk theory and write fiction, and who are wont to paint rainbows in the vernacular of the modern collegian just entering upon public life, and whose words are solely for home consumption.

I have always advocated the establishment of tariff schedules under the guidance and direction of a scientific nonpartisan tariff board, and I trust my good friends on the other side of the aisle, notable among whom are the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and the Speaker of this House, both of whom are on record as favoring that manner of tariff reform, will not take offense when I state that since Congress through its Democratic Members has abandoned that mode of procedure that the Members of this House will be tempted to look out more particularly for the interests of their respective districts than for the general welfare of all the people. We will be forced into the position of using our own judgment based upon the best data available, which, to say the least, is most unsatisfactory. By abolishing the tariff board you have simply gone back to a farcical local proposition wherein each and every locality will, in the very nature of things, look out for itself. In the State I represent there are many industries entirely dependent upon a protective policy of legislation, and the Representative who fails to recognize it and who votes against protection simply votes against the interests of his own people. I can not do so, and I do not believe other Members will do so. We untrained and unscientific men are apt to err in attempting to fix the proper rate of protection without the guidance of a scientific and nonpartisan tariff board, and, besides, we are also apt to be forced into the position of standing in with some one else who wants too much protection in order to see that our

own interests are properly safeguarded. For that reason I dislike the manner now proposed of establishing the various tariff schedules, and for that reason alone have thus protested. No tariff schedule ever yet adopted by Congress has proven satisfactory to all the people, and by the present procedure never will be, nor would perhaps a tariff established by a tariff board be satisfactory to all the people, any more than a verdict of a jury would be acceptable to all the people; but it would at least have some sort of foundation based upon judgment and logic and free from the sectional objections I have heretofore mentioned.

This is the sixth time in the history of our Government when the majority Members of the House have sought to "cut out" the principles of protection. The first five times it signally failed and hard times, disaster, business stagnation, and starvation followed the experiment. If it does not fail this time—and I sincerely trust that it will not, but that marked prosperity will be the result of the legislation of the new administration—I will be agreeably surprised. Inasmuch as you on the other side of this House are certain to pass tariff schedules without regard to the element of protection, I certainly wish you success, for I am no blind partisan, and if the principles you advocate are the ones which will bring the greatest good to the greatest number of our countrymen, then will I, for one, meekly submit to the superiority of your judgment.

The great trouble with tariff making has ever been that the interests of the people as a whole have been disregarded, and certain localities with sufficient "political pull" to get what they desired, regardless of the general welfare of our people, have succeeded in passing tariff measures calculated only for special interests. Whenever any system of tariff revision can be devised whereby favoritism to certain interests and localities will be abandoned and the interests of the whole people cared for, then will I support the measure. That was my reason for supporting a scientific, nonpartisan tariff board.

The Tariff Board, however, for the time being is a thing of the past, and we can only strive to work for the general welfare as best we can, realizing our shortcomings and our weaknesses, as have ever "cropped out" under the present mode of procedure.

Why, gentlemen, when the sugar schedule was up for revision at the last session of Congress my good friends from the State of Louisiana, and though loyal Members of the majority side of this House, came squarely out for the particular interests of their particular section. Other Members of this House have done likewise for their sections, myself among the number. You can not get away from it any more than you can from your own shadow on a sunny day. It is the everlasting bickering, trading, and "back scratching" in the fixing of schedules that I detest. It has been the cause of all our "top-heavy" and "lopsided" tariff schedules since the beginning of this Government.

For some time the political leaders on the majority side of the House have been looking for some term that will designate their doctrine other than tariff for revenue only, and have at last hit upon the euphonious words "competitive tariff." That may suffice for a time, but when the working people of this country find that it means a sort of "free-for-all" competition with all the laboring classes on the face of the earth there will be a sudden change in the designation and some other high-sounding term used. Why not say free trade and be done with it? That is what you mean, but you do not dare come out openly and espouse it. You try to mislead the American people. I am a protectionist, and believe in it, and am not afraid to say so.

You hear much talk about the high cost of living. It is universal. One of the chief causes is the barrier between the consumers and the producers. Our consumers are too far removed from the producers, both by distance and the intervention of middle men. Could the profits of the middle men be eliminated, the cost to the consumer would be lowered and the producer not injured. The farmer, while prosperous, is not getting it all. He is only getting what rightfully belongs to him. He deserves it, and I hope he continues to get the same prices under the present administration. You told him before election times would be better. He voted for you, and now it is up to you to make good. You told him you would give him cheap machinery, cheap farming implements, cheap sewing machines, and all sorts of good and useful utensils for farming. Your promises before election reminded me of "pink pills for pale people"—a veritable panacea for all the ills that flesh is heir to. Of course the farmer will not feel the effects of free foodstuffs from the four corners of the earth. Oh, no; not at all! His cheap implements will offset that. But let me tell you, gentlemen, the farmer will not only get less for his produce, but he will pay just as much for his machinery and implements. The importer and middle men will get the benefit, if anyone does. The stock raiser will doubtless sing your praises for the interest you are taking in him. You will let in the stock and herds from Canada and Mexico and South America and will, besides, bring in free wool from Australia and elsewhere. That will be quite a boon to the sheepmen.

In November of last year the people of the United States gave into the hands of our Democratic brethren the reins of Government, and for the first time in many, many years the three separate and distinct branches of Government are of the same political complexion. Did I say separate and distinct? Yes; and I trust that they will ever remain so; but in these days of strenuous life and political and commercial activity there is far too great a tendency to combine the executive, legislative, and judicial branches into one great semi executive, legislative, and judicial branch and depart far from the fundamental principles upon which this Republic was based. We are moving in the direction of a monarchial form of Government through our failure to maintain the complete independence of the three departments of Government.

Just as long as the consumers of this country clamor for lambs and lamb chops and calves and veal chops and pigs and pigs' feet and squabs on toast will the herds and flocks decimate and the prices of those table foods continue to increase. You can not kill off the young and keep up your herds and flocks. The stock raiser finds more profit in the sale of the young than in the sale of the old, and accordingly the market price for meat continues to soar. The areas of lands suitable for stock raising is diminishing at an alarming rate. Much of the land has been put into forest reserves and considerable of it cut up into small farms for the culture of food cereals, and our population is continually on the increase. In other words, the production does not keep pace with the consumption, and as long as that continues we can not hope for much relief as far as the high cost of living is concerned. Some of you say open our markets to the world and then the consumer can obtain the foodstuffs cheaper. Yes; but what of the producer? It is only of recent years that the farmer has come into his own. He deserves it. His life has been one of hardships and privations, and through his efforts has our Republic flourished and progressed. Take away his profits and you will hit at the bone and sinew of the Nation. Perhaps you gentlemen on the other side of the House will reduce the cost of beefsteak. You told us so before election, and we are willing to be shown, even those of us who do not come from Missouri.

You told us particularly that we were being robbed by giant corporations and that as soon as Congress could get together in extraordinary session the greedy corporation plutocrats would be sent to jail, and that clothes, shoes, boots, underwear, and foodstuffs would come tumbling down, and that the wage of the wage earner would increase, and that the dinner pail he carried under the Republican administration would not half hold the good things he could buy for the same money under your administration.

> But stop and listen; I hear a sound;
> It's the butcher a chasing CHAMP'S dawg around.

And the workingmen. They are breathlessly waiting for that increased wage scale and the corresponding reduction in the necessaries of life. Of course some of them are waiting for pie at the pie counter, but even the price of pie and plums has not been reduced to any perceptible degree. Perhaps that is owing to the increased demand since the inaugural ceremonies. At any rate, brethren, the people have given you full power and authority to do things. We will await your efforts. But if I might venture a guess I will say right here that four years from now you will hear a sound, and it will not be some one "kickin' CHAMP'S dawg around." It will be the sound, steady tread of millions of misled American voters on their way to the polls to repudiate your action in taking away from them the prosperity they are now enjoying.

You have come into power by means of Catalysis, notwithstanding the fact that you have fallen heir to the largest revenues ever known in American history. On March 3, 1913, the balance in the general fund amounted to $149,335,711.78. Your appropriations are increased $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914. Never in American history has there been a more prosperous administration of Government affairs and never before have the opportunities of our citizens been better.

Republican statesmanship and far-sighted wisdom have wedded the Atlantic and the Pacific and brought into closer commercial relations the nations of the entire world; has conserved for prosperity the natural resources of our country; has reclaimed and improved millions of acres of arid lands; has built up a great beet-sugar industry; has protected the farmer and manufacturer along legitimate lines, and leaves you as trustees of the greatest Nation on earth. What will you do to perpetuate our independent sovereignty? Will you down the

industries of this country for experimental purposes? Or will you continue the policies which have made them flourish? Republican statesmanship preserved the Union and extended our domain; has preserved for all time the Monroe doctrine and the liberties of the people of the South American Republics; has built up internal improvements, and preserved through troublous time the Constitution of our fathers—the liberties of 100,000,000 free men.

Republican statesmanship has settled our troubles without as well as within; has increased our revenues, advanced the Nation along lines of progress, and made of our people—cosmopolitan though they be—the most free and independent people on the face of the globe. Our farms are producing as they never produced before; our mines are giving up their wealth to be poured into the channels of trade and commerce; our relations with foreign powers are of a friendly nature; our mills and factories are working overtime; and our working classes are receiving the highest wages on an average ever paid for the same class of work in this country or in any other country. Inventions are coming thick and fast, and the impossible is becoming the possible. Railroads are extending in all directions. Urban and interurban lines connect, and the farmer's produce is carried to market directly from his door. Rural delivery and the pacel post contribute to his success, and the American people are making such advancement and enjoying a prosperity never before known in our history.

And yet, crazed by an overprosperous administration of national affairs and misled by what I believe to be unsound doctrine, systematically and skillfully preached from platform and through the medium of the press, the executive and legislative branches of the Government has been changed, and men whose policies are directly opposite to our views are now in control. We accord to them lofty purposes and high ideals and concede their intelligence, but condemn as unsafe and experimental their doctrine. The prosperity of this country and general good of the people are too important to be trifled with. But the people have willed it; have taken you at your word, and you must "fish or cut bait." It is a case of "you'll be damned if you do and be damned if you don't," but in your deliberations here act the part of men, sound, reasonable, broad-gauged men, and legislate in the light of experience rather than in the dreams of theory. Theoretical doctrine plausibly preached may win votes enough to upset an administration, but it will not clothe the naked and feed the hungry.

My friends of free-trade persuasion on this and the other side of the aisle which separates the majority from the minority, you are responsible to this country for your stewardship. If your policies prove to be all that you claimed for them during the recent campaign, God help us protectionists; if they prove to be otherwise, God help you and save the country. You came into power with an overwhelming majority in the House and a working majority in the Senate. You are all in perfect harmony. A sort of love-feast feeling permeates your caucuses and your deliberations. All, all, is harmony. But stop and listen, you can not hear a sound, everybody's patting the "dawg around."

The leader of the majority, that estimable gentleman from Alabama, Mr UNDERWOOD, has poured Standard Oil upon the troubled waters and doubtless abundant streams of revenue will gush forth. Our Democratic friends from the South and West will consent to free lemons, in the interest of peace and harmony at home and in the interest of the foreign lemon growers abroad. Our friends from Louisiana will give up their protective ideas concerning sugar and will bow to the will of the majority in the interest of harmony, and the Sugar Trust will sing a sweet requiem over the departed spirits of Democratic antagonism.

Just stop and listen—you can't hear a sound—
Everybody's loving each other around.

And, in conclusion, with apologies to the poet of Alabama, the Hon. THOMAS HEFLIN, and in the interests of harmony at home and abroad, I submit the following verses as appropriate for singing at the next Democratic caucus:

Take off the old tariff, let lemons in free;
Look out for the fruit men of old Italee.
Cut out your beet sugar, let it come in free;
Let's do all we can for our friend Germanee.
Take it all off of lumber, and let it in free;
Lend a hand to the axman in old Canadee.
Take it off of rice, and let it come free;
We must not forget John, the heathen Chinee.
Take it off of laces, let cheap goods in free;
It will give better wages to the brown Japanee.
Let in your free boots and shoes; don't you see
It will raise the cheap wages across the blue sea?
Take it all off of everything, let it all come in free;
We must—if we fight for it—have harmonee.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, when I first read the bill as it was introduced in the first instance, it seemed to me that I would desire considerable time in which to discuss both the principles of the bill and the items of the bill, and I feel the same way now. But the time for debate was so limited, and the demand was so great on this side of the House, that I did not feel at liberty to ask preference over those Members who wished to discuss the bill as affecting the interests in their districts.

But, after all, Mr. Chairman, what we say here is of no great interest to the country at large. What we say amounts to little; what we do will be the guide by which the country judges us, and in the main what we do has all been settled by the Democratic caucus. We may talk and talk, but when this bill becomes a law and people know its effects, then they will judge by the results, not by the prophecies.

We believe on our side of the House, chastened perhaps in spirit by defeat, learning somewhat through experience, we believe in a scientific adjustment of the tariff, in the placing of tariff duties based upon information and not upon ignorance. [Applause on the Republican side.] We stand for a tariff commission to learn facts, so that we know when we act in tariff legislation. You, on the other side of the aisle, declare that you know better the facts already than you can learn through a commission to be selected for the purpose of obtaining information. We believe that when your law takes effect the country will learn that you are now ignorant on the subject, and the country will demand a party in power who profited by experience, learned the facts, and based a tariff upon scientific information. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In theory, perhaps, in one sense, we are not so far apart. While you have, on the other side of the aisle, for years talked of a tariff for revenue only, I notice that in the speeches which have been made, and particularly the opening speech in the presentation of this bill to the House, there was little said about tariff for revenue but a great deal said about a competitive tariff. Competitive tariff means what? It either means that our industries are to be protected by tariff duties, so that foreign industries can only meet them in fair competition, or else it means that you propose that our capital and our labor and our factories shall meet the competition of cheap labor from abroad. That you do not dare to acknowledge to the world, you do not dare to acknowledge it in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it has been frequently said on the floor in this debate that nothing which could be said would affect any provision in this bill, and I will be pardoned, after all these speeches of this character if I call attention to some provisions of this bill, and while what I may say may not affect any amendment as to them in the House, yet it will be sure to change the bill in one of its vital particulars before it is sent to the President of the United States for his approval. On page 207 of the bill, subsection 7 of paragraph J of section 3, is this provision:

That a discount of 5 per cent on all duties imposed by this act shall be allowed on such goods, wares, and merchandise as shall be imported in vessels admitted to registration under the laws of the United States.

Presumably that means what is says, and in the report accompanying the bill the majority Members say this, referring to this paragraph:

It is a discrimination in favor of American shipping similar to the provisions of some of the first tariff bills that were enacted by the Congress of the United States. Under like legislation the merchant marine of the United States was encouraged and developed in the early decades of the last century until our merchant marine became the largest carrier of merchandise in the world. We believe that to again discriminate in favor of American shipping will build up our merchant marine and keep at home millions of dollars that are now being paid to foreign vessels to carry the products of our country to foreign markets.

A plain statement that the purpose of this section is to give a discrimination in favor of goods brought in American bottoms to the extent of 5 per cent. In other words, that if goods are brought in American bottoms under the provisions of this paragraph, duties will be not 100 per cent as fixed in the law, but 95 per cent of the duties fixed in the law. There is nothing in the bill there in reference to the treaties. Does this section mean anything? Is it the purpose of the law to have 100 per cent collected in any case? Does the discount apply only to goods brought in American bottoms? I yield for a reply from the other side of the House as to whether this provision will apply to any goods except those brought in American bottoms. Will it or not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield sufficient time I will be very glad to answer the question.

Mr. MANN. I will yield for a yes or no question, and that is all I can yield for. This is a simple proposition. Does it or does it not allow any goods to be brought in other bottoms

than American bottoms to have the discount of 5 per cent? That is a simple proposition. It does not require an explanation. It requires only an answer—yes or no. Yet, under another paragraph of the same bill, we find this provision, being subsection 1 of paragraph J:

J. Subsection 1. That a discriminating duty of 10 per cent ad valorem, in addition to the duties imposed by law, shall be levied, collected, and paid on all goods, wares, or merchandise which shall be imported in vessels not of the United States, or which being the production or manufacture of any foreign country not contiguous to the United States shall come into the United States from such contiguous country.

I read only part of the paragraph. That is existing law—a discriminating duty of 10 per cent against goods brought in foreign bottoms, with this exception that I now read:

But this discriminating duty shall not apply to goods, wares, or merchandise which shall be imported in vessels not of the United States entitled at the time of such importation by treaty or convention or act of Congress to be entered in the ports of the United States on payment of the same duties as shall then be payable on goods, wares, and merchandise imported in vessels of the United States.

In other words, if under the treaties goods brought in foreign bottoms are not entitled to pay only the same rate of duty as goods brought in American bottoms, then they must pay 10 per cent more than the amount fixed in the law. There is a 10 per cent discrimination against goods brought in foreign bottoms which are not entitled to come in at the same rate as goods brought in American bottoms.

Under the provisions of this bill no goods brought in any bottoms can pay 100 per cent of the tariff rates. It is either 95 per cent, the rate fixed here for American bottoms, or else it is 110 per cent, the rate fixed for goods brought in foreign bottoms, which do not enjoy the same rate as goods brought in American bottoms. That is care in making a bill. That was a brilliant thought. The gentleman in charge of this measure took an existing law, passed in the first place many years ago, providing for a discriminating duty of 10 per cent against goods brought in foreign bottoms, so that our country would be enabled to force foreign countries to enter into treaties and conventions with us by which we and our vessels would have the same rights abroad as we were willing to grant here. And, finding that in the law, finding it had been effective, finding it had compelled every foreign country or maritime power to enter into conventions with us providing that goods brought in their vessels should pay the same rate of duty coming here as goods brought in our vessels and goods going abroad in our vessels and entering foreign countries should pay the same rate as goods in their own bottoms—finding that in the law, they then inserted the other provision that all goods brought in American bottoms should only pay 95 per cent, but these treaties that we have made provide also that goods brought in foreign vessels shall pay the same rate of duty as goods brought in American vessels, and if they do not pay the same rate of duty, then they pay 110 per cent of the tariff rate. Is it the intention of the gentleman to administer and hold that this 5 per cent discriminating duty does not apply in favor of foreign vessels? If so, then the discrimination is not 5 per cent, but 15 per cent.

Do the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, having proposed a 5 per cent subsidy, as they thought—and I use the term advisedly—subsidy to American bottoms, intend that they should apply a law to give 15 per cent of the subsidy to American bottoms? I have noticed, Mr. Chairman, in service in the House that it was sometimes well for gentlemen who prepare bills to read them. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] In this case the gentlemen took the law on the statute books and repeated it in the bill without knowing or considering what it meant and added on another provision practically in direct conflict with its terms or what they intended to provide in the second part of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the other side of the House, however, upon one provision in the bill, and that is the antidumping clause, a purely protective measure, intended for protection and nothing else, flying in the face of every statement that they have made in the House about their desire to have goods cheaper for the consumer, a proposition to increase the tariff by protection. We believe in the principle of protection on our side of the House. We welcome a proposition which will prevent the dumping of foreign goods on American soil and driving out American industries and the cheapening of American labor. We would go further than you. You go one step toward protection in your antidumping clause. We are in favor of protecting Americans on American soil, of building homes on American soil, of having men work on American soil, of producing here the things which we use which we consume instead of going abroad and encouraging industries there. Mr. Chairman, when tariff bills are before the House brought by the Republican side of the House the inquiry of the House is, What new industries will be developed, what new manufacturing plants will be located, what new factories will be built, how much will wages be increased, but when a tariff bill is presented from the other side of the House no such inquiry is made.

The people are wondering now what factories will be dismantled, what manufacturing establishments will be closed, how much wages will be reduced, what industries will be destroyed. We leave that to be settled by what comes, hoping on behalf of the country as against party advantage that disaster will not overtake us, that prosperity will continue, but fearing in the light of experience and common knowledge we will again learn the blessings of adversity. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, it is always a pleasure for me to listen to the remarks of the distinguished leader of the Republican Party, but it was peculiarly a pleasure for me to listen to him to-night. Here is a great revenue measure, a reorganization of the financial system of our Government, and the leader of the party that has been in power for the last 16 years, chargeable with the erection of two great tariff bills in the country, sticks in the bark, leaves the substance of the bill alone, and is captious about his criticism of the nonpartisan administrative features of a bill. Why, my friend from Illinois does not know the distinction between for and against. He has overlooked the fact that the provision in paragraph J that he refers to is to protect this country against discrimination by foreign nations, discriminations that are erected by a foreign land, and that section 7 of paragraph J is a discriminating duty given by this country to its own ships and in favor of its own ships. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is not a subsidy, but it is a subvention. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] since I have been a Member of this House voted for a ship subsidy that was a discrimination in favor——

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not yield; I have only 10 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I did not know that the gentleman had any time. I think the gentleman ought to yield, as long as he is making a statement about me.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. MANN. I may vote for a ship-subsidy bill, although I never have done so yet. The gentleman is as accurate about that as he is about other things.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman may not have been here.

Mr. MANN. I was here.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But his party was in favor of the ship subsidy, and that was in favor of American shipping, as this provision is, and there was not one line in that bill repealing the part the gentleman refers to in the present bill. The gentleman from Illinois was unable at that time to discover the fine discrimination he points out to-day. As I said before, the only difficulty with my friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is that he has never been able to discover the distinction between for and against.

But I have one word to say in conclusion. My friends on that side of the House, in either political party that represents the minority, have been chargeable with the tariff legislation of this country for the last 16 years. You sat in the Republican Congresses, or your Representatives did; you occupied the White House, or your Presidents or standard bearers did, and as long as you remained in power you were not willing to confess your own ignorance that you confessed to-day. You wrote the Dingley bill without a tariff board. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You wrote and signed the Payne bill without a tariff board. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It was only when the people of the United States had repudiated you and driven you from power that, on your bended knees, you came before this House and confessed your own ignorance and your own legislative inability to write a revenue measure that was just and honest to the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And, more than that, you plead for a tariff board to-day. I want to challenge you to look into the hearings that were held when this bill was before the Ways and Means Committee and find for me a manufacturer in the wool or cotton or iron and steel schedules that was willing to uphold the Tariff Board appointed by your own party when it came down to the particular schedule in which he was interested. In every instance where they appeared before the committee and they were asked if they agreed with the findings of your Tariff Board they repudiated it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, you are proud of the fact that you write your tariff bills for the great manufacturing interests of the country and not for the people. But those you wrote them for—the manu-

facturing interests of this country—have repudiated the last Tariff Board you appointed. You appointed a tariff commission in 1883. That commission reported in favor of a low tariff, and your Republican Congress, because it did report in favor of a low tariff, repudiated the action of your own commission. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You know as well as I know that if this bill becomes a law, as it will, and stays on the statute books for four years, and you should by some ill fate that may happen to the American people be returned to power, you will never wait for a tariff board to investigate in order to repeal the bill. You would throw a tariff board to the winds and come back in here with your ill-conceived ideas of a tariff revision, and once more walk into your committee and allow the great manufacturing interests of the United States to dictate the terms of the bill to you. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You would do that in the future as you have always done it in the past. I am not surprised that you confess your own ignorance in the writing of a tariff bill and of necessity claim that all others are equally as ignorant. Why should you not be ignorant? You have never attempted to learn the art. It has never been necessary for you to learn the art. When the time came to write the bills you called in the beneficiaries of your acts, the great manufacturers of this country, and they told you how much they wanted and you put it in the bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. CLINE having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3321, a bill to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the permanent RECORD, wherever it appears that I have yielded time to any gentleman, the amount of time shall not be stated.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask that that include everybody.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask that that include not only time yielded by me, but time yielded by everyone.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that wherever it appears that time has been yielded by any person in this debate having control of the time, that the amount of the time shall not be stated.

Mr. GARDNER. In the permanent RECORD.

Mr. MANN. I shall not object, although I would rather have the time yielded to me stated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. SLEMP, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for three days, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, April 29, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 4348) to establish a school of agriculture at the Chilocco Indian School, in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois (by request): A bill (H. R. 4349) to amend the laws relating to patents for designs; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 4350) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare designs and estimates for and report cost of a national archives building in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 4351) to regulate detached service in the line of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4352) to provide old-age pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 4353) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant further extensions of time within which to make final proof on desert-land entries in the county of Grant, State of Washington; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4354) to authorize the board of county commissioners of Okanogan County, Wash., to construct and maintain a bridge across the Okanogan River at or near the town of Malott; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 4355) relating to entries on the public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4356) to authorize the coinage of 3-cent pieces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 4357) to provide for the inspection of any parcel sent by mail which contains fruit, plants, trees, shrubs, nursery stock, grafts, scions, peach, plum, almond, or the pits of other fruits, cotton seed, or vegetables, at point of delivery in any post office of the United States that requests such inspection and where the requisite inspectors are provided by the States to perform such service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 4358) to define the true intent and meaning of section 48 of the act of August 28, 1894, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITHERSPOON: A bill (H. R. 4359) to prevent the desecration of the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILL: A bill (H. R. 4360) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the present post office and site thereof in Jersey City; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 4384) to create an interstate trade commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARDNER: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, relative to an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the practice of polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THACHER: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, relative to an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the practice of polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 4361) granting a pension to Herbert Montgomery; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 4362) granting a pension to Thomas Glynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4363) granting a pension to Lucy A. Wharton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 4364) granting an increase of pension to James B. Wilkinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4365) granting a pension to John H. Opperman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4366) granting a pension to Sarah Hought; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4367) for the relief of Benjamin R. Buffington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4368) for the relief of Henry E. Thomas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4369) granting a pension to George L. Mickle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4370) granting a pension to Emma Holland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4371) granting a pension to Henry Neff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4372) granting a pension to Elizabeth Boetticher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4373) granting a pension to Mary McGregor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4374) granting a pension to Annie E. Farber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4375) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Gish; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4376) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Douglass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4377) granting an increase of pension to Rufus H. Slaymaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4378) granting an increase of pension to John Herndon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4379) granting an increase of pension to Phebe A. Deming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 4380) granting an increase of pension to Edward D. Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 4381) granting an increase of pension to James Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 4382) granting a pension to Odilion C. Shupp; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALLIN: A bill (H. R. 4383) granting an increase of pension to John Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

The SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Alb. Buscher against the income-tax section in House bill 10, relative to mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of Hawaii, against reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of Arthur E. Bisberg, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring an amendment to the income-tax provision taxing mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., against the duty on wheat, oats, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), memorial of the city council of Buffalo, N. Y., against the revision of the tariff schedules affecting milling, packing, and other industries of Buffalo; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN: Memorial of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 4, Cincinnati, Ohio, against admission of cigars free from Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of John A. Miller, Lottie Craig, and William Craig, of West Lafayette; G. C. Parrill and Charles E. Merrick, of Newark; Glenn W. Foster, of Coshocton; George G. Koegler, of Loudonville; and John Mertz, of Smithville, Ohio, against the income-tax section in House bill 10; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNETT: Petition of T. J. Christopher and 3 other citizens of Glass and Boaz, Ala., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of sundry citizens, insurance companies, and other corporations of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Albertype Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the proposed tariff on gelatin-printed pictures, post cards, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the F. Meyer Boots & Shoes Co., Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the removal of the duty on boots and shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Cloak, Suit, and Skirt Manufacturers' Association, Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against placing wool on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. O. Myers, Charles H. Tesch, and 3 other citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the passage of legislation prohibiting the importation of plumes and feathers of wild birds for commercial use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the National Cloak, Suit, and Skirt Manufacturers' Association, of Cleveland, Ohio, against the duty of 35 per cent on finished clothing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of G. B. Desatenk and Henry Schade, against the income-tax section in House bill 10, relative to mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of M. K. Gurtwood and Lillie Ahrens, of New York, N. Y., favoring the clause prohibiting importation of aigrettes, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring an amendment to the income-tax provision taxing mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Adelaide Kemsey and Mary Irwin, of New York, N. Y., against placing bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce of Buffalo, N. Y., against the duty on wheat, oats, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of 26 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Business League of America, Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of House bill 1725, for the enactment of an adequate consular law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against admitting wheat, flour, meats, etc., free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the King Brinsmade Mercantile Co., St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of legislation for the improvement of the railway arbitration law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the W. T. Ferguson Lumber Co., St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of legislation making an appropriation for the continuance of the Commerce Court; to the Committee on Appropriations

Also, petition of the Citizens' Industrial Association, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 2441, exempting labor organizations from the provisions of the Sherman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Wisconsin, favoring an amendment to the income-tax provision taxing mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the National Business League of America, favoring retention in the Consular Service officials of efficiency, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Progressive Party of Hawaii, against the reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANCIS: Petition of sundry citizens of Bellaire, Ohio, against the reduction of duty on glass and glassware; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Cigar Makers' International Union, against free trade with the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rev. B. R. Bulkley and other citizens of Beverly, Mass., favoring repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of sundry citizens of the twenty-third congressional district of New York, against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, of Buffalo, N. Y., against the duty on wheat, oats, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the twenty-third congressional district of New York, against the placing of Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILL: Petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, protesting against including life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of sundry citizens of Watertown, N. Y., protesting against the placing of paper on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the William Wrigley, jr., Co., Chicago, Ill., protesting against the proposed increase of duty on chicle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Cloak, Suit, and Skirt Manufacturers' Association, Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against placing wool on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Business League of America, relative to improving the efficiency of the consular service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Progressive Party of Honolulu, Hawaii, protesting against the removal of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Local No. 15 of the International Brotherhood of Paper Workers, Fulton, N. Y., protesting against the removal of the duty on paper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Oswego Chamber of Commerce, Oswego, N. Y., protesting against any reduction of the duty on car wheels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Charles Matteson, Archibald C. Matteson, William J. Brown, Henry W. Roth, James A. Crum, Louis Swift, Harry F. Miller, and Thomas Ready, Providence, R. I., favoring the passage of legislation exempting life insurance funds from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Arthur Boucher, H. N. Gartier, Holden O. Hill, Frank E. Chafee, John H. Hawbly, Charles Matteson, and Archibald Matteson, Providence, R. I., and Arnold Schaer, Warren, R. I., protesting against including mutual life insurance in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Atlantic Mills, Charles K. Hancock & Co., Mosberg Wrench Co., Brown & Sharpe Co., and Theodore Foster & Bros. Co., Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of legislation exempting labor organizations from the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts (by request): Petition of B. T. Martin and other citizens of Chelsea, West Somerville, Winthrop, and Everett, Mass., favoring repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from payment of tolls, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of E. C. Colman and other citizens of Woburn, Mass., favoring repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of Henry E. Ayres, Thomas J. Sweeney, and other citizens of New York, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Cloak, Suit, and Skirt Manufacturers' Association, Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against placing wool on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' International Union of America, Chicago, Ill., protesting against admitting Philippine tobacco and cigars free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the William Wrigley, jr., Co., Chicago, Ill., protesting against the proposed increase of duty on chicle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of Carrol Lewis Maxey and other citizens of western Massachusetts, favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union favoring passage of legislation relative to the closing of the gates of the Panama Exposition on Sunday; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of the Political Study Club, of Ithaca, N. Y., favoring legislation conferring the right of suffrage on women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Bronston Bros. & Co., of New York, N. Y., relative to the straw-hat industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the George Urban Milling Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., against the duty on wheat, oats, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Primos Chemical Co., of Primos, Pa., against the reduction of the tariff on metal and alloys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Cornell Equal Suffrage Club, of Ithaca, N. Y., favoring an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving women suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 50 citizens of the thirty-seventh congressional district of New York, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of citizens of the thirtieth district of New York, favoring an amendment to the income-tax provision taxing mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting increase of pension to John Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of W. G. Van Name, favoring retention of provision prohibiting the importation of the skins and plumage of certain birds in tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILDER (by request): Petition of Rev. Emanuel C. Charlton and other citizens of Brookfield, C. L. Judkins and other citizens of Barre, and Frederick Foodick and citizens of Fitchburg, all of the State of Massachusetts, favoring the repeal of the clause in Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, of Buffalo, N. Y., against the duty on wheat, oats, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employees of the Moehle Lithographic Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the reduction of the duty on lithographed articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' International Union of America, against free trade with the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the National Business League of America, favoring the retention in the consular service those officials of efficiency, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of sundry citizens of Shelby, N. C., against duty on monzonite and thorium; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *April 29, 1913.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, source of all our longings, hopes, and aspirations, strengthen our arm of faith that we may draw nearer to Thee; be inspired with brighter hopes, a warmer, purer love for Thee and our fellow men; that selfishness may depart, evil cease, and brotherly love prevail; that godliness may enrich the heart, the home, society, the Nation; that the world may be a better dwelling place for all classes and conditions of men, to the glory and honor of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire to correct a statement of mine in the RECORD of yesterday's proceedings, in the closing of the tariff debate. In the crush attendant on the closing of the tariff debate last night I seem to have permitted a lapsus linguæ, or more strictly speaking a "lapsus pencilibus." I spoke of the noble and generous Jane Addams as desiring pensions for all persons. I meant, instead, to refer to the Member from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY], who only yesterday introduced a bill to provide old-age pensions of $10 each for all persons over 65 years.

It was not my desire to criticize either Miss Addams or the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY], but to show that they, in connection with Vice President MARSHALL; former President Roosevelt; the Industrial Workers of the World leader, Bill Haywood; and the food poisoner, Ettor, are all striving—each with different motives—for the great brotherhood of man, but each one setting back this movement thousands of degrees.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF TELEGRAPHS AND TELEPHONES.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a resolution passed by the city council of the city of Tacoma, one of the largest and most populous cities of the State of Washington, on the government ownership of telegraphs and telephones.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] asks unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the paper which he sends to the Clerk's desk. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the resolution referred to:

Resolution 6129.

Whereas the telegraph and telephone are ever-increasing public necessities; and

Whereas these services could be more certainly and more fairly rendered under a system of government ownership of these utilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the city council of the city of Tacoma, That it is the judgment of the council that the time is ripe for the acquisition of these utilities by the Government of the United States, and that the Congress of the United States be urged to take the necessary steps for the establishment of a Federal telegraph and telephone system rendering a local and interstate service like the Post Office Department; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk send copies of this resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Washington.

April 16, 1913. Adopted on roll call: Yeas 5, nays 0, absent 0.

W. W. SEYMOUR, *Mayor.*

Attest:

HOMER H. EDWARDS, *City Clerk.*

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER. Are there any Members here who desire to be sworn in?

Mr. STANLEY and Mr. PATTEN of New York appeared before the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill. By previous order of the House general debate on this bill is concluded, and the Clerk will read the bill for amendment under the rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the day following the passage of this act, except as otherwise specially provided for in this act, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles when imported from any foreign country into the United States or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila) the rates of duty which are by the schedules and paragraphs of the dutiable list of this section prescribed, namely:

DUTIABLE LIST.

Schedule A—Chemicals, oils, and paints.

1. Acids: Boracic acid, ¾ cent per pound; citric acid, 5 cents per pound; formic acid, 1½ cents per pound; gallic acid, 4 cents per pound; lactic acid, 1½ cents per pound; oxalic acid, 2 cents per pound; pyrogallic acid, 10 cents per pound; salicylic acid, 2½ cents per pound; tannic acid and tannin, 4 cents per pound; tartaric acid, 3½ cents per pound; all other acids and acid anhydrides not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

On last Saturday evening, in the few moments of time allotted me, I made some reference to the fact that Thomas Jefferson was a protectionist, and made some quotations from his messages and writings. Yesterday I was asked by gentlemen on both sides of the Chamber if I could give the references. I am very glad to do it.

I read from the History of the Protection Laws, by R. W. Thomson, chapter 14, page 137. The first passage I shall read gives the views of Mr. Thomson himself. He says:

"The discussions which preceded and were called forth by the tariff law of 1816 were not confined to Congress alone, but became general throughout the country on account of the great public satisfaction felt at the result. Mr. Jefferson was then in retirement at his home in Virginia, but his interest in matters concerning the general welfare was not abated on account of his declining years, as is shown by his celebrated letter, written in 1816, to Benjamin Austin, wherein he professed himself as continuing to be the earnest friend of the protective system. His observations and experience had thoroughly matured his judgment, and the occasion enabled him to reaffirm the principles he had avowed during his Presidency. In this letter he said:

"'Compare the present state of things with that of 1785, and say whether an opinion founded in the circumstances of that day can be fairly applied to those of the present. We have experienced what we then did not believe—that there exists both profligacy and power to exclude us from the field of interchange with other nations; that to be independent for the comforts of life we must fabricate them for ourselves. We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturist. The former question is suppressed, or, rather, assumes a new form. The grand inquiry is now, Shall we make our own comforts, or go without them at the will of another nation? He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufactures must be for reducing us either to a dependence on that nation or be clothed in skins and to live like wild beasts in dens and caverns. I am proud to say I am not of them. Experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort, and if those who quote me as of different opinion will keep pace with me in purchasing nothing foreign where an equivalent of domestic fabric can be obtained, without regard to any difference of price, it will not be our fault if we do not have a supply at home equal to our demand, and wrest that weapon of distress from the hand that has so long wantonly violated it.'

"So thoroughly imbued was Mr. Jefferson's mind with these sentiments and so ardent was he in his friendship for the system of protection that during the next year, 1817, he substantially repeated them in another letter written to Mr. William Simpson, who had forwarded to him a pamphlet wherein protection to home manufactures was advocated. He then said:

"'I have read with great satisfaction the eloquent pamphlet you were so kind as to send to me, and sympathize with every line of it. I was once a doubter whether the labor of the cultivator, aided by the creative power of the earth itself, could not produce more than that of the manufacturer alone and unassisted by the dead subject on which he acted; in other words, whether the more we could bring into action of the energies of our boundless territory in addition to the labor of our citizens the more would be our gain. But the inventions of the later times by labor-saving machines do now as much for the manufacturer as the earth for the cultivator. Experience, too, has proved that mine was but half the question. The other half is whether dollars and cents are to be weighed in the scale against real independence. The question is then solved, at least as far as respects our wants.

"'I much fear the effects on our infant establishments (manufactures) of the policy avowed by Mr. Brougham and quoted in the pamphlet. Individual British merchants may lose by the late immense importations, but British commerce and manufactures in the mass will gain by beating down the competition of ours in our own markets.'"

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that Washington, John Adams, Jefferson, James Monroe, James Madison, Andrew Jackson, and James Buchanan were all protectionists. John C. Calhoun at first was also a protectionist, but in later years was a free trader. But I have no hesitancy in saying that if John C. Calhoun were living to-day he would be a protectionist.

I want to add that in the first instance Daniel Webster was a free trader, but after the tariff act of 1824 and from that time on to his dying day he was a protectionist.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks quotations from the annual messages and writings of those and other distinguished statesmen to show that they were protectionists.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the matters indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The messages and writings referred to are as follows:

FIRST PROTECTION PERIOD—1789 TO 1816.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. The first subject discussed by the First Congress was the tariff question, and from that day to this it has been the one subject that has never been finally settled. Many subjects of great national importance have been discussed and settled in the intervening years, but the tariff was never a more live and inspiring question than it is at this very hour.

It is well known that the first thing to be done by the First Congress was to regulate the form of the oath to be taken by officials and that it was merely formal, but the first act of that Congress affecting the country was the act establishing a protective tariff, passed and signed by George Washington July 4, 1789.

The discussion lasted for a long period of time, and was participated in by some of the most eminent men of the day, and I am glad to say that as a result of their deliberations they passed a tariff act in the interest of protection and not for "revenue only," for in the preamble to the act occurred these words:

"Whereas it is necessary for the support for the Government, for the discharge of the debt of the United States, and for the encouragement and protection of manufacturers that duties be laid on imported goods, etc.: Therefore be it enacted," and so forth.

It may be remarked in passing that a large majority of that First Congress were farmers, but they saw the necessity of encouraging and protecting manufacturers. Why? In order that they might be free from servile and dangerous dependence upon foreign nations for the arms, the implements of farming, and other machinery needed for their safety, protection, and independence, as have been pointed out by Charles Carroll, Rufus King, Fisher Ames, James Madison, and other great characters that participated in those deliberations.

It will thus be seen that the doctrine of protection to home manufactures—to home products—was coevil with our national organization. It had its enemies then as now, and ever will have, many of them being made up from the importer, the foreigner, and those who symphatize with them, preferring to encourage manufactures, capital, and labor abroad rather than in this country; but of all the men who took a prominent part in the legislation of that hour and made the Revolution a success, and the men who formulated our glorious and splendid Constitution and secured its adoption by the several States, all these voted

for the protective tariff bill and rejoiced when it became a law, as men do in this day and age who want to encourage home industries, encourage the farmer, and see that the laborer is given a fair wage six days in the week.

OPINIONS OF PRESIDENTS AND OTHERS.

It will be interesting to recall that five of these leading men became President while the law of 1789 remained on our statute book, and it may be interesting as well as profitable to know what these great men thought of protection to home manufactures.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

In his first annual message, speaking of our Nation as "A free people," he said: "Their safety and interest require that they promote such manufactures as tend to render them independent of others for essentials, particularly military supplies."

In his seventh annual message he shows that "our agriculture, commerce, and manufactures prosper beyond examples," under the tariff law of 1789. "Every part of the Union displays indications of rapid and various improvement and with burden so light as scarcely to be perceived. Is it too much to say that our country exhibits a spectacle of national happiness never surpassed if ever before equaled?"

Was not this a splendid tribute by the Father of our Country to the first protective tariff act?

In his eighth and last annual message, Washington said: "Congress has repeatedly, and not without success, directed their attention to the encouragement of manufactures. The object is of too much consequence not to insure a continuance of their efforts in every way which shall appear eligible."

JOHN ADAMS.

Our second President, in his last annual message, referred to our economic system and congratulated the country upon the great prosperity then existing, and added: "I observe with much satisfaction that the product of the revenue during the present year has been more considerable than during any former period.

"This result affords conclusive evidence of the great resources of the country and of the wisdom and efficiency of the measures which have been adopted by Congress for the protection of commerce and preservation of the public credit."

THOMAS JEFFERSON.

I have already quoted at some length from Thomas Jefferson, our third President, but I want to add the following. In the message sent to Congress by Jefferson on December 15, 1802, he gives approval to the protection of manufactures in the following language:

"To cultivate peace, maintain commerce and navigation, and protect manufactures adapted to our circumstances, etc., are the landmarks by which to guide ourselves in all our relations."

Thomas Jefferson was one of the great defenders of the American system.

In 1809 he wrote to Thomas Leiper, of Philadelphia, as follows:

"I have lately inculcated the encouragement of manufactures to the extent of our own consumption, at least in all articles of which we raise the raw material. On this the Federal papers and meetings have sounded the alarm of the Chinese policy, destruction of commerce, etc. This absurd hue and cry has contributed much to federalize New England; their doctrine goes to the sacrificing agriculture and manufactures to commerce, to the calling all our people from the interior country to a seashore to turn merchants, and to convert this great agricultural country into a city of Amsterdam. But I trust the good sense of our country will see that its greatest prosperity depends on a due balance between agriculture, manufactures, and commerce."

JAMES MADISON.

Our fourth President, recognized as "the father of the Constitution," in a special message to Congress May 23, 1809, said: "It will be worthy of the just and provident care of Congress to make such further alterations in the laws as will more especially protect and foster the several branches of manufacture which have been recently instituted or extended by the laudable exertions of our citizens."

Again, in a special message, February 20, 1815, Mr. Madison said: "But there is no subject that can enter with greater force and merit into the deliberations of Congress than a consideration of the means to preserve and promote the manufactures which have sprung into existence and obtained an unparalleled maturity throughout the United States during the period of the European wars. This source of national independence and wealth I anxiously recommend, therefore, to the prompt and constant guardianship of Congress."

JAMES MONROE.

Our fifth President, in his inaugural, said: "Our manufacturers will likewise require the systematic and fostering care of the Government. Possessing as we do all the raw materials, the fruit of our own soil and industry, we ought not to depend, in the degree we have done, on supplies from other countries. Equally important is it to provide at home a market for our raw materials, as by extending the competition it will enhance the price and protect the cultivator against the casualties incident to foreign market."

In his seventh annual message he says: "Having formerly communicated my views to Congress respecting the encouragement which ought to be given to our manufactures and the principles on which it should be founded, I have only to add that those views remain unchanged. I recommend a review of the tariff for the purpose of affording such additional protection to those articles which we are prepared to manufacture or which are more immediately connected with the defense and independence of the country."

Here you have the views in brief of our first five Presidents and the foremost men of the years in which the tariff act of 1789 was a law.

Do you find any hint of dissatisfaction with protection, any suggestion of a repeal of the law which had wrought such wonders, or any intimation of a modification of the tariff law, except to give them prompt and constant guardianship and consideration and "additional protection to those articles we are prepared to manufacture"?

BENEFITS OF THE TARIFF OF 1789.

I can not refrain from saying a word respecting the glorious results of the first protective tariff act, for agriculture admittedly became more extensive and prosperous, our commerce increased with wonderful rapidity; old industries were revived, as they always are under a protective policy; new ones were built up and established in various parts of the country; our merchant navy was revived and multiplied and all branches of domestic trade were prosperous; our revenue, always an important consideration, soon became sufficient to pay the expenses of the Government and give relief to its creditors; the people again became contented, happy, and industrious, as they have been during the years since the passage of protective laws, beginning in 1897, under the administration of President McKinley, and the whole country seemed to be and was on the high road to great national wealth and prosperity.

There is still another great national character, often spoken of as a patron saint of the Democratic Party, who expressed his views when a United States Senator, in 1824, as follows—what he said very forcibly indicates that he was a strong advocate and supporter of protection:

ANDREW JACKSON.

"Providence," said he, "has filled our mountains and our plains with minerals—with lead, iron, and copper—and given us a climate and soil for the growing of hemp and wool. These being the greatest materials of our national defense, they ought to have extended to them adequate and fair protection, that our manufacturers and laborers may be placed in a fair competition with those of Europe and that we may have within our country a supply of those leading and important articles so essential in war. We have been too long subject to the policy of British merchants. It is time we should become a little more Americanized, and, instead of feeding the paupers and laborers of England, feed our own, or else in a short time by continuing our present policy—that under the tariff of 1816—we shall all be rendered paupers ourselves. It is my opinion, therefore, that a careful and judicious tariff is much wanted."

Hear what President Andrew Jackson said in his annual message, in December, 1832, concerning the results and benefits of eight years of protection under the tariffs of 1824 and 1828: "Our country presents on every side marks of prosperity and happiness unequaled perhaps in any other portion of the world."

I think it will be conceded that the paramount question for a national constitution was demanded by the people of the country because under the Confederation we could not shield our "home industries from the assaults of foreign competition through the regulation of commerce with other nations so as to check or to prohibit the importation of commodities that interfered with the growth and prosperity of domestic manufacturers and so as to give native productions an impetus which would develop all the resources inherent within the boundaries of the Nation essential for the supply and consumption of the population at all times. No fact is more securely established than is this."

DANIEL WEBSTER.

Daniel Webster, historically known as "the Great Expounder of the Constitution," in a speech at Buffalo June, 1833, declared:

"The protection of American labor against the injurious competition of foreign labor, so far at least as respects general handicraft productions, is known historically to have been one end designed to be obtained by establishing the Constitution."

Years later Mr. Webster repeated this idea, but much clearer and stronger, in a speech at Albany in August, 1844, when he said:

"In colonial times, and during the time of the convention, the idea was held up that domestic industry could not prosper, manufactures and the mechanic arts could not advance, the condition of the common country could not be carried up to any considerable elevation, unless there should be one government to lay one rate of duty upon imports throughout the Union, regard to be had in laying this duty to the protection of American labor and industry.

"I defy the man in any degree conversant with the history, in any degree acquainted with the annals of this country from 1787 to 1789, when the Constitution was adopted, to say that protection of American labor and industry was not a leading, I might almost say the leading, motive, South as well as North, for the formation of the new Government. Without that provision in the Constitution it never could have been adopted."

I will conclude as to Webster's views upon the subject of protection by quoting what he said respecting the condition of the country that had been realized through the tariffs of 1824 and 1828:

"The relief to the country attained through these tariffs of 1824 and 1828 was profound and general, reaching all classes—the farmer, the manufacturer, the shipowner, the mechanic, and the day laborer. The change was as great as was wrought when Hamilton smote the rock of public credit and abundant streams of revenue gushed forth."

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

President John Quincy Adams, who succeeded Mr. Monroe, was also a strong friend of protection, and in his fourth annual message discusses at some length our agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing interests, and shows that "all these interests are alike under the protecting power of the legislative authority," and proceeds to make himself clear and explicit in his defense of the principles of protection.

JOHN C. CALHOUN.

It was in 1816 that John C. Calhoun made a strong speech in favor of the protective tariff, in which he said: "When our manufacturers are grown to a certain perfection, as they will under the fostering care of the Government, the farmer will find a ready market for his surplus product, and what is of almost equal importance, a certain and cheap supply of all his wants. His prosperity will diffuse itself to every class in the community. It," a protective tariff, "is calculated to bind together more closely our widespread Republic and give greater nerve to the arm of the Government."

Mr. Calhoun continued to be a protectionist until 1832, when he became a free trader; but with all his commanding ability he was never able to answer his own arguments made as a protectionist.

How can anyone read the utterances of these great men and eminent statesmen, well knowing what protection has done for this country during the last 50 years—developing the most marvelous growth of all nations—without frankly acknowledging that if we are to continue to prosper in the future as we have in the past we need and must have a fair share and measure of protection and not any "tariff for revenue" or "free-trade policy," which during every period that it has been tried in our country's history has proven ruinous and disastrous?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be understood at the beginning that leave has already been granted, and there is no occasion to delay the House in its proceedings by requesting it further.

I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, in answer to what the gentleman has said, that I am anxious to get along with the bill, and I do not want to unduly cut off debate, but I hope gentlemen will confine themselves within the rules to the paragraphs before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. MURDOCK. I rise to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, to ask of the gentleman who has charge of the schedule [Mr. HARRISON of New York] a question concerning boracic acid. Under the Payne law borax bears a duty of 2 cents a pound. In this bill it is placed on the free list. Boracic acid, which bore a duty of 3 cents a pound under the Wilson bill, 5 cents under the Dingley tariff, and 3 cents a pound under the Payne tariff, has now been reduced to three-quarters of a cent a pound. I should like to ask the gentleman in charge of the schedule what was the underlying philosophy in making that reduction. How was the rate arrived at?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Does the gentleman from Kansas maintain that the reduction on boracic acid is too severe?

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not know. I am trying to find out.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas that the rates of duty as they existed under the Payne law were entirely illogical. The duties that were laid upon the raw material, borax, were laid really for the purpose of making the people in the East pay the freight rates across the continent from the Pacific coast borax mines, and they were not properly balanced in that law with the rates on boracic acid, which is made of borax, and when we put the raw material, crude borates, upon the free list, we made what we thought to be a proper cut in the rates of duty upon boracic acid—to three-quarters of a cent a pound, which is about 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MURDOCK. The old duty on borax, as I understand it, went on away back in the Wilson bill.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I just wanted to know why it was fixed at three-fourths of a cent; why not seven-eighths? How do you arrive at that exact figure? What is the philosophy under which a duty of that kind is laid?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas that, in considering every one of the rates in so technical a schedule as Schedule A, regard must be had to the uses to which the different articles are put, to the rates of duty, if any, upon the raw materials, and many other considerations. That is one of the arguments against revision schedule by schedule; that you can not properly balance your tariff rates. Boracic acid is very largely used in manufacturing, in fluxes, in making glass, and so on, and due regard is had for the consumers of the acid as well as for the basis on which the duty on the raw material is fixed.

Mr. MURDOCK. I see you estimate that there will be an importation of 600,000 pounds under this reduction.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is virtually the same importation that took place under the Dingley law in 1905.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, when the chemical-schedule bill was before the House a year ago it included an item, "benzoic acid, 5 cents a pound." I offered an amendment to restore benzoic acid to the free list, where it is now under the Payne law. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] then declined to accept any proposition to make the rate of duty lower than 5 cents a pound or to put it where it is now, on the free list; but I notice that this item does not carry benzoic acid at 5 cents a pound. So it may be assumed that the arguments then presented, which had no influence upon the committee or the House at that time, have since then sunk deep into the minds of the gentlemen who prepared the bill.

In the bill last year phthalic acid was also on the dutiable list at 5 cents a pound. It is now on the free list. I called attention at that time to the fact, in offering an amendment to restore phthalic acid to the free list, that phthalic acid was used largely in the manufacture of chemical compounds and medicinal preparations. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], who had prepared the bill, denied that statement and said that phthalic acid was used only in the manufacture, I believe, of high-priced coal-tar products. Yet now the gentleman has permitted the information then offered to sink deep into his mind and he leaves phthalic acid off the dutiable list and puts it back on the free list, where we proposed to put it at that time.

In the course of that debate the gentleman insisted that phthalic acid was used for one purpose and I insisted that phthalic acid, in the main, was used for another purpose, and I made this remark:

> The situation, however, illustrates the need of having a tariff board to give us accurate information in reference to these matters before we endeavor to enact tariff legislation.

It is true that we have had no tariff board to report upon this since the bill was before the House last year, but even the information furnished in the House at that time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] has caused him to recede from his position. Last year he knew that phthalic acid ought to go on the dutiable list at 5 cents a pound, while it is now on the free list.

But in the light of information then furnished to him he now restores phthalic acid to the free list. If we had a tariff commission to furnish information, the gentleman would not have made the mistake in the first place as to this item, and would undoubtedly be able to correct many errors in this bill as to other items. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I would like first to answer the observation of the gentleman from Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The gentleman from Illinois is under a complete misapprehension as to the motives which induced the committee last year to place a tax on various articles and then this year restoring them to the free list. I do not deny that the gentleman from Illinois is an exceedingly well-informed and industrious Member of the House, but I do deny that, like the simple little ostrich, he knows it all. He does not know apparently the reasons that actuated Democrats in laying taxes. Our motives are entirely for raising revenue, and he looks at the matter from an entirely different point of view.

Last year when we brought in Schedule A we were revising the tariff schedule by schedule, and personally I have been opposed to that method of tariff making, because it is impossible to consider one schedule of the tariff without considering at the same time the effect it has upon other schedules. It is impossible in a schedule-by-schedule revision to make what reductions the committee may desire to make, because it produces inconsistencies in other schedules subsequently to come.

When we made our report on Schedule A last year, we had to sacrifice a great deal of revenue in other schedules that theretofore had passed through the House, and the endeavor was made in Schedule A to collect revenues sacrificed in other places. Consequently a number of taxes were laid by the committee on articles that had theretofore been on the free list, and which for the most part were noncompetitive; that is to say, they were chiefly produced in foreign countries, and therefore there was no question of protection connected with them. The gentleman from Illinois, as far as benzoic acid is concerned, is in error again. It has gone into the basket clause at a duty of 15 per cent.

Mr. MANN. Which amounts to about 2½ cents a pound.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Making it a proper balance with benzoate of soda that has gone into this bill at 5 cents a pound.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. With pleasure.

Mr. MOORE. In Schedule A it is apparent that a very large number of articles have been made dutiable that were hitherto free. Very many persons have been under the impression, because of what they believe to be the Democratic policy, that there was an error on the part of the Ways and Means Committee in placing raw materials on the dutiable list. I would like to ask whether the gentleman is ready to answer if the committee made an error in placing raw materials on the free list, or whether it was intentional?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say that so far as I am aware there are no errors in this schedule or elsewhere in the bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This was intentional. I will say to the gentleman that if he will study Schedule A as reported now and as reported last year, he will see that since we are now able to complete a whole tariff bill we have not had to resort to sources to collect revenue that we did when we were proceeding schedule by schedule. Consequently we have been able to restore to the free list $25,000,000 worth of imports upon which we had proposed to levy a tax.

Mr. MOORE. It may save time in offering amendments if we understand and the committee thoroughly understands that it did put raw materials on the dutiable list and that there was no error about it.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Unfortunately we did not have the benefit of the presence of the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the committee at that time. In spite of that these things were not entirely an error. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. I call this matter to the attention of the gentleman now, because the committee has changed its policy with regard to raw materials and has now put many of them on the dutiable list. Is it not true that on page 35 of the report, in a table presented by the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee, it appears that the committee hopes to raise by a transfer of raw materials from the free list to the dutiable list a total revenue of $102,000,000?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have not the figures before me, but of course I accept the gentleman's statement.

Mr. MOORE. Then there has been a change of policy in that in this bill the majority has decided to tax raw materials which enter into the manufactures in this country.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, if I have any time I would like to briefly reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important question.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for three minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I regret to say that I shall have to object to that, as we have to run this bill under the five-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Egg albumen, 3 cents per pound.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Last year when the chemical schedule bill was before the House, introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], but I suppose properly referred to in one sense as the Harrison bill, it provided for a tax on albumen at 6 cents per pound, the present rate being 3 cents per pound. I offered an amendment to restore albumen to the dutiable list at 3 cents a pound—the existing law—and to not increase it to 6 cents a pound. My distinguished friend from New York strenuously opposed the amendment, and it was defeated, of course, as all amendments we will offer here will be defeated; but yet in the light of the information furnished on the subject this year when the bill comes in it contains the provisions of the amendment which I offered in the House last year, which the gentleman then declined to accept.

I suppose the same excuse will be given now that was given in reference to acids—that in making up a special bill for a special schedule gentlemen found necessity for raising revenue, while in making up the whole bill at once they do not find that necessity. That is a very flimsy excuse. If it was right to put albumen on the dutiable list at 6 cents a pound a year ago, it is right now. It again illustrates the need of information in making up a tariff schedule, information which the committee did not then have and probably would not have had now if we had not called their attention to it last year so that they have looked it up, while if we had had a tariff commission we would have had the information. That is what we stand for over here—information, not ignorance, in making up a tariff bill.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN. What necessity have we for a tariff commission with such an energetic Member the leader of the majority-minority side?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ALLEN] acknowledges he knows nothing about the subject, and does only what he is told by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], we do not assume that all information is contained within the skull of either the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] or the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], or both combined, and I might say also, including that of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ALLEN], though I do not think he would add much to the information. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, opposing the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], of course we all know that our friend from Illinois, the distinguished leader of the opposition, is always right; at least, is always right in his own opinion; but your committee does not suffer from this peculiar disease. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] We know that we are human and that any committee that drafts a revenue bill, except a Republican committee, is likely to make mistakes at times. This committee, if it makes a mistake, is perfectly willing to come out here on the floor of the House at any time and say so and make a correction for the good of the country. I do not know, I am not willing to say, that we made any mistakes in these particular items last year; that is, any mistake in the way of a serious mistake. This schedule is a very involved schedule and a very technical one. Last year we were endeavoring to make these various schedules as we were amending the tariff bill, schedule by schedule, produce in the neighborhood of as much revenue as the present law produces, and at the same time reduce the rates for the benefit of the American people.

Of course, amending the bill schedule by schedule and attempting to make each schedule balance the revenue we were handicapped to that extent in properly adjusting our rate. This year,

when we had the opportunity to write a large portion of the taxes of the country against the great wealth of the United States, we have not suffered from the same trouble. We have got a full bill. We can get our revenue from any schedule or any portion of the bill, and necessarily we have made a number of changes.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not right now. We have made these changes, particularly the changes the gentlemen have referred to, because we no longer needed the revenue from this schedule and could place it somewhere else; but I am free to say that so far as this committee is concerned, or this end of the committee is concerned, we do not bring the bill before the country with the cocksureness of the Republican committees in the past, who had learned their lesson from the protected manufacturers and who always claimed upon the floor of this House that everybody else was ignorant and that they were always right. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I say to the gentleman from Illinois that we do not propose to let you write this bill, because it is our business and we are responsible to the country; but should information come, even from the gentleman from Illinois, this committee will welcome it most gladly, and if we think you are right we will accept it.

Mr. MANN. Next year.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Committee on Ways and Means in the last Congress went before the country with the statement that the only scientific way in which a tariff bill could be enacted was schedule by schedule. They led the country to believe that if a tariff bill was reported as a whole an amount of logrolling could be engaged in between Members of Congress which would enable them to secure a sufficient number of votes for schedules in which Members did not believe, in order that they might get the things they wanted in the schedules in which they did believe, and so they led the country to believe, or tried to do so, that this was an iniquitous way to enact tariff legislation. Now when they are in complete control of the Government they come to Congress with a bill which does the thing which they said should not be done. They engage in secret conclaves and drive every man into line for every item in every paragraph in this bill, regardless of whether he thinks it is just or not, and now give us to understand that they can not properly balance the rates in the tariff schedules and regulate the income in separate bills, but that in order to harmonize the revenue with the rates and do no injustice to any interest—and at the same time not lose any votes—they now bring a bill in with all the schedules tied together. The American people believed what the Democrats said before the election, when they said the thing to do was to pass tariff legislation schedule by schedule, where no combinations could be made to secure votes for any item in the schedule that did not have merit in it, and a great many of the people voted for the Democratic Party because they believed what they said, and now they are proceeding to prove to the people that they did not mean what they said by coming to the House with a bill that in many particulars is iniquitous and with every Democrat in the House bucked and gagged to vote for it whether right or wrong.

I am very glad they do this, because it is what they always do whenever they get into power, and the people might as well know early in these proceedings that whenever Democrats gain power they will always be certain to do the wrong thing. Tariff legislation should be passed upon its merits. Every schedule should be submitted separately. If that were done, many men here, regardless of politics, would vote for many of the schedules suggested regardless of who suggested the schedules.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. HARDWICK. Did the gentleman participate in the Republican caucus that considered the Payne bill?

Mr. MADDEN. No; there was no caucus.

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, what did you call it—a conference?

Mr. MADDEN. No; there was neither a conference nor a caucus. It was considered on the floor of the House in the open light of day and every man in the United States could see what was being done without glasses.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is it not true that the Republican side of the House was so gagged and bound at that time that a caucus was not necessary? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I would just like to have time to say one word. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] always tries to be spectacular, regardless of whether there is any merit in what he has to say or not.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin will be heard in opposition to the motion to strike out the last two words.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, in reference to what has just been said, I wish to say I agree with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] that during the consideration of the Payne bill the House was bound by a gag rule and bound in exactly the same way that the Democratic majority to-day is bound by a caucus rule, and there is no difference. Now, Mr. Chairman, the purpose for which I rose was in reference to a statement made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that even now, at this time, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] should be able to furnish to the Democratic side information that some mistake had been made or that they had been wrong in some particular with reference to this bill, that even at this time they were willing to correct the mistake; and I would like, and I know this side would like, and the country would like, a little further explanation from the gentleman from Alabama with regard to that question. It is the understanding of this side, it is the understanding of the country, that the Democratic side has in caucus settled the fate of this bill; that you are not at liberty to vote for a single amendment, however meritorious, that may be proposed to this bill. And I want to ask the gentleman from Alabama now whether, if amendments are proposed upon this side that appeal to his judgment, that appeal to the judgment of the Democratic side of this aisle, whether they are now at liberty to vote for those amendments or whether it will be necessary before they shall be at liberty to do so to take this bill back again into secret caucus and pass upon the proposition?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman yield? My time has expired, and I did not propose to extend any time.

Mr. LENROOT. I will yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman candidly that this side is responsible to the country and that that side of the House has been repudiated by the country. This side of the House has been commissioned to write this bill. In a free and open and ungagged caucus we have written the bill that we present to the country as a bill of this side of the House. We are responsible for it, and the country does not expect you to legislate.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman answer this question? He did state to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that even at this time they were willing to correct the bill if it was wrong in some particular; and I want to ask the gentleman whether he is willing, if an amendment is proposed that appeals to his judgment, or appeals to the judgment of Members on that side of the aisle, whether they are at liberty to vote for the amendment, or whether his statement to the gentleman from Illinois was correct or not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will yield, I will make the statement to him.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Ways and Means Committee of the House has been authorized fully to offer such amendments as they see proper. I do not expect that side of the House to show us any mistakes in the bill, because they confess their ignorance, and say they need a tariff commission to advise them. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But I will say to the gentleman that we are perfectly prepared and able, if an error is presented to us that appeals to our judgment, to lay it before the House at any time during this debate, coming from the Ways and Means Committee, who are the agents of this side of the House, and the House will have an opportunity to vote on it. But I would have to be shown before I yielded to the amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. If an amendment, then, is presented which appeals to a Democrat who is not a member of the Ways and Means Committee, is he at liberty to vote for it?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. He has appointed his agents, and his agents are acting for him. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Chairman, the majority leader [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has just stated "that his party has framed the tariff bill and is responsible to the country for it," and "that the country has repudiated that side of the House," meaning by that to convey the idea that all except the Democrats have been repudiated.

The majority leader has been a Member of Congress a long time. He is now a great leader. Under all conditions he is courteous and considerate, both to his supporters and to those who work from a different viewpoint and in opposition to him. With his party in power and backing him, he can easily push forward to accomplish the results that he fights for. He

is really a great man, and I gladly acknowledge my respects, but I differ with him on the methods that should be adopted in the administration of the Government. He believes that the Nation should be governed by a party. That, in my judgment, is wrong. The party is always smaller than the Nation and should not dominate the Nation. And yet party government is the "nominal" form that has been practiced for a long time. But I am certain that the self-interest of the people, as well as national pride, once the people realize how much party government robs them of their rights, will repudiate any party that usurps the national powers and sets itself up as responsible and prevents the people's representatives generally from effectively performing their duties.

The Nation most certainly should govern itself, because that is the fundamental basis on which it is organized. That is why I arose to criticize the statement of the majority leader. He has no right to say that the Democratic Party is alone responsible for legislation, nor that those Members who are not Democrats have been repudiated.

No person holding a seat in Congress has been repudiated. Every Member has a constituency, and could not be in Congress except by his election, which directly refutes the idea of repudiation. Furthermore, a candidate may even be defeated without its meaning his repudiation, because we all know that only one of several candidates for the same office can be elected, even though all may have the confidence of the people.

The President, Mr. Wilson, has taken no such view as that expressed by Mr. UNDERWOOD, for only a few days since, he delivered a speech in his home State and announced that the country had not declared itself for Democracy, basing his statement on the fact that he had not received a majority of the votes cast for President.

I positively oppose the Government being dominated by any political party. I stand for an effective National Government with every representative selected by the people acting for his constituency unbridled by any party. As long as I live I shall fight for a government to be controlled by the people for themselves. Political parties came in and usurped the power of the Government, because domineering men wanted to control, and party division enabled them to do that. It divided the people, so that the bosses could whip one party with the other, and then the successful party would divide into factions, and the strongest would whip the weakest, and then offer the inducement of "party harmony" and get submission. In that way the Government has been run by a few bosses principally for themselves.

The bosses, of course, are very suave in their arguments and in their demeanor. They must play a smooth game in order that the people shall not know that in truth it is the political party government of Congress that has made it possible for a few persons to control the wealth of this country.

The rich get hearings here in Congress. They come themselves as well as send their agents and their attorneys to frame things up to their advantage; but the plain working people, farmers and others, neither can come themselves nor can they send agents or attorneys to represent them. When their representatives in Congress fail to represent and protect their rights, then they get no representation. That is just what party government amounts to. Party government is factional government. That is why things are so one-sided—a few rich, many poor. It will continue to be so as long as the people flock to party banners that are carried by party bosses.

The tariff bill that is being read was passed by the Ways and Means Committee first. In point of effect the bill was prepared by 14 members on that committee. I count the Democrats only, because the others were not permitted to have any effective representation. Seven of the 14 are from the South, and its chairman is from the South. In fact, the South, with a comparatively small portion of the country's population and resources, controls the committee. The South controls practically all of the committees. That statement is not made with the slightest disrespect toward the South nor toward the gentlemen on the committee. I do not believe that there is a material difference in the morals and intelligence of any one section of country that distinguishes it from others. Human nature is practically the same in them all.

It is quite natural for all people to be self-interested. They take care of themselves first and are generous when it pays to be so. That is the way it has always worked out in human affairs. That is the way it works out in this bill. Politics have, of course, played a prominent figure in the bill, as they always will when the Government is run by party bosses. On that account some schedules have been modified for expedience; but, taken as a whole, the bill is most favorable to the South and to the large cities. If the two can be held together for one party government it would assure that party success. The hopes of party leaders that that may be the case can be read from this bill and also in the appointment of committees of Congress. The farmers have not had their interests equally protected, and the tariff bill as a whole, in my judgment, is unfavorable to them and to the towns and villages supported directly by the farming industry.

The second step for the bill was to pass it through the Democratic caucus. That is a self-appointed, unofficial body, and it owes no official responsibility to the people. It works in secret. Its real purpose is to harmonize the party organization, so that a few bosses may run the whole party and likewise control the Nation. When the bill got out of the caucus fuse and upon the floor of the House there was not a Democrat with backbone enough to talk or vote against a single item except when, for expediency in a few cases, the political bosses permitted it for the sole purpose of fooling the constituency of some Member.

If there had been even 50 of the Democrats who had supported the Constitution and the laws of the land and had fought for the adoption of a bill by the membership of the House unshackled, we would have gotten a very much better bill. If this House was given an opportunity to legislate instead of letting the bosses legislate by trading committee appointments and trafficking in patronage, all of which the people pay for, Members could be satisfied that their constituencies had at least been represented. But under the present system they have not.

This play that we are going through now is a farce. The bill was passed by the Democratic Ways and Means Committee, and then to harmonize the party elements it was put through the caucus furnace with slight changes, as a matter of form, resulting as it is now before the House. But it was settled as to what would be done with it in the House before it was allowed to come upon the floor of the House. Only perfunctory amendments can be made to cover clerical errors and things previously forgotten. If anyone proposed a material amendment that seemed to make a few Democrats doubt and hesitate as to what they should do, you would not dare to let the House settle it, but would call a caucus to fuse the doubtful ones in the caucus furnace.

You Democrats are no more to be criticized for that system than the Republicans who preceded you, except that you ought to have learned by their bad examples to have avoided it. Republicans probably would not make the same mistake again.

You say that the House is too large a body to legislate. Well, that is what political bosses said when there were less Members in Congress than now attend your Democratic caucus, but I do not hear it said that your caucuses are too large to legislate. Anyone who knows anything at all about it knows that this body is larger than it should be, but large as it is it can legislate as one of the Houses of Congress better than it can by dividing into unofficial groups and having one caucus do all of the legislating that the bosses order.

I am not here to defend any political party. This Congress does not belong to a party. Congress belongs to the people, and when they run it as their own the Members sent here will legislate for the people. It will never be done before.

You Democrats have promised to make good times by tariff tinkering. You have promised a lower cost of living. It is the same old fake promise that all parties make about something or other in order to get into power. I wonder how long it will take people generally to learn that no party, acting as such in Congress, can bring prosperity. When we get good times—the kind of times that the natural resources, coupled with their development by the people for themselves, would give—it will be when political party lines have been wiped out and favoritism ceases and Congress is run on a business plan instead of as an incubation plant for developing political parasites.

Just think of a promise to make better times by tinkering with the tariff. Do you think that the people of some other land are going to feed and clothe us? We are more prosperous than any of them are, and still the delusion is held out that we shall have good times if we revise the tariff. I do not question that the tariff ought to be revised and revised downward. It ought, however, to be done impartially, which is not the case with this bill and will not be the case with any bill that is prepared in the way that this one was. It is the system by which the bill has been prepared that is wrong.

We never can get the tariff even temporarily right by the present system, and I am not particularly stuck on the kind of tariff board that has been proposed, though I am not opposed to such, for it can do some good work that must be done, anyway. But the tariff, as long as we have it, should be managed by some automatic system, so that it may be adjusted to the neces-

sities as changes in conditions arise. These changes occur continually, and the tariff, as long as it exists as a system, is properly an administrative measure, and should be under the management of some authority responsible to the people for its administration, which should be regulated by laws made by Congress, but without the necessity of Congress entering into the details, which it has shown itself incapable of handling well.

The income-tax provision in the bill is a long step in the right direction. I believe that the tax on large incomes should have been more, but that is a matter of detail that can easily be remedied in the future. There are other provisions in the bill that deserve commendation. Considering the false method in which the bill has been prepared, I must say that it is a better bill than would ordinarily come out of such a proceeding. I think the moral influence of the President, together with the good intention of most of your Members, is responsible for that. With the bill already passed by your caucus you are wasting time here in the House by not bringing in a rule to pass it without a farcical discussion here on the floor. You know that the caucus has tied your hands, and why not admit it and pass the bill without further cost to the country so that it may at once be sent to the Senate? Of course, some Members wish to get up and make a showing that they have tried to do something with it, but that amounts to absolutely nothing under the circumstances.

I think it will be admitted by any thinking person who has ever studied the subject that the only sure road to prosperity for the people is one that they will have to make for themselves. No foreign people are going to feed and clothe us. We shall have to do that for ourselves, and I believe that the most of us wish to do that. The most of us know that it is just as easy, and perhaps more so, to form combinations for the control of prices in other countries as it is in this. Furthermore, we know that whenever there is a prospect of making profits out of such combinations that selfish parties will be on hand to make them. The only way to be assured of prosperity in our own country is to properly regulate the affairs that are wholly within our own jurisdiction and control.

It is not enough to simply promise times as good as the best we have ever had. Nor is it enough to even promise times that would be better than any that have been. What we should do is to take an inventory of our resources and advantages wherever they are and bring about an application of human energy to secure for the people in general the kind of good times that are available when we make use of the advantages.

People work hard, so hard that most of them have not had time to learn the conditions that govern them, and therefore they do not realize what great advantages exist for bettering their conditions. By taking advantage of the natural resources and making use of the great mechanical devices and of the best methods of application, they could reduce the hours of their toil easily by one-half and increase their resources more than double. Those persons who have accumulated great wealth prove that they have known the facts in this regard, and have applied their own energy in supplementing it thousands of fold by appropriating the products of other people's energy. The people have worked hard to create that wealth, but they do not control it. It is, in fact, a tax upon them because those who possess it are allowed to and do charge them enormous profits for the privilege of using it, and besides, under the present system, it really controls the industries. The degree of the people's success in the future will be determined by the extent of their knowledge of the truth about these facts. They can not be generally successful as long as they permit others to appropriate the best results of their energy.

The future social betterment of men and women must come through their own intelligence, and that intelligence must be exercised and expressed through their votes. There is no moral, natural, or social distinction separating the men from the women in this right and duty, nor in the interests they have, to vote. When they shall join their common interests and also obliterate all party government, the people will be able to solve their own problems, but as long as they permit a few bosses supported by a faction of a party to run the party as well as the Government, more and more burdensome problems will arise to tax them.

Really, I do not see anything of which the politicians long in service had to brag about. To start with, the territory comprising these United States in its original creation is not excelled in the richness of its resources in all the world. Here it was, the property of all people, dedicated to them by God's glorious creation. The showers and sunshine and the seasons have come and gone in regular succession to keep nature in constant response to the demands of men. Nothing has been lacking in the supreme forces out of which all things may come that men require for a utilization to the advantages of all of them. Thus, we realize that no fault occurs in nature. All that men had to do to be prosperous was to establish a good government and administer it properly and be industrious themselves.

Surely no one will complain that we have not had the proper natural advantages. But that is not all. Since we first came into national existence discoveries have been made in the way of utilizing our individual energies to make our industry more productive. The various inventions of mechanical application and discoveries in regard to chemical results and the means by which natural forces are harnessed may be made to work in the production of things necessary and in the establishment of conditions desirable for people generally. The good that would come from all these if properly handled would be enormous. But with nature responding at its best, and with the genius of the period of our national existence at its highest, still we have not succeeded in giving to people in general advantages that are anywhere near the equivalent of what is due to them out of the advantages that have existed.

It has not been due to nature's failure nor to the lack of inventive genius that people generally have not been able to secure better results. Neither has it been due to any failure of industriousness on the people's part, for they have been industrious. The actual production of material wealth shows that to be so. Therefore we can look to neither of those conditions as unfavorable. There is but one thing left to which to charge the failure, and that is the political management. It has been managed by party bosses. They are fine gentlemen, but very expensive to the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

5. Alkalies, alkaloids, and all chemical and medicinal compounds, preparations, mixtures and salts, and combinations thereof not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 16, after the word "section," strike out "15" and insert in lieu thereof "20."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this is a compromise between the rate of the Payne bill and the rate of the so-called Underwood bill of the last Congress. The Payne bill gave a protection of 25 per cent. The Dingley bill gave a protection of 25 per cent. The Wilson bill gave a protection of 25 per cent, and we ask that this industry be given at least the same protection that the Wilson bill afforded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

6. Alizarin, natural or synthetic, dry or suspended in water, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. If the motion prevails, as I suppose it will [laughter on the Republican side], in the light of the last statement made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], I shall offer a motion when the free list is reached to place this item on the free list.

Alizarin is now on the free list. It is a dyestuff, as indigo is a dyestuff; a fast dye. I believe that at one time indigo, in connection with this bill, was placed on the dutiable list and in the caucus or somewhere was restored to the free list. This bill proposes to reduce the rates of duty on articles produced by the aid of alizarin where alizarin is used as a dye. It proposes to add to the dutiable list this dyestuff, which is now on the free list.

Of course, it is very well to say that this item is to raise revenue, and that the item reducing the duties on the finished product is to give the consumer the benefit. But that is cutting off at both ends.

This is one of the amendments which I offered a year ago. I regret that the committee did not have time to investigate this subject and place alizarin, along with indigo, on the free list, where both belong.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] a few moments ago, indulging in the same kind of cheap talk which is occasionally indulged in by Members not so responsible in

authority as he is, said that I was very certain of the amendments which I offered; that I claimed perfect knowledge upon the subject. I do not do that, although I congratulate the majority side of the House that as to a number of the amendments to which I shall call attention, offered by me a year ago, the gentlemen now admit that I was right then by accepting propositions which we made from our side of the House.

They say they have gained information. Very well. Then they rejected the information placed before the House. Then they refused to accept the amendments, as they will refuse now to accept any amendment affecting the tariff rates offered from this side of the House, regardless of the merits. It will take the gentlemen a year to find out, as it has taken them a year to digest a portion of the information offered from this side of the House a year ago. Where they have digested the information they have applied it to this bill, and if they were wise they would now accept the amendments proposed and place this necessary raw material, so far as coloring is concerned, upon the free list along with indigo.

I wonder that alizarin did not have some special friend in the Democratic caucus as indigo had, whereby alizarin would have been placed on the free list along with indigo, which was placed on the free list through the personal efforts of gentlemen who were interested in friends who were interested in the manufacture of indigo. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult indeed to satisfy the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. The last time he was on his feet he was complaining because he claimed we had adopted an amendment proposed by him.

Mr. MANN. No; I congratulated the gentleman, instead of complaining.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Now the gentleman is on his feet complaining that we have not adopted another amendment which he proposed. The gentleman from Illinois is entirely in error in saying that because of information supplied by him the committee have restored to the free list certain items which they taxed last year. He sometimes does supply information, but for the most part he supplies declamation. When these items were before the House last year he did not give us any information about them. The only reason why we taxed them then and do not tax them now is because we were then looking for sources of raising revenue which are now rendered unnecessary by the adoption of the income tax by the Democratic Party, which gives us the opportunity to raise the funds a part of which we had to resort to formerly in this chemical schedule.

Now, alizarin is not on exactly the same footing as indigo. The gentleman's argument in favor of putting alizarin on the free list would apply with equal force to putting all coal-tar dyes and products on the free list. I would like to see all the things that the manufacturers of woolen and cotton buy go upon the free list if we could dispense with the revenues that we raise from them; but we have got to raise the revenues to run this Government in part from tariff rates, and so long as we are obliged to do so I would like to see the revenues raised from articles like alizarin, which are not produced in the United States, which are produced entirely in foreign countries, so that no question of protecting anybody comes in when we levy a rate of 10 per cent upon alizarins. Now, indigoes are used for dyeing the cheapest kind of blue cloths. Alizarins, on the other hand, are the most expensive kind of red dyes. The interest of the consumer might appeal to us to leave indigo upon the free list, while the same interest would not appeal to us to put alizarin upon the free list. The price of alizarin has fallen nearly 20 per cent in the last few months, and this 10 per cent tax that we propose upon alizarin will not burden the manufacturers of this country in comparison to the prices they recently paid for alizarin. The probability is that even with this tax they will be able to buy alizarin cheaper than they have bought it up to date.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. From the viewpoint of the consumer of carpets, this duty on alizarin will increase the cost of living. There is a German combination that controls alizarin. It is manufactured in Switzerland and Germany. There is none of it manufactured in the United States. A gentleman who was a very pronounced Progressive in the last campaign, who is a manufacturer of carpets, but who wanted some changes in the tariff duties of the Payne law, writes me that it looks to him as if the framers of the Underwood bill did not know what they were doing in putting the duties upon dyestuffs, which have been free, and which still further handicap the American manufacturers.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield to me?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman from Pennsylvania might be spared the effort of making this argument if he knew that not a single pound of alizarin is used in making carpets.

Mr. MOORE. I understand it enters into the dyestuffs that go into the manufacture of certain carpets, and that the John & James Dobson Co., who employ 5,000 men in their textile works in Philadelphia, have sued the combination which controls this product, under the Sherman antitrust law, for damages amounting to $400,000. If the Democratic Party think that by now imposing duties upon raw materials they are going to reduce the cost of living they will find that in imposing these duties upon raw materials that are not made in the United States they are simply adding a tax to the consumers of the product and also destroying the labor which enters into the construction of the product in this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn; and the question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], to strike out the paragraph.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division. This is a sort of test.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois demands a division.

The committee divided, and there were 83 ayes and 138 noes.

So the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

9. Argols or crude tartar or wine lees crude or partly refined, containing not more than 90 per cent of potassium bitartrate, 5 per cent ad valorem; containing more than 90 per cent of potassium bitartrate, cream of tartar, and Rochelle salts or tartrate of soda and potassa, 2½ cents per pound; calcium tartrate crude, 5 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This paragraph puts argols or crude tartar or wine lees on the dutiable list at 5 per cent. That is the rate of tax by the existing law. The bill a year ago carried the rate at 10 per cent. I offered an amendment to restore the rate to 5 per cent, which amendment has now been accepted by the committee. I gave the reasons then for offering the amendment, and after the reasons were stated the distinguished gentleman from Alabama made this statement in regard to the amendment to the paragraph carrying argols at 10 per cent:

> Mr. Chairman, I will only take up the time of the committee for a few moments, and this paragraph illustrates as clearly as any in this bill the dividing line between a Republican tariff bill, written in the interest of certain manufacturers, and a Democratic tariff bill, written in the interest of the Government and the consumer.

And yet they now accept the amendment I then offered and which the gentleman from Alabama said then clearly illustrated the difference between a tariff bill written by Republicans in the interest of the manufacturers and a tariff bill written in the interest of the consumer. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Pray tell me whether this bill, with the acceptance of the proposition made a year ago, is now written in the interest of the manufacturers? The gentleman said a year ago that the proposition then offered, now written into this bill, was in the interest of the manufacturers against the interest of the consumer, and illustrated as clearly as anything in the bill the dividing line between the bill written for the manufacturer and the bill written for the consumer.

The gentleman has abandoned his dividing line; he has abandoned his claim that the bill was written in the interest of the consumer, because now he writes into the bill the very thing which he said then was in the interest of the manufacturer and clearly showed the dividing line. I wonder where the dividing line is now. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the gentleman from Illinois has read my speech and pointed out the situation. Of course I do not expect the gentleman from Illinois ever to recognize the dividing line between the great masses of the American people and the great corporations for whom that side of the House always legislates. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

But, as I have stated before, a year ago we wrote a 10 per cent tax on argols, a noncompetitive product—a product that came into this country and was purchased entirely by the manufacturing interests. We levy a tax on these representatives of wealth. These manufacturers are great representatives of wealth. We increased their taxes 10 per cent in order that we might rid the taxes in this bill on soap and paints and other

products that the poorer people of the United States have to use. To-day we have shifted that tax from these particular manufacturers to the income tax, where it falls on the backs of the rich. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Of course the gentleman from Illinois is unable to differentiate between the propositions, but as I told him a year ago, we were not here to exempt from taxation great manufacturing interests of the country if the taxes were just, but when we have an opportunity to levy these taxes in another place, and levy them more effectively, we prefer to levy them through an income tax than to levy them on their raw products. That is the whole proposition. The gentleman from Illinois, I have no doubt, holds a commission from the special interests in this country which my friends on that side of the House always champion. Why, they were shocked a year ago that we should tax anything that a corporation wanted to buy. We did not hesitate to do so when it was necessary for us to tax them to relieve taxation on the necessities of life. All through this bill, of course, the gentleman, I have no doubt, believes himself that it was solely due to his eloquence and his logic and his persuasion that it was necessary for us to untax these corporate products. But I can assure the gentleman that there are a number of cases in Schedule A where we have untaxed the manufacturer at the gate of his factory, but we have laid the tax on the net income of his corporation that falls at his office if not at the gate of his factory. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I have a very high regard for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] from many standpoints. My regard for him as an inventor has increased greatly in the last few days. He invented and copyrighted the so-called competitive tariff proposition. He has now invented, and I suppose will copyright, an entirely new proposition of representative government, and in order to properly carry out his new principle it will be necessary to somewhat modify the oath we all recently took at the bar of the House to something like this:

I do solemnly promise to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, provided I am instructed by my agents, the Ways and Means Committee, so to do.

He announces to us what none of you gentlemen would be frank enough to do, that you have entirely waived your duties, responsibilities, and obligations, and transferred them in toto, en bloc, to the gentleman from Alabama. How unwise you are in doing that is illustrated by a few remarks the gentleman from Alabama just made on the matter under discussion. You are to follow him because he is the fountain of knowledge and information, particularly when he proceeds to tell you that they have retained the same duty on argols and wine lees that is now contained in the Payne law in order to make soap cheaper. Soap! Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Alabama has consulted his experts to no better purpose generally than in this case——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not misquote me. I did not make any such statement. I said that we increased the tax on argols because we wanted to reduce the tax on soaps. There was no connection in the sentence.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman has not reduced the tax on argols. He has retained the tax just as it was. He increased it a year ago. Now, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] he has placed it back to the present duty, and if he did not intend us to understand that it was in order to enable him to reduce the price of soap, why did he say so, for he discussed the matter in the same connection and without a single pause. Argols, wine lees, if the gentleman would like to know, I understand—and I am not an expert in the matters and have not consulted the experts—are used for the making of cream of tartar and like products. I never heard of their being used for the manufacture of soap, and yet the high and mighty authority to whom you on the other side have transferred all of your responsibilities insist that you shall resist any proposition to change the duty on argols because you are trying to reduce the price of soap. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I can not understand the objection that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has to our having reduced the duty upon soap. There is a great big housecleaning going on in the Republican Party now, and they need plenty of soap. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman hear me say anything in the way of complaint about the reduction of the duty on soap?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman seems to be very much exercised over the fact that we are going to let more soap into the country, but he has entirely misconstrued the statements of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. The gentleman from Alabama knows, even though the gentleman from Wyoming does not seem to know, that argols are not used for making soap. They are used for making cream of tartar and tartaric acid, things that go into the textile trades, and also into the manufacture of baking powder. We have reduced the duties upon these latter things, we have nearly cut them in two, for they are the things that the consumers buy. The consumer does not buy argols. The only people who buy argols are manufacturers of cream of tartar and tartaric acid, and when we reduce the tax this year from 10 per cent in our bill of last year to 5 per cent in this bill, in the matter of the collection of revenue we had to give up $150,000; but we did it, as the gentleman from Alabama has so well stated, because we have the income tax to resort to now.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

10. Balsams: Copaiba, fir or Canada, Peru, tolu, and all other balsams, which are natural and uncompounded and not suitable for the manufacture of perfumery and cosmetics, if in a crude state, not advanced in value or condition by any process or treatment whatever beyond that essential to the proper packing of the balsams and the prevention of decay or deterioration pending manufacture, all the foregoing not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem; if advanced in value or condition by any process or treatment whatever beyond that essential to the proper packing of the balsams and the prevention of decay or deterioration pending manufacture, all the foregoing not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That no article containing alcohol shall be classified for duty under this paragraph.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I hold in my hand an editorial taken from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of Thursday, April 24, 1913, in which an attempt is made to explain the reason why the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee has no comprehension of the industrial conditions of the country, as shown by the Underwood bill, and, among other things, in that editorial the following statement is made:

Of the 14 Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee—the only members of that committee permitted even to learn of any of the details of the new tariff bill until it was presented to the Democratic caucus—the men who framed this tariff in secret and refused to hear suggestions or advice from anyone outside of their membership, 9 are country lawyers. The record of each is closely identical with that of the others. After service as prosecuting attorney in some small county, in an agricultural district which had seen little or no progress for a generation, each was elected to Congress.

One comes from Sherman, Tex., a town of 12,412 inhabitants; 1 from Brunswick, Ga., a town of 10,182 inhabitants; 1 from Jefferson City, Mo., a town of 11,859 inhabitants; 1 from Scotland Neck, N. C., with less than 2,500 inhabitants; 1 from Carrollton, Ill., less than 2,500 people; 1 from Mount Vernon, Ind., 2,915; 1 from Carthage, Tenn., a village of some 600; 1 from St. James, Minn., less than 2,500; and 1 from Stroudsburg, Pa., 4,379. These 9 village lawyers constituted rather more than two-thirds of the committee which framed a measure which will directly affect every man employed in manufacturing and in commerce throughout the whole United States. How well qualified they are by education, by past experience, and by the environment which surrounded them until their entrance into Congress can be judged by the simple facts recorded above.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; if I have the time.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I wondered if the editor knew that Abraham Lincoln came from a town of less than 10,000?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; and he knew that Abraham Lincoln was not a Democrat. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. He would also know that Abraham Lincoln could not be a Republican if he were living now.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have often heard it said, and I have no doubt men now here present have heard the same, that the great and successful men in the business, commercial, and professional world, and in fact all walks of our life, are the men who have come from the country or small towns. The statement of the gentleman from Washington is a further demonstration of that being true, and it is due to that fact that we have the great and able men who have prepared this tariff bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn; the gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, and then the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 12, after the word "balsams." strike out to and including the word "valorem" in lines 18 and 19.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, after going to school upon this schedule at the last session, I will admit that the Democratic majority have considerably improved Schedule A,

but, unfortunately, although they had such able tutelage under the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] they did not follow all of his suggestions, and, in my judgment, here is one particular in which that schedule needs and ought to be amended. The part which I have asked to have stricken out refers to crude balsams used in medicinal compounds for the purpose of alleviating coughs, and which are largely used by the poorer classes. It is a tax, pure and simple, upon necessities which were heretofore on the free list. There is no need for it and there is no use for it and it ought to be taken off this schedule.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, the statement read by the gentleman from Washington is the most characteristic and candid utterance of the spirit of Republicanism heard within the walls of this Chamber in 20 years. His boldness is as amazing as his candor. We long have known that they upon that side believe that all virtue, all power, and all wisdom reside in the great financial centers, and was to be found only among the enormously rich in the great cities. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We are told that the Ways and Means Committee is incompetent, because we come from towns no larger than those in which Washington and Jefferson, Madison and Monroe once found an abode. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We are told that you must go to the great marts where your Harrimans, your Fricks, and your Morgans, and the other patron saints of Republicanism hold absolute dominion and implore those high gods the privilege to write the laws of the land. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am from a small town; yea, verily, and I glory in it. I am the representative of a rural population, and I thank God for it. It is natural, it is inevitable, that they who believe the farmer, the small merchant, should be fed with a spoon from the hands of the millionaire enriched by a Republican Ways and Means Committee and Republican tariff should look from the soil, the source of all wealth and the abode of virtue, to the great city, to the office of the broker and the factory of the tariff baron, to find the source of prosperity and plenty. We upon this side look out upon the spreading fields, blessed by God's sunshine and His dew, and when there is an abundant harvest, when there is prosperity among the toiling masses, when the farmer and the small laborer join in one grand chorus of hope and content, then will you find prosperity deserved and earned even among the mighty rich. But when their millions are wrung from the sweat and toil and misery of the unnumbered masses, when their palaces are builded upon the ruins of ramshackling huts, upon the ruined fortunes and the blasted hopes of a people, when their factories are filled with the pauper labor of Europe, from which the American has been exiled, in such an hour it ill becomes the defenders of plunder to turn upon us in the country and in the small towns with the cold and pitiless sneer that we are ignorant and poor and ought to be oppressed. I am here to say it is indeed a truth to the leathern conscience and blind perceptions of Republicanism, but it is a slander and a lie to the nobler impulses and clearer vision of the spirit of Democracy. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman who has just spoken so eloquently that while he states that the broad fields of the country are blessed with God's sunshine that if you pass this bill there is nothing else that can bless them in the bill?

If you rob the farmer, whom he has so eloquently defended, of all the protection he has heretofore enjoyed from our tariff laws, and if you keep up the protection for these great city interests that you attack, what can the farmer expect except economic enslavement and disaster? [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment of the gentleman from Michigan will be withdrawn.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Having grown up on a farm, never having lived since my early youth for any length of time, before my election to Congress, in a town of more than 2,000 people, I am in sympathy with the eloquent tribute paid by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], always eloquent, and never so eloquent as when he gets to soaring among the clouds to the farmer. And when I think of the farmers of Ohio and the farmers of Michigan and the farmers of the great mountain West, whose sheep and wool business is to be destroyed by this bill; when I think of the farmers who are now contributing to the wealth of Louisiana through the growth of sugar; when I think of the farmers in the beet-raising regions all over the country, whose industry is condemned by this legislation, I wonder the gentleman from Kentucky, with all his fine sympathy for the farmer, has not indicated it in opposition to this legislation. The fact that the gentlemen who framed this bill come from small towns is no proper criticism of them, providing they had the breadth of view to realize the fact that only under proper protection of the industries of the country everywhere can the farmer and the dweller in the small town, as well as in the city, prosper. The difficulty was not that the members of the committee come from small towns but that they were small and limited in their knowledge, in their view, and in many instances that limitation of information and of view redounds to the benefit of the manufacturers of the great cities, for there are items in this bill, which, taking into consideration the benefits the manufacturer receives through free raw material, leave him with a larger aggregate of protection on his manufactured products than he now has in the Payne bill. On the other hand, there is scarcely a product of the farm, there is scarcely an industry of the small town that this bill will not paralyze or destroy. And I appeal to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], who loves the farmer, who sympathizes with the toiler in the country places, as I do, to vote against this bill, which, while whatever its effect may be upon the manufacturing industries of the Nation, will put the greatest blight and the heaviest burdens upon the farmers and the dwellers in the small towns of the Nation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] is recognized in opposition.

Mr. STANLEY. The gentleman who has just addressed you has told you of his birth upon the farm, while the record shows he was born in that vast and fertile region known as St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman is as accurate as he often is. I did not say I was born on a farm. I said I grew up on a farm. I got out of the city and onto the farm as soon as I could, at the age of 7.

Mr. STANLEY. Well, he must have learned most of his farming before the age of 7. [Laughter.] The corn he saw was on sale in St. Louis, and the only plow he knows anything about is the plow of a street car, and his consistency in discussing farming as he learned in St. Louis is even more edifying than his tribute to liberty and freedom as learned from Joe Cannon. There is nothing more unique in its absurd incongruity than this assault the standpatters are now making on the tyranny of the Ways and Means Committee. Why, it will take another year of growth of hair before the mark of Cannon's collar will be off of their necks. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] The stoop has not left their bowed forms, the result of 10 long years of crawling into anterooms to ask the once despotic Speaker for the power to introduce a bill or advocate a measure. And now out of that loathsome house of bondage, in a hopeless minority, literally spewed out of the mouths of liberty-loving people on account of their servile obedience to a despot and to despotism, they come here and profess a holy horror because the Democrats propose to speak through the responsive and obedient agents of a free and triumphant majority.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, if the committee can now extract itself from the wilderness into which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] has led it, I would like to ask——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, just one moment. I understood the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] had already addressed himself to the amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am proposing to speak on the amendment offered by the last gentleman, and I simply exercise the right that has been exercised by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman—which I do not intend to do in this instance—I want to make as rapid progress on this bill as is reasonably possible, and I think gentlemen should confine themselves to one speech on a paragraph. I do not object at this time, because I did not object to my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], but I shall object in the future.

Mr. MANN. I would suggest to the gentleman from Alabama, rather sympathizing with his purpose, that an objection would not be in order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I think an amendment had been made to the third degree, as I understand the parliamentary situation.

Mr. MANN. No; it is not an amendment to the third degree. But I think that it is desirable in the main for gentlemen on both sides of the House, under the circumstances, as a rule, not to expect to talk more than five minutes on a paragraph, unless it is some very substantive amendment. Inasmuch as the gen-

tleman from Alabama, after making desperate strides up the alleyway, was not able to reach the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] in time and direct him to take his seat, I hope he will not object to the gentleman from Iowa. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois that inasmuch as I did not object to the gentleman from Kentucky I shall not object to the gentleman from Iowa in this instance.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I shall not consume all the five minutes that I could take. I simply wanted to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] why it was that these balsams were taken from the free list and placed on the dutiable list?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, the effect of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], if adopted, would be to transfer these balsams from the paragraph where they now carry 10 per cent to the drug paragraph, in another part of the bill, where they would be taxed at the same rate; so that his amendment would have no effect upon the law if it were adopted.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] will permit, inasmuch as it is not permissible under the rules of the House to amend a bill in two places, I wish to say that if the amendment is agreed to here and the gentleman offers an amendment under the free list, that carries out the purpose.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman from Illinois is correct. I could not instruct him. When the gentleman from Illinois makes such a motion he always discloses the fact that he knows what he is doing.

As to placing a 10 per cent tax on these balsams, it is true, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] has stated, that they are used in the manufacture of various patent medicines and cough mixtures, but I can not agree with him that this is a grievous hardship upon the poor. If I could, I would stop the circulation among the poor of most of these fake cough medicines, which they themselves are generally ashamed to take in public and squander their money for in private envelopes.

I think it is a very just tax. It is not confiscatory. It is perfectly proper and it is not oppressive, and it is designed to raise about $15,000 worth of revenue.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment, without objection, will be considered withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

11. Barium, chloride of, one-fourth cent per pound; dioxide of, 1½ cents per pound; carbonate of, precipitated, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 4, line 5, by inserting, after the words "ad valorem," the following: "*Provided*, That no preparations containing alcohol shall be classified for duty under this paragraph."

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the amendment.

This is a purely technical amendment, devised to perfect the language of the bill. It is not intended to effect a change in rate. It was adopted by the committee on a suggestion just received from the Treasury Department.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. With pleasure.

Mr. PAYNE. When the gentleman says it is simply "a technical amendment," I want to ask him if it does not restore the alcohol duty on these articles where alcohol is used in the article?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to my colleague that it was never intended by this committee that the alcohol in any article containing alcohol should be taxed under this paragraph.

Mr. PAYNE. I know that is true, probably.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. We considerably broadened the language of the paragraph in the Payne law, which applies only to blacking or to creams or powders intended for polishing shoes or boots. We have enlarged the language of the law so as to include polishing powders and preparations of all kinds for polishing metals and everything else, and some of these do come in liquid form.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to congratulate my colleagues on the fact that they have made some progress. When they had under consideration the chemical schedule before, when it came from the Senate it put all alcohol products on the free list, you gentlemen forgetting that there was such a heavy tax upon alcohol. I congratulate them that they have made some little advance, and that at this late moment they have discovered that they ought to make this exception to this paragraph. I am heartily in favor of the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to get a little information from the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], if I may, in reference to how extensive the change is which is made by this paragraph. The bill of last year provided, and the present law provides, for blacking and polishing for boots and shoes. Now, the gentleman leaves out "for boots and shoes." Of course, this item now covers all blacking or polishing preparations or creams of any kind that are not specially provided for in the section. Of course, I assume that there are an immense quantity and variety of these polishing preparations. Has the gentleman given them very careful attention——

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. MANN. In order to be sure that this does not include a lot of things here that he does not wish to include, that are either on the free list now or else ought to pay a higher duty?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say that the words "not specially provided for" would cover the situation that he points out. This would not take in the polishing powders for polishing granites, and grit shot, and materials of that kind, because they are specially provided for; but this will include the metal polishes, whereas we originally had proposed to tax only the boot and shoe polishes.

Mr. MANN. Where did they go before?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. They were carried in the basket clause at 25 per cent in the old law, and we have reduced them here to 15 per cent.

Mr. MANN. Of course there are many polishes besides metal polishes and boot and shoe polishes. There are furniture polishes——

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes; and glass polishes.

Mr. MANN. A great many different kinds of polishes of all sorts. Now, does this amendment exclude from this all polishes that have alcohol in them?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes; so they will fall under the alcohol paragraph of this same schedule.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was going to explain, but did not explain, to us about the Treasury Department and the information it brought to the committee in regard to this item. The gentleman said he had information from the Treasury Department about this item, but he did not explain what it was.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas that we have just received a criticism from an agent of the Treasury Department to the effect that there might be some confusion in administering the laws if we did not make it perfectly clear in this paragraph that the liquid preparations of blacking containing alcohol were not intended to come in at a rate which is unfair to alcoholic preparations, considering the fact that they have to pay an internal-revenue tax under another feature of the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

15. Calomel, corrosive sublimate, and other mercurial medicinal preparations, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 4, line 13, by striking out the word "medicinal."

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, this is another committee amendment which is offered merely to perfect the language of the bill, and does not propose to change any rates in the law. The mercurial preparations, other than medicinal, would come in anyway at the same rate of duty under paragraph 5, but by striking out the word "medicinal" here and allowing all mecurial preparations to come in, in the same paragraph as well as at the same rate, it will avoid confusion in the statistical reports to the Treasury Department.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I do.

Mr. MOORE. In paragraph 22 would the gentleman be willing to make the same exception and to insert the words "not medicinal"? Paragraph 22 reads as follows:

22. All other products or preparations of coal tar, not colors or dyes, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Will the gentleman make the same exception there?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman that the words "not medicinal" in the present law were deliberately stricken out of that paragraph, and the case is not parallel with this.

Mr. MOORE. That would not be excepted?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It would not be excepted, because, in my judgment, there is no analogy between the two.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

21. Coal-tar dyes or colors, not specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of obtaining some information. The present law on this paragraph is 30 per cent ad valorem, the same rate carried in this bill. In the Harrison bill of last year it was proposed to reduce the rate to 25 per cent ad valorem. What is the reason for now increasing that rate?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that this is purely a revenue proposition. It is imported already to the extent of about three-quarters of the consumption in this country, and we have to make up somewhere in the tariff for articles that we put on the free list.

Mr. MANN. If this is purely a revenue proposition, when the gentleman was making it up last year in what was much nearer a scientific measure than this, why did he then propose to reduce the rate? What information has the gentleman received since then as to the revenue proposition?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. When we were proposing to reduce the rate from 30 to 25 per cent we were at the same time proposing to tax $25,000,000 of imports that we have now restored to the free list.

Mr. MANN. That is all very well; but last year when the gentleman brought in his bill he stated the reason for his reduction was that it was a revenue measure. Now he gives the same reason for increasing the rate.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Oh, no; I beg the gentleman's pardon. Last year I made the argument for the benefit of the consumer; I did not make the argument that it would increase the revenue by reducing the duty, because it would decrease it.

Mr. MANN. I will do the gentleman from New York the credit to say that I believe he was a real tariff-for-revenue man when he prepared the schedule. Last year he proposed to increase the rate on the raw material and reduce the rate on the finished product, so as to get the largest sum on the raw materials and increase the importation of the finished product. That was a consistent scientific position to take. But now the gentleman is receding from his former position, and gives the same reason for increasing the tax that he gave before for reducing it—in direct opposition.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman is mistaken.

COAL-TAR DYES.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York gave as an excuse a year ago that he considered the bill from a different standpoint, that they were looking for revenue under that bill. Now they have to put back the rate to comply with the present—as my friend used to say—"iniquitous tariff law." I have been glad to notice how much they have found good in the Payne law. Where we increased the rates under that law, time and again they have adopted our increased rates instead of going back to the rates under the Dingley law or putting them below those.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like for the gentleman from New York to point out any single instance in this bill where the Payne bill increased the rate from the Dingley bill and we have kept it.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, on wines and spirits; perhaps the gentleman will recognize that.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is that not true of the coal-tar dyes?

Mr. PAYNE. Take jewelry also, another thing. I do not want to yield my time to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MURDOCK. I was going to help the gentleman out. The statistics in this case sustain the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you. Now, if the gentleman from Alabama understood his bill, he would find a number of instances where we increased the rates and they followed them. I think the gentleman is not quite ingenuous in answering the question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Kansas is wrong.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the gentleman from Alabama has heard from the manufacturing interests in this country in reference to coal-tar dyes. He has learned something of their struggles in this business, which have been severe; he has learned that they are now trying to meet the competition of Germany on these colors and dyes, and possibly he looked at the books, as I did, and saw that they were making nothing on their capital. One concern with $2,000,000 invested, struggling to make cheaper dyes in this country for the manufacturers of cotton and woolen goods was making nothing. Perhaps he has done that and relented a little from his original proposition to tax the manufacturers all along the line, and still when you get to another paragraph with these unpronounceable names, you will find that he has put a tariff duty on the material which these people use in making these coal-tar dyes. I do not know why he did that. It is in the interest of revenue. He said that he is not looking for revenue, and yet in this very schedule we find in note 1, at the bottom of page 84, tucked away in the finest of type, that they have put a duty on $15,000,000 worth of goods in this very Schedule A that are on the free list in the present tariff law. It looks as though the gentlemen were looking for revenue all along the line in Schedule A, instead of discarding it, and are going back to the rates as proposed by the gentleman from Illinois, the same rates that are in the present law, because they did not need the revenue. I can not exactly understand the theory on which this bill is proposed. They say that they are for a competitive tariff, and here is a competition that is wiping out all chance for any profits on the industry, all chance for any increase, and these people are simply subsisting by having a line of trade in other goods that keeps them from the poorhouse, with their $2,000,000 of invested capital in the city of Buffalo. They do not allow them to have their raw material without paying a tax on it, and putting a tax on the manufacturer, as was said by my colleague from New York countless times during the hearings, saying that that was the Democratic idea, and there was no dissent from any member of the committee during the time of those hearings.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is in error in saying that this committee is following him in the raises that he made from the preceding law. We propose to tax these coal-tar dyes and colors 30 per cent. That is the rate in the existing Payne law and in the Dingley law.

Mr. PAYNE. I have stated that myself.

Mr. MURDOCK. It was lower than that in the Wilson law.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes; that is correct. I was about to say that. In the Wilson law it was only 25 per cent ad valorem, but the business of making coal-tar dyes and colors in Germany has largely been created since the days of the Wilson law, and they have to-day substantially displaced most of the natural dyes and colors throughout the world. It is in the hands of an enormous monopoly over there, and I am quite willing to lay this tax on that monopoly. I am not proposing to raise any rates in the law. We are merely adopting the same rates that have been in force that, in view of the fact, seeking for competitive tariffs, we have one here in which about four-fifths of the consumption is imported. My colleague from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has evidently accepted, without investigation, the statements of manufacturers in our country about what does or does not constitute their raw material. I am quite as unable as he is to pronounce the name of the articles to which he refers, but these are not raw materials. He puts them on the free list at the request of a manufacturer in our State, and we propose to put them back again and lay this tax on that manufacturer. They are not raw materials; they are intermediate products. They are semimanufactured, partly finished products, and really all that this manufacturer in Buffalo does with them is to assemble them and then sell them as coal-tar dyes and colors.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] that I examined and found out just what raw material these people did use, and that I cheerfully put it on the free list. They wanted 35 per cent duty, and they demonstrated that in order to meet German competition they needed it. Yet the gentleman says four-fifths of all the product comes in now from Germany. I wanted to put it at 35 per cent, but I was not able to do so, because the manufacturers of cotton and woolen goods did not want the duty put at 35 per cent, just as they do not now, and just as the gentleman is following out their views. I have the right to say that if he says the other of me. They did not want it. They thought they could not get along with the cotton and woolen industry with it. That did not affect me. I was for the 35 per cent, and I am for it to-day if those things have to go back on the dutiable list. I want that industry to thrive. I want

the prices to go down because they do live, because every time these people put one of these coal-tar dyes on the market and get the market in this country the Germans come in here with lower rates and outsell them on that line, and it is only because of the inventive genius of the chemist who is at the head of that Buffalo concern that they have lived a single moment under the rates which they get now.

And the gentleman came along with the announced intention of putting a tax on manufactures, not only a tax upon incomes but a tax upon the materials which they use and have to get and import into this country in order to wreak vengeance on the manufacturer. That seems to be with the majority of this committee a class that should be driven out of existence. Why, they tell you about the immense wealth of the protected manufacturer. I would not invest a dollar in any manufacturing industry in this country under any circumstances. When I was younger I did. My first venture was closed out at 20 cents on the dollar, and I took my 20 cents. I had one dividend in 20 years of 6 per cent, and that was the enormous profit I got.

Mr. MURDOCK. Was that a protected industry?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; it was a protected industry. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It was the manufacture of agricultural hand tools, and they handed it down to me in that way. I have had other manufacturing investments, very small, and every one of them turned out worse than that.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, a little while ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] attempted to justify certain rates that were lower in this bill than those in the bill of last year by saying that new sources of revenue had now been found and that therefore they could reduce the rates from the bill of a year ago. In this particular case they not only have not reduced the duty, but they actually increased the duty 5 per cent. Now, the gentleman suggests one reason for that is that a foreign monopoly controls the product. Now, a monopoly did grow up under the 30 per cent tariff. It has been conclusively proven that we can not maintain the industry in this country with the 30 per cent tariff. Now, does the gentleman take the position that he is willing to further contribute to the foreign monopoly, permit them to charge our American manufacturers what they choose, or that he is in favor of competition by a competitive tariff? Would not he be consistent instead of making a rate of 30 per cent to make it 35 per cent, as the gentleman from New York contends for, so there may be some competition in this country as against that foreign monopoly? If that is not correct, then why does he increase the rate at all? Not for the purpose of revenue, because only half an hour ago he said it was not necessary. These coal-tar dyes are necessaries as much as any item in the bill, for every yard of cheap cotton cloth bought in this country must use dyes of this character, and I submit that the committee is entitled to some further explanation from the gentleman from New York. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, to be quite frank, I do not understand upon what side of this question the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin is speaking. He surely did not mean to accuse us of raising any rate. We are not raising rates; we are retaining the same rate as in the present law——

Mr. LENROOT. I mean over the bill of last year.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Merely to collect revenue on a highly competitive product, and I will say frankly to the gentleman——

Mr. LENROOT. Did not the gentleman say half an hour ago that because of new sources of revenue it was not necessary in this bill to seek for sources of revenue as you did a year ago?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Well, we have transferred back again to the free list about $25,000,000 worth of imports that we did propose to tax under last year's bill, and I conceive that the committee has done perfectly right in maintaining such a very highly competitive rate as this and keep the rate at the same figures they are in the present law.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the gentleman call a competitive rate a rate upon an article that is practically not produced in this country at all, but is produced wholly abroad?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Well, it is so highly competitive I should think that if the gentleman were writing this bill from his point of view he would be perfectly consistent in writing in a 35 or 40 per cent rate, because that would still be competitive and would probably afford the American manufacturer sufficient protection, or at least as much as they ask for. The committee conceived it their duty in this particular case to leave it at the point it now is, and——

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman's idea is that there should be competition in this country?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. With foreign manufacturers.

Mr. LENROOT. With foreign manufacturers and between domestic manufacturers as well, is it not?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Certainly; undoubtedly.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, if there be no competition, this being a foreign monopoly, would not the gentleman from his own standpoint be justified in writing the tariff so that it would create competition at home as well as abroad?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. That would be a very grave hardship upon the consumer. I think that would be pushing the matter too far.

Mr. LENROOT. Would it be any hardship if a foreign monopoly controls a product, because they can charge what they choose?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman that there are foreign monopolies growing up in a great many products which are now imported into the United States, and if we were to fix our tariff rates with sole consideration for that fact we would not ever be able to reduce any of the tariff rates. It is a subject that will undoubtedly occupy the attention of Congress for some years to come, but it can not be, in my judgment, disposed of through the tariff without too great punishment to our own consumers.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

22. All other products or preparations of coal tar, not colors or dyes, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The gentleman referred a while ago to the gentleman from New York as for tariff for revenue only. I agree to that if it is assumed that there is no difference between a free trader and one who believes in tariff for revenue. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] has generally appeared to me more nearly as a free trader. He said a moment ago, however, that they had not increased rates generally in the items under discussion. The item now under discussion and some of the items following it, including picric oil, creosote oil, aniline oil, and aniline salts, and coal-tar products with unpronounceable names, and so forth, are all taken from the free list and made dutiable; they are increased in rate. We have had a wonderful object lesson this morning of new Democratic formulas—the formula of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] applying to all the gentlemen on the other side. It is to the effect that if you on that side want to know what your opinion is with regard to any of these items, ask the gentleman from Alabama. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] has another formula. It is a sort of a darky's coon-trap formula. It is warranted to "catch 'em comin' and a-goin'." It is a little like the formula of a quack doctor who could not cure anything but fits, and therefore tried to throw his patients into fits when they came to him for treatment.

When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asked the gentleman from New York why he reduced the duty on any one of these articles, he said: "Why, because we have an income tax, and therefore do not need the revenue." We did not have it a year ago; therefore we can make the duty lower than we made it a year ago. And when he asks the gentleman why he takes an article from the free list and places it on the dutiable list, he says that it is because they need the revenue. That is wondrously consistent. The gentleman has been in the minority so long that he does not realize that the time has come now when some of the people in the country will expect him to be consistent. He can not use as an argument that he reduces one rate because he does not need the revenue, and in the same breath, where he increases the rate, that he does it because they do need the revenue. They either do or they do not need the revenue.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield to me for just a suggestion?

Mr. MONDELL. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It is our duty to raise some $250,000,000 of tariff rates. We have exercised our judgment as best we could, and we have restored to the free list a very large proportion of the taxes we propose to put in upon the schedule revision.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman's answer to all of these questions and the excuses he makes for the committee all illustrate this fact: That so far as the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] is concerned, it is a matter of utter indifference to him what the effect on the industries of the country will be. There is no suggestion in any of his excuses that protection is not needed or protection is needed. He is perfectly cheerful in reducing the rate on a manufactured or

advanced product and at the same time increasing the rate on every raw material used in advancing or finishing the product.

The gentleman, whatever he may be, is certainly at no point a protectionist. And the only regret he has in regard to this bill is that as we go further along in the bill some other member of the committee will take his place and advance an entirely different formula with regard to other schedules. And we may hear later, not that we do or do not need revenue, but that possibly an industry may need a little protection in order to live. So far as the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] is concerned—and I honor him in his honesty of intent and expression—I can not agree with him. As far as the gentleman from New York is concerned, and a large number of gentlemen on the other side, the fact is they have no concern as to the effect of these schedules on the employment or the industries of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

24. Coal-tar products known as aniline oil and salts, toluidine, xylidin, cumidin, binitrotoluol, binitrobenzol, benzidin, tolidin, dianisidin, naphtylamin, diphenylamin, benzaldehyde, benzyl chloride, nitro-benzol and nitrotoluol, naphtylaminsulfoacids and their sodium or potassium salts, naphtolsulfoacids and their sodium or potassium salts, amidonaphtolsulfoacids and their sodium or potassium salts, amidosalicylic acid, binitrochlorbenzol, diamidostilbendisulfoacid, metanilic acid, paranitranilin, dimethylanilin; all the foregoing not medicinal and not colors or dyes, 10 per cent ad valorem.

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph, and I do not think there should be a dissenting vote after hearing the paragraph read. [Laughter.]

But there is a better reason for striking out the paragraph than that. I am in favor of giving those people here in this country who have invested their money in an enterprise where they are trying to make coal-tar dyes from these articles to put them on the free list, as they get them free under the present law.

Why, you have demonstrated that you do not need the revenue. You are going to get that out of your income tax. You have demonstrated that you have been trying to throw away revenue, and yet you get back to the chemical schedule you had before the House a year ago. There is no excuse for putting a duty on these articles, except it is to help the German syndicate in securing the balance of the market in this country.

I want to warn the gentlemen on that side that when you have driven these people out of existence here who have been struggling along trying to make these coal-tar dyes and colors, the German syndicate, having their own market, will put their own price upon the articles which are imported here, and they will collect the revenue and our people will have to pay it.

As it is now, they pay the revenue to the United States. But if we can go on and make these articles in this country, and thus take away part of that four-fifths of the monopoly of our market that the German syndicate now has, I think it is worth while. I think it ought to appeal to the good sense of every man on that side, if any there be over there who have not surrendered their conscience and their judgment to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to do their business for them.

Why not quit now, gentlemen, and let the gentleman from Alabama report this bill at once, unless you are going to represent something here besides the German syndicate that has got control of this whole business? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. METZ. Mr. Chairman, there has been so much said about this German syndicate and this coal-tar schedule that I want to say a few words to set the matter right.

Every product in this whole paragraph is made by some German syndicate. They would rather sell these products than the finished products, because these products are controlled by syndicates abroad, while most of the colors are not.

We have been taxing every manufacturer of cottons and woolens, every cotton and woolen mill, every ink man, and every paint man on aniline colors 30 per cent, to prove that we can not make those articles in this country. There is one plant in Albany, N. Y., one in Buffalo, and two in Newark, N. J., and I own one of them. We can not make these colors and never will.

There is no German syndicate, so called. There are several combinations of German manufacturers. One of them is composed of three manufacturers. And then there is a combination, not as direct as the first, of three manufacturers on certain interests and almost entirely on scientific lines. There is competition among every one of them. Every one of them has a branch or agent in this country, and they all compete, hammer and tongs, tooth and nail. The prices are the same throughout the world. Each factory sells its own product to every country in the world at the same figure. Our mills are in competition with certain people in England, who buy at a certain price less our duty. They have branches in this country engaged in manufacturing. They have accounts with the German manufacturer, and they get the same discount on the goods they buy for the branch in this country that they do in England.

In this country we have been taxing the manufacturer of woolens and the manufacturer of cottons on these articles for 30 years past.

All these products are bought from the German syndicate. These intermediate products—not the raw material—are highly developed compounds. They are controlled abroad by syndicates, and all the syndicate has got to do is simply refuse to sell to the American manufacturer and he is out of business. When this proposition was offered in the Payne-Aldrich bill, I opposed it. I was not on the floor, but came down here and opposed it.

Mr. MURDOCK. The proposition to put them on the free list.

Mr. METZ. To put them on the free list. There is no sense in it. There has not been one single additional aniline color made here, and I will tell you why, because some of the factories here had to agree to make no new colors in order to get the stuff at all from the other side.

Let us get away from this trust business on colors on the other side. There is no such thing, and the American manufacturer of cottons and woolens has got to pay 30 per cent more for every pound of dyestuff he uses in the cheapest cloths than the manufacturer in Germany and other European countries has to pay. That is the real situation.

Mr. SWITZER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he had to account for this product sent over here by the German syndicate?

Mr. METZ. No; I said this: Take the English manufacturer. I have one in mind now who says he is going to close up. He has a branch here. He buys in England and he buys here. He gets from the German manufacturer a discount at the end of the year for all the color he buys, and he includes in that discount what he buys for his American branch.

Mr. SWITZER. Do you have to account for the goods?

Mr. METZ. No; I do not account. He reports what he buys here.

Mr. SWITZER. Are you an agent?

Mr. METZ. I am not an agent. I buy and sell on my own account and get all I can get out of it. That is my business.

Mr. SWITZER. You have to account for the goods?

Mr. METZ. I do not have to account at all. He accounts to the people abroad, and that is the way they control it over there; but there is active competition between the various color manufacturers.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman's contention is that this paragraph contained in this bill will be a help to the maker of fabrics.

Mr. METZ. No; it will not help him. The manufacturers of fabrics do not use these raw materials. The only men who use them are the few aniline color makers in this country, of whom I am one.

Mr. MURDOCK. I understood the gentleman to say it would be a benefit to the manufacturer of fabrics.

Mr. METZ. He has to pay 30 per cent on the finished colors when he buys his colors, and we charge a profit on the duty and the colors. I am simply stating the facts. I am not talking on the merits of it at all.

Mr. PAYNE. I move to strike out the last word. I am glad to find out who is responsible for this business. I remember my colleague here appearing four years ago in the guise of a manufacturer of these colors and dyes.

Mr. METZ. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. He says he is discouraged. I should think he would be. He well may be. I only wish he had the splendid courage of Mr. Schoellkopf, of Buffalo, who has not only put his fortune but his life work into the development of this industry. He is a chemist who has no superior in Germany or the United States.

Mr. METZ. He would not believe that himself.

Mr. PAYNE. He is a man who understands his business, and who is still hopeful, still struggling, and will continue to struggle as will many an American manufacturer under the iniquities of this proposed bill.

Why, some one said the other day that there would be no stopping of industries unless it was done for effect.

How little such a man understands the courage of the average American. They will not stop until they are forced to stop. This gentleman gives up now and throws up his hands, and, as I understand him, is a customer of this German syndicate.

Mr. METZ. So is Mr. Schoellkopf.

Mr. PAYNE. In these articles with unpronounceable names; yes. My colleague speaks in one breath of the German syndicate and in another he says there is no German syndicate. I do not know what he means. His colleague on the Ways and Means Committee says there is a German syndicate, and that is the universal information that comes to us. Why help the German syndicate? Do you help the American manufacturer of cotton goods in keeping the same duty of 30 per cent on these colors and dyes? It is not these unpronounceable things that the manufacturer of cheap cloth goods uses in this country: it is the finished color and dyes. What possible excuse is there for putting this duty on these unpronounceable things except to cripple the American manufacturer of colors and dyes, destroying his industry, for the men can not live altogether on courage—which my colleague seems to lack—not altogether on courage, but he must get something back in order to live. Why destroy this industry to help no one except to get a few paltry dollars of revenue on these unpronounceable things? Why destroy an industry in the interest of the German syndicate? If they do not get the unpronounceable things they can not go on with the industry; they can not make the color and dyes. Why, the committee could not have planned better to destroy this great industry of the men of brawn and brains in the city of Buffalo if they had gone deliberately about it; but yielding to the importunities of my friend from New York who deals with the German syndicate in these unpronounceable things they have yielded.

Mr. METZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to set the gentleman from New York right and I want to set myself right.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman will set himself right first.

Mr. METZ. That is what I will do. I know this business and the gentleman does not, with all due apology to the gentleman from New York. These things that he speaks of with the unpronounceable names I can pronounce myself.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; and I can if I work hard.

Mr. METZ. I know the gentleman can. He has been up against them a good many times, especially in connection with Mr. Schoellkopf. I sell him some of these things myself. All these things are controlled by the syndicates and the finished colors are not—only to a small extent. There is competition, and that is the difference. Now, I have not advocated putting these things on the dutiable list. I am a member of the Democratic Party, and I am with my party on this thing.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course the gentleman is.

Mr. METZ. And so is the gentleman from New York with his party.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARDNER. The rules provide that there shall be five minutes' debate on either side of an amendment, and I make the point of order that debate is exhausted.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I would like to ask as between the gentleman from New York, Mr. METZ, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE, if we have not a demonstration here that you can not revise the tariff intelligently without a scientific report?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order that the debate on the amendment proposed is exhausted.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MURDOCK. But, Mr. Chairman, I have offered another amendment.

Mr. GARDNER. I raise the point of order that there are already two amendments pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE, offered an amendment to strike out the paragraph, and on that was heard for five minutes. The gentleman from New York, Mr. METZ, was heard in reply for five minutes. Thereupon the gentleman from New York rose and moved to strike out the last word. The point of order was not made, and the gentleman from New York being a member of the committee, the Chair did not feel called upon to offer a suggestion, and the gentleman from New York proceeded.

Mr. MANN. And I submit that it was not subject to a point of order; where a motion is made to strike out a paragraph, it is in order to perfect the paragraph.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Alabama said that he intended to enforce the rule under the five-minute debate, and he shut off a man from the floor who had rights. Here is the situation: The gentleman from New York, as the Chair has said, offered an amendment striking out the paragraph. Debate on that amendment is exhausted, but as an amendment to that, quite within the rule, a motion to strike out the last word was proposed, and debate on that was exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman permit the Chair to correct him? Debate on that was not exhausted. The gentleman from New York addressed himself to his amendment to strike out the last word, and it was during his address that he was questioned by his colleague the gentleman from New York, Mr. METZ.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE, was through and that then the gentleman from New York, Mr. METZ, took the floor. Then the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE, again spoke, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. METZ, interrupted him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the time of the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE, on his last amendment was not exhausted. He apparently had concluded, and turned to take his seat, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. METZ, rose and asked him if he would yield, and he did yield, and then the debate occurred.

Mr. GARDNER. The Chair would not hold that if the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE, had abandoned the floor that that was not the equivalent of his five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE, really had not taken his seat.

Mr. PAYNE. I was asked a question, but I yield the floor now.

The CHAIRMAN. He was turning to take his seat.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, another parliamentary inquiry: Is the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] to strike out the last two words in order except as a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not. The Chair thinks, however, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is entitled to recognition for five minutes in opposition to the last amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE.

Mr. GARDNER. Provided the time was not exhausted by the gentleman from New York, Mr. METZ, who had the floor, apparently, in his own right, because he did not await recognition either of the Chair or of the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hold, in connection with that, that that was in the time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. GARDNER. The Chair will permit me to say that I was particularly watching, noticing that the debate was being carried on so that the Members of the House could not hear, and that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] was out of the room. I was particularly watching, and saw the occurrence, as I believe, exactly as I stated it to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, of course, may be in error.

Mr. GARDNER. I wish to point out that the rules were being neglected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes in opposition to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be withdrawn and the question is upon the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York to strike out the last word.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

26. Collodion and all other liquid solutions of pyroxylin, or of other cellulose esters, or of cellulose; compounds of pyroxylin or of other cellulose esters, whether known as celluloid or by any other name, if in blocks, sheets, rods, tubes, or other forms not polished, wholly or partly, and not made into finished or partly finished articles, 15 per cent ad valorem; if polished, wholly or partly, or if finished or partly finished articles, of which collodion or any compound of pyroxylin or other cellulose esters, by whatever name known, is the component material of chief value, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Collodion and all other liquid solutions of pyroxylin or of other cellulose esters or of cellulose, 15 per cent ad valorem; compounds of pyroxylin or of other cellulose esters, whether known as celluloid, pyralin, fiberloid, viscoloid, or by any other name, if in blocks, sheets, rods, tubes, or other forms, not polished, wholly or partly, and not made up into finished or partly finished articles, 35 per cent ad valo-

rem; if polished, wholly or partly or if finished or partly finished articles, of which collodion or any compound of pyroxylin or other cellulose esters by whatever name known, is the component material of chief value, 45 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That no article of which a compound of pyroxylin, or of other cellulose esters, is a component of chief value, shall be entered for import under any other classification bearing a lower rate of duty.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, the material with which this paragraph deals and to which my amendment in the way of a substitute refers is what is commonly known as celluloid, and my amendment is to increase the duties on the ordinary sheets to 35 per cent and on the finished product to 45 per cent. Now, this is a comparatively new substance in the industrial world. It was invented by Americans, it is an original American product, but Germany and France have equipped themselves and can make this substance cheaper than we can, and for two reasons: First, because of the ordinary reason of cheaper labor cost there, and, second, for the additional reason that all these materials from which this product is made are cheaper there than they are here. The tissue paper, for instance, which is one of the main ingredients, is cheaper by 3 cents per pound. Camphor is one of the most expensive articles used in the manufacture.

Now, all our camphor comes practically from Japan, and in Germany it is all admitted free, while in the United States it is taxed; and this very bill, while reducing the tax on celluloid, increases the tax on camphor, one of its essential ingredients. It reduces the tax on the finished product but increases the tax on the raw material.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman puts the duty at 35 per cent—I am not supposing what the law is on camphor—and then puts the duty of 35 per cent on the finished product of celluloid, is not the celluloid manufacturer on the whole amply compensated for the 35 per cent he pays on his camphor?

Mr. GILLETT. That is not the fact. If the gentleman will listen, I think I can show him. That is not the fact, because the duty on camphor is increased. The camphor in a pound of celluloid costs 2 cents more here than in Germany. Alcohol is also a necessary ingredient. That is 1 cent a pound more expensive here than in Germany, and then the oils and acids are each 1 cent a pound cheaper there, so that the German cost of materials is about 8½ cents per pound less than our cost of materials, which makes, reduced to percentage, a difference in favor of Germany of about 20 per cent.

Now, as I understand, the Committee on Ways and Means thinks the cost of materials is only about 15 per cent higher here than in Europe. I think they are mistaken in that, but it is only a difference of opinion, and the difference is not great. But the fundamental and fatal danger to this American industry is that the basis on which the Committee on Ways and Means have fixed this 15 per cent ad valorem, which they have given, is that that exactly equalizes, in their opinion, the difference in the cost of the ingredients which go into the manufacture in Europe and here, and leaves the German manufacturer and the American manufacturer on exactly an equal level, taking no account of the different cost of labor here and there. The advantage is, of course, all with the German. But that, I understand, is the theory upon which they have fixed the percentage of 15 per cent ad valorem, because that exactly compensates for the different cost of materials. Now, that leaves absolutely no allowance in the difference of the cost of labor in Germany and France and the United States, and therefore in my amendment I provide a greater duty, 35 per cent, not enough I fear, but enough to somewhat equalize the labor cost between Europe and the United States. That is the Republican system.

And I might also mention that there has recently been started in Japan, where all the camphor comes from, by one of the wealthy families of that country which controls all the output of its camphor, a $1,000,000 plant, equipped with American machinery, ready to manufacture for the world's markets, with the cheap Japanese labor and with the world's supply of camphor under its control.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] accepts the rates we have proposed in this bill upon collodion, which we have reduced from 70 to 15 per cent, but he proposes to raise the duty upon the manufactures of collodion which are generally known as celluloid. The gentleman from Massachusetts has given us a statement which, no doubt, has been furnished to him by reliable people as to the difference in cost of manufacturing celluloid articles here and abroad, and I want to point out that he gives a perfect illustration of the impossibility of fixing tariff rates upon investigations into the cost of production. He says, for example, that the additional cost of the paper out of which the celluloid is made is 5 cents a pound to the disadvantage of the American manufacturer.

Mr. GILLETT. Three cents a pound in the material. The amount the paper pays is 5 cents, but 3 cents a pound on the celluloid.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. That is exactly the statement furnished to me, namely, that it was 3 cents a pound. I received from a manufacturer recently a statement as to costs, which somewhat parallel those which the gentleman from Massachusetts has advanced here. But I wish to point out that these arguments as to the cost are largely theoretical. Now, in the first place, as to paper. The way they make celluloid is to dip the tissue paper in a bath of mixed acids and with a solution of camphor they make the celluloid. The manufacturers here make their own paper. The tariff of 30 per cent on paper probably has nothing to do with their own factory cost. It is also true that they refine their own camphor. They import crude camphor from Japan. The rates of duty on refined camphor are not of so much importance to them. Now, the acids that they use—nitric and sulphuric acid—are on the free list, so that the only item on this bill in which the tariff adversely affects the manufacturers of celluloid in the United States is this 1 cent per pound we propose on crude camphor. If they choose to import refined camphor instead of crude, we have reduced the duty on that from 6 to 5 cents a pound in this bill. I think the 15 per cent ad valorem proposed upon celluloid in blocks, sheets, and rods represents fairly the rate under which there will be competition. There are several million dollars' worth made in our country, and look at the importation for last year. There were $2,600 worth of importation. The probability is that the present specific duty on these articles is so prohibitive that it is somewhere in the neighborhood of 100 per cent instead of 20 per cent, as it appears in the Treasury reports, and I feel that they have taken full advantage of the manufactured duty in the prices which they charge the American consumers. What do they do with the celluloid? They make it up themselves into boxes, brushes, and combs, so that the duty on celluloid in sheets is of very little importance to the American manufacturer. What they sell to the public is the finished product of the celluloid, and on this our duty is 35 per cent. I think this is a very fair and competitive tariff on the three grades of articles carried in the paragraph.

Mr. GILLETT. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact, as you say, that little of it is incorporated as appears in the reports, that there is a great deal of celluloid imported that does not appear in the customhouse reports as celluloid, because it comes in as other articles?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It does; and that is a cause of a great deal of complaint, because articles like brushes and combs, which were intended to carry a small duty, and American manufacturers have endeavored sometimes to have them carried under this celluloid paragraph, which bears a very high duty. That is one of the questions which I think is cleared up under this bill. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

27. Coloring for brandy, wine, beer, or other liquors, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GARDNER. I hold in my hand a letter dated at Washington, D. C., April 10, 1913, addressed to some finishers of textile fabrics in my State:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 10, 1913.*

MY DEAR SIR: In the caucus yesterday, when Schedule A was under discussion, I offered an amendment placing indigo on the free list instead of at 10 per cent ad valorem. I picked indigo out because it was the most logical item on which to appeal to the caucus, as it affected the cotton mills of the South, and because it had been struck from the late Underwood bill by the Senate Finance Committee and recommended to be put on the free list in both the majority and the minority reports. The result was a vote of 54 in favor and 112 against. This showed that the Ways and Means Committee has the caucus under working control.

I was informed by many Members, some of them I had not known before, that they were impressed by my argument, and that, as they put it, "I had put it all over" the committee. I feel that I have gained at least the attention of the Members and that they think that I at least know what I am talking about.

With this advantage in view I am going to offer an amendment to Schedule K to insert, after section 322, page 77, the words—

"The rates provided in this schedule shall take effect on the first day of the sixth month following the passage of this act."

And in the free list, after sections 764 and 655, page 129, to insert the words—

"To take effect first day of the third month after the passage of this act."

I will explain to the caucus the reason for these amendments and what will be the effect of the bill as it now stands if it goes into effect immediately upon passage.

I am promised the support of many Members for the first proposition, but of not so many for the last one. However, if I get the first the last will not be so important. It may help with the wool men.

I am afraid, however, that not a single amendment to the committee bill as reported will be made by the caucus, and the only hope of change of any kind lies in the Senate. It appears to have become an administration measure, pure and simple, and many of the schedules have been rewritten within the last 10 days, as far as I can see, at the suggestion of the President and on the basis of passing a competitive and revenue tariff only.

Yours, truly. H. A. METZ.

[Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Is he our Member here?

Mr. GARDNER. The writer is a Democratic Member of this House. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. METZ. Mr. Chairman, I plead guilty. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I wrote that to some of the mills in the East with which I have been in business relations for many years, who made suggestions to me to put before the caucus. That was my duty, which I, as a manufacturer of woolens myself, owed them.

I said before that I did not approve of some of these rates. I made my fight in the caucus and was beaten, and I am willing to stand by my caucus bill and by my House bill as it is approved by my party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I realize that some of these things might be changed and I said so in the caucus. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I know as a manufacturer that they might be improved. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.] But I want to say that they are just as good as some of the things in the old Payne-Aldrich bill for the manufacturer. I do not, as a manufacturer, want protection. What I want is the same chance that I get in Europe, and therefore I suggested that indigo be made free because it is free in Europe. I suggested that it be made free, not only for the benefit of the South, which makes these cheap kinds of goods, but for the benefit of the mills of the rest of the country also.

I would like also to have the free list extended by the addition of alizarine and aniline colors. The committee said they were put on the dutiable list for revenue purposes. They are noncompetitive articles. We must import them. In the judgment of the caucus they are revenue producers, and I shall vote for them as revenue producers. I will, however, continue my efforts to change them along the same line while the bill is before the Senate. I do not apologize for that letter. I think it is the duty of every Congressman from every State to vote as he thinks in the caucus and to stand for what he thinks will help, as to anything he knows about, rather than to do it in a perfunctory way where it does no good. I plead guilty to the writing of that letter, and I am glad I wrote it. [Applause.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. METZ. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I notice you said in this letter that the vote upon this particular motion that you made in the caucus was 112 for and 54 against.

Mr. METZ. No; the other way.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. One hundred and twelve against.

Mr. METZ. I think it was 102. I do not remember the exact figures, whatever they were.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I was going to ask you how that vote of 112 to maintain this item in the bill in a House of 433 Members compared with the average vote on these different items?

Mr. METZ. Do you mean as a caucus vote?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. METZ. I guess it was as good a vote as was ever had in any Republican caucus.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Does it compare favorably with the other votes on the various items?

Mr. METZ. I think it was somewhat larger than most of them.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Most of them were smaller?

Mr. METZ. This was a little larger, I think.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. METZ. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman would confer a great favor upon us all if he would tell us how, after the caucus had voted down his amendment by a vote of 2 to 1, he managed to slip it into the bill before the bill was introduced into the House.

Mr. METZ. I want to say for the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois that I did not slip anything into the bill.

Mr. MANN. It is in the bill as reported.

Mr. METZ. I was very much gratified, and so were the manufacturers, when my colleague from New York [Mr. HARRISON] told me the committee had reconsidered and had decided to put indigo on the free list, where it always had been, for the benefit of men who make cheap cotton goods, among the most important of which are the overalls worn by laboring men. [Applause on the Democratic side.] These cheap cotton goods include goods which are made in this country for export—cheap calicoes, cotton prints, and cheap cotton goods of various kinds—as against the manufactures in England.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. METZ. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand that after the Democratic caucus had voted down the amendment proposed by the gentleman to place indigo upon the free list, notwithstanding the vote in the caucus, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], a colleague of my distinguished friend now on the floor, had the authority to change it entirely?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Oh, no.

Mr. METZ. I do not think so.

Mr. MANN. He did it.

Mr. METZ. No; I believe that my argument was so good that the Ways and Means Committee were convinced I was right and saw the justice of it and put it on the free list; that is all. Have you got any more letters? [Laughter and applause.]

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

28. Drugs, such as barks, beans, berries, buds, bulbs, bulbous roots, excrescences, fruits, flowers, dried fibers, dried insects, grains, gums, herbs, leaves, lichens, mosses, roots, stems, vegetables, seeds (aromatic, not garden seeds), seeds of morbid growth, and weeds; any of the foregoing which are natural and uncompounded drugs and not edible, and not specially provided for in this section, but which are advanced in value or condition by shredding, grinding, chipping, crushing, or any other process or treatment whatever beyond that essential to the proper packing of the drugs and the prevention of decay or deterioration pending manufacture, 10 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That no article containing alcohol shall be classified for duty under this paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I personally feel very much obliged to the gentleman from New York for accepting as true the statements which I made last year, which he then contradicted, concerning the effect of inserting in this paragraph the word "peeling." In the bill last year he put a tax on barks, and so forth, which had been advanced by peeling. The gentleman and I had quite a controversy as to what that meant. The gentleman insisted then that he was right. I thank him now for admitting that I was then right, by leaving out the word "peeling," proposed in the paragraph of last year.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. MANN. I have only five minutes. In this paragraph last year were nutgalls. Nutgalls are now on the free list. In the bill of last year it was proposed to put them on the dutiable list. The bill restored nutgalls to the free list. Nutgalls are used for the manufacture of gallic acid. Gallic acid is used in the manufacture of pyrogallic acid. The gentleman last year proposed to put a tariff on the raw material and reduce the tariff on the finished product, and defended it as a revenue proposition. Now, in this bill he proposes to restore the raw material to the free list and increase the tariff on the finished product, directly the reverse in both cases of what he did last year. He then said he wanted to put a tariff on the raw material to raise revenue. Now, he abandons the idea of a tax on the raw material and puts an increased tariff on the finished product.

The gentleman will have great difficulty in explaining why he has made the changes he made in this bill from the one of last year. Then he said he could tax the raw material and reduce the tax on the finished product. Now he says that he comes to the position which I urged last year in an amendment which I offered, which, on the gentleman's advice, was rejected, that we ought to give the manufacturer the raw material free and a reasonable tariff on the manufactured product. That is what this bill does. So that after all, even without a tariff commission, a mere debate in the House adds something, possibly, to the sum of knowledge possessed by so distinguished a gentleman as the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON]. If we had a tariff commission which would report the facts in regard to cases like this, there would not be the mistake in the

bill passed last year by the House and which, if the gentleman had had the power, would have been sent to the President, which has been retracted this year as to both lines of argument.

Mr. COOPER and Mr. HARRISON of New York rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I will take only a minute, if the gentleman from Wisconsin will permit me. I have already answered these arguments of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who seems to assume that he has written this schedule. I am very glad to have him get some of the glory of it, but I am sure he will not assume any of the responsibility. Gallnuts were put back on the free list because since the proposed revision of last year we have put all leathers on the free list, and gallnuts are used not only in making gallic acid but in making tannic acid, and tannic acid is used to some extent in tanning leathers. That is the reason for that change and not the additional information which the gentleman from Illinois seems to think has burst upon us as the result of his speeches.

Mr. MANN. Having put nutgalls on the free list, for any reason, then why does the gentleman increase the rate on the finished product?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman that the Payne law puts the same tax on gallic acid and pyrogallic acid, the one being made from the other, and we have merely corrected that illogical situation.

Mr. MANN. Not at all. The gentleman is mistaken as to his facts.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. I assert that the gentleman is mistaken as to his facts.

Mr. COOPER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized in my own right.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak upon this paragraph, but changed my intention after hearing what was said a moment ago by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. He ridiculed the idea that any possible good could come out of a tariff commission and declared, in effect, that anybody who says that such a body will be a nonpartisan commission talks nonsense. I happened to remember what the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] said about the tariff board in debate here when he was discussing the chemical bill last year and of the great assistance the board's report had been to him and to the other gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee in the preparation of the chemical schedule which they then submitted, and so I went to the library and procured the volume of the RECORD which I have in my hand.

And by the way, Mr. Chairman, before I read what the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] said at that time, I will digress long enough to remind the House that in 1911, two years ago, the Committee on Ways and Means reported a bill to completely revise the chemical schedule, and that every rate in that bill was an ad valorem rate. Members on the other side voted for it unanimously, and it passed the House; but last year, only one year later, they reported another chemical schedule, with entirely different rates, abandoned the ad valorem rates, and made every rate specific that could in any way be made so. And why? Hear the gentleman tell why. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], in supporting that bill, in February, 1912, said:

> But, more than this, and in addition, the Democratic membership of the Committee on Ways and Means in the preparation of this bill has had the benefit of the report of the Tariff Board on Schedule A. [Applause.]
>
> The report of the Tariff Board consists of a glossary of the paragraphs of the existing law and, in addition, an economic review of the chemical industry in the United States, in Canada, in France, in England, and in Germany. The members of the Ways and Means Committee take this opportunity of expressing to the Tariff Board their appreciation of the very valuable assistance which this report has been to them in the preparation of their bill.

That was a direct declaration by the distinguished gentleman from New York that the board's report was of great value, and the members of the board were competent, industrious, and honest. What becomes, then, of the statement of the gentleman from Texas about the uselessness of such a board? It was sarcastic and not a little harsh, if we think of the men who composed the board, but it met with applause upon the other side of the aisle.

Mr. DIES rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I can not yield, I have only a moment or two longer. I wish to add this only. The Tariff Board did not report, did not have the time to report, upon the difference in the cost of producing chemicals and their compounds in foreign competing countries and in this country. It is true that the board had not had sufficient time to investigate and to submit a report upon that point, touching the chemical schedule, although they had so reported upon the cotton schedule and the woolen schedule. If the members of the board were honest, competent, and industrious in reporting on this chemical schedule, in so far as they had time to go, so competent, industrious, and honest that their work was of great value to the gentleman from New York and to his colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, what right has he or any other man now to say that if they had had an opportunity to go further the board would not have been equally honest, competent, and industrious in reporting upon the difference in the cost of production in this and in competing countries? In other words, why should not this House have what Germany has, what France has, a report of impartial experts, presenting all the facts which we, as legislators, ought to possess in order to legislate wisely upon a subject of such an exceedingly important character? [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up the time of the committee in discussing something that is not pertinent to this paragraph, but I have heard gentlemen on that side of the House continually refer to the necessity of a tariff board, ignoring the fact that this House has equipped a bureau of the Government to do this work. Of course, I recognize there are some gentlemen on that side of the House who desire a tariff board or tariff commission, which shall be empowered with the duty and the power to take away from this House, the representatives of the people, the right to tax the American people.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I can not yield.

Mr. COOPER. I deny there is any such man in the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not talking about the gentleman from Wisconsin. The gentleman sometimes thinks he is the whole show, when he is a very small part of that side of the House. I am talking about that side of the House. There are those on that side of the House, on both sides of the minority, who would surrender the rights of the American people to legislate through their Representatives.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I can not yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to deny that for the Progressives.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But I recognize there are others, and I think these others constitute a majority of the Members on that side of the House, and a large majority, who merely desire a tariff board for the purpose of gathering information. Now, I most heartily concur with those gentlemen who desire to have the committees of this House informed on this great question from other sources than the interested sources from which that side of the House for many years obtained its information, to wit, the parties who benefited by the protective-tariff duties.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I asked not to be interrupted; I have only five minutes. Now, I want to say to that side of the House and gentlemen on this side of the House who are not informed as to the legislation of the past that although this side of the House declined absolutely to continue the Tariff Board—that cost the American people a half a million dollars for three years in doing the work that was only partially executed and that would have taken 10 or 12 years to revise a whole tariff bill—this side of the House wrote into one of the great appropriation bills the organization of a Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in the Department of Commerce, giving it full authority, more authority than you gave your so-called Tariff Board, more authority than you proposed in the bills you have introduced to create a tariff commission, to investigate the facts in reference to all matters that concern the making of a tariff bill and to report those facts both to the President of the United States and to the Congress of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, the board that you created was to report to the President and the report had to filter out to the people's Representatives through the Executive of the Nation. The bureau we have created with the power to investigate these tariff questions is authorized and directed to report directly to the Congress of the United States. Now, that bureau is not vitalized; and why? We put the law on the statute books; it is there; but after it was enacted into law your party, being in power, authorized to make the estimates for the Government, failed or refused to make the estimates to fully vitalize that bureau.

Now, I want to say to the gentlemen on that side of the House that you need not worry about this question. The Democratic administration and the Democratic House in the near future is going to vitalize that bureau by the necessary appropriations and extend its powers to get information that will be of use to the committees whether they are Republicans or Democrats in the future. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, after line 21, add a new paragraph, as follows: 28½. Copperas, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to assume that there is something in the argument of the eloquent gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] with regard to the farmer's boy, and that having been born somewhere in Kentucky, and having first seen the light of day under his father's humble roof, he was urged by the folks to better his condition and get out of the slough of the farm and go to the city; that having done so he studied the art of chemistry, and, having perfected himself, he made certain discoveries which were of value to his countrymen; that having thus put himself in a position to compete with men of talent and ability he organized a business and started a factory for the manufacture of copperas; that having done this and brought into employment men to whom he paid on an average $11.50 a week he found that he was compelled to compete with men engaged in the same business, men of the same cleverness and of the same ingenuity, in Italy and Spain and in England, and that he found that in England they paid a weekly wage of $4.87 against the $11.50 he had paid for American labor; that he also had to compete against labor in Italy at 75 cents a day and labor in Spain at 55 cents a day. Then I want also to draw the attention of the folks back home to this boy who, by borrowing money and inducing friends to have confidence in him in the great city, had made an investment of $250,000 in the plant. I want them to know that his success was due to protection which had been assured him by the laws of the United States against the cheap material that was coming in over the borders from 55 and 75 cents a day labor, which protection is now about to be removed by a bill known as the Underwood bill.

I want the folks back home, who still have some pride in the boy whom they sent to the city, to know what the country boy who came to the city is up against through the measure now advanced by his alleged friends of the Democratic Party. I am making this argument for the benefit of the folks back home, and in order that you may pass the amendment I have offered restoring the protective rate on an American industry which protects the country boy in the city who suddenly finds himself cast down by those who happen to be in political control. Vote for the farmer's boy and let this amendment go through.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply interested in what my farmer friend from Pennsylvania is saying——

Mr. MOORE. I was born on a farm.

Mr. ADAMSON. He looks it.

Mr. DIES. I am interested——

Mr. HOWARD. Sit down.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I heard from a Member rising on the other side of the House a moment ago the admonition "Sit down." I want to ask whether it is in the rules?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman it is not within the rules, but the gentleman is out of order inasmuch as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has the floor.

Mr. MOORE. Is it in order for the Chair to call a gentleman down when he is out of order, or is it in order for a Member to say, "Sit down"?

The CHAIRMAN. It is certainly in order for the Chair to call the gentleman from Pennsylvania to order if he is out of order.

Mr. MOORE. "The gentleman from Pennsylvania" submits to the Chair.

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

29. Ergot, 10 cents per pound.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, we have just heard from the leading counsel for the defense as to his objection to a tariff board. We have heard what he has to say against the Republican Party because it favored a tariff board.

Why, gentlemen, exactly the same bill that we are going to offer in our motion to recommit was before this House on January 30, 1911, and in casting my eye down the column to see who voted in favor of that tariff board I find the name of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat amused by the belated activities of our Republican and other friends for a tariff board. It is true that during the dying hours of the Sixty-first Congress, just before the Democratic Party came into power in the House, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and his colleagues made a pretense of attempting to establish a tariff board. [Applause.] They had permitted the entire session to go by, and in its dying hours pretended that the wicked Democrats, of whom I was one of the most conspicuous, had prevented the most autocratic machine ever known in this House from passing the bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But their belated efforts are amusing to those who are familiar with legislation and with the facts. In 1888 Congress conferred this power upon the Bureau of Labor by this provision:

The Commissioner of Labor, in accordance with the general design and duties referred to in section 1 of this act, is especially charged to ascertain at as early a date as possible, and whenever industrial changes shall make it essential, the cost of producing articles at the time dutiable in the United States, in leading countries where such articles are produced, by fully specified units of production, and under a classification showing the different elements of cost, or approximate cost, of such articles of production, including the wages paid in such industries per day, week, month, or year, or by the piece; and hours employed per day; and the profits of the manufacturers and producers of such articles; and the compartive cost of living, and the kind of living. * * * What articles are controlled by trusts or other combinations of capital, business operations, or labor, and what effect said trusts or other combinations of capital, business operations, or labor have on production and prices. He shall also establish a system of reports by which, at intervals of not less than two years, he can report the general condition, so far as production is concerned, of the leading industries of the country.

That statute was passed, as I have said, in 1888; and yet the Republican Party revised the tariff three times after it was enacted, and never suggested that a single dollar be appropriated to enable the Republican Commissioner of Labor to ascertain the facts authorized to be ascertained under that statute.

But after the country had repudiated the Republican Party for the indefensible pretense of a revision of the tariff downward, contained in the Payne-Aldrich bill, in order, as President Taft said in his famous Winona speech, to tide over the four years of the period intervening before a presidential election, so that the Republicans could have a chance to get together, they suggested in the dying hours of the Sixty-first Congress that a tariff board or commission be created, so as to prevent the Democratic Party carrying out the mandate of the country. In the Sixty-second Congress the Democratic House enacted a very beneficial piece of constructive legislation. It consolidated in the Department of Commerce and Labor certain functions that had theretofore been assigned to certain bureaus in the Department of State, together with these functions in the Bureau of Labor. That law was approved in August, 1912. The Republicans had been pretending that they wished information obtained in a certain manner, and yet the Republican administration submitted no estimate to carry out the enlarged functions of the newly established Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce until January, 1913. Two days after the legislative bill had been reported to the Senate of the United States, after having passed the House, the Republican administration transmitted a communication to Congress requesting an appropriation of $20,000 to enable it to obtain the desired information. In explanation of the transmission of the estimate otherwise than in the regular Book of Estimates, as required by the statute—and this act having been enacted in August there was ample time to transmit it in the regular way—they stated that it was impossible for the department to submit to Congress an estimate of this work——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. With the permission of the House, I will extend this in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. I shall object to extensions of remarks when the requests are made from the floor in this way, as gentlemen already have the authority.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did not catch the gentleman's remark.

Mr. MANN. Gentlemen already have general authority to print—which I regret.

Mr. FITZGERALD. For the information of gentlemen on that side I wish to state that I will print this in the RECORD.

Secretary Nagel in his letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, which was transmitted by the latter to the President of the Senate on January 11, 1913, made the following statement:

It was impossible for the department to submit to Congress an estimate for this work before this time, owing to the fact that the extent of the requests for information along the lines covered by the law, which necessarily would control the extent of the investigations to be made by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, could not be determined subsequent to the time the law imposing these new duties upon that bureau was passed by Congress.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] stated that the Democratic Party had created a great new bureau of the Government to obtain information such as we desired to have obtained by a tariff commission. I suppose it is not strange that the gentleman from Alabama has fallen into that error, because with his multitudinous duties in regard to the tariff he does not keep very close track of the appropriation bills.

What you did do was to cut out three bureaus of the Government and put only one in its place, and then not make a sufficient appropriation for the maintenance of the one. There was the Bureau of Manufactures, the Bureau of Statistics, and the Bureau of Foreign Commerce in the State Department, the first two being in the Department of Commerce and Labor. You abolished these bureaus as a matter of economy, and it was so stated on the floor to the House, and you created only one bureau to take the place of the three and then refused to make a sufficient appropriation for the one.

I am surprised, in a way, at what has just been said here. I suppose there is no one in the House except the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], who just addressed it, who would have the gall to lay upon a Republican administration the failure to make the appropriation he suggested. The Taft administration sent an estimate to the House asking for an appropriation to continue the Tariff Board. That was the proposition we desired to have enacted into law. You refused to give the appropriation to continue the Tariff Board, and at the same time, with all your ingenuity, did not propose to increase the appropriation for the new bureau. You were not frank then and you are not frank now about it. We were asking for an appropriation of sufficient amount to do the work which was desired to be done. If you preferred to have that work done by the bureau in the Department of Commerce, why did you not make the appropriation for that bureau instead of for the Tariff Board, for which the President had asked it? You have always resisted the increased appropriations for the Department of Commerce and Labor, and they never had the authority to make the investigation which we on this side of the House desired to have made. I do not know whether you are in the end going to do what the gentleman from Alabama says—largely increase the appropriation for this bureau. I have consistently fought for many years to secure an increase of the appropriations for these bureaus, for one of which I wrote the law creating the Department of Commerce and Labor.

You abolish that bureau. You have put nothing in its place which properly answers for the work it was designed for. If you increase your appropriation, very well. What the country wants is a tariff commission in which it will have confidence, and which when it reports as to the facts those facts will be taken as true by the country and by the Members of Congress who pass tariff laws. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, the inconsistency and insincerity of the Republican Party, when it wants to play politics, is wonderful to behold. Many of you will recall that during the final days of Republican majority in this House we had this contention as to tariff commissions before us, and during the progress of that bill I introduced an amendment in which I proposed a bipartisan commission instead of a commission to be appointed by the President and to report to him. I proposed in that resolution that the members should be appointed one by the majority of the House, one by the minority of the House, one by the majority of the Senate, one by the minority of the Senate, and the other by the President of the United States.

But the same gentlemen who are industriously clamoring for a nonpartisan tariff commission now opposed that amendment bitterly, and it was defeated by a vote of nine. I believe this country needs some sort of a board or commission to ascertain from time to time the need of tariff revision and to so report to the tariff-making body. I have long believed so, but the Republican idea of delegating all that authority to the President, the leader of their party, that he may constitute a partisan commission to report to him, thus giving the Congress of the United States such portion of the report as he chooses and throwing the balance into the Potomac River if he chooses, is no sort of a commission that will satisfy the business interests of the United States.

If the business men of this country are asking anything at all in this line, they are asking that a commission shall be appointed, as the Democrats propose, which will give to the country a businesslike report which will enable Congress to reach fair, honest, and legitimate conclusions. And I want to repeat what I have before said on this question, that a strictly partisan commission will not satisfy; a nonpartisan board is out of the question, because all tariff experts have partisan opinions; and so the best thing we can do is to permit the parties in the House and Senate to select the tariff board membership, so that each party will have fair representation on the board of experts. No other method of tariff board creation will convince the country that its reports are full and complete. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I am much surprised to hear the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] express a lack of confidence in the present President of the United States.

During the last Congress we upon this side proposed the appointment of a nonpartisan tariff commission by the President of the United States. Then we had a Republican President. We had confidence that in appointing the tariff board he would throw aside politics and look only to qualifications.

Mr. Chairman, before this bill shall finally pass there will be a motion from this side of the House proposing a tariff commission to be appointed by the Democratic President of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side] Are you afraid of your own President, that he will appoint a partisan commission, as the gentleman from Indiana now suggests? We apparently have more confidence in your President than you have.

Now, with reference to what the gentleman from New York said with reference to the defeat of the tariff-commission bill two years ago. It is not true that the Sixty-first Congress did not pass that bill until the dying hours of the session. The RECORD will show that the bill was passed through the House in ample time for the Senate to consider it and to be sent back to the House before final action long before the 4th day of March.

But the RECORD also shows that Republicans in the Senate of the United States tried day after day to secure consideration in that body of that tariff-commission bill, and there was objection always upon the part of Democrats there. It was only in the closing days of the session that they were successful in securing a consideration of the bill. It was passed upon the morning of the 4th day of March, and on the 4th day of March, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] well knows, through the activity of himself and others and through a deliberate violation of the rules by the then Speaker of the House, the bill failed, or it would have been a law to-day.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I am not accustomed to making statements here that are not accurate, and even if the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] makes the assertion, it does not in any way impair the accuracy of what I have said. I repeat that in the dying hours of the Sixty-first Congress the Republican side of the House attempted to pass a tariff commission bill. I know whereof I speak, despite the statements of the gentleman from Wisconsin. That bill came back from the Senate the day before, or rather the Committee on Rules met the day before Congress adjourned and adopted a rule to consider the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. It came back the same morning.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The bill came back early in the morning, and Republicans delayed and deferred calling the bill up. If those in charge on that side of the House——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman does not want to misstate the facts.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not misstating the facts.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken in making the statement he does.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not misstating the facts. I left the Chamber at 8 o'clock in the morning to get breakfast, upon the assurance of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Dalzell, that the bill would not be called up while I was in the restaurant.

Mr. MANN. It had not come over at that time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was here at that time.

Mr. MANN. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I decline to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. Then I make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HAY). In what way?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has already addressed himself to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late. The gentleman was already upon his feet and had addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANN. But, Mr. Chairman, a point of order never comes too late.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But if the gentleman is afraid to have the truth stated and the point of order is good, I will take my seat.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist upon his point of order?

Mr. MANN. I made the point of order for the purpose of attracting the attention of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will state that I supposed that when the gentleman rose to his feet another paragraph of the bill had been read since he last spoke.

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will ask my friends upon this side not to speak twice on one paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I do not make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. Three minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And it was while I was at breakfast, Mr. Chairman, between 8 o'clock and half past 8 o'clock, that the bill was called up. It is ridiculous to allege that that old autocratic machine between half past 8 o'clock in the morning and 12 o'clock noon could not have concurred in one Senate amendment and have agreed to it and have passed the bill. The truth of the matter is that the gentlemen over there were not sincere. They were just trying to fool the country in their belated performance. More than that, Mr. Chairman, in view of what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has said, I wish to say that, for one, I am opposed to any so-called tariff board or tariff commission. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is a mere pretense to aid in enacting legislation along the lines of a protective tariff. The only reason for ascertaining the cost of production here and abroad and measuring tariff rates by that difference is to give protection to the manufacturer. According to the views which I hold, according to my opinion of how a tariff should be levied, I am not in favor of writing a tariff bill so as to afford protection to the manufacturer. More than that, many of those who are clamoring for protection do not need it. We are selling the products of our factories in every country in competition with the foreign manufacturers right at their doors. Such gentlemen do not need protection to enable them to meet the foreign manufacturers, but they desire it for the purpose of fleecing the American public. Gentlemen from New England have been protesting against putting boots and shoes on the free list and claim that the European manufacturers can lay their output down in Boston as cheaply as can the New England manufacturers, and yet none of them has ever been able to explain something that has been recently called to my attention, and that is that they are paying a duty of thirty-odd per cent on the shoes and shipping them into Canada and meeting European manufacturers in competition in Canada. Perhaps some gentlemen who represent the New England boot and shoe industries will be able to state how it is that the American manufacturer can ship into Canada and pay the duty and meet competition——

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I can not yield—and yet can not meet competition at his own door in Boston.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the statements of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], who has just addressed the House, are so unlike him, so unfair, so misleading that I do not think they ought to go uncontroverted. The tariff commission bill passed this House in, I believe, January, and went to the Senate. Its passage in the Senate is admitted to have been delayed by Democratic opposition. That bill came back to the House on the 4th of March. Final adjournment necessarily took place at 12 o'clock noon. The House was in session all night the night of the 3d of March. Members had no time, were in insufficient numbers to constitute a quorum. There were a number of appropriation bills in doubt as to getting through at all. A hot fight was on over the post-office bill, as I recall, and several others were in question. Those bills were being passed, if at all, by the House, so far as final conference reports were concerned, without a quorum. No one dared in the House at that time to raise the question of a quorum or of bringing up a question that required a quorum until business was further along and these appropriation bills were disposed of, because everyone here who knew anything about the House knew that it was not possible to get a quorum of this House together before 10 o'clock or half past 10 in the morning after an all-night session. The appropriation bills were finally disposed of and the tariff commission bill, which had come over from the Senate at the earliest possible moment from a legislative standpoint, was called up with a proposition to concur in the Senate amendments, not one amendment but amendments, and thereupon the other side of the House commenced a filibuster. Some gentleman here the other day, I think the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], unfairly, as it seemed to me, stated or intimated that we might turn the clock back in order to pass that commission bill. Mr. Chairman, it is a common thing to turn the clock back on the 4th of March for immaterial things, for the little final windup, but I think nobody has ever proposed to turn the clock back in violation, in effect, of the Constitution for the purpose of passing a hotly controverted political proposition. I was unwilling on that day, and would be now, to turn the clock back in violation of the Constitution for the purpose of passing any controverted proposition. Gentlemen seem to think that it is fair to criticize the then Speaker. He did everything in his power under the rules of the House at that time to agree to the Senate amendments so that the tariff commission bill should be passed. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] here was doing everything within his power, but there come times in this House when a strong minority, ably led as that minority was at that time by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], can prevent speedy action by the House. I helped to give an illustration of that in the last session of Congress, when it took, as I told gentlemen on the other side it would take when it commenced, three hours and a half to approve the Journal of the House, and we did not have as large a minority as you had at this other time. But a strong minority, if they wish to filibuster, can delay action, and you wished to filibuster at that time and you were able to delay action by the House on the final morning after the Democrats in the Senate had delayed action in the Senate until the very last day.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, what is the truth about the tariff commission action on the morning of the 4th of March, 1911? The exact truth is—and the RECORD will bear it out—that the men who were standing sponsor for it on the Republican side were making a pretense, and Mr. FITZGERALD, leading the fight on the Democratic side, was openly against it. That tariff-commission bill went from this House to the Senate on January 11. It was held back in the Senate until the morning of March 4, when it came into this body and was offered expedition here by a resolution from the Committee on Rules which proposed to expedite it by moving that all votes on the Senate amendments should be taken in gross, a fact which the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] yesterday denied. Now, a filibuster was at once begun against it by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. In the midst of that filibuster—the fight being led on the Republican side by Mr. Dalzell, of Pennsylvania, who has been against the tariff commission, who was then against the tariff commission, and who, as shown in the records of Congress repeatedly, I think, spoke against the tariff commission—Mr. Dalzell asked in the midst of that fight on the previous question on the resolution for the ayes and noes.

Even that sort of a move would have been enough to have beaten the bill, but what further happened, as a matter of fact? Now, listen. Finally the resolution itself came to a vote. The yeas and nays were ordered and taken. As the gentleman knows, we call the roll here twice. For the only time, probably, in the history of the American Congress when the roll had been called for the first time this happened: Mr. Tawney, of Minnesota, a member of the machine, came in here with the conference report on the general deficiency bill, rose to his feet, got the recognition of the Speaker, Mr. Cannon, and on a motion to concur in the Senate amendments on the general deficiency bill another roll call was ordered. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] remembers this.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; and I protested against it.

Mr. MURDOCK. He certainly did protest, and made a point of order. When one roll call was half concluded—a roll call which would have given the people of the United States a tariff

commission if the Republican leaders had been in earnest in this matter—contrary to parliamentary practice, contrary to common sense, the Speaker allowed another motion to come in, and in the midst of one roll call another roll call was taken.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, that was also contrary to an express rule of the House.

Mr. MURDOCK. It was contrary to every rule. It was in that hour that the Republican leaders of this House put this reform behind them. It was their chance. They had met the rebuke of the people in the preceding November election, and they had not learned their lesson, and they turned against it. The truth is that at this late hour the Republican leaders are trying to take up the thing they dropped. They were given their chance. They will not be given it again. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Most of the Democrats in this Chamber are against a tariff commission. I do not agree with them that a tariff commission is not a good thing, even for a tariff for revenue only; but they are open in their opposition; they are against a tariff commission. The Republican leaders of this body are pretending to be for a tariff commission. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Put them back in power, let this bill which the Democrats will pass bring disaster upon the country, and if by any misfortune the Republican leaders shall come back into power they will have no tariff commission. They will begin to revise the tariff in the same old way, getting their information from the men who want to be protected at the expense of the general public. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DIES, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. CAMPBELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is recognized.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take the negative of the motion on which the gentleman has spoken, as a member of the committee. I claim the floor in preference to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts as a member of the committee.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] has evidently prepared that speech for this occasion. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Now, every man who was present in this House on the memorable day of March 4, 1911—and only those people who were present understand the situation—is entitled to his opinion as to whether on that day the Republican leaders acted in good faith or not. In my opinion, everything on our side was done in good faith and with the intention of passing the bill. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], who interrupted a moment ago, whether or not, in his judgment, the Republican Party was acting in good faith.

Mr. SHERLEY. In my judgment, there was not the slightest excuse, and I so stated then and have said repeatedly, publicly and privately, for the ruling of the Chair, in the face of a direct rule, that it was in order to stop a roll call to receive a conference report from the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Tawney.

Mr. GARDNER. Very likely the Chair may have been mistaken in his rulings; but I asked the gentleman from Kentucky whether he thought the leaders were acting in good faith, and he has not answered.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will answer that their action was taken so late that almost any opposition was sufficient to prevent success attending their efforts——

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman has not answered. I will ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] if, in his opinion, the Republican leaders were in earnest that day?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, my judgment about it is that there never was a Republican leader in this House that was in favor of that tariff commission. [Loud and prolonged applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri rose.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee). The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, there is a great deal of misapprehension about the position of various gentlemen and of the two parties about a tariff commission. I am against it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is, against an outside body that is not made responsive to the House of Representatives.

Here is the situation: The Constitution of the United States devolves upon the House of Representatives the duty of making revenue bills—that is, of introducing them. The Senate can not do it. Therefore it is the House of Representatives which primarily needs the information on the subject of the tariff.

The second step is consideration of revenue bills by the Senate.

The last body that has anything to do with the tariff bill is the President. Now, what is the sense, or what ever was the sense, in spending four or five hundred thousand dollars—I believe it was $250,000 a year—to get up a tariff board to instruct the President of the United States on the details of the tariff bills? I will tell you who needs the instruction and the information, and that need is constant. It is the House of Representatives. [Applause.] We are the ones who need it.

The statement has been lugged in here that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] voted for a tariff commission; and if the gentleman who made the statement had gone up the column a little further he would have found my name. But we never did vote for the tariff commission that they have been talking about. We never did anything of the sort.

I have stated it three or four times on the floor of this House. Here is what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and myself and the other Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee did: We induced the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means to agree to make it responsive to the House, and then we brought in a unanimous report here. Afterwards one gentleman changed his notion about it, as he had a perfect right to do, and then they started an agitation around here, and the first thing that the gentleman from Alabama and myself knew they rolled us most thoroughly. [Laughter.] I mean the Democrats, now, not the Republicans. Of course, the Republicans were standing by and consenting, like Saul at the stoning of Stephen. [Laughter.] But they actually rolled up a majority against Brother UNDERWOOD and myself on the Democratic side, and it was the first time and the last time they ever did it. The only reason they did it then was that they caught us napping. [Laughter.] We were so certain we were right that we did not believe anybody would object to it; but we changed our opinion the next day. [Laughter.]

Here is the Democratic position about this board, or commission, or whatever you please to call it: We welcome information on the tariff question and solicit it from any source under heaven that is reliable. It is an interminable job. Nobody ever gets through with it. My venerable friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has participated in four tariff revisions here. This is the fifth tariff revision in which he has helped one way or another, and he is still a learner. When I came here 20 years ago I thought I knew all about the tariff. I have been studying it ever since, and I feel to-day as Sir Isaac Newton said he felt after studying philosophy all his life—like a boy walking up and down the seashore picking up shells. You never get through with it. Here is what I am in favor of, and I know it is what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is in favor of, because we have talked about it hundreds of times. We are in favor of the Ways and Means Committee, upon whom we devolve the duty of making tariff bills, having all the expert help that it needs. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I do not care whether it is 1 expert or 40; if it needs them, I will vote the money to-morrow, and I would have voted it when the Republicans controlled this House. Whenever the bureau which the gentleman from Alabama talks about is vitalized, as it is going to be very shortly, then a large part of the expert tariff work is provided for. One word more. No man who was in this House on the 4th of March, 1911—of which occasion so much has been said—will ever forget that transaction while the world lasts.

I have seen this House in a rage time and time again, but I never saw the Democratic side of it so enraged as it was that day. It verged on riot. I violate no confidence in saying that my good friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN], whom I highly esteem, came to me and suggested that I prepare a resolution thanking Mr. Speaker Cannon at the close of the session, and I prepared it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes, not to constitute a precedent for the remainder of the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thank my friend from Illinois and the committee. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], as I say, asked me to prepare a resolution thanking Speaker

Cannon, and I did it. I was glad to do it. It was all arranged that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] should preside and I would offer the resolution, make a speech, and everything would be lovely. [Laughter.] Then the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] led that fight about this Tariff Board, and then the Democratic side of the House got madder about Mr. Speaker Cannon's ruling than I ever saw it, even about an election case, and you new Members will find out that that is one of the most irritating subjects that ever comes up in the House. The situation became so serious that I went to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and told him that I could not offer the resolution; that if I did the Democrats would throw me out of the window. [Laughter.] I told him that he would have to do it himself. So it went along that way for a few minutes and then some gentleman—I have forgotten whether it was the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] or the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Dalzell—withdrew the bone of contention, and the effect of it was like the sun breaking through an April shower. Everybody got into a good humor on our side of the House, and in a few minutes I offered a resolution thanking Speaker Cannon, and it was passed unanimously.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. It was almost 12 o'clock and we were calling the roll, not on a final vote but on a motion to recommit. I went to the gentleman from New York and one or two other gentlemen on this side of the House opposed to the gentleman from Missouri, and said that the clock would not be turned back for the purpose of passing any controverted proposition. That was agreed upon, otherwise there would have been a riot in the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MANN. There is no question about it. Gentlemen who were not here do not understand the feeling. That having been agreed to, so far as we could agree to it at least, I went to the gentleman from New York and said to him, "It is impossible to pass this amendment by 12 o'clock. We can not afford to have a riot in the House. We will not finish up our other business if this matter is set before the House," and the gentleman from New York withdrew his proposition.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman from Missouri state how many minutes it lacked to 12?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It was right around 12.

Mr. MANN. The clock was not turned back at all, and the matter was disposed of immediately after. Those gentlemen who were criticizing immediately came in and then found that instead of being 12 o'clock it was a little after 11 o'clock.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman from Missouri mean to say that in view of the history of this matter and what occurred that day I was not in earnest in trying to pass these amendments through the House and using every power I could command to do it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I will not say anything of the sort. I will tell the gentleman what I will say, and I believe it is absolutely true, and that is that the gentleman from New York had experienced a change of heart about the commission, and that day he was trying to get that bill through here——

A MEMBER. What about Dalzell?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will not speak of him, for he is not here.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; certainly.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Missouri has left the impression on this House that in his opinion there was a conspiracy afoot that day on the Republican side to defeat that bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, no; I have never stated that.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman, in answer to my question whether the Republican side was trying to pass the bill——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was not the question the gentleman from Massachusetts asked.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Missouri may be technically correct, but the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] had given the House to understand that there was a conspiracy afoot on the Republican side and that we deliberately planned to seem to wish to pass the tariff-board bill that day and yet did not intend to pass it. I asked the gentleman from Missouri whether that was so?

And half the House roared with delight when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] evaded the question by saying that in his opinion no Republican leader had ever wanted to pass that bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, there were plenty of Republicans in the House then, a great many of whom were honestly in favor of a tariff commission. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] was. He is now a leader in this House. I do not think he, at that time, would rate himself as a leader on the tariff question. That is not said in bad temper or anything of the sort. The gentleman from Massachusetts has fine capacity, and I congratulate him on his promotion to the great Committee on Ways and Means. I was talking about the men who were running the Committee on Ways and Means upon the tariff question, the leaders on that subject March 4, 1911.

Mr. GARDNER. On that day?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, that day.

Mr. GARDNER. That is the point.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was not the thing the gentleman was asking about.

Mr. GARDNER. That is the point I am asking the gentleman to answer. The gentleman from Kansas charges a conspiracy upon that day. Does he charge us justly?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] was honest on that day.

Mr. GARDNER. No; but was there a conspiracy?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not know.

Mr. GARDNER. What does the gentleman think?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will tell the gentleman what I think. I think that some Republicans were in favor of a tariff commission, and that some of them were as bitterly opposed to it as I was.

Mr. GARDNER. I know; but was there a conspiracy on that day?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I can not tell, because I was not in it if there was one. [Prolonged laughter.] I can not tell, therefore, I never charged any conspiracy. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] preferred that charge.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman does not have to tell. I ask him what he thinks.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I never charged there was a conspiracy.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman will not answer the question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I can not answer it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat, that Democrats welcome information on the tariff question from any reliable source under heaven, and after we get all we can get we will not have enough, and neither would the Republicans, because the subject is absolutely inexhaustible. I once learned something on the tariff question, and a very important thing, from a man from whom I was not seeking information, and that was this, that the railroads had a very great interest in the tariff question. That was 20 years ago. I never had thought about their having any more interest in the tariff question than any other large business institution that was not engaged in manufacturing. It was in the Christmas time between 1893 and 1894, when we were framing the Wilson bill. This gentleman said that if we put coal on the free list, West Virginia and Maryland would both go Republican. He said that we would recoup among the farmers for what we lost among the miners, but that the great transportation lines running through those two States would go over, body and breeches, to the Republicans, because they made their living by hauling coal to the Atlantic seaboard and that free coal would give that trade to the Nova Scotia mines. And, Mr. Chairman, if he had been Elijah, and all the rest of the major prophets rolled into one, he could not have hit it better, because West Virginia has been Republican ever since and Maryland hanging on by her eyelids. [Laughter.] So, if you are busy about it you can secure tariff information from almost everywhere.

One other thing and then I am going to quit. I want experts to help this Committee on Ways and Means, to help the House, and they are the ones who ought to have it. There is no such thing as a nonpartisan board. It is an impossibility in nature. It is a thing incredible that any man who is fit to sit on a tariff board has no political opinions which lead him into some sort of affiliation with some political party in this country. As far as I am individually concerned, if I were making up a tariff board or a board of tariff experts, you could rely upon the fact that it would have a working Democratic majority, because I believe in the Democratic theory, and if the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] or the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] or any of the rest of them were making up a tariff board they would put a Republican majority on it. That is all there is to it. I hope, Mr. Chairman, it will never be again charged on the floor

of this House that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and incidentally myself, ever voted for this thing that they call a tariff commission, as it is popularly understood in this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not willing to let go unanswered the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] that in response to an inquiry I made him an equivocal answer. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Speaker of this House, has well said that that was a day of intense excitement. It was. The memory of what happened is stamped indelibly upon the minds of those who were present on what to me was the most exciting day I ever experienced in my 10 years of service here. In my judgment this is the actual fact. There never was a time when those in control of the majority on that side of the House were believers in the tariff board. The President of the United States was a very sincere believer in it, as I have always been and now am, because for my part I still favor a tariff board, and I am glad that I had something to do with creating the language that makes a practical tariff board out of the Department of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Now, with the position of the President of the United States being what it was, it became necessary for certain leaders upon this floor to get into harmony of action with the President. Therefore they became, as his representatives here, as the party's representatives, the advocates of a tariff board, but in my humble judgment there could have been no other subject under the sun up at that time on which a roll call could have been interrupted by recognition from the Chair of a gentleman to offer a conference report and thereby bring on another roll call, except that one question of a tariff board. Now, there is a great deal of difference between men being for a proposition legislatively and being for it because they believe in it in their heart of hearts, and there were many men here on this floor, as the gentleman from Massachusetts knows and as I know, who in their heart of hearts did not believe in a tariff commission, but the exigency of politics and the position of the leader of their party, the then President of the United States, forced them into that sort of position. Now, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I did not mean to use the word "equivocal" in a disagreeable sense. I mean the gentleman did not answer the question exactly as it was put.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course, I did not answer it the way the gentleman wanted me, and I admit that now, but I think I did answer it the way it was put. Now, this is true. It is true those men at that late hour were pushing the bill forward, but my answer was strictly accurate—that their conversion was such a deathbed conversion that it gave no possibility, with any sort of opposition, that they would be able to carry through the object that they undertook.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman now answer me this question—and let me preface it by saying that it often happens in this House that men do their best to pass bills in which they do not believe in order to carry out a party policy: Granting, if the gentleman chooses, that the tariff-board bill was unnecessarily delayed in the Senate—it may have been, for all I know—granting that a great many Republicans were opposed to it—I know a great many were opposed to it——

Mr. SHERLEY. I trust the gentleman will come to his question; I have only five minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. I think the House is willing to hear the gentleman's answer. The gentleman has heard this morning from the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] a distinct charge that the Republican leaders on the 4th of March, 1911, were playing false; that at that time they were deliberately not trying to pass the bill. Now, I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the intense excitement it was quite possible that even Mr. Speaker Cannon might admit a roll call which was out of order, and which we all know was out of order. I want to ascertain the gentleman's impression whether or not that was merely a stage play or whether the Republican side of the House on that day was legislatively doing all that it could—your side trying to resist to its utmost—to pass that bill, because it is a grave charge which the gentleman from Kansas has made. He was present, I was present, and the gentleman was present, and we have opposing opinions. What I wish to know is, Were we scoundrels?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not hold a brief either for the gentleman from Kansas or the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I decline to be put in a position of undertaking to testify to the inner motives of the leaders of the Republican Party.

This I say to the gentleman, and I would say more if some of the men who were actors in that scene were here present, that I believe there could have been no other subject up, which being up could have been interrupted by recognition by the Chair of the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Tawney, to present a conference report.

Mr. GARDNER. Does the gentleman think that the Chair was trying to beat that bill by the lapse of time?

Mr. SHERLEY. I have stated the facts. The gentleman can draw his own conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, one moment. I would like to have the gentlemen finish their discussion on this question, but I would like to close, and without objection I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 10 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. I would like to have time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, I will extend the time to 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, what is the paragraph? Is it paragraph 29, to strike out 10 cents a pound?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Of course closing the debate on this paragraph will not close debate on this subject unless the gentleman enforces the rest of the rule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing for the House to work out the debate on this and get rid of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I reserved the right to object in order to see whether I could get some kind of an understanding with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] for the benefit of the committee. How far does the gentleman desire the committee to proceed to-day with this bill before we adjourn?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I hope we will get through many pages before we adjourn to-night, but I recognize that this is a question that gentlemen want to debate. I have no desire to unduly cut it off, but I would like to reach some agreement about the time for such debate. I understand the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] desire to speak, and if there is any other gentleman on that side of the House who wishes to speak I will extend the time. I ask unanimous consent, reserving five minutes to this side, that the time for debate on this paragraph be closed in 15 minutes, with the understanding that we will go on with the bill at the end of that time.

Mr. MANN. I wanted to know if the gentleman could not assure us that if we would be very good in school and we would be able to finish the chemical schedule, which is one of the difficult schedules in the bill, at half past 6, we could not get out this evening?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say that I would prefer to have night sessions for the present.

Mr. MANN. I should prefer not to have.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is recognized.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, the charge made by my colleague from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] is one of the most serious a Member could make against his colleagues on the floor of the House. I was present during the entire night of March 3 and the morning of March 4, 1911—two years ago.

I am a little surprised, on account of the political history of the time, that such a charge would be made by him dating back for two years. I say what I am about to say with the most kindly feeling for my friend, for he is my friend. The Republican Party was not hopelessly abandoned to all that is honorable and fair, even last summer and fall. He secured a nomination from it in the last campaign and secured an election to this House, and the seat that he now holds, as a Republican candidate upon the Republican ticket. If it was good enough for his purpose last fall, it was not so bad two years ago and now as he says.

But upon the question of the tariff commission I think I speak advisedly as to the sincerity of the Republican Party. I speak with all sincerity when I say that it is my confident belief that upon the 4th of March, 1911, everything was done that could be done to secure the passage of a tariff-commission law. We have just heard a description of the almost tragic opposition that was made to that bill upon the Democratic side of the House. There never has been a time when the conditions were so acute in the House during my service here as upon that day. The opposition was more determined that day upon that bill than upon any other bill or any other question during the 10 years I have been in this House.

I had studied the sentiment of gentlemen upon this side, because long before the birth of the Progressive Party, long before any other gentleman upon this floor was in favor of a tariff commission, I introduced a bill providing for such a commission. I introduced the first bill for that purpose as far back as December 11, 1906, and have been reintroducing such a bill in every Congress since, and have been earnestly advocating its becoming a law.

And I have canvassed during the years that have intervened since 1906 the sentiment of the membership of this House, and I have seen the Members changing from a position of united opposition, from the White House down to the Members on the Committee on Ways and Means, to a position of advocacy.

The White House in 1906 was opposed or indifferent to a tariff commission. I prepared and brought here in November of that year a bill authorizing the creation of such a commission. I took it to President Roosevelt and urged him to favor such a commission in his message of December, 1906. He refused to mention it in his message. I went to the Committee on Ways and Means. I could get no consolation from them. But, as I say, working among the membership, talking with the Members and urging the measure, I have been gratified to see the sentiment, not only of the Committee on Ways and Means but the sentiment of the Republican Members of the House, change from a unanimous sentiment against the establishment of a tariff commission to a position in favor of it; and I am gratified now to learn that Mr. Roosevelt, after his retirement from the Presidency and after he became the leader of a new political party that was born in August last, has become the advocate of a tariff commission that he refused to favor when he was President. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, there has been such a variety of descriptions here as to what took place in the House on the memorable 4th day of March, 1911, that I am reminded of Carlyle's saying, "History is a distillation of rumor." For what would a future historian write as to the occurrences on that 4th of March if, picking up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of to-day, he should read the statements of gentlemen testifying from mere general recollections without having consulted the RECORD to ascertain the exact facts?

I was present in the House on that day and saw all that transpired. But before speaking of this, I desire first to call the attention of both sides of the Chamber to a statement in Hinds' Precedents touching the rules and procedure of the House relating to roll calls:

> When once begun the roll call may not be interrupted even by a motion to adjourn, a parliamentary inquiry, a question of personal privilege, the arrival of the time fixed for another order of business or for a recess, or the presentation of a conference report. But it is interrupted for the reception of messages and upon the arrival of the hour fixed for adjournment sine die. Incidental questions arising during the roll call, such as the refusal of a Member to vote, are considered after the completion of the call and before the announcement of the vote.

Observe that it is thus expressly declared that a roll call can not be interrupted, even for the presentation of a conference report. Who knew that such were the rules and precedents of the House? Every Member of the House on that day knew it. Never before had the House seen a violation of the rules similar to the one perpetrated on that day. The Clerk had called the roll for the first time on the bill containing the provision for a tariff commission. When the first call had been completed, and as the Clerk was about to begin the second—I know that my recollection is correct, because I went to the House library and consulted the RECORD—Mr. Tawney, a close friend of the Speaker, and as close a friend of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], a persistent filibusterer against the tariff commission, brought in a conference report on the general deficiency bill and moved its passage in the midst of the unfinished roll call. The yeas and nays were called for on Mr. Tawney's motion. Thereupon ensued a very remarkable scene. Never has the House witnessed greater indignation upon both sides of the Chamber than was displayed here when Members saw that the Speaker was about to permit a violation of the rules of the House.

And he did permit it. The roll call then in progress was interrupted and a new roll call begun and taken on the conference report on the general deficiency bill in absolute violation of rules and precedents. When this new roll call had been completed the House then resumed the roll call on the bill which contained the provision for a tariff commission.

I make no accusation, but if asked the question which has been put here I will answer it. I will not evade it. [Applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman believe that the Republican leaders were for a tariff commission?

Mr. COOPER. I believe that two or three who had it in their power to do it deliberately entered into an agreement which prevented the consideration of that bill. [Applause.] The attention of the House was called to the rule that a roll call could not be interrupted even for the presentation of a conference report. But the roll call was interrupted——

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. I attempted to make the point of order at the time, and the Speaker declined to entertain it.

Mr. COOPER. Oh, it was made over and over here without avail, and the RECORD shows that the Speaker, to restore some semblance of order so that he could get that roll call to go on, directed the Sergeant at Arms to take the mace and command order, and that the Sergeant at Arms obeyed and carried it out to the head of the center aisle.

Now, does any gentleman pretend that it was the friends of the tariff commission who secured the interruption of that roll call and brought on that scene?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask that the Clerk resume the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> 30. Ethers: Sulphuric, 4 cents per pound; amyl nitrite, 20 per cent ad valorem; amyl acetate and ethyl acetate or acetic ether, 5 cents per pound; ethyl chloride, 20 per cent ad valorem; ethers and esters of all kinds not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That no article containing alcohol shall be classified for duty under this paragraph.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, it has occurred to me that this paragraph relating to "ether" suggests a proper amendment at this time. We ought to have "ether" free and cheap, so as to peacefully and painlessly put to sleep the men who persist in occupying the time of this body by fighting old and ancient battles over again. [Laughter.]

I confess to be somewhat amused and confused by the reminiscences indulged in, and still more confused and amused by the position taken by the gentlemen of the majority on the question of the tariff board or tariff commission, or whatever you like to call it. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], as I understand him, and the Speaker of the House favor a partisan tariff bureau. Why they should favor a partisan bureau, why the bureau of experts should be under the control of the Ways and Means Committee, is beyond my comprehension. I can not understand why men would desire the services of experts, who by virtue of their appointment or position would be considered partisan experts, on a great matter of general legislation which concerns the welfare of all the people, and industrial conditions generally. [Applause on the Republican side.] Partisan experts are hired in bad lawsuits to prove things that are not true. Partisan experts will do party politics in their reports and prove worthless.

Mr. Chairman, I am still more confused by the position of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], who, if I understand him rightly, says he is against any tariff board. He does not need information. And I am still more confused by other points of view on the other side of the Chamber as to this matter. The gentleman from Alabama says he wants information. We all want information. Everyone concurs in that view. Men can not legislate intelligently upon a great subject like this in the absence of accurate information. But the gentleman from Alabama says "we want a competitive tariff." Other gentlemen on the other side say "We want a tariff for revenue; what we want is to secure revenue by virtue of these customs duties, and the matter of protection has nothing to do with it." Therefore they oppose a tariff board and disregard the facts. One idea conflicts with the other.

Mr. Chairman, if men will have information they must have it through a board that is nonpartisan, composed of intelligent, brave, courageous men who will not do the will or the bidding of any Ways and Means Committee or of any President, for partisan purposes, but who will ascertain judicially the facts that are concerned in the matter. And, furthermore, if we are to have competition, I assert that the competition must be based upon an intelligent consideration of the actual facts showing the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. There can be no competition if the tariff is so high as to shut out importations. There can be no competition if the tariff is so low as to destroy American industry. Gentlemen from Kentucky and from Texas talk here about the farmer. But in this connection they do not really concern themselves with the interests of the agriculturists of this country, as is shown by this bill. It is unfair to the farmers and to the West. I confess I am amazed that men should stand here, responsible

leaders of the majority, and say to gentlemen on this side, "You have been repudiated; you have no part in this great work." I want to say in reply that that statement is not true. I myself stand here as a representative of the whole great State of Minnesota, elected by a majority approximating 85,000 votes, more than 2 to 1 over my Democratic opponent and almost 2 to 1 over all opponents combined. I have not been repudiated by the people of my State. I have a sacred right to stand upon this floor and plead the cause of the people of my State. I have a right to be heard in the making of this law. I have a right to represent the interests of farmers and laborers and business interests of my State, and it is unfair and unjust to say, because forsooth a mix up in the Republican Party has brought an overwhelming majority on that side, that we have, or our point of view has, been repudiated. No, Mr. Chairman, that is not true; it is not honest; it is not patriotic.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

36. Glycerin, crude, not purified, 1 cent per pound; refined, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. COPLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 8, line 26, after the word "refined," strike out the numeral "2" and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "3".

Mr. COPLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced this amendment for the purpose of calling on the unfailing good humor and courtesy of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] who has charge of this bill. I am going to ask him if he will give the minority Members in this House some information had when the schedule was adopted, and tell us under what theory they revised the tariff and put 2 cents a pound on refined glycerine which under the Payne bill was 3 cents a pound and under the present bill 2 cents a pound.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to my friend that the rate of 3 cents a pound on refined glycerine is practically prohibitive, and it was in the hope that we would induce a more substantial import of refined glycerine that the rate is proposed to be reduced from 3 cents to 2 cents. I will be perfectly frank with the gentleman. I would like to see a further reduction made. I have an apprehension that we have not gone far enough to induce any substantial importation of refined glycerine. The ad valorem equivalent of refined glycerine at 2 cents a pound, however, is the same as the ad valorem on crude glycerine at 1 cent a pound, and under those circumstances that is the proper balance.

Mr. COPLEY. Does the gentleman believe that a rate of 3 cents a pound has worked to the detriment of the American public and given undue profit to the American manufacturer?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman must recognize the fact that our primary motive in fixing these tariff rates is to collect some revenue, and 3 cents a pound on refined glycerine is practically prohibitive.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. If the gentleman will yield, in looking at the handbook of information which gentlemen of the committee have furnished for the guidance of the rest of us, I notice that there were imported in 1912 under this item 3,893 pounds, and the estimate of the gentleman's expert of the amount that will be imported is still less.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman from South Dakota is correct in the reading of the figures, but I will state that I did not make the estimate, and I believe they have underestimated the probable amount of imports. Moreover, the import figures are misleading because the greater portion of refined glycerine is imported in bond and reexported.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Well, the revenue which it is estimated to produce is less than that of last year.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say that that is an average estimate based on a number of preceding years and not simply the last year. It is estimated that instead of $1,533 we will get $3,500.

Mr. COPLEY. How do you estimate an increase of revenue by a decrease of the rate and a decrease of importations?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I have said to the gentleman that the figures given as to the amount of pounds imported are evidently misleading.

Mr. COPLEY. Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances and upon the information given, I insist on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

Gums: Amber, and amberoid unmanufactured, or crude gum, $1 per pound; arabic, or senegal, one-half cent per pound; camphor, crude, natural, 1 cent per pound; camphor, refined and synthetic, 5 cents per pound; chicle, 20 cents per pound; dextrine, burnt starch or British gum, dextrine substitutes, and soluble or chemically treated starch, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In the chemical bill submitted to the House a year ago there was included in this paragraph copal, gum resin, kauri, damar, lac, crude, seed, button stick, and shell. These articles are now on the free list. On this bill they are on the free list. In your bill passed by the House a year ago they were put on the dutiable list. At that time I offered an amendment striking them out of the dutiable list and restoring them to the free list, and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], in charge of the bill then and in charge of the bill now, made this remark:

I should gather from the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that his constituents are in the habit of consuming gum kauri, damar, and amberoid. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

As a matter of fact, these guns are the constituent materials in the making of varnish, and what the consuming public uses is the varnish from which they are made. Now, we have very carefully reduced the rates of taxation upon varnish so that the manufacturer shall not unload upon the public the tax that we are laying on the manufacturer. The time has come to put an end to this school of economics whereby people are taught to look upon a tariff as a benefit. Taxation is not a benefit, but a burden; and now we are going to place upon the manufacturers their share of the burden.

And yet, now they put it upon the free list in conformity with the amendment which I offered a year ago. The gentleman has experienced a change of heart. Last year he proposed to end this school of economics and place the tax upon the manufacturer. Now, he proposes to continue the school of economics and admit the articles free of duty, as they are under the existing law.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I gather from the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that he is going to vote for this tariff bill. He seems to believe that he has written the whole thing, and I am all the more induced to believe that he might vote for a Democratic bill because he found himself unable to vote for a Republican bill when the Payne bill was reported to the House.

I have already explained to the gentleman why we were able to restore to the free list a great many taxes that were proposed to be levied last year. I shall not detain him or tax the patience of the committee by detailing that further, but surely in discussing the rates of duty on varnish, which is made from these various gums produced in the East Indies and in Mexico, he has not overlooked the fact that in this bill we have further reduced our proposed rates on varnish from 25 per cent to 10 per cent ad valorem.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 7, after the word "pound," insert the following:
"*Provided*, That dextrine, burnt starch, or British gum, dextrine substitutes, and soluble or chemically treated starch, when made from potato starch, 1 cent per pound."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I shall take only one moment, and I rise in large part as a matter of inquiry. My amendment is concerned with only the last two lines of section 37. Looking ahead to paragraph 239 of the act, we find that starch made from potatoes is dutiable at the rate of 1 cent per pound. I understand that dextrine and the various other commodities referred to in that connection are, in large measure at least, made from potato substance; and I rise to inquire why, in view of that fact, there should be a less duty upon the manufactured product than there is upon the raw material of that product.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts is correct in saying that some dextrine is made from potato starch, but there is some loss in substance in making this transfer, and the rates of duty of 1 cent a pound upon potato starch are pretty fairly balanced by the rate of duty of three-fourths of a cent per pound upon the finished product of that starch, namely, dextrine; but the gentleman overlooked the fact that by far the greater bulk of the starch in this country is made from sago or tapioca flour, which is on the free list. This affords a large differential.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman will notice that my amendment is so phrased as to deal only with the potato starch, and I think that overcomes the second portion of the gentleman's suggestion. As to the first portion, the manufacturers from my section of the country say that the protection is hopelessly inadequate and have asked for a protection of 1½ cents per pound. The former duty was 1½ cents, and my amendment calls for a duty of 1 cent.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my colleague a question in reference to that. I understood the gentleman

to say that there was a quantity of starch wasted in making dextrine.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I said there was some quantity.

Mr. PAYNE. What? A quarter of a pound?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I can not answer the gentleman correctly. There might be 15 per cent.

Mr. PAYNE. Suppose there might be a quarter of a pound, for the sake of illustration. I want to see if I can get the gentleman's idea. Suppose there might be a quarter of a pound out of the starch used in making a pound of dextrine. At a cent a pound that would be a cent and a quarter duty on the starch. I trust I can get my colleague's attention.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. PAYNE. If there was a quarter of a pound more starch used, or, say, a pound and a quarter, of starch used in making a pound of dextrine, then the duty on the starch used would amount to a cent and a quarter. Do I understand my colleague to say he has balanced that duty by charging only three quarters of a cent on dextrine?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will admit to the gentleman from New York that it is a very close calculation upon the manufacture of potato starch——

Mr. PAYNE. A close calculation? There is no calculation at all. I want to say to my gentlemanly colleague that if there is a duty of a cent and a quarter paid on a pound and a quarter of starch—and it takes that to make a pound of dextrine—in order to compensate for the duty on the starch there should be at least a cent and a quarter instead of three-quarters of a cent on the dextrine. It works that way; it does not work by subtraction, but by addition. I trust the gentleman understands.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I see what the gentleman aims at, and I will say that this rate is fixed for dextrine made of all kinds of starch, and without particular reference to the one kind to which the gentleman refers, and it is a perfectly fair disposition of the subject.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand that dextrine is made, perhaps, exclusively from potato starch.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, largely so.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. No; that is not correct.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, whether it is made from either one, and it takes a pound and more to make a pound of dextrine, there should be a cent and more duty added to compensate in the dextrine for the use of the starch.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. If we were writing a protection tariff, the gentleman is perfectly correct; but as we are not doing that, I am not convinced by his argument.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman is writing any kind of a tariff, he ought not to put on a greater duty and try to justify it by using subtraction instead of addition.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say it is not the purpose of this committee to create industries in this country by levying tariff taxes.

Mr. PAYNE. And you said it was not your purpose to destroy any legitimate industry. What have you got against the dextrine industry?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

38. Ink and ink powder, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, after line 8, insert the following:
"Par. 39. Indigo, natural or synthetic, dry or suspended in water, 10 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, we are having here this afternoon the first object lesson in the new art of national legislation by party caucus. The people of the country, as well as Members of the House of Representatives, will know more about this system a little later than they know now, but a few features are already manifest, and the amendment which I have sent to the desk is illustrative at least of one step in the progress of this new system. The amendment which I have offered is taken as paragraph 39 of the original print of this bill as House bill 10, and it contains a 10 per cent ad valorem duty upon indigo and certain similar products. It has developed from the letter read by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] from a Member of the majority who attended the caucus that in the Democratic caucus he offered an amendment to this provision striking out this 10 per cent paragraph and placing it upon the free list, and that he made a very eloquent, able, and convincing argument, but that the influence of the Ways and Means Committee overpowered his eloquence and his convincing statement in the Democratic caucus, and they voted him down by a vote of 112 to 54; and in his letter to his constituent he suggests that the proper relief now will be to seek relief in the Senate. But it crept out in the incidental debate that came out on the reading of the letter that he had done even better than that—not gone to the Democratic caucus again, but he has gone to the Ways and Means Committee, or certain members, a committee which is all powerful in this House until the other committees are appointed or suggested or nominated, and that he had his way outside of the caucus.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Would the gentleman like to get a correct statement of fact?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I am giving it correctly so far as it is out.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The original proposition was voted down in the caucus. The Ways and Means Committee gave a careful consideration later on and reported back to the caucus, and the caucus placed this amendment in itself.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. If the gentleman from Alabama is correct in this latter statement, it is evident that the gentleman who wrote the letter was not aware it ever had gone to caucus again when the letter was written.

I am bound, I suppose, to take the statement of the gentleman from Alabama that it had gone back to the caucus. My impression after reading the letter was quite to the contrary. It illustrates that the Ways and Means Committee and its chairman are all potential in shaping up the tariff business. Why was a majority of the caucus against it? Again it comes to the caucus after certain suggestions have been made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. METZ], who is still sitting by the side of the manager of this schedule. He has been there most of the afternoon. He is not now a member of the Ways and Means Committee, but he may be later, I suppose.

Mr. METZ. I will not be here that long.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. It would be enlightening to the country and to the membership of this House if the gentleman from New York in charge of this schedule, when the proper time comes, would elaborate the controlling reasons that placed the Democratic caucus on both sides of this question. I am wondering what those reasons were and what those inducements were, and I am wondering which way those gentlemen in caucus who voted both ways on this proposition will be found to vote now. I apprehend they will be voting with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

I am in very great doubt whether the system that the Democrats have brought upon us under cover of a committee on committees is not a species of oligarchy in government, more to be feared and avoided in Government institutions even that a one-man power, because when you have one man you can locate responsibility and know where to place it when things go wrong.

What is this? It is government by party caucus. There are 289 Democrats in this body, 126 Republicans, and 18 Progressives. That is, the latter confess to be Progressives. They are for progress, and they represent it all if you take their word for it. In that caucus at any time 145 men can control the absolute vote of this House upon the great questions pertaining to the revenues of the country and its economic conditions, under which men are to prosper or to go down in financial defeat. Yet it is the vote, at most, of only 145. You place that responsibility in the hands of the most powerful committee in this House, that has the initiation of the great revenue measures of the country. One hundred and forty-five Members of this House of 433 Members control the legislation of this body. It is a system the country will not stand for. It is not a step in the direction of reform, whatever may have been the herald or announcement made when it was set in operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 59, noes 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

41. Licorice, extracts of, in pastes, rolls, or other forms, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to the fact that by this section licorice root, unground, is taken from the free list and placed upon the dutiable list, and also that further on in this bill the duty is reduced on the manufactured products of licorice, the whole proceeding being in accordance with the plan and theory upon which this bill is drawn. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], I will say that the situation which exists under the present law by which there is a high rate of duty on licorice paste, and licorice root is on the free list, has enabled the American manufacturers of licorice paste, who for the most part are subsidiary companies connected with the Tobacco Trust, to have an absolute monopoly of the American market; and the levying of a very small tax upon the licorice root and the reduction of the duty on licorice paste insures the fact that the manufacturers of licorice will not be able to hand on to the consuming public the tax that we have laid upon the raw material.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. With pleasure.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman think that the levying of a duty on the raw material will break up that monopoly?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. No; but I think they will pay some of the tax.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And then the gentleman believes in putting a higher rate of taxation on the manufactured article than on the raw product?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I do not think the gentleman from Iowa need concern himself about the subsidiary companies of the Tobacco Trust. That is what this is for.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The "gentleman from Iowa" is not concerned about that. He is concerned about the principle upon which this bill is based all through.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. This allows a very fair manufacturing margin between the tax on the licorice root and the tax on the licorice paste.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to my colleague [Mr. HARRISON of New York] that instead of trying to help any kind of legitimate business he is simply trying to help the business of the trusts.

Now, it is true that the Tobacco Trust manufactures and uses licorice in the United States; but there are some small concerns outside the trust that manufacture it in a small way, and in this readjustment of rates to make the manufacturer pay that tax, which drives the little fellows out of business, the trust would get the full benefit of it by supplying all the licorice used in the United States. That is the beauty of a tariff bill for revenue only, except for the trusts.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman did not do me the honor to heed the last part of my argument, or he would have seen that I maintain that we have left the licorice extract manufacturing business in this country in a position to continue the manufacture, but the tax will make them pay their taxes.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the gentleman will admit that the little fellows will be driven out by the duty and the big fellows will be able to stand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be considered withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

42. Lime, citrate of, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. In the bill which was presented a year ago, the chemical schedule of the bill, paragraph 42, was the item of lemon juice, lime juice, and sour-orange juice at a rate of 10 per cent. Those articles are now on the free list.

I offered an amendment at that time to restore them to the free list. They are upon the free list of this bill, but when I offered the amendment a year ago the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], again outlining the policy of the Democratic Party, said:

We have placed a tax upon articles covered by this paragraph because they are chiefly used in the making of drinks at soda-water fountains, and therefore they are a proper subject for taxation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, those article, proper subjects for taxation, are placed on the free list, but there is no applause on the Democratic side. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

I suppose, now, it is not needed to raise revenue. Then they wanted to put a tax on the soda-water fountains in order to raise revenue. Now, they find some other method of raising revenue. Pretty soon we shall find some place where they will put an increased tax, as they did on licorice root, over and above what they proposed a year ago. Then they proposed to tax licorice root, largely used by the youth of the land, at fifteen one-hundredths of a cent a pound. In this bill the rate is one-fourth of 1 cent a pound. They need that to raise revenue. Of course it evens up. [Laughter on the Republican side.] They put a tax on the licorice root that the boys chew, and then they take it off the soda water which they drink. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

A slight difference, but after all what is the reason for it? Then it affected your principles. I suppose now the principles have been blown to the winds. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

45. Oils, rendered: Cod, sod, seal, herring, and other fish oil, not specially provided for in this section, 3 cents per gallon; whale oil, 5 cents per gallon; sperm oil, 8 cents per gallon; wool grease, including that known commercially as degras or brown wool grease, crude and not refined or improved in value or condition, ½ cent per pound; refined or improved in value or condition, and not specially provided for in this section, ¾ cent per pound; lanolin, 1 cent per pound; all other animal oils, rendered oils and greases, and all combinations of the same, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 9, line 22, by striking out the word "cod."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out in line 24, page 9, the words "whale oil, 5 cents per gallon," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Whale oil, 8 cents per gallon."

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I should like to get from the gentleman in charge of the bill at the present time some information as to why it is that the tariff of 8 cents per gallon on sperm oil under the present law is maintained in this bill, while the tariff on whale oil is reduced in this bill to 5 cents a gallon? There are many citizens of California engaged in the whaling industry, and for some years that industry has not been very prosperous. I am advised that any considerable reduction in the tariff will mean the going out of business of the large number of people who are engaged in it. I should like to know the reason that actuated the committee in reducing that particular item from 8 cents a gallon to 5 cents a gallon.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will state to the gentleman from California that, contrary to what we believe to be the correct usage, the present law taxes a number of different articles 8 cents a gallon, thus putting a specific tax upon the basket clause, which includes a number of different articles of different unit values. The effect of that was to apply a different rate of taxation to different oils. For instance, the unit of value put upon sperm oil, crude, is 42 cents a gallon; refined, 50 cents a gallon; and the unit of value upon whale oil is 31½ cents a gallon; so that in order to levy about the same rate of duty upon the two kinds of oil it is advisable either to apply an ad valorem rate to the basket clause or else to specify different specific rates for the different kinds of oil, and the committee have chosen the latter course.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

46. Oils, expressed: Alizarin assistant, sulphoricinoleic acid, and ricinoleic acid, and soaps containing castor oil, any of the foregoing in whatever form, and all other alizarin assistants and all soluble greases used in the processes of softening, dyeing, or finishing, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem; castor oil, 12 cents per gallon; flaxseed and linseed oil, raw, boiled, or oxidized, 12 cents per gallon of 7½ pounds; poppy-seed oil, raw, boiled, or oxidized, rapeseed oil, and peanut oil, 6 cents per gallon; hempseed oil, 3 cents

per gallon; almond oil, sweet, 5 cents per pound; sesame or sesamum seed or bean oil, 1 cent per pound; olive oil, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem; olive oil, in bottles, jars, kegs, or other packages having a capacity of less than five standard gallons each, 30 cents per gallon; all other expressed oils and all combinations of the same, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 10, line 21, by inserting, after the word "kegs," the word "tins."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, in line 20, page 10, the words "20 per cent ad valorem" and insert the words "40 cents per gallon."

In line 22, page 10, strike out the figure "30" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "50."

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I simply desire to say that the olive industry is coming to be a very large industry in California, and that the profits on olive oil for the past years have often been considerably less than 20 cents a gallon. The provision in the present bill would reduce the tariff 20 cents a gallon. I have offered an amendment to maintain the present rate of duty. The bill reduces it from 50 to 30 cents a gallon, which, as I say, would take away all the profit and more than the profit made by the California olive-oil producers and put an end to the industry if that policy is to be pursued.

Last year we produced 800,000 gallons of olive oil. We have 12,000 acres planted to olive trees, one half of them in bearing and the other half not yet in bearing. It is an industry which, if allowed to develop, will in a few years come to produce all the olive oil and practically all the olives that we consume in this country. We believe it is in the interest of all the people of all sections of the country that that industry should be carried on upon our soil rather than in Italy and Spain. Therefore I offer the amendment.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have on several occasions debated this question with my good friend from California, and he has failed even yet to convert me to his point of view.

Mr. HAYES. And the gentleman from New York has failed to convert me to his point of view.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say that inasmuch as California produces only one-fifth of the olive oil consumed in the United States the rate of the duty of the present law was a heavy burden and hardship upon those people on the Atlantic seaboard who are of Mediterranean birth or ancestry and are accustomed to use olive oil where other people use butter. The proposition of the gentleman from California is to make the people of the East pay the freight rates from the Pacific coast on all the olive oil that is consumed in the East, and that is an unjust and improper method of tariff taxation.

Mr. HAYES. Is the gentleman from New York aware that the tariff amounts to 3½ cents on each small bottle usually sold to consumers? Does he think that this tax reduced or entirely taken away will decrease the cost of olive oil to the consumer? I do not. I want also to suggest that in the last three years we have increased the planting of olive orchards 1,000 acres per year, and if he will let us have an opportunity for a few years we shall be able to produce not only one-fifth of the olive oil used in this country but five-fifths.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman from California is aware that the present rate of taxation is 35 to 40 per cent ad valorem, and that that is too high a tax upon the common food product consumed very largely by the poor of the cities.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 10, line 17, at the beginning of the line, strike out the words "peanut oil, 6 cents a gallon."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am advised that there is no competition in this country in the manufacture of peanut oil. The provision seems to be for the purpose of protection rather than for the purpose of revenue.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman aware that under existing law peanut oil is on the free list?

Mr. MOORE. I am informed that there is no competition in it.

Mr. MANN. It is on the free list, and it is proposed to put it on the taxable list.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania ask me a question?

Mr. MOORE. I would like to know whether the gentleman maintains that there is any competition in peanut oil.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Very little of it, if any, is made in this country. It is not made from peanuts grown in the Southern States. It is made from peanuts of an inferior kind unfit as a food product.

Mr. MOORE. They are grown in foreign countries?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. In Africa and Japan.

Mr. MOORE. May I ask what is the necessity of a protection of 6 cents a gallon on peanut oil?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. This is not for the purpose of protection. There is so little of it produced here that it does not enter into the question from that point of view. It is a revenue proposition, and we expect to get from $30,000 to $40,000.

Mr. MOORE. But a duty has been left on the peanuts.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It has been reduced.

Mr. PAYNE. Is this peanut oil used as a substitute for butter?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. To some extent.

Mr. PAYNE. Then why does the gentleman put a duty upon it? It is a food product and you are going to relieve the consumer.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman knows that peanut butter is not used on the table of the people of this country; it is used more particularly in industry.

Mr. MANN. We use it on our table.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the discussion and because I am for protection, I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if peanut oil is being taxed as a revenue measure, I do not quite understand why the tax is reduced from 10 cents again, as carried in the chemical bill last year, to 6 cents a gallon in this bill. As a revenue proposition on an article not produced in this country, so it has to be imported, why could not you leave it as it was last year?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Because, I will say, we were able to remit some of the taxes that we then proposed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago the House voted in reference to the tax on olive oil. Olive oil which is rendered unfit for food is now on the free list. Last year in this paragraph it was put on the dutiable list. I offered an amendment to restore it to the free list, and my distinguished friend from New York at that time said:

Mr. Chairman, in taking denatured olive oil from the free list we have placed upon it a tax of three-eighths of 1 cent a pound, which is about 3 or 4 per cent ad valorem. There is no reason why, if we tax the olive oil which is used as a food of the poor people, we should not place a revenue tax on the olive oil which is used by the manufacturer.

Does the gentleman stand for that, or does he repudiate it?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, if I were able to deliver my own speeches as well as the gentleman from Illinois does, perhaps the committee would not have put it on the free list. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Last year the committee did not put it on the free list, after having heard the gentleman's speech. They kept it on the dutiable list; but, having the attention of the gentleman called to it, as would have been more perfectly the case if we had had a tariff commission, the gentleman now proposes to put it on the free list. He retracts. He says now that we ought to tax the food but not tax the manufacturer. Last year he boldly avowed, and so led the gentlemen on the other side of the House, that if we taxed the food consumer we must tax the manufacturer. I like to see the gentleman consistent for more than one year at a time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to protest for a moment against this outrageous increase of rates over the present law. [Laughter.] Here is a food product on the free list in the present law, and they propose now to put on it a duty of 6 cents a pound, and so it is all along the line in this schedule, not only items by the score, but items in the aggregate. We imported in 1912 abolutely free of duty items to the amount of $15,000,000, but in this schedule they are put on the dutiable list. Why, gentlemen, are you trying to revise the tariff upward? [Applause and laughter.] I am presenting more proof than you ever presented about the present tariff law, about revision upward—absolute proof. Are not you satisfied with the rates in the present bill, that you must increase them all along the line? [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague does not need to appeal to me as to what is

or is not a revision upward, because he is the leading expert on that subject in the United States.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. He was until the gentleman from New York came.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The fact is that the reason why he left the articles on the free list which we now propose to tax was because they are not produced in the United States, and it was of no benefit to any manufacturer in America to put a customs duty on them. That is the very reason we have taxed them—because we are making a tariff for revenue only, while he was making a tariff for the purpose of protecting the American manufacturer.

Mr. PAYNE. What became of your free food in this item—olive oil, the poor man's butter? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

47. Oils, distilled and essential: Orange and lemon, 10 per cent ad valorem; peppermint, 25 cents per pound; mace oil, 6 cents per pound; almond, bitter; amber; ambergris; anise or anise seed; bergamot; camomile; caraway; cassia; cinnamon; cedrat; citronella or lemongrass; civet; fennel; jasmine or jasimine; juniper; lavender, and aspic or spike lavender; limes; neroli or orange flower; origanum, red or white; rosemary or anthoss; attar of roses; thyme; and valerian; all the foregoing oils, and all fruit ethers, oils, and essences, and essential and distilled oils and all combinations of the same, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That no article containing alcohol shall be classified for duty under this paragraph.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 11, line 5, by striking out the word "or" and inserting the word "and."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

49. Perfumery, including cologne and other toilet waters, articles of perfumery, whether in sachets or otherwise, and all preparations used as applications to the hair, mouth, teeth, or skin, such as cosmetics, dentifrices, including tooth soaps, pastes, including theatrical grease paints, and pastes, pomades, powders, and other toilet preparations, all the foregoing wholly or partly manufactured; if containing alcohol, 40 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem; if not containing alcohol, 60 per cent ad valorem; floral or flower waters containing no alcohol, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I would like for a moment the undivided attention of my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. A few moments ago he challenged me about the statement I made that so many items in this bill will carry the increased duty we placed upon them four years ago. Here is this paragraph about perfumery. Four years ago we increased the duty on perfumeries. The gentleman comes in now and not only adopts our increase, but he goes us one better and increases the duty that we put on perfumery four years ago. It is a little blind and covered up, but it is here all the same. I refer to page 47 of the handbook. We had a duty of 60 cents per pound and 50 per cent where the perfumery contained alcohol. Here is a duty of 40 cents per pound and 60 per cent where they contain alcohol. The ad valorem duty on our bill on the importations of 1910 was 71.17; 1912, 72.8, and on his 74.29, not only equal to our duty but more duty than we put on it. I simply want to call the attention of my friend to this, and he has put that on perfumeries contained in this paragraph 49. They have increased the duty, except on Florida water, which I believe they have left at the same rate of 20 per cent. And as we go along I may call attention to others all the way through the bill that where we increased in many instances he adopted the increases. Now, I am going to justify him. It is more sensible than a good many things he put in the bill where he reduced the duty. We increased the rates on things which were luxuries, like perfumery, and he followed our example. On things like wine and spirits and jewelry and a number of other items, I will call his attention to and show what is in his bill, because he did not seem to know this morning and was rather indignant that I should make such an imputation upon his bill. I do not criticize him for it; I rather commend him, and if he had only followed more of the rates in the present bill he would not have half as much trouble on his mind as he is having now about the future of the law if he gets it on the statute books.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman asked me the question this morning, and I asked him to point out where the increases he made over the Dingley bill were adopted by this committee and where in some instances we recognized the fact and even increased the Payne rate; but I desire him to point out this, and I am glad that he points it out now. I made this statement in reference to this very article in my opening speech when this bill came before the House—that we had increased luxuries and untaxed necessities, and I think the first item I called his attention to where we had increased the Payne rate was this very perfumery item to which the gentleman refers now. Now, on luxuries such as perfumeries we are proud to say we not only keep the gentleman's increases, but we went him one better and put the rate even higher; and on the tax on alcohol we accepted the increase which he made and recognized it was a revenue tax and a proper place to levy taxes. What I wanted to point out was where we had followed his increases or increased the rate that it was either on alcohol or it was on an absolute luxury of the rich, and we did not follow him when he increased the rate on cotton goods and other necessities of the poor. We not only decreased his rates but we put them below what the Dingley bill was and in some instances what the Wilson bill was.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

52. Baryta, sulphate of, or barytes, including barytes earth, unmanufactured, 15 per cent ad valorem; manufactured, 20 per cent ad valorem; blanc-fixe, or artificial sulphate of barytes, and satin white, or artificial sulphate of lime, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to ask the gentleman in charge of this measure what reduction is made on barytes, the crude and manufactured article?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman from Tennessee will find that by consulting the handbook that the reduction on crude barytes is from the ad valorem equivalent of 77 per cent to 15 per cent. The reduction upon the manufactured article is from 65 per cent to 20 per cent.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, something has been said in the discussion of this tariff bill in general debate that it is a sectional bill, and criticism has been directed to the fact that southern Members on the Ways and Means Committee have taken care of the South in the preparation of this bill. I am a southern Representative on the floor of the House and a Republican, and I wish to state that that charge is not well founded. There are 7 men on the Committee on Ways and Means from the Southern States, counting Missouri as a Southern State, of the 14 Democrats, and I want to say in justice to them that they have not, in the preparation of this bill, discriminated in favor of the South as against the North, East, and West. Take, for instance, the State of Alabama. Its coal is placed on the free list; iron ore on the free list; bauxite on the free list, out of which they manufacture aluminum; lumber is on the free list; steel rails on the free list; pig iron reduced from $2.50 to 80 cents and $1.25 a ton; and cotton goods and hosiery reduced to such an extent that the American Manufacturers' Association of the South, representing more than 850 mills, with an invested capital of $300,000,000 and the employment of over 200,000 operators, have stated that the operation of this bill will virtually impair, if not destroy, the manufacture of cotton goods in the South.

The State of Arkansas produces zinc and lead and bauxite and lumber. Zinc is virtually placed on the free list in this bill, which will prevent the further development of that industry in Arkansas, but will revive the industry in zinc and lead in the Republic of Mexico. Bauxite is placed on the free list, and that raw material is only found in the United States in Arkansas, Georgia, Alabama, and Tennessee. Lumber, produced in Arkansas, is placed on the free list.

Now we come to the State of Florida. The Members from that State can testify what effect this bill will have on the citrus fruit and lumber industries of that Commonwealth. When we reach the State of Georgia iron ore, bauxite, and lumber are on the free list and cotton goods and hosiery reduced, when we are already importing $65,000,000 worth of cotton goods made in foreign mills. Kentucky suffers because coal is on the free list and her lumber on the free list. Louisiana's sugar industry, according to the admission of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] last night, is to be destroyed at the end of three years, an industry in which more than $100,000,000 of her citizens is locked up in sugar plants and half of her inhabitants affected directly or indirectly by the industry.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I have not time in the five minutes.

Not only sugar, but there is lumber in Louisiana which is placed on the free list.

Mississippi's lumber goes on the free list.

Well, take North Carolina; the duty on her cotton goods and mica reduced and her lumber and paper placed on the free list. Take South Carolina, with magnificent cotton mills scattered

all over that State, the duties reduced to such an extent that practically every cotton mill in South Carolina is entering a protest and sending a letter of protest to the Democratic caucus here stating that if this bill becomes a law it will destroy or greatly injure this great industry of the State. Oklahoma, broom corn and coal on the free list and gypsum about free. Take Texas, and her wool is on the free list, meat on the free list, and her iron ore on the free list. Tennessee with coal on the free list, iron ore on the free list, bauxite on the free list, zinc and barytes virtually on the free list, lumber on the free list, pig iron reduced from $2.50 to 80 cents and $1.25, and her cotton goods and hosiery industry stabbed to the very heart. Virginia has her coal and lumber placed on the free list, the pig-iron duty greatly reduced, zinc and cattle practically on the free list.

I repudiate the statement that the southern members of the Ways and Means Committees have drawn this bill on sectional lines and in the interests of the South. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

54. Black pigments, made from bone, ivory, or vegetable substance, by whatever name known; gas black and lampblack, dry or ground in or mixed with oil or water, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I intended to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] a while ago in reference to olive oil, in paragraph 46. It says:

Olive oil not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem; olive oil, in bottles, etc., 30 cents per gallon.

I recall that under the existing law the rate is fixed per gallon in each case. Is the olive oil not provided for intended to cover olive oil in bulk?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It is intended to cover the denatured olive oil, which is on the free list.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. Denatured olive oil is on the free list. On page 10, lines 19 and 20, it says:

Olive oil not specially provided for in this section.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman is correct, and it also covers the denatured olive oil, which is on the free list.

Mr. MANN. Is that 20 per cent ad valorem to cover olive oil in bulk?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Now, on the theory of making that rate an ad valorem rate and making the rate on olive oil in packages a specific rate, is that intentional or did you intend to have that?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. That was correct; that was intentional. The specific tax is just about the same ad valorem equivalent as the ad valorem itself.

Mr. MANN. I understand it runs at the rate of about a dollar a gallon?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I thought the gentleman would say that in the operation of the price of olive oil, making an ad valorem rate on one method of bringing it in and a specific rate on the other, it might absolutely cut out one or the other and give a great preferential to some particular importer or an exporter.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Taking it along in a great number of years it seems to run about the same ad valorem equivalent. The question of trade-mark and label enter very largely into these matters, anyway.

Mr. MANN. If it runs about the same, why did not the gentleman fix it specific in both cases, or else ad valorem in both cases?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman wherever it is possible I am in favor of putting ad valorem taxes in the bill, but it is very difficult indeed to apply ad valorem rates to these importations of olive oil in bottles, jars, kegs, and other packages, because it may require you to go back to some village in Italy and find out what the market price is there. It is much easier to find in dealing with large imports in bulk with an ad valorem rate.

Mr. MANN. I suppose olive oil coming in is of the same value, so far as the export is concerned, whether it is in one form or another, unless you put the rate on the packages themselves.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It is very much more difficult to trace these imports of bottles of olive oil in the small villages where they may have bottled them than to trace the large bulk importations, which can be very easily traced and on which there is a certain market price.

Mr. MANN. If olive oil should go up in price, it would practically result in all the olive oil being brought in in these packages?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I think it would be regulated in that way; yes.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether that is desirable or not.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is considered withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chrome yellow, chrome green, and all other chromium colors in the manufacture of which lead and bichromate of potash or soda are used, in pulp, dry, or ground in or mixed with oil or water, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to ask my colleague, Mr. HARRISON, whether, in fixing these duties on lead paints and paints made from lead, he took into consideration the fact that in making lead into paint the weight is largely increased?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Well, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] knows, a large proportion of the cost of manufacturing lead paints is the cost of the lead itself. In the case of white lead, I believe, it amounts to over 90 per cent; but, although I think our margin was a little bit close in our last year's bill between the tax on lead and the tax on lead paints, still I think that situation has been improved in this year's bill by a further reduction in our proposed duties upon the lead itself. I think this provides a pretty satisfactory arrangement of that situation.

Mr. PAYNE. Both of them are taxed by weight, are they not?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course, the conversion of lead into paint increases largely the duty automatically?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not now know the exact proportion. I have not thought of that for about four years. It looks to me as though the gentleman had an undue proportion of duty on lead paints in comparison with his duty on lead, but I am not particular about it. I am only making a suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lead, acetate of, white, and nitrate of, 1¼ cents per pound; acetate of, brown, gray, or yellow, 1 cent per pound; all other lead compounds not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, a great many Members on the floor are using this report, and I wish therefore to ask that the Clerk be directed to read the paragraph numbers also.

Mr. MANN. They are a part of the bill, and the Clerk ought to read them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the numbers.

The Clerk read as follows:

65. Potash: Bicarbonate of, refined, ¼ cent per pound; chlorate of, chromate and bichromate of, 1 cent per pound; cyanide of, 1½ cents per pound; nitrate of, or saltpeter, refined, $7 per ton; permanganate of, 1 cent per pound; prussiate of, red, 2 cents per pound; yellow, 1¼ cents per pound.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, line 25, after the word "yellow," strike out the numerals "1¼" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "2."

Mr. MOORE. This is a proposition, Mr. Chairman, to increase the rate from 1¼ cents per pound on yellow prussiate of potash to 2 cents a pound. There is an intense competition in this commodity and there is a struggle on the part of those engaged in the industry in this country to maintain it. I am informed that the difference in the wage cost is as the difference between an average of $2.25 per day to the wage earner in the United States and 3 marks or 75 cents a day to the wage earner doing corresponding work in Germany. It is believed that the one and a quarter cents duty proposed in this bill is not sufficient to enable the industry to thrive properly in the United States.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MOORE. I do. I am through. I merely wanted to make a plain statement of the situation.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, the bill proposes to reduce the duty on yellow prussiate of potash from 4 cents a pound to 1¼ cents a pound.

This article is used in making colors, in textiles, and has a very large consumption in other manufacturing processes. The testimony before the Senate Finance Committee last year indicated that under the existing duty, which is over 40 per cent ad valorem, the American makers of yellow prussiate of potash were gradually going out of business; that of the seven firms that formerly made it here only three survive to-day.

It is true that a large part of our consumption of this article is imported, perhaps over 50 per cent, but the reason for that is not, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] stated, because of the difference in wages here and in Germany. It is because the American manufacturers of yellow prussiate of potash are using an obsolete method of manufacture. They make it here now in the way it used to be manufactured in Europe, out of old leather scraps, horn, old shoes, and so on, and carbonate of potash. In Germany they now make it out of coal gas, a very much cheaper and simpler process, and there is no justification for a rate of duty which will equalize an inefficient and obsolete method of manufacture in the United States with the foreign production cost.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. With pleasure.

Mr. MOORE. It is true that there were seven establishments manufacturing this yellow prussiate of potash a few years ago, and that there are only three now—one in Philadelphia, one in Syracuse, and one in Cincinnati. The gentleman is so advised, is he not?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. And is it not true also that in endeavoring to maintain these establishments there is the difference in wages substantially as I stated a moment ago?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I do not admit the gentleman's contention that that is what causes the cheaper cost of production abroad. I maintain, on the contrary, that it is the newer and cheaper process they have adopted.

Mr. MOORE. I understand the gentleman's argument is that because antiquated machinery or antiquated methods are used in the United States, therefore the men engaged in the business here should not continue in business in the manner in which they are now doing business; but the gentleman does not deny that in doing business as they do do it, whether efficiently or otherwise, in the gentleman's opinion, they still have to meet this difference in labor cost between $2.25 and 75 cents a day?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman and I can not agree as to the bearing that has upon the argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I regard the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] as one of the ablest Members of this or any other body of men. [Applause.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Bust! [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. There is no "bust" about that statement. A year ago the gentleman from New York drew a chemical schedule bill which was presented to the House. As he stated at the time, he had some assistance from experts, and I think did some very able work in regard to the bill, as tariff bills go. As no one else on our side of the House seemed likely to give any special attention to the chemical schedule at that time, I undertook to make some investigation myself, hurriedly, without expert advice in the main, and when the bill was presented to the House I offered a series of amendments to it. Of course the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] in charge of the bill resisted all of the amendments, as I suppose it was his duty to do, acting as he was practically under caucus direction. Among those amendments I offered were some which were to items carried in this paragraph.

There was refined carbonate of potash, there was caustic or hydrate of potash, there was crude nitrate of potash or saltpeter. They were all then on the free list.

They were all on the free list, and I proposed to restore them to the free list, and the gentleman declined to accept the amendment. They were rejected, but, in the light of information subsequently received, the gentleman has put them all back on the free list in this bill.

The same is true of a large number of other amendments which I offered at that time. They are incorporated in this bill, having been rejected a year ago. I call attention to this solely for the purpose of showing the necessity of some one who will obtain accurate information in advance, in order to assist the committee which makes up the tariff bill. The gentleman from New York, a distinguished and able man, drew the bill a year ago, and upon the suggestion, in the House here under debate, that many of the items were incorrectly placed in the bill he made a further study and incorporated in this bill the most of the amendments which I offered a year ago. What would be the case if he had accurate, trustworthy, specific information acquired by a nonpartisan or partisan commission? Doubtless many of the items which escaped my attention a year ago, and therefore have escaped the attention of my distinguished friend from New York, would either be taken out of the dutiable list and put on the free list or, perhaps, taken out of the free list and put on the dutiable list in this bill.

No one Member of the House, in my judgment, knows more thoroughly the schedules in this tariff, perhaps, than did the gentleman from New York, and yet the gentleman from New York now, after having received some suggestions and advice from a nonexpert, has acquired a vast fund of information, which has caused him to make many changes in this bill; and the most of the changes, I am frank to say, in my judgment, greatly improve the character of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this has been a field day on the question of a tariff board or a tariff commission. It is not my purpose to tax the patience of the House with any extended remarks. I think it has been a valuable day, for it has revealed the attitude of the Democrats on the subject.

The statement made by the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], as to the doctrine of himself and Mr. UNDERWOOD, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, shows that they are in favor of a tariff board or commission, but that it must be a partisan board. The Republican position on that subject has been from the start that it must be a nonpartisan board or commission. The gentleman from Missouri says that there is no such thing as a nonpartisan board on great industrial questions of this kind. I do not agree with him. I believe we had a nonpartisan tariff board that gathered the facts of the wool industry and of the cotton industry. Although they were selected from different parties, as the law required them to be, that board was unanimous in its reports.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is not that kind of board a bipartisan board instead of a nonpartisan board?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. That is a mere quibble of words. You can call it a bipartisan board; it was not a partisan board.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why do they always constitute the board with an odd number of members?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I suppose so that the majority may rule if it comes to a disagreement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly; and it is always your majority.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. But the work of that committee or board was unanimously reported upon. You can call it a bipartisan or a nonpartisan board.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; a nonpartisan board would be a board that had no politics, and I do not believe there are five men in the United States that have sense enough to know anything about the tariff that have no politics. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. The purpose of a commission or a board of that kind is to pass upon the facts, and we may find men broad enough, although they may have convictions of a partisan kind, and a knowledge as to where these facts would lead in the making up of schedules, yet they are not charged with the responsibility of making the schedules, but with the responsibility of gathering the facts in regard to industries and reporting upon them, and I undertake to say that it is not difficult at all to find men of sufficient breadth, no matter what political views they may have, to make a nonpartisan report upon those facts. I undertake to say that the work done by the last tariff board was of that character, and although they were appointed from different parties, they agreed unanimously on all the facts involved. That is what this House needs, that is what the country needs in approaching a revision of the tariff. It is not a report that is colored by the partisanship of men, but a report on essential facts so plainly found, so nonpartisan in its character, that any political party acting on these facts may know they have the truth of the facts involved. Then it is for the party to apply its own theory in the shaping of the different schedules, based upon those facts.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. A great deal has been said here to-day about a tariff board and a tariff commission. One wing of the Republican Party demands a tariff board and the other wing demands a tariff commission. We have had some amusing things here to-day. The falling out of these remnants of the old party has brought some very interesting and amusing things to light. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] has brought into question the sincerity of the leaders of the old Republican Party. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has undertaken to prove that they were sincere by Democrats. This he has failed utterly to do, and I do not see why he should bring these matters in question here since those leaders have gone

from this floor. This is a new day, and the people are once more in control. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No wonder you demand a tariff board or a tariff commission. The interests back of you have always demanded that power be placed in the hands of the smallest number of men possible, for it would be easier for them to influence a board of 5 members or a commission of 5 members than it would be to influence a House of Representatives of over 400 men coming up from all sections of the country. They favor a tariff board or a tariff commission and, in my judgment, the American people will never submit to a tariff board or a tariff commission, which is one and the same thing, the insurgents favoring one and stand-patters favoring the other. The difference is that between tweedledum and tweedledee. A tariff board? Oh no. A tariff commission? Oh, yes. There stands the leader from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] on this side demanding a commission and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] demanding a board.

Why can not we get information before the Committee on Ways and Means? That committee can have expert men and does have expert men before it. Why can we not give them money to employ experts—competent men to get up important facts and bring to the committee? They can get evidence from every nook and corner of the earth and they do do it; but, gentlemen, you never can explain to the American people why you have written the most obnoxious bill ever put on the statute book without the aid of a commission, without the aid of a board, and when you were raising the tax rates you did not need a board and you spurned the assistance of a commission, but when we come to lower the tax rate you say, Give us a board or give us a commission. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, in reply to our friend from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], I want to say that I do not see that he follows his own logic. He tells us that the reason the Republicans are favoring a tariff commission is that they want to get the control and regulation of the tariff in the hands of the fewest people so that they can be reached by the interests. In other words, he discredits five men or six men but is willing to trust a larger number of men. He wants to trust 435 men who are on this floor to-day, or who ought to be here representing the people of this country; but the system that his party has adopted has reduced the 435 men to 146 men, a bare majority of the Democratic membership of this House. One hundred and forty-six men, by reason of the binding effect of the secret caucus, are absolutely controlling the vote of the 290 Democratic Members of this House, and by this means a minority of the Members of this House are actually thwarting the will of the majority, and the remainder of this House are gagged and bound, tied hand and foot. Will the gentleman follow his own logic and will he give the remainder of us a chance to engage and take part in this tariff discussion and in this tariff making?

Could a more unreasonable or unjust policy have been adopted? Has not public opinion of late demanded that the tariff making be separated from partisan politics and that the tariff in the future be based upon a knowledge of the facts and not upon partisan interest?

But from the very beginning of this Congress every Member has been driven by the majority of the Democratic caucus into a position where he has to support this bill in its entirety or be deprived of taking any effective part in framing this bill. He is not permitted to vote for those schedules he is in favor of or to vote against those he is opposed to. He must vote for all or against all. One hundred and forty-six men have assumed control of this House, and they are going to maintain it at all costs. Gentlemen, go on and maintain it, but there is a future. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I have heard a great deal about the confusion between the name "tariff board" and "tariff commission." It means nothing more than a confusion. Some people prefer the one name, others prefer the other name, and it does not offer any argument against the tariff commission or the tariff board. If there is any reason for a tariff commission, there would be the same reason for a tariff board, for they are both designed to get information that we need, and I can not understand why anyone would stir up the dust or confuse the meaning when a great principle is at stake, simply because of a quibble of terms. In this day, the day of efficiency, the day of economy, when we are trying to ascertain the facts in every case, the time of commissions, when we are using this method of securing definite and expert knowledge more than ever before, we hear upon this floor utterances against this method of securing information. It would seem to me that we should not seek information upon the tariff from the standpoint of politics. I say, gentlemen, it is little short of a crime to the business of this country at every periodic time to be hung up, not able to know how to make their contracts to be fulfilled within the next six months or a year. Tariff legislation can never be constant; tariff revision from time to time is absolutely necessary. If you make a tariff bill to-day you have got to make a different one in five or ten years from now. It is not the fault of the bill. It is because the business of the country develops under different conditions, and consequently rates must be changed. Now, I ask why not have a nonpartisan board—a commission, if you please, that will be nonpartisan—to get the information, not to recommend rates but to give information, not as a political body, as this Ways and Means Committee must always be political. From the very character of the organization of this House the Ways and Means Committee must be political. This is what we wish to avoid by a commission.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield? I just want to ask him the question how he would secure a nonpartisan tariff commission?

Mr. FESS. The gentleman must make a distinction between political individuality and a political board. I can be on a board and retain my politics, but my politics does not need to go into the board. You can have a nonpartisan board composed of men every one of whom still has his political views on other matters. Do you say the Supreme Court is partisan? Is the Interstate Commerce Commission partisan? Is the Industrial Commission partisan? Is the educational system of our States and Nation partisan? Who appointed Mr. Claxton, a friend of mine, the great representative of the Southern States, as the head of the educational movement of this country? It was William Howard Taft, a Republican, who appointed a Democrat from the Southern States. Do you say that is partisan? Who chose the Supreme Justice of the United States, the Hon. Mr. White of Louisiana? Our late President chose him. Do you say that is partisan? You can have a board made up every man with his own political views, but the board is not political. You must make a difference between political activity individually and a political board. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FESS. My time is about gone.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Does the gentleman remember what happened when the Tilden election case came before the Justices of the Supreme Court?

Mr. FESS. I will say to the gentleman from New York this matter came before an electoral commission, upon a subject that was political, growing out of an election dispute. Had it not been that the Democrats made three specific blunders they would never have had the situation that came. Who was it that was responsible for the electoral commission? It was Allen G. Thurman, of my State, who favored it, while Roscoe Conkling and James G. Blaine opposed the commission. If you are not satisfied with the results, blame the Democrats and not the Republicans. [Applause on the Republican side.] This tariff commission should be established upon the basis of a nonpartisan character, and then when a schedule needs modification change it, but do not attempt such change in a political campaign, a campaign which unsettles business by hanging it to the contingency of the results of an election. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 2973. An act making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 577. An act authorizing the President to appoint an additional circuit judge for the fourth circuit.

THE TARIFF.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

67. Soaps: Perfumed toilet soaps, 40 per cent ad valorem; medicinal soaps, 30 per cent ad valorem; castile soap and unperfumed toilet soaps, 10 per cent ad valorem; all other soaps not specially provided for in this section, 5 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 4, after the word "soaps," strike out "40" and insert in lieu thereof "50."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of correcting what seems to be an error in the policy of the majority in taxing luxuries. Perfumed soap is unquestionably a luxury, as it comes in from abroad. The French soaps and English soaps are sought principally by those whose toilets and boudoirs are of such a nature as do not provoke the enthusiasm of the downtrodden workingman.

Under the Payne law perfumed soaps, which the Republicans rated as luxuries and not necessities, were taxed at the rate of 50 per cent. Under the Underwood bill the duty has been reduced to 40 per cent in order that the rich, not the poor, may obtain these French soaps at 10 per cent ad valorem cheaper than they did under the Republican system.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. In answer to the facetious remarks of my friend from Pennsylvania, I will call his attention to the fact that we estimated by making this reduction in rates from 50 to 40 per cent we would stimulate imports and collect more revenues.

Mr. MOORE. On luxuries?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I think the rate of 50 per cent is higher than the best revenue point.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield a little further?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. With pleasure.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Did I understand the gentleman to say he expected to collect more revenue?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Those are the committee estimates.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then you are a little more fortunate than you have been in other places in the figures you have placed in this handbook, because we estimate a lower rate.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The estimates I have before me are $162,000 and increased to $174,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not the one I have here. It is $162,000 to be reduced to $150,000.

Mr. MOORE. A dead loss of $12,000 in the revenue by reducing the rate so that the rich may obtain this perfumed soap lower than they did last year.

Mr. MANN. I do not know what figures the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] may have. He says he refers to the committee estimates. Are those different from the figures which were submitted with the report?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. From what the gentleman from Iowa says, evidently it is true. The estimates which I hold in my hand, contained in the revised caucus print of last year, are the figures upon which the committee did its voting, and in these estimates there is an increase of revenues expected, as I indicated.

Mr. MANN. When was this document made up, pray? This is the report of the committee to the House.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. That was made subsequent to the time this was made.

Mr. MANN. Then does not the gentleman think, after ascertaining that the information which he has before him is incorrect and that the information here is supposedly later and correct, that he ought to change his attitude upon the bill? He gave as his reason for making the reduction that it would increase the revenue, whereas the estimate contained in the report made by the committee is that the amount now collected under the present rate of 50 per cent is $162,255 for the year 1912, and the amount that will be collected under the bill as the rate has been reduced is $150,000, or $12,255 less than the amount actually collected last year.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman will, of course, realize that estimates of revenues are purely a matter of judgment. Nobody can make an affidavit as to what the revenues will be or will not be. But my own judgment is, as the figures of our revised caucus print show, that this rate will stimulate imports and raise more revenue.

Mr. MANN. But do I understand that the gentleman in preparing this bill obtained these figures and then did not look at them?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that so far as my vote was concerned, it was based on these figures, and that if there is any discrepancy between them and the figures the gentleman holds in his hand, I shall stand on these.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says these were the figures we had last year.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Those figures were prepared this year, in February.

Mr. MANN. But these figures were prepared by the committee and submitted in its report to the House. The gentleman must have had these figures before him when he prepared his bill. The caucus must have had these figures before it when it passed upon the bill. It is one of those things that the gentleman does not seem to be able to explain, and I am sure no one else can.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Of course, Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has said, the printed figures submitted in this report a few days ago are the only figures we have to guide us. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] how these figures were prepared, as presented by the committee in its report?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. They were prepared by the clerks of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Does the gentleman wish to discredit them?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman that the probability is that the gentleman wishes to discredit me. That is more like it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I would suggest that if the gentleman can not discredit the figures here, he had better give us a better reason for the committee provision.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. When the committee acted, it acted upon its best judgment and information in the matter. In making estimates no human being can arrive at perfectly accurate figures. No human being can do that. This is only an estimate.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. The gentleman says that this estimate was the controlling motive in making the change contained in this provision from the rate fixed in the present law. If their estimates on which they base their action are not correct, we had better return to the old law and the old rate.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. I rise to support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman rises in his own right.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], answering the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] hurriedly, did not recall the real reason for this reduction. The gentleman from New York is something of a free trader. He has not reduced—and I say "he" advisedly, for I understand that in the case of this chemical schedule he is the agent for all you gentlemen on that side—he did not reduce the rates on the raw material of perfumed soaps. They remain the same. How can you fix American industries to suit a free-trade Democrat better than by maintaining the present rates on the raw material, or in raising them, and reducing the duty on the finished products? It is entirely logical from the gentleman's standpoint. Heaven knows that American industries will ordinarily suffer enough if we reduce the rates all along the line and place them in unprotected competition with the balance of the world; but if you want to trim them up in a way to be particularly pleasing to a free-trade Democrat, the thing to do is to do as they have done in this case—retain the duty on the oil which is used for the manufacture of the soap, retain the duty on the perfume used in its manufacture, or increase it a little, and then put the American producer of the finished article out of business by reducing the rate on the finished product. While the gentleman from Kentucky appeals for the farmer, there are a few perfumed dandies who must be taken care of by this Democratic tariff bill, and so we are pleasing both the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from New York in this matter and adjusting it so as to arrange that we shall not only pay about what we now pay for toilet soaps, but make sure that they are all going to be made abroad. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

71. Vanillin, 10 cents per ounce; vanilla beans, 30 cents per pound; tonka beans, 25 cents per pound.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking a question.

A gentleman came into my office the other day and said he was interested in the manufacture of vanillin, which he said was made out of cloves. He stated that you have reduced the duty on vanillin under this bill from 20 cents an ounce to 10 cents an ounce, and that in the meantime you have imposed a duty on cloves. Cloves, his raw material, have been transferred from the free list to the dutiable list at 2 cents an ounce. Was that a correct statement?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I believe that the gentleman from Massachusetts has correctly stated the tax proposed upon cloves, but is in error in supposing that vanillin is made solely from oil of cloves. Vanillin is and was formerly made chiefly from oil of cloves, but is now made to an increasing extent from coal-tar derivatives. And it is not at all improbable that this will entirely drive the other process out of the market.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman may be correct about that, but I am not sure that he is correct. I find on looking it up that vanillin was formerly made from vanilla, and that later on it was made from oil of cloves, and such is the case to-day. Vanillin is also made sometimes from coniferin, which, as the gentleman knows, is the sap of coniferous trees. I understand that this industry is of importance, and that in the State of New Jersey it employs a large number of men.

Now, is it just, from the point of view of the gentleman, to reduce the duty on vanillin down to 10 cents per ounce simultaneously with an imposition of a duty on cloves? The gentleman is aware, perhaps, that in the Dingley bill the duty on vanillin was 80 cents per ounce. The Payne bill reduced the duty to 20 cents per ounce, and now you have reduced it to 10 cents per ounce.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman from Massachusetts, while stating the figures correctly, does not call the attention of the committee to the very great ad valorem equivalent of those figures. Under the Dingley tariff 80 cents an ounce amounted to 251 per cent. The Payne law reduced it to 20 cents an ounce, which is nearly 90 per cent ad valorem, and our tax of 10 cents an ounce is an ad valorem equivalent of nearly 48 per cent, which still leaves a very generous manufacturing margin between the finished product and the oil of cloves.

Mr. GARDNER. I should not so much doubt the wisdom of reducing the duty if that were the whole question. I admit those high equivalent ad valorems. I do not, however, think the gentleman ought at the same time to put a tax on cloves, unless he thinks that they are a luxury. Now, when I have had occasion, as has happened once in awhile, to take a single clove, I have never supposed that I was indulging in a luxury. I doubt if the gentleman is correct in supposing that cloves are luxuries.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman no doubt refers to the return homeward in the evening. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARDNER. I do.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 5, after the word "pound," insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That none of the articles specified in this schedule shall be admitted to the United States until it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that the foreign labor employed in the manufacture thereof shall have been paid wages equal to wages paid for similar labor in the United States, and that such foreign labor has not been employed thereon exceeding 8 hours per day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to that.

Mr. MOORE. I think the amendment is clearly in order. I offer the amendment for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the House the advisability, if we are to introduce foreign goods into the United States, of imposing the American wage scale and the American limitation as to hours of employment upon the competitor on the other side. In other words, inasmuch as the 8-hour law is in force in the United States and has continually been upheld by this House in all legislation, and as that is the limit of time for labor of the United States, that labor should not be put in competition with goods made by men in any foreign country who work more than 8 hours a day.

It is a matter of fact that can not be contradicted that in certain countries like England and Germany, where labor unions are supposed to be strong and vigorous, that the wages are lower than in the United States and the hours of labor longer. It is perfectly well known that in Italy and Spain and other southern European countries where competition with American labor exists, that they labor on through the night and for wages that are intolerable from our viewpoint. We are now entering on a policy which proposes that we shall give cheap goods to the people of the United States, thus reducing the opportunity for the employment of labor in the United States, and we should at least impose some restrictions on the foreign labor employed on cheap goods that are to drive the American laborer out of employment and reduce the American wage.

I submit that the amendment is in order. It is a limitation upon the schedule in the bill and is entirely germane. It is at least a humane amendment, which ought to be adopted by those who want to reduce the hours of labor and increase the wage of the workman and do not want him subjected to unfair and unjust foreign competition.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, a few years ago when in Japan I went into a woolen mill at Osaka. It contained German up-to-date machinery as fine as any in the United States. While walking through the factory I asked the superintendent how long the employees worked and what wages they were paid, and he replied, "We pay the men 44 sen and the women 40 sen a day." That was equivalent, respectively, to 22 cents and 20 cents a day of our money. Up-to-date machinery, free Australian wool, and expert operatives working 11 hours a day for 20 and 22 cents a day.

Does it do any good to exclude the Japanese workingman if he can stay at home and send his product here to compete with labor using similar machinery and receiving $2 or more a day and working 8 hours a day? That is this tariff question. If the competitors were just across the Potomac River here in Virginia everybody on this floor would see the true issue in its real significance. But the fact that the competition comes from across the Pacific or the Atlantic Ocean does not in these days of cheap transportation by great ocean freighters make the tariff any less a problem of tremendous importance to the industries of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts or the gentleman from New York what vanillin is; what it is used for?

Mr. GARDNER. It is a flavoring extract.

Mr. COOPER. I noticed that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] said that it is being made also from coal-tar derivatives. Is there any question as to whether it is possible to make entirely healthful edibles from coal tar?

Mr. GARDNER. I do not know; I did not know the fact until the gentleman from New York spoke. I have read that it was made of coniferin.

Mr. COOPER. What does the gentleman from Illinois know about that?

Mr. MANN. This is one of the so-called synthetic productions from coal tar that are entirely healthful. There are a large number of them made in Germany now. They are getting so they make every kind of flavoring extract from coal tar.

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to know that, but the explanation given by the gentleman from New York is entirely new to me.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman's argument I wish to say that the rates in this schedule are about 20 per cent, or a little less. The Payne rates are a little less than 26 per cent. There is no very great reduction as a whole in this schedule, and the present rates, as fixed in Schedule A, more than equalize the difference in labor cost at home and abroad. There can be no question about that, placing them on the average.

As to the protection of labor, there is but one way that you can really protect labor, and that is to protect it in the home market by not allowing an oversupply of labor. Some of us have been in favor of reasonable restriction of labor coming in in competition against American labor. Until you do that there is no use of talking about protecting labor from competition abroad through tariff rates when you leave the sluice gates wide open for European labor to come in to compete with our own.

Mr. Chairman, I now make the point of order. I think there can be no question about this coming within the rules. It must be germane to the paragraph and germane to the section. If this were introduced as an original proposition, it would not go to the Committee on Ways and Means, and there is no question about a limitation. There might be a question of the matter being germane as a limitation to an appropriation, but there is no question of a limitation to a revenue bill whatever. Therefore I think it is clearly out of order and is not germane to the paragraph or to the section.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose is to get a vote or expression of sentiment on this general question, and to bring it in at the close of some schedule where it will be given a test so that it can be determined whether we want to restrict the goods that come in, so far as the labor employed on them is concerned. If this is not germane to the schedule, and it reads "all goods referred to in this schedule," then I can not see where it can come in as an original matter at all. The bill provides for certain imports into the United States. It is surely within the province of the House to say how those goods shall come and what kind of goods they shall be. That is stated in every paragraph of the schedule thus far read, and to say that the goods so admitted into the United States shall not be made by men who work more than eight hours a day or shall not be made by men who work at a wage lower than the American wage, is clearly within the power of the House. Let the Chair

consider what has been done from time to time in the matter of the Army and Navy appropriation bills, and in the matters of riders upon the regular appropriation bills. I am sure it will be difficult for him to distinguish between the limitations there set out and the limitations here proposed. This limitation has a direct reference to the goods that shall be admitted under the tariff bill. What kind of goods shall come in under this bill? The bill says, for instance:

Talcum, ground talc, steatite, and French chalk, cut, powdered, washed, or pulverized, 15 per cent ad valorem.

The kind of talcum is designated.

It also provides in another paragraph:

Salts and all other compounds and mixtures of which bismuth, gold, platinum, rhodium, silver, and tin constitute the element of chief value, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Has the House not a right to strike out bismuth and limit it to salts alone? And by the same token has not the House the right to say that the salt that shall come into the United States shall be salt dug out of the salt mines by men who do not work more than eight hours a day or who do not work for wages such as exist in foreign countries?

Mr. AUSTIN. And does not this bill itself prohibit the importation of convict-made goods?

Mr. MOORE. It does. There is a limitation in point, and I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for bringing it to the attention of the Chair. I submit this matter and will endeavor to get it up in some way. I shall not appeal from the decision of the Chair if the Chair shall rule against me on the point of order. An effort will be made to have a determination of this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] offers the following amendment:

Page 17, line 5, after the word "pound," insert a colon and the following:

"*Provided*, That none of the articles specified in this schedule shall be admitted to the United States until it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that the foreign labor employed in the production or manufacture thereof shall have been paid wages equal to wages paid for similar labor in the United States, and that such foreign labor has not been employed thereon exceeding eight hours per day."

To this the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] makes the point of order that it is not germane.

The Chairman has hastily examined such precedents as he could find. Clause 3 of Rule XXI reads:

No amendment shall be in order to any bill affecting revenue which is not germane to the subject matter in the bill; nor shall any amendment to any item of such bill be in order which does not directly relate to the item to which the amendment is proposed.

It seems to the Chair that under that rule, especially when measured by the following precedent to which the Chair will call attention, the amendment is not now in order. The precedent is as follows:

On March 26, 1897, the tariff bill was under consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the Clerk had read the first paragraph as follows:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That on and after the 1st day of May, 1897, unless otherwise specially provided for in this act, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles imported from foreign countries or withdrawn for consumption, and mentioned in the schedules herein contained, the rates of duty which are by the schedules and paragraphs respectively prescribed, namely."

To this Mr. Alexander M. Dockery, of Missouri, proposed this amendment:

"*Provided*, That when it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that such articles are manufactured, controlled, or produced in the United States by a trust or trusts, the importation of such articles from foreign countries shall be free of duty until such manufacture, control, or production shall have ceased, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Nelson Dingley, of Maine, made a point of order against the amendment, and it was held by the Chairman, the late Vice President, Hon. James S. Sherman, that the amendment proposed was not germane. It seems to the Chair that is a case analogous to the one here. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out of lines 4 and 5 the words "vanilla beans, 30 cents per pound."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 12, by striking out of lines 4 and 5 the words "vanilla beans, 30 cents per pound."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment should prevail I shall offer an amendment when the free list is reached, placing vanilla beans upon the free list, where they now are. There is a peculiar situation in this paragraph. Vanillin, which is a synthetic production of coal-tar products, is, in a way, in competition with the extract and other products from vanilla beans. Vanillin is not now imported to any great extent. A small amount only is imported. The present rate at 20 cents per ounce is to a large extent prohibitory as against vanilla beans that come in free of duty. Now, what is the proposition in this bill? To reduce the rate on vanillin and put a duty on vanilla beans. Here is protection, not for American industries, but protection for German coal-tar industries. With vanillin at 10 cents an ounce and vanilla beans at 30 cents per pound, we will be importing large quantities of vanillin from Germany and drive out the importations of vanilla beans from North and South America. What is the theory of this? We sometimes have advocated a theory of protection to American industries, but I have not yet heard that anyone desired to put a high tariff on one product and a low one on another in order to encourage German industries at the expense of industries in some other part of the country. We are now importing $2,000,000 worth of vanilla beans a year, and they are on the free list because they are raw material used in the manufacture of many products that enter into the making of vanilla extracts, and so forth. You propose to put a duty of 30 cents per pound on those, a very high rate of duty, and then cut in two by the duty on vanillin, which is a competitive article with vanilla beans.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 42, noes 57.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Alabama has privately indicated his intention to compel us to go ahead with this bill to-night. Practically it could only be done by unanimous consent and I am not disposed to object to reasonable progress. It is now nearly a quarter after 6 and we have finished the chemical schedule. Does not the gentleman want us to get a chance to eat a little, even if we do not take a drink?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, as far as this House is concerned we are responsible to the country for this bill, and if a quorum does not appear here I expect to send for one——

Mr. MANN. Oh, I understand.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We are responsible, and our people ought to be here, and I want to try to keep them here. I appreciate the House has run on in good humor; we have tried to give gentlemen on that side the opportunity they desired, and they have not violated the privilege in any way.

If the gentleman desires now that a recess be taken, I am willing to accommodate him. I will take a recess until half past 7 o'clock.

Mr. MANN. That is the understanding. It can only be done in the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR EVENING SESSION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair assigns the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] to preside as Speaker pro tempore this evening.

RECESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess until 7.30 this evening.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 7.30 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

At 7.30 o'clock p. m., the recess having expired, Mr. GARNER, as Speaker pro tempore, called the House to order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties

and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE B—EARTHS, EARTHENWARE, AND GLASSWARE.

72. Fire brick, magnesite brick, chrome brick, and brick not specially provided for in this section, not glazed, enameled, painted, vitrified, ornamented, or decorated in any manner, 10 per cent ad valorem; if glazed, enameled, painted, vitrified, ornamented, or decorated in any manner, and bath brick, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Last year I noticed that the street car companies of Washington were laying on the street-car tracks a slag brick which was imported. May I ask the gentleman whether there is any provision in the bill in reference to a duty on those brick?

Mr. DIXON. They would come in under the heading of vitrified bricks.

Mr. MANN. I was told last year that these brick came here because they came in free of duty, although the language in the existing law in that respect is the same as in the pending bill.

Mr. DIXON. It is. It comes under section 480, under manufactures not otherwise specified, if it were not particularly mentioned.

Mr. MANN. They stated that it came in free. I talked with one of the District commissioners at the time, and made inquiry as to how it happened that they could import paving brick from Europe to pave the street-car tracks in the city of Washington, and I was told that there was no duty on that brick. It seems to me that if other brick are to have a duty imposed upon them it would be perfectly proper that this slag brick should have a duty upon them.

Mr. DIXON. I agree with the gentleman. My understanding is that they come in under vitrified brick.

Mr. MANN. I think that class of brick are carried in the existing law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know the class of brick to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has, no doubt, seen them piled up in the streets of Washington.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think I may have seen them, but I did not examine them, and if I had I do not think I would know them.

Mr. MANN. I was told they were a hard vitrified brick, made from ground slag in Belgium or somewhere else in Europe.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman's informant must have been mistaken, because I know of no provision in the existing law which would allow such brick to come in free. If they would not fall in a classification that is fixed here, they would fall into the basket clause, and be subject to duty at some rate unless they were enumerated especially in the free list.

Mr. MANN. Whether they came in under the head of slag or not I do not know. Slag is made free under the existing bill. I do not know. But my informant was Commissioner Judson, who would undoubtedly know, and I am quite strongly of the impression that my recollection is correct that he said these brick were brought here because they came in free, and that the freight rate was probably less, coming by water to Washington, than it would be to ship brick from Pittsburgh or from anywhere in Indiana or any of the other places around here that furnish paving brick.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think there must be some mistake, because they are clearly not slag, and I know of nothing in the existing law that would allow them to come in free.

Mr. MANN. I called the gentleman's attention to the matter so that he could look it up.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Brick is not on the free list, and there is nothing in the existing law that would let them come in free. They are undoubtedly brick, and could not come in as anything else.

Mr. MANN. I think if brick are to be placed on the dutiable list at all that class of brick might well be on the dutiable list, either for revenue purposes, from the standpoint of the gentleman from Alabama, or for revenue and protection purposes, from our standpoint.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think there must be some mistake about it.

Mr. DIXON. The circumstance that none of the brickmakers of the United States called the attention of the committee to that fact is an indication that nothing of that kind has come in free; otherwise they would have raised the point to the committee.

Mr. MANN. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the gentleman will allow me, I inquired about this brick when I was in Pittsburgh and talked with some of the manufacturers there, and they told me the reason they did not manufacture them was because they came in free of duty, and they were unable to manufacture them in competition. I remember asking them about the bricks that were used here to pave the streets in the city of Washington, because it struck me as rather unusual and something of which we should not feel proud that we import brick here to pave the streets of the National Capital.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

73. Tiles, plain unglazed, one color, exceeding 2 square inches in size, 1½ cents per square foot; glazed, ornamented, hand-painted, enameled, vitrified, semivitrified, decorated, encaustic, ceramic mosaic, flint, spar, embossed, gold decorated, grooved and corrugated, and all other earthenware tiles and tiling, except pill tiles and so-called quarries or quarry tiles, 5 cents per square foot; so-called quarries or quarry tiles, 20 per cent ad valorem; mantels, friezes, and articles of every description or parts thereof, composed wholly or in chief value of earthenware tiles or tiling, except pill tiles, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 17, line 20, by inserting after the word "tiles" the following:

"But including tiles wholly or in part of cement."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MANN. Do you want the word "but" in there?

Mr. DIXON. Yes. It will then read:

And all other earthenware, tiles and tiling, except pill tiles and so-called quarries or quarry tiles, but including tiles wholly or in part of cement, 5 cents per square foot.

That amendment is put in for the reason that there are being imported into the United States at this time some cement tiles, two-thirds of the tile being cement; but at the top there is a grinito marble that is being polished, and these tiles are coming in under another paragraph at a considerably lower rate. We thought they ought to be in the same paragraph with other tiles, because they are used for the same purpose.

Mr. AUSTIN. May I ask the gentleman what the increased importation of tiles under this schedule will amount to?

Mr. DIXON. From 108,000 square feet to 200,000 square feet.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, in relation to the tiles paragraph I desire to introduce the following letter from the officers of the International Brick, Tile, and Terra Cotta Workers' Alliance protesting against the reduction of duties:

INTERNATIONAL BRICK, TILE, AND
TERRA COTTA WORKERS' ALLIANCE,
Chicago, Ill., March 31, 1913.

Hon. J. H. MOORE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our Trenton (N. J.) union of tile makers have called our attention to a proposition to reduce the duty on floor and wall tile which will be considered by the incoming Congress.

Should the present duty on floor and wall tile be reduced we very much doubt if anyone would benefit except importers or foreign manufacturers.

You are doubtless familiar with the comparative wage scales of the countries of Europe, therefore we will not burden you with tiresome statistics.

We would, however, call your attention to this fact: That the American tile presser and the kiln placer receive $14.50 and $15, respectively, while the Belgium worker receives $3.92 and $4.90 for the same labor. We would further call your attention to the fact that the wage earners of Spain and Italy in this line of work receive much less than those of Belgium.

Should the present rate on tile be reduced our American manufacturers and tile workers could not hope to meet the competition of the underpaid worker of Spain and Italy, who, we understand, works long hours and at a wage that would render any attempt at competition by the native ware hopeless.

In the struggle to meet the changed conditions, should the present protective tariff be lessened, it will inevitably happen that the smaller and weaker tile plants must succumb and be forced to the wall and the American worker deprived of the opportunity of earning his living at the trade that he has made his life's calling.

The American manufacturer and workman in the tile industry have done much to beautify the structures of our country. Even in the comparatively short period of 30 years that they have been in existence they have outstripped European competitors in the excellence of their material and in artistic expression and execution. Our American manufacturers have done much to develop and improve the art of tile making and even with the present protective tariff rate have not always received compensation in proportion to the results obtained.

Should the present rate be reduced the standard of the ware would of necessity become lower. In order to meet the changed conditions there would be a general reduction of wages, which are not even now sufficient, in some instances, to adequately maintain the American standard of living.

Trusting that you will give this, the protest of the tile workers, due consideration, we are,

Sincerely, yours,

[SEAL.] FRANK BUTTERWORTH, *President.*
WM. VAN BODEGRAVEN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

75. Lime, 5 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 3, after the word "Lime," strike out "5" and insert in lieu thereof "25."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of the Payne law the lime industry in my State was greatly injured, and it will be completely destroyed by this bill if it goes upon the statute books.

The lime industry of British Columbia is located upon Vancouver Island, so that they have the advantage of cheap water transportation not only into the markets of Washington but also of Oregon and California, which are the principal markets for the lime of Washington. The lime manufacturer of British Columbia employs Chinese labor. On our side——

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask if the gentleman from Washington is addressing himself to line 3? My understanding is that the Clerk had only read line 2.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I thought he had read line 3.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I undertook to rise at the end of line 2, and thought that was the last line that had been read by the Clerk, when the gentleman from Washington rose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will not object to going back if the gentleman wishes to offer an amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have no objection. I thought the Clerk had read line 3.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let us dispose of the amendment of the gentleman from Washington first, and then you can go back. I would not be willing to go back very far, but in this case it was a mistake.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It probably was a mistake. I hope this will not be taken out of my time.

The lime manufacturer in the State of Washington employs white labor. The Chinamen receive $1.75 per day. American labor receives $2.87 a day.

The barrels in British Columbia cost 5 cents, and in the State of Washington 7 cents apiece. The wood for the burning of the lime in British Columbia costs $1.40 to $1.65 a cord, the Government furnishing timber to the lime producer at a low price. In the State of Washington they have to pay from $2.50 to $3.35 a cord.

The duty that British Columbia imposes upon our lime going into that country is 17½ per cent ad valorem, and they also charge the same rate upon the "package," as they term it, which is of equal value to the lime, so that in order to sell in the British Columbia market we have to pay 35 per cent ad valorem. It is proposed in this bill to reduce the duty we charge to 5 per cent ad valorem, while we have to pay to get into British Columbia 35 per cent. And it is not necessary for me to argue that it is impossible under this tariff for the American manufacturer to go into the British Columbia market. Not only that is prohibitive, but they have a law there that absolutely prohibits the American manufacturer from selling in British Columbia any article produced in this country for less than he sells it at home.

So that we are absolutely barred in the State of Washington from selling our lime there if we should happen to have an overproduction. Under the Payne law the greatest lime manufactory in the State of Washington has been running less than one-half of its capacity, while immediately across the line the large factory upon Vancouver Island has more than doubled its capacity. If the present duty is reduced, it means the end of the lime industry in that State. The industry is not very great. The industry, I believe, is estimated at a value of some $13,000,000 last year, but it does employ American workingmen and it does pay American wages. Yesterday we heard a very eloquent address by a distinguished Democrat about our right and our duty upon the Pacific coast to exclude Japanese labor.

We have excluded the Chinese, but we have not excluded the result of that labor when it is brought into British Columbia. One-fourth of the men in British Columbia are orientals. When you reduce this tariff and drive the American lime manufacturer out of business, it is not going to reduce the cost of lime to any American citizen. If it was, we might perhaps view it with a little more complacency.

I received a day or two ago a letter which I wish I could make public, but it is a personal letter, written to me by a friend of mine of many years' standing, and in it he states that his entire fortune is invested in lime manufacturing. He said that if this bill went through, and he anticipated it would, he expected his business to be entirely destroyed, and in his old age he would have to go back to the practice of his profession. I appeal to the members of this committee. If there ever were any circumstances when we ought to have protection, it seems to me we ought to have it in this case. There is an absolute monopoly in British Columbia. They will not permit us to sell in their markets, and they produce their products by Chinese labor. We have heard the statement made by the President that we must go out and secure world markets. Will some gentleman on that side explain how it is possible for us to go into British Columbia markets when we let their products come in practically for nothing and they enact a prohibitive tariff against us?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to ask the gentleman about the item of lime. I find in the handbook that since the Wilson law the duty on lime has been 5 cents per hundred pounds. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; but the gentleman will notice in the ad valorem that it has been reduced right along.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; that is true; and yet the quantity which we have imported seems to have constantly diminished. In 1896 we imported 428,000 pounds. In 1905, 261,000; in 1910 we imported 180,000 pounds; and in 1912 only 99,000 pounds. We seem to be taking pretty good care of ourselves under the present law in the matter of lime.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know what the situation is on the east coast. I am giving it on the west coast where we come into competition with this cheap oriental labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say in reference to these two paragraphs, and I include the one before this because the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] indicates that he desires to offer an amendment to it, that this is really a freight-rate proposition; that when you get farther into the interior there can not be any competition, or even a short distance into the interior. It is a freight-rate proposition. The freight rate soon eats up the competition. The only reason we left a small rate was that the only competition there can be would be right on the border. It is a border proposition. I recognize that the gentleman from Washington is on the border, and there may be some undue competition in this particular item right at his place, but we can not afford to tax the people all over the United States to take care of one border proposition.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The rate at present under the Payne law is only 9 per cent, and the gentleman from Washington not only wants double that but more than double that. His amendment would increase the rate to 25 per cent, which would make a tax on a very large number of people in order to protect the industry that happens to be located inadvantageously on the border at a particular point. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The duty against us is 35 per cent ad valorem, and even at 25 per cent it would be 10 per cent less than they levy against us.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; it is 17½ per cent ad valorem in British Columbia on the lime and 17½ per cent on the package, and the package is of greater value than the lime, so it makes it 35 per cent ad valorem.

I desire to call the attention of the gentleman to the further fact that in addition to having a water market they also have the advantage of foreign tramp ships, which they can get at a cheaper rate than we can to reach both Oregon and California. I would like to make this suggestion to the gentleman from Alabama, that I do hope somewhere in this bill that he will see fit to make some provision in order that our manufacturers may be protected and our people be protected from the arbitrary action of British Columbia, not only in regard to these rates, but

in the matter to which I called attention a few moments ago, where we are absolutely prohibited from selling an article over there at less than here. I remember a man sold a logging engine, which was confiscated because it was below the regular rate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman this bill has a clause in it that is similar to the dumping clause of Canada.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do hope the gentleman will work out something that will protect us.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. What the gentleman is complaining of is the dumping clause of Canada, and this bill contains a dumping clause.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, when the subject was before the committee four years ago, we found—we knew it before—there was a very large lime business up at Rockland, Me. I have been at Rockland since and I have found the lime business there has increased largely by the putting in of more capital and the building of new mills, and I was told when I was there, as I learned before the committee, that the business was very much depressed at 5 cents a hundred pounds, the original duty they had there for many years. Now, it is hardly fair to say it is a local industry, because there they ship the lime to the American ports along the coast of New England and even as far as the city of New York. Of course, we have limekilns all over the United States, and I believe they are all over Canada. This was a complete business where they had gone into it on a large scale with a large investment of capital, and I kept the duty the same as it had been in the bill, although they asked for a much higher rate, and I think if the rate the gentleman put here is kept he will injure a very legitimate and large business.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, the rate the gentleman from New York has in the present bill is only a little bit over 9 per cent in ad valorem figures, whereas the rate that the gentleman from Washington proposes, if I understood his amendment that I heard read, was 25 per cent.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is a very large increase. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, in line 1, page 18, by striking out "5" and inserting "20."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, line 1, page 18, by striking out the figure "5" and inserting "20."

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, this makes the rate 1.32 less than the present rate. Now, it may seem on first blush to many Members that this is a matter of very little importance to an industry far into the interior of the country. When you note that there are large importations of cement under the present rate of more than 20 per cent it is not difficult to see that a lesser rate would pay the freight farther into the interior. The trouble with the cement industry in my section of the country is that it is crowded from the best cities back into the interior and we are compelled to seek a market out into the intermountain country instead of on the seacoast and in the larger cities of the Mississippi Valley which are our natural market. The freight rate from Germany to St. Louis on cement is less than the freight rate from Chanute, Kans., to St. Louis on the same commodity. It comes in practically as ballast to the seaport, and the balance of the through rate, for some unaccountable reason, is always less than the rate from the interior to the coast of our country. The fear that I have is that this rate, being reduced from 21.32 per cent to 5, will have an injurious effect upon the industry and at the same time, as is estimated by the committee, reduce the revenues derived from the importation of cement.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to supplement what the gentleman says by adding that every cement plant in the United States is in bankruptcy now because they can not make cement at the price at which it is being sold.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I was not anxious to advertise the fact that large cement industries, with millions invested, are having the greatest possible difficulty to keep out of the hands of a receiver, and, indeed, some of them are in the hands of receivers to-day, all because their best market has been taken away from them by the importation of the cheaper-made cement. And as a revenue measure I ask the committee if they will not agree to the present rate, or, at least, a rate of 1.32 per cent below the present rate? It will incidentally act as a protection to a very large industry that employs a very high grade of labor and a very large amount of capital in the interior of our country.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I can not understand why my colleagues on this side of the Chamber will continue to appeal to the majority of this House to write any protective features in this bill. The Democratic Party has declared, and its representatives upon the floor of this House and on the stump have declared, that protection is unconstitutional.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But if my friend from Tennessee will permit me, the President has said over and over again in the campaign, and since the campaign, that it was not the purpose of the Democratic Party to injure any industry in the United States, and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has made a similar statement.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill on the report contained on pages 34 and 35 shows that under the chemical schedule—Schedule A—our increased importations will amount to $18,864,345; under Schedule B, we are now considering, the increase is $6,583,935; under the metal schedule, $26,074,130; under the wool schedule, $575,057; agriculture, $10,035,844; spirits, $4,463,767; cotton schedule, $12,568,604; woolen schedule, $20,692,626; silk schedule, $10,289,490; paper and pulp, $2,133,579; Schedule N, sundries, $71,285,231. Under these schedules the increase of foreign-made goods to be sold in the American market the first year under this bill amount to $183,566,620. Under Schedule F, the sugar schedule, the first 12 months shows a decrease of $521,052. Under Schedule J, the flax and hemp schedule, a decrease of $48,386,102, growing out of a transfer of certain articles from that schedule under a new arrangement to Schedule N, making a net total increase in foreign-made goods sold in the American market the first 12 months under this bill of $135,659,466.

Under this bill we are going to take from the American workshops and the American wage earners business amounting in the first year to $135,659,466. Sixty per cent of that amount in wages, at $2.50 a day, would sustain 100,000 wage earners in the American mills for 12 months. I ask those in charge of this measure, and responsible for this proposed legislation, what are you going to do for these wage earners that you rob of $136,000,000 in the output of their mills? What employment are you going to substitute for the employment that you take from them? And why should the American lawmaker legislate here to increase the output of foreign mills against American mills, where the capital is American money and where the men who own them are American citizens, giving employment to American wage earners at the highest known standard of wages? Yes; President Wilson's platform promised that no legitimate industry in this country should be injured. I ask the Representatives from Louisiana if the sugar industry in that State is a legitimate industry; I ask the Representatives on that side of the Chamber who represent Western States that are interested in the wool industry if the woolen business is a legitimate industry? I ask the men who represent the Democratic Party on the other side of the Chamber from the Southern States if the cotton mills, 850 in number in the South, are a legitimate industry under the interpretation of your platform? I ask you if the coal companies now shipping coal to New England from Maryland, Kentucky, and West Virginia are engaged in a legitimate industry in the eyes of the Democratic Party; and why should this business be turned over to the coal companies of Nova Scotia?

This side of the House believes in giving American orders to American mills and the work to American artisans, laborers, miners, and mechanics, as against foreigners. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the amendment suggested, I desire to say that last year we produced 80,000,000 barrels of cement, to the value of $66,000,000, and that we imported, in round numbers, $247,000 worth and exported over $5,000,000. We exported 20 times more than the amount we imported.

In addition to that, at the time of the building of the Panama Canal and the opening of the bids there was a contest as to who was to get the contract for the 4,500,000 barrels of cement that was to be furnished there, and while there were bids from a number of countries, the lowest bid was made by and the contract was awarded to an American bidder at a lower figure than any of the figures that were given by any of the foreign contractors, and it is very evident that the price in the United States is cheaper than abroad.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is that not a splendid argument for maintaining the 20 per cent duty that has been imposed on cement heretofore? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DIXON] if he knows how those prices compare?

Mr. DIXON. I do not know that I can quote the exact figures. They are printed in the hearings.

Mr. RAINEY. I can give them. The contract for 4,500,000 barrels of cement was awarded to the Atlas Portland Cement Co., of Northampton County, Pa., at $1.19 per barrel, and the bids of 14 foreign companies ranged from $1.25 up to $2.10. In connection with this contract I addressed this question to the Isthmian Canal Commission:

If the contract had been awarded to the foreign factories, would the foreign manufacturers have been compelled to pay any duty to the United States Government? In other words, was the tariff a factor at all in the bidding between American and foreign firms for cement?

The answer of the Isthmian Canal Commission was:

As a matter of fact the bids for foreign cement were all higher than the bid of the Atlas Portland Cement Co.

The figures are all printed here. Then I asked this question of the Isthmian Canal Commission:

Why was the contract awarded to the American bidders?

And the answer was:

Because they were the low bidders on a well-known Portland cement, which was perfectly satisfactory to the authorities on the Isthmus, and whose bid was strictly in accordance with our specifications.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does your report show the bid next to the lowest bidder—the Atlas Portland Cement Co.?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; the Portland Cement Co. works at Antwerp was $1.25. The Wouldham Cement Co. was $1.76, and so the bids run up. The bid of another German company was $1.82.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 3, after the word "lime," strike out the figure "5," and insert "10."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, while I have very little faith that I will get a favorable response from that side of the House toward protecting an American industry, yet in order that it may not be said that the rate which I offered in the amendment was too high and that given as an excuse, I offer the one now, which is practically the prevailing duty. I want to read a letter which I received from the owners of the lime plants in the northern tier of counties in Washington. These include all of the available limestone deposits in the Pacific Northwest. It is as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 21, 1913.*

Hon. W. E. HUMPHREY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the owners of all the lime plants located in the northwestern tier of counties of this State, which practically includes all its available limestone deposits, I was delegated to take up and lay before you the conditions of this industry at the present time and to ask you to use your best endeavors to have the iniquitous tariff conditions we are now operating under adjusted on some fair and equitable basis.

The industries are owned by citizens of the State of Washington who have invested their capital and earnings, and many of them have spent the best years of their life in building up the business in the hope of securing a reasonable return on their venture, but for the last few years this has been impossible, owing to industrial conditions that have placed them at the mercy of competitors across the boundary line in British Columbia.

The lime deposits of British Columbia are located upon Vancouver Island and have deep-water transportation not only to the principal markets of their own country, but likewise to the principal markets of the States of Washington and Oregon. In addition to this the railroads absorb their local freight charges to interior points that puts them on an equality with our home manufactures, with the added privilege of employing Chinese labor which averages but $1.75 per day, while the average white labor in the lime plants of this section is $2.87½ per day.

At the limekilns in British Columbia, where the product is put up in barrels, the Chinese contract the cooperage at 5 cents per barrel, while our manufacturers are compelled to pay 7 cents per barrel. The British Columbia manufacturers were given by the Government of that country large areas of timbered lands from which to draw their fuel supply for burning the lime, and their average cost of wood ranges from $1.40 to $1.65 per cord, while the manufacturers of the State of Washington are compelled to pay from $2.50 to $3.25 per cord for the same class of wood delivered to their kilns.

These physical conditions are a very serious handicap to the lime manufacturers of this section when they have to come in competition with British Columbia manufacturers on equal terms, and much more so when our Government places a bounty in the shape of a preferential tariff in favor of these foreign manufacturers, as is the case at the present time and has been for some years last past.

The Canadian Government places a duty upon manufactured American lime and ground limestone going into Canada of 17½ cents ad valorem, which also includes the cost of the package, and compels our manufacturer to invoice his shipments at his selling price to jobbers, which means that we must pay a duty not only upon the manufacturing cost but also upon the anticipated profits. For violation of this clause or the slightest attempt at undervaluation they invoke what is known in Canada as the dumping clause, which adds to the 17½ cents a penalty for double that amount. This places the ordinary duty of our lime entering Canada under the present prices at $1.92½ per ton.

The United States Government, on the other hand, allows the Canadian manufacturer of lime to ship his products into this country at a specific tariff duty of $1 per ton, with package free, notwithstanding the fact that the manufacturing cost of this package equals, if it does not exceed, the cost of the lime it contains, and they are then able to sell the empty barrels at from 10 cents to 15 cents each, in direct competition with the American cooperage factories, and which gives a tariff advantage to the Canadian manufacturer, in addition to all the other physical advantages, of from 92 cents to $1.05 per ton, and makes this country the dumping ground for the surplus product of the British Columbia lime manufacturers, which they have been quick to take advantage of, as every manufacturer knows that the cost of producing a certain article is decreased in proportion to the increased volume of the output of the plant and his ability to keep his plant running continuously.

Just as an example and to show the actual conditions, I will quote two instances:

The Roche Harbor Lime Co.'s plant at Roche Harbor is one of the largest on the Pacific coast, operating 14 kilns, with an investment of more than $1,000,000. For the past two years this plant has averaged but little more than two and one-half kilns in constant operation, and there have been times when not even a kiln was burning.

The Pacific Lime Co.'s plant of British Columbia has been during the same period running full blast and have installed additional kilns to more than double their capacity. The British Columbia markets have not been able to absorb their entire output, but with the very favorable tariff regulations they could very conveniently dump their surplus upon this market and cut the price below where it could be profitably produced by our own manufacturers.

When the schedule of tariffs for the bill now before Congress reached us, we find that instead of getting relief from the condition already prevailing it is proposed to wipe out the last vestige of industrial stability for this product by reducing the already low tariff by 50 per cent. It hardly seems reasonable to any citizen of this country that men elected to a high legislative office will deliberately plan to ruin their own citizens for the benefit of a foreigner or to carry out the theoretical idea of an economic problem. The placing of this tariff upon the statute books means nothing more or less than the formation of a trust between the United States Government and the British Columbia lime manufacturers which will destroy the property of their own countrymen, who are compelled to pay taxes from which the executioners derive a yearly revenue.

If the manufactured article in question was one in use by a class of people whose earning power was limited, or had any relation to the high cost of living or any of the various economic questions that confront us to-day, there might be some excuse for this action; but in this particular instance the contrary is true. Lime to-day is not used by the poor man. His house is plastered by a cheaper article than lime can possibly be produced, known as gypsum hard wall plaster. His chimneys, owing to the known danger of fire, are to a large extent laid up in cement mortar, and the use of lime therefore is largely restricted to brick and terra cotta construction in large and massive office buildings, factories, warehouses, and the like, and for which we, in turn, are compelled to pay the highest rate for occupancy and use. Therefore from an economic standpoint it has no relation whatever to the abstract question, but is purely one of business judgment.

On behalf, therefore, of the lime manufacturers of this country, and especially those of the Northwest, I have been delegated to file with our delegation a most emphatic protest against the reduction of the present tariff and to ask instead that a reciprocal tariff be demanded between these two countries, whose boundary line is imaginary instead of physical, and to ask that you use your best effort to see that this industry and the men who have invested their entire resources and years of effort be not destroyed.

The lime manufacturers of this section are not asking for protection, but justice, a fair field, and no favors, an equality of opportunity to invade the foreign field on the same terms and conditions that they are allowed to enter here, and we submit that under the present conditions we are entitled to a specific duty of $2 per ton on manufactured lime entering this country from foreign ports.

If it is impossible to raise the tariff on this class of goods shipped from British Columbia into the United States equal to that demanded by the Canadian Government at the present time, that some provision be made whereby the President and his Cabinet would have the right, after proper investigation, where certain tariffs were working hardships against the citizens of the United States and no other redress was possible, to suspend the tariff and make it equal to that of the foreign country. This is now being done, and has been for years, in Canada, where the tariff law can be changed at will by the simple process of making what is known as "An order in council."

Trusting that you will give this question your prompt attention and be able to secure some reasonable adjustment on a fair basis to the citizens of this country, I remain,

Very respectfully,

J. J. MAURY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does not that letter clearly indicate that your people were trying to dump on Canada at a rate less than they were selling to the American people, and were attempting to engage in the business of invading the Canadian markets instead of the Canadian invading your market? It seems to me quite a clear inference from the letter the gentleman has read.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. What they did wish to do was to have a fair opportunity with the Canadian manufacturer. The manufacturers in Washington have largely reduced their output. It is not likely that we would invade the British Columbia market to any extent when you remember that it costs more for the fuel that we use, more for the labor that we use, and when they have the advantage of foreign cheap tonnage to reach our markets, which we do not have. They have the advantage in labor, in material, and in trans-

portation and I hope the Democratic Party will not take away what little protection we now have.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

76. Plaster rock or gypsum, crude, ground or calcined, pearl hardening for paper makers' use, Keene's cement, or other cement of which gypsum is the component material of chief value, and cements not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 18, line 7, by inserting, after the word "and," the following: "all other building."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out paragraph 76 and insert in lieu thereof the following:
"76. Plaster rock or gypsum, crude, 30 cents per ton; if ground or calcined, $1.75 per ton; pearl hardening for paper makers' use, 20 per cent ad valorem; Keene's cement, or other cement of which gypsum is the component material of chief value, if valued at $10 per ton or less, $3.50 per ton; if valued above $10 and not above $15 per ton, $5 per ton; if valued above $15 and not above $30 per ton, $10 per ton; if valued above $30 per ton, $14 per ton."

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, if I am correctly informed, the Dingley bill was the first law to put a tariff upon gypsum. That law provided a tax of 50 cents a ton on crude gypsum. The Payne bill reduced that from 50 cents a ton to 30 cents per ton, and that is the rate now placed on crude gypsum. The provision in the bill we now have under consideration provides for 10 per cent ad valorem. That would be a reduction of about 60 per cent. I think the ad valorem rate under the present law on the importations for 1910 is 27 per cent, and for 1912 it is 25 per cent, so that it makes a reduction of about 60 per cent.

I do not understand, of course, why this reduction should be made. There was very strenuous objection to the reductions that were made in the Payne law. Gypsum is a very abundant article in the United States, being found, I think, in western New York, in Michigan, in Virginia in large quantities, and in Iowa, Utah, California, Texas, and Oklahoma. There are very large deposits in the State of Oklahoma. Prof. Charles N. Gould, who is now the State geologist of Oklahoma, in an article in Mining Science, December 12, 1907, on page 542, says:

The gypsum area, of which the Oklahoma beds form a part, is the largest in the United States. The area extends practically uninterruptedly from southern Nebraska across Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, nearly to the Pecos River. It is not to be understood that the line of outcrops is entirely continuous, but that throughout this entire distance the rocks are more or less impregnated with gypsum. Over a considerable part of this area, however, the outcrops are continuous, and one may travel 200 miles or more and not once be out of sight of heavy gypsum ledges. The line of outcrops from southern Nebraska to west-central Texas is approximately 600 miles long. The width of the area containing gypsum varies from a few miles to more than 100 miles. Oklahoma is in the center of the region, and the most extensive deposits are in that State. The amount of gypsum in Oklahoma is practically inexhaustible. With perhaps two exceptions, every county west of the main line of the Rock Island Railroad contains enough material to supply the United States with cement and plaster for an indefinite length of time.

The congressional district which I represent is the heart of that gypsum deposit. There are seven or eight gypsum mills in my district. They employ a large number of men—I can not state the exact number—and add largely to our wealth. The gypsum that was imported comes from Canada, and is mostly crude gypsum. I do not think any good can come to the country at large by reducing the tariff on gypsum. Thirty cents a ton is a very small and insignificant duty. Now, if you reduce it down to 10 or 15 cents a ton you might as well put it on the free list.

Under the present law the importations of gypsum have been increasing from year to year. It seems to me that when we have in this country an article or product of any kind in large quantities, scattered through various States in every section of the Union, it is bad policy to invite importations from a foreign country, to open our markets to their products, when the industry is capable of development to a scale that will absolutely supply our needs in every way at all times.

Mr. DIXON. I do not think the gentleman need fear about the gypsum in Oklahoma. The freight rate from the seaboard will be ample protection for the Oklahoma gypsum.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that the testimony before the committee showed that the mills in Virginia, instead of supplying the eastern market, have to send their products west, and that crowds and restricts and limits the field for the Oklahoma product? Is not that true? Was not that the testimony?

Mr. DIXON. The hearings did disclose the fact that in the regions named they did ship some of their products to some parts of the West; but does the gentleman desire that there shall be no market in the West for any other gypsum except that of Oklahoma?

Mr MORGAN of Oklahoma. As long as gypsum comes out of American soil, I am willing that it should come to Oklahoma, but I protest against going to a foreign country to procure crude gypsum.

Mr. DIXON. There are 17 States in the Union that produce gypsum. Last year we produced about $13,000,000 worth in the United States. There was about $400,000 worth imported into the United States. Gypsum is being used more and more all the time for the making of wall plaster, and it is becoming a necessity in all parts of the country. This is an effort to lower the price to the builders of the United States.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that this reduction in gypsum is made especially to help out the people who live in the Northeast, where they get the most protection for their manufactured articles, and that it is in response to a demand made from a section that should not object to protection on an article that is produced in the West?

Mr. DIXON. In the making of this tariff bill there was no section recognized. We tried to treat all parts of the Union alike.

In addition to this, gypsum is used as a fertilizer, and it ought to be made as cheap as possible for the farmers of this country. All other fertilizers are on the free list.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, gypsum is used on farm lands. It is not a fertilizer, but it has the property of attracting moisture, which, of course, is beneficial to growing crops, grasses, and things of that kind.

Mr. DIXON. It is used like lime.

Mr. PAYNE. When I was a boy on a farm I used to drive for about 10 miles to a gypsum mill and draw home some gypsum that was always put upon the grass, and it operated in the way I have stated. When we were adjusting the rate upon gypsum rock I took a good deal of pains with it, to get the facts, in order that the duty might be properly adjusted.

The greatest competition that comes from gypsum rock is about New York City and along the New England coast, the rock coming from Nova Scotia. Being near the ocean, of course, it is loaded into the vessels and goes down very cheaply. Competition is sharpest right there about New York City and the mills along the coast that get their gypsum rock from somewhere a little west in the interior. The problem was to adjust the duties so as to furnish the difference in the cost of labor in acquiring the rock at these near-by places, near where most of the cement was manufactured out of the gypsum, to be used in the eastern cities for the purpose of building. I got it so nearly adjusted that I sacrificed one or two interests in my own district in doing it. The gypsum quarries were closed on account of the low duties in the bill. I thought they might be when they put the duty on, but I was trying to make a bill for the country and not for my own district. I heard from that locality in the election, but I told them frankly what I had done and that I thought I was right about it; and while I lost votes I did not lose my self-respect. I think the duty was adjusted at about the right figure, and that a less vigorous reduction than that proposed in this bill ought to satisfy the gentlemen who are making a purely revenue bill. I think they would get more revenue out of a duty more nearly approaching the duty we left upon it in 1909. I do not know that I have anything further to say on the subject. I never was in favor of protecting from the eastern trade or for the eastern trade this gypsum in Oklahoma or in Iowa. I remember a good many years ago one member of the committee—and I will not speak of his locality, for he is dead now—who wanted to protect some of that western gypsum rock. I fought him then as I have always tried to fight for a reasonable duty that made up the difference in the cost, and not an excessive duty on all these articles.

Mr. DIXON. The gentleman from New York was a member of the Committee on Ways and Means when the Dingley bill was put into law.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. DIXON. That bill passed the House with gypsum on the free list and it was put on the dutiable list in the Senate.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; that is correct. And in the McKinley bill there was a duty upon gypsum, but the duty that was put on in the Senate in the Dingley bill was more nearly right than the Senate sometimes gets the duty when a bill gets over there. The experience we had under the Dingley bill showed it was more nearly right, and I tried to adjust it in

the light of the experience we had under that law when we were adjusting this duty in 1909.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 4, after the word "crude," strike out "ground or calcined," and in line 8, same page, after the words "ad valorem," insert a semicolon and the words "plaster rock or gypsum, ground or calcined, $1.75 a ton."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the cases that seems to have justified Mr. Hancock in declaring the tariff to be a local issue. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has just explained the difficulties that confronted him in endeavoring to adjust the tariff bill to meet the wishes of the various sections of the country. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] has spoken for gypsum in its crude state, as it originates in his section of the country. Along the Atlantic seaboard the question arises as to the payment of the enormous freight rates on bulky material like this that would have to be paid from Oklahoma or Minnesota or Michigan or any of the Western States. Of course the question of the cost of building construction arises when these freights are considered. It would be far cheaper to bring gypsum from across the water, from France or Germany, than it would be to bring it in from Oklahoma to the eastern section of the country. Those of us who believe in protection desire to be consistent in the matter, although as a result of the proposed change in the Underwood bill we are told that at least one enterprise to construct a factory for the manufacture of Keene's cement has already been discontinued. It is apparent that if the duty on ground or calcined cement, which is the manufactured product of gypsum, goes into effect, then the industry along the east coast will be seriously affected. It is asked that a duty of $1.75 per ton be permitted to remain upon the manufactured article.

If it does not so remain, then it will be entirely within the power of those who are controlling the quarries in Nova Scotia, taking advantage of the lower rate of duty proposed in this bill and the freight rates due to local conditions, to enter the eastern market and put out of business those who are now engaged in the manufacture of cement or calcined plaster, which enters so materially into the cost of construction of the homes of the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

78. Clays or earths, unwrought or unmanufactured, not specially provided for in this section, 50 cents per ton; wrought or manufactured, not specially provided for in this section, $1 per ton; china clay or kaolin, $1.25 per ton; fuller's earth, unwrought and unmanufactured, 75 cents per ton; wrought or manufactured, $1.50 per ton; fluorspar, $1.50 per ton; limestone-rock asphalt, asphaltum, and bitumen, 50 cents per ton: *Provided*, That the weight of the casks or other containers shall be included in the dutiable weight.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 18, line 20, by inserting after the word "asphalt" the following: "25 cents per ton."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, what is the amendment?

Mr. DIXON. The amendment is, after "limestone-rock asphalt," to make the rate 25 cents per ton, leaving the other as it is. Fifty cents is the present rate, and the other items have been cut, and this amendment will make this in harmony with them.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. The Republicans carried that amendment through.

The Clerk read as follows:

80. Common yellow, brown, or gray earthenware made of natural unwashed and unmixed clay; plain or embossed, common salt-glazed stoneware; stoneware and earthenware crucibles; all the foregoing, not ornamented, incised, or decorated in any manner, 15 per cent ad valorem; if ornamented, incised, or decorated in any manner and manufactures wholly or in chief value of such ware, 20 per cent ad valorem; Rockingham earthenware, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, if I thought anything I could say here or any motion I could make correcting these rates would have any effect I would change all of these rates with reference to crockery and earthenware and china and put them as they are under the present law. I would inquire whether the gentleman from Indiana, who has charge of this schedule, as I understand, will be as fair and frank as the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] in dealing with the last schedule, when in answer to some inquiries put to him by myself and some other gentlemen he said they were not making any tariff for the manufacturers; that he did not care anything about that and did not propose to put any protection on the articles under consideration. This crockery schedule is all on a competitive basis. About $10,000,000 worth of crockery and earthenware are now imported; about $16,000,000 worth are manufactured in this country.

Ten millions are imported at the import price, the foreign price. Most of the crockery in this schedule is imported, far more than the domestic production in certain lines. Ten million dollars at the foreign price would amount to more than double the manufacture in the American price.

In china alone there is four times as much imported as made in this country; something like $8,000,000 being imported and only about $2,000,000 in value being made in this country. Now, if the principle of the competitive tariff, as to which the gentleman from Alabama has spoken so eloquently to-day, is to be put into effect anywhere why not put it into effect in regard to this schedule, and if the gentleman from Indiana, who has charge of this schedule, cares nothing about the manufacturers who make these articles, does he and his party care nothing about the workingmen who are employed in the factories and who receive 50 to 55 per cent of the value of the products that they are turning out in their wages? Well might the gentleman from Tennessee ask what does the Democratic majority propose to do with those men who are employed by these factories, for they can not continue at the same wages and sell at the same prices as now under this proposed tariff. More goods are imported now in one class, one of the most important classes—china—than are made here, and it is easy to see that the foreigner really has an advantage now, and if this competitive tariff that we have heard about does not mean simply competition with the low wages of Europe, then this schedule ought to be changed. But I have no expectation that that will be done. I expect that the majority will continue to make rates here regardless of what becomes of the American workman and the American laborer.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman yield for a statement there?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. AUSTIN. Under this paragraph that we are now considering, 81, we will increase the amount of foreign-made goods in the first year of the Underwood bill by $1,400,000 in round numbers.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is in the figures in the handbook.

Mr. AUSTIN. In the handbook.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think they are altogether too small in some instances.

Mr. AUSTIN. I know they have been repudiated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But that much, at least, is contemplated and intended to be imported.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

If the rates of duty provided by law on this class of goods were strictly enforced the amount of protection given to the industry would be an entirely different matter. I have been reliably informed on several occasions, this being an ad valorem rate of duty, that many undervaluations have been discovered on importations. In fact, one gentleman, Mr. Burgess, president, I believe, of the pottery association, made the statement before the Ways and Means Committee four years ago that they had discovered that on chinaware tea sets which had been imported into this country, when ferreted out and run down, were found to have been manufactured in Belgium, and the Belgium house had a house in Paris and a house in New York under an assumed name or different name, but when the truth was known they were all one institution.

Those goods were consigned by the Belgium manufacturer to the Paris house at a price far below their manufactured cost, and in turn assigned to the New York house at a price far below their value, thus evading the law, evading the payment of the just rate of duty on those goods that were provided for by law, and some $9,000,000 worth had come into this country at less than $5,000,000 in value, and a duty was paid on $5,000,000 instead of $9,000,000.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I was going to ask my friend why, when he wrote the Payne bill, he did not remedy that condition?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman—and I will be candid with you—that a specific rate of duty can be placed on chinaware. I am not complaining about that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. You are talking about consigned goods. It is very easily remedied. We have remedied it in this bill.

Mr. FORDNEY. You have not. You have an ad valorem duty.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman was complaining about the fact that on these consigned goods the valuation was not fixed. If the gentleman will look at the administrative features of this bill he will find we have a clause in here that compels them to fix the rate.

Mr. FORDNEY. I am not contradicting or complaining. You have undoubtedly gone as far as you could to correct the error. I will say to the gentleman that I have a list of the names of importers that have robbed this Government of the just rate of duty on many kinds of goods, both on the specific and ad valorem rates, as provided for in the law. We have laws that punish severely the crime of murder and many other crimes, but, God knows, there is no law written that will make all men honest. What I am trying to impress upon you is this, that you have reduced the rate of duty on those goods, and to-day, and for many years past, and it will occur in the future, there have been violations of law in undervaluation. There is no question about that. To read over a list that has been furnished me by the Treasury Department of prosecutions in the last four or five years leads me to believe that the average importer is an inveterate smuggler.

I have the amount of money furnished to me in figures by the Treasury Department of fines and penalties that have been paid by some of the largest importers in this country, and it is astounding. The sugar companies alone that have been here asking for lower rates of duty or free trade could not get lower duties under the Payne law, except by stealing it. Some of those responsible are now serving time in State prison for underweighing and undervaluation and fraudulent drawbacks, and have paid four millions and some three or four hundred thousand dollars in fines.

Mr. MADDEN. That is due to the adoption of an ad valorem instead of a specific duty.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will not say that, because a duty, whether specific or ad valorem, will not prevent a man from being dishonest and underweighing, which was the charge against those people.

Mr. MADDEN. It will give them an opportunity to undervalue.

Mr. FORDNEY. I fear so. I am very much opposed to ad valorem duty. I think with a specific duty there is less opportunity for fraud. I may be wrong about it, but, Mr. Chairman, I would, if I could, induce the gentleman to put the rate of duty back where it is under existing law, because I do not believe the rate you have fixed in this bill will give adequate protection to that industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman from Alabama permit me to have just one minute more? I do not want to violate the rule. I have not taken up any time heretofore.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not like to have speeches run over five minutes by a single Member.

Mr. FORDNEY. Only one minute, if the gentleman please.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I shall not object.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will not take up any more time than necessary.

I have here a statement furnished to me showing that in white ware the labor cost of production alone in this country is 55 per cent of the total cost of the manufacture of that article, not allowing for the labor cost in the material used. And in white ware and a small amount of decorated ware 58 per cent is the labor cost, and in another article 64.2 per cent is the labor cost. Therefore I do not believe that a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem or 40 per cent ad valorem is a sufficient duty to offset the cost of production in this country.

I shall offer an amendment to the next paragraph.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, on line 24, page 19, the figures "40" and insert "50."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered withdrawn.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Where was the amendment intended for?

Mr. MOORE. For line 24, on page 19.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That paragraph has not been reached yet.

Mr. DIXON. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], who has been talking about the interests of the manufacturers, that there has not been a single manufacturer—and there have been a large number who appeared before the committee—who has made the slightest objection to the rates in this paragraph.

All that the gentleman from Iowa has been talking about is in reference to paragraphs that we have not yet reached. Under this paragraph the American production is about $14,000,000. The importations are only $150,000. They are all bulky and heavy, and that fact alone is practically all the protection that the American manufacturers would need, and there has been no criticism by those gentlemen themselves in reference to this paragraph.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, did not the gentleman understand me to say I was speaking in reference to both paragraphs?

Mr. DIXON. I supposed the gentleman was speaking on the paragraph that was pending before the committee.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Did I not speak expressly with reference to that and the following paragraph?

Mr. DIXON. Probably the gentleman did.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I do that for the purpose of gaining some information about the next preceding paragraph, which was passed over before I realized it—the mica paragraph. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana as to the reasons that led the committee to modify the present duties upon mica.

Mr. DIXON. The Democrats have never believed in a compound duty—a specific and an ad valorem duty together—and the committee concluded to put in simply the ad valorem duty instead of a compound duty. That is the reason.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. That is the real reason for the change?

Mr. DIXON. That is the reason. The rates are not materially changed. The rate here is 30 per cent, and under the old law it was about 35 per cent.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. On the basis of the importations of 1912 the rate is 34.19 per cent, and the new rate is 30 per cent.

Mr. DIXON. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Of course you allow for additional importations of about $40,000 and a reduction of some $5,000 in revenue.

If the gentleman will bear with me for a word on that schedule, I will say that it is true that the reductions are not large, but I was not sure as to the controlling reasons why you should make that much of a change in an industry that is new and growing. The product of this manufacture is used largely as an insulator in electrical machinery.

Mr. PAYNE. I will explain it to the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I would be glad if the gentleman would.

Mr. PAYNE. The committee has fixed about the same rates as at present. They could not bring themselves to an exact indorsement of the present law, so they put on an ad valorem rate that is pretty nearly as good.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. They are losing about $5,000 of revenue.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is aware of the fact that mica is an important industry of an important district in North Carolina. Does the gentleman recall that?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. That may save us somewhat in South Dakota, which produces more mica than any State in the Union at the present time. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will answer the gentleman in my own time.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I will proceed just for a moment. Of course, in the great multiplication of electrical machinery mica becomes an important American product. Outside of what is made in the United States, it comes chiefly from a small importation from Canada, and the rest, I believe, from India. Of course, it is unnecessary to say that in competing with the labor of India we are competing with about the cheapest labor in the world—something like 8 cents a day.

In the last few years the production of mica in my State has increased until it produces about two-thirds of the mica that is made in the United States. With the continuation even of present conditions, which can properly be met by this great and rich manufacturing electrical industry, which takes the product for insulation, in a very few years it can manufacture all the mica that we consume here at home, notwithstanding that the electrical industry is growing and its demands will be greater.

As a protectionist—although I believe in only moderate protection—of course I should hate to see, even in an effort to apply a theory to this tariff revision, any serious disturbance of an industry that will become quite important if allowed to grow.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I know that some of our friends who, when they have been in power, have always protected their own are very desirous of finding some place where the majority on this side have protected something that is located in their own States. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr MONDELL], showing his lack of information about a tariff bill, missed it far when he shot at North Carolina. The mica in North Carolina is low-grade mica, and the only way in which it could be protected, if you wanted to protect it, would be under a compound rate. The mica that is actually imported is a high-grade mica, and a 30 per cent rate will be a good revenue rate on that high-grade mica; but on the low-grade mica it is a very low rate and does not accomplish the result.

The committee did not desire greatly to reduce the rate because of our importations and because of the competitive feature; but as mica varies very much from high-grade mica to low-grade mica, we found that under the compound rate there are some anomalies in this schedule. I believe one witness came before us and stated that there was a sample of mica that had come to the customhouse upon which, under the compound rate, the duty amounted to an equivalent ad valorem of 3,000 per cent, if I recollect aright, on account of the very low grade of the mica. Of course, this was an unusual case. So we found that as mica varied so much in quality there was no specific rate you could levy which would not make the equivalent ad valorem on the low-grade mica very much higher than on the high-grade mica. We did not want to do this; and when you come to these compound rates, it makes the duty on part of the mica absolutely prohibitive, where on the other part it is competitive. For that reason, in order to try to make competition all along the line, the compound rate was stricken out and an ad valorem rate was adopted, although in the general average there is not a great amount of reduction.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in answer to the old-fashioned, stock Republican argument which has been presented here by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] against the ad valorem rates in this bill. It is true that all through the bill, in accordance with Democratic precedent and Democratic belief, we have written ad valorem rates wherever we thought they were practicable and workable.

There are objections which may be urged against ad valorem rates; but the truth is that every objection which can be raised against an ad valorem rate can be raised with equal force against a compound rate, which consists of a specific with an ad valorem in addition thereto, because in each of those cases it is necessary for the appraiser, in order to fix the rate, to fix the value of the imported article. Further than that, every argument which can be offered against an ad valorem rate can be offered against value classifications. All through the tariff law are numerous divisions of articles according to their values, different rates being written for the different values. The Payne law, like the Dingley law, was filled with compound rates and with value classifications. In writing this bill we have taken out practically all of the compound rates, and we have taken out of it practically all of the value classifications, leaving very few. And we have made so great a reduction in the number of classifications in the bill by reason of these changes that while I have not made the calculation, and can not speak with exactness, I am satisfied that we do not have any more ad valorem rates in this bill than there were compound rates and value classifications in the Payne law, so that the inducement for undervaluation, by reason of these ad valorem rates, is no larger in the present law than the law which it supersedes.

I want to say one further thing: That I think gentlemen will find that under the administration conducted by the party which believes that the first interest in the receipts of the customhouse is that of the Government rather than that of interested parties, either producers or importers, you will find during the next four years, during the operation of this law, less undervaluations than you have found under the Payne law. Why, it is currently reported that a great importer, a great merchant in the city of Philadelphia, a man who in days gone has performed great service for the Republican Party, who has collected enormous campaign funds from the beneficiaries of the tariff laws in the State of Pennsylvania for the use of the Republican Party, and who has held a high place in the Government under a Republican administration, came to Washington on the 3d of March, within 24 hours of the time that the Republican administration was to go out of power, and settled with the Treasury Department fraudulent-entry cases at the port of Philadelphia, extending over 10 or 12 years and involving an amount of more than $100,000.

On the very eve of the Democratic administration coming into power that was done, because of the fear that the Democratic administration would look out for the interests of the Government and see that the revenue honestly levied should be honestly paid into the Treasury.

I am glad to say that that act was largely responsible for the cleaning out of the Philadelphia customhouse by the present administration, and the President has appointed for collector of the port of Philadelphia a man under whom no such conduct can prevail in the future, a man who made his reputation in Pennsylvania by prosecuting capitol grafters and robbers, a man whose only enemies are ex-Republican State officials and State officeholders, now or recently residing in the State penitentiary. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am satisfied that these ad valorem rates will bring the amount which the Government is entitled to under the law. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. My time has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. As to the first part of the gentleman's statements in regard to a distinguished individual to whom he has made reference I have no knowledge. It is an interesting statement, and, of course, the gentleman is responsible for it. But as to the irregularities in the Philadelphia customhouse being responsible for the recent change in the collectorship I think there is considerable doubt. The collector of the port of Philadelphia, who has just given way to the principal protégé of my friend on the other side [Mr. PALMER], the new leader of the new Democracy in Pennsylvania, did not resign the office as he was requested to do, desiring to know whether any charges had been filed against him. And while his term of office had not expired, and it is to be presumed that charges would be preferred against him, or that there would be some political justification, or civil-service justification, for his removal, he is to be deliberately removed because the Secretary of the Treasury in response to the collector's personal demand declared that he preferred to have some one in that office who was "in sympathy" with the administration. There were no charges, because the gentleman himself asked if there was any charge against him, and was told there was not.

This was the first evidence of a desire of the party in power, those who are now in control of the administration, to get the offices in Pennsylvania and to let the collectors of the ports throughout the country know that the time had come for a change. The Democrats wanted the jobs. [Applause.] I do not blame the gentlemen for wanting the jobs.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I do not blame Democrats for wanting the jobs.

I do not blame the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] for coming in here and getting them as fast as he can. I congratulate him on the supreme control he has, not only over the warring Democratic factions in Pennsylvania, but over the White House itself, which up to this time has yielded to no man in this country except to the gentleman from Pennsylvania in removing without cause a Republican collector against whom they could find nothing, and whose term of office had not expired.

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] a few moments ago indulged in some observations on the question of ad valorem duties. He said that the mixed duty—that is, the combination of the specific duty and the ad valorem duty—was just as bad as an ad valorem duty. That was substantially his affirmation. A specific duty upon a pound of goods or some unit of goods by which they are measured can not be evaded. It is simply a matter of weight or measurement, and that can not be got around, unless by connivance of somebody, and so far as that specific duty goes it is absolute. If there is an ad valorem duty in addition to that, a portion of the ad valorem duty may be evaded. But a mixed duty is as much better than an ad valorem duty as the specific duty upon an article is in proportion to the ad valorem duty. The gentleman thought they had not put any more ad valorem duties into this bill than to take the place of the ad valorems in the present law and the specific and ad valorem mixed. What a memory these gentlemen have.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Just a minute.

Mr. PALMER. But I did not say that.

Mr. PAYNE. I understood the gentleman to say that.

Mr. PALMER. I said that I did not believe there were more ad valorem rates in this bill than there were ad valorem, compound, and value classifications in the Payne bill.

Mr. PAYNE. That amounts to pretty nearly the same thing. Mr. Chairman, it is strange how these gentlemen seem to

have forgotten what was in the bill. I had to remind the chairman of several important items that had absolutely slipped his memory, some of them since he made his speech on last Monday, and now the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] has overlooked the last item under discussion, the subject of lime, where there is a specific rate in the present law, and an ad valorem rate in this, and they run all through the bill. I only speak of it in order to recall the gentleman's recollection to a recent event. Of course, every country has discarded ad valorem rates wherever a specific rate is practicable. Great Britain held on to it the longest, but during the last four or five years she has been getting rid of her ad valorem rates and returning to more specific rates of duty. Every Secretary of the Treasury of the United States condemned the ad valorem except the patron saint of Democracy, Mr. Walker, the man who made a tariff bill that they refer to with pride, but would not if they understood what it was. Now, Mr. Chairman, the difficulty of the ad valorem rate is on the valuation of the goods. Four years ago I took hold of this subject to see if I could not work out a section of the bill and put it in there. It has so commended itself to you that you retain it verbatim. I think it is section 11 of the administrative features of the bill. The difficulty is when you put on an ad valorem duty these people immediately go to work to see how they are going to evade it, and they do evade it by taking the whole product of the factory and having it consigned to them generally on a false invoice and false prices. Duties should be levied on the market value of the goods in the place where manufactured, but there was no market value of the goods.

There was no sale except to this single consignee in the United States, and to no other country. They were not freely offered for sale, and then the problem came how to value these goods. Well, it struck me in case of no market value abroad it would be a good thing to take the market value at which those goods were sold in the United States and work backward, deduct the duty paid or which should be paid, deduct the item of freight and insurance and the fees, the percentage of the consignee, if any was actually paid, not exceeding 6 per cent, and let that be the valuation. That worked pretty well for a while. They were afraid of it, I am told, and there were more correct valuations and more attempts to get market values abroad. But some importer came over here with some goods one day and fell into the hands of the authorities, and the attorney before one of the boards of appraisers over here in New York proved that there was no market value at the place where the goods were manufactured, and sat down with the usual smile upon his countenance of such gentleman, the attorney for the importer thinking that he had won his case. The attorney for the Government immediately took up the question of the market value at which those goods were sold in the United States, and worked backward to prove his case——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. Have I had five minutes? I would like to have a little more time on this question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to surrender the right about maintaining the five-minute rule, but the gentleman is the senior Member on the committee, and I will not object to his proceeding; but I ask unanimous consent that when the gentleman from New York concludes, the debate on this particular paragraph conclude.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the gentleman from New York concludes, debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall close. Is there objection?

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes on this.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On this paragraph?

Mr. POWERS. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. The next paragraph is on crockery also.

Mr. POWERS. I can take time then.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I had gotten to the point where the case had been rested before the subboard of appraisers, consisting of three gentlemen, and then the importer asked for an adjournment of the case, and it was adjourned from time to time for three or four months, the attorney for the United States trying to push it forward, and finally they got ready for a hearing, and, lo and behold, they proved that during the adjournment some man had gone over there where these goods were manufactured and freely offered them for sale to three or four interested parties, the same goods at the same price that the consignee had imported them into the United States, and they came and proved that before the board of appraisers, and that board of appraisers allowed that sort of thing to get around this statute. I am glad to say that the board of appraisers will never repeat this operation again in the United States, because some things have happened since that was done, and probably this valuation paragraph or section will prove of some benefit.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is almost a hopeless case. We can not catch them for perjury; we can not get hold of their books. We are at their mercy. It happened a while ago, in the examination of one of these cases, that they were showing their books, and some sharp fellow from the customhouse got to mussing around a little and got hold of a letter book and opened it. They said, "Oh, this is a private letter book." He said, "This letter does not seem to be private," and he read a letter from the man here, to whom the goods were consigned, to the factory in which all the parties were interested on the other side, which said, "I inclose a check for 47,000 francs to cover the difference between the cost of those products in our factories over there and the prices put into the consignment"—the consignment being the price on which they paid the duty. We are open to all sorts of fraud when we have these ad valorem duties, and that is why every enlightened nation on the globe has, wherever it is practicable, a specific duty, in order to avoid fraud in the undervaluation of goods by the importers. And all the importers are not Republicans; most of them who come before the committee are Democrats. The Democrats are sometimes as honest as Republicans and they are sometimes as dishonest as Republicans. Dishonesty does not belong to any one particular party. Avoidance of customs rates does not belong to any one political party; fraudulent valuations do not belong to any particular party. As long as there is a feeling of graft among merchants there is a loose feeling that permits a man to go to work and cheat the Government out of the revenue, and he thinks he is not doing anything morally wrong as long as he avoids State prison, and he gloats over it. As long as that is the feeling among the people of the United States you will have fraud and undervaluations in the customhouse. I am glad I never have had a hand in making ad valorem rates to tempt this fraud, wherever specific rates were practicable. On crockery they are not practicable; they can not work out; and so you have to have ad valorem rates on crockery.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALEXANDER). The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

81. Earthenware and crockery ware composed of a nonvitrified absorbent body, including white granite and semiporcelain earthenware, and cream-colored ware, and stoneware, including clock cases with or without movements; pill tiles, plaques, ornaments, toys, charms, vases, statues, statuettes, mugs, cups, steins, lamps, and all other articles composed wholly or in chief value of such ware; if plain white, plain yellow, plain brown, plain red, or plain black, not painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, printed, ornamented, or decorated in any manner, and manufactures in chief value of such ware not specially provided for in this section, 35 per cent ad valorem; if painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, printed, or ornamented or decorated in any manner, and manufactures in chief value of such ware not specially provided for in this section, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 19, line 13, by striking out the semicolon at the end of the line and inserting in lieu thereof a comma.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 21, strike out "35" and insert "55."
In line 24 strike out the figures "40" and insert "60."

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment chiefly for reasons that I gave a few minutes ago, but I will go further and say that I have here a statement of the difference in wages paid abroad and here, which is a good or fair illustration of why, in my opinion, 35 per cent ad valorem and 40 per cent ad valorem is not a rate sufficiently high to offset the difference in cost of production here and abroad. The wages paid here, as given in a number of instances, to plate makers, to jiggermen, dish makers, cup makers, saucer makers, handlers, pressers, dippers, sagger makers, mold makers, throwers, turners, kilnmen, and transfer girls are shown, and the average wages in England is $6.65 a week as against the average wages paid for the same kind of work in the United States of $25.57

a week, or about 25 per cent of the wages paid in Europe that is paid in this country for the same class of work.

Mr. Chairman, I submit then that 40 per cent ad valorem is sufficient to offset the difference in the cost.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman tell me where he got those figures?

Mr. FORDNEY. I got those figures from a pamphlet which was handed to me, and I think they are given in the United States reports.

Mr. MOORE. You got it on page 4.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] if it is not the brief of Mr. Burgess, one of the pottery manufacturers, who was pleading for higher duty?

Mr. FORDNEY. I think it is, although it is not signed by Mr. Burgess.

Mr. Chairman, in this country, as the figures given here show, the percentage of female labor as compared with male labor is 100 males to 20 females; in England 100 males to 80 females; and in Germany 100 males to 300 females. Some gentleman asked the question here the other day why it is in England the wages are higher than in any other country in Europe. That is rather a hard question to answer, but I can give my explanation of it if some man will answer this question for me.

I will speak now of something about which I know something. I do not like to talk about a matter unless I know what I am talking about. I am in the lumber business, and the men in the lumber woods of the State of Mississippi to-day receive in round figures an average of $1.80, and for the same class of labor in the State of Washington they receive $3.25 a day.

That is the difference that exists in the United States for the same class of work, and when you describe the difference between the wages paid in the mills of Germany and of France and of England, you should take into consideration the question of how much of that labor is female labor in one country as against the proportion employed in another country. I have shown the female labor in Germany in those factories constitutes 75 per cent of their employees, while in England it constitutes but 44.4 per cent.

I believe that would answer the question which that gentleman asked the other day. But there are many elements that might make up this difference in cost. It is a fact to-day that the wages in the lumber woods in the State of Mississippi are lower than they are in the State of Washington in the United States, where your measure of protection and my measure of protection is fixed by the same yardstick, where the measure of protection in the States of Oregon and Washington in the lumber business is identical with the measure of protection in the State of Mississippi.

Mr. HARDWICK. Is not that because one laborer is white and the other black?

Mr. FORDNEY. It is not necessarily so, because the white laborer in Mississippi receives the wages I have described to you, namely, $1.80 a day. I know it because I am paying it, my friends, right now, and I have got the figures to show that.

It is true that colored labor is cheaper than white labor, generally. But why is it, my friends, that the labor in your cotton mills in North Carolina and South Carolina is only 80 cents a day on the average, while the average wage in the cotton mills of Massachusetts is $1.38 a day?

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] stated the other day that there was no colored labor in the cotton mills of the South. The gentleman is mistaken. I have been in the cotton mills of the South and I know that the common labor in the cotton mills of the South is generally colored labor.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, the committee did in fact separate crockery and earthenware, and in that respect our bill differs from the specifications and classifications in the Payne bill. We placed china and porcelain in one paragraph and earthenware in another paragraph, because we believed that chinaware was more of a luxury, and that therefore the rate on chinaware should be higher. For that reason we reduced the rate there only 5 per cent. But as to the ordinary earthenware, which is used by the people generally over the United States, we believed that the rates under the Payne law were unduly high, and for that reason we separated them, in order to put a higher tax upon the article of luxury than upon the article of ordinary use or the article of necessity.

We reduced the duty on earthenware from 55 and 60 per cent down to these rates, and we do not believe that these rates will in any factory in this country justify the reduction of the wages of a single employee.

It may be true, and it is true, that the wage of an American laborer per day, measured in money, is greater than that of the laborers of any other country.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I do not care to be interrupted at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana declines to yield.

Mr. DIXON. But measured by the sure test of the productiveness of that labor, we claim that the American laborer is not the highest paid in the world, although he is the most efficient and the most intelligent and the most productive in the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, we have not changed the present law in regard to the tax on the crates or bundles in which this earthenware is packed, and that will give these gentlemen an additional rate over that amount, and we believe that the rate provided in this bill is ample to cover any alleged difference between the cost of labor abroad and at home.

But that was not the basis upon which this bill was written. It was believed that by lowering the duties to that amount there would be some competition. There is $15,000,000 of earthenware of this classification produced in the United States. Of imported there was about a million and a half dollars' worth. It is estimated that there will be more importations under this bill, but not an undue amount, and that the American production will continue at about the same amount as it is at the present time.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. DIXON. Certainly.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know anything about the correctness of the figures, except the source from which they come. I hold in high esteem as an estimable, honest gentleman the man who gave me the figures, or sent them to me.

Mr. DIXON. I have a copy of them.

Mr. FORDNEY. He said here that the consumption of china and earthen ware in this country was $37,000,000, of which $15,000,000 has been produced in this country.

Mr. DIXON. I think he puts the selling price of the importations instead of the price at which they were imported.

Mr. FORDNEY. He says, in the middle of the first line, "the wholesale value."

Mr. DIXON. On what page?

Mr. FORDNEY. The first page:

> The total consumption (wholesale value) of china and earthen ware, such as is made in Trenton and East Liverpool, is about $37,000,000, of which about $15,000,000 worth is made in the United States.

Mr. DIXON. The census figures were $15,642,000 under the first, and under the second $24,006,983. Those are the census figures for last year.

Mr. FORDNEY. Produced in this country?

Mr. DIXON. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know anything about those figures. I presume they are correct. They may be a different class of goods.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The name of the great Henry Clay, of the State of Kentucky, has been assailed upon the floor of this House, and I can not sit idly by and see his fair name or his deeds misrepresented. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] for the purpose of giving an example of repartee, made the statement that it was Randolph who stepped aside and let Mr. Clay pass. If I read history aright it was Henry Clay who stepped aside. It was a rainy day, and there was a boardwalk across the street, not wide enough for both men to pass. Great feeling existed between Randolph upon the one hand and Clay upon the other, and as the two men were approaching each other one of them had to get off the boards. Mr. Randolph, approaching Clay, said—I can not give his exact language upon an occasion of this character, but he said in substance—that he did not give the sidewalk to any infamous scoundrel. Mr. Clay, the courteous gentleman that he was, the compromiser of difficulties, the avoider for 10 years of civil strife between the States, stepped aside and said, "I do." It is in justice to the fair name and fame of Henry Clay and in the interest of the truth of history that I make this statement. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised at my friends thinking we ought to have a tariff board when they come to treating some schedules like this. My friend from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is always well informed, and he is a man for whom I have the highest respect, because, although on the tariff question we differ as far as the North and the South Poles, he is an honest protectionist, and he is sincere, because he will protect the other fellow as well as himself, and you do not find many of that kind. [Applause.] But I want to call my friend's attention to this fact. He is complaining of this rate because we do not protect the labor cost. Now, I find in the census reports of 1905 that the production of the pottery indus-

try was something over $76,000,000. I am giving only round figures now, because I have not had a chance to estimate to the last detail, but I am giving the substance. There was $76,000,000 of production. The wages paid were $29,000,000, which made the wage rate 38 per cent of the cost of production.

Now, take a dollar's worth of production. Of course, at an ad valorem rate of 35 per cent you would have 35 per cent of incidental or actual protection, whichever you want to call it. I do not warrant the figures that the gentleman has presented in Mr. Burgess's brief. I am not criticizing Mr. Burgess, but I think the figures as to the difference in wage cost are clearly exaggerated on Mr. Burgess's side of the question. But assuming, for the sake of argument, that he is right, that the wage scale in Europe is only one-fourth of the wage scale here, if you will take the 38 per cent of wages as shown by the census report and take one-fourth off of 38 per cent, it leaves you but 29 per cent of wages, and we have given in this bill 35 per cent of protection of wages. So even according to the exaggerated reports of the brief that my friend has presented this 35 per cent covers the difference in the wage scale by more than 6 per cent.

So it is not a question of wages. I can not speak for every paragraph in this bill, but I can recall no paragraph in the bill where the difference in wages between this and a foreign country is not covered by the rates now in the bill.

Now, there is only one other question: The gentleman says, and says correctly, that paragraphs 93 and 94 of the present law and in this bill paragraphs 81 and 82 are highly competitive, and therefore we ought not to have reduced these rates. My friends, as you treat them as a whole they are highly competitive, but the only reason that the gentleman has made this assertion that the rates ought not to be changed is because he has not studied the question.

Under paragraphs 93 and 94 of the present law china and earthen ware are imported under the same paragraph. There was no distinction drawn between chinaware and earthenware. Now, it was with great difficulty that the committee was able to differentiate between chinaware and earthenware. We did not do it ourselves, but we sent to different ports of this country to get an expert. Finally the Government sent Mr. McNair, from the port of New York, who is considered the greatest china expert in this country; and he perfected this classification that in paragraph 81 taxes earthenware and in paragraph 82 taxes chinaware.

What was the condition under your law as it exists to-day? You had a highly competitive rate on chinaware, a luxury that should bear a high rate. But you put the same tax on earthenware, the dishes of the poor, that you did on chinaware, and made it prohibitive and brought no revenue whatever to the Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, this committee, after great labor and great trouble, have differentiated between the two, and we have practically kept your rate; we have reduced it from 60 to 55, but practically kept your rate on luxuries, chinaware, where the competition arises, and we have reduced the rate on earthenware, where there were no importations coming in. Oh, I think there was a little in high-grade decorated earthenware, but, as a rule, you may say there were no importations coming through the customhouse at all on earthenware. We have reduced it to a competitive basis. On what you had as competitive we have left the rate alone.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. FORDNEY. Perhaps the figures given by the gentleman to me are on a higher grade of ware than the average, which might make the difference in the labor cost as described by the gentleman from Alabama; but if the figures the gentleman has given me are right—that we have some $37,000,000 consumption in this country, and only $15,000,000 of that produced in this country—then, certainly, the present rates are not too high, and they are not prohibitive.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman is talking about chinaware, and I am talking about earthenware. We have left the rate on chinaware practically as it is, and on earthenware we have reduced it.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The President of the United States, so far as his chief political career is concerned, originated in the city of Trenton, N. J., the distinguished pottery town. The mayor of that city was a particular friend of the President of the United States, whose policy is being enacted here to-night by the enactment of this bill with the assistance of the gentleman from Alabama. The mayor is the first commission mayor under the Woodrow Wilson system in the State of New Jersey. He is a friend of the laboring man who works in the potteries of Trenton, N. J. In view of the fact that the committee does not seem to care to discuss labor conditions at all, but seeks only to obtain revenue in this bill, and to discuss the tariff rates, I desire to quote from the mayor of Trenton, N. J., the commission mayor, a good Democrat and a warm supporter of the President of the United States, in his defense. He says:

On china we have $8,000,000 (foreign value) of $18,000,000 (American landed value) against our home production of $2,000,000.

The committee has, in the face of these facts and in face of their oft-repeated declarations relative to desiring only fair competitive rates and their purpose not to injure any legitimate business in this country, cut the rate on china from 55 per cent on white and 60 per cent on decorated to 50 per cent and 55 per cent, respectively, and on earthenware from 55 per cent on white and 60 per cent on decorated to 55 per cent and 40 per cent, respectively.

COST OF PRODUCTION.

The total cost of producing earthenware in the United States is over 75 per cent greater than in England. The average rate of wages paid in the United States is about 110 per cent higher than in England.

From 60 per cent to 66⅔ per cent of the total cost of pottery ware made in the United States goes directly into the pay rolls and pay envelopes, depending on the kind of ware made and whether decorated or undecorated.

Any reduction in the cost of production made necessary by the lowering of the tariff and allowing the cheap European and oriental labor produced goods to reduce our selling price must of necessity fall heaviest on the wage earner.

I thank God for this honest expression of an honest opinion by an honest Democrat.

HOW THE POTTERY INDUSTRY WILL BE AFFECTED BY THE BILL.

Mr. AUSTIN. In spite of the fact that the Representative from Texas [Mr. DIES] is on the floor, I am going to quote some more figures from the Committee on Ways and Means, and I hope he will not try to repudiate the report of his own committee, even if they have placed wool on the free list, which affects his district very largely. I am not going to engage in a joint discussion with the gentleman from Texas, but I shall endeavor to arrange with President Wilson or his old friend, the Hon. William Jennings Bryan, to have a joint discussion on free raw wool.

Under paragraph 81, now under consideration, according to the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, found on page 74, we will increase the importations from $8,603,674 to $10,000,000 per annum, or an increase in four years—and that is just as long as this bill will remain on the statutes—of something over $5,000,000—about $5,600,000. The average amount of wages is 60 per cent, and 60 per cent of $1,400,000, the increase under this paragraph, is $840,000 in wages in one year, or $3,360,000 in wages in four years. So under this single paragraph you are going to take from the pottery workers in Trenton, N. J., and in the Youngstown, Ohio, district, and in other parts of the United States $840,000 in wages in 12 months. What are you going to do with these wage earners? You said in your platform that under a Republican protective-tariff system the Republican Party made "the rich richer and the poor poorer." When you legislate out of employment men who are drawing $840,000 a year in wages in the pottery industry in this country are you going to make them richer or poorer?

If there is anything in the newspaper reports, the gentleman representing the Trenton district, Mr. WALSH, and the Democratic Member representing the Youngstown, Ohio, district, Mr. WHITACRE, in your caucus occupied considerable time in an effort to convince you that this proposed legislation would seriously cripple and injure the pottery industries in their districts.

The Democratic Party had this pledge in their platform, that they "would not injure any legitimate industry." Is the pottery industry of Trenton, N. J., a legitimate industry, and is the alleged statement of the Democratic Member of Congress from that district [Mr. WALSH] correct, that this proposed legislation will cripple and injure that industry and turn the wage earners out of employment in the potteries of that district?

On the day that the President addressed the House of Representatives from the Clerk's desk I talked with a new Member from the State of New Jersey. I asked him how the people of New Jersey regarded this new tariff bill, and his reply was that they are very much up in arms against it. This is shown in the public meeting in Passaic, N. J., a few nights ago, when by a unanimous vote the commercial organization of that city condemned this bill. I also asked the new Democratic Member from New Jersey what would be the result of this legislation as far as the next election in New Jersey was concerned, and his reply was that it will defeat every one of them for a reelection. It will do more than that, Mr. Chairman; it will defeat your party at the polls four years from now. [Applause.]

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the statements made as matters of fact by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] and by other gentlemen with reference to wages, evidently discloses to this House that the tariff has but little

to do with wages. In the first place, labor is a commodity, based upon, first, the principle of the cost of keep, of production; and, second, upon the supply of work and of the supply of labor; and the third and cheapest element of high wages is organization. The difference between the wage in Mississippi and Washington and Oregon is explained in the fact that you can not organize the negro, and further, the fact that the cost of keep in wages in the State of Mississippi and in the State of Arkansas is less than the cost in Oregon and in Washington. The difference in wage in England, a free-trade country, and in Germay, a protective country, is found in the cost of keeping, because the English are a beef-eating people, while the German is a sauerkraut consumer. [Laughter.] You will find that wages in Mexico are not high, that the ordinary peon will milk goats all day for 10 cents. He can thrive upon his tortilla.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. No. They have no organization to maintain a wage.

Now, then, after we get the cost of keep in wages you can raise it higher by organization, but you can not raise it higher than a reasonable profit to the man who employs the labor, but between the cost of keeping and the cost of local production it may conflict and go up or down in proportion to the ability of the laboring men in the organization to maintain that wage. The reason why the cost of a laborer in Massachusetts is greater than a like cost in the South is almost wholly due to the question of organization. They have never been enabled in the South to maintain that organization as they have in the New England States. It is true that wages are high in America, and we are glad of it, but it is due principally to the one fact that the laboring men say, we want more than enough to eat or enough to keep us, we want enough on certain occasions that we may dress our family well, that we may educate our children, that we may maintain that dignity in society becoming a human individual. They get more because they demand more, but whenever they cease to demand they will cease to get that wage irrespective of tariff laws or any other legislation by this Government.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. FARR. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that labor in England is the best organized in the world?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. And I am aware also that the cost of wage to keep it in England is cheaper than it is in America.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. No; the gentleman is stating facts and not asking questions, or, rather, trying to state facts by innuendo.

Mr. FARR. No; I am making a very pertinent, direct question.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. And the gentleman is trying to inject into my statement a statement of fact that is not wholly true.

Mr. FARR. Entirely true; I will give the gentleman a statement of fact that is entirely true.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I can not yield further; my time is nearly up and I desire to conclude.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will not the gentleman yield to enable me to ask him a question bearing upon this point? I desire to ask the gentleman if he has considered why wages are higher in protection Germany, for illustration, than in protection Belgium?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. That, I have no doubt, will be found in an explanation of the difference between the cost in Oregon and Washington and the cost in Mississippi and Arkansas, the cost of wage.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. No; Belgium is highly organized and so is Germany.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I am not undertaking to say; I did not speak of organization, but of the keep of wage.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Why are wages higher in Germany than in France, for illustration?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. The cost of keep in wages, as I said before, is cheaper in the Southern States than Oregon or Washington. I dare say that is true with reference to the two countries to which the gentleman referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit just one question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman can speak in his own time.

Mr. FORDNEY. I have spoken once, and I did not want to intrude again. I only wanted to say this: There is no organization in the lumber camps in Mississippi, in the State of Washington, or any other State of this Union I have ever heard of.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman desire to speak on this paragraph? I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the scene has shifted since early in the evening, as I predicted it would. Then we had seated beside our amiable and beloved friend from Alabama a confessed free trader, to whom it is a matter of complete indifference what the effect of schedules on American employment and American wages may be. The gentleman who now occupies the seat of honor next to the chairman of the committee is apparently somewhat concerned about American employment, and he endeavors to persuade us, without saying so in plain words, that as to most of the items under discussion they have endeavored to cover the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. In connection with this matter of labor cost and wages I have been very much interested in what the gentleman from Oklahoma has said.

It is an old, sophistical, threadbare argument, scarcely worthy of being dignified by being referred to as an argument, that by organization men can wring a living wage from an enterprise that does not pay. Did you increase the wages of the sheep herders in Wyoming when you put them out of business under the Wilson bill? Will all of the organizations in the world increase wages or maintain wages in the industries that are injured by the passage of this act? It is true that organization is useful and valuable and necessary.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I have only five minutes. As I said, organization is useful and valuable if men are to secure from their employers a reasonable proportion of the wealth they create, but men can organize from now until doomsday, and they can not draw from an industry any portion of a profit that the industry does not have or create. They do organize in England, it is the best labor-organized country on the face of the earth, and yet the average rate of wage in England is considerably less than half of that in the United States. It is much lower in many of the highly organized industries in England than it is in the unorganized industries here. Organization can, and organization does, compel the payment of a fair wage, and a fair wage is the wage that an industry can stand and live. No amount of organization, no amount of strife, no demands that can be made, can compel men, or ever has compelled men, to pay wages so high that they can not conduct their business at a profit. Our wages are higher in this country under organization, because by and through a protective tariff that maintains prices it is possible for the manufacturer to pay a good wage, and therefore possible for the organized laborer and the organized artisan to compel the payment of a good wage.

But take from the industry its profits, place it in competition with unpaid labor abroad, make it nonproductive, and you can make bread of stones and draw blood from a turnip as easily as you can secure a living wage under those conditions.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. The gentleman remembers the organization of the Cobden clubs in England, the adoption of free trade in that country, and the history of it. Why was it between the wage before and after the free-trade laws, the corn laws, were adopted that wages went down to the difference between the cost of living before the laws were passed and after the laws were passed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MANN. That question never will be answered.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

82. China and porcelain wares composed of a vitrified nonabsorbent body having a vitrified or semivitrified fracture, and all bisque and parian wares, including clock cases with or without movements; plaques, ornaments, toys, charms, vases, statues, statuettes, mugs, cups, steins, lamps, and all other articles composed wholly or in chief value of such ware, if plain white, or plain brown, not painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, printed, or ornamented or decorated in any manner; and manufactures in chief value of such ware not specially provided for in this section, 50 per cent ad valorem;

if painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, printed, or ornamented or decorated in any manner and manufactures in chief value of such ware not specially provided for in this section, 55 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 20, line 4, by striking out the semicolon after the word "movements" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. During the general debate yesterday evening the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] was making a speech, and I propounded to the gentleman a question something like this: He was talking about the increase of wages and I asked him if it were not a fact that from 1899 to 1909 the increase in the annual wages paid——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] is not speaking to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

86. Glass bottles, decanters, and all articles of every description composed wholly or in chief value of glass, ornamented or decorated in any manner, or cut, engraved, painted, decorated, ornamented, colored, stained, silvered, gilded, etched, sand blasted, frosted, or printed in any manner, or ground (except such grinding as is necessary for fitting stoppers or for purposes other than ornamentation), and all articles of every description, including bottles and bottle glassware, composed wholly or in chief value of glass blown either in a mold or otherwise; all of the foregoing, not specially provided for in this section, filled or unfilled, and whether their contents be dutiable or free, 45 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this act, bottles with cut-glass stoppers shall, with the stoppers, be deemed entireties.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 9, after the word "free," strike out the figures "45" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "60."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the cut-glass industry in the United States is comparatively new. It is growing. It is subject to the fiercest competition. The Japanese are now beginning to send cut glass to this country. Under the Panama Canal act a special advantage was given to foreign manufacturers of cut glass in that they can now send in practically free the cut glass that enters into the equipment of ships built in the United States. American factories have already suffered materially for this reason. Orders have been solicited even by the Navy Department of the United States from foreign sources.

Much of this is due, no doubt, to the conditions that prevail on the Panama Canal, where free trade practically prevails. Those industries that are undertaking to manufacture cut glass in the United States and build up an American industry ask that the existing duties be retained, because they are already suffering from the conditions I have stated, and in order to avoid competition, particularly from Japanese and Belgian sources, it is urged that the amendment raising the rate from 45 per cent, fixed now in the Underwood bill, to 60 per cent ad valorem be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

87. Unpolished, cylinder, crown, and common window glass, not exceeding 150 square inches, seven-eighths of 1 cent per pound; above that, and not exceeding 384 square inches, 1 cent per pound; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, 1⅛ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 1,200 square inches, 1⅓ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 2,400 square inches, 1⅔ cents per pound; above that, 2 cents per pound: *Provided*, That unpolished, cylinder, crown, and common window glass, imported in boxes, shall contain 50 square feet, as nearly as sizes will permit, and the duty shall be computed thereon according to the actual weight of glass.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 12, strike out the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"87. Unpolished, cylinder, crown, and common window glass, not exceeding 150 square inches, valued at not more than 1½ cents per pound, 1½ cents per pound; valued at more than 1½ cents per pound, 1¾ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 384 square inches, valued at not more than 1¾ cents per pound; valued at more than 1¾ cents per pound, 1¾ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, valued at not more than 2¼ cents per pound, 2¼ cents per pound; valued at more than 2¼ cents per pound, 2¾ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 864 square inches, 2¾ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 1,200 square inches, 3⅓ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 2,400 square inches, 3¾ cents per pound; above that, 4⅓ cents per pound: *Provided*, That unpolished cylinder, crown, and common window glass, imported in boxes, shall contain 50 square feet, as nearly as sizes will permit, and the duty shall be computed thereon according to the actual weight of glass."

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, if I can retain my right to the floor I will ask that the Clerk read the next section, in order that I may offer the amendment to that section that I hold in my hand and will send up to the Clerk's desk. Then I shall make such observations as I have concerning the two sections all under one head.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the two paragraphs may be considered at the same time.

Mr. DIXON. That is all right.

Mr. MANN. As if they were one paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that paragraphs 87 and 88 may be considered at the same time. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report paragraph 88.

The Clerk read as follows:

88. Cylinder and crown glass, polished, not exceeding 384 square inches, 3 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, 4 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 1,440 square inches, 7 cents per square foot; above that, 10 cents per square foot.

The CHAIRMAN. Now the Clerk will report the amendment presented by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 1, strike out the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"88. Cylinder and crown glass, polished, not exceeding 384 square inches, 4 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, 6 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 1,440 square inches, 12 cents per square foot; above that, 15 cents per square foot."

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, there is no theory held by the Democratic Party upon the tariff question that will justify the reductions that have been made in these two sections.

No one has complained in recent years about the high price of plain window glass. It is very cheap in the United States, and does not figure extensively in the cost of the building of the average house. I doubt if any one in any way connected with the preparation of this bill has heard any complaint at all about the high price of window glass, so that the committee can not claim, or the Democratic Party can not claim, that it is reducing the duty on window glass for the purpose of reducing the cost of living or enabling the poor to get cheaper window glass in their houses.

In the second place, it can not work an advantage on the theory that it will produce revenue unless at the same time the Democratic Party admits that they will close for an additional length of time the glass factories of the country which produce window glass to-day. The glass factories of my district run about seven months in a year; no longer. In every glass-factory town in my district the laborers have held meetings, which have been largely attended, and these laborers have sent to me petitions, drafted by themselves, protesting against the provisions of this bill, which they say will reduce the time during which they may hope to have employment in a year from seven months to anywhere from three to three and a half or four months in a year.

They say that they can not live in the way in which they have been taught to live as American laborers and compete with the Belgian product of window glass. The reason why they can not compete is that they live upon a higher plane than those who produce the commodity with which they would have to compete in our markets. It is easy enough for them to run in the United States more than seven months in the year if they are willing to come down to the plane of the lowest paid labor that produces window glass that has access to our markets. If they will take a reduction in wages they can run. If they refuse to take a reduction in wages Belgium will supply the window glass of the United States, the glass factories in the United States will close their doors, and the laborers employed in them will be wandering around over the highways of the country hunting for work and unable to find it.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] made some observations about the beef eaters of England. Why, there are very few laborers in England or anywhere in Europe or anywhere outside of the United States who are beef eaters. They may have a little meat upon the table of laboring men outside of the United States once or twice a week, but the instances

are rare. The American laborer lives like a man. He puts meat upon his table two or three times a day, every day in the week that he wants to, when the product of his labor is protected from a ruinous competition with the products of lower paid labor in other countries of the world.

There is no question in the minds of the laborers who are engaged in making window glass that they will lose their jobs as a result of the passage of this bill if you maintain this schedule. There has been a large glass industry in the State of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DIXON]. I am not sure that there is now.

Mr. DIXON. Yes; there is.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I know that many of the best former citizens of Indiana are now citizens of my district. There are no better men than they. They are glass blowers, and they are the men who have been writing to me, sending me letters and petitions, telling me that they want to work more than three months in the year; that they want to work for the standard of wages that they have been receiving, and at the same time giving the people of the country as cheap glass as anybody could want as a result of labor well employed. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I spoke a little while ago about gypsum as a product of Oklahoma. Oklahoma has something else besides gypsum. Oklahoma produces glass. There are a number of glass factories in Oklahoma. The fact is that if our State could be kept under the protective-tariff policy it would become one of the great manufacturing States of this country.

The glass factories in Oklahoma do not happen to be in my district, but they are in my State, and in part I represent on this floor the entire State of Oklahoma. So when it happens that my colleagues who represent those districts that have the glass factories do not rise here to speak for the men who labor in those glass factories, to protect their interests, I am glad to do it. I maintain that under the rates in this bill the wages in our glass factories will have to be reduced.

I want to read something here from the bulletin issued by the Bureau of the Census to show how under a protective tariff wages have increased. When I called the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] last night to the increase in wages from 1890 to 1899, he insisted that the increase had not been 70 per cent, as I contended it had been. But here in this Government document it shows that the increase from 1899 to 1909 was 70 per cent. I mean in the total amount of wages paid. This table shows that in 1860 the sum of $378,000,000 was paid out to laborers in the manufacturing industries of this country. Yet after half a century of protection, except for a short period, we paid out in 1909 to the wage earners in our manufacturing establishments $3,427,000,000 a year. To-day probably the total wages paid to laborers in manufacturing establishments in the United States amount to $4,000,000,000. No other country on earth pays out so large an amount in wages anywhere, and in no other country do we distribute such an amount of the total wealth in wages. That is the way that we must distribute wealth, in large degree, through wages.

And when you pursue a policy, when the gentleman from Alabama, as head of the Ways and Means Committee, the leader of the majority in this House, with all his ability and courtesy to every Member of the House, leads the House and the Nation into a tariff policy that will reduce the total amount of wages paid out, it means a loss to every one of the 7,000,000 men who are employed in the manufacturing industries, and I protest against it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas desired to consider the two paragraphs together and talks about the effect on the wages of the laboring men of this country by reason of the reduction of the rates in the two paragraphs. There is no glass produced in this country under this second paragraph. That is all imported, and the reduction of 1 cent a square foot will not in any way affect the wages of the American workman.

As to the other schedule the reductions are probably radical, but as a matter of fact there have been no importations of glass for glazing purposes in the United States since the passage of the Payne bill. As a matter of fact, the glass manufacturers of this country have not taken the full advantage of the present tariff and they sell in competition among themselves at a lower price than the foreign manufacturer can import his goods into this country, pay the duty and the freight, and for that reason imported glass for glazing purposes is not sold in any part of the United States.

The window glass that is imported is used for pictures. They import a better class of window glass than is manufactured by a number of window-glass manufacturers. It is higher priced, and for that reason it is imported and does pay the duty.

Now, the gentleman from Kansas in his amendment asks that the rates of the Payne bill shall be reenacted. There is not a glass manufacturer that has appeared before the committee or has talked to the members of the committee privately that has asked for any such rates. They concede that the rates above the inch bracket, 36 by 24, unit of 60, is not necessary to keep it where it is now, and they are willing to-day to concede that the rates in our bill as to the large brackets are higher than necessary to protect them from competition from abroad, and we have not lowered it in these brackets, for the reason that there is imported a large amount of colored glass that is based upon the same rate plus 4 per cent, and we would be allowing that kind of glass to come in at a rate that is entirely too low if we would reduce the rate on this class, and for that reason as to the larger brackets under this bill there will be no tariff competition with the glass manufacturers of the United States.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the gentleman will permit, the letters and petitions I have from the men who blow glass say that the bill will affect them, and they ask that the duties be retained at just about what they are at the present time. Let me ask the gentleman what possible service the committee can render to the country by reducing the tariff upon glass if already we are selling the American product in this country cheaper than any foreigner can produce a like glass and can sell their product?

Mr. DIXON. Immediately after the passage of the Payne bill there was a combination made, by which the prices were increased up to the full benefit of the tariff, and while that did not last for any great length of time, while it did last the American consumers were compelled to pay too much, too large a price, for the glass. After the combination was dissolved, after suit was brought in the United States court, and the directors were compelled to pay large fines, totaling, I think, about $10,000, that combination was dissolved, and then there was competition between the different manufacturers and the price has been reduced, so that they take no advantage of the present tariff. What we want to do is to reduce the rate so that there will be no future combination.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But the Sherman antitrust law is still in force, and I take it it will not be repealed within the next four years.

Mr. DIXON. While we have reduced the rates considerably, if the gentleman will take the prices to-day on Belgian glass, the French price, and add our duty and freight, and you can take the glass manufactured in Pennsylvania, pay the freight to the New York market and compete. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to propound an inquiry to my distinguished friend at the head of the table. I have heard a good deal said about the desirability of ad valorem duties as against specific duties, by gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, and a good deal said upon this side about the desirability of specific duties instead of ad valorem duties. I have noticed, I think, up to this point in the bill in the main that gentlemen preparing the bill have given preference to what they announce is the only scientific policy, namely, ad valorem duties instead of specific duties, yet, lo and behold, we now reach a point in the bill where the gentleman says the existing tariff has no effect, that we are making and selling glass here more cheaply than anybody can bring it from abroad, and where certainly, if at any place, an ad valorem duty could be safely tried, it could be tried here. Yet I notice that in spite of all of the arguments in favor of ad valorem duties, the gentlemen provide only for specific duties. Why is it?

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, in the importation of glass, it comes in large boxes. To take those pieces of glass out and examine the different crates would require considerable time and considerable expense and uncertainty. For that reason we prefer this; and I will say that the appraisers thought that this was preferable to the other on account of the increased cost in the administration.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, I think the appraisers are in favor of specific duties all the way through. Certainly it requires more effort to open the boxes and ascertain the rates fixed in the bill under specific duties than it would to take the invoices and fix the rates on ad valorem duties, because that does not require the opening of the boxes. This requires the actual inspection in some way of the glass for specific duties, in which, of course, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments proposed by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken, and the amendments were rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

90. Cast polished plate glass, finished or unfinished and unsilvered, or the same containing a wire netting within itself, not exceeding 384 square inches, 6 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, 8 cents per square foot; all above that, 12 cents per square foot.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 23, line 22, strike out the figure "6" and insert "10." In line 24, on the same page, strike out the figure "8" and insert the figures "12½"; and in the same line strike out the figures "12" and insert the figures "22½."

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, my reason for offering this amendment I will explain as briefly as possible. In 1909, when the Payne tariff law was being prepared by the committee, according to my recollection the importations of the smaller sizes of plate glass, which then paid a rate of duty of 8 and 10 cents per square foot, had increased from 250,000 square feet to, as I now remember, several million feet. The rates of duty on the larger sizes, something below 720 square inches, were 22½ cents per square foot, and on large sizes, above 720 inches, 35 cents per square foot. This showed that the rates of duty on the lower sizes were entirely inadequate to keep out of our market a great surplus of that size of glass made abroad. In the making of plate glass when the plate is rolled out, if it comes through the rolls without breaking, it is very valuable; but if it be broken or cracked, it then must be cut into sizes such as the pieces will make, and, like any other product, the smaller sizes are a by-product. The amount of profit made by a factory depends upon their ability to dispose of those smaller sizes at a fair advantage, and thus work off on to the market their larger sizes, so that under the Dingley tariff law the duties on the smaller sizes were evidently entirely too low to protect that size of glass made in this country. In the Payne law the rates were raised from 8 and 10 cents per square foot to from 10 to 12½ cents per square foot; and the importations under those prices of those sizes are now small, showing that the increased rates given in the Payne tariff have become effective.

Protecting the industry here by keeping out of our markets these smaller sizes that were greatly embarrassing the manufacturers of plate glass in this country. Again, gentlemen, no matter what the rate of duty on plate glass is, I have in my possession a statement prepared some two years ago, showing that on imported glass from Germany there is a discrimination of freight rates in this country against domestic glass. On a consignment of glass from Germany to St. Louis or Chicago entering New Orleans, such imports paid a rate of freight at that time from Germany to St. Louis or Chicago of 32 cents per hundred pounds, 12 cents of which was ocean freight and 20 cents railroad freight from New Orleans to St. Louis or Chicago; but if that glass were to originate in St. Louis the rate of freight by railway from New Orleans to St. Louis is 75 cents per hundred pounds; but in Germany, where much of the railroads are owned by the Government, the railroads give a cheaper rate on any article made in Germany shipped from an inland town to the seaboard for export—a much lower rate, about one-half the rate that is placed upon those goods if they are to be consumed in Germany. On the other hand, import goods entering Germany pay twice the freight from the seaport town to the inland town that domestic-made goods of Germany pay if they originate in Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in my remarks when this bill was under general debate I claimed that the competition which ensued under a protective tariff reduced the price of the commodity below what the foreign manufacturer exacted before the tariff was levied.

This fact is borne out by actual experience in every line of manufacture. It is true of all lines of iron and steel, of cotton and woolen, of tin plate and of glassware.

The fact that domestic competing manufacturers, by combinations and trusts, absorb competition and proceed under a high tariff to extort unreasonable profits does not alter the argument that domestic competition under a protective tariff does reduce prices to the consumer below what the foreign manufacturer obliged him to pay before the tariff was levied, although it does show that besides a protective tariff there is need of effective legislation. That will prevent such combinations and will maintain domestic competition.

GLASS.

Pertinent to the schedule now under discussion I wish to state that the plate-glass industry of the country is a case in proof.

Prior to 1875 we were importing practically all our plate glass, which was costing the actual consumer from $1.75 to $2.25 per square foot.

Under a tariff in 1875 we began to make plate glass and are now practically producing all we consume, with the result that the actual consumer paid per square foot in—

1875	$1.69
1880	1.21
1885	1.09
1890	.97
1895	.72
1900	.90
1905	.46
1908	.43
1912	.39

This result has been accomplished under a tariff of 22½ cents per square foot, but with actual and strenuous competition between the 12 plate-glass companies of this country.

It is now proposed to reduce the tariff from 22½ cents to 12 cents.

This reduction, at a time when no American plate-glass company is making a profit, will enable the European glass trust to occupy this market.

Especially is this apparent when freight rates are considered. The freight rate from Belgium is 2 cents per square foot in any quantity to any Pacific coast city, while the rate from Pittsburgh to those cities is 7½ cents in carload and 10 cents on less quantity, and the railroads have filed rates to increase the charges to 18 cents on less-than-carload lots.

And the figuring applies in about the same relation to window glass and other glass products.

Freight on glass from Belgium to San Francisco is about one-fifth as much as the freight from Pittsburgh to San Francisco and one-third as much from Belgium to New Orleans as from Pittsburgh to New Orleans.

The Democratic Party, despite its promises not to injure an industry that has honestly grown up under the protective system, in which there has been no engrossing and monopolistic combinations, by this bill will throw our markets open to the European international trust, destroy American competition, and in consequence compel the American consumer to pay more for his glass.

The Democratic policy is to secure competition by surrendering our markets to the foreigner.

The Progressive policy is to secure competition amongst our American manufacturers by effective legislation to prevent monopolistic combinations, and keep our markets for Americans.

The Democrats would give our markets to competing foreigners.

The Progressives would give our markets to competitive American manufacturers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

92. Cast polished plate glass, silvered or unsilvered, and cylinder, crown, or common window glass, silvered or unsilvered, polished or unpolished, when bent, ground, obscured, frosted, sanded, enameled, beveled, etched, embossed, engraved, flashed, stained, colored, painted, ornamented, or decorated, shall be subject to a duty of 4 per cent ad valorem in addition to the rates otherwise chargeable thereon.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

This paragraph adds the rate of duty of 4 per cent ad valorem on certain glass which is rated at specific rates. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DIXON] a while ago stated that the reason they did not reduce the specific rates to ad valorem was because it would be unnecessary to unpack the boxes and take out the glass and look at it. That would be still necessary as to this 4 per cent ad valorem, would it not?

Mr. DIXON. I will state to the gentleman we could not put a specific duty on that.

Mr. MANN. But you can put an ad valorem on the other. Why did you not if you believed it?

Mr. DIXON. It was necessary to put it on in this case and it was not necessary in the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

93. Spectacles, eyeglasses, and goggles, and frames for the same, or parts thereof, finished or unfinished, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my friend from Indiana if he read carefully the hearings before the Senate committee or the hearings on this question of gentlemen who appeared in behalf of the industry of making lenses special?

Mr. DIXON. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. They were very much agitated over these rates. They do not share in the cheerful hopefulness of the members of the committee. They are afraid, and, more than that, they feel certain they have got to cut their wages very largely or else stop business. Now, I know some of these gentlemen. I have known them for years, and they are just as honorable and just as honest as any gentleman who sits on this floor. They are conservative men. They understand their business. Oh, that slander that has to go out about the American manufacturer that does not understand his business. They say that he has to learn and brace up, and all that folly. It is un-American to indulge in it; it is unpatriotic and untruthful. Our manufacturers are in the van all the way along. They are willing to go into the markets of the United States on their own merits. They insist, and you have yielded to it, in putting a brand on the goods imported from the country of their origin in order that our people may sell. These gentlemen are lampooned, made fun of, and told that they do not understand their business.

Men who would not know a good, well-organized factory if they went into one shout loudly from their platforms and their thrones that our people do not understand their business. Why add insult to injury? Why not tell the truth? You know and I know that they understand their business. You know and I know that they have reached the point of the highest art of manufacturing. Why not be honest about it. Do not talk about their cutting down their business for effect. You will eventually shut them down by these rates that you are giving them, because they will have to work on short time and lower wages if they do anything, or else turn the key in the lock and lose the organization of their men, waiting for the people of the United States to correct this iniquitous tariff bill which you are trying to force upon the people of the United States.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] that this is the first time that I have been able to agree with him on any matter during this tariff debate. We have for a long time contended that the industries of our country were no longer infants, but that they were able to successfully compete with the industries of the world. The gentleman from New York says that our manufacturers know their business, that they have reached the highest point of efficiency and success, and I agree with him.

The Democratic Party contends that in view of that efficiency and success there is no need for and no excuse for demanding a protective tariff tax of the American citizen. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We do not want to injure any legitimate industry and we do not expect to do so. We want to be just and fair to all men and all concerns, and we will do that when we levy a tariff tax for revenue only. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, after the Clerk reads the next paragraph I want to move to strike out the last word. I want to tell the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] something that he does not know.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PALMER). Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

94. Lenses of glass or pebble, molded or pressed, or ground and polished to a spherical, cylindrical, or prismatic form, and ground and polished plano or coquille glasses, wholly or partly manufactured, 30 per cent ad valorem

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to finish this schedule to-night, but it is now 11 o'clock. I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. PAYNE. I am sorry that the gentleman's colleague [Mr. HEFLIN] has run away.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose, and Mr. GARNER, Speaker pro tempore, having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce the tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 577. An act authorizing the President to appoint an additional circuit judge for the fourth circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 30, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of inland waterway from Pamlico River through Goose Creek to Jones Bay, Pamlico County, N. C. (H. Doc. No. 38); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Tradewater River, Ky. (H. Doc. No. 39); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination with plan and estimate of cost of improvement of Shoal Harbor and Compton Creek, N. J. (H. Doc. No. 40); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Kanawha River, W. Va., with a view to increasing the height of the locks and dams on said river so as to make a 9-foot stage to the Ohio River (H. Doc. No. 41); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VAUGHAN: A bill (H. R. 4385) to increase the tax on distilled spirits and the tax on beer, lager beer, ale, porter, and other similar fermented liquors produced in the United States to equal the customs tax levied on such liquors imported, to produce revenue for the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 4386) providing for a survey of Lake Champlain at Rouses Point, N. Y., and vicinity; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 4387) making appropriations for irrigation investigations and experiments in the humid regions of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 4388) for the erection of a public building at Manchester, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 4389) to pension widow and minor children of any officer or enlisted man who served in the War with Spain or Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4390) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for second homestead and desert-land entries," approved February 3, 1911 (Public, No. 340); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4391) granting homestead entrymen six months within which to begin improvements and establish residence, and authorizing registers and receivers to grant additional time; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 4392) to constitute the District of Columbia a judicial district of the United States and to reorganize the courts in the said District; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 4393) to repeal an act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize and require an extension of the street railway lines of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., and for other purposes," approved February 25, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 4394) allowing credit in computing the pay of any officer of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps for service while in the Revenue-Cutter Service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4395) to amend section 177 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4396) to class mates in the Navy as warrant officers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4397) to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States

Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4398) to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4399) to credit certain officers of the Medical Department, United States Army, with services rendered as acting assistant surgeons during the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 4400) to incorporate the Virginia Terminal Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 4401) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, and to provide a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States," approved June 29, 1906; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CURLEY: A bill (H. R. 4402) appropriating money to enable the President to propose and invite foreign governments to participate in an international conference to promote an international inquiry into the causes of the high cost of living throughout the world, and to enable the United States to participate in said conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Resolution (H. Res. 80) that no Member should serve on the Banking and Currency Committee who is a banker, agent, or attorney of any bank or banks, or who is the owner of any bank stock or other interest in a bank; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOWARD: Resolution (H. Res. 81) to pay certain contingent expenses, etc.; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CURLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 78) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: Memorial of the Legislature of New York, favoring the reestablishment of the customs ports of New York as they formerly existed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Memorial of the Legislature of Colorado, asking for the creation of the Rocky Mountain National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Colorado, setting forth rights of the West in relation to the public domain and asking Congress to legislate in the interest of the development of the country; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Colorado, in favor of national highways and the good-roads movement; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, asking passage of law prohibiting further withdrawal of public lands in New Mexico, and favoring restoration of reserved lands untimbered and not needed in reservation, and reclassification of mineral and oil lands so that such as be found not mineral be open to entry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Assembly of the State of New York, favoring pensions for letter carriers of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Assembly of the State of New York, protesting against the abolishment of many customs ports of entry, and requesting that same be reestablished; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New York: Memorial of the Assembly of the State of New York, protesting against the abolishment of many customs ports of entry, and requesting that the same be reestablished; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 4403) for the relief of Margaret F. Watson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4404) for the relief of William Henry Hayden; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4405) for the relief of Frederick J. Ernst; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4406) for the relief of Capt. Frank B. Watson, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4407) for the relief of Capt. Edward T. Hartmann, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4408) for the relief of Lieut. S. M. Rock, United States Revenue-Cutter Service; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4409) for the relief of Capt. Frederick G. Lawton, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4410) for the relief of Capt. James Ronayne, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4411) for the relief of the Snare & Triest Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4412) for the relief of Capt. Chase W. Kennedy, United States Army, and others; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4413) for the relief of Capt. W. W. Quinton, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4414) for the relief of Capt. Frederick B. Shaw; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4415) for the relief of Capt. W. W. Wright and Capt. Claude B. Sweezey, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4416) for the relief of the heirs of Lieut. R. B. Calvert, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4417) for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of Valentine Brasch and others; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4418) for the relief of the estate of Richard W. Meade, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4419) for the relief of the estate of John Stewart, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4420) for the relief of the legal representatives of Jennie M. Hunt, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4421) authorizing and directing the Secretary of State to examine and settle the claim of the Wales Island Packing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4422) providing for the recognition of the heroic services of Chief Boatswain Patrick Deery, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 4423) for the relief of Bessie McAlister McGuirk; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRODBECK: A bill (H. R. 4424) granting a pension to Susanna Olewiler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4425) granting an increase of pension to Martin C. Gross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4426) to correct the military record of Peter Gouker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 4427) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Teed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4428) granting an increase of pension to Edwin O. Kimberley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4429) granting an increase of pension to Kate Somers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 4430) to reimburse Simon Caro; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 4431) granting a pension to James W. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 4432) granting an increase of pension to Frances E. L. Bayliss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4433) granting an increase of pension to John Rielly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4434) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. De Pue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4435) granting an increase of pension to Ann Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4436) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Sweet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4437) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bliss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4438) granting an increase of pension to Bruno Grummel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4439) granting an increase of pension to Curtis W. Lyday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4440) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4441) granting an increase of pension to James M. Huff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4442) granting an increase of pension to William H. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4443) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 4444) for the relief of Edwin S. Metcalf; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 4445) granting a pension to Esther Neddo; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4446) granting a pension to James H. Bartlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4447) granting a pension to John Bresett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4448) granting an increase of pension to Orlando Burt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4449) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Quinn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4450) granting a pension to Homer C. Putnam; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4451) granting a pension to William H. Merchant; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4452) granting a pension to Claude Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4453) granting a pension to Andrew J. Heatley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4454) granting a pension to Philip H. George; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4455) granting a pension to Rufus H. Hickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4456) granting a pension to Ulysses S. G. Maus; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4457) granting a pension to Heinrich Branz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4458) granting a pension to Henry Herring; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4459) granting a pension to Samuel T. Pribble; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4460) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Kennedy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4461) granting an increase of pension to Katharine Grant Jervey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4462) granting an increase of pension to Edmond S. Norris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4463) granting an increase of pension to Michael Balenti; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4464) granting an increase of pension to James V. Chenoweth; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4465) granting an increase of pension to John W. Grimm; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4466) granting an increase of pension to James A. Cochran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4467) granting an increase of pension to Milton Laird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 4468) granting an increase of pension to Norma E. McEnhill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4469) granting a pension to Ella M. Decker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 4470) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Jubitz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 4471) granting a pension to John A. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4472) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth E. Olson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 4473) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINSLOW: A bill (H. R. 4474) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Barlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 4475) restoring the name of Melina Day to the pension roll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 4476) to correct the military record of James Shafer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the St. Charles Building and Loan Association, of St. Charles, Mo., against the income tax on building associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of G. F. Aufderheide, of Bland; Sam K. Black, jr., of Sutten; and Charles Beakman, of McKittrick, Mo., against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), memorial of the Baltimore Federation of Labor, condemning the action of Joseph E. Ralph, Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, for his unfair and hostile attitude to the workmen's compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of sundry union printers of North America, protesting against the tendency to abuse the right of free speech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the United Hatters of North America, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on hats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of sundry citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on meats, flour, wheat, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Consolidated Sheet Metal Works, the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., and other corporations and citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of James Ford Rhodes and other citizens of Boston and vicinity, favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls or the arbitration of the question at issue with the British Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mary Monahan, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the clause prohibiting importation of wild-bird plumage, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Virginia Phillips, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against placing Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of sundry citizens of the twenty-third congressional district of New York City, against taxing mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of sundry citizens of the twenty-first Illinois district, against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of the Hazel Atlas Glass Co., of New York, against the clause relative to importation of olives in glass bottles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of William J. Serrill, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of legislation prohibiting the importation of feathers and plumes of wild birds for commercial use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILL: Petition of sundry citizens of Jersey City and Hoboken, both in the State of New Jersey, favoring the passage of an amendment to the income-tax bill to exempt from taxation the proceeds of all life insurance funds, including the premium refunds to policy holders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Purabla Oil Co., of New Jersey, asking that the duty on seed shall be entirely removed or the duty on oil be increased; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Petitions of G. E. Hume and 226 citizens, of Oxnard; R. H. Schluer and 62 citizens, of Woodland; A. C. Hughes and 51 citizens, of Salinas; D. W. Horst and 20 citizens, of Norwalk; M. O. Boggs and 20 citizens, of Colusa; Bank of Lompoc and 21 citizens, of Lompoc; H. Brunner and 33 citizens, of Santa Maria; P. F. Shepard and 30 citizens, of Van Nuys; Irving F. Sinsheimer and 22 citizens, of Huntington Beach; H. B. Farmer and 20 citizens, of El Monte; Henry Planchon and 25 citizens, of Santa Ana; and 250 other citizens, all in the State of California, protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Paul Reiger & Co., of San Francisco, Cal., against the increased duty on perfume materials; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, of San Francisco, Cal., against reduction of the pay of customs guards at San Francisco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Ventura, Cal., against reduction of the tariff on citrus fruits, sugar, lima beans, and borax, and against the duty on grain when all by-products are free; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John Sherman, of Campbell, Cal., against reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Swayne, Hoyt & Co., of San Francisco, Cal., against the increase of the tariff on rice; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco, Cal., for early completion of the new Golden Gate Life-Saving Station; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco, Cal., favoring Government ownership of the telegraph and telephone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENSLEY: Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Missouri, against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of the Cigar Makers' Union, against any increase of the revenue tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Credit Men's Association of the State of Utah, favoring a reform in the banking and currency laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: Memorial of the Honolulu Merchants' Association, of Honolulu, against reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of the fifteenth congressional district of Pennsylvania, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fort Covington, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation relative to closing the gates of the Panama Exposition in California in 1915 on Sunday; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition of the American Association for International Conciliation, favoring the repeal of the law with reference to Panama Canal tolls, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STONE: Memorial of the council of the city of Peoria, Ill., favoring Government ownership of the telegraph and telephone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Memorial of Horse Creek Grange, Adams County, Colo., favoring Government loans on farm property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Farmers' Institute of Larimer County, Colo., against the reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 35 citizens of Douglas, Colo., favoring the placing of sugar and wool on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 175 citizens of Eaton, 130 citizens of Greeley, 350 citizens of Loveland, 400 citizens of Fort Collins, 320 citizens of Sterling, 295 citizens of Longmont, 153 citizens of Fort Morgan, and 55 citizens of Windsor, all in the State of Colorado, protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, of Buffalo, N. Y.; the Niagara Falls Milling Co.; and Henry D. Waters, of Buffalo, N. Y., against the duty on wheat, oats, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of New York, against reduction of the duty on printed matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Cutlery Co., of Chicago, Ill.; the Clement Manufacturing Co. and the Northampton Cutlery Co., of Northampton; the Lamson & Goodnow Manufacturing Co., of Shelburne Falls; the John Russell Cutlery Co., of Turners Falls, Mass.; the Goodell Co., of Antrim, N. H.; Landers, Frary & Clark, of New Britain; the Meriden Cutlery Co., of Meriden, Conn.; and the Ontario Knife Co., of Franklinville, N. Y., against reduction of the duty on table cutlery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Association of Woolen and Worsted Manufacturers, of New York, against a change in Schedule K of the tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Griswold Worsted Co., of New York, N. Y., favoring a greater difference in duty than that in the tariff bill on raw hair and manufactured products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of manufacturers, dyers, and finishers of cotton, corduroys, velvets, and velveteens, asking that the present rates of duty under the act of 1909, Schedule I, be continued; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Rochester Button Co. and the German-American Button Co., of Rochester; the Seneca Button Co., of Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; and the Federal Button Co., of Newark, N. J., against reduction of the duty on vegetable ivory buttons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Hanlon & Goodman Co. and 27 other companies of New York, Massachusetts, Maryland, Ohio, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Illinois, protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on brushes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Spice Trade Association, New York, N. Y., protesting against the levying of the same duty on ground spices as on the whole spices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Lancaster Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade, Lancaster, Pa., protesting against placing Philippine tobacco and cigars on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York Association of Biology Teachers, New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation prohibiting the importation of feathers and plumes of wild birds for commercial use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the placing of Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Bricklayers B. & P. Union, No. 1, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring an amendment to the Sherman law in relation to trade-unions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers Local Union, No. 132, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against free trade with the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., policy holders in mutual life insurance companies, against the income-tax provision; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of Mayor George M. Wright and other citizens of Worcester, Mass., favoring repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from payment of tolls, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Worcester County League of Unitarian Women, favoring the passage of the Page vocational education bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WITHERSPOON: Memorial of Finklea Ben and Ephriam Sam, Carthage, Miss., requesting Congress to grant their share in the Choctaw Indian fund; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *April 30, 1913.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, deliver us, we beseech Thee, from the bondage of sin, with its blighting, corroding, damning effects, incarcerating the soul, shutting from it the light of Thy countenance, the warmth of Thy love, the influence of divine help; eliminating self-respect; damming every avenue which leads to freedom, peace, and righteousness. We thank Thee for Thy patience, forbearance, and love, which continues its work in the spirit of the Master who revealed Thy heart to the children of men and poured out its love on Calvary that we might live in Thee, our God and our Redeemer. "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong. Let all that ye do be done in love." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

96. Opera and field glasses, telescopes, microscopes, photographic and projection lenses and optical instruments and frames or mountings for the same; all the foregoing not specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 25, line 7, by inserting, after the word "optical," the following words: "and surveying."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

97. Stained or painted glass windows, or parts thereof, and all mirrors, not exceeding in size 144 square inches, with or without frames or cases; incandescent electric-light bulbs and lamps, with or without filaments; and all glass or manufactures of glass or paste or of which glass or paste is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 17, after the word "section," strike out "30" and insert in lieu thereof "40."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the difference between the gentlemen who are the proponents of this bill and those who are opposing it is that the friends of the bill are levying duties for the purpose of raising revenue only, and those who are opposing the bill believe in protection and believe the bill is not sufficiently protective to American industries.

Much has been said upon the other side in answer to the suggestion that the Democrats are giving no attention whatever to the labor question, and that they are eliminating the matter of wages altogether; and the substance of what is said on the other side is that the labor unions actually fix the wages in the United States; and this in spite of the fact that it is known to everybody who knows anything about labor organizations at all, that England, the best labor-organized country in the world, pays the poorest wages.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], in his usual eloquent way, pleaded on several occasions yesterday for the labor of the mills, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] came in late last night with an eloquent discourse on the ability of the labor unions to hold up the wages of the country, and he spoke in opposition to the industries of the country upon which labor depends. He would exalt labor by razing the mill. He would exalt labor by taking away the wage. The gentleman is always eloquent, and most eloquent when he treats of the "downtrodden mill working girls," whose wages in fact are superior to those of many of the girls who work in department stores or who engage in domestic service.

I rise this morning to say in support of this amendment that the labor unions of this country generally stand for protection, and they do not stand for a lessening of the wage, as contemplated by the Democratic Party in this bill. If gentlemen ask for authority for this statement I cite numerous labor bodies in the district from which I come that protest against this bill upon the ground that it cuts wages needlessly or menaces the business out of which they get their employment. I have in hand, in opposition to the reduction of duty proposed in this paragraph 97 with regard to stained and painted glass windows, a communication from labor itself, from the Decorative Glass Workers' Protective Association, men who work at this trade. In the course of their communication they say that they protest against the reduction of duties on manufactured stained glass. The secretary of the union was instructed to respectfully say that every effort should be used to prevent the reduction of duty on manufactured stained-glass windows from a 40 to a 30 per cent duty, as is proposed in the Underwood bill. The communication states that—

Paragraph 659 of the bill, which has been inserted for the sole benefit of the importer, means that the stained glass for church use shall be admitted free of duty.

That eliminates the making of stained glass in the United States.

We most emphatically protest against the passage of this law—

Says this protective labor union—

which will destroy the industry in which we earn our livelihood.

What are you legislating for? Are you legislating in order that these men, who earn their living by the sweat of their brows, shall be deprived of the daily wage and of the bread and butter necessary for their families? It would seem that this is exactly what you propose to do in this instance.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of the labor employed in this trade, the men who are behind the guns, those who support the families of the land, I ask you to lift the embargo upon their business and to raise this duty against cheap foreign labor from 30 to 40 per cent.

The letter above referred to is as follows:

DECORATIVE GLASS WORKERS' PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION OF PHILADELPHIA AND VICINITY, LOCAL NO. 41, A. G. W. I. A.,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 25, 1913.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a special meeting of the above-named association, held April 23, 1913, the subject of reducing the duty on manufactured stained-glass windows was thoroughly discussed, and I was instructed to respectfully request that you use every effort to prevent a reduction of the duty on manufactured stained-glass windows from a 40 to a 30 per cent duty, as is proposed in the Underwood bill.

Paragraph 659 of this bill, which has been inserted for the sole benefit of the importer, means that stained glass for church use shall be admitted free of duty.

We most emphatically protest the passing of this law, which will destroy the industry in which we earn our livelihood.

Therefore we most respectfully request that you give this matter your sincere consideration and support, in order that there will be no reduction of the duty on stained-glass windows in any manner or form.

Thanking you in advance for your support and influence, I remain,

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPH M. RICHIE, *Secretary.*

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] says that the labor unions in the country favor a protective tariff. The members of labor organizations of the country do favor a protective tariff, but that kind of a protective tariff which will give them some of the benefits of that tariff. I sat here yesterday from the beginning of the reading of the tariff bill until 11 o'clock at night. The first schedule up was a very technical one—the chemical schedule. So far as we could observe there were but two men on the floor, or, at best, three men, who were informed in any way as to its technicalities. Of course, first of all was the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who knows everything. After him the gentleman in charge of the schedule, Mr. HARRISON, who has made a special study of it; and after him Mr. METZ, who introduced himself to the country and to the House as being the only man in this Congress who had taken an appeal from the Democratic caucus to the Ways and Means Committee and had won.

But the most significant thing in the consideration of the first and second schedules here has been the activity of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. He, more than any other Republican on the floor, offers amendments, and those amendments are typical of him, his doctrine, and that of the Republican Party as it is to-day. Now, he offers these amendments conservatively and with some reluctance. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is a standpatter in the sense that he is a standstiller, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is a standpatter with a rising inflection. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Pennsylvania offered as his first amendment a proposition to raise the duty on alkalis and alkaloids 5 per cent; he was going up. He started to change the duty on peanut oil.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Wait till I get through. He started to change the duty on peanut oil, but discovering it was now on the free list and that the Democrats proposed to put a duty of 6 cents a gallon on it, he withdrew the amendment and stood for the Democratic proposition.

Mr. MOORE. Does not the gentleman understand the motive in referring to peanut oil?

Mr. MURDOCK. If the gentleman will wait until I get through with this statement, I will yield. I understand that the next amendment which the gentleman offered was an amendment with reference to yellow prussiate of potash. In the bill it carries a duty of one and one-quarter of a cent per pound, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, following out the Republican policy of high protection, offered an amendment to increase it to 2 cents per pound. On the item of soap he offered an amendment to increase the duty of 40 per cent ad valorem to a duty of 50 per cent.

Mr. MOORE. That was perfumed soap.

Mr. MURDOCK. Perfumed soap. On glass bottles he took the duty offered in the Underwood bill and offered an amendment increasing it to 60 per cent. The gentleman, in his amendments, is indicative of his party. He believes in a high protective tariff.

Mr. MOORE. I do.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman believes in a prohibitive tariff.

Mr. MOORE. Not necessarily.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is put on the Ways and Means Committee from Pennsylvania. He has been chosen for that committee among the large number of men from Pennsylvania on the Republican side; and a good many of those men

here, by the way, received more Progressive votes in Pennsylvania than they did Republican votes.

Mr. MOORE. Was not I elected by votes of Democrats, Republicans, and Progressives alike?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania should observe the rule.

Mr. MURDOCK. Now, in the course of time and under the rules of seniority in this House—if the Republican Party should come back into power—with Mr. MOORE, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, does anyone here have any doubt what sort of a tariff bill he would write? Does anyone here think that Mr. MOORE would wait for a report from a tariff commission? Everyone here ought to know that he is a high protectionist, and in writing a tariff bill he would out-Payne PAYNE himself. [Laughter.] Now I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. That is very kind of the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, in line with what the gentleman from Kansas has said, I am not sure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has carefully considered the amendment that he has presented at the desk to protect labor. The complaints against the reduction from 45 to 35 per cent is that labor is not properly protected. We reduced it in order that the schedule might become somewhat competitive. Not that that would affect labor; we do not affect labor—that is, if the manufacturer is willing to give labor a fair portion of the protective tariff, or incidental protection or protective tariff, or a revenue tariff, that he gets at the customhouse.

I find from the census reports lying on my table that in round figures in this stained-glass paragraph under consideration the annual production in 1909, the last census, was about $16,000,000. The labor cost in round figures was about $5,000,000. That shows that in this industry the amount of labor involved in the cost of production was about 31 per cent. This bill gives a tariff rate of 30 per cent, within 1 per cent of the total labor cost in this industry in the United States. I imagine they do not make this glass abroad for nothing. There must be some labor cost over there. There must be some cost of transportation of that glass to the United States, and there must be some insurance rates. Therefore, as a matter of fact, I think that probably the cost of making this glass is about 40 per cent of the labor cost in this country. But we have not only in this bill given a rate that is sufficient to cover the labor cost, but far more than would cover the difference in the labor cost and enough to cover some incidental cost in addition.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that under the free-trade clause much stained glass can now come into the country for churches and for institutions of that character?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think it will be a very small portion. I am not sure about it and I do not assert it as an absolute fact; but my recollection is that the stained-glass windows for churches came in free under the Dingley bill.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is aware that we passed a bill, I think, in the last Congress, relieving certain importers of duties that had actually been paid upon stained-glass windows that came in for churches, which, of course, if tolerated to any large extent, or if allowed to come in through any loophole in a free-trade clause in this bill would mean that foreign stained glass would eliminate that business in the United States.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is a very good illustration of the difference in the way that side of the House legislates and the way this side of the House legislates. My recollection is that under the Dingley bill stained-glass windows for churches were free, as in this bill, and that the Payne bill put a tax on all stained glass, and made no discrimination. I recognize the fact that the gentleman's side of the House did pass some bills admitting stained-glass windows for churches free. In other words, you were playing favorites with the churches just as you played favorites with other people. We propose to give to the churches free admission of stained glass for any church that desires to apply for it without having to come to this Congress to get that privilege. As I said, there is a comparatively small amount of this glass used for that purpose. I do not think it is going to seriously embarrass this industry, and it is certainly made for a good cause.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the statements that have been made here by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] are not quite correct, and I hardly think either one of them desires to make a misleading statement in regard to the position of organized labor in respect to the question of a protective tariff. It is true there are some unions and there are some officials of unions that have been influenced by their employers to exercise what influence they had to keep up a high protective tariff, those officials of unions thinking probably there might be less danger of conflict with those corporations; but in my opinion it is an insult to the intelligence of the representative trades-union men in this country to leave the impression that they are in favor of a protective tariff or that they are under the impression that a protective tariff ever has, does now, or can benefit the wageworkers of the country.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I can not yield at this time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Not as an organization, but as members.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. As members or organizations. I want to say to the gentleman that I solved this question to my own satisfaction and thorough conviction as a workingman and not as a partisan or politician. When I was slinging the hammer, driving rivets, I studied this question out so that it left no doubt in my mind that the high protective tariff argument was a delusion and a snare. In the first place, it does not keep up the price of labor. The only thing that has kept up the price of labor in this country is a unity of action of the working people themselves and their efficiency and stability in standing for a fair share of the wealth that they produce. If the argument be correct that the protective tariff has kept up the price of labor, who in the name of God pays for it? Is it anyone else besides those who work? Who are the great consuming masses of this country but the laboring people; and is it not taking out of one pocket and putting into another? I want to show another thing to convince you that organized labor is not supporting a protective-tariff policy. Every man who was elected to this Congress as a labor man you will find will vote for this bill, no matter which side of the House he is on.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I have not the time to yield and say what I desire to say. I would be glad to yield otherwise. I know whereof I speak. I have opposed the protective-tariff policy in the trades-union movement. I know there are a few there who favor it, but I am speaking in regard to the matter in the main as the great majority both of the officers and the members of the trades-unions believe. Now, let us see what kind of protection the Republican Party or the country under the domination of the Republican Party has given the working people of this country. I have here figures compiled as to the average wage scale of the country. The average wage earners receive $9.99 per week. The average wage scale that the salaried workmen and the wage earners receive was $11.35 a week. If there is anybody who thinks that a workingman can live and raise a family on wages of an average of $11.35 a week in Chicago or in any other of the industrial centers at present prices, if he knows how it can be done, it will be very valuable to have the receipt. Not only that, but if I have the time I desire to have read this clipping, and it is certainly something to boast of—the conditions that the Republican Party through its domination have created in this country for the working people. They have destroyed them physically and morally. I want to say to gentlemen on both sides of this House that I have never been so encouraged in all my life as by the fact that at this time educated men, men in high places, are beginning to see the necessity of exercising their influence to give relief from the conditions which this small clipping will show to exist.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDUSTRIALISM MAIN CAUSE—CORNELL PROFESSOR CHARGES IT RESPONSIBLE FOR CRIME AND INSANITY.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *March 17.*

That industrialism is the principal cause of the filling of jails and insane asylums, the killing off of one-third of all babies in the first year of their lives, and the restricting of other births was declared by Dr. M. G. Schapp, professor of neuropathology at Cornell University, in an address here yesterday at the conference on mental hygiene.

"Degeneration and race suicide," he said, "increase with industrial supremacy, and the stress of modern competition is the cause of much of the insanity. Employment of women in factories and the almost ceaseless activity demanded of all classes in efforts to retain their positions are leading causes in the breakdown of mental health."

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Gentlemen, if that condition is something you want to boast of under your protective tariff policy in this country, why, you have that pleasure, but it seems to me that it takes a great deal of nerve, an almost galvanized nerve, for men to get up and claim—in spite of the efforts of organized labor and its friends—to be responsible for this condition described. It seems to me that it is certainly nothing to boast of on the part of those who have been in power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the head of the bumblebee party this morning is not imputing motives to his colleagues that are not warranted, and is rather leaving the muckraking business to the real head of his party and is making a criticism that is at least not insulting. He says that I am a "standstiller," and yet I put on the statute books a protective tariff bill and lowered the duty more than any tariff bill ever written and put on the statute books up to that day from a previous tariff. [Applause on the Republican side.] Why, gentlemen, it reminds me of a young reporter who came around to see me before I came to Washington last fall, a reporter who was engaged on an independent paper that printed Democratic editorials every day, except they varied them by putting in boosts for the Bull Moose Party in order to encourage the vote for the Bull Moose candidate in my district, and he asked me how I stood on several questions. I told him. Finally he wanted to know how I stood on the amendment to the Constitution providing for the popular election of Senators. I said, "My dear boy, I have been voting for that for 16 years, and I have voted for it three or four times." "You have been voting for it?" "Yes." "Why," he said, "that is a Progressive proposition." I said, "Why, good heavens, my boy, I voted for that long before any of the present race of Progressives had been politically born." "Well," he said, "all these are Progressive measures you have been voting for." And now comes along this astute gentleman from Kansas and says I am a "standstiller." Well, I never have advanced to that plane where I accuse every man with whom I disagree of some sinister motive; where I had witnessed a fight in which men I did not agree with were spending their best energies to accomplish a purpose, I did not come around some time afterwards and accuse them of not acting sincerely.

Then my friend from Alabama tells the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we have admitted some stained glass for certain churches free of duty. There was always a good reason for it. Perhaps it arose out of the ignorance of the people who imported it and got in a hole, and so we remitted that duty.

He says, "You play favorites." We do not. We exempted two or three churches, but we do not play favorites. He put stained glass on the free list for all churches. He is playing favorite by the wholesale if we are chargeable of playing it at all.

And so we go on here. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] says he is a labor-union man, and he gives it as his opinion that labor does not get any benefit out of the tariff. I refer him to that great head of the Federation of Labor of the United States, Samuel Gompers, who went through Europe. He said it was a fact that our laboring men could live here at the same rate that the laboring people live there, and for the same amount of money here obtain shelter, food, and clothing, and all if they would choose to live on the same plane, but they demanded something better—a better house, better food, better clothing, and better conditions for their families. He was bound to say in conclusion as to the whole matter that we have advanced to a higher plane in providing for the laboring people in the United States.

And on this very question of glass, an intelligent labor-union glassmaker, as intelligent as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN], speaking as well as any Member on the floor of this House in his proposition to the committee, was asked the usual question, "You say you need this for the benefit of labor?" His reply was, "Yes." "How are you sure you are going to get any benefit of it?" His prompt reply was, "You give us a protective tariff and we will take our share of it, as we have always been doing and are doing now."

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield now? I would like to say something as to his statement concerning Mr. Gompers.

Mr. PAYNE. I can not yield now. And that was true of this glass industry. Laborers are as well organized there as they are in any other industry in the United States. This was the testimony of an intelligent man, and, if I am not vastly mistaken, he says he voted for Woodrow Wilson last fall and is a Democrat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will ask that the gentleman from New York be given five minutes more.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not want it. I will get in again by and by. I like to deal these out in installments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] is recognized.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, this debate at this point illustrates to me what seems to be the great evil of a protective tariff. The gentleman from New York has well said, with reference to the special enactments favoring certain churches, that there was always a good reason for each special favor. There "always is a good reason" for favor. I want to warn my Progressive friends that declare they are for a protective tariff, but a reasonable protection, that there is absolutely no difference between them and my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], who declares he is for a high protective tariff for the simple reason that every man seeking a higher duty on the commodity that he is interested in always finds a good reason for the special favor he wants. And when our friends the Progressives run after the protection idea there is no limit to the distance which each one of them will go in behalf of the interests in which each one is interested, and there is no limit to the length they will go in combining with other interests in order to get what they want. You may think you are so virtuous you can not ask too much, but there is no possible line you can draw if you start in with the idea that we are protecting certain industries. The principle is befouling and corrupting. It is like all evil.

> Vice is a monster of so frightful mien,
> As, to be hated, needs but to be seen;
> Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
> We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

You love your country. You really believe in justice to all and special privileges to none. You ought to be now on your knees, praying the prayer our Savior taught, "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil."

The whole system was started in this country on the notion of easily raising a revenue to run the Government and incidentally by just such mild and moderate protection as you now talk of, building up infant industries, and it has grown up to be a juggernaut that crushes out the life of the labor of this country. Come out of the darkness, Mr. Progressive, and stand for a tariff which is only for the benefit of the Government. There is no middle way. You can not satisfy the interests and serve the people. You say you are for a liberal administration. You say you are for protection but not for excessive protection, but no protection is excessive for the man who is interested. My friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. MOORE, still says and he seems to think that a duty of 30 per cent will destroy or greatly reduce the wages of an industry that now has a 42 per cent protection when the whole percentage of labor in the products of that industry is only 31 per cent. I do not impute wrong motives to men who say these things. We can believe anything.

Why, we know that in times gone by good men have believed that infants not two spans long were burning in hell. And so a good man may believe that a 30 per cent duty on a product of an industry in which the labor element is only 31 per cent is still destructive to that industry. Let us be fair. Let us be honest. Let us obey the Constitution, which says that a tax on imports must be levied for governmental purposes, and let us refuse to violate it and break it, and decline so to levy taxes on imports as to give special favors to one class to the detriment of other classes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. No; I can not yield. No one sitting here believes that a protective tariff is in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution.

Mr. LENROOT. Do the gentleman's remarks also apply to the duty on the hair of the Angora goat? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARDY. That remark, I will say, also demonstrates that there is always a reason. I heard the leader of the other side say the other day that there are a million Angora goats in this country, and that out of that million 999,999 were located in Texas; and a few minutes afterwards a gentleman not from Texas got up and stated how many hundred thousand Angora goats there were in his State. [Laughter.] I would not know an Angora goat when I saw it, and if there are any in my district I do not know it. But I know this, that there is a reason for placing a duty on the hair of the Angora goat. Cloth produced from the hair of the Angora goat is a luxury. Most of it is used in equipping Pullman palace cars and automobiles, and little of it used by the common people, and a duty on it that will produce revenue is justified on that ground, whereas wool used in the production of the cloth which all our people use and want to use should not bear a tax. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And let the gentleman take this and bear it with sweet unction in his heart, that if there is one goat in Texas I am willing to sacrifice him. I will put him on the altar and give him to my people or to the people over there on that side. But if you are going to levy a duty do you want to levy it on the luxuries of life or on the necessities of life? The fewer the Angora goats there may be in this country the more certain it is that every dollar of duty laid on the hair of the Angora goat will go into

the Treasury and not into the pockets of special-privileged interests. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. In this bill is there a duty on rice? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARDY. I think there is. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Is rice a necessity or a luxury?

Mr. HARDY. I think rice is a necessity. And I will say, furthermore, that when the time comes to take the duties off other articles, we will take them off all necessities.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Why do not you take it off of rice?

Mr. MURDOCK. When will that time come?

Mr. HARDY. For my part, if I can not get all duties off of all common necessities, I would rather take some of them off than to lie down and let all the monstrous duties we now have on the commonest and cheapest necessities remain.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Why are you not willing to do it now?

Mr. HARDY. I am willing to do it, and I want to travel just as fast as we can, but on your side you want to pile the burdens up higher and higher.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I am for a tariff that covers the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

Mr. HARDY. And yet you would vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], who wants a protection of 40 per cent on this item in which the whole labor cost is only 30 per cent.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. But I shall not vote for this bill.

Mr. HARDY. Oh, no; you would not vote for this bill.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. No; but I would vote for a proper bill.

Mr. HARDY. Then the gentleman should vote for this bill.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. You do not show your faith by your works.

Mr. HARDY. Oh, you never did show your faith by your works, if you have that faith; that is, that you only wanted a duty to cover the difference in the cost of production here and abroad.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Do not let him have the last word. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. "Faith without works is dead." By your work on rice you shall be known. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARDY. And by your works—your votes for high duties, not for revenue, but to benefit the few and burden the many—you are known, and I have got the last word. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fusible enamel, 20 per cent ad valorem; opal or cylinder glass tiles or tiling, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have listened to the remarks of the leader of the Progressive Party in this House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], and I want to state to him that I think his reflection or his criticism of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is uncalled for, in view of the fact that three years ago the gentleman from Kansas, on a roll call, voted to pass the Payne tariff bill through this House. He did it without a criticism or without an objection. He sat on this side of the House for 10 years, elected by a constituency in Kansas that believes in the policies of the Republican Party, and I doubt whether he can point to a single word or line of criticism or objection to the policy of his party during the time the Republicans of Kansas intrusted him with power in this House. The gentleman from Kansas the other day criticized this bill and read some letters from millers in his district who objected to the free importation of flour from Canada.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Will the gentleman be fair?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. I read a letter from a miller in Kansas who said that the bill was faulty in that it did not either put both wheat and flour on the free list, or put an equal duty on both, if a duty were to go on at all.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman from Kansas made an appeal in the interest of the millers of Kansas. He favors a protection on the flour industry of his district, as against the cheap flour industry of Canada. He opposed reciprocity in the interest of the agricultural constituents that he represented, and he stood still and stood pat against the importation of anything that would affect the interest of his immediate constituents; but when it comes to legislating in a tariff bill to protect the industries of the district represented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and the district represented by myself in Tennessee, then the gentleman is in favor of a reduction that would permit the importation of foreign articles in competition with those manufactured in our districts.

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, the gentleman wants to keep within the facts.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; always.

Mr. MURDOCK. I did not vote against reciprocity; I voted for reciprocity.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; but the gentleman's party assailed President Taft, and that was one of the chief slogans against him in the Northwest, the fact that he favored reciprocity.

Mr. MURDOCK. But the gentleman made the accusation against me that I was standing for a local, personal interest as against the interests of the Nation. I voted for reciprocity.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then I accept the gentleman's statement. But he does not deny the statement that he voted for the Payne bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Not at all.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then the gentleman pleads guilty.

Mr. MURDOCK. I voted for the Payne bill when it passed the House; but I voted against it, as the gentleman did not, after it had been ruined in the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I voted against it in the House, and was the only Republican to do so, because it was seeking to put coal and iron ore on the free list, which affected my district; and had it placed flour and wheat on the free list, and the articles in which the gentleman's constituents are interested, he would have been untrue to his commission and their trust had he not voted against it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Now, let me ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. AUSTIN. Not unless I have more time. The gentleman from Kansas is a Progressive. He progressed here, holding a seat by virtue of the votes and the support of a Republican district for 10 years, and now he has changed his official designation in the directory from a Republican to a Progressive.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I dislike to make the point of order on these gentlemen, but some of our friends have discussed politics in reference to this bill in season and out of season.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will make the point of order against the gentleman from Kansas the next time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I must insist that the gentleman discuss the paragraph under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The gentleman from Tennessee will proceed in order.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, in reference to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN], the labor leader——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am going to answer the gentleman on a question that he submitted here, and which he submitted without protest from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would say to the gentleman that the paragraph before the committee does not relate to that proposition. It has been passed.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman from Illinois discussed labor conditions in this country and Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is, of course, familiar with the rule, and if the point of order be insisted upon the Chair will state that he must proceed in order.

Mr. AUSTIN. All I ask is that the gentleman from Alabama will treat the Members of his side just as he does me.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to my friend from Tennessee making speeches, but I must insist that this bill progress.

Now, I will withdraw the point of order if, after the gentleman has finished his discussion on this particular matter, he will let us go along and discuss the paragraphs of the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. I say to the gentleman from Alabama that when he permits anyone on that side of the House to make these general speeches on the tariff, I intend to exercise the same right in reply.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that those speeches have been made on both sides of the House. I have been trying to let them run, but the gentleman has made quite

a number of speeches in this debate, and most of them entirely foreign to the subject matter before the House.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think I told the gentleman before we entered upon the discussion of this bill under the five-minute rule that I had no opportunity to make a speech in the general debate, and my only opportunity was to do it under the five-minute rule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing that the gentleman should proceed this time, but I intend to insist on the enforcement of the rule hereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama withdraws the point of order. The gentleman from Tennessee will proceed.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN], speaking as a labor man, decries the condition of the laboring people of this country. I commend to him the volume entitled "Labor in Europe and America," by Samuel Gompers, written as the result of a trip in 1909 through England, France, Austria, Italy, Germany, and the industrial centers of those countries. I wish to read a few extracts from that remarkable book.

On page 42 Mr. Gompers, the great American labor leader, says:

> The deepest impression that England made upon me came from its poverty. Physically thousands have become unfit, and are almost irreclaimable from idleness. Vice and the result of idleness make of them ready victims to death. Poverty is on view in all parts of London; slums and back streets border on fashionable thoroughfares; figures in dirt and rags slouch along amid the gay and well-attired promenaders of the park. With regret I must confess I came away from London with a sense of depression. From time to time since, those numbers of demoralized, degraded objects which ought to be men and women have formed in my mind's eye a procession moving along together past me, mournful, hopeless, repellent—a disgrace to our boasted civilization.

The last paragraph in Mr. Gompers's book reads as follows:

> The Old World is not our world. Its social problems, its economic philosophies, its current political questions are not linked up with America. All the people of the globe may be on the broad highway to social justice, peace among men of all tongues, and universal brotherhood, but all the nations and Governments have not reached the same points on the road. In the procession America is first.

Beginning on page 221 Mr. Gompers quotes some figures on the comparative wage scale of this and European countries. Let me quote them for the information of the House and the country, and for the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN], who, in the speech he has just made, expresses the opinion that a protective tariff is not beneficial to the American working people. According to Mr. Gompers, wages run as follows in the shipyards in England and Scotland:

> Platers, riveters, and calkers, holders-up, from $6 to less than $9.50 a week. In Germany only three or four of the trades average over $300 per annum; most of the averages run less than $250. For instance, the Berlin Saddlers' Organization, 9 hours per day, $6.28 to $6.52 per week. The Hamburg shipbuilders, $7.90 to $11.62 per week. The Berlin plumbers, $8 to $9 per week.
>
> In Budapest bricklayers, among the best-paid workmen in the building trades, get from $1 to $1.20 per day. In the winter they find unskilled work at 60 cents a day. Budapest has 1,000 female cigar makers working in the Government factories at 30 to 40 cents a day. Miners in northern Hungary sometimes attain to the level of 60 cents per day. The wages in Italy reach the highest point in Milan, the great modern and commercial city of the Kingdom.

The following are some of the demands of the unions:

> The painters and paper hangers a minimum of 60 cents, 80 cents, and $1 per day (American money), 8½ hours in winter and 10 hours the rest of the year. Stationary firemen, 9 cents an hour; gold-leaf workers, $1.20 per day; assistants, 75 cents, 9 hours; bookbinders, 80 cents a day. In the building trades, minimum per hour, 9 cents; lithographers, graded, $8.40, $7.80, and $7 a week. Street cleaners, graded, 78, 72, 67, 60, and 45 cents a day.
>
> The policemen in London get $6 to $9 a week; in Paris, $6 to $8; in Vienna or Rome, $5 to $7 per week; and in New York, $20 to $30 a week.

Mr. Gompers states, on page 228 of his book, that—

> The printing trade, in all Europe at the highest point in union organization, affords a basis for wage comparisons. In New York the union weekly scale for compositors on morning newspapers is $31; on bookwork, $21. In London the book scale is 39s. (less than $9.50); in Paris, the minimum $9; in Milan, $7 (5.20 lire) per day; in Austria the towns and cities are divided into six classes for compositors' weekly wages, running, respectively, $4.40, $4.80, $5.20, $5.60, $5.80, and $6.20; in Budapest the minimum scale is $4.80.

To sum up, Mr. Gompers states that wages are more than twice as much in this country as in Europe, and the hours of labor on the other side longer, the latter being from 9 to 12 and 14 hours in some of the cotton industries. In the matter of the cost of living, he states that if the American workingman would deprive himself as the European wage earner is compelled to do, the cost of living would be the same.

In conclusion I have quoted Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, against the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] says he wishes to proceed with the discussion of the provisions of this bill, and I propose for a few moments to satisfy him on that point if I can. The statements he has made with reference to the percentage which the wages paid for labor bear to the total value of the product in this industry are wholly misleading and, in fact, entirely incorrect. They are in line with the remarks which the gentleman made last evening with reference to the pottery industry. He stated then that the pottery industry in this country produced products amounting to $67,000,000, and that the wages paid were $29,000,000. The figures which the gentleman gave were not for the pottery industry but for the pottery, fire-clay, and terra-cotta industry combined, and it is well known that the terra-cotta and fire-clay industries have a much lower wage scale than that which is paid in the crockery line. Proceeding on those figures the gentleman drew the deduction that the percentage of wages in the pottery manufacture was only 38 per cent. As a matter of fact it is over 50 per cent, and in most cases in the china factories about 60 per cent.

I hold in my hand a statement from one of the largest concerns operating in this country, manufacturing china and white ware of certain kinds. Their product last year amounted to $1,800,000. Of this amount $1,120,000, or over 60 per cent, was paid in wages—handed out in the pay envelopes to their workmen. Yet the gentleman has proceeded to draw the provisions of this bill in accordance with his statement that 38 per cent was all that was paid on the articles which were manufactured under paragraphs 81 and 82 thereof.

The gentleman said in that same connection that he thought a tariff board was necessary sometimes for the benefit of his Republican friends. It is necessary for them, and it is doubly necessary for our Democratic friends when they persist in putting forth such misleading statistics, and when they deny, as they have been obliged to in some cases, the statistics from their own handbook and their own report which they have presented in connection with this bill. I am like the gentleman from Ohio who addressed the committee on the subject of a tariff board the other day. I have never been able to perceive why a Democrat should not be able to make calculations as well as a Republican, and why, when a tariff board is organized for the purpose of obtaining facts, a Democrat can not ascertain those facts and make those calculations as well as a Republican. But they have had so much trouble all along with their figures that I begin to doubt the mathematics of the Democratic Party.

When we were discussing this subject the other evening the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] asked the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] if he could not be fair, and the gentleman from Texas, wishing to be quite truthful, I suppose, said no, he could not. Now, if gentlemen can neither figure nor be fair, I will admit that they are of no use upon a tariff board. Otherwise I can not see any reason why the tariff board should not be made up to work in perfect harmony, although its members differ in their political faith, and give us what the Tariff Board which we formerly had gave us—harmonious results and unanimous reports, no matter of what party they are made up.

Now, this being the situation it emphasizes the necessity of a tariff board in order that we may have some correct figures upon which to base these rates. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], in speaking of the amount of labor employed in this glassware schedule, lumped the whole schedule together, including glassware of the cheapest kind, in which the labor is a small percentage, with that where the labor constitutes by far the greater part of the cost of the product, as in the particular provisions which are now under consideration. I submit that this is an unfair and improper way of making up a schedule. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's remarks are about as close to the facts as can be expected. Now, here is a paragraph relating to stained-glass windows, covering most of the items that are in the census report. How can you get closer to governmental figures than when the census report picks out a paragraph on which to give statistics? I hold the report in my hand. It says:

> Glass cutting, staining and ornamenting.

That is what is involved in this paragraph.

It says that the total wages scale was $5,249,000, and the total production was $16,100,000. The average amount of wages paid in that industry as fixed by the census was 31 per cent. Of course, I do not expect gentlemen on that side of the House who have for five decades gone to school to the interested manufacturers of this country, who are unwilling to recognize anyone in authority as to what interests the people of the United States on a tariff bill, except information that comes from a source that had such interest, to take the returns of their own Government as to the amount of the wages spent in the industry. Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate on this paragraph.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman will permit, I would like a little time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, last evening, in the discussion between the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and myself about the importations and productions of earthenware, and so on, some figures were given, but the ad valorem rates as fixed in the bill included everything under earthenware. It included sewer pipe and tile and terra cotta, and does not relate to chinaware, about which I was talking.

Some gentlemen have said that the Republicans had heretofore, in the preparation of their tariff bills, listened absolutely to the manufacturers. I send to the Clerk's desk a letter that has been handed to me to show that there are others besides manufacturers interested in the preparation of our tariff bills.

The Clerk read as follows:

AMALGAMATED GLASS WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Boston, Mass., April 25, 1913.

Mr. SAMUEL E. WINSLOW,
Representative, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Decorative Glassworkers of Boston, Local 28, at their last meeting instructed me to write you to protest against section 659, page 132, House bill, being passed, which reduces the duty on painted and stained glass windows imported into this country, and which, if it becomes a law, will seriously affect our trade, which at present is none too well paid, and will throw a majority of our members out of work.

Yours, very truly,

[SEAL.] M. T. MOONEY, *Secretary.*

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I have sat here, as have other gentlemen, and heard arguments on both sides of the House and evidently in the middle, with nothing but criticism and faultfinding. When God Almighty blew the breath of life into some men He must have been bilious [laughter], because they have kicked from the time the light of day came to them to the present time and never stand for anything to build up, but always ready to tear down. Gentlemen, I do hope that in the discussion over this bill such discussion may hereafter be eliminated and the discussion and arguments confined to merits or demerits of the propositions before the House and not engage in so much personality. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired, and, without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE C—METALS AND MANUFACTURES OF.

104. Iron in pigs, iron kentledge, spiegeleisen, wrought and cast scrap iron and scrap steel, 8 per cent ad valorem; but nothing shall be deemed scrap iron or scrap steel except secondhand or waste or refuse iron or steel fit only to be remanufactured; ferromanganese, chrome or chromium metal, ferrochrome or ferrochromium, ferromolybdenum, ferrophosphorus, ferrotitanium, ferrotungsten, ferrovanadium, molybdenum, titanium, tantalum, tungsten or wolfram metal, and ferrosilicon, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 16, insert after the word "ferrosilicon" the words "and other alloys used in the manufacture of steel."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether his amendment will increase or decrease the tariff on these articles?

Mr. PALMER. It will decrease the tariff.

Mr. MANN. What is the rate now?

Mr. PALMER. I have in mind only two such alloys. Cobalt is one, which I understand now would come in at 25 per cent.

Mr. MANN. How does it come in now?

Mr. PALMER. As metals not enumerated.

Mr. MANN. Under the existing law?

Mr. PALMER. Under the Payne law.

Mr. MANN. Under the bill without this amendment it would come in in the same way.

Mr. PALMER. I suppose so. We put it in in order to make all pay the same rate. We believe they ought to pay the same rate; they are constantly used in the manufacture of steel.

Mr. MANN. In the metal schedule bill of last year the rate was fixed at 10 per cent.

Mr. PALMER. On the ferro alloys?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman offers this amendment to come in just before the 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. The amendment I am offering is to insert, after the word "ferrosilicon," "and other alloys used in the manufacture of steel."

Mr. MANN. The ad valorem in the schedule last year was 10 per cent.

Mr. PALMER. No; it was 15 per cent in the last bill.

Mr. MANN. I will accept the gentleman's statement, but my recollection was that it was 10 per cent.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman is mistaken. I have the Underwood bill of last year before me, and it carried 15 per cent last year for ferro alloys. What the gentleman may be thinking of is pig iron, which carried a rate of 10 per cent in the same paragraph last year and in the Senate was reduced to 8 per cent. We carry it now at 8 per cent.

Mr. MANN. I understand that. You had 6 per cent in the metal schedule bill last year, did you not?

Mr. PALMER. What, pig iron?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. Pig iron we had at 8 per cent.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman permit me one question? I understood him to say these ferro metals, these ferro substances, would come in under metals not enumerated. Would they not rather come in under the general provision at the end of the bill, section 7, I think it is—I do not remember now—that puts a duty of 10 per cent upon unmanufactured articles not enumerated?

Mr. PALMER. Under the present law? Oh, I think not.

Mr. PAYNE. Under the present law or under this bill.

Mr. PALMER. I do not pretend to construe the act, but I think, as I said before, that it would come in under the higher rate, but be that as it may, whether a reduction or not, we thought all alloys should bear the same rate.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 16, after the word "ferrosilicon," strike out "15 per cent ad valorem" and insert "$2.50 per ton."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] permit me to ask him a question? Will the gentleman be willing to accept the amendment which I have offered?

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman will not.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman is cruel; usually he is not. He should not so rudely dash a hope which I so tremblingly entertained. I do not anticipate, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment will be adopted; if I did I would not vote for it myself [laughter], because I do not propose to take any part in running off on the public a bill which is feared by American industry and which, according to prophecy, can not long survive. I mean to leave the ship before it hits the rock. It is suggested to me by my constituent that the duty on this product, which is used in the manufacture of steel, ought to be fixed at a specific duty as in the present law at $2.50 a ton, because the ad valorem duty of 15 per cent offered in the present bill will raise the duty on ferromanganese from $2.50 a ton to $8.70 per ton. I have no particular objection to the Democratic Party favoring ferromanganese with a duty of $8.70 per ton, but I am wondering what my friend from Pennsylvania had in his mind when he raised the duty over the Republican mark. Ferromanganese can be produced in this country. There are furnaces that produce it, I am told. The Steel Corporation makes it for its own use, but the independents have to purchase it. Is it the purpose to encourage this industry? Is my constituent wrong when he figures that the duty upon this product has been raised from $2.50 to $8.70 per ton, based on the ad valorem duty? Can this be a Democratic protection? My constituent says this product sells at this time in the market for $61 per ton. Mr. Chairman, as I have already said, I have no hope, of course, that this amendment will be adopted. It is not well drawn, but will do to vote down. Neither have I any hope that this bill will be defeated. I have had no opportunity to criticize it because there was nobody to listen to my criticism had I offered it. I came here regularly every day and heard gentlemen thunder in the cavern, greatly pleased with their own echoes. I have had no chance to present to this House, because there was no House, my views upon this bill, which I fear will bring trouble to all our people. I am not certain of it because I do not know, but I am anxious to live to a time that I may know. But I am thoroughly comforted when I recall the dictum of Mephistopheles found in Faust, "All that comes into being deserves to perish," and I believe this proposed law is enumerated in that list, and some day the torch of indignation will be applied to it and it will perish along with other Democratic extravagances. Mr. Chairman, I am not a pessimist, permit me to say; it is easy to be a pessimist and because of its ease we should guard ourselves against it—I do not criticise these gentlemen making this bill. The country will deal with them when the result of their performances is fully discovered. The responsibility is on them as they do the writing and the voting. That the business people are shocked and

terrified no one denies. They did not expect a free-trade law. Their protests are loud. They should have protested last November. Republicans can make no successful fight here.

The Democrats imagine they were commissioned, but they were not. A majority did not put them in power. Many of those who trusted them expected better of them. But they are sincere in their purpose, and we all wait to see what the effect of their written views will be. I said to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] yesterday, who was so skillfully explaining the chemical schedule, and who is an expert, as we all agree, upon it, that the Democrats steering this bill are treating us quite as well as we treated them on similar occasions. As I remember, we shot them in the squat. They permit us to run for our lives. They give us a chance to offer these amendments, so that they may have the pleasure of defeating them. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Did you shoot them on the impulse of the moment?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. This is the only real live chance I have had on this bill—it is to be short in time—the only time I have found Members in their seats. Why they are here I do not know. [Laughter.] When I see a Member of Congress in his seat I always imagine that he fears he is being watched by his constituency. [Applause and laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE. I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] a question. I desire to speak, but first to ask the question.

Mr. BUTLER. Maybe I can not answer it.

Mr. MOORE. His amendment pertains to ferromanganese?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. I have listened to his statement, and I think his facts are confirmed by information that comes from constituents of mine. They tell the story so much better than I can that I shall read what they say:

> Independent steel manufacturers are heavily handicapped by this increase, in view of the fact that the leading interest, the United States Steel Corporation, operates blast furnaces making ferromanganese in this country from imported ore, to be admitted free of duty. They are the only makers of ferromanganese in this country, the independent manufacturers importing the manufactured alloy, for which the present tariff bill imposes a duty of approximately $8.70 a ton. The price of ferromanganese at several times has passed $100 per ton. It has sold as high as $150.

Instead of reducing duties for the relief of the consumer, therefore, it appears that in this instance the committee has actually raised the duty from $2.50 a ton under the Payne bill to $8.70 under the Underwood bill.

It has not yet been explained why the Democratic Party did this. They are pledged to enact a tariff law for the purpose of collecting revenue only. In this instance they seem to be operating in behalf of the United States Steel Corporation, presumably the greatest trust and combination in the world. This is the only concern that will get the advantage of the raise in the duty from $2.50 provided in the Payne bill to $8.70 as provided in the Underwood bill.

Mr. PAYNE. As I understand, the gentleman is protesting against the high protective tariff which the committee has put in this bill?

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman for that question. While I am a protectionist, and wish to protect labor, I do not subscribe to the doctrine of protecting trusts and combinations, as they are protected in this bill in this particular instance. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I blush for my native State. [Applause on the Democratic side.] My colleague, the gentleman from the Chester-Delaware district [Mr. BUTLER], offers an amendment that is absolutely absurd upon its face, and my other distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Philadelphia [Mr. MOORE], rises to confirm everything that his mistaken colleague has said. He proposes an amendment which would strike out the rate of 15 per cent on these ferro alloys and substitute $2.50 a ton. If it were put into the law it would be the laughing stock of the steel and iron industry of the country. This rate applies not alone to ferromanganese, but to every ferro alloy. The average unit of value of all ferro alloys is something over $1,000 per ton, and the gentleman's amendment would have the effect of writing a rate into this bill on an average of two-tenths of 1 per cent. Now, if the gentleman means to put all this stuff on the free list, he ought to do it, but he ought not to fool anybody by an amendment of this character.

Now, as to ferromanganese, much has been said and much has been written to Members of Congress about this article. It is one of the two increases which this bill carries over the Payne bill in the steel and iron schedule, the other increase being plated gold and silverware and gold and silverware. Each of them is increased for the same reason, purely and entirely as a revenue proposition. We want this bill to be recognized by the trade as a logical and symmetrical bill by which they can do business.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PALMER. I can not yield. I have only five minutes.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], who knows more about writing a tariff bill in a minute than my colleagues from Pennsylvania will know in all their lives, when he brought his bill into the House put ferromanganese in with the ferro alloys. Just exactly as we have done, and he defended it, and he was right as a logical proposition. There was where it belonged. He was beaten in another part of this Capitol, because the iron and steel manufacturers of this country were able to bring pressure to bear upon the conferees and upon the other branch of this Congress, and reduced the tax upon this ferromanganese, and following the method that was then so popular in changing this law, instead of putting it there boldly and frankly and openly, and reducing the rate on ferromanganese, they hid it under pig iron at $4 a ton and subsequently reduced that to $2.50 a ton.

Now, I say we put it back in the ferro alloys class, where it belongs, because we want the steel and iron manufacturers to pay a share of the taxes to run this Government. It is purely for revenue purposes. It will not protect anybody and it will not seriously injure the consumer of steel and iron products. There is no ferromanganese made in the United States for sale. Absolutely the only manufacturer of ferromanganese in this country is the United States Steel Corporation, which makes it entirely for its own use. If it were in the market selling ferromanganese, perhaps there would be some force in the argument that we are doing something for its benefit.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I can not yield in five minutes. All the other manufacturers of steel and iron import their ferromanganese, and consequently, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has said time and time again, playing no favorites, we say that all of these people who import this article ought to help pay the taxes to run the Government.

As I said before, it can not affect the consumer, because ferromanganese, like these other ferro alloys, is a medicine which is intended to give a peculiar character to certain kinds of steel, certain kinds of high-priced steel used in the manufacture of the finer forms of steel which, when they get to the consumer, are very much increased in value. There is 1 per cent of a ton of ferromanganese in a ton of steel. Even at the present high price of ferro of $60 a ton there is therefore 60 cents worth of ferromanganese in a ton of steel, and at 15 per cent, which is this tariff, we levy a tariff upon the manufacturers of the country of 9 cents per ton of steel. And that is a kind of steel that goes into small tools and various things of that kind, which, as I said, when they get to the consumer, can not by any human ingenuity have this 9 cents a ton in the steel passed on.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] ought, I think, to be to strike out, in line 12 of this paragraph, the word "ferromanganese," with a statement that if that amendment should prevail the gentleman will offer an amendment at the end of the paragraph reading, "ferromanganese, $2.50 per ton."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I can not yield in five minutes.

Mr. MOORE. I have the amendment right here.

Mr. MANN. Half a dozen gentlemen have the amendment.

Now, what is the situation? The United States Steel Corporation produces and uses about 120,000 tons of ferromanganese per year. They manufacture their own ferromanganese. Now, with the present rate of duty of $2.50 per ton it is estimated that the rate of duty of 15 per cent, as provided in this bill, will raise the duty to the neighborhood of $7 or $8 or $9 per ton. All of the independent steel manufacturers buy imported ferromanganese now. They are in competition with the United States Steel Corporation. There is nearly as much ferromanganese used by the independent steel manufacturers, imported from abroad at $2.50 per ton duty, as there is used by the United States Steel Corporation, manufactured by itself.

Now, the proposition is to increase the rate of duty on this article, necessary in the production of steel, from $2.50 per ton to $8 per ton and to give that much of a handicap against the independent manufacturer and in favor of the United States Steel Corporation. These independent steel manufacturers today can not afford to manufacture ferromanganese, and the United States Steel Corporatoin now can afford to manufacture ferromanganese.

There can be only one of two purposes in the proposition to increase the rate of duty. One is a protective purpose, to encourage a manufacturing establishment in this country which will manufacture ferromanganese for the use of the independent steel manufacturers. The other—if it is not a protective measure for them—is purely in the interest of the United States Steel Corporation. What do we find in this bill? The very articles into which ferromanganese goes have the duty decreased by the bill, tending to increase the foreign competition, and while they are decreasing the rate on the finished products they are adding to the rate on the raw material which we must import from abroad. That is cutting both ends. That is playing both ends against the middle.

I am a protectionist. If the purpose of this measure were, within reasonable limitations, to build up an industry here which would manufacture ferromanganese at reasonable rates, where there could be competition, I would favor it.

But that is not the purpose, and probably that will not be the effect. The effect of that increase is simply to add to the profits of the United States Steel Corporation and increase their power in competition with the independent manufacturers. It ought to be the policy of our country at this time to give aid to those who are independently competing with the great combinations of capital and the great organizations which seek to monopolize the markets, rather than, as this proposes to do, give aid and comfort to the monopolies against the independent competitors. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I desire to insert as a part of my remarks the following letters:

AMERICAN STEEL FOUNDRIES,
Chicago, April 24, 1913.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANN: There is a curious inconsistency in the proposed new tariff law, Schedule C, clause 106, which it is very difficult to understand—in fact, I have not found anyone who could explain it. It is proposed to change the duty on ferromanganese from $2.50 per ton to 15 per cent ad valorem. This means on the present market price abroad, say, $58 a ton, that the duty would be at the rate of $8.70 a ton—a net increase of $6.20.

There is only one producer of ferromanganese in this country and that is the Carnegie Steel Co., and all of its product goes to the Steel Corporation. They produced in 1911 123,000 tons; in 1912, 121,000 tons.

All of the independent steel manufacturers, steel foundries, and others import their ferromanganese. In taking off the tariff on fabricated steel and iron manufacturers in this country are thrown into direct competition with foreign manufacturers, under the most unfavorable conditions as to labor cost, and why, in addition to this, it is now proposed to radically increase the duty on the one element that must go into every ton of steel and that must be imported, it is difficult to understand.

If the answer is made that this high duty will encourage the domestic manufacture of ferromanganese, the reply is that it at once becomes a highly protected form of industry, which, as we understand it, is just the thing that the present law proposes to avoid. The tonnage of ferromanganese imported annually is generally estimated at about 125,000 tons, so that the income from the duty is a comparatively insignificant item and it would hardly seem that this could be urged as a reason for the serious increase.

I think the whole thing has come about through a misunderstanding as to what ferromanganese really is. In the bill it is put under the same heading as to duty as chromium, titanium, tungsten, etc. As a matter of fact, ferromanganese is simply pig iron with a high percentage of manganese. It is an absolutely necessary constituent of every ton of steel that is made, whereas the other alloys are added to an extremely small percentage of steel that is required for special purposes, such as making tools, etc.

Aside from the unnecessary increase in the cost of all steel made in this country, this increase in the duty on ferromanganese seems so uncalled for and inconsistent that it should not be allowed to go through. I trust you will find it consistent to do what you can to get the thing straightened out.

Very truly, yours,

R. P. LAMONT, *President.*

ROGERS, BROWN & CO.,
Chicago, April 21, 1913.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are writing to you as our Representative in Congress, to ask that you use your influence in the matter of whatever duty is established for ferromanganese to have it a specific instead of an ad valorem duty. The bill now under consideration in the House provides for a "15 per cent ad valorem." The present duty is specific, being $2.50 per ton, having been reduced from $4 per ton by the tariff act of August 5, 1909.

A 15 per cent ad valorem is a very heavy increase over the existing rate, too large, in our opinion, and, as you no doubt know, rests lightly on one and bears heavily on the shoulders of all other steel manufacturers.

The difficulty with the ad valorem duty is the confusion which arises from that form of assessment, making it almost impossible for a buyer when he places his order to know what the stuff will cost him when it is finally delivered, if we are correct in understanding that the duty is assessed on the market value at the time of the arrival of the material in this country or time of shipment from abroad.

We respectfully urge you also to use your influence for maintaining the duty on pig iron where it is. It has been very heavily reduced in recent tariff acts and has now a very low duty. Recently there have been developed in China and India large iron works, built by American engineers on American models for Chinese and Indian ownership, which are manufacturing pig iron at a very much lower cost than is possible at any point in the United States. We understand American-made pig iron is being supplanted to a considerable extent on the Pacific coast, and as these institutions grow American manufacturers may expect to have to surrender all of that trade to foreign-made iron and face the possibility of the eastern seaboard being eventually thus invaded. From Asia the danger of competition in future is more serious than anything we may expect from Europe.

Yours, truly,

ROGERS, BROWN & CO.

PRIMOS, DELAWARE COUNTY, PA., *March 29, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We respectfully call your attention to the inclosed short supplementary brief stating our positions referring to proposed tariff changes asking for tariff for revenue only.

We earnestly request your support in this matter.

Respectfully, yours,

PRIMOS CHEMICAL CO.,
WALTER M. STEIN, *President.*

PRIMOS, DELAWARE COUNTY, PA., *March 25, 1913.*

Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,
Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In accordance with the announcement of the Committee on Ways and Means, dated December 11, 1912, and in compliance with the suggestions contained therein, we beg to submit herewith our brief and to outline herein the information desired by the committee.

Name of company: Primos Chemical Co.

Location of works: Primos, Delaware County, Pa.; Newmire, San Miguel County, Colo.; Lakewood, Boulder County, Colo. (the Primos Mining & Milling Co., a separate corporation).

Sales offices: Primos, Delaware County, Pa.

Nature of business: Manufacture of metals and alloys.

Principal metals and alloys manufactured: Tungsten metal, ferrotungsten, molybdenum metal, ferromolybdenum, ferrovanadium.

Subject: Paragraph 184 of the tariff law of 1909.

SCHEDULE C.

In addition to brief submitted January 8, 1913, we give you the following facts:

Importations of tungsten ore.

(1912. Tons of 2,205 pounds. Duty, 10 per cent ad valorem.)

First quarter	194.0 tons,	$94,980;	duty,	$9,498.00=$104,478.00
Second quarter	137.0 tons,	67,272;	duty,	6,727.20= 73,999.20
Third quarter	218.8 tons,	104,814;	duty,	10,481.40= 115,295.40
Fourth quarter	184.0 tons,	95,356;	duty,	9,535.60= 104,891.60
	733.8 tons,	362,422;	duty,	36,242.20= 398,664.20

During the year 1912 the two mills of the Primos Mining & Milling Co., as well as the mills of other producers of tungsten ore in the United States, had to shut down for about five months, as it was impossible to compete with foreign ores, due to the high rate of wages paid in the mining districts of the United States, and the eight-hour working day.

Total ore importations, 806.74 net tons during the year 1912.

Total production of the Primos Mining & Milling Co., of Colorado, largest producer in the United States, for the entire year, 204 tons.

Importations of tungsten metal and ferrotungsten, 1912.

(Ton of 2,205 pounds. Duty, 20 per cent ad valorem.)

First quarter	41.01 tons,	$40,679.00.	Duty, $8,135.80
Second quarter	39.50 tons,	46,567.00.	Duty, 9,313.40
Third quarter	83.30 tons,	98,150.00.	Duty, 19,630.00
Fourth quarter	124.00 tons,	138,476.00.	Duty, 27,695.20
	287.81 tons,	323,872.00.	Duty, 64,774.40=$388,646.40

Per pound, 61.38 cents with duty; per pound, 51.15 cents without duty; 287.81 tons of 2,205 pounds, or 317.31 short tons of 2,000 pounds, or 634,621 pounds.

Besides ourselves, there are two other producers of metal whose total production altogether is probably not over 50,000 pounds for the entire year. Our production of tungsten metal for 1912 amounted to 625,000 pounds.

As explained before the various tariff boards, 20 per cent duty on tungsten metal or ferrotungsten is not protective, but is now on a basis of tariff for revenue only.

Wrong classification: Tungsten metal, ferrotungsten, molybdenum metal, ferromolybdenum, and ferrovanadium manufacture is a chemical-metallurgical problem, not a purely smelting proposition. Everything used in the manufacture in the nature of chemicals, other materials, and electric power is very much higher in this country than in Europe, and the wages of labor, skilled chemists, and mechanics employed are from two to three times those paid in Germany and other competing countries on similar products exported to this country. The ever-increasing imports are the best proof that the present duties of 20 per cent on metal and 10 per cent on ore are not sufficient. A 35 per cent duty on metals and alloys would not be prohibitive, but would be on a basis of tariff for revenue only. The imports will remain substantially the same as at present and the revenue to the Government will be increased without injury to the consumer, the advantage to the producer arising entirely from the increase in consumption, because the domestic consumer will be able to get his alloys in the United States without being dependent upon foreign syndicates, which will be the case if the American producer is driven out of business by a lowering of the tariff rate.

We therefore most earnestly request that the present rates be not lowered but raised to the basis of the tariff for revenue principle.

In closing we would earnestly invite the attention of your committee to the evidence given by our president at the hearings before the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate, Sixty-second Congress, of H. R. 18642 ("Duties on metals and manufactures of metals"), February 15, 1912, and to the brief submitted by us on January 8, 1913.

Respectfully submitted.

PRIMOS CHEMICAL CO.,
WALTER M. STEIN, *President.*

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment. I make the modification upon the sug-

gestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], because I think it is more likely to be adopted. Therefore I ask to modify my amendment by moving to strike out, in line 12, the word "ferromanganese," it being understood that if this amendment prevails I will then offer an amendment to put ferromanganese on the list at $2.50. I may, however, be saved the trouble of offering that amendment. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment by striking out in line 12, the word "ferromanganese," with the statement that if that amendment prevails he will then offer the amendment indicated at the end of the paragraph.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if we strike out the word "ferromanganese" here and then your amendment offered later is voted down, what becomes of the duty on ferromanganese?

Mr. BUTLER. It will remain where it is now.

Mr. MANN. It will go in the basket clause.

Mr. MURDOCK. What rate does the basket clause carry?

Mr. MANN. I think it carries the same amount.

Mr. BUTLER. If it is stricken out and the other amendment is not agreed to, then it will go into the basket clause, but I have not anticipated that it would be stricken out. I have not thought that far ahead.

Mr. MANN. The probability is that if there are votes enough to strike it out here there are votes enough to put it back.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as modified.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER offers the following amendment by way of a new paragraph:

"104½. Iron ore, including manganiferous iron ore, and the dross or residuum from burnt pyrites, 15 cents per ton: *Provided*, That in levying and collecting the duty on iron ore no deduction shall be made from the weight of the ore on account of moisture which may be chemically or physically combined therewith."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, this is not an entirely new subject. It has been before this House on two or three different occasions during the past four years, and has been voted upon.

I do not expect, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be adopted, sharing as I do the views of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] of the impenetrability of the phalanx on the other side of the aisle; but I do want the membership of this House to know what they are doing when they vote for the paragraph just voted upon and when they vote upon this amendment which I have just offered.

Never since this Government was established has it been proposed to put iron ore on the free list until about four years ago. There have always been excellent reasons why a duty should be placed on iron ore, but there never was a time when those reasons were so forceful and so strong as they are to-day. There are several iron-ore producing sections of this country. The county in which I live produced last year 30,000,000 tons of iron ore. The total production in the United States was 49,000,000 tons. The producing areas may be called the Lake Superior district, which is the largest; the Tennessee-Alabama district; and a small one located in the State of New York. The inquiry readily follows, Whence will the competition come? In recent years large ore deposits have been found in various parts of the world, which affect the iron situation in America. The two principal areas from which iron ore will come to America are Sweden and Finland and Cuba. The ore from the Sweden-Finland district need not be particularly feared, but that from Cuba presents a grave situation. These Cuban iron-ore deposits are of very great extent and exceptional accessibility. Those iron ores are to-day coming into the United States at 12 cents per ton, and those from Sweden are coming in at 15 cents per ton, and they have driven the iron ores of this country entirely west of the Appalachian range. The extreme low wage scale in Cuba and low freight rate to America enable these Cuban ores already to drive American ore west of the mountains, and soon they will capture Pittsburgh, the great ore mart of the world. Last year there were imported about 2,000,000 tons, which paid $300,000 in revenue. This bill proposes to take away that $300,000 from the Treasury of the United States and give it to the Pennsylvania Steel Co. And what is the Pennsylvania Steel Co.? It is the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

The Commissioner of Corporations, reporting upon this subject but a few months ago, said that the Pennsylvania Steel Co. is controlled by the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., and has acquired by purchase the Spanish-American iron ore deposits of Cuba. When this bill becomes a law the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., together with Charles M. Schwab, will be beneficiary to the extent of $300,000 annually. Adopt this amendment and that $300,000 each year will be put into the pockets of the American people and kept from the pockets of the greatest railroad company on earth and one of the iron magnates of the world.

In harmony with the paragraph just voted upon I beg to call attention to another phase of this paragraph.

Our good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], able as he always is, informed us that ferromanganese is in the nature of a medicine to go into the production of steel products, and would be a tax on the iron and steel manufacturers and not increase the price to the consumers. I think he is right. He followed by saying that he proposed to increase the tax 350 per cent for the purpose of making the companies pay more into the Treasury. I looked at the figures in the tables submitted by the Ways and Means Committee, and I find that in 1910 under the Payne bill there was imported into the United States $4,000,000 worth of ferromanganese, paying a duty of $284,000, and these estimates furnished by his own committee tell us they expect to import $550,000 worth of the product each year and pay a tax of $82,000. When in time have men been able to figure to show that it is? This prohibitive duty will cut importations from $4,000,000 to $550,000; reduce revenue from $284,000 to $82,000 each year. There will thus be taken again from Uncle Sam's pocket $200,000 each year, and where will it go? We are told the only manufacturer of ferromanganese in the United States is the United States Steel Corporation; therefore the people of the country have taken from their pockets each year $200,000 to increase the profits of the Steel Corporation. Free iron ore and a prohibitive duty on ferromanganese combined will take from the people's pockets $500,000 each year and no one will be benefited but the manufacturers of iron and steel. How any Democrat can profess what they all do and vote for such a schedule as this surpasses the imagination of man. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, referring first to the last proposition which my friend from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] has mentioned, the loss of revenue to the Government, I want to say that he is clearly mistaken, as he must see if he examines closely into the figures. The imports of ferromanganese last year were in the neighborhood of 75,000 tons. Fifteen per cent upon the value of that will very largely exceed the present duty on iron ore under last year's importations. The duties on iron ore amounted to $263,000. The reason the estimates were printed as the gentleman has read was doubtless because of the fact that the new price in ferromanganese was not taken into consideration in writing that estimate, the estimate being based on the old price.

Mr. MILLER. Are the estimates wrong?

Mr. PALMER. The estimate was based on the former price when the Underwood bill was written last year.

Mr. MILLER. Has the price been changed within a week?

Mr. PALMER. I have stated the facts. Now to return to iron ore. The gentlemen on the other side complain that we are punishing the independent steel and iron manufacturers by putting manganese at a higher rate and voting against that punishment; and then they come forward with a proposition to punish the same people, the independent steel and iron manufacturers, by retaining the duty on iron ore. The great benefit growing out of the reduction of this tax on iron ore will go to the independent steel and iron manufacturers of the country. The United States Steel Corporation owns or controls not only all the ore which it uses, but a very large part of the merchantable ore which is available for consumption in the United States. The independent manufacturer is forced either to get upon his knees and go to the Steel Corporation for ore or find a new field in a foreign market, and most of them have endeavored to find iron ore abroad. The Bethlehem people, the Pennsylvania people, the Cambria people, the manufacturers in the district represented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], have gone into Cuba and into South America after ore. This reduction from 12 cents on Cuban ore and 15 cents, as far as South American ore is concerned, will of course make it easier for them to compete against the concern which not only owns all the ore it uses, as in the case of ferromanganese, but has a pretty tight grip on the ore that anybody can use or get.

My friend from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], of course, preaches the true Republican doctrine, when he comes here trying to protect the interest which is chiefest in his district, yet four years

ago, when the Republican whip cracked over his head, he voted for free iron ore.

Mr. MILLER. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not.

Mr. PALMER. Did not the gentleman vote for the Payne bill in the House?

Mr. MILLER. I did not; I voted against it.

Mr. PALMER. I thought the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] was the only Republican who voted against the Payne law in the House, and I think that is right.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman can consult the RECORD, and he will find that I did not, although I am not particularly proud of it.

Mr. PALMER. Of course, I take the gentleman's statement for it. If he did not vote for the bill, I withdraw my statement; but all the rest of the Members on that side of the House who now propose to vote for this tax on iron ore except the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] four years ago voted with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and put iron ore on the free list. The gentleman from Tennessee is really in an admirable position. Iron ore has been his hobby, and he is going to be able to say when he gets back home to the cross-roads of Tennessee that he, too, has been upon both sides of this proposition. [Laughter.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I have not been on both sides of this proposition.

Mr. PALMER. I will convince the gentleman right now that he has.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well; proceed.

Mr. PALMER. He did vote against the Payne bill in the House, but he voted for the conference report that put the Payne law on the statute book and reduced the duty on iron ore from 40 cents a ton to 12 cents, and now he gags at taking 12 cents more. Then he was willing to take a reduction of 28 cents a ton for iron ore, and voted for it. He can go back and tell his people that he would not vote for a reduction on iron ore for the benefit of independent manufacturers when it came up in a Democratic House, but he can turn the other way and tell the manufacturers of his district or his State that when the Payne bill came up he did vote for a reduction for them.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SAUNDERS). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] says that the increase on the duty on ferromanganese is intended as a revenue proposition. Yesterday we learned from the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], who was in charge of the chemical schedule bill, that the report was not to be considered as reliable. Whenever a controverted proposition came up, and we appealed to the figures in the report of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] said that those figures were not reliable, and now, when we meet the metal schedule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] representing that schedule on the floor, says the same thing about it.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I can not in five minutes.

Mr. PALMER. I will really take only 15 seconds of the gentleman's time to correct his statement.

Mr. MANN. I did not interrupt the gentleman, but I will yield if he will be brief.

Mr. PALMER. All I want to say is this, and the gentleman ought to know it: The present price of ferromanganese is $60 a ton, and upon that price there will be a large increase. The reason these figures are as the gentleman states is because the officials of the department took last year's average price, which is very much lower.

Mr. MANN. Let us see whether that is correct or not. The average price stated in this report for ferromanganese under the Wilson tariff was $24 a ton, under the Dingley tariff $32 a ton, and under the Payne tariff $37 a ton, and last year it was $37 a ton.

Mr. PALMER. That is what I said.

Mr. MANN. No; that is not what the gentleman said. He said the price had been reduced from $60 to $37 a ton, when the report of the committee shows that all the time $37 is the highest rate.

The report shows that last year ferromanganese was imported to the extent of $2,821,000, and that it paid a duty of $190,000, and that a proposition to increase the rate for revenue purposes will import $550,000 worth, less than one-fifth of the amount now imported. On that the revenue will be $82,500, less than one-half that now paid. Figures! Every time the question comes up the gentleman repudiates the figures in the report.

What is the situation? Ferromanganese is used by all the independent steel manufacturers, including those in the West. I have several in my district, independent as well as the United States Steel Corporation. It is proposed to increase the rate on ferromanganese which these independent manufacturers in the West and elsewhere must use and at the same time reduce the rate on iron ore, which is imported from abroad exclusively for the use of the steel manufacturers on the Atlantic coast, the chief one of which is in the district represented by the distinguished gentleman who wrote the metal-schedule bill.

And if that does not reelect him for life I do not know what will.

Mr. PALMER. It will.

Mr. MANN. But that is the situation. He said a moment ago that he was taking off the tariff for the benefit of the independent manufacturers of iron ore and putting it as a revenue measure on ferromanganese. What is the fact? The western manufacturers will pay the increased tax on ferromanganese, and the reduction which the gentleman makes is exclusively for the benefit of the steel manufacturers in that portion of the country from which the gentleman himself comes. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I do not charge a purpose of favoring the great Steel Trust of this country, but I am satisfied if the Members of this House read the statements at the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee of the great independent concerns that they will be convinced that there is discrimination in favor of the United States Steel Co., the so-called Steel Trust, and that there is additional punishment for the independents. I will quote from the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] to prove the additional punishment. In the discussion of this subject the other day Mr. AUSTIN, of Tennessee, stated:

> Mr. AUSTIN. I am asking you if the record does not show what I have stated, and that the remission or the placing of iron ore on the free list benefits the steel corporation in your district to the extent of $42,000 a year on importation of Swedish iron ore alone, taking that amount of money out of the Treasury and turning it over to the Bethlehem Steel Co.?
>
> Mr. PALMER. No; that is not an accurate statement. I go as far as the truth will permit any man to go when I say that iron ore is imported by the Bethlehem Steel Co. and that we have put iron ore on the free list. But iron ore is imported by many other independent steel or iron makers of the country besides the Bethlehem Steel Co., and the gentleman knows that. And I will say another thing to the gentleman, that the Bethlehem Steel Co. are large producers of the kind of steel which takes ferromanganese, and that company will pay a higher tax on its ferromanganese by reason of the change in this law than it will save by the putting of iron ore on the free list.

Mr. PALMER. I expect the gentleman is reading that for the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. No; he is reading it to have the gentleman repudiate it.

Mr. FARR. On page 1021 of the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, the representative of the great Republic Iron & Steel Co. said:

> There is only one concern in this country that is a large enough user of ferromanganese to avail itself of this privilege, viz, the United States Steel Corporation. The amount of ferromanganese used varies from 25 to 50 pounds per ton of steel. A concern that produces 20,000,000 tons of steel ingots could operate a blast furnace or two on ferromanganese. A concern producing a million tons of steel, as we do, could not afford to operate a blast furnace on ferromanganese, because our consumption per annum would not be sufficient to feed a furnace. There are no two other manufacturers that I know of who are big enough to operate a blast furnace for their own supply of ferromanganese.

The great Lackawanna Steel Co., of Buffalo, also objects, as do all the independents who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, to this increase in ferromanganese, stating it is directly for the benefit of the United States Steel Co. The gentleman from Pennsylvania made the statement upon this floor the other day admitting that the United States Steel Co. was the only producer of ferromanganese in the country, but he said it did not sell any. Now, I ask the gentleman if he is convinced of the truthfulness of that statement to-day?

Mr. PALMER. That has been my information at all times.

Mr. FARR. Well, the information is virtually to the effect that the company either by barter or for cash furnishes other concerns of this country with ferromanganese, and I desire to submit with this aditional tariff on ferromanganese if the Steel Trust will not have an additional advantage over great independent concerns that are fighting for their livelihood to-day.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman permit me to say, does not this tend to very greatly increase the value of ferromanganese to the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. FARR. Certainly, it does; and the United States Steel Co. are the only ones in this country who are producing it.

Mr. BUTLER. It raises the value of it.

Mr. FARR. I submit, not for the purpose of being heard in this House, but to suggest to gentlemen on that side, that here is one schedule that you have not thoroughly or in any way scientifically considered. I do not charge the Ways and

Means Committee with the purpose of affording any advantage to the Steel Trust, but it certainly does so in this paragraph.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I do.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman says that ferromanganese is controlled wholly by the trust.

Mr. FARR. By the United States Steel Co., according to the word of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], who is sponsor for the metal schedule; he admits the fact and says they are the only people in this country who are making it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Why does not the gentleman suggest to the Democratic Party that the Democratic platform pledges that party to put all trust-controlled products on the free list?

Mr. FARR. It is a trust-made article on the dutiable list. You are going to injure the independents. You are going to give them an additional opportunity to crush them. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] made the assertion on the floor the other day that because of the world-wide trust in the matter of steel rails there would not be any reduction in the cost of steel rails to the users in this country, notwithstanding steel rails in this measure are on the free list. In the statement I believe the gentleman is right. The placing of steel rails on the free list will be another advantage to the United States Steel Co., which, it is believed, is a part of the world-wide trust, and a further disadvantage to the independents in their efforts to compete with the United States Steel Co.

But there is, to my mind, danger in free importations of steel rails. It may be imaginary, but it can be real and exceedingly hurtful. The United States Steel Co., it is contended and believed, is a part of the world-wide Steel Trust. The American independent manufacturers are not. Wages abroad in steel making is half, in many instances less than half, what is paid to workmen in that industry in this country. Suppose we have labor troubles in a mill of the United States Steel Co.? Would not this world-wide trust, through the mutual sympathy that goes with it, be a danger factor? Or for any other reason that might appeal to this great steel company, what would prevent them from shutting up a mill in this country and importing their rails from England, Germany, Belgium, or any other foreign country where the trust understanding exists?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] is recognized.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] stated that I could go back to the iron manufacturers in my district in reference to the duty in the Payne bill on pig iron. I will say that he can go to Bethlehem, Pa., and tell Mr. Schwab that he can get in his foreign iron ore free. Mr. Schwab was in Washington four years ago to obtain from a Republican Ways and Means Committee free iron ore. In one of the New York papers some time ago he said that he had made a contract to secure from Sweden 25,000,000 tons of iron ore. If you reduce the duty on iron ore and put it on the free list, and he imports 25,000,000 tons of it from Sweden, then you have saved for the man who has always opposed your election to Congress more than $4,700,000 of tariff duty. Mr. Schwab ought to give our distinguished colleague a gold medal and aid in keeping him in Congress as long as he lives.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Schwab testified before the committee that the Bethlehem Steel Works, he, and Mr. Carnegie, own all the iron ore mines that have been so far discovered in Cuba.

Mr. AUSTIN. Last year we imported from Cuba 1,200,000 tons of iron ore. Mr. Schwab not only buys iron ore in Cuba, where he has purchased large holdings and constructed wharves and railroads, but he is a large importer of iron ore from Sweden.

Now, in the United States we pay $2.48 per day to men who mine iron. In Cuba they pay $1 a day; Spain, where women are employed, pays 50 cents to $1 a day; Sweden, 75 cents to $1 a day. In Chile, where Mr. Schwab has recently secured large deposits of iron ore, which it is proposed to import free, the labor cost is from 50 cents to $1 a day.

Now, the gentleman speaks about the United States Steel Corporation controlling all the iron ore in this country. There are nine iron furnaces in eastern Tennessee that are not controlled by the United States Steel Corporation, that own their own ore lands, and they are shipping their pig iron to Pennsylvania; and in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee Mr. PALMER learned for the first time that southern furnaces were selling from 15,000 to 20,000 tons of pig iron per month on the Delaware River. I oppose free iron ore because it is a strike at the great pig-iron industry of the South, now producing over 3,000,000 tons per annum. The South is compelled to sell its output not in the South but in the Mississippi Valley and along the Atlantic coast and in the New England cities as far up as Boston, and if you give this advantage—free iron ore—to the Pennsylvania Steel Co., which owns also the Maryland Steel Co. and the Bethlehem Steel Co., you will have robbed the southern iron furnaces of the difference in the cost of laying down pig iron in the East in competition with the companies who own the iron-ore lands in Cuba and which are importing iron ore from Spain and Sweden.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] said, as I understood him, that the Steel Trust controlled practically all the iron-ore bodies in this country. The Republic Co., which is the principal independent company of this country, has 21 mines alone.

Mr. AUSTIN. I want to say, in reference to that, that if his statement was true that the United States Steel Corporation owned all the iron-ore lands in this country, would it not be for the benefit of the American wage earner in this country to buy all of that ore, to mine it in this country, and keep the money here, keep our men in the iron-ore mines of Alabama, New York, Michigan, Tennessee, and Minnesota employed, rather than to give employment to foreigners who work in the mines of Cuba, Spain, and Sweden?

What else do we do? According to the official records, we take out of the Treasury now about $300,000 in revenue and present that to the two great steel corporations, the Bethlehem Steel Co. and the Pennsylvania Steel Co. We present that to them, and as the result of it they will save from 30 to 45 cents a ton on the manufacture of pig iron, and with that advantage they will injure the sale of southern pig iron that is now shipped to the East on a freight charge of $4.20 a ton.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the eloquent appeal of my friend from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] for my constituents, because they are more involved in this question than are the gentleman's constituents. We have in the district I have the honor to represent a very much larger supply of iron ore than has the district represented by the gentleman from Tennessee, and probably the largest supply next to that of the district represented by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] who has spoken. On the other hand, we buy our ferromanganese.

Now, as a practical question, the appeal of the gentleman from Tennessee to keep this tax on iron ore is just exactly the same appeal that the citrus fruit men of California made to your side of the House four years ago—to raise the price on lemons in order to equalize freight rates to the eastern seaboard. That is all your argument means. You want us to keep a tax on iron ore in order that we may progress a little further into somebody else's territory and take care of freight rates.

Now, as a practical question it is not 30 or 45 cents a ton difference. Most of this iron ore comes from Cuba, and under the treaty the rate is 12 cents per ton from Cuba, which makes the rate on that iron ore used in a ton of pig iron about 24 cents, so that the actual benefit they get is 24 cents a ton; no more and no less.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is greater on Swedish ore and Spanish ore.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Very little Swedish ore comes in. There was formerly some Spanish ore that came in.

What is the practical question on this iron ore? Before the Payne bill was passed the duty on iron ore was 45 cents a ton. That duty was reduced under that bill to 15 cents a ton, and as it comes from Cuba it means 12 cents a ton. Now, up to the time the Payne bill became a law—which my friend voted for when the conference report came here—the producer of iron ore in the district of the gentleman from Minnesota and in the Wisconsin districts penetrated to the eastern seaboard. None now penetrates to the eastern seaboard. It came there under the 45 per cent duty. But when you reduced the tax to 12 cents from Cuba, then the freight rate intervened, and it was cheaper for the men on the eastern seaboard to buy it from Cuba than to buy it from Minnesota; and, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] said, you drew the line as to how far east the western ores could come at the Allegheny Mountains. Now, if you take off this 12 cents duty the freight rate with the 12 per cent off will stop the iron ore at the Allegheny Mountains.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not yield. I have only five minutes, and I want to finish. You are going to stop it there anyhow. The line of demarcation will be there under this bill, at the Allegheny Range, with free ore, just as it is to-day under the Payne bill with 15 cents on ore.

But there is another reason why this ore should be placed on the free list, and it is not going to affect the production in the gentleman's district. It is this: We have greatly reduced the tax on pig iron. The competitive point on pig iron is the eastern seaboard, where water transportation brings the foreign iron into competition with the domestic iron. There is no danger of competition with the furnaces of the gentleman's district, or of mine, or with the furnaces west of the Allegheny Mountains, because the $2.50 freight rate on pig iron shuts out the foreign product. The real point of competition is at the water front, and we have reduced the rate on pig iron. We have brought them down to a competitive rate, and whether it is your constituents or mine, representing all the people of the United States it is nothing but right that we should do justice to these blast-iron furnaces on the seaboard, and inasmuch as we have cut their rate to a competitive point, we should give them an open door so that they might have freer ore for their own territory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, just a word.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Did it not come out in the testimony that the Alabama furnaces sold from 15,000 tons to 20,000 tons of pig iron in Pennsylvania, on the Delaware River, and that their sales extended to New Jersey, Delaware, New England, New York City, Brooklyn, northern New Jersey, and Newark?

Mr. FORDNEY. That is my recollection; but I am not positive about the figures. But the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] now states that because of their lowering the duty on pig iron and putting iron ore upon the free list they have brought the products of this country on a competitive basis with foreign competitive products.

It will be remembered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that Mr. Gary, president of the United States Steel Corporation, testified before the Ways and Means Committee four years ago. When the question was put to him, "Can you produce pig iron and continue to manufacture steel in this country under free trade?" his answer was in the affirmative. He said, "There are some gentlemen in this room who will bear out my statement that by putting iron ore, pig iron, and steel on the free list you will drive out of existence the independent steel manufacturers in this country. Why? Because the United States Steel Corporation, that produces 44 per cent of all the steel produced in this country, can live under free trade when the independents must go out of business." The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee asked why that was. He asked, "Is your machinery more modern or more efficient? Have you greater experts in the manufacture of steel than have the independents?" Mr. Gary replied that the independent manufacturers of steel in this country purchased their pig iron from the United States Steel Corporation, and that there was no other pig iron produced in this country for them to purchase, and that the United States Steel Corporation made a profit of $2 per ton on that pig iron when selling it to the independent manufacturers, and that if worst came to worst that $2 per ton on their pig iron would be a profit to the Steel Corporation and the independents would be compelled to go out of business.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] corrects me when I say that Mr. Schwab testified that the Bethlehem Steel Co. owned all the iron mines in Cuba. He states that practically all the iron mines in Cuba were owned by them, as stated by Mr. Schwab. I accept the correction, but it is my recollection that Mr. Schwab said that the Bethlehem Steel Co., or he and Mr. Carnegie, owned all the iron mines in Cuba that had been discovered that were valuable, and that the iron ore produced in Cuba was much superior to the iron ore produced in this country in one certain respect—for the manufacture of open-hearth steel. To the iron ore mined in this country a certain amount of nickel must be added in the steel, but the ore from Cuba contains a sufficient amount of nickel, so that it is unnecessary that in the production of open-hearth steel made from Cuban ore any nickel be added.

But there is another disadvantage to the Cuban ore—that it contains a greater amount of moisture than the ore of the United States—but Mr. Schwab said he thought that in the near future some method of extracting that moisture economically would be discovered, and that in the near future Cuban ore would be much more valuable to the manufacturer of iron than the ore of this country. Therefore, gentlemen, in placing iron ore on the free list and bringing the manufacturer of pig iron in this country on a competitive basis with the foreigner there is no question in my mind that, without any intention of being unfair, you have erred in your judgment and you have thrown all the benefits to be derived to one concern in the United States—the United States Steel Corporation.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that at the end of five minutes the debate on this paragraph and amendments may be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that at the end of five minutes the debate on this paragraph and amendments shall be considered concluded. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will withdraw the request at this time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect to take any part in the debate on this subject. I did not think the House would want to hear from the stand-stiller who cut the duty on pig iron from $4 to $2.50 a ton and made as big a cut as this committee have made, because they have only cut in two the duty of $2.50, according to the equivalent ad valorem.

I did report a bill putting iron ore on the free list. What was the condition? The United States Steel Corporation had tried to get all the iron ore in sight up in Minnesota. They had made their contracts with Mr. Hill, which covered all his holdings and the interests with which he was allied up there, at a rate for the iron ore that was progressive and would have increased the price from year to year if it had not been interfered with, so that perhaps it would have satisfied my friend from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] on the iron ore there and my friend from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] on the iron ore up in that State. I thought that if we put iron ore on the free list it would help break up that little arrangement.

Although I have never made any progress, according to the ideas of some gentlemen, I did more to break up that monopoly on the part of the United States Steel Co. than appears anywhere in this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to suggest to the gentleman from New York that since that time the Hill leases have been canceled.

Mr. PAYNE. I was just about to say that they had been canceled; and why? Because of free iron ore, or iron ore at 12 cents a ton, which is pretty nearly free. They had to cancel the leases; they had to get out of it. They did not have a monopoly of sending the iron ore east of the Allegheny Mountains. It so happened that most of the independent manufacturers of iron and steel were east of the Alleghenies. While some of them were large concerns some were small, and they were making nearly 60 per cent of the production.

I acknowledge freely that I wanted to encourage them, or at least I did not want to turn or keep back the whole thing into the hands of the United States Steel Co. and leave these people at their mercy. I made what investigation I could, and I became satisfied that free iron ore would not hurt any iron mines in the United States except possibly those in the State of New York. I examined into that question pretty closely, because these were large interests, employing a good many people and turning out a good deal of ore. I became satisfied that they could stand free iron ore without injury to their business, largely because they had to have other ore to mingle with theirs in order to manufacture pig iron, and the only place they could get it from was the western mines, or else from Cuba or Nova Scotia.

The gentleman from Michigan misunderstood my reply a few minutes ago. I told him that while Charles M. Schwab said that he had an option or agreement, or had purchased a large quantity of ore in Cuba, that he did not claim that he had all of it. It was then undeveloped, and he frankly stated that he thought it was going to be a success. He did speak of moisture, but thought he could overcome that. Nobody that has come in contact with Mr. Schwab, who seems to make a very fair statement, and I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania will agree with me—I say nobody will deny that he has an engaging personality, and he certainly knows as much about the iron and steel industry as any man I ever met.

Mr. PALMER. He has engaged me in an interesting conflict several times. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state in the interest of accuracy that the United States Steel Corporation not only does not control all the iron ore in this country, but it does not control anything like one-half of the known deposits of iron ore

in this country. In the entire history of the business it never has controlled one-half.

I want to say further that the only known deposits of iron ore that can be imported into this country are controlled by the Pennsylvania Steel Co. and the companies controlled by Charles M. Schwab at Bethlehem. Four years ago the tariff on iron ore was reduced, as has been stated, from 40 cents a ton to 15 cents a ton. I then stated that that meant simply taking 25 cents a ton out of the Treasury of the United States and making a present of it to Charles M. Schwab and the Pennsylvania Steel Co., and that certainly was the effect. In six months after the bill was passed iron ore advanced 50 cents a ton in price. You can readily see that the effect of it was to take 25 cents from the United States Treasury and make a present to Charles M. Schwab and the Pennsylvania Steel Co., for they were the only people that imported iron ore into the country.

Now, following the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee, I say to you, and I think I know something about this business, that if you take the duty off iron ore, now 12 cents a ton from Cuba, it will not affect the price of pig iron to the consumer, it will not affect the price of anything in the country, but the only effect will be to take 12 cents a ton otherwise paid into the United States Treasury and make a present of it to Charles M. Schwab and the Pennsylvania Steel Co.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYES. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I was told only yesterday that the Bethlehem Steel Co. was now building and had nearly completed a fleet of vessels to run between here and South America for the purpose of carrying iron ore as soon as the Panama Canal was opened.

Mr. HAYES. That is true.

Mr. AUSTIN. And they have bought large holdings in Chile.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether or not it has been mentioned in this discussion, but I want to say further that the Steel Corporation has been favored in another matter in this bill, and that is the taking off the tariff on manganiferous ore. That is the only corporation in this country that imports manganiferous ore, so they have not only an advantage in the increase in the rate on ferromanganese, but they have the advantage of receiving their manganiferous ore into this country free of duty, and they are the only ones that can use it under the present conditions.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, there are some facts connected with the production of iron ore in our State of which I do not think the Committee on Ways and Means has been fully informed. The United States Steel Corporation by no means controls the major portion of the iron ore produced in our State. Since the Hill leases have been dissolved, and Mr. Hill and his companies will take charge of their holdings next year, they may from their large holdings produce as much as the total production of the Steel Corporation itself. In addition, there are quite a number of mines owned by independents, which produce almost as large a proportion as either of those two holdings already mentioned. Further, there have been discoveries of a new and vast range known as the Cayuna Range, west of the Mesabi Range, which promises to be as large a producer as any of those holdings that have yielded so much in the past. In the new range and in the Mesabi Range the State of Minnesota itself, in its public capacity, owns and controls a very large part of the production by its school and public land leases, and by its public policy, as declared by its legislature and its governor, the State is doing its best to protect the independent producers and the independent steel companies, to prevent monopoly and any possibility for oppressing any of our people, so that the United States Steel Co. by no means has the control of these products of our State. The independents in the future will have even a better opportunity to obtain whatever supplies may be necessary there by means of these policies and these new discoveries. One fact still further should be known by the Committee on Ways and Means. Quite a number of times during the past few years, at various large meetings of the commercial associations and of waterway associations, it has been stated that when the Erie Canal shall be finished this iron ore can be landed from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan ranges into Buffalo, there transferred to 1,200-ton canal barges, and taken thence through the canal and connecting waterways to the furnaces along the Atlantic coast almost as cheaply as can be done from importation. The advantage that the small tariff on this ore would mean right now would be in the development of these new and independent ranges in Minnesota, together with the proposed development of the new waterway and cheap transportation system from these ranges to the Atlantic coast. The problem of the new range in Minnesota is twofold—first, to separate the ore from the foreign matter, which must be done by means of large water supplies, which are at hand in northern Minnesota, and, second, to dry the ore after the foreign matter has been washed out of it. Those processes are being developed and will be developed; but it takes a great deal of experimentation and a very great deal of money to do this work, and if you discourage that now, while the new processes of mining and preparing and new methods of transportation are being developed, you will discourage the development of the iron mining, preparation, transportation, and you will help the large holdings of the steel company and discourage the independent producers and the independent competitors of the Steel Corporation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FESS rose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I overlooked the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 10 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. I do not want more than 2 or 3 minutes upon this amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment I desire to offer.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Is it about this ore paragraph?

Mr. AUSTIN. It is to the pig-iron paragraph under consideration.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to cut out any gentlemen who want to speak to the bill. I understand the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] desires to address the committee. I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended to 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Reserving the right to object, there are two or three amendments, and it will be a question how we may divide the time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In 15 minutes with three gentlemen desiring time, each one would have 5 minutes. I have withdrawn my motion, so that each one of the gentlemen could have 5 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think there has been too much crimination and recrimination against men who rise to speak on this measure as being prejudiced in the interest of the productions in their own districts. I feel a little somewhat like John C. Calhoun, who once said that simply because I believe in a principle that favors my own section that does not mean I am opposed to that principle when applied to another section; and I think that the leader of the majority here upon this particular phase has exemplified this fact with reference to the duty on ore. I would not charge the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] with favoring this particular increase of 35 per cent duty on manganese because he comes from the section possessing United States steel industries. I do not think that statement is quite fair; and I am objecting to the charge of selfishness or sectional interest if I rise to speak in the interest of any particular commodity which happens to be produced in my district that I shall be open to the imputation that my views are colored by my interest in that commodity. That is unfair. This is a larger principle than that. I want to raise this one question here, however, in reference to the point under discussion. President Wilson said that one of the problems before the public was to give equal opportunity to everybody in the rivalry of life. The Democratic Party professes to believe in equalizing opportunities, as I understand it from their platform and their various utterances upon this floor and in the press, and it seems that the Democratic Party has been in opposition to the large concentration of power, if we can rely upon their statements. That seems to be one of the problems for our solution to-day.

This is the question I want to raise: Does not this particular phase of this bill which increases the duty on manganese 350 per cent favor the United States Steel Corporation as against the independent producer? Is not that in direct conflict with the oft-repeated statement of the Democratic leadership and Democratic Party and its following? I think it is. What is the United States Steel Corporation? It is the largest corporation, perhaps, in the world to-day, with a capitalization of

$1,437,000,000, with units numbering up to 200, and with an ownership in the ores of the country, according to the Commissioner of Corporations, that amounts to from 500,000,000 to 700,000,000 tons in their own title; possessing more than a thousand miles of railroads in their own ownership. This corporation owns more than 100 lake vessels carrying ore upon the Lakes. It owns 50,000 acres of the best grade of coal that is found to-day in this country. This tremendous corporation has an annual capacity of 9,000,000 tons of steel. It can thus save the expense of many of these various items that the independent producer must pay for. The independent producer pays for the coal because he must seek it in the mine, while the United States Steel Corporation owns its mines which supply its needs. The independent producer pays for the ore which he does not possess, although many producers do own ore mines, while the United States Steel Corporation draws its supply from its own mines, with a capacity of hundreds of millions of tons. The United States Steel Corporation does not feel the high railroad rates because it owns 1,000 miles of railroads. It saves upon the rail transportation, also upon the lake transportation, both of which are important items in the estimates of costs.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. STANLEY. What independents does the gentleman refer to when he says they own no ore and no transportation facilities?

Mr. FESS. I would answer the gentleman that I do not mean that no independent corporation owns any ore. There are many independent corporations that do not own their own ore. I have an independent steel manufacturer in my district who does not own any ore, and there are hundreds of others. The United States Steel Corporation produces 47 per cent, according to the Commissioner of Corporations, of the steel products, which leaves 53 per cent that is produced by the independent mills. It must appear at once how difficult it will be for the small producer to compete with this enormous corporation, with its numerous advantages.

Mr. Chairman, we are informed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] that there is no ferromanganese produced in this country except that which the United States Steel Corporation produces for its own use. That being the case, since the corporation chooses to produce it rather than import it at a rate of $2.50, the rate fixed by the Payne tariff bill, how can the small producer afford to pay $8 duty, as proposed by your bill? Since the independent mill can not purchase it from the United States Steel Corporation, as we are informed the latter does not produce it for sale, it will be compelled to pay $8 duty if this bill becomes law, while its mighty rival can supply its own mills. Is this not a discrimination in favor of the trust? What about the equal opportunity in the world of production about which we hear so much these days?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time is up.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I desire to offer an amendment to paragraph 104, which I understand we have not passed.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Kentucky that there is an understanding under which debate is to close at the end of 15 minutes and that time is to be divided between three gentlemen indicated who desire to be heard. That is included in the motion of the gentleman from Alabama, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania is one of those gentlemen.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. I want to offer an amendment at the end of paragraph 104, which I understand is still under consideration.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No, Mr. Chairman; I make the point of order that the paragraph is passed. The paragraph that we are considering is the paragraph that the gentleman from Minnesota offered as an independent section.

Mr. MOORE. My understanding was clear. I was watching the situation. My understanding was that the gentleman's motion was an amendment to that paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] offers an amendment as a new paragraph, No. 104½, and that is the pending paragraph, and paragraph 104 has been passed.

Mr. MANN. Is not the time limited on the debate, anyhow?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman ought not to object to the offering of an amendment.

Mr. MOORE. I have no desire to speak to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]. Will the gentleman ask unanimous consent to return?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If there was a misunderstanding on the gentleman's part as to the previous paragraph, he can send up his amendment and let it be voted on.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman can proceed.

Mr. MOORE. There is a pending amendment, and I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can send it to the desk and the Chair will put it. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 12, after the word "remanufactured," strike out the word "ferromanganese"; and at the end of line 16, same page, strike out the period and insert a semicolon; and insert also the following: "Ferromanganese, $2.50 per ton."

Mr. MOORE. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. AUSTIN. May I offer my amendment?

Mr. MOORE. The line was so tightly drawn in the discussion over ferromanganese between those of us on this side of the House who believe this ad valorem rate to be excessive and in the interests of the great United States Steel Corporation and the other side of the House, which seems to believe that it was acting in the interests of the consumers of the land, that I call for a vote on the amendment, which squarely states the issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 38, noes 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 9, page 27, strike out "8 per cent ad valorem" and insert "$2.50 per ton."

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer proposes to retain the present duty on pig iron—$2.50 per ton. As I understand the new duty on pig iron, it will place a duty of 80 cents to $1.25 per ton on it, the amount depending upon the market value. The estimate of the Committee on Ways and Means on importations of pig iron the first year under this bill is $1,500,000, and the importations under the present law last year were $384,000, making a total increase in the importations of pig iron made abroad of $1,115,000 per annum under the new bill. I believe the weight of testimony before the Ways and Means Committee at the hearings developed the fact that the amount or cost of labor in the production of a ton of pig iron was 80 per cent. Eighty per cent of the amount would show the wages involved in the increased importations would be $892,000 per annum, or during four years under the operation of the Underwood bill the amount of wages would be $3,578,000.43. In other words, we are going to take from the wage earners of this country who are engaged in the manufacture of pig iron $3,578,000, and give that money to the wage earners in the iron furnaces of England, Germany, Scotland, and China. They are making pig iron in China from $7 to $8 per ton. The transportation charges across the Pacific Ocean are $2.50 per ton.

We heard a speech on the floor of the House from the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] in reference to the pending Japanese question in the State of California. We voted during the last session of Congress for the restriction of undesirable foreign immigration, and came within 6 or 8 votes of a two-thirds vote of passing the measure over the unwise veto of President Taft. The argument was that we should protect the American wage earner from the importation of cheap foreign labor into this country. We proposed by the adoption of this new rate on pig iron not to protect the American wage earner in iron furnaces, but to transfer employment from our iron ore mines and our big independent iron furnaces in Alabama, Tennessee, and in the North, and give that work to their competitors in foreign lands. Now, I stated, in the discussion of this metal schedule a year ago, that since the importation of pig iron from China under the reduction of the tariff duty on pig iron the Birmingham furnaces had virtually been driven out of the Pacific coast market. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] said:

I will say to my friend, Mr. AUSTIN, that they never did—namely, that the Birmingham mills never did sell any pig iron on the Pacific coast.

Now, I know that the gentleman from Alabama did not intend to make a misstatement. He evidently forgot the facts, because I hold in my hand a letter from the vice president of the Sloss-Sheffield Steel & Iron Co., of Birmingham, Ala., in which

he states that even under the present law they sold 11,880 tons on the Pacific coast, and that under the operations of the Dingley bill they sold 25,000 tons there.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will allow me, it costs them $10.50 a ton. If that is so, I never heard of it; it is an exceptional case. It costs $10.50 to carry a ton from Birmingham to the Pacific coast. It costs the English manufacturer $5.

Now, if they can pay a differential freight rate of $5.50 from Birmingham to the Pacific coast, in the Lord's name, what do they want with a tariff rate to protect them on the Atlantic seaboard?

Mr. AUSTIN. Here is a letter from the vice president of the Sloss-Sheffield Steel & Iron Co., showing that they did sell on the Pacific coast. On the completion of the Panama Canal I say Birmingham and Tennessee will be able to ship pig iron to the Pacific coast at less than $10 per ton—perhaps $2.50 per ton—and will be able successfully to meet the Chinese and English pig iron, provided we can retain the present duty on pig iron.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

105. All iron in slabs, blooms, loops, or other forms less finished than iron in bars, and more advanced than pig iron, except castings; muck bars, bar iron, square iron, rolled or hammered, round iron, in coils or rods, bars or shapes of rolled or hammered iron not specially provided for in this section, 8 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, this provision, with reference to the effort to increase the tax on slabs, structural forms, and pig iron, is utterly indefensible.

In the first place, there is no menace from Chinese or Japanese pig iron. The furnaces that are now erected in China are, the largest of them, under the supervision of an American engineer, the greatest engineer on the globe to-day, Julian Kennedy, who appeared here as a Republican and was for a long time in charge of the works of the Carnegie Steel Co. He stated that from his actual knowledge it costs as much to produce a ton of pig iron in China as it costs in the United States, and he had made pig iron in both countries.

It is universally conceded that a ton of pig iron can be made at Birmingham, Ala., $4 cheaper than anywhere else in the United States, and Judge Gary and Charlie Schwab and the whole outfit of them admit that we can produce pig iron in the United States cheaper than anywhere else on the habitable globe.

There is an equal amount of nonsense in this hue and cry about producing pig iron with American labor. There is no more American labor used in the production of pig iron in Pittsburgh than is used in Hongkong. I know, too, that the pig iron made in India and the pig iron made in China is made under the supervision of American overseers and American skilled workmen, and the pig iron made in the United States is made under the supervision of Americans, making identically the same labor as when made abroad. Over 50 per cent of the men employed in the blast furnaces in Pittsburgh can not speak the English language. Eighty per cent are foreign born. Not one-tenth of the unskilled labor used in the manufacture of pig iron to-day in Pittsburgh and at Gary but what are either foreign born or of alien parentage. Sixty per cent and over of the miners at the Mesabi Range, digging this ore, are foreign born, and nine-tenths of them do not stay in this country more than 10 years, according to the reports of your Commissioner of Labor.

It is a question of foreign labor both here and there, either way. The work about the pig-iron furnaces is simple but onerous. Those men are worked from 12 to 20 hours a day and seven days in the week. That labor is the poorest-paid skilled labor to-day in the United States, and the Dago and the Montenegrin and the Bohunk and the Syrian have long since not only driven out the American laborer but driven out the German and the Scandinavian and the Welshman and the Englishman.

The only profit that is made by the so-called independents or by the United States Steel Corporation from the manufacture of pig iron is made by the men who own the furnaces and the men who manipulate the bonds.

You talk about the independents having to buy their ore. Where are any independents making pig iron? The United States Steel Corporation makes 2,000,000 less tons of pig iron than tons of steel, although it takes 11 tons of pig iron to make 10 tons of steel.

The Lackawanna Steel Co., the Bethlehem Steel Co., the Cambria Steel Co.—all these great steel companies in the East—own their own ships and boats, and they own their own deposits of ore. In Birmingham, Ala., they not only work foreign labor, but they work slave labor. They work convicts in the mines—that is, of the Steel Corporation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman is mistaken. There is no convict labor worked at any furnaces or ore mines.

Mr. STANLEY. They work them in the coal mines.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is some convict labor worked in some of the coal mines, but I think practically now all those coal mines are independent mines.

Mr. STANLEY. I will say for the independent companies in Birmingham that they do not do that, but I have it from the sworn testimony of men who know that until very recently the Steel Corporation sent runners out to the police courts to get boys that were arrested for playing cards on public conveyances or taking a drink of whisky or some other misdemeanor, to get the fellows who were confined in the jails and from the police courts to put them in these mines.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. STANLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. I think the gentleman's memory with reference to the testimony before the committee is mixed with what somebody said they would testify to, because I cross-examined the witnesses before the committee with reference to the particular matter referred to in Birmingham, and the witnesses did not bear out the statements that had been made to the chairman before they came before that committee.

Mr. STANLEY. I will put statements in the RECORD made by Mr. Harrison, of the Sage Foundation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. STANLEY. I ask unanimous consent for one minute.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield to the gentleman a minute from my time.

Mr. STANLEY. I do not wish to do anybody an injustice. What I wish to state is that this idea that there is American labor in the coal mines or in the iron mines or about the blast furnaces of the Steel Corporation, whether in Birmingham, in Pittsburgh, or anywhere else, is all moonshine. There is no American labor there except the skilled labor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not desire to contradict the gentleman, but I must do justice to my own constituency. I do not know where the gentleman got his information, but it is absolutely unwarranted by facts. There never has been any convict labor in any blast furnaces in Alabama.

Mr. STANLEY. If I used the words "blast furnaces," it was an error. I referred to the coal mines.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There never was any convict labor employed in the iron mines. There was a time when the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co., now a subsidiary company of the United States Steel Corporation, did work convicts in its coal mines. I am not sure, but I am under the impression that it does not do so now. There are some independent coal operators who do work convicts in their mines.

Mr. BARTLETT. Permit me to say that the testimony from the Steel Corporation before the committee was that they had abandoned that, or at least that that contract had expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It had. Now, as to the gentleman's reference to their gathering men from the police courts, I want to say that he is mistaken in that, because that class of convicts are not worked in the mines. The class of convicts who are worked in the mines are State convicts.

Mr. STANLEY. The difference is this: The State convicts are worked in the mines by the State. Convicts from the jails, convicted of misdemeanors, are worked by the corporation itself. It has its own jail and its own guardians over them. This statement is made——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. What corporation is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. STANLEY. The Tennessee Coal & Iron Co., now the United States Steel Corporation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. STANLEY. This statement is made by Mr. Harrison, of the Sage Foundation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not yield any further time, because I want to use it. I am satisfied the gentleman thinks he is correctly informed, but I know he is not, and I think he is doing my people an injustice.

I voted to put iron on the free list. I have cut the products of this schedule without opposition, and it comes out of my

own district; but I can not stand here and allow a statement to be made—I do not mean to charge that it was made intentionally by the gentleman—which is a slander of the constituency that I represent, because the condition described by the gentleman does not exist.

And more than that, although there may be a very low class of European labor that work in some districts of the North, I will say that, so far as my district is concerned, a great deal of the labor is American labor coming out of the hills and mountains of Alabama, and the white labor in that district is largely from northern Europe. The Italians we have in our country do not work in the mines and factories. We have Italians, but they are not engaged either in the furnaces or mines to any great extent. The miners we do have there of foreign birth are made up of old Scotch and Welsh miners that came to Alabama after the great strike in Pennsylvania 30 years ago. So that, although I speak for no other part of the country, I do speak for my district. I do not know from whom the gentleman from Kentucky got his information, but I do say that, as to the district I represent, the facts that he has detailed are not true.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], as he always does, gave us an interesting word picture, but, as usual, conspicuous as a monumental example of inaccuracy of statement.

Mr. Chairman, words idly uttered, even upon the floor of this House, may be taken outside with a degree of seriousness by those who are not acquainted with the habitual methods of the speaker. I can not for one pass in silence and let the statement the gentleman has made go by unanswered. When he says that nine-tenths of the 25,000 miners in my county, whom I represent, do not stay in the United States for a period of five years, he states absolutely that which is not true, however much he may think it is true.

Mr. Chairman, the miners in Minnesota, most of them, are old in experience; most of them have been there a great many years, or elsewhere in the United States, and the big majority of them either are citizens or are in the process of becoming citizens of the United States. [Applause.] They are drawing from $2.35 to $3.50 per day. They are building themselves homes; they are buying themselves farms; and they are sending their children to the best-provided schools on God's earth. These boys and girls are growing up to love the American flag. They are growing up to become citizens of the highest character and standing, and any father and mother who will give to their children these advantages, and keep them in these advantages, are not entitled to the description the gentleman from Kentucky has given them. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Kentucky says we have them work from 12 to 20 hours a day. Mr. Chairman, I marvel whence came to him that phantasmagoric dream of a disordered fancy. They work 8 hours a day, and there are three shifts a day.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I stated that in the blast furnaces the employees work 12 hours a day. I quoted the record. The gentleman is not contradicting me, he is contradicting the Commissioner of Labor in a written report.

Mr. MILLER. I am not contradicting anything the gentleman said about blast furnaces, because I do not know anything about them. I am contradicting what he said about the laborers in the mines which he classed with all those, and it is that ridiculous looseness of statement that I think ought not to go unchallenged.

Now, one word in regard to the iron-ore situation, which seems to trouble many gentlemen. I have heard it stated on the floor of the House time and time again, and more often by the gentleman from Kentucky than by anyone else, that the United States Steel Corporation controls the iron-ore deposits in the United States. They never did; they do to-day less than they ever did before. I suppose they control more iron ore in the State of Minnesota than any other part of the country, because there is more iron ore there. Their headquarters are there, their greatest mines are there, because there is found the world's greatest iron-producing region.

Mr. Chairman, the Minnesota State tax board has made extended investigation. Their last report shows that the United States Steel Corporation now in operation of known deposits does not now control over 50 per cent of the ore in my State. Prior to the relinquishment of the so-called Hill lease a year or so ago the Steel Corporation controlled about 63 per cent of the ore in my State. When we also consider the great area recently discovered, known as the Cuyuna Range, one that promises to become one of the greatest iron ranges in the whole world, and in which the Steel Corporation does not control a ton of ore—when we consider this range, which the tax commission did not, the percentage of iron controlled by the Steel Corporation becomes very much less than 50 per cent. In the entire Lake Superior district, comprising Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan, the Steel Corporation controls only about 51.6 per cent. When we examine the situation Nation-wide, we find that the Steel Corporation controls less than 50 per cent of the developed or proven deposits; and as future years witness the proving and development of other deposits within the United States, the per cent controlled by that great corporation will be more and more reduced.

It is ridiculous to say that any one concern does control the iron-ore deposits or has them corralled.

I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], whom we all love and admire very much, when he said that he felt he had played a conspicuous part in divorcing the great northern ore deposits from the United States Steel Corporation. I dislike very much indeed to take from him any of the sentimental feeling he may have in that respect, but I desire to say that a power greater than the gentleman from New York brought about that dissolution. The omnipotent hand that fashioned the universe made that lease absolutely impossible of fulfillment. The discovery of large ore deposits previously unknown created a condition in the ore market such that even the Steel Corporation could not carry out the terms of its Hill lease.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

106. Beams, girders, joists, angles, channels, car-truck channels, tees, columns and posts or parts or sections of columns and posts, deck and bulb beams, sashes, frames, and building forms, together with all other structural shapes of iron or steel, whether plain, punched, or fitted for use, or whether assembled or manufactured, 12 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, it is all very well for the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], without facts or figures or any semblance of information except his bald and impudent assertion, to question the veracity and the accuracy of a gentleman upon this floor in a most offensive manner. He is making a pitiable exhibition, not of my looseness of statement but of his own lamentable ignorance. I have the facts here, which he will not question. I have the report of the tax commissioner of Minnesota, and he says the Steel Corporation owns the greater part of all Minnesota ore. I have a statement of the men who own the ore as to what portion they have of it. The minutes of the Steel Corporation show, Judge Gary himself states—

We certainly have everything on the Vermilion. We bought everything on Mesabi that is good, that is best, that is first class, with perhaps one exception, which we could not get.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Gayley reports that they own 90 per cent of all the best of the old-range ore. In 1901, Gayley declared it was the purpose of the Steel Corporation to get every pound of the remaining 10 per cent of Bessemer ore on the old ranges and all that was left on the Mesabi. Herbert Knox Smith, your own commissioner of corporations, states:

Authoritative data submitted to the Senate Finance Committee in 1909 by a prominent iron manufacturer, with the Steel Corporation's consent, showed that the corporation itself then reckoned on about 1,625,000,000 tons of lake ore, of which 1,258,000,000 tons was of the current commercial standard. On this basis, therefore, the Steel Corporation would have had over 75 per cent of the total commercial available ore in the entire Lake Superior region.

* * * * * * *

In 1907 the holdings of the Steel Corporation in Minnesota, which State includes the Mesabi and Vermilion ranges, according to a carefully prepared schedule of the Minnesota tax commission, amounted to about 913,000,000 tons, or 76 per cent of the total ore deposits of the State.

Now, that is according to the State tax commissioner, which commissioner is quoted by Herbert Knox Smith.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I can not now. By 1909 the corporation had made further inroads into the slender supply of ores still remaining in this region. Herbert Knox Smith, your Commissioner of Corporations, reports:

In this connection it may be noted that the secretary of the Minnesota tax commission, in a letter to the Commissioner of Corporations, dated May 12, 1909, said: "They (the United States Steel Corporation) now control at least 80 per cent of the present known tonnage in the State."

And in the face of such figures as that the gentleman gets up here with his pitiable declaration about my inaccuracy of statement. The gentleman does not contradict my statement; he contradicts the authoritative record. The gentleman does not advertise my lack of information, but he makes a pitiable exhibition of his own ignorance and of a decent appreciation of his lack of any sort of information on this subject.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to move at the end of 15 minutes that debate on this paragraph close.

Mr. GARDNER. I would like about half a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close at the end of 15 minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] should have further entertained the House by some archaic figures, some back-number observations, and a full measure of rhetorical vituperation. The gentleman quotes from the Steel Corporation, under date of 1901. Iron ore was not discovered on the Mesabi Range until 1892, just 9 years before, and not 20 per cent of the present development had then occurred. What was true then is no more true now than that America is undiscovered, as it was in the youth of Columbus. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Keep still; I will not yield to the gentleman, as he would not yield to me.

Mr. STANLEY. I quoted from 1909.

Mr. MILLER. I will come to 1909 in just a minute. So much for the Steel Corporation's figures in 1901. I will say to the gentleman that since that date the available iron ores in Minnesota have multiplied sixfold and within a few years more they will multiply very many more times as we discover new fields.

Then he comes down a little bit further, and I am astounded that he is able to get within four years of the present. Good God, he has not been within 100 years of the nineteenth century since he began his investigation of the United States Steel Corporation. His committee sat for three months and took testimony that told to the world things we had known in Minnesota for 10 years, and nothing else except a lot of things nobody ever knew before and do not know now.

Mr. Chairman, with a prodigious effort he got within four years of to-day, and he did get a report of the tax commission; but if he had industry equal to his capacity to speak, he would get the figures now, and would find that since 1909 an entirely new range has been opened, greater, perhaps, than either of the others, and in which the Steel Corporation does not own one ton and does not control one ton of iron ore; and if he will come down to this point, he will also find that the Steel Corporation has given up its Hill lease and thereby lost a quarter of its holdings; and having done that, he will find that I told the truth. [Applause on the Republican side.] I invite the gentleman from rhetoric to facts. I invite the gentleman from vituperation to honest and careful consideration of the truth that the House and the country may know the facts. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] in his characterization of the statements of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY]. The only question in my mind is whether the gentleman from Minnesota is not wasting his time in undertaking to educate him, but I will add one more correction for the benefit of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY]. He stated that the independent manufacturers were not able to make pig iron, and that they bought it from the Steel Trust. He was not within 14,000,000 tons of being correct in that statement. The independents manufacture 44 per cent of the pig iron produced in this country.

And now I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that the most recent figures read by the gentleman from Kentucky took no account of the fact that the United States Steel Corporation has canceled its biggest lease, and that the iron-ore lands involved in that lease are no longer in the control of that corporation. Now, I only say it from memory, Mr. Chairman, because I have not had a chance to examine the facts lately, but I am quite sure—and I am speaking only as one of the committee that investigated the United States Steel Corporation—that last summer I came to the conclusion that this Steel Corporation owns or controls between 50 and 55 per cent of the Lake Superior ore lands. I can not tell just at the present instant the figures on which I based that conclusion a year ago, but I shall look them up. At all events, as a result of the cancellation of the Hill ore lease, the whole situation has been changed since the figures were prepared which have just been read by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield? Have you information as to whether or not the Steel Corporation has secured control of the transportation lines, namely, the ore vessels that transport the ore from Mesabi Range to the mills? Is it not a fact that they are in a position to collect a rebate from those who own and produce that ore?

Mr. GARDNER. Well, the best of my recollection is that the Steel Corporation controls two railroads which transport the iron ore from the Minnesota ranges down to Lake Superior. The railroads are the Duluth, Missabe & Northern and the Duluth & Iron Range.

Mr. MILLER. It is true they control those two, but there are four roads now hauling ore from the range.

Mr. GARDNER. Let me answer from my recollection. I am trying to answer the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN]. I think, at all events, in a large part of that territory, as I remember it, the Steel Corporation had a monopoly of the transportation to the lake. The gentleman from Minnesota in front of me says that the monopoly exists only with regard to ores of the Vermilion Range. The Vermilion is the second most important range.

I rather gathered the impression that it was to the corporation's advantage to have the railroads charge as high rates as possible. Obviously payments made by the Steel Corporation on account of freight pass from one pocket into another inasmuch as the corporation owns the railroads. On the other hand, excessive payments by competitors swell the corporation's profits, at the same time handicapping its competitors. Although I felt that there was great exaggeration in the statements with regard to these excessive payments, nevertheless, I came to the conclusion that the corporation ought not to be permitted to own those railroads. I am inclined to doubt whether it is a sufficient remedy to empower the Interstate Commerce Commission to control rates on those ore roads. Now, with regard to the lake transportation—as I remember it, there is free competition on the Lakes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. If the gentleman will permit, I just read an article in the newspapers where there had been a combination of all the lake-shipping interests, and the Steel Trust was really in control of the whole matter.

Mr. GARDNER. I am simply speaking of the conditions as they were when the investigating committee sat. My impression at the time was that there was free competition on the Lakes, but that the Steel Corporation had an advantage; perhaps they were entitled to it and perhaps they were not. It was largely due to the remarkable foresight displayed by its managers or their predecessors in securing advantageous terminal facilities. In the matter of lake terminals, to the best of my recollection, the United States Steel Corporation has a conspicuous advantage.

For instance, from Conneaut, on Lake Erie, to Pittsburgh, the corporation owns a railroad called the Bessemer & Lake Erie, or the Pittsburgh, Bessemer & Lake Erie—I always forget which railroad is the holding company. Obviously the higher the freight rate charged the better it is for the Steel Corporation. On its own freight its payments pass out of one pocket into the other pocket.

In the case of its competitors the situation is quite otherwise, I did not take the point of view of some gentlemen that this opportunity was flagrantly and outrageously abused. Nevertheless, I doubt whether the Steel Corporation ought to be allowed to own the Pittsburgh, Bessemer & Lake Erie Railroad.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

108. Iron or steel anchors or parts thereof; forgings of iron or steel, or of combined iron and steel, but not machined, tooled, or otherwise advanced in condition by any process or operation subsequent to the forging process, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem; antifriction balls, ball bearings, and roller bearings, of iron or steel or other metal, finished or unfinished, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 18, insert, after the word "unfinished," the words "and parts thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking a question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

Under the bill of the last Congress friction balls and ball bearings and roller bearings were subject to a duty of 25 per cent. That duty seems to have been increased to 35 per cent in this bill. I would like to know the reason for this change of heart.

Mr. PALMER. The reason for it is that we found on further investigation that of the amount of production of ball bearings and antifriction ball bearings in this country the imports under

the present rate were a larger proportion of the domestic production than had been supposed. The old rate is 45 per cent, which is now highly protective, because about 75 per cent of the antifriction balls are imported into this country—75 per cent of the American production. I speak roughly; I can not give you the exact figures. So that we raised the rate from 25 per cent to 35 per cent, believing that it was already highly competitive.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the gentleman think it remarkable that he did not have this all-important information when he wrote the other bill?

Mr. PALMER. Well, I think the situation is somewhat changed since the other bill was prepared, and I will say that we had more information at the time this bill was written than we had two years ago or a year and a half ago, of course, because we have been working upon these matters ever since.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] that he has raised the rate on these ball bearings from 25 per cent, as proposed a year ago, to 35 per cent. The present rate is 45 per cent.

The raising of the rate from 25 per cent, as contained in the bill a year ago, to 35 per cent is intended as a protection measure, pure and simple. If the rate were fixed at 25 per cent, all of these ball bearings could be imported. With a 35 per cent rate it is expected that there will be practically no increase of importations and no change in price in this country. The addition from 25 to 35 per cent is intended to protect the industries of the country. I hope it will be a successful protection, and to the extent that it is protective I congratulate my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania and welcome him, to that extent, to the protection ranks. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PALMER. Well, if the gentleman from Illinois will excuse me——

Mr. MANN. Certainly——

Mr. PALMER. He will understand that in an article where the rate is now competitive, so that perhaps three-quarters of the amount of the American product comes through the custom-house, the result of an increase from 25 per cent to 35 per cent will simply be an increase in the revenue which the Government will receive.

Mr. MANN. But there is no pretense that there will be any increase in the revenue by this measure, from this paragraph.

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Unless the gentleman again repudiates the figure submitted by his committee.

Mr. PALMER. Thirty-five per cent is more than 25 per cent. The gentleman knows that, or ought to know it.

Mr. MANN. The duty collected on these articles under the present law in 1912 was $679,000. The gentleman estimates that under this bill there will be collected $560,000. It is certainly not as a revenue measure that the gentleman proposes to decrease the amount of collections. This duty is raised as a protection measure. Whether it will be successful or not I do not undertake to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

111. All iron or steel sheets, plates, or strips, and all hoop, band, or scroll iron or steel, when galvanized or coated with zinc, spelter, or other metals, or any alloy of those metals; sheets or plates composed of iron, steel, copper, nickel, or other metal with layers of other metal or metals imposed thereon by forging, hammering, rolling, or welding; sheets of iron or steel, polished, planished, or glanced, by whatever name designated, including such as have been pickled or cleaned by acid, or by any other material or process, or which are cold rolled, smoothed only, not polished, and such as are cold hammered, blued, brightened, tempered, or polished by any process to such perfected surface finish or polish better than the grade of cold rolled, smoothed only; and sheets or plates of iron or steel, or taggers iron or steel, coated with tin or lead, or with a mixture of which these metals, or either of them is a component part, by the dipping or any other process, and commercially known as tin plates, terne plates, and taggers tin, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 16, after the word "valorem," strike out the period and insert the following:

"Tin plates, coated with metal, and metal sheets decorated in colors or coated with nickel or other metals, by dipping, printing, stenciling, or other process, 20 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment can be stated very briefly. This is the tin-plate paragraph. There is no provision in the law for tin plate covered with other metal, and under the law as written any such plates would come in under the basket clause in this bill at 25 per cent. We think they should bear the same rate when covered with metal as steel sheets bear when covered with tin, and consequently we insert them here, where they logically belong.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, no man has had much opportunity to know very much about this schedule. There has not been sufficient time for any man to examine it carefully; but this paragraph seems to me entirely and wholly inexcusable. It puts a number of products, made by different processes, in different stages of manufacture, all at the same ad valorem rate. In many instances that ad valorem rate is in excess of the total labor cost, and I am inclined to think in excess of the total converting cost involved in bringing the article to the state of manufacture covered by this paragraph.

Under the Payne law the articles in this paragraph were covered by specific duties covering the conversion cost, in some instances much higher than the conversion cost, it is true, but conforming in most particulars to the conversion cost involved in making the article. The 20 per cent duty provided in this bill is, in many instances, as I have said, several times the labor cost involved in bringing the article to the stage of manufacture covered by the paragraph. In many instances 5 per cent would be amply sufficient to cover the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] will more nearly conform to the pledge of his party for downward revision if he follows the classification pursued in the Payne law and reduces some of the rates provided in this paragraph instead of increasing the rates by the application of a flat rate of 20 per cent ad valorem.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] a question that perhaps I should have propounded under the one hundred and ninth paragraph of the bill. I understand the design is to make cotton ties free, whilst other hoops of iron or steel are subject to an ad valorem duty of 12 per cent. Now, I am told that the same phraseology has been used in this paragraph, putting cotton ties on the free list, as formerly was used in other tariff bills where cotton ties were put in with other hoops and strips of steel subjected to a duty. I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he is satisfied that there is a sufficient distinction made in describing the cotton ties in the five hundred and fourteenth section of the free list, or if he does not think that there are a great many strips of steel that are not designed for cotton ties that might be imported under the one hundred and ninth section?

Mr. PALMER. I will say to my colleague that the language of section 514 was drafted after a conference with experts in the Treasury Department, and we believe it is clear enough to cover simply cotton ties and baling ties.

Mr. HULINGS. How is it with the one hundred and ninth section—hoops and bands of steel and iron?

Mr. PALMER. Section 109 provides for band iron or steel "not otherwise provided for in this section," which means, as far as that paragraph is concerned, "not provided for in paragraph 514," which is also a part of the same section as paragraph 109. So under the bill as it now stands cotton ties would come in under 514 free, and all band, hoop, or scroll iron under 109 at 12 per cent.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman is satisfied that that makes the distinction, very well.

Mr. PALMER. I am satisfied that it makes it as clearly as language can make it. We intended to put cotton ties on the free list in paragraph 514, and it is so written. In the opinion of the cotton producer and the persons who buy cotton ties, in the opinion of the manufacturers of hoop and band iron, it will put cotton ties on the free list. The only question is whether in doing it something else which looks like cotton ties may go on the free list. But I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that section 514 requires something to have been done to the hoop or band steel to indicate the purpose for which it is going to be used, and that process will be a sufficient indication to allow only such ties to come in.

I recognize that there is some difficulty about it. There may be trouble about it, but in accordance with our purpose to put baling ties on the free list, it being impossible to make it more definite, we believe that we have got as near to our purpose as we can.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I have a communication from the Sharon Hoop Steel Co., a large independent concern in my district making these articles, and they suggest that under the phraseology used in section 514, which is the same as heretofore used in describing ties as hoops or bands when they were all subject to duty, that they believe that the division of cotton ties in that paragraph 514 should be as stated in this letter, which was directed to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

SHARON STEEL HOOP CO.,
Sharon, Pa., April 21, 1913.

DEAR SIR: I would respectfully direct your attention to paragraph No. 518 in the free list of the Underwood bill now under consideration in the House. This paragraph reads:

"Hoop or band iron or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity."

As I understood, when appearing before your committee, this was designed to admit cotton ties only to this country free of duty. As the paragraph is worded it will be impossible for even an expert in the steel business to prevent the free importation of hoops and other similar commodities unless the phraseology is changed.

Paragraph No. 111 of Schedule C of the bill provides for a duty on hoops and bands or scroll iron or steel of 12 per cent ad valorem, and the two paragraphs are necessarily conflicting.

If I am correct in my understanding that it is the purpose of the committee to admit cotton ties free, but to give to hoops and bands the same rate of duty as to other like steel commodities for revenue purposes, then there is no doubt but that the phraseology of paragraph No. 518 should be changed. As a cotton tie is a strip of steel 15/16 of an inch wide by 20 gauge, coated with cotton varnish, put up in bundles of 45 each, each bundle having 30 buckles, I would earnestly urge that a wording more correctly describing cotton ties be given, and in order to make the description broad enough to leave no question about cotton ties, regardless of some slight variation from the standard width, gauge, and length, being admitted free, would ask, if possible, that this paragraph be changed to read as follows:

"Strips of iron or steel narrower than 1¼ inches and lighter than 15 wire gauge, cut to length, painted or unpainted, with or without buckles, for baling cotton or any other commodity, and to be used as baling ties only."

Your attention to this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly, yours,

SHARON STEEL HOOP CO.,
———— ————, *President.*

Those are the suggestions of a gentleman who is in that business who fears that in the importation there will be a great many strips that look like cotton ties and fall within the phraseology, but which may be imported under paragraph 514 when they ought to fall under another paragraph carrying a tariff duty of 12 per cent.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I seldom quote figures from memory. Gentlemen who have furnished us with many broad assertions have quoted no figures, and have shown no authority whatever. I am so well acquainted with the data in this case that I can quote it accurately from memory. I wish to put in the RECORD certain statements from the report of Commissioner Neill, whom a Democratic President wished to keep in power on account of his ability and conservatism.

As you understand, about 80 per cent of the ores on the Mesabi Range prior to giving up the Hill leases were controlled by the Steel Corporation. The company which mined the ores was known as the Oliver Iron Mining Co. Of the total in the year 1907 of 12,018 employees, only 879 were native born. Those of foreign birth being 84.4 per cent of the total number of employees. Almost one-half foreign born, 49.3 per cent, had not resided in the United States over two years. I will put in the RECORD a table showing that out of 10,000 only 452 had resided 6 years; 3,237, 5 years; 900, 4 years; and only 1,205 over 10 years. Only 48.6 per cent of the employees considered in this table can speak English.

The table is as follows:

POPULATION AND NATIONALITY.

The mines have attracted a population remarkable in several ways. The increase of numbers has been rapid. The following table shows the population of the chief range communities in 1895, 1900, and 1905:

Population in the chief mining communities of St. Louis County, Minn., 1895, 1900, and 1905.

[From the Fifth Decennial Census of Minnesota, 1905, p. 42.]

Localities.	1895	1900[1]	1905	
			Number.	Percent of increase over 1895.
Aurora village	.....	.....	336	.....
Biwabik Township	365	500	541	48.2
Biwabik village	1,011	1,299	946	[2]6.4
Breitung (including Soudan)	1,464	2,034	1,344	[2]31.2
Buhl village	.....	.....	788	.....
Chisholm village	.....	.....	4,231	.....
Ely city	2,260	3,717	4,045	79.0
Eveleth city	764	2,752	5,332	597.9
Fayal Township	222	1,016	1,316	492.8
Hibbing village	1,085	2,481	6,566	505.2
McKinley village	136	262	232	70.6
Mesabi Mountain Township	708	1,296	940	32.8
Mountain Iron village	443	470	604	36.3
Sparta village	.....	950	960	.....
Stuntz Township	68	1,083	1,749	2,472.1
Tower city	1,265	1,366	1,340	5.9
Virginia city	3,647	2,962	6,056	66.1
St. Louis County (excluding Duluth)	19,199	29,963	52,571	173.8

[1] Figures from the Twelfth Census of the United States. [2] Decrease.

Several of these communities show an enormous increase in population from 1895 to 1905, while only two show a decline.

Of the population of St. Louis County, 84 per cent reside in cities or villages, which is very conclusive as to the predominance of the iron-ore industry.

The leading nationalities were Finnish, Austrian, Swedish, Canadian, and Norwegian, in the order named. As shown by the State census of 1905, the nationalities represented and their respective numbers in the chief mining centers were as follows:

Principal foreign-born elements of the population in the chief range communities of Minnesota, 1905.

[Data from the Fifth Decennial Census of Minnesota, 1905, p. 177.]

Localities.	Country of birth.							
	Germany.	Sweden.	Norway.	Denmark.	Canada.	Ireland.	England.	Russia.
Vermilion Range:								
Breitung (including Soudan)	7	130	21	2	7	3	20	.....
Ely city	22	101	29	5	55	9	104	13
Tower city	10	156	67	1	85	9	23	10
Mesabi Range:								
Aurora village	8	26	7	1	16	4	12	3
Biwabik Township	2	37	20	2	18	2	16	.....
Biwabik village	12	57	26	2	38	8	19	6
Buhl village	9	64	23	.....	24	1	6	7
Chisholm village	21	206	93	2	110	19	87	47
Eveleth city	38	325	77	6	151	39	119	65
Fayal Township	14	85	22	1	16	10	20	8
Hibbing village	72	516	314	9	498	.....	78	47
McKinley village	1	15	21	.....	1	2	6	1
Mesabi Mountain Township	7	38	2	.....	20	11	37	5
Mountain Iron village	5	20	17	5	34	13	14	4
Sparta village	5	17	8	.....	42	5	9	24
Stuntz Township	12	65	47	2	148	10	3	10
Virginia city	120	557	296	7	337	53	71	89
St. Louis County outside Duluth	770	4,228	1,898	112	2,433	312	763	400

Localities.	Country of birth.				Total foreign born.	Total native born.	Total population.
	Poland.	Finland.	Austria.	All other.			
Vermilion Range:							
Breitung (including Soudan)	.....	280	180	9	659	685	1,344
Ely city	.....	911	852	122	2,222	1,823	4,045
Tower city	.....	184	29	19	593	747	1,340
Mesabi Range:							
Aurora village	1	62	44	14	198	138	336
Biwabik Township	.....	111	98	14	320	221	541
Biwabik village	.....	287	44	17	516	430	946
Buhl village	.....	200	64	50	448	340	788
Chisholm village	43	1,197	693	187	2,705	1,526	4,231
Eveleth city	1	1,145	676	333	2,975	2,357	5,332
Fayal Township	5	152	430	164	927	389	1,316
Hibbing village	30	1,169	323	481	3,537	3,029	6,566
McKinley village	.....	31	34	4	116	116	232
Mesabi Mountain Township	.....	250	130	31	531	409	940
Mountain Iron village	.....	127	14	37	290	314	604
Sparta village	.....	347	116	11	584	376	960
Stuntz Township	9	220	279	299	1,104	645	1,749
Virginia city	77	1,193	136	123	3,059	2,997	6,056
St. Louis County outside Duluth	296	9,945	4,461	2,313	27,929	24,642	52,571

No statistics as to nationality are regularly kept by the mining companies, but the Oliver Iron Mining Co. has taken a census of its own employees at different times, the results of which are given below:

Length of residence in the United States of foreign-born employees of the Oliver Iron Mining Co., May 1, 1907, by race or people.

[Data supplied by the Oliver Iron Mining Co.]

Race or people.	Number living in the United States—						
	Under 1 year.	1 year.	2 years.	3 years.	4 years.	5 years.	6 years.
Austrian	135	199	155	92	76	55	29
Bohemian	3	14	8	3	4	3	3
Bosnian	24	58	39	11	9	3	1
Bulgarian	79	67	41	23	2	5	.....
Croatian	280	496	419	240	141	103	56
Czech	2	5	1	1	1	.....	.....
Dalmatian	43	34	25	4	10	4	1
English	.....	9	6	1	4	9	5
Finnish	263	389	464	244	271	263	134
Flemish	.....	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
French	3	4	4	1	2	2	3
French-Canadian	1	2	.....	1	.....	2	2
German	49	27	30	16	7	4	4
Greek	.....	.....	.....	1	1	.....	.....
Hebrew	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Hervat	2	3	4	2	3	2	3
Hungarian	8	8	12	5	3	3	1
Irish	.....	1	.....	1	2	1	2

Length of residence in the United States of foreign-born employees of the Oliver Iron Mining Co., etc.—Continued.

Race or people.	Number living in the United States—						
	Under 1 year.	1 year.	2 years.	3 years.	4 years.	5 years.	6 years.
Italian	27	39	40	19	37	24	14
Italian (north)	23	65	50	23	31	30	19
Italian (south)	43	79	101	50	47	54	35
Japanese			2				
Korean						1	
Lithuanian	1		1				
Macedonian	1						
Magyar	19	34	46	21	36	24	10
Montenegrin	35	40	21	5	1		
Polish	12	33	20	22	16	10	6
Roumanian	1	1	2	1			
Russian	3	11	8	9	7	4	
Ruthenian						1	1
Scandinavian	29	23	44	30	35	28	26
Scotch	1	1	1	1	2		2
Servian	16	29	18	15	7	6	2
Slav	26	30	26	23	20	12	12
Slovak	46	47	68	29	33	40	20
Slovenian	25	66	85	42	47	44	27
Syrian						1	
Tyrolese	5	10	18	13	18	11	9
Not reported	56	73	84	29	44	27	25
Total	1,261	1,879	1,856	976	917	776	452

Race or people.	Number living in the United States—						Total foreign born.
	7 years.	8 years.	9 years.	10 years.	Over 10 years.	Years not reported.	
Arabian	1						1
Austrian	19	16	5	4	27	2	814
Bohemian					11		49
Bosnian						1	146
Bulgarian	1	1			1		210
Croatian	25	29	13	12	59	8	1,881
Czech					1		11
Dalmatian	4	3		1			129
Dutch					2		2
English	2	5		5	114		160
Finnish	127	73	35	43	216	3	2,525
Flemish					1		3
French		2	2	1	44	1	69
French-Canadian	1	4	1		8		22
German	3	3	2	3	42		190
Greek					1		3
Hebrew	1				3		5
Hervat	1						20
Hungarian		3			5		48
Indian		1					1
Irish	1	1			71	1	81
Italian	12	3	1	3	15	1	235
Italian (north)	9	9	5	5	26	3	298
Italian (south)	26	12	5	8	35		495
Japanese							2
Korean							1
Lithuanian					1		3
Macedonian							1
Magyar	1	4	4	2	9		210
Montenegrin							102
Polish	9	1		5	15	2	151
Roumanian							5
Russian	1	2			5		50
Ruthenian					1		3
Scandinavian	14	23	12	11	241	5	521
Scotch	2	2			41		53
Scotch-Irish					1		1
Servian	1				1		95
Slav	10	7	4	3	18		191
Slovak	18	11	2	6	38	1	359
Slovenian	19	12	3	8	34	3	415
Syrian							1
Tyrolese	1	4	2	1	17		109
Welsh					3		3
Not reported	14	5	4	4	98	2	465
Total	323	236	100	125	1,205	33	10,139

Of the 12,018 employees of this company in 1907 only 1,879 were native born, those of foreign birth being 84.4 per cent of the total number employed. Almost half of the foreign born, 49.3 per cent, had not resided in the United States over two years. The races showing a large proportion who had resided in this country 10 years and over were: The Irish, with 87.7 per cent; Scotch, 77.4 per cent; English, 74.4 per cent; Scandinavian, 48.4 per cent; and German, 23.7 per cent. Those with a small proportion were: Bulgarians, with less than one-half of 1 per cent; Austrians and Croatians, with only 3.8 per cent; Italians, 8.9 per cent; Finns, 10.3 per cent; and Slavs, 11 per cent. Of all the foreign-born employees but 13.1 per cent had resided in the United States 10 years and over. The principal races with a residence of less than a year were the Montenegrins, with 34.3 per cent; Austrians, 16.6 per cent; Croatians, 14.9 per cent; Slavs, 13.6 per cent; and Slovaks, 12.8 per cent. Of all the foreign-born employees 12.4 per cent had resided in the United States less than one year.

In the following tabulation, which was furnished by the Oliver Iron Mining Co., American includes Canadians, English, Irish, and Scotch; Austrian includes, among others, Bulgarians, Bohemians, Hungarians, and Montenegrins; French and German includes Belgians, Swiss, and Hollanders; Finnish includes Russians; and Scandinavian includes Norwegians, Swedes, and Danes.

Nationality of the employees of the Oliver Iron Mining Co. on the various ranges of the Lake Superior region July 1, 1908, by locality.

[Data supplied by the Oliver Iron Mining Co.]

Locality.	American.		Austrian.		French and German.	
	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
Mesabi Range:						
Hibbing district	628	21.9	1,326	46.2	140	4.9
Mountain Iron district	217	22.9	446	47.1	16	1.7
Eveleth (Fayal) district	296	27.4	316	29.2	40	3.7
Eveleth (Adams) district	225	18.9	544	45.8	12	1.0
Biwabik district	74	20.9	204	57.5	4	1.1
Canisteo district	383	28.2	606	44.6	77	5.7
Total	1,823	23.4	3,442	44.1	289	3.7
Vermilion Range	85	15.3	291	52.2	13	2.3
Marquette Range	680	49.2	20	1.5	10	.7
Menominee Range	195	16.5	120	10.2	141	12.0
Gogebic Range	442	28.3	109	7.0	38	2.4
Grand total	3,225	25.8	3,982	31.9	491	3.9

Locality.	Finnish.		Italian.		Polish.	
	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
Mesabi Range:						
Hibbing district	212	7.4	378	13.2	65	2.2
Mountain Iron district	100	10.6	79	8.4		
Eveleth (Fayal) district	125	11.6	165	15.3	1	.1
Eveleth (Adams) district	188	15.8	123	10.3	20	1.7
Biwabik district	53	14.9	3	.8	2	.6
Canisteo district	92	6.8	51	3.7	5	.4
Total	770	9.9	799	10.2	93	1.2
Vermilion Range	100	18.0	21	3.8		
Marquette Range	415	30.0	108	7.8	7	.5
Menominee Range	81	6.9	201	17.0	79	6.7
Gogebic Range	405	26.0	162	10.4	199	12.7
Grand total	1,771	14.2	1,291	10.4	378	3.0

Locality.	Scandinavian.		Miscellaneous.		Total.	
	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
Mesabi Range:						
Hibbing district	116	4.0	6	0.2	2,871	100.0
Mountain Iron district	88	9.3			946	100.0
Eveleth (Fayal) district	135	12.5	2	.2	1,080	100.0
Eveleth (Adams) district	69	5.8	8	.7	1,189	100.0
Biwabik district	15	4.2			355	100.0
Canisteo district	143	10.5	2	.1	1,359	100.0
Total	566	7.3	18	.2	7,800	100.0
Vermilion Range	47	8.4			557	100.0
Marquette Range	142	10.3			1,382	100.0
Menominee Range	362	30.7			1,179	100.0
Gogebic Range	204	13.1	1	.1	1,560	100.0
Grand total	1,321	10.6	19	.2	12,478	100.0

Nationality of the employees of the Oliver Iron Mining Co. on the various ranges of the Lake Superior region June 1, 1908, by locality.

[Data supplied by the Oliver Iron Mining Co.]

Locality.	American.		Austrian.		Finnish.	
	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
Mesabi Range:						
Hibbing district	472	29.5	671	41.9	67	4.2
Chisholm district	149	9.1	1,002	61.5	154	9.5
Mountain Iron district	178	24.7	236	32.8	170	23.6
Eveleth (Fayal) district	262	20.7	377	29.8	256	20.2
Eveleth (Adams) district	283	21.4	603	45.7	140	10.6
Biwabik district	53	16.6	193	60.5	45	14.1
Canisteo district	355	22.8	733	47.1	131	8.4
Total	1,752	20.8	3,815	45.4	963	11.5
Vermilion Range	99	12.9	402	52.6	175	22.9
Marquette Range	739	49.5	40	2.7	372	24.9
Menominee Range	228	15.8	165	11.5	98	6.8
Gogebic Range	435	22.7	137	7.1	625	32.5
Grand total	3,253	23.2	4,559	32.5	2,233	15.9

Nationality of the employees of the Oliver Iron Mining Co., etc.—Contd.

Locality.	German.		French.		Italian.	
	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
Mesabi Range:						
Hibbing district	52	3.3	47	2.9	209	13.1
Mountain Iron district	5	.3	2	.1	155	9.5
Eveleth (Fayal) district	.....	.....	12	1.7	36	5.0
Eveleth (Adams) district	17	1.3	.....	.....	224	17.7
Biwabik district	9	.7	4	.3	177	13.4
Canisteo district	4	1.3	.....	.....	3	.9
	31	2.0	80	5.2	33	2.1
Total	118	1.4	145	1.7	837	10.0
Vermilion Range	2	.3	4	.5	30	3.9
Marquette Range	13	.9	5	.4	178	11.9
Menominee Range	33	2.3	122	8.5	284	19.7
Gogebic Range	12	.6	37	1.9	232	12.1
Grand total	178	1.3	313	2.2	1,561	11.1

Locality.	Scandinavian.		Polish.		Total.	
	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
Mesabi Range:						
Hibbing district	59	3.7	23	1.4	1,600	100.0
Chisholm district	104	6.4	58	3.6	1,629	100.0
Mountain Iron district	88	12.2	.....	.....	720	100.0
Eveleth (Fayal) district	108	8.5	23	1.8	1,267	100.0
Eveleth (Adams) district	84	6.4	20	1.5	1,320	100.0
Biwabik district	21	6.6	.....	.....	319	100.0
Canisteo district	179	11.5	14	.9	1,556	100.0
Total	643	7.6	138	1.6	8,411	100.0
Vermilion Range	53	6.9	.....	.....	765	100.0
Marquette Range	145	9.7	.....	.....	1,492	100.0
Menominee Range	407	28.3	102	7.1	1,439	100.0
Gogebic Range	184	9.6	260	13.5	1,922	100.0
Grand total	1,432	10.2	500	3.6	14,029	100.0

This company had 12,478 employees on July 1, 1908. The Americans were 25.8 per cent of this number. The Austrians were the most numerous, with 31.9 per cent. On the Vermilion range 52.2 per cent of the employees were Austrians.

On June 1, 1909, this company had 14,029 employees, of whom 23.2 per cent were Americans, 32.5 per cent Austrians, 15.9 per cent Finnish, etc. Those nationalities that showed an increased proportion employed in 1909 compared with 1908 were Austrians, Finnish, Italians, and Polish. Those that decreased were Americans, French, German, and Scandinavians.

Number and per cent of foreign-born employees of the Oliver Iron Mining Co. who speak English, May 1, 1907, by race or people.

[Data supplied by the Oliver Iron Mining Co. Figures do not include 25 persons not reporting as to whether they do or do not speak English.]

Race or people.	Speak English.		Do not speak English.	Total.
	Number.	Per cent.		
Arabian	1	100.0	.....	1
Austrian	244	30.0	570	814
Bohemian	25	51.0	24	49
Bosnian	29	19.9	117	146
Bulgarian	24	11.4	186	210
Croatian	580	30.8	1,310	1,881
Czech	2	18.2	9	11
Dalmatian	44	34.1	85	129
Dutch	2	100.0	.....	2
English	160	100.0	.....	160
Finnish	1,372	54.4	1,151	2,523
Flemish	1	33.3	2	3
French	64	92.8	5	69
French-Canadian	20	90.9	2	22
German	84	44.2	106	190
Greek	2	66.7	1	3
Hebrew	4	80.0	1	5
Hervat	9	45.0	11	20
Hungarian	23	47.9	25	48
Indian	1	100.0	.....	1
Irish	81	100.0	.....	81
Italian	146	62.1	89	235
Italian (north)	164	55.0	134	298
Italian (south)	257	51.9	238	495
Japanese	2	100.0	.....	2
Korean	1	100.0	.....	1
Lithuanian	3	100.0	.....	3
Macedonian	1	100.0	.....	1
Magyar	72	34.3	138	210
Montenegrin	28	27.5	74	102
Polish	70	46.4	81	151
Roumanian	2	40.0	3	5
Russian	22	44.0	28	50
Ruthenian	3	100.0	.....	3

Number and per cent of foreign-born employees, etc.—Continued.

Race or people.	Speak English.		Do not speak English.	Total.
	Number.	Per cent.		
Scandinavian	451	87.6	64	515
Scotch	53	100.0	.....	53
Scotch-Irish	1	100.0	.....	1
Servian	14	14.7	81	95
Slav	71	37.2	120	191
Slovak	145	40.4	214	359
Slovenian	327	79.0	87	414
Syrian	1	100.0	.....	1
Tyrolese	68	62.4	41	109
Welsh	3	100.0	.....	3
Not reported	240	53.5	209	449
Total	4,917	48.6	5,197	10,114

Only 48.6 per cent of the employees considered in this table can speak English. A considerable number of the races reported 100 per cent able to speak English, but the number of persons involved is too small upon which to base a conclusion. Austrians report 30 per cent; Croatians, 30.8 per cent; Magyars, 34.3 per cent; Slavs, 37.2 per cent; and Slovaks, 40.4 per cent speaking English, while the Italians report 55.2 per cent; Finnish, 54.4 per cent; Slovenians, 79 per cent; and Scandinavians, 87.6 per cent who speak English.

Number and per cent of foreign-born employees of the Oliver Iron Mining Co., 5 years in the United States, who have become naturalized, May 1, 1907, by race or people.

[Data supplied by the Oliver Iron Mining Co. Figures do not include 68 persons not reporting as to naturalization.]

Race of people.	Naturalized.		Not naturalized.	Total.
	Number.	Per cent.		
Arabian	.....	.....	1	1
Austrian	52	33.5	103	155
Bohemian	9	52.9	8	17
Bosnian	.....	.....	4	4
Bulgarian	2	25.0	6	8
Croatian	73	24.6	224	297
Czech	1	100.0	.....	1
Dalmatian	2	15.4	11	13
Dutch	2	100.0	.....	2
English	114	83.2	23	137
Finnish	310	34.9	578	888
Flemish	.....	.....	1	1
French	40	81.6	9	49
French-Canadian	9	50.0	9	18
German	41	68.3	19	60
Greek	1	100.0	.....	1
Hebrew	3	100.0	.....	3
Hervat	.....	.....	6	6
Hungarian	6	50.0	6	12
Indian	.....	.....	1	1
Irish	65	87.8	9	74
Italian	22	30.6	50	72
Italian (north)	35	34.3	67	102
Italian (south)	53	30.5	121	174
Korean	.....	.....	1	1
Lithuanian	.....	.....	1	1
Magyar	7	13.0	47	54
Polish	11	25.0	33	44
Russian	5	41.7	7	12
Ruthenian	1	33.3	2	3
Scandinavian	242	69.5	106	348
Scotch	33	82.5	7	40
Scotch-Irish	1	100.0	.....	1
Servian	1	11.1	8	9
Slav	21	31.8	45	66
Slovak	42	31.1	93	135
Slovenian	34	28.6	85	119
Syrian	.....	.....	1	1
Tyrolese	27	60.0	18	45
Welsh	3	100.0	.....	3
Not reported	83	48.5	88	171
Total	1,351	42.9	1,798	3,149

There have been naturalized 42.9 per cent of those who have been in the United States five years. About one-third of the Austrians, Finns, Italians, Slavs, and Slovaks have availed themselves of citizenship through the naturalization laws. Over 80 per cent of the English, Irish, and Scotch and 69.5 per cent of the Scandinavians are naturalized.

Number and per cent of foreign-born employees of the Oliver Iron Mining Co., 21 years of age and over, reporting conjugal condition, May 1, 1907, by race or people.

[Data supplied by the Oliver Iron Mining Co.]

Race or people.	Married.		Single.	Total.
	Number.	Per cent.		
Arabian	.....	.....	1	1
Austrian	343	52.3	313	656
Bohemian	21	52.5	19	40
Bosnian	78	68.4	36	114

Number and per cent of foreign-born employees, etc.—Continued.

Race or people.	Married.		Single.	Total.
	Number.	Per cent.		
Bulgarian	118	64.8	64	182
Croatian	903	58.4	642	1,545
Czech	4	40.0	6	10
Dalmatian	73	74.5	25	98
Dutch	1	50.0	1	2
English	89	58.2	64	153
Finnish	902	39.3	1,392	2,294
Flemish	1	33.3	2	3
French	41	63.1	24	65
French-Canadian	21	95.5	1	22
German	100	58.8	70	170
Greek	2	66.7	1	3
Hebrew	1	33.3	2	3
Hervat	10	52.6	9	19
Hungarian	27	62.8	16	43
Indian			1	1
Irish	36	45.0	44	80
Italian	106	50.7	103	209
Italian, north	147	56.5	113	260
Italian, south	263	59.2	181	444
Japanese			1	1
Korean	1	100.0		1
Lithuanian	1	33.3	2	3
Macedonian	1	100.0		1
Magyar	100	54.9	82	182
Montenegrin	26	34.7	49	75
Polish	65	47.4	72	137
Roumanian	4	80.0	1	5
Russian	23	53.5	20	43
Ruthenian	2	100.0		2
Scandinavian	225	47.5	249	474
Scotch	28	54.9	23	51
Scotch-Irish	1	100.0		1
Servian	31	46.3	36	67
Slav	95	57.2	71	166
Slovak	167	54.6	139	306
Slovenian	202	56.6	155	357
Syrian			1	1
Tyrolese	43	41.7	60	103
Welsh	1	33.3	2	3
Not reported	235	58.8	165	400
Total	4,538	51.6	4,258	8,796

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman give the figures showing that?

Mr. STANLEY. I will.

Mr. MILLER. From what is the gentleman reading?

Mr. STANLEY. From Commissioner Neill's report of 1907 and 1908. Here is a report of 1908 giving the total of——

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I was present a few moments ago when the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] was suppressed for not speaking to the subject matter before this House. I raise the point of order that the gentleman from Kentucky is not speaking to the subject matter before the House.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Connecticut if he will withhold that until the gentleman from Kentucky——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut makes the point of order that the gentleman from Kentucky is not addressing himself to the amendment before the House.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will permit me to correct a statement that has been made.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I submit that this ought to be fair. The gentleman from Tennessee was suppressed, and he was put into a position that needed to be explained, and there ought to be some limit to these gentlemen who are old Members of the House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut makes the point of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman that I will put into the RECORD a statement showing 10,139 employees—Arabian, Austrian, Bohemian, Bosnian, Bulgarian, Croatian, Czech, Dalmatian, Dutch, English, Finnish, Flemish, French——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut makes the point of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. STANLEY. I am talking about iron ore—Japanese, Korean, Macedonian, Magyar, Montenegrin, Polish, Roumanian, and Russian, giving the numbers——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order. I have no objection to the gentleman talking, as far as I am concerned, but iron ore is not the subject under discussion at this time.

Mr. STANLEY. I have concluded, Mr. Chairman. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. In violation of the rules of the House the gentleman has concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I submit there is no amendment pending.

Mr. MADDEN. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, that amendment was pending.

Mr. PALMER. But debate on it has been exhausted.

Mr. MADDEN. Then I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a good deal of controversy here as to what constitutes an American citizen, whether anybody has a right to work in any employment in this country except a man who is born on American soil. There seems to be an attempt made to discredit men who have been born somewhere else than in America.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman from Illinois is not speaking to the subject before the House. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I was endeavoring to reply to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the Chair sustained the point of order made by the gentleman from Connecticut to the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman from Kentucky talked on, however.

Mr. MADDEN. I desire to discuss the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has sustained the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Then the Chair does not care to hear arguments upon it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is pretty clear in his own mind on that proposition. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed in order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's point of order is not well taken, for the reason that in a discussion of the question of this tariff bill or of any section or any paragraph of the bill it seems to me we have a right to enter into every phase of the question so that we may be enabled to act intelligently upon it when we are called upon to vote. It seems to me that labor is one of the essential elements in the consideration of the question of the tariff, and that the question of whether a man is an American citizen or whether he has a right to live here if he is not one is one of the questions to be considered. It does not make any difference whether a man was born in England, Ireland, Scotland, or Wales, he ought to have a right to live wherever he may be, and ought to have the right to work wherever he can find employment. There was a time not many years ago, during the history of my short experience, when the men who did the mining, the work that is being done in these mines, preparing the ore for the mills, came from England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales.

The time came when the children of these men attended the public schools of the United States and assimilated with the American people, became identified with American institutions, became lovers of the American flag. They went from these lowly employments in other walks of life. They became doctors, and merchants, and lawyers, and bankers, and manufacturers——

SEVERAL MEMBERS. And Congressmen.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. MADDEN. They became active instruments in the development of the institutions of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky demands the regular order.

Mr. MADDEN. I am discussing this point of order, Mr. Chairman. [Laughter.]

Mr. POWERS. The Chair has ruled on the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. No; the Chair allowed the gentleman to discuss the point of order, and that is what I am discussing.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the disposition of the Chair, naturally, as the gentleman knows, is to give every man a chance.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not often take up the time of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. But where there is a demand for the enforcement of the rule, of course the Chair must enforce the rule, and the gentleman from Illinois knows the rule.

Mr. MADDEN. I do, and, Mr. Chairman, I am trying to discuss the point of order as best I can. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. I hope the committee will indulge me in a discussion of this question. I hope the gentleman who made the point of order will withdraw it, because I think this is an important phase of this question and I hope I may be permitted to proceed.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the gentleman be allowed to continue his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not care to do that; I do not do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. MADDEN. I will get an opportunity to object to some things which gentlemen may want to do one of these days and I will do it. Now, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that he may be allowed to proceed.

Mr. GUDGER. Mr. Chairman, I object. I hope the gentleman will avail himself of the opportunity——

Mr. MADDEN. No one else has been objected to in this manner.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I would not like to object to the gentleman continuing, but the gentleman from Alabama, who is in charge of the bill, has declared it his purpose——

Mr. MADDEN. I only want five minutes.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman has spoken more than five minutes, has declined that the five-minute rule be extended, and in his absence I do not think the gentleman from Illinois ought to ask any further time.

Mr. MADDEN. I am not going to ask any further favors——

Mr. GUDGER. Mr. Chairman, I have objected.

Mr. MADDEN. I only want the same indulgence that has been accorded the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

Mr. GUDGER. I hope the other side will object to Mr. STANLEY or anybody else if they try to speak again.

Mr. MADDEN. All right; it will take more time, and if you are going to object we will show you how to object.

Mr. GUDGER. Then we will bring in a rule.

Mr. MADDEN. Bring in your rule; go ahead, bring it in.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

Mr. PALMER. Does the gentleman from Illinois want five minutes?

Mr. MANN. I am going to ask that my colleague have five minutes.

Mr. PALMER. I submit that the colleague of the gentleman from Illinois has been discussing the question now for five minutes or more and I think we ought to proceed.

Mr. MANN. I am trying to proceed. The request was made to close debate in five minutes.

Mr. PALMER. Well, I will join the gentleman's request.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that debate close in five minutes, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to be recognized for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PALMER. That is, debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. On this paragraph and all amendments thereto. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I was saying when I was interrupted [laughter] that the time came when the sons of the men who came from the north of Europe left the lowly employments and went into other employments of life.

Then the Germans came on to the scene, and they took the places of these men who came from England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. They did this kind of work. They were not American citizens when they came, but their children grew, and they went to our schools and became American citizens; and in the process of evolution they left this kind of employment and became factors in the development of the great industrial institutions of this country, and they are potential factors in the life of the Nation to-day and among our best American citizens. Following them, the Swedes came, and the process of evolution went on exactly the same. Their children are doctors, and lawyers, and merchants, and bankers, and fill every other walk of life, and are doing the things that make for the best good of the people of this great Nation. Following them came the Poles, and the same process of evolution went on with them. Their sons and their daughters are influential factors in the life of this Nation. They are among the best American citizens. And following them were the men from the north of Italy, and the same thing went on with them, and their boys and girls grew into manhood and womanhood. They are American citizens, and they love our flag and our institutions and are as patriotic as any other of our citizens. [Applause.] Following them came the Austrians, and the same process of evolution went on with them, and their boys and girls are now men and women, are now American citizens, living under the protection of the American flag and ready to fight for the flag whenever need be. They are the men we have heard traduced as men who work in the lowly walks of life to-day. Some men must do this work. Who is the American? What is the American? What did he come from that he has any special rights? How many men would be here to-day sitting on these seats if their fathers and mothers and grandfathers and grandmothers had not come from across the sea? Where did these men who are talking about Americans come from? What kind of meat do they eat that makes them so great? I want to say to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and anybody else on this floor, that men coming from any part of Europe who are willing to work should be welcome to our shores. I have nothing to say of any man——

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Do you include the Chinese?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not include the orientals, but I mean from any place in Europe, in all the Caucasian race, whether he is a south Italian or north Italian, an Irishman, an Englishman, a Scotchman, a Swede, a German, an Austrian, a Hungarian, or whatever he may be. And I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to you, gentlemen of this committee, that it is a slander upon the human race to say that because a man comes from some other country and can not speak the English language he is unworthy of consideration as a workman in the mines, in the fields, on the farm, and in the factories of the United States, where we need brain and brawn to create the wealth to push forward the great industrial development of which we are all so proud. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

112. Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms and slabs, die blocks or blanks, billets and bars, and tapered or beveled bars; mill shafting, pressed, sheared, or stamped shapes, not advanced in value or condition by any process or operation subsequent to the process of stamping; hammer molds or swaged steel; gun-barrel molds not in bars; all descriptions and shapes of dry sand, loam, or iron molded steel castings, sheets, and plates, if made by the Bessemer, Siemens-Martin, open-hearth, or similar processes, not containing alloys, such as nickel, chromium, tungsten or wolfram, molybdenum, titanium, iridium, uranium, tantalum, boron, and similar alloys, and steel not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem; steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms and slabs, die blocks or blanks; billets and bars and tapered or beveled bars; pressed, sheared, or stamped shapes not advanced in value or condition by any process or operation subsequent to the process of stamping; hammer molds or swaged steel; gun-barrel molds not in bars; alloys used as substitutes for steel in the manufacture of tools; all descriptions and shapes of dry sand, loam, or iron molded castings, sheets, and plates; rolled wire rods in coils or bars not smaller than No. 6 wire gauge, and steel not specially provided for in this section, all the foregoing when made by the crucible, electric, or cementation process, either with or without alloys, and finished by rolling, hammering, or otherwise, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 29, line 19, after the word "shafting," strike out the comma and insert a semicolon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I also offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 24, after the word "plates," strike out the comma and insert "; all the foregoing."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I also offer a further amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 1, after the word "nickel," insert the words "cobalt, vanadium."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers a further amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 3, strike out the words "and steel not specially provided for in this section."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 17, after the word "otherwise," insert the words "and all steels by whatever process made containing alloys such as nickel, cobalt, vanadium, chromium, tungsten, wolfram, molybdenum, titanium, iridium, uranium, tantalum, boron, and similar alloys."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, what rates do those now bear, according to the bill?

Mr. PALMER. Under the present law?

Mr. MANN. Under the present law and according to the bill as it stood before.

Mr. PALMER. I will say this to the gentleman in explanation: We have made a new classification in this paragraph for crucible steels, giving them a rate of 5 per cent higher than the Bessemer or open-hearth steels.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. PALMER. Just a moment. Under the present law the equivalent ad valorem rates are about 22 per cent on all the products covered by this paragraph. However, the crucible-steel products are such a small proportion of the total of imports that the 22 per cent is not a fair statement of the real equivalent ad valorem on the crucible steels, which is very much higher. Therefore, in writing this paragraph we have reduced the rate on Bessemer and open-hearth steel covered by the paragraph from about 22 per cent to 10 per cent, and on the crucible steels from something higher than 22 per cent—it is impossible to say just what—to 15 per cent.

Now, the effect of the amendments which I have just offered is simply to make certain that purpose of making this difference in classification between open-hearth Bessemer steels on the one hand and crucible steels or alloy steels on the other.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not a fact that on most of the articles mentioned in this paragraph the duty has been increased over the bill of last year from 10 to 15 per cent?

Mr. PALMER. Oh, no. The bill of last year carried this paragraph at 10 per cent.

Mr. ANDERSON. It now carries it at 15 per cent.

Mr. PALMER. Not at all. The bill carries the Bessemer or open-hearth or ordinary process steel at 10 per cent, the same as last year, and those are the preponderating imports and manufactures of steel, as any gentleman who has given the matter investigation will show you, while the crucible steels, of which about 100,000 tons are produced in the United States per annum, are reduced to 15 per cent.

Mr. ANDERSON. But they are increased in the bill of a year ago.

Mr. PALMER. The crucible steels are higher than in the bill of a year ago, but the gentleman said we were increasing all the articles covered in this paragraph.

Mr. ANDERSON. I said most of them.

Mr. PALMER. That is a mistake. The crucible steels are a very small proportion of the articles covered by this paragraph.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. ANDERSON. The paragraph just read and the one that follows afford additional evidence of the eleventh-hour conversion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] to protective ideas. The gentleman himself admits that some proportion at least of the articles named in the paragraph just read have been increased from 10 to 15 per cent. On paragraph 113, which follows, the duty has been increased to 20 per cent. On articles mentioned in paragraph 114, grit, shot, and so forth, the duty has been increased from 20 per cent in the Underwood bill of the last Congress to 30 per cent in the pending bill. I am not complaining about the conversion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER]. My regrets are directed to the fact that his conversion, tending toward the protective tariff, has not included the agricultural schedule. I had hoped that it might extend to some of the products raised in the great Northwest. My regret is that the gentleman seems to have greater consideration for the Steel Trust and the steel industry than he has for the agricultural interests of the great Northwest. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 30, line 17, by inserting after the words "ad valorem" a semicolon and the following: "*Provided*, That none of the articles herein specified shall be admitted to the United States until it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that the foreign labor employed in the production or manufacture thereof shall have been paid wages equal to wages paid for similar labor in the United States."

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that amendment that it is not germane to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes a point of order against the amendment of his colleague [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, that amendment is in different form from the one upon which the Chair ruled yesterday, and it is made pertinent to the paragraph itself. I think it is entirely in order, and I would like to discuss it for a moment, if the Chair cares to have me do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. The paragraph fixes tariff rates upon steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, and slabs, and so forth, and other products of iron and steel, with a view to protecting their manufacture in the United States; or, rather, with a view to raising revenue for the Government of the United States. The amendment which I have offered proposes to put a limitation upon the kind of commodities that may come into the United States as provided in the paragraph. I assume it is within the province of the House to say that if the wages paid for the manufacture of iron and steel products in the United States are twice or three times as high as the wages paid for similar labor in foreign countries that goods shall not be admitted in competition with the labor of the United States, if the foreign wages paid were less.

The purpose of this amendment is so to define the law that a Secretary of the Navy, for instance, who gives instructions by direction of Congress to an American manufacturer of iron and steel that he must limit the hours of labor to eight, may, by the same token, be permitted to say to a foreign manufacturer who is competing with the American laborer that the wages paid for the product which it is proposed to put into the ships of the United States or any other commodity of the United States shall conform to the American wage.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman concluded?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair ruled yesterday afternoon on a proposition very similar to this. Whether or not there is a place in the bill where this might be in order, the Chair will not undertake to say at this time; but the Chair holds that it is not germane to this paragraph and sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

115. Rivet, screw, fence, nail, and other iron or steel wire rods, whether round, oval, or square, or in any other shape, and flat rods up to 6 inches in width ready to be drawn or rolled into wire, all the foregoing in coils or otherwise, including wire rods and iron or steel bars, cold rolled, cold drawn, cold hammered, or polished in any way in addition to the ordinary process of hot rolling or hammering, 10 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That all round iron or steel rods smaller than No. 6 wire gauge shall be classed and dutiable as wire.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 25, insert after the word "wire" the words "or strips."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

116. Round iron or steel wire; wire composed of iron, steel, or other metal, except gold or silver, covered with cotton, silk, or other material; corset clasps, corset steels, dress steels, and all flat wires and steel in strips not thicker than No. 15 wire gauge and not exceeding 5 inches in width, whether in long or short lengths, in coils or otherwise, and whether rolled or drawn through dies or rolls, or otherwise produced; telegraph, telephone, and other wires and cables composed of metal and rubber, or of metal, rubber, and other materials; iron and steel wire coated by dipping, galvanizing, or similar process with zinc, tin, or other metal; all other wire not specially provided for in this section and articles manufactured wholly or in chief value of any wire or wires provided for in this section; all the foregoing, 20 per cent ad valorem; wire beddles and healds, 25 per cent ad valorem; wire rope, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 22, after the words "ad valorem," at the end of paragraph 116, insert the following: "Fourdrinier wires and bronze, brass, or copper wire cloth, partly or wholly manufactured, 45 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, yesterday we heard a good deal said by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] about this tariff bill not being prepared in behalf of the manufacturing interests of the country. I wish to submit that, in connection with the amendment I have offered, it is not prepared in behalf of the laboring people of this country. It happens that in my district there are two mills making what is known as Fourdrinier wire or wire cloth used in paper manufacturing. I was waited on last week by representatives of the American Wire Weavers' Protective Association. They are laboring men who work at the loom making that wire cloth, and they ask that the present rate of duty on wire products be retained, in order that they may maintain their families and homes in this country and not be obliged to submit to the rivalry and competition of England and France in their line of employment. They are a high-grade class of working people. I have letters here showing the way in which they stand with their employers. They have not asked in 25 years for any increase of wage. They are receiving on an average about $4 per day, or $25 per week, in comparison with the same class of work in England at $10 to $12 per week and in Germany at $6 to $7 per week. It is impossible for the rates of wages which are now being paid to continue at any less duty than now appears under the basket clause in this schedule. Consequently I ask that the rate be restored on this wire-cloth manufacture, that these man may continue to receive employment at home.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield? I would like to ask him why they pay so much more in England than they do in Germany?

Mr. TREADWAY. I can not yield; I have only five minutes. The wage in this country, as I have stated, is $25 per week and in Germany for the same class of work the employees receive $6 to $7 per week. Now, at an average price of 22 cents per square foot, which 60-mesh wire costs, the laboring man has 50 to 60 per cent, and as the fineness of the wire increases a greater proportion goes to the man at the loom. At the present rate of duty foreign competitors can undersell our manufacturers in the home market.

Yesterday there was adopted in the Massachusetts Legislature resolutions to this honorable body, not because the Democratic governor sent a special message to the legislature upon the subject of the tariff, but because just such industries as the one to which I now refer and hundreds of others in our State realize what the effect of the adoption of this bill will mean to the working men and women of the State. Massachusetts believes in the spirit of protection—protection to the laboring man—and it is on that account that they memorialize this Congress.

I desire, Mr. Chairman, if I may, to submit an extract from these resolutions, and I also desire to submit a brief that was submitted to the Ways and Means Committee by the American Wire Weavers' Protective Association, and also a letter from one of the manufacturers, in which he speaks of the standard of these employees. We ask, therefore, that the same rate of duty which applies to this line of goods be retained in the present bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The matters referred to are as follows:

PROTECTIVE TARIFF URGED—MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE MEMORIALIZES CONGRESS AT REQUEST OF GOV. FOSS.

BOSTON, *April 29.*

In accordance with a request of Gov. Foss expressed in a special message, both branches of the legislature to-day adopted a resolution memorializing Congress. The resolution declares:

"That the policy of opening the markets of the United States to the unrestricted competition of the rest of the world, advocated by the President in his message and the pending bill, which is a long step toward the complete establishment of that policy, appears to the legislature to be in direct contravention of the wishes of the voters of the United States, and especially of this Commonwealth, as expressed in the last election."

It is urged that any tariff legislation should be based upon the protective principle, that a tariff commission of disinterested experts be reestablished, and that reasonable opportunity be given those interested to be heard before final action is taken.

—

BRIEF OF THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE AMERICAN WIRE WEAVERS' PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION.

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y., *January 7, 1913.*

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We beg to file this statement with your honorable body in the name of the iron, bronze, copper and brass, and other kinds of wire-cloth weavers of the United States.

Understanding it to be the intention of the incoming Congress to revise the tariff schedules, we wish to urge for your consideration whatever claims our industry may have, if not to an increase, at least to a retention of the present duty.

We do not think it possible that there can be any reduction in the tariff on iron, bronze, copper and brass, and other kinds of wire cloth if your honorable body is made acquainted with the facts of this industry as we know them.

Any reduction at this time will be detrimental to the interests of every wire weaver in this country as well as to the interests of the large number of workers in the allied branches of the trade.

While the cost of living has increased, the wages of the wire weavers of America are lower to-day than they have been for 30 years, lower, in fact, than they have been since the establishment of this industry in the United States; as a direct result of the importation of wire cloth from abroad a reduction of wages amounting to 20 per cent has been made necessary within the past year.

Even under the present tariff many American wire weavers have been thrown out of employment by reason of German manufacturers finding a market for iron, bronze, copper and brass, and other kinds of wire cloth in the United States. There has been a considerable increase in these importations within the past year, making employment in some American factories less certain than formerly.

The wire weavers in Germany work 60 hours per week. This is 10 hours per week longer than the American is required to work in the same line. There can be no comparison between the wages paid to the German wire weavers, a statement of which is herewith appended, and those received by the weavers in this country for the same grade and class of work. Even taking into consideration any possible difference in the cost of living in Germany, as compared with the United States, the German wire weaver works for a wage so low that his standard of living can not approximate to that deemed necessary for the American mechanic.

Under the present tariff, the German wire-cloth manufacturer is able to place his finished product in the American market at a price lower than his American competitor. We think any reduction in the tariff would give the German an unfair advantage. We believe it would mean discrimination against American labor, and tend to discourage the investment of capital in home enterprise.

Again, we may cite the condition of the British wire-cloth manufacturer. While they have not been of any great injury to the American wire-cloth manufacturer, this possibly being due to the present rate of 45 per cent duty, and also to their higher rate of wages paid the British weaver over that of their German competitor, yet they, too, may become as serious a menace to the American manufacturer should a reduction of the tariff take place. We submit, herewith, a statement showing the rate of wages paid by the British manufacturer as compared with the American manufacturer.

We know that you will not purposely retard the growth of any legitimate interest in our country, but as our product does not seem to be specifically classified under the present law it has seemed to us necessary to draw it to your attention in this way. We think you would be encouraging American labor as well as American capital in this case by protecting us against unfair foreign competition.

If such encouragement is to be given we urge you, if you do not recommend an increase in the duty, to see that the present tariff is maintained. We would not ask that this statement be filed if we were not fully convinced that a reduction in the tariff on iron, bronze, copper and brass, and other kinds of wire cloth, would be detrimental to the workers in whose interests we write and tend to interfere with the growth of a legitimate American industry.

We have been given repeated assurances that no reduction in the tariff will be made by Congress if it can be shown that such a change will discourage the normal growth of legitimate business enterprises.

We do not know, of course, that any change is contemplated in the case of iron, bronze, copper and brass, and other kinds of wire cloth. If any such change may be contemplated, we beg your honorable committee to give us an opportunity of acquainting you with whatever facts we possess when the schedule is taken up.

Thanking you in anticipation of a careful perusal of the statements herein set forth, we beg to remain,

Yours, very respectfully,

AMERICAN WIRE WEAVERS' PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION.
E. E. DESMOND,
Secretary-Treasurer, 27 Woodland Avenue, Woodhaven, N. Y.
JOSEPH O'NEIL, *31 Brown Avenue, Holyoke, Mass.*
PATRICK A. WATERS, *20 Bayard Street, Belleville, N. J.*

—

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE
AMERICAN WIRE WEAVERS' PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION,
Holyoke, Mass., April 4, 1913.

Hon. ALLEN T. TREADWAY, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your letter to Mr. Fred Childs, which he handed to me with request that I reply to the same, I beg to say that the brief filed by our committee at the time of hearing by the Ways and Means Committee covers the matter, and to which you have access.

Trusting that things will turn out better than we expect, and thanking you for any efforts you may have put forth in our behalf and for anything you may do in the future,

I am, very sincerely,

ARCHIBALD A. BROOKS.

—

LEE, MASS., *March 29, 1913.*

Mr. ALLEN T. TREADWAY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TREADWAY: I received your letter of the 15th instant, in regard to the tariff, and am sending you herewith some figures and statements. I trust you will do your best for me regarding this matter, and appreciate your kindness in sending me the letter.

The wire manufacturers do not mean to be selfish or unjust in asking that the duty on our particular product remain, at least, where it is without any reduction. At present under the latest tariff ruling, the manufacturers of brass-wire cloth are protected by a duty of 45 per cent. This may seem like a very large duty, but it is warranted by the difference in labor conditions. We, with other manufacturers, have figured very carefully the cost of making the brass-wire cloth that we furnish our customers, and at the present price of copper, which is about a normal price, find that what we call No. 60 actually costs us from 21 cents to 21¼ cents per square foot. Our customers use these grades of cloth in about four different meshes, No. 60, No. 65, No. 70, and No. 80. The No. 60 furnishes a fair illustration. As stated above, with very careful figuring we find that it costs us 21 cents to 21¼ cents, and is sold to our trade in no case over 24 cents, and very frequently sold at 23 cents to 23½ cents. This cost mentioned above does not figure any rebates for poor service, which is one of the sources of complaint and which we can not seem to overcome in any way. This alone adds about 2½ per cent to 3 per cent to our cost of manufacture. Of our cost, our workmen get 50 per cent, or about 10 cents per square foot on the total of 21 cents to 21¼ cents.

These men average $25 per week, very frequently running up to $35 and $38 per week, not including overtime, simply straight time-work, very seldom going below $15 or $16. It is piecework, hence the difference in the wages.

In England the workmen get from $10 to $12 per week, and turn out practically the same amount as our own men. The looms are very similar in construction. In Germany, from which we have the strongest competition, the weavers get $6 and $7 per week. This enables the representatives of the German manufacturers to sell No. 60 wires in this country at 22 cents per square foot and pay freight, insurance, and 45 per cent duty. To-day the strongest competition is from Germany, and they are sending large quantities of their goods to this country. Our own workmen are getting the same wages that they have for the last 25 or 30 years. Never in all that time have they made any demands on us for increase as the cost of living has increased. For the most part they are steady, faithful men, and of a high order of intelligence and thrift.

The lowering of the duty, therefore, on our particular product would seem to indicate nothing but lower wages for them, or the stopping of some of the production in our line of goods in this country. If the lowering of the tariff reduces our income, as it necessarily must, and as the Government expects to tax incomes above a certain amount, it is simply losing this tax on incomes from the American manufacturer and encouraging the foreign manufacturer. We can not see it in any other way, that it seems to be helping the business of the English and German manufacturers at the expense of the American manufacturer.

If there was an enormous profit on our line of work, we might be able to stand something of a cut, but 8 per cent does not seem to us to be an excessive profit, and that 8 per cent is determined very largely on whether we get the highest or lowest price mentioned above. The manufacturer who makes his goods at a cost of 21½ cents and sells them at 23 cents is not making 8 per cent. It would seem to us, therefore, as though we really needed protection. We have taken No. 60 as an illustration, but the same truths apply to the other meshes.

Hoping your assistance will prove satisfactory to the trade, I remain,

Yours, very truly,

THISTLE WIRE WORKS,
GEORGE W. ROBERTS.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the paragraph, that I may ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] a question. I have had submitted to me a brief touching the telegraph, the telephone, and other wires. I am in ignorance on the subject of this paragraph, upon what is known as telegraph and telephone wire. Will the gentleman please tell me whether or not a telegraph or telephone wire covered with lead is included in this paragraph?

Mr. PALMER. I would say that it was.

Mr. BUTLER. I am asking for the gentleman's best impression, because I know that he is familiar with it. It seems to me that it is. I understand that such a wire covered with lead will have on it a duty of 20 per cent?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I would like to inquire why smooth wire is put on the dutiable list while wire nails and barbed wire is on the free list?

Mr. PALMER. We made the distinction very largely because, following the bill of a year and a half ago known as the farmers' free-list bill, we wanted, where we could, to write a tariff bill in such a way as would bring the benefits of the reduction close home to the people. We know of nothing in the agricultural section of the country that is of more general use than this kind of wire and wire fencing and other articles the gentleman names which we have put on the free list. It is in the interest of the consumer.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I understand the gentleman perfectly. It is because they put it on the free list a year ago that they now wish to put barbed wire and nails on the free list as a bid for the farmers' vote.

Mr. PALMER. The country has approved of what we did in that matter [applause on the Democratic side], and we think they will approve of it again.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no; the country has not approved of that at all. The majority was against you; and the farmers are not clamoring for anything of that kind. This is simply another instance of the rule which has been applied in a number of instances throughout this bill, where you have put a duty on the partly finished product and let the completed article made from it bear a higher duty. Barbed wire is so cheap now that the farmer never thinks anything about it, and nails are so cheap that a man can not afford to stop and pick up one when he drops it, and both of them have been made so by the application of the principle of protection and the protective tariff that has been put on these products by the Republican Party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, as I understand this bill it puts nail rods on the dutiable list, and nails made from nail rods on the free list. Am I correct?

Mr. PALMER. Nails are on the free list.

Mr. MANN. Nails are on the free list. I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read in my time letters from an independent manufacturing concern located in my district, which makes tacks, nails, etc., as to the justice of the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRAND CROSSING TACK CO.,
Grand Crossing, Ill., April 19, 1913.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MANN: The tariff bill as introduced by Mr. UNDERWOOD on April 7, 1913, which you so kindly sent to me, has been received, and I just wish to offer a few comments that may be of more or less interest to you.

When this bill reaches the House the first move the Republicans should make as soon as they have the opportunity would be to amend its title by calling it a bill to perpetuate the trusts by insuring their great solidity and power to monopolize, and then pass the bill just as it stands, which would give the country an everlasting monument of Democratic stupidity and wise statesmanship. This may seem sarcastic, but the real facts as they exist in the bill will demonstrate that it is no idle talk, as it is well illustrated in the iron and steel schedule and free-list section.

Ask Mr. UNDERWOOD or any of his Democratic colleagues, or even the President himself, who in all logical reason of all the producers in this country of tacks, cut nails, wire nails, brads, staples, barbed wire, galvanized fence wire and wire fence, is the best able to stand competition against the world? Is it the ones who have their iron ore and coal mines, steamship and transportation companies, and blast furnaces in which they can smelt the ore, and coal dug from their own mines, and the same raw material brought in from other countries free of duty, or is it the hundred or more small producers of the above-named articles, whose raw material is either pig iron and scrap, or billets and sheet bars, or wire rods, or plain wire or sheets, who have been struggling for years in competition with the trust against the natural advantage the larger concern has over them in their cheap raw material and the cost of converting that raw material to the point where the small concern goes into the market and buys his raw material and then finishes the conversion and finally goes into competition with them to sell the finished product to the consumers? There is only one answer—the trust. And now the Government by the proposed bill is going to add another burden to the small concern by taking away all of his possibilities of profit by putting the above-named finished articles on the free list, leaving him to the mercy of the competition of the world in addition to his competition with the trust, and takes away all of the chance he might have to survive by leaving his raw material on the dutiable list with a duty of 8 per cent to 15 per cent, and depriving him of the chance of the world's free competition in buying these articles which are his raw material.

Surely this bill could be rightfully christened a bill to league the Government in helping the trust to crush all competition, because that is what the passage of this bill will do in effect, and the facts bear out the argument; and if what I have said is not enough, look up and figure out what effect the proposed changes on ferromanganese and ferrosilicon will bear on this subject, as well as the proposed duties on zinc in pigs, known in the market as spelter. From every angle that I can study the bill from the facts which I know, they all point to the same common end—trust advantage, small manufacturers' disadvantage.

Kindly plead with the dominant party to give us small manufacturers at least an even chance by taking off the free list paragraphs 562 and 649 and give them a duty commensurate with the duty on kindred articles and the semiraw material out of which these articles are made. If this can not be done, then be fair with us by giving us free trade on those semifinished iron and steel articles, which are our raw material, by putting on the free list pig iron and scrap, ferromanganese, ferrosilicon, found in paragraph 106; ingots, blooms, slabs, billets, and bars, found in paragraph 114; sheets of iron or steel, common or black, skelp, iron or steel, found in paragraph 109; rivet, screw, fence, nail, and other iron or steel wire rods, round, in coils, found in paragraph 115, and all of paragraphs 166 and 167. They can not be fair and just to us small manufacturers who are trying to compete against the so-called Iron and Steel Trust, who own their own raw material in the ground, unless they give us at least one or the other of the above propositions.

I fully realize the conditions as they now exist in Washington and the very slim chances that there are of any changes being made in the proposed tariff bill which is now before the Democratic caucus, but at the same time I wish to set the facts forth as they actually are and leave it to you to use them in any way that you may see fit, with the small hopes that possibly something might be done to help us out in some way.

Thanking you for the attention that I know you will give to the subject, I am,

Yours, very truly,

O. N. HUTCHINSON.

—

GRAND CROSSING TACK CO.,
Grand Crossing, Ill., January 9, 1913.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MANN: I wish to lay before you an argument prepared by Mr. William F. Donovan, president of the Atlas Tack Co., Fairhaven, Mass., in reference to the proposed new tariff bill in reference to tacks and small cut nails. I have read over this document, and I can give it my hearty indorsement. He seems to have stated nothing but facts, and has put them in a very terse manner.

Of course, we presume it is hardly possible that any argument or facts that we can bring forth will have any influence upon the dominant party. Be that as it may, however, we believe it is advisable to file just as vigorous a protest as we possibly can, and we ask you to do everything in your power to that end.

We sincerely hope that through their errors the business interests of this country will come back to their own again in a very short time.

Yours, very truly,

O. N. HUTCHINSON.

—

JANUARY —, 1913.

SIR: At a recent conference of the manufacturers of tacks and small nails relating to the proposed new tariff bill, it was shown that any further reduction of the duty on this class of products would result in

very great hardship to the manufacturers of this country, and in all probability in the importation of foreign goods to an extent which would put many of those exclusively engaged in that line out of business or compel a reduction in wages, which does not seem desirable, feasible, or even possible.

It became evident that even in the tariff bill of 1909 an unjust discrimination was made against this class of products, and we were only saved from foreign importations under the existing duty because of the extremely low prices which have prevailed until very recently in the cost of raw material in this country, and the almost destructive competition which has existed in our home trade.

We therefore appeal to your sense of justice and your known desire to be of service to your constituents in all proper ways to give us the benefit of such assistance as we feel sure you can render in insuring proper consideration being given to this class of product by those concerned in the revision of the tariff which is now being undertaken, and upon which hearings will be held before the Ways and Means Committee on the 10th instant.

Briefly stated, the facts, as they apply to our industry, are as follows:

In the revision of 1909, notwithstanding the protests of all the manufacturers engaged in producing this class of goods, the duty upon them was reduced one-half, or from 1¼ cents per pound to five-eighths cent per pound on the smaller sizes, and from 1¼ cents per pound on the larger sizes to three-fourths cent per pound, while on the plate and sheets from which tacks and small nails are made the duty of one-half cent per pound was retained (sec. 125, Schedule C), thus leaving only from one-eighth cent to one-fourth cent as proportion to labor on the manufactured tacks, which is approximately 60 per cent of the material cost, the protection to labor being, therefore, only 11 per cent of the average labor cost, while the raw material is protected to 27 per cent of its total cost.

Surely this shows unjust discrimination, and it is further shown in the existing tariff by the duty which is carried on other manufactured articles involving a much smaller percentage of labor, such, for example, as rivets (sec. 165, Schedule C), which are given a protection of 1¼ cents per pound, or 52.7 per cent of the labor cost, while the rivet rods from which these rivets are made are protected only to the extent of three-tenths cent per pound.

Iron and steel wood screws, in section 167, Schedule C, are given a protection of from 8 cents to 12 cents per pound on the lengths which correspond to the lengths in which tacks are made, an average of 10 cents per pound protection on these sizes of iron and steel wood screws. The screw wire rods from which the screws are made pay a duty of only three-tenths cent per pound under provisions of section 133 of Schedule C, thus giving a protection of $9.67 per 100 pounds to the labor of making steel wood screws, or approximately 37 per cent.

These comparisons are made, not for the purpose of trying to show that the other products referred to are unduly protected, but as a basis for an inquiry as to why the tack manufacturer should be the "goat."

What the present views of the Ways and Means Committee may be in this connection we, of course, can not say; but assuming that the bill which passed the House of Representatives on January 29, 1912—H. R. 18642—represents its views, a still further injustice would be done to the tack-making industry, as that act placed tacks upon the free list, while a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem is retained upon the raw material from which tacks are made.

Consular report issued by the Bureau of Manufactures under date of June 19, 1912, gives the price of fine sheets in Germany on January 1, 1912, as from $33.32 to $34.51. Allowing the American differentials for sheets of heavier gauge—sheets gauging from 17 to 21, which are used in tack making—would make the price for such sheets $29.32 as against the lowest price quoted in this country, for the last 10 years at least, of $31. With tacks upon the free list, the German tack manufacturer, buying his raw material at a price lower than it has been sold in this country under the severest competition and with labor at little more than one-half the cost in this country, would only have the freight against him—approximately 10 cents per cubic foot from Antwerp to New York—or not to exceed $2.75 per ton C. I. F., while the American manufacturer will have, in trying to import his raw material, a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem—approximately $4.65, the importer's profit, if only 5 per cent—of $1.55, the freight and insurance of $2.75, making a net handicap of $6.20 per ton, even if it were possible for a small tack manufacturer in this country to keep himself supplied with this long-distance material, which could only be done in the event of importers carrying a stock in this country to meet his requirements, in which event, of course, the allowance made for the importer's profit would have to be largely increased, and the fact that such stocks would be carried in this country is so improbable that it is not worthy of consideration.

The German tack manufacturer would therefore have an advantage over the American manufacturer of $6.20 plus the difference in labor, which, assuming the German labor to be 60 per cent of the American labor cost, would give the American tack manufacturer a further handicap of at least $12 per ton, or a total of $18.20 per ton—equal to 18 per cent—in the presence of which he could not continue to exist.

What is true of Germany is true of France and Belgium likewise, particularly the latter.

Tack plates and sheets are now being made in Canada, where, again, we are confronted with cheaper labor, and it is certain that the American market will receive the surplus products of the Canadian tack manufacturers in the event of tacks being placed on the free list, unless the market is occupied with other foreign products, while the American manufacturers can not indulge in reprisals, owing to the heavy Canadian duty.

In view of these facts, are we not entitled to better consideration, and will you not render us such assistance as you can in seeing that our business receives it?

Respectfully, yours, WM. F. DONOVAN.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

121. Finished automobiles and automobile bodies, 45 per cent ad valorem; automobile chassis, 30 per cent ad valorem; finished parts of automobiles, not including tires, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This paragraph offers a very good example of the mental gymnastics necessary to write a bill of this character. The present law provides for a duty of 45 per cent ad valorem upon automobiles and finished parts alike. The pending bill reduces the duty on the finished parts from 45 to 20 per cent, thus increasing the protection of the assembler in a very large degree. The only result of this situation will be to increase the importation of the finished parts of automobiles from foreign countries so that they can be assembled in this country and offered for sale in competition with the finished automobile here. The result will be inevitably a taking away from the American workman of work involved in the making and finishing of these parts. I think that the duty on automobiles might very properly be reduced. I think that the duty upon the finished parts might very properly be reduced, but it is impossible for me to understand the mental gymnastics that justify the increasing of the protection upon automobiles by 30 per cent.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, it would not be difficult for the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] to understand this change in the rates if he would take the time and the trouble to study the question of the automobile industry, both at home and abroad, as it has been studied by the Ways and Means Committee in connection with the drawing of this bill. Under the present law automobiles pay a rate of 45 per cent. That is not a high rate or an unconscionable rate, from our point of view, for a foreign luxury such as one of these automobiles.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Not at this time.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman knows of the export of automobiles.

Mr. PALMER. Yes. Mr. Chairman, the kind of automobiles that that duty covers is not the cheap automobile, but the high-priced car. The average unit of value of imports of automobiles exceeds $2,000. The only kind which come into the country are the high-priced cars, purchased by people of large means, who get the car because it is a foreign car and because they want to make a show before their neighbors and friends by having a Fiat or a Mercedes or some other famous foreign car.

We left that duty just where it is, but we did reduce the duty on the parts, because we believe that, while 45 per cent is a proper duty for an article of luxury purchased by the rich, it is not a proper rate of duty in view of the other rates in this bill upon an article which is largely a raw material of a great industry in this country. The fact is that the American manufacturer of automobiles uses foreign parts to a great extent, and we by making this rate 20 per cent are keeping it in line with other semiraw material used by manufacturing industries in the country. There is no danger whatever, and all automobile manufacturers and importers acknowledge that—the gentleman from Minnesota could find it out if he would take the trouble to read the hearings—there is no danger that the foreign automobiles will be imported as knocked-down cars in order to get rid of this 45 per cent rate. These parts come in as parts, and never come in as a knocked-down car, because the imported car that the American buys abroad he buys because he wants it, and he wants it because he is getting an automobile made in Europe which bears the foreign mark and the name. He does not care anything about having foreign parts in his car; he does not care anything about having a foreign wheel or a foreign axle. What he wants is a foreign car, and the reason these foreign cars come in at this excessive, this large, rate of 45 per cent is because the rich American is willing to pay any price in order to show himself off to his neighbors and his friends.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I will yield if I have the time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the gentleman know that under this provision it would be possible to import an entire automobile exclusive of the tires at 20 per cent ad valorem?

Mr. PALMER. No; it would not be done.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, it can be done, can it not?

Mr. PALMER. The automobile chassis, which the gentleman from Minnesota must know, is practically the finished car with the exception of the top and the tires, comes in at 30 per cent. The automobile parts which would be imported under the Treasury definitions and the definitions of the courts are such parts as are capable of being used in manufacture here or in repair of local cars. The experts in the import offices would have little difficulty, it seems to me, in noting the difference between parts sent in to repair a car or parts of a car which had been made, manufactured, completed, and then taken apart and knocked down. The whole answer to it lies in the fact that there is no incentive to that kind of an importation because the finished car is what the American wants.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the peculiar features of this bill. Automobiles now pay 45 per cent duty, which is a prohibitory duty in the main, absolutely prohibitory as to all except a few high priced and in the main French cars. It is easy enough to carry out the provisions of this bill, 45 per cent

on those cars, without carrying a prohibitory rate on the poor man's car, and it will not do any longer to say that automobiles are only for the rich. Even Members of this House who are not rich are able to own automobiles, and many of their constituents, with an annual earning of less than one-tenth of a Congressman's salary, own automobiles. But here is a prohibitory tariff, absolutely prohibitory on all of the cheap automobiles, direct in the face of the statement which has been made by the gentleman from Alabama as to the theory of this tariff. We imported less than $2,000,000 worth of automobiles last year. We exported over $9,000,000 worth, and the amount produced in the United States and consumed was $165,000,000 worth of production, and yet the gentlemen say in making up a competitive tariff that they must keep the price of automobiles up to a 45 per cent ad valorem rate. I am prepared to say that there would be due protection to the American industry with a considerable reduction in price. Automobiles have become a necessity in the land. For many years the price naturally was high because it was controlled by patents, but the time has come when automobiles ought to be made cheap in competition with the ordinary cheap buggies. No longer do people possess carriages, buggies, and horses to the extent they did formerly, but they now want to get automobiles. Here is a proposition which proposes to keep the rate now the same rate that has been on for years on automobiles, a prohibitory rate on all except the highest priced machines.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. PALMER. I want to say to the gentleman this is the fact about the automobile business: That the finer, the high priced, the luxurious cars come in as finished automobiles——

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman said that before.

Mr. PALMER. Wait a minute. On them we lay a duty of 45 per cent. The cheaper cars which are imported for use here, the trucks, the commercial cars, all come in as chassis at 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. But we export finished automobiles of that character, as the gentleman well knows. I have no objection to making the tariff rate 50 per cent or 60 per cent on machines that cost over $1,000 or $1,500.

But why is that a reason for maintaining 45 per cent on machines which sell for less than $1,000 and cost less than $300 to make. The automobile business is now maintaining the newspapers of the country through advertising. It is doing a large amount of expensive work in every direction in that way. The same thing that applied to sewing machines at one time, which sold from $75 to $150 per machine because of patented processes, now applies to automobiles under this provision in the bill. I say the tariff rate ought to be reduced on automobiles, so that there would be some competition, and that people might have machines. It would not injure an industry in this country.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the arguments which I have just heard from the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] illustrate the united position the Republican Party occupies to-day on the tariff question. We have just heard an eloquent and able speech from the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], a member of the Ways and Means Committee, charging us with the fact that this violent reduction of rates on automobiles was going to destroy the business, and, on the other hand, the leader of the Republican Party, in the next breath, comes up here and tells us that we have written a prohibitive rate on automobiles, which will destroy the American people. Now, there you are. Take your choice on each side of the Republican Party, a gentleman who says that it will destroy industry, and a gentleman who says at the same time the prohibitive rate is ruining the American people.

As a matter of fact, the automobile is the chassis. The balance is merely a carriage top. We have reduced the rate very considerably on the automobile—that is, the chassis—which means the entire car except the carriage part, the top of it, and the rubber tires. We have reduced it from 45 per cent to 30 per cent, a reduction of one-third. Now, as to the top, it is the cheaper part of an automobile, for the use of an ordinary man, a man of reasonable means. Of course, for the luxuriant rich the limousine top may cost a great deal of money, and it is that kind of a top, that kind of seating arrangement, that we are going to tax, and keep the tax of 45 per cent on. If a man wants to come over here and ride in a French car and display his wealth to his friends, he ought to pay for it, and he is going to pay for it under this bill. But when you can bring into this country at 30 per cent, a reduction of a third, the well-made, well-manufactured chassis, the working part of the car, it is not going to destroy the business as our friend from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] suggests, but it is going to bring real competition to the American manufacturers of automobiles, because it will build up an industry among those men who import the chassis, put an American top to it, and it brings real competition that will bring down the price of the home-made article.

Mr. Chairman, I ask to close debate on this paragraph.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit me just a few minutes?

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will first yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SIMS. It puts 40 per cent on motor cycles. I did not understand those to be a matter of luxury, but rather for utilitarian purposes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. One of my boys owns two of them, and I think they are a matter of nuisance more than anything else.

Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate on the paragraph in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is recognized.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, the business of manufacturing automobiles in the State of Michigan is a very important one. There are establishments in the city of Detroit and other cities in Michigan which employ from 5,000 to 8,000 high-class laboring men. By high-class men I mean mechanics who receive a high rate of wages, from $5 to $10 and $12 a day.

A few days ago a gentleman gave me a ride in a very magnificent automobile, and when returning to the hotel, he said, "What do you think of my automobile?" He told me it was a French machine, for which he had paid $8,700.

Now, poor people do not own machines of that kind, and I do not care how high you put the duty on that class of luxury. I would like to see it sufficiently high so that all such machines that are used in this country will be made in this country and made by American laboring men, at the scale of wages paid in those factories here in the United States. In this bill you put a rate of duty on the finished parts of an automobile, not including tires, of 20 per cent ad valorem. The finished parts of automobiles means that the machine will be finished abroad and brought here to be assembled.

There are but few people who are to-day classed as poor people who own automobiles.

I saw a notice in a paper the other day to the effect that a farmer living in the State of Illinois, Mr. MANN's State, brought to market 12 hogs in an automobile and took home in return $480 in cash.

Mr. MANN. The farmers all own automobiles in my State. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; they are all wealthy—the farmers——

Mr. MANN. Under the present laws.

Mr. FORDNEY. Under the present laws and the general prosperity that we have enjoyed during the last 16 years the farmers, not only of Illinois, but elsewhere, are rich. I want to see them remain rich. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MADDEN. They have all got money in the bank. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say to the gentleman that in my district I have a little town of 4,000 people, and most of them are farmers, and they told me that by actual count last fall over 300 automobiles were owned in that town.

Mr. FORDNEY. I have a letter which I will send to the Clerk's desk to have read when the matter comes up to which the letter is germane; a letter in which the person who writes it says that a few years ago he paid from 12½ to 15 cents a yard for ordinary calico for a dress for his wife, but that now his wife takes to market in an automobile one setting hen and can buy a silk dress with the proceeds thereof. [Laughter and applause.] That illustrates the difference between the values of farm products and manufactured products then and now. The point I wish to make, gentlemen, is that in reducing the duty from 45 per cent to 20 per cent on this item, if it will permit the importation of automobile parts, you will have then transferred the labor that is now employed in the automobile factories of this country to a foreign land, and to that I most strenuously object. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

122. Bicycles, 25 per cent ad valorem; motor cycles, and finished parts thereof, not including tires, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, if there is any industry in America that has demonstrated its ability to stand on its own feet, it is the automobile industry.

I have listened to a very remarkable statement here, made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. Detroit is prob-

ably the greatest automobile center in America. There is not a man possessed of ordinary business capacity who has gone into the automobile business in Detroit but has not only made a good living but has made in most instances a very great fortune; and if the gentleman will pick up any trade paper in this country or any trade paper published in France or in England he will find that the cheap American automobile has taken a large part of the market in England and in France.

Now, what happened was this: The people abroad were earlier than we in the building of automobiles; they built up an industry long before we did; and there was a time in this country when we were not able to make a machine that was anything like as good as the foreign machine. That time has long since passed, and American ingenuity, American skill, and American ability have, with high-priced American labor—in the sense that it was high-priced in the wage that it got, but was cheap in the work that it gave—have developed what is to-day the greatest automobile industry in the world; and if you had free trade in automobiles, in my judgment, you would not have any serious competition in the cheap automobile industry—in the automobiles that sell anywhere from $750, like the Hupmobile, or similar cars, up to $1,000 or $1,500.

We to-day are making those machines better and cheaper than they are made anywhere else in the world, and it is simply folly, in the face of the actual facts, to talk about a threatened industry. Nothing is being threatened about it. There ought to be a tax on the higher priced cars. But, speaking for myself, I would not feel that there was the slightest risk to the industry as a whole if automobiles were put on the free list.

Let me ask the gentleman what has been the experience in the city of Detroit? How many multimillionaires have been made there, almost overnight, in the automobile industry?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know. I am not in the business.

Mr. SHERLEY. I know, because I happen to know some of the men who have made the money. I am glad they have made it. But I know that there has not been a single concern, well managed, but has not only made a success but a success so great as to be the marvel of modern manufacturing enterprise.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. I know of one gentleman whom the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] knows very well, who by the fortunate investment of a few thousand dollars in an establishment making a very low-priced car, has to-day an annual income very much larger than either the gentleman or I receive for serving our country.

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me say to the gentleman that the only complaint I am making is that if by lowering the rate of duty from 45 to 20 per cent you encourage importation, then you have injured the industry, or the labor, by transferring it abroad; and if it will not do that, why lower the duty?

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course the gentleman and I can never meet upon common ground. He believes we ought to make it impossible for anybody to bring anything into this country. He believes it ought to be made a capital offense. He thinks America can go on selling to the rest of the world and never buying from it. I think it is time for these industries to get out of their swaddling clothes and to go out into the world's market and capture some of it.

Mr. FORDNEY. What you think "the gentleman" thinks, and what you know about what the gentleman thinks, may be two different things.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course, for I am limited to what the gentleman says he thinks, and I may be wrong in my conclusion.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not think I have said anything from which you could draw such a conclusion.

Mr. SHERLEY. During my 10 years of service here the gentleman has stood as the champion of the highest protective tariff that could be written. To-day he is in constant quarrel with nearly every man on his own side, because some of them want to progress, and he wants to stand pat on the tariff.

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend, I always object to progressing as a crawfish does.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, yes; but perhaps the trouble may be in your vision rather than in the direction in which people are progressing.

Mr. FORDNEY. Perhaps.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman has stood on this floor talking about lumber, and he has the same sort of idea about that; whereas it is well known that every man who invested in standing timber as long as five years ago has had the benefit of such an increase in value as to amount to a great return upon the investment. Yet the gentleman thinks if you change a single rate touching lumber you are verily laying an impious hand on the ark of the covenant.

Mr. FORDNEY. Again you are asserting what the gentleman thinks, without knowing what he thinks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I will ask the gentleman in charge of this schedule of the bill for information concerning paragraph 122. I notice it provides for a duty on bicycles of 25 per cent ad valorem, and on motor cycles and finished parts thereof, not including tires, 40 per cent ad valorem. I wish to ask this question because I have a manufacturer back in my home town who asked me recently as to the provision of the present bill as it affects his bicycle-saddle business, the largest in the country, I believe. I notice that in referring to motor cycles it provides for 40 per cent ad valorem on the finished parts thereof, not including tires. Does that include the saddle used on a motor cycle?

Mr. PALMER. I should think so. That is a part of the motor cycle.

Mr. SHARP. Then how would it apply to bicycle saddles? Would it be 25 per cent ad valorem?

Mr. PALMER. The reason that language was not put in in reference to bicycles is that practically all of the parts of bicycles would come in under the basket clause at the same rate that bicycles carry, while as to motor cycles, the basket clause is lower than the motor-cycle rate. In other words, there is not the same necessity for putting it in as to bicycles that there is for putting it in as to motor cycles, because the basket clause and the bicycle rate are the same.

Mr. SHARP. But taking the saddle of the bicycle, would that receive an ad valorem protection of 25 per cent?

Mr. PALMER. No; saddles do not come in the basket clause of the metal schedule.

Mr. SHARP. Does the gentleman mean that bicycle saddles do not?

Mr. PALMER. Unless they are composed in chief value of metal. I am not prepared to say whether those saddles are composed in chief value of metal or in chief value of leather. They have both metal and leather in them.

Mr. SHARP. Turning over to page 114, paragraph 535, you provide for all leather not specially provided for in this section; and then in the latter part of that section you say:

Harness, saddles, and saddlery.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That means leather saddles.

Mr. SHARP. Is that broad enough to include bicycle saddles?

Mr. PALMER. It would if the saddle was composed wholly or in chief value of leather. In that case it comes in under the free list. If it is composed wholly or in chief value of metal it comes in the basket clause of the metal schedule.

Mr. SHARP. Would not the same statement apply where it is used for a motor cycle?

Mr. PALMER. I think not, because under that language it would be a finished part of the motor cycle.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I notice in lines 8 and 9, page 33, motor cycles are dutiable at 40 per cent and the finished parts of the motor cycles, not including tires, also at 40 per cent. In other words, so far as motor cycles and finished parts are concerned, the tariff is 40 per cent, whereas automobiles are dutiable at 45 per cent and the finished parts at 20 per cent. Why is that distinction made between automobiles and their finished parts and no distinction made between motor cycles and their finished parts?

Mr PALMER. The finished parts of small machines are very much larger in value proportion of the finished article than the finished parts of large machines like automobiles. Therefore there is less logic in making parts come in at a less rate in motor cycles than in automobiles.

Mr. COOPER. I can not understand the logic of the gentleman's statement. I do not know why bringing in an automobile chassis and the finished parts of an automobile is not in effect bringing in the automobile itself. It can all be set up here.

Mr. PALMER. Is the gentleman asking me a question

Mr. COOPER. I say I do not understand the logic of the gentleman's statement. I do not know why the finished parts of a motor cycle should be dutiable at the same rate—40 per cent—as the motor cycle itself, and that the finished parts of automobiles should be dutiable at 25 per cent less than completed automobiles

Mr PALMER. I have stated to the gentleman the reason that the committee had.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the two paragraphs, I think, will cause a serious commentary in the mind of any person. The gentleman from Wisconsin just endeavored to extract some in-

formation as to why there was a difference in theory between the two paragraphs, but I did not hear any reply which seemed at all satisfactory.

Mr. GARNER. We are not responsible for the gentleman's failure of mind.

Mr. MANN. Usually it is desirable to make finished parts pay a little higher duty than the entire assembled machine, because that causes the parts to be made here rather than abroad. But under the automobile paragraph itself it is to the interest of anyone to make the parts abroad, or have them made abroad and brought here. You can bring in an entire automobile, if knocked down, and that is the way they naturally will come in, at 20 and 30 per cent advalorem instead of 45 per cent for the finished machine.

And yet when you get to motor cycles the rate on the finished machines is made at 40 per cent instead of 45 per cent, as it is on the finished automobile, and the rate on the finished parts is put at 40 per cent, and only 20 per cent on the finished parts of automobiles. No wonder the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not furnish an explanation. A man to understand that will have to eat a welsh rarebit and go to sleep. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

125. Bolts, with or without threads or nuts, or bolt blanks, finished hinges or hinge blanks, nuts, and washers, 15 per cent ad valorem; spiral nut locks and lock washers, whether of iron or steel, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 21, insert, after the word "bolts," the words "of iron or steel."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 22, insert, after the word "nuts," the words "or blanks."

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word; and, with the permission of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I want to ask him a question. I received a letter this morning from Dr. J. B. Mason, of London, Ky., who wants to know what tariff duties, if any, this bill carries on scientific and surgical instruments and equipment. He goes on further to state that it is his opinion that they are not manufactured in this country to any great extent.

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania refuse to answer the question?

Mr. PALMER. Oh, no; I do not refuse. They are not in this schedule. I am trying to find them, and if the gentleman will read the bill he will find them.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I have read the bill, but I failed to find them.

Mr. PALMER. Is the gentleman talking about surgical instruments or surgical utensils?

Mr. POWERS. Surgical instruments and equipments and those used by dentists.

Mr. PALMER. Hospital utensils would come under paragraph 136, which is printed on page 36, while surgical instruments not specifically enumerated would, if made in chief value of the metals covered by the metal schedule, come in under the basket clause, at 25 per cent.

Mr. POWERS. Does paragraph 136 cover the instruments that dentists use in their profession?

Mr. PALMER. No; I would think not.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman's attention to page 120 of the bill, paragraph 587:

Professional books, implements, instruments, and tools of trade, occupation, or employment in the actual possession of persons emigrating to the United States owned and used by them abroad; but this exemption shall not be construed to include machinery or other articles imported for use in any manufacturing establishment.

I suppose that has reference to professional instruments.

Mr. POWERS. That is on the free list; but that only applies to instruments brought here and used by immigrants.

Mr. PALMER. That is for scientific, religious, literary, or experimental purposes.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to state that my constituents inform me that the instruments used by dentists are not manufactured in this country at all, or that virtually few of them are, and that the American dentists pay at least 100 per cent more for the equipment of their offices than do the German dentists. If that is true, a provision ought to be made letting those matters come in free of duty.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

126. Card clothing not actually and permanently fitted to and attached to carding machines or to parts thereof at the time of importation, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of drawing the attention of the committee once more to the protective-tariff tendencies of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER]. Under the bill of last Congress articles named in this paragraph were made dutiable at 30 per cent. They are dutiable in this bill at 40 per cent. It seems, however, that upon at least one class of the articles dutiable under this paragraph the gentleman from Pennsylvania has somewhat exceeded the speed limit. On card clothing manufactured with round iron or untempered round steel wire the duty under the present law amounts, in ad valorem equivalent, to 16.29 per cent, based on the importation of 1911. This paragraph increases that duty 250 per cent. That certainly ought to be satisfactory to any protectionist, even though he come from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PAYNE. But being in this bill it is a revision downward, nevertheless.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes; of course.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON]. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill why certain parts of this paragraph were eliminated in H. R. 3321 as against H. R. 10.

Mr. PALMER. Those words were simply descriptive in H. R. 10.

Mr. MURDOCK. That was the sole reason for their elimination?

Mr. PALMER. That is all. They got into H. R. 10 because following the language of the Payne bill the descriptive words were necessary by reason of the larger number of classifications, and when we put them all in at one rate, without any classification, it became unnecessary to have these descriptive words, and we dropped them out. It has no other effect.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota has several times adverted to the fact that rates of duty in this bill were raised over what they were in the Underwood bill passed in the Sixty-second Congress. If his judgment of my practice in regard to tariff making were to be taken at its full value in Pennsylvania, I would be popular with manufacturers, indeed.

But as they look at the facts and consider that which has been done by the Ways and Means Committee, I find I am somewhat unpopular in Pennsylvania with the manufacturers. Thanks to my friend from Minnesota, therefore, I expect to get it from both ends. I want to say to him now, to end this discussion once and for all, that this Schedule C carries every rate lower than the Payne tariff law, with two exceptions, and those are the ferromanganese item, which we have discussed before, gold and silver ware and gold and silver plated ware.

Mr. MANN. How about finished automobiles?

Mr. PALMER. Finished automobiles are the same in this law as the Payne law.

Mr. MANN. But not any lower.

Mr. PALMER. Well, I said we did carry two increases in this bill.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman said it carried lower rates in every case except two. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PALMER. Well——

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman amends that.

Mr. PALMER. I will amend that if the gentleman wants to be so accurate, and say there are two increases in this bill—I thought that is what I did say—over the Payne law, and those are the two I have mentioned. Every other item in the bill has a very considerable reduction below the Payne bill, so that the average reduction is from 34.35 per cent to about 20 per cent throughout the schedule. Now, the Underwood bill last year is somewhat different from this bill now, and there are just 11 increases in this schedule of the bill over the rates of the Underwood bill and 12 decreases in the rates of this bill under those of the Underwood bill; but on the whole this bill is lower than the bill of the Sixty-second Congress, as far as Schedule C is concerned. I have them here in a list and will publish in the RECORD the changes that have been made in this schedule from those in the same schedule of last year's bill in the Sixty-second Congress. Therefore, taking the schedule throughout, there is absolutely no truth in the insinuation or intimation that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] would throw out

that this bill indicates a tendency toward an upward scale in the making of a tariff from that of a year and a half ago. If he will be honest with the committee and with the House while he goes along and calls attention to these slight and inconsequential increases, he will call attention also to the fact of the large and considerable decreases which we have put in this law under those of the Underwood bill of a year ago. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER rose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit me, I desire to ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Referring to the statement just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] in contradiction of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], will the gentleman from Pennsylvania turn to page 100 of his report? Has the gentleman that page? Now I will ask the gentleman whether it is true that card clothing manufactured with round iron or untempered round steel wire is charged to-day a duty of 20 cents per square foot. Is that correct or not according to your report?

Mr. PALMER. That is right.

Mr. GARDNER. That is true. I understood the gentleman to say that is true?

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman can read as well as I can.

Mr. GARDNER. Very well. Under your new bill that same card clothing is charged 40 per cent ad valorem, and the gentleman from Minnesota declares that to be a rise in duty over the Payne law. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania deny that?

Mr. PALMER. Well, the rate on card clothing under the Payne law is nearly 60 per cent. The rate in this bill now is 40 per cent, but even at 60 per cent the fact is that there was very considerable competition, and that is the reason why we raised this rate slightly above the Underwood bill of a year ago.

Mr. GARDNER. I am afraid the gentleman did not understand my question. As an illustration, I singled out the first item in paragraph 145 of the Payne law, as did the gentleman from Minnesota. I referred to "card clothing * * * when manufactured with round iron or untempered round steel wire." The duty under existing law is 20 cents per square foot. In the pending bill you have raised the duty on that kind of card clothing to 40 per cent ad valorem. According to your figures on page 121 the average value of imported card clothing per square foot is 82½ cents. Consequently the 40 per cent ad valorem duty which you propose amounts to 33 cents per square foot. Unless it is denied that a duty of 33 cents per square foot is higher than a duty of 20 cents per square foot, it is evident that the gentleman from Minnesota was correct in his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

127. Cast-iron pipe of every description, 12 per cent ad valorem; cast-iron andirons, plates, stove plates, sadirons, tailor's irons, hatter's irons, and castings and vessels wholly of cast iron, including all castings of iron or cast-iron plates which have been chiseled, drilled, machined, or otherwise advanced in condition by processes or operations subsequent to the casting process but not made up into articles or finished machine parts; castings of malleable iron not specially provided for in this section; cast hollow ware, coated, glazed, or tinned, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, at the end of line 14, insert the words: "Not specially provided for in this section."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if it would have done any good, I should have offered, and would hereafter offer, some amendments as we progress in the bill, raising the rate of duty proposed. I recognize the futility of offering amendments of that character in the present temper of the Democratic majority, and that the offering of such amendments would only consume much more time than would otherwise be spent. While I think that this bill will be very injurious to the business and other interests of the country, still I have never felt like prolonging agony beyond the time when it might be ended, and as we are to have the passage of the tariff bill through the House in the present form substantially, with a reasonable discussion which so far, I think, has been allowed, the sooner the better. This item reduces very materially the rate of duty on chains, and I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to be read in my time a letter from one of the prominent men whom I know and who is engaged in the manufacture of chains.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOUSTON). The Clerk will read the letter.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk is about to read a communication for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in his time.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHICAGO, *March 18, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Now that President Wilson has issued the call for a special session of Congress to consider a new tariff bill, we wish to call your attention to the item of chain in the iron and steel schedule.

The present duty on chain is 45 per cent ad valorem, and I understand that Mr. UNDERWOOD proposes to cut this to about 20 per cent.

This is entirely too much of a reduction, for the simple reason that it will allow chain which is made in foreign countries to come in in such quantities as to close down the shops in this country unless the wages of our men are almost cut in half.

This is a pretty strong statement, but when you consider that in Germany boys of from 12 to 16 years of age are employed in making the lighter sizes of chain and are paid 35 cents a day; from 16 to 18, 45 cents per day; 18 to 20, 60 cents per day; and married men, 87½ cents per day.

In England, in the "black district," women and girls make all the smaller sizes of chain, and it is one of the worst "sweated" trades there is. These women are known as "outworkers" and earn from $1.50 to $3.50 per week.

The making of chain is on a piecework scale of wages, and on one size the men are paid 40 cents per 100 pounds, where we in this country pay 84 cents, other sizes in proportion.

A very timely article on this subject appeared in the January 3, 1913, edition of the Hardware Reporter, and it fully describes the condition in "the black country."

A reduction in the tariff, as proposed by Mr. UNDERWOOD, will come very nearly destroying the chain-making industry in this country, and we trust you will do everything in your power to have a duty sufficiently high retained to enable us to continue in business and pay reasonable wages to our men.

After a careful study of the situation, we firmly believe that any duty lower than what would be the equivalent of 35 per cent ad valorem would be disastrous to the industry.

Will you kindly let us hear from you in regard to the above?

Yours, very truly,

S. G. TAYLOR CHAIN CO.
S. G. TAYLOR, JR., *President.*

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert as a new paragraph the following:

"PAR. 128½. All scientific and surgical instruments and equipment, 5 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that is not in order at this point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, what is the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. That it is not germane to this paragraph of the bill.

Mr. MANN. It is a new paragraph. It was not offered as germane to any paragraph. It is germane to the bill and germane to this schedule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman overlooks the proposition that it must be germane to the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but he offered it as an independent paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understood the gentleman to offer it as an amendment to this paragraph.

Mr. MANN. No. He offered it as an independent paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order. I think that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS] is recognized.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to state this to the majority leader, as I do not believe he was in the room a while ago. I received a letter this morning from Dr. J. B. Mason, of London, Ky., who is a dentist, and in his letter he wants to know what data, if any, your bill carries on scientific and surgical instruments and equipment. He goes on further to state that it is his information that practically none of these are manufactured in this country. He states further that it costs an American doctor at least 100 per cent more to equip his office than it does a German doctor. Now, if that is true, I think this paragraph ought to be voted into this bill. I would like to hear the majority leader on the matter.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that the gentleman proposes to put a tax of 5 per cent on surgical in-

struments. Now, most surgical instruments in this bill are taxed under the basket clause 25 per cent. Some of them are in 136, "Hospital utensils," that are also taxed at 25 per cent. But the bill carries in the bill philosophical and scientific apparatus, utensils, instruments, and so on, imported specially by order for the use of any society or institution incorporated or established for religious, philosophical, educational, scientific, or literary purposes, or for the encouragement of the fine arts, or for the use and by order of any college, academy, school, or seminary of learning in the United States, and so on.

Now, I think that that is a very broad exception to the rule. These surgical instruments, under the bill as it stands, for a hospital, or for an eleemosynary institution, can be brought in free. But even that liberality was protested against. The testimony had before the Committee on Ways and Means showed that some of the surgical instruments are patented, and that many are devised by American doctors without patents. As a rule, they do not take out a patent on them, but get a manufacturer in America to make them, and after they are made and introduced and used here they are copied abroad and shipped in here.

I think this provision exempting them from taxation when intended for use in hospitals or in eleemosynary institutions and in works of science is as broad as it is necessary to go. They are on a revenue basis, and I do not think there is any reason for adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. If I understand the gentleman's explanation, that provision applies to hospitals and eleemosynary institutions?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. But it does not apply to the individual dentists, and those individual dentists' tools would come in under the basket clause, which carries a duty of 25 per cent?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; and that is a reduction from 45 per cent to 25 per cent.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. On page 120, in the free list, these instruments and tools of trade are exempted to those persons who emigrate to the United States—professional persons. Does not the gentleman think that if those persons can bring their instruments here with them our own professional people ought to have an equal opportunity of obtaining them?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I think the gentleman's question is rather captious. When an immigrant comes to our shores and wants to bring with him the tools of his trade we let him bring them, as we let him bring the clothes on his body, free. We do not want him to wander around the streets without clothes, or be taxed for the clothes on his back, and we allow him to bring in also the tools of his trade in his hand, so as to enable him to earn an honest living in America. The conditions are entirely different.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate be closed on this paragraph and amendments thereto.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is quoting an old Republican doctrine that has been heard here for a good many years. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

130. Penknives, pocketknives, clasp knives, pruning knives, budding knives, erasers, manicure knives, and all knives by whatever name known, including such as are denominatively mentioned in this section, which have folding or other than fixed blades or attachments, and razors, all the foregoing, whether assembled but not fully finished or finished; valued at not more than $1 per dozen, 35 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than $1 per dozen, 55 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That blades, handles, or other parts of any of the foregoing knives, razors, or erasers shall be dutiable at not less than the rate herein imposed upon the knives, razors, and erasers of which they are parts. Scissors and shears, and blades for the same, finished or unfinished, 30 per cent ad valorem: *Provided further*, That all articles specified in this paragraph shall, when imported, have the name of the maker or purchaser and beneath the same the name of the country of origin die-sunk conspicuously and indelibly on the blade, shank, or tang of at least one or, if practicable, each and every blade thereof.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the paragraphs where the gentlemen on the other side have had a change of heart since the Underwood bill of a year ago was prepared. That bill put a duty of 35 per cent on all of these articles. This bill, after exempting a considerable class of articles which sell for less than a dollar a dozen, leaving those in that class at 35 per cent, increases the remainder from 35 per cent to 55 per cent.

I am inclined to think that if the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means had about 10 years longer they would be able to get up a pretty good bill, because occasionally when they make a move they move in the right direction. They have improved the Underwood bill of a year ago very much on this paragraph.

Now this paragraph puts the same duty on the parts as it does on the assembled knives. This thing of bringing in knives in parts is something that occurred away back in 1890, when they evaded the proper tariff on cutlery by bringing it in in parts at a lower rate of duty—just what they would do if there is any opportunity to do it in the case of automobiles. I do not care so much about automobiles. Four years ago we found that they were not building any automobiles in this country and we placed a lower rate on a great many things that came in in the basket clause at 45 per cent and left automobiles at 45 per cent. The result has been in the last four years something that is marvelous, or would be if it had not happened so frequently in this country before, to the same or to a greater degree, by the multiplying of the products of the factories since putting on a protective tariff. Why, it was almost a new industry four years ago, and you have heard a description of the wonderful growth of it in the city of Detroit and in Michigan and all over the country. In my own town there are three factories that are making automobile parts, and they are busy all the time and inventing new parts. Our inventive genius has been at work, and it will always be at work whenever we have an industry here protected so that the boys and the men can be brought face to face with the problem to see what they have got to do toward inventing machines that cheapen the cost of production and add to the value of the labor that is put in by the human hand. We have developed this wonderful industry in automobiles in the last four years. The gentlemen have kept the duty on. Of course it was not at all for the sake of protection. They did not do it because they did not want to run the risk of throttling this industry, but they have kept on the duty of 45 per cent.

I think probably they could safely have reduced it, because the industry has become established, and because we are doing the best work, and we are selling our cheap machines abroad. And notwithstanding the slander that has gone out from high quarters against our American manufacturers and against the laborers at work in our shops and the skill of our mechanics, four years have demonstrated that we can learn more about making automobiles, and have learned more, than any other country in the world. Now, that does not mean that we can get along unless we can keep this market for our people, even at competitive rates. We must have the difference if we pay the difference in wages to labor. We have got to have this, the best market in the world, to keep our factories running, and when they do run, to sell something across the water and increase the output, and run them day in and day out, day and night. And having paid the original overhead charges, we can cheapen the article here and cheapen it elsewhere, and so go on from prosperity to prosperity. Do not turn them out and tell them that we will not give them an adequate tariff to make up the difference in cost here and abroad because of our labor, but give them the continued opportunity. I shall have something to say again, by and by, when we reach it, on these articles that we snatched out of the "not otherwise provided" clause in the tariff, where they had been running for years, four years ago, and put them in other places in the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman criticizes this clause in the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I am commending it, as far as it goes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But the gentleman criticized our putting the same rate on blades and handles and other parts of knives and cutlery that we placed on the knives themselves.

Mr. PAYNE. I was commending it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understood the gentleman to criticize it.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, no; you did exactly right, as far as you went.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that on pocketknives and clasp knives valued at not exceeding $1.25 a dozen the rate in his bill was 5 cents per piece and 40 per cent ad valorem. On parts of knives and

blades valued at not exceeding $1.25 per dozen the rate was 5 cents per piece and 40 per cent ad valorem. On knives valued above $1.25 and not exceeding $3 your rate was 10 cents apiece and 40 per cent ad valorem. On parts valued at more than $1.25 but not exceeding $3 your rate on the parts was 10 cents apiece and 40 per cent ad valorem. On knives valued above $3 per dozen your rate was 20 cents apiece and 40 per cent ad valorem. On the parts valued above $3 per dozen your rate was 20 cents apiece and 40 per cent ad valorem, putting exactly the same rate on the parts as you put on the knives themselves. Yet you criticize our bill for doing the same thing.

Now, we did change this rate. Gentlemen on that side of the House are disposed to criticize this committee because we are not standpatters. Well, I recognize that we are not standpatters. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is an old member of that school in every sense of the word; but this committee was glad to receive information, glad to adjust its rates according to its principles. With the lights before us a year ago, we fixed a rate of 35 per cent on this entire schedule. After further investigation we found that the 35 per cent was an ample rate, in our judgment, on cutlery valued at less than $1 a dozen, but that we were going to have a very competitive rate on cutlery valued above a dollar a dozen. Now, our principle is to levy a revenue tax, and by that we mean a competitive tax, and by a competitive tax we mean a tax that produces reasonable competition and not disastrous competition.

As we thought that the rate we had a year ago probably was too drastic and allowed competition to be too great, and unnecessarily too great, and by a division of rates we could still have a reasonable competitive tariff—one that would bring sufficient revenue to the Government on a competitive rate—both rates were largely decreased in the present bill. We concluded that it was wise for us to divide this paragraph in two parts and put a higher rate on those valued at a dollar a dozen in order that we might carry out our principles within reasonable limits.

Now, the gentleman from New York criticizes the fact that we made changes in this bill. Why, gentlemen, if you would view the Payne bill as it came before this House four years ago, I believe after it was reported to the House, not originally introduced—there were two prints in the House, and when it came back from the Senate its own author did not know it. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

On many of the vital items in the bill the gentleman from New York took this bill back into the committee and changed it continuously.

Mr. PAYNE. I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that this bill has not got back from the Senate yet. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not a prophet, but I think the bill will come back more recognizable than did the gentleman's bill. Mr. Chairman, I ask that debate on the paragraph close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOUSTON). The gentleman from Alabama moves that debate close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 35, lines 9 and 10, after the word "dozen" in each line, strike out the figures 35 and 55, and insert in lieu thereof the figures 45 and 65.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Alabama whether he does not think the present rates are really entitled to be called competitive? According to the statistics I have, the American production of pocketknives amounted to about $3,000,000, with importations amounting to about two million and a half dollars. That comes pretty near making competitive rates. The rates in this paragraph have been cut below the rates in the Wilson bill of 1896, which were 53.12, and these rates are 40. It seems to me that they ought to be put back to what they were in the Wilson bill or a little above.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that there are some parts of this schedule that are quite competitive. There are other parts that are entirely prohibitive. The lower grade of knives under the present rates is prohibitive. The competitive part of this schedule is largely above the dollar a dozen. We have cut most of the things that go into the cost of production in these knives. Take the whole schedule and there was only $811,000 in importations. Now, we have not made a drastic cut in these rates under these circumstances, because we have left on this class of knives above a dollar a dozen 55 per cent, one of the highest rates in this bill. When you come to consider that 55 per cent will largely more than equalize the difference in cost of labor—as a matter of fact the 55 per cent will more than amount to the entire labor cost—it seems to me that we have left a very reasonable rate in this bill so far as the manufacturer is concerned, and yet a rate that, I think, will produce a fair amount of competition, and we intended to produce a fair amount of competition.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am occupying the time of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman from New York has yielded the floor. A moment ago, in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], the gentleman from Alabama said that the Committee on Ways and Means had changed the rates in the pending Underwood bill from those in the Underwood bill of a year ago, because on further investigation the committee had found that the bill of a year ago would permit too great competition. Too great competition for whom—the consumer?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; it could not be too great for the consumer.

Mr. COOPER. Then, if it is not too great for the consumer, is the gentleman trying to protect the producer—the manufacturer—against competition?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We were compelled to lower the tariff to a revenue basis, and a revenue basis does not mean that there shall be great competition with the American producer, that he shall be overwhelmed with competition.

It means reasonable competition, and, as I stated, we were apprehensive that the rate established two years ago on the top end of this schedule might produce too great competition with the American manufacturer, and therefore, in justice to the American manufacturer we put the rate higher than we had it in last year's bill, but make a considerable reduction below what it was in the Payne bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, too great competition means too much importation, but great importation would produce revenue. Does the gentleman mean too much revenue?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, the gentleman is trying to assume that it is necessary for us to throw down the bars and consider nothing in this reduction but the question of the floodgate of importation and increasing the revenue.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption right there?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Wait one moment until I finish. I have said in the beginning, and I say now, that although on that side of the House you criticize this bill as a drastic bill and as a drastic revision, that except in some vital necessities the committee has endeavored to lower this tariff with a jackscrew and not with an axe, and in cutting this rate we preferred to make it more gradual than we had it in the other bill. That is the whole thing.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, what I had in mind was this: The Democratic platform declares that a tariff levied to protect an American industry is in violation of the Constitution of the United States. If this be true, it follows, therefore, that Members of Congress having sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, and to support it without mental reservation, have taken an oath not to enact a tariff to protect an industry against too great competition. The Democratic tariff must be for revenue only, and the question of the welfare or the condition of an industry or the question of too great competition ought not to be taken into account.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. MANN. But, Mr. Chairman, I understood that certain gentlemen were to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota was to be recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. I thought I was to be recognized for five minutes, and if the Chair will recognize me now I will be very glad to yield one minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] said that under his bill of a year ago there was danger of too great competition, but not, he said, too great competition for the consumer—there could not be for the consumer. Then he must have meant for the American producer—that is, the American producer and manufacturer were to meet with too great competition—and to remedy this the rates were changed in the Underwood bill now before us. And yet, according to the Democratic platform adopted last year, rates fixed in a tariff bill in order to shield a manufacturer from

too great competition violate the Constitution of the United States.

I cite this only to show in this instance the utter inconsistency between Democratic platform principles and Democratic practice.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, when the bill passed last year it carried a 35 per cent ad valorem rate upon knives valued either above or below $1 per dozen. In the veto message which President Taft sent to this House he called attention to the fact that this rate on knives would destroy the industry of producing the higher priced knives in this country. The gentlemen thereupon made a further study of the subject, and now propose a rate of 35 per cent on knives below $1 a dozen and 55 per cent on knives above $1 a dozen. Of course, with the rate at 35 per cent the amount paid would be very much higher on knives above a dollar a dozen than on knives below a dollar a dozen; but here is a jump in the rate from 35 per cent to 55 per cent, as a protective measure, and to that extent I commend the gentlemen for following the advice of President Taft on the subject.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] a moment ago undertook to say, as I understood him, that under the Payne law the rates on parts of knives is the same as the rate on the finished knives. I do not so understand. I do not know what the gentleman was reading from, but probably one of the Treasury reports.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Here it is in my hand—imports for consumption.

Mr. MANN. Very well, and I hold the law in my hand.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Here is the Treasury authority upon the subject.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; that is not Treasury authority at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It gives the rates.

Mr. MANN. That is, giving the amount of importations.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no; it gives the rates. If the gentleman wants to see it, I will be glad to show it to him.

Mr. MANN. I will take what the gentleman said there, although that is not complete. There the rate given was 10 cents each, plus an ad valorem rate, whether it was a knife or an unfinished part of a knife. Does anyone say that is the same rate? If you have 10 cents apiece on the blade and 10 cents apiece on the knife that is not the same as 10 cents on the finished knife. I am going to say I know the gentleman from Alabama is able to add 10 and 10 together and make 20. The rate is not the same and was not the same, and the information which the gentleman has is not complete. This is the law which I am holding in my hand in comparison with the existing law. The Payne law was designed to have knives made and assembled here in this country by American labor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] repudiates with considerable heat and some scorn the idea that he is a protectionist. If I have said anything from which it may be fairly inferred that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was a real protectionist, I did him a great injustice. He is not a real protectionist. He is only a semiprotectionist. He believes in partly protecting the industries of the great State of Pennsylvania. He does not believe in protecting the wool industry of the State of Wyoming or the wheat industry of the State of Minnesota, so I say that he is only a semiprotectionist. Now, the gentleman from Alabama insists that the rates of the present bill are competitive. I pointed out several instances in which the rates of the present bill are very large increases over the rates of the Underwood bill of the last Congress. We were told during the last Congress that the rates of that bill were competitive. Now, I submit that if the rates of that bill were competitive the rates which have been increased in this bill are prohibitive. Again, if the rates of this bill are competitive, the rates of that bill were way below the competitive rate and destructive, and the only fair inference is that that bill was offered and passed through the House and the Senate with a view of its meeting the presidential veto and of fooling the American people.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, we have heard much in reference to the proposed new competitive tariff. If there is any place that it has application, here is the schedule to which it ought to be applied. The importations of this class of goods are now large, and they are constantly increasing. The rates which are imposed by this bill under consideration, with one exception, are not as much as they were under the Wilson bill, under which the industry was gradually dying out. The wages paid in this industry here in America are three times what they are in Germany, from which nearly all the importations come. The gentleman says he has imposed a rate in this bill which will cover the difference in cost. If so, why were these importations being continually increased, and what figures have been given to show when the wages are so much larger in this country than they are abroad? This rate that is proposed is not nearly enough to cover the difference in wages and the other increased costs of manufacturing in this country. It is simply leaving the American worker on cutlery at the mercy of his foreign competitors.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

137. Needles for knitting or sewing machines, latch needles, crochet needles, and tape needles, knitting and all curriers', drawing, farriers', fleshing, hay, tanners', plumbers', painters', palette, artists', and shoe knives, forks and steels, finished or unfinished, without handles, 25 per cent ad valorem; with handles, 30 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That all the articles specified in this paragraph, when imported, shall have the name of the maker or purchaser, and beneath the same the name of the country of origin indelibly stamped or branded thereon in a place that shall not be covered thereafter.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I tried to get recognition from the Chair on the last paragraph in regard to butcher knives, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not hear the gentleman and will recognize the gentleman now.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I simply want to call attention to the fact that there is a raise on the butcher and kitchen knife business in the duty. The paragraph in the former Underwood bill had a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem in those knives with or without handles, but they differentiate here; without handles they put it at 25 per cent and with handles they put it at 30 per cent, another instance where he ought to take off his hat to President Taft and beg his pardon for what he had said about him in the campaign when he called attention in his veto to these various little slips that he had made in that bill, having so many things not even on a competitive basis let alone a protective basis. There is another thing to which I wish to call attention. The President of the United States in his campaign last fall said that his cheek blushed with shame when he saw in a shop an article stamped, "Made in Germany" He did not know that was in the law. They have got it in this bill, they had it in the former paragraph requiring the stamping of the name on the article itself, and I hope the gentleman, when he consults with the President the next time about this bill, will tell the President that that was put in the law way back in 1890 and it has been kept there ever since.

That is the reason his cheeks flushed with shame when he saw "Made in Germany" on the knife, and arrived at the unpatriotic conclusion that that was because the Germany goods were better. It was because our American goods are better that our American manufacturers insisted that that stamp be put on the article, way back in 1890, and because of their insistence it is there yet in this present law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman states that this paragraph is a raise in the rates. The Payne bill levied a rate of 41 per cent.

Mr. PAYNE. I did not say it raised the rate in the Payne bill, but in the Underwood bill of a year ago.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman failed to explain himself, and therefore I will apologize.

Mr. PAYNE. I spoke about the President's vetoing of your bill a year ago. The gentleman does not pay attention.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will leave it to the RECORD. You would imagine from what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said a moment ago that the President had vetoed these iron and steel schedules on account of these items we had raised. I have just read the veto message to see whether he said anything about knives, or butcher knives, or the raising of the rates; and if the President ever heard of the subject he entirely overlooked it and did not mention it in his message.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman will allow me, I could tell the gentleman they were not mentioned by name in the veto message, and also that the President got his information before the Senate committee, both as to knives and other items, and that is the reason he vetoed your bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. He vetoed it without informing us, and, therefore, as he did not inform us it is evident that we did not raise the rate on account of the President's vetoing it.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman has the message there. Did he not say he vetoed it because you had reduced the rates on certain articles there?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; the principal tune the President sung in this message was in relation to machine tools made in Cincinnati.

Mr. PAYNE. He spoke generally about rates.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The President probably told the gentleman from New York his reasons for vetoing the bill under the

impression that he was the Congress, and then forgot to put it in his message.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Exactly. And cutlery is a very important industry in the State of my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE], and as the President left it out of the veto message I have no doubt he salved the soul of the gentleman from New York by telling him he was taking care of his home industry.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say to the gentleman that I never said a word concerning the veto message to the President.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in view of the recent statement of an explanation of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] as to the competitive principle in this tariff, I would like to ask the gentleman whether on the paragraph we passed a short time ago, as to automobiles, the 45 per cent is a competitive or a revenue-raising rate?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I positively decline to go back to it at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I hope we will have time to do so in the consideration of this bill, so that we may have an explanation as to whether the rate in the automobile item is a competitive or a revenue-raising rate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that during his absence I fully discussed that, as did my colleague, and I refer him to to-morrow morning's RECORD for the information.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, line 12, after the word "shotguns," strike out the comma.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

135. Breech-loading shotguns and rifles, combination shotguns and rifles, and parts thereof and fittings therefor, including barrels further advanced than rough bored only; pistols, whether automatic, magazine, or revolving, or parts thereof and fittings therefor, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] a moment ago were unreasonable enough to expect the gentlemen in charge of the bill to express or to exhibit any consistent line of argument with regard to it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I want to advise my friend from Wyoming that I am going to be unreasonable enough to insist that he shall argue this paragraph. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. Very well. I shall be very glad to do it, because this paragraph illustrates the inconsistency to which I was going to refer. Sometimes the gentlemen place a higher rate of duty on the raw material or on the parts of the finished product than on the finished product itself. Sometimes the rates are just the other way, and sometimes, as in this case, the rate is the same on the raw material, on the parts, and on the finished product.

I was about to remark, when interrupted by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], that it is altogether unreasonable for gentlemen on this side to expect the gentlemen in charge of the bill to be logical in their explanation of the bill, because the bill itself is so illogical that there is no logical explanation that can be given of its paragraphs and of its rates. We started out with a free-trade schedule and with a free-trade defender thereof in the person of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON]. The next schedule was defended by a tariff-for-revenue gentleman, with some leaning toward protection. This particular schedule is in the charge of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], who is a partial protectionist in spots. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Wyoming is not discussing kitchen knives or table knives, although his discussion is very pointed [laughter], or any sort of a gun.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the cases where I understand the gentleman has reduced the rate with a jackscrew. [Laughter on the Republican side.] How much the gentleman must have regretted it when some one who is said to reside at the other end of the Avenue took the jackscrew from under his wool rate! [Laughter on the Republican side.]

I will not say that placing wool on the free list is a reduction with an ax, it is a reduction by dynamite, even more destructive than by any ax. [Laughter.] In this particular paragraph the gentleman is consistent in his inconsistency, and the American manufacturer can either buy the parts of his shotguns abroad or buy them at home, as he sees fit. Ordinarily in the interest of competition the gentleman from Alabama has so arranged the rates that it is to the advantage of the manufacturer or of the assembler of manufactured articles to buy the parts abroad and employ no labor in the United States in the fabrication of these articles, save alone in their assembling. But the gentleman is not consistent as to that, because that rule, carried out in some of the schedules, is violated in others, as it is in the one now under discussion. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

136. Table, kitchen, and hospital utensils, or other similar hollow ware of aluminum or of iron or steel, enameled or glazed with vitreous glasses, but not ornamented or decorated with lithographic or other printing, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, line 20, after the word "ware," insert the words "composed wholly or of chief value."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

140. Rivets, studs, and steel points, lathed, machined, or brightened, and rivets or studs for nonskidding automobile tires, and rivets of iron or steel, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem.

141. Crosscut saws, mill saws, pit and drag saws, circular saws, steel band saws, finished or further advanced than tempered and polished, hand, back, and all other saws, not specially provided for in this section, 12 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask my friend from Pennsylvania if these saws embraced in this paragraph at 12 per cent duty include the Disston saws that he found advertised in the Saturday Evening Post that were sold all over creation and everywhere else?

Mr. PALMER. Yes; and we reduced the rate from something like——

Mr. PAYNE. I can tell the gentleman—from 25 per cent to 12 per cent.

Mr. PALMER. I think it was from 30 per cent to 12 per cent.

Mr. PAYNE. No; from 25 per cent to 12 per cent.

Mr PALMER. Below the Payne law.

Mr. PAYNE. I think I cut it in two four years ago.

Mr. PALMER. And we followed suit and cut it in two again.

Mr. PAYNE. You are following suit on a good many things and are learning all the time. If you would only be consistent about it we could commend your bill.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I should like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania why it is that he reduced down to 20 per cent ad valorem the duty on rivets or studs for nonskidding automobile tires but retained the duty of 45 per cent on the automobiles?

Mr. PALMER. If the gentleman had been here when we discussed the automobile question——

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Unfortunately I was not, and unfortunately also I have not the disposition to read all that the gentleman said about it. It would take too much time.

Mr. PALMER. I do not think the gentleman ought to take advantage of his absence from his duty to compel us to go over again that which we have discussed very considerably in his absence.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And I think it is very unfair to ask the rest of us to listen to it, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. PALMER. I think so. I agree with that entirely. But I will say to the gentleman from South Dakota briefly that it is only finished automobiles that bear the rate of 45 per cent. The automobile chassis, which is the only part of the automobile which is imported for the cheaper cars or for the commercial cars, comes in at 30 per cent, and parts of automobiles under this law come in at 20 per cent.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Why should these separate parts pay 20 per cent and the parts combined into an automobile pay 45 per cent?

Mr. PALMER. In the interest of finishing this bill I refer the gentleman to the RECORD. I do not care to go over that any more.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

143. Umbrella and parasol ribs and stretchers, composed in chief value of iron, steel, or other metal, in frames or otherwise, and tubes for umbrellas, wholly or partially finished, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, line 13, after the word "finished," strike out "35 per cent ad valorem" and insert "40 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph illustrates the habit of the committee of imposing even higher duties on the raw materials than on the finished articles. It is strange that so many people of the United States were deceived during the late campaign into believing that the Democratic Party would play fair with the manufacturers of the country, and would not destroy legitimate industries.

One of the gentlemen who had perfect faith that the party now in control would frame a tariff bill that would not destroy legitimate industry advises me that "a mistake" has been made in that part of the bill which relates to umbrellas and the component parts thereof. Indeed, I find there are several gentlemen who have the same notion. One of them writes:

Now, it must surely have been an oversight on the part of the committee to give a preference of 15 per cent to foreign manufacturers and to otherwise handicap the American makers by having the completed article 15 per cent lower than the component parts. Such a schedule, if put through, would be apt to put every American manufacturer out of business.

Mr. Chairman, the committee in this bill fixed the umbrella duty at 30 per cent ad valorem, and then they fixed the duty upon umbrella and parasol ribs and stretchers which enter into the manufacture of the umbrella at 35 per cent. Then, in order to make it still more interesting to the man whose industry in this country was not to be destroyed, when it came to the woven fabric, of which silk was a component part, they provided a duty of 45 per cent ad valorem, so that they made it utterly impossible, if a man wanted to manufacture an umbrella in this country, to get any of his raw materials at a less price than the foreigner could send his finished umbrella into the country for.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman will allow me, I want to suggest to him that the item was in at 30 per cent instead of 35 per cent in the Underwood bill a year ago, and undoubtedly the veto was what called attention to it. I want to inquire whether it would not have been better for these gentlemen to have gone to the White House a year ago, instead of confining their visit to about a month ago?

Mr. MOORE. I think the gentleman is entirely right in his supposition as to what they should have done. But the truth is, the committee saw that an error had been made in attempting to establish a revenue duty in regard to umbrella frames, and did, on the appeal of certain Democratic representatives of manufacturers of umbrellas, change base and give an added protection of 5 per cent, bringing the rate upon finished umbrellas up to 35 per cent. As the situation now stands, umbrella and parasol ribs and stretchers, composed in chief value of iron, steel, or other metals, and tubes for umbrellas are to come into the United States at a duty of 35 per cent, and the finished umbrella is to come in at 35 per cent, but the silk which goes into the umbrella—and most people, whether rich or poor, use umbrellas in this country—is taxed at 45 per cent. So everything as it stands in the bill is in the interest of the men who want to send abroad to manufacture umbrellas and the component parts, because it is impossible for men in the United States to get their raw materials cheaper than the finished product.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, the discussion with which we have been favored ought to commend itself to the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming——

Mr. MONDELL. It does. [Laughter.]

Mr. PALMER (continuing). As evidence of that inconsistency in the conduct of men when it comes to making tariffs that seems to arouse his criticism. He would do well if he would train his popguns upon his colleagues on that side of the aisle who have just now exhibited this startling inconsistency.

We find the gentleman from New York cooperating with the gentleman from Minnesota at all times, and complaining against our conduct in raising the rates in the bill over those of the Underwood bill of a year ago. We find immediately afterwards the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], and the gentleman from Iowa, to whom evidently an absolutely contrary duty has been assigned in this debate, complaining because we did not raise the rates high enough.

The gentleman from New York takes us to task for raising the rates from 30 per cent to 35 per cent over the Underwood bill, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania takes us to task for not raising the rates from 30 per cent to 40 per cent.

Now, as to the gentleman's charge of inconsistency by reason of carrying a larger rate on the materials or parts than we do on the finished product. I could call his attention to dozens of cases in every tariff law which has ever been on the statute books where that necessarily inconsistent feature appears. It is far less inconsistent in a Democratic bill written upon a Democratic theory than it would be or has been in some of the Republican bills in the past, because when we write a rate with regard to the competition which will result from the rate we do not necessarily take into consideration the rates upon the component materials that go into the finished product, but the exact situation in trade between this country and other countries.

There may be now less competition in the finished article than in the component parts, or vice versa, and it is a question of how much competition now prevails under the present rate. That is largely instrumental in determining whether the rates should be reduced, and how far, in order that a proper amount of competition throughout the entire line of business activity in these manufactured articles may be kept up; we consider the amount of the production in this country in connection with the amount of imports under the rate, and fix the rate with regard to that. If it so happens that the component materials carry a higher rate than the finished article, it will be because there is to-day less competition in the finished article than in the component material, and we desire to bring about a proper relation.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman think that is a fair argument to apply to a man whose house is burning?

Mr. PALMER. Nobody's house is burning as far as umbrella ribs are concerned. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think this afternoon of the second day of proceeding under these various schedules has got far enough along to sample the quality of this bill and to demonstrate conclusively that it is not built upon any consistent plan or system that the gentleman from Pennsylvania or anyone else can explain to the satisfaction of reasonable men.

If they have made a reduction in the rates and it will bring in a greater revenue because of greater importations, the explanation is that this is a revenue tariff, and they have no regard for its effect upon the industries of the country; and if, on the other hand, they have so changed the rates that importations will be reduced, they state that we are not compelled to seek a revenue from this particular item because we now have an income tax. Here is an instance in the umbrella schedule upon which they have the rates on the raw material higher than the finished product. We have just had another schedule, to wit, the automobile schedule, in which they have the finished product rates much higher than the rates on the various parts composing it.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman will notice that if the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] shall prevail, the rate on the raw or semiraw materials will be still higher than the rate on the finished product.

Mr. MOORE. We will come to that when we reach it.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am not so much interested in the position of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] as I am in the efforts—futile efforts, it seems to me—of the gentlemen to explain the system of construction upon which the bill has been made. It makes no difference what you call the rate on any article; it is to the extent of the rate protective. Take the automobile industry—a consumption of automobiles in this country to the amount of $158,000,000. There is a rate of 45 per cent. That is prohibitive, practically. Less than $2,000,000 in value of automobiles were brought into this country, and only about $2,000,000 in parts and completed automobiles altogether.

Take the completed automobiles and the component parts and the consumption in this country is over $240,000,000. The rate of 45 per cent is practically prohibitive. It is a protective rate, no matter what you call it. It does not produce revenue; it does not produce foreign competition in the industry. The Republican Party are frank enough to say that this rate is made because the industry is employing thousands and thousands of American laborers and consuming thousands upon thousands of American raw materials as well as foreign raw materials; building up a great profitable industry that has probably added more impetus than any other one single industry to the prosperity of this country in the last 10 years. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] is not willing to destroy this industry nor to place it upon either a revenue basis or a competitive

basis, and he is not frank enough to say that he has regard for this important industry. The fact of the business is that the rates protect. If you can produce an article in this country and you put a rate upon it, you protect it, no matter what you may call it, and the merits of this bill, when it is in operation, will be judged by whether it tends to encourage or destroy the great prosperity in which we are now indulging.

Last year, 1912, marked the high-water mark both in production and exportation. We produced in round figures something like $30,000,000,000, $8,500,000,000 in agriculture and $21,000,000,000 of manufactures. We exported $2,204,000,000 of that. We imported something like $1,600,000,000. They were the largest exportations and importations in the history of the country. We can stand experimentation now, perhaps, as well as at any other time, and when these gentlemen have placed their tariff schedules in operation, they will be judged according to how they work. A protective principle always has worked well and always will work well in this country, and I commend their preserving some measure of protection on some of the important industries, although I can not commend their lack of frankness in confessing the fact.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, speaking of the umbrella paragraph, in order that I may be within the rules, I am glad that there is one proposition on which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] and I are in full agreement. He says that the bumps and inconsistencies in this bill are not so remarkable in a Democratic bill as they would be in a Republican bill. I agree with him on that proposition absolutely. As a matter of fact, I have about come to the conclusion that the gentlemen do not expect to be expected to be consistent. It is unfortunate the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not give sufficient attention to what was said by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] and his colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] to understand that they did not protest against his having increased or decreased any one particular rate. What they did protest against was the bumpy, humpy, hobble-skirted, limping character of these schedules. For instance, here are certain of the component parts of umbrellas at 35 per cent. Over on page 97 are other parts of umbrellas at 30 per cent, and in the silk schedule are other parts of umbrellas at 45 per cent, and the umbrella itself bears a rate of 35 per cent. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows—we all know—that there is neither rhyme nor reason in that sort of thing. It is just common, ordinary blundering, as, in my opinion, the rates on automobiles and their parts are. When the gentleman from South Dakota asked why these inconsistencies in the automobile schedule, he is told to read in the RECORD to-morrow the explanation the gentlemen from Alabama and Pennsylvania claim to have made.

The trouble is that when the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from South Dakota examine the RECORD to-morrow they will discover that the gentlemen from Alabama and Pennsylvania sent them to the RECORD for a snipe hunt. They will find no explanation there. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] well said, there is no one on earth outside of a certain class of eleemosynary institutions or the victims of an overdose of Welsh rarebit who can explain why automobiles should be 40 per cent, parts of automobiles 20 per cent; bicycles, 25 per cent, parts and all; and these little choo-choo affairs that are a cross between the bicycle and the automobile bear a different rate from either of the other two, both in whole and in part. There is no explanation for these things, no logic in them.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I care to take up the full five minutes. The discussion of this bill, as the discussion of all tariff questions, brings out argument in favor of designing measures that will protect laborers, and some gentleman has this afternoon stated that organized labor was for a protective tariff. Even in this debate since this bill has been before the committee reference has been made to a comparison between some of the building trades in this country and those of some foreign countries, when in fact the tariff can not have anything to do with the wages of the building craftsmen of this country. They do not build buildings in foreign countries and sell them in competition with the builders here, and the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the American building craftsmen are not only the best paid workmen of this country or any other country, but they are the most efficient and capable workmen. We construct buildings cheaper in the United States than anywhere else. I do not blame the gentleman for taking these things as a joke, because he does not care anything about the working people anyhow, probably. The fact is you are not going to fool the working people any more with this argument that you are making about protecting the American workingman. He has waked up to the fact that you have been fooling him for all these years and he is not going to allow the wool to be pulled over his eyes any longer.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. This is umbrellas.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. That is one of the hopeful signs, that they have woke up to the deception that has been practiced on them in these arguments by men who should be representing them here in a sincere and honest manner.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I just want to call the attention of the gentleman from Alabama to the fact that the gentleman from Illinois is not strictly observing the rule that he enforced against me this morning

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman is talking about honest men now.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have no objection and I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. If I have made any objectionable remarks, I might withdraw them, but I am getting tired of this argument about protecting labor when labor has always had to fight its own battles, and probably will have to in the future. What labor wants is to have their legal and constitutional rights protected and a fair opportunity and a square deal; they do not need any tariff laws to protect them at all. I want to have read here as a part of my remarks, in my own time, a statement made before President Taft by the secretary of the Federation of Labor urging the signing of the immigration bill. I desire to have part of that read to show the position he takes; that a protective tariff, while it protects the manufacturer in collecting tribute in the way of abnormally high prices from the working people of this country, never has given the workingman any protection in the way of high wages.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. President, it is now an undisputed fact that in many industries the emigrants who come here are working for such low wages that the American born can not compete with them. They can not live on the wages paid and support a family.

In support of the position that the American born can not compete with foreigners and live on the wages paid to them and support a family, I refer you to the investigation of the Bethlehem Steel Works made by a committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ and the investigation made by Commissioner Neill, of the Department of Labor, as to wages and conditions in the steel industry.

We ask for this legislation for the purpose of giving the wage workers of this country an opportunity for self-improvement; an opportunity for a breathing spell, so they can secure improved conditions both as to hours and wages.

In passing I will call your attention to the fact that industry is protected by a tariff, but labor is not. The products of labor are protected, but we have a free flow of labor coming to these shores all the time. The manufacturers have protection against products manufactured by cheap labor in foreign countries, but labor has no protection against the importation of cheap labor.

The opponents of this measure will say that if the products of labor are protected, then labor itself must be benefited, because the manufacturer can sell the product at a much higher rate than can be obtained in other countries, and will thus be in a position to pay higher wages to his employees. The first contention is well founded. The manufacturer does receive a higher rate than the products can be purchased in other countries, and the second contention, that they can pay higher wages to their employees, is also true, but the fact is they do not pay higher wages. They pay lower wages. We find that in the highest protected industries, particularly in the industries that are now controlled by trusts, such as the Steel Trust, Rubber Trust, Sugar Trust, packing-house employees, and textile industry, the lowest wage in the country is paid to their employees, and in some of them less than a living wage for a family. A high tariff has nothing to do with the wages paid in these industries.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MOORE. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 23, noes 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

144. Wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, made of iron or steel, and steel-tired wheels for railway purposes, whether wholly or partly finished, and iron or steel locomotive, car, or other railway tires or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured, 25 per cent ad valorem; ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, or blanks for the same, without regard to the degree of manufacture, 10 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That when wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, of iron or steel, are imported with iron or steel axles fitted in them, the wheels and axles together shall be dutiable at the same rate as is provided for the wheels when imported separately.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 38, line 18, after the word "manufactured," strike out "25 per cent ad valorem" and insert "one-fourth cent per pound"; and on the same page, line 20, after the word "manufactured," strike out "10 per cent ad valorem" and insert "1 cent per pound."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this is essentially a labor proposition. I sit in this House sometimes amazed at the sort of twaddle that is passed out to the public through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as the voice of labor in the United States. It seems to me the time has come when a Member of this House, who is as much a laborer as the man who belongs to a union or the man who stands here assuming to speak for a union or a particular class of workers, ought to be man enough to assert h'mself. It is an odd thing that one or two men here should always be picked as the real spokesman of labor. Awhile ago we could not quote from Samuel Gompers even without objection when the thing to be quoted disproved what has been said on this floor against the protection of labor.

I said the amendment I offer is a labor proposition. It is a labor proposition, because it not only involves millions of capital but the employment of thousands of men who may or may not belong to labor unions, or may or may not have special spokesmen on this floor, but who have a right to the protection of the law in this country, which my friend from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] said awhile ago they did not need. A little while ago we had read from the Clerk's desk a clipping from some newspaper quoting some crank or other, some new faddist, who intimated that all the people in the insane asylums were people who had toiled in the mills, and by reason of excess of toil had been forced into insanity, when the real truth doubtless is that many of those who get into insane asylums are those who do not have any useful thing to do and who do not give their real share of labor to the common welfare of the land.

I say this amendment is essential to the labor. In Germany and in France these railway wheels, made by honest but ill-paid labor, are protected by the laws of those countries in a manner in which you do not propose to protect them in the Underwood bill. Germany makes it compulsory upon the people to buy railroad wheels of the German manufacturers, and England makes it compulsory upon the people of England to buy the railway wheels made by the workingmen of England. And yet in this bill you propose to reduce the rates that have afforded protection to the men who make the wheels in the United States and offer inducements to England and Germany, with cheaper material, to send their material here.

Mr. Chairman, I speak for men who work. I work, and I do not take odds from anyone with regard to the amount of work I do. It is of service to the community, and I am doing my part just as worthily, I hope, as any man who wears a badge or label of any kind; and so it is with every man who earns his salt. He is something of a demagogue who takes any other position. I intend to incorporate in my remarks a statement that comes from men over their own signatures—over 100 of them—men who work in the mills making car wheels, who ask this Congress to protect them in their American occupation against the cheaper labor of England and Germany which some of the professed friends of labor on this floor wish to introduce in order to beat down the American wage.

I append the following letters:

RAILWAY STEEL-SPRING CO., SCOTT WORKS,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 21, 1913.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will find inclosed herewith a petition from the local officers and employees of the Railway Steel-Spring Co., at Philadelphia, Pa., together with signatures of some of the most prominent business men at this point, protesting against the proposed reduction in the tariff on railway tires as covered by the proposed amendment to the tariff in the bill now before Congress, reading as follows:

"Wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, made of iron or steel, and steel-tired wheels for railway purposes, whether wholly or partly finished, and iron or steel locomotive, car, or other railway tires or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured, 25 per cent ad valorem," etc.

There are millions of dollars invested in this industry at various places in this country, and a large number of men are employed in the works at this point. The maximum wages have been paid, and satisfactory labor conditions have prevailed at all times. The present tariff on tires is 1¼ cents per pound, and the proposed reduction to 25 per cent ad valorem is a percentage reduction of 64 per cent. We can not help but feel that this is a situation which has not been properly presented to Mr. UNDERWOOD and the other gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee, and this opportunity is taken to inform you of the true facts of the case.

In England and Germany tires are sold at higher prices than are charged by American manufacturers to railroads in the United States.

Canada and Mexico are practically the "dumping grounds" of Europe for the excess production of these materials by European manufacturers, and it is certain the United States would receive large quantities of these products from England and Germany if the proposed reduction in tariff on tires becomes a law.

England protects its industry by compulsory use of British tires in England and the colonies, while Germany does the same for the German manufacturers by means of a high tariff.

The tire-manufacturing plants in America have been and still are able to produce these materials largely in excess of the American demands for them, and it was in the endeavor of American manufacturers to dispose of their excess production that they learned of the prices prevailing in Canada and Mexico.

We feel that it is but right and just for us to request simply the retention of the present duty on wheels and tires for the purpose of conserving to this country the manufacture and sale of products for which, as above stated, this country is already oversupplied with producing capacity.

In submitting the inclosed petition, therefore, we ask you to use all the means at your command to prevent any reduction whatever in "wheels for railway purposes or parts thereof, etc., or railway tires or parts thereof, etc.," as a matter of justice to American tire manufacturers as well as the protection of the large number of workmen employed in this industry.

Respectfully submitted.

RAILWAY STEEL SPRING CO., SCOTT WORKS,
FRED W. HARRIS, *Manager.*

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *April —, 1913.*

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, residents of your congressional district, hereby respectfully call your attention to the matter of the proposed reduction in the tariff on "wheels for railway purposes and parts thereof, etc., * * * and other railway tires or parts thereof, etc.," now pending before Congress.

The proposed reduction in the tariff on the above-mentioned products would seriously affect one of the most important industries as carried on by the Railway Steel Spring Co. in the city of Philadelphia, and would positively result in the cessation of that company's activities at Philadelphia. It is well known to you that the Railway Steel Spring Co. is one of the best wage-paying factories in Philadelphia, and upon its operation a great many workmen and their families depend.

We therefore earnestly petition you to use all honorable means at your command to prevent the proposed reduction in the tariff on the above-mentioned products.

Charles T. Nichols, F. W. Harris, J. E. Morrison, Edward Williams, Martin T. Convery, Thomas G. Coleman, William Ostertag, Chas. Bohmer, Jas. N. Foster, William H. Desher, sr., Adam Hoover, B. Frank Roland, James McLees, Wm. McConnell, Wm. Isherwood, W. O. Vane, Albert J. Hastings, Geo. W. Dargin, W. H. Desher, jr., Chris. Bersold, Patrick Hughes, James Shepherd, W. Harry Bright, Milton Hersch, John C. Whitman, Abe Rossman, Adolph Otto, H. F. M. Withington, August Laiex, George F. Radford, Thomas Gauden, Frank B. Homan, Frank H. Hughs, John H. Mairs, Leonard Coffin, W. Bright, Chas. McKenner, George F. Moore, William Coffin, James Santime, Walter Schaeffer, Charles Artese, Geo. Brunetti, P. Schmidt, Guido Brunetti, Angelo Dike, Dominico Fressl, Henly Perrow, G. Dare, S. Leeser, J. Schurm, W. C. Ebbert, Joseph Rafman, Pasquale Amato, Lues Segal, Francis McLean, John Merklinger, Joseph W. Lunn, Edward J. Williamson, Theo. G. Rambo, Samuel McCall, James G. Fowkes, P. M. Walton, Thos. H. Rowdall, Chris. Graham, Peter Cremins, Leo Maynas, Henry J. O'Neill, Frank W. Davis, Edward L. Birch, A. Penrose Ambler, William E. Conover, G. Howard Byan, Edward P. Crawford, George Veale, William T. Nichols, H. R. Edwards, Wm. M. Mervine, John H. Wolf, P. L. Frey, H. A. Tripple, John Kloos, J. Donovan, Wesley Miller, Stanly Shultz, William Futz, Yoekule Koll, Max Muntz, Tony Giuseppe, Harry Camenisch.

STANDARD STEEL WORKS CO.,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 22, 1913.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
The Raleigh, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Underwood tariff bill, which is before Congress for consideration, contains the following:

"Wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, made of iron or steel, and steel-tired wheels for railway purposes, whether wholly or partly finished, and iron or steel locomotive, car, or other railway tires or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured, 25 per cent ad valorem; ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, or blanks for the same, without regard to the degree of manufacture, 10 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That when wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, of iron or steel, are imported with iron or steel axles fitted in them the wheels and axles together shall be dutiable at the same rate as is provided for the wheels when imported separately."

As manufacturers of the material affected by this portion of the bill we wish to place on record our protest against the reduction of the present tariff relating to the articles mentioned. If the bill passes and becomes a law with the recommendations as contained therein it will not be possible to compete with the importation from Europe. This is proved by our inability to successfully compete with European manufacturers for the sale of tires in Canada, Japan, or South America, where the chances of securing business are equal, the deciding factor being price only. We secure no Canadian business except when the demand is urgent and the time for delivery from Europe is too long. Our information of conditions indicates that the price of tires for home consumption in Europe is higher than the prices charged for tires by American manufacturers to home consumers. England protects its industries by the compulsory use of British tires in England and the colonies, and Germany by high tariff. America would become therefore another dumping ground such as Canada for the excess production. The total productive capacity of American manufacturers is so much in excess of the possible requirements that our plant is never operated to its full capacity. As the plants are not now run to their full capacity every endeavor is made to obtain orders for rings for crushing machinery and commercial uses other than tires for railway purposes in substitution for the same articles ordinarily made of steel castings to assist in the plants' operation to as near maximum capacity as possible, in order to secure the benefit of lowest cost.

It will be clearly apparent, therefore, that the deprivation of business that will surely occur if the bill is enacted can have no other result than an advance in cost due to the lesser quantity produced, increasing thereby the intensity of the already severe competition.

We would suggest the advisability of a specific tariff per pound instead of per centum ad valorem, with its uncertainty of actual amount of tariff and its inducement to improper and untrue statements of price in order to secure lower tariff charges. We especially protest against a lower rate of tariff for "ingots, cogged ingots, blooms or blanks for the same, without regard to degree of manufacture," than is charged for "iron or steel locomotive, car, or other railway tires, or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured," because in the manufacture of tires the process proceeds from the cast ingot to the cogged ingot, to the rolled blank, from which the tire, with but little additional cost, is finally rolled. The sketch attached hereto illustrates the various degrees of manufacture referred to in the bill, indicating clearly the possibility of construing the rolled tire as a blank.

(Sketch not printed in RECORD.)

Therefore a bloom or blank, upon which almost all the cost of manufacturing tires has been placed, could be entered under the 10 per cent clause and do irreparable injury to the tire manufacturers in this country.

We trust the facts herein set forth clearly indicate that it is not our desire to secure a tariff which will permit exorbitant selling price, but, on the contrary, indicate a desire to be granted sufficient protection to insure the acquisition of business which is rightfully ours, with the reasonable profit to which we are justly entitled.

Will you be good enough to acknowledge receipt, advising if we may expect your support toward preventing any reduction in the present tariff on the articles mentioned.

Yours, very truly,

STANDARD STEEL WORKS CO.,
ROBERT RADFORD, *Secretary.*

P. S.—The present tariff is 1¼ cents per pound on tires and 1 cent per pound on the ingots from which they might be made.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]——

Mr. BUTLER. Upon what?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That this amendment is essentially a labor proposition. It would be very laborious for me, and I believe it would be so for 99 per cent of the Members present, to determine whether his amendment, proposing to place a specific duty on these materials in place of an ad valorem duty, as fixed in the bill, will increase or decrease the rate of duty proposed by the committee. Inasmuch as the gentleman has refrained from imparting or has withheld from the committee the needed information as to whether this proposed specific duty would result in an increase of the duty fixed in the bill or a decrease in the duty fixed in the bill, it is a matter of labor for the Members to ascertain for themselves whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is intending to increase or to decrease the rate proposed.

Those of us who have not had the advantage of the information furnished to the gentleman from Pennsylvania from the protected industries of his State, which have so long fattened at the expense of the people, and those of us who have not been able to devote all of their time and energy to tariff questions and to public duties so as to be worn to a frazzle, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania happens to be, can not tell offhand whether a specific rate proposed will increase this definite ad valorem rate or decrease it. I desire to exercise some intelligence in voting upon the amendments that are proposed. I can only assume from the conduct of the gentleman from Pennsylvania heretofore that, no matter what rate may be proposed in this bill, it is not sufficiently high to satisfy him, and that he really intends to increase the proposed rate, whether he gives any information from which that conclusion may be drawn.

Some time I should like to go quite fully into some of the questions raised by the gentleman. Congress some years ago provided that the Government should purchase armor plate, manufactured in the gentleman's own State, from American manufacturers. They have frequently taken advantage of the Government to foist upon it, for the protection of the ships designed for the defense of the country, armor plate that was absolutely worthless.

They have resorted to all kinds of tricks and devices to deceive and mislead the inspectors furnished by the Government to protect the Government. Serious questions have at times been raised as to whether the armor of the ships that have been provided for the defense of the country and armored with the armor plate manufactured in the gentleman's State was of such a character as to afford the protection intended.

Perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania desires some of his industries to furnish all of the parts for the rolling stock of our transportation companies, and thus place not only those who are enlisted to defend the country, but the general public, in the power of some of the not overscrupulous manufacturers for whom he has been so assiduously working during the consideration of this bill.

In some respects the consideration of this bill has been very edifying and educating. For the first time—either in my experience or in the experience of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, or in the experience of the gentleman from Wyoming, or that of some of the other gentlemen who have been criticizing several items of the bill in their endeavor to ascertain the logic or the reasoning which influenced the Committee on Ways and Means in fixing in the bill certain rates—has a tariff bill been read by the House so that it can be considered by the Committee of the Whole.

I am inclined to believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is the first time that many of these gentlemen have either heard read, or read themselves, any tariff bill that has ever been enacted into law. Their own party never gave them an opportunity to question the men in charge of a tariff bill as to the particular reasons influencing the committee that prepared the bill in placing the duties at one rate or another. Their bills were considered under a special rule, which provided that the Committee on Ways and Means at any time might offer amendments to any part of the bill, and thus the bill was never read, and the gentlemen never had an opportunity either to offer amendments themselves or to question those who represented them as to their reasons for fixing particular rates. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] says this is the first time an opportunity has been granted to Members of the House to read a tariff bill. It is strange that the gentleman from New York has not taken advantage of the opportunity, if this is the first time; but evidently he has not. If he had taken advantage of the opportunity to read the bill and examine the report of the committee, he would not have needed to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] whether his proposition meant an increase in the ad valorem rate, because the committee, endeavoring to give information for the benefit of the House, which was wasted on the gentleman from New York, however, gives the information that under the existing rate, which is now proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], the ad valorem would be at least double what is proposed in this bill. The gentleman should read the report.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That would involve labor.

Mr. BUTLER. A well-deserved rebuke! [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Well, perhaps it is labor for the gentleman. I apprehend that he is so accustomed to bringing in appropriation bills without any information in his report that he considers that nobody examines the reports of committees in the House. Evidently he has not examined at all the report on this bill. Possibly he does not know even that the committee made a report to the House.

Mr. Chairman, unless the antidumping clause acts as a protective measure, this reduction of the duty on car wheels will to a large extent destroy the car-wheel industry in the United States. I do not know whether there will be sufficient protection under the antidumping clause to protect the industry or not. That is a matter of estimate. It may be that it will protect. In the other countries, outside of England and Germany, the industries are to a large extent driven out of those countries by the surplus from Germany and England being dumped upon them, England protecting itself by a positive requirement that the wheels or tires shall be of English construction, and Germany protecting itself by a prohibitory tax. We propose, barring the antidumping clause, to admit the products of their factories practically free, or at a greatly reduced rate, into the United States.

In connection with my remarks I will insert some further information upon this subject, knowing that it is useless to give it to the House otherwise, the Democrats having determined that there shall be no amendment proposed from this side of the House accepted by them. It would be useless to give any information to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. Usually independent, usually somewhat progressive, he is bound feet and arms, and he is gagged, except to abuse or criticize this side of the House. His vote is delivered in advance. He dare not on any proposition vote for an amendment submitted by this side of the House or vote against his own side of the House. He conducts bills in the House which are considered on their merits. It is unusual for the gentleman from New York to be so bound, but now he is bound like my colleague from Illinois over on the other side [Mr. BUCHANAN], whom I see rising to his feet.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois that if he will offer any amendment that has merit and can furnish information that will convince any reasonable person I will be glad to vote for his amendment.

Mr. MANN. I have offered some amendments and have furnished reasonable information.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman imagines that. It is not a fact. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I offered amendments a year ago which the gentleman, along with his party, voted against, decried them, said

they ought not to go in the bill. Yet when the bill is brought in this year it contains the very provisions which I then offered and which the gentleman, after receiving the information, voted against a year ago. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

I insert as a part of my remarks the following letters relating to this subject:

RAILWAY STEEL SPRING CO., PULLMAN WORKS,
Pullman, Ill., April 18, 1913.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will find inclosed herewith a petition from the local officers and employees of the Railway Steel Spring Co., at Pullman, Ill., together with signatures of some of the most prominent business men at this point, protesting against the proposed reduction in the tariff on railway tires, as covered by the proposed amendment to the tariff in the bill now before Congress, reading as follows:

"Wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, made of iron or steel, and steel-tired wheels for railway purposes, whether wholly or partly finished, and iron or steel locomotives, car, or other railway tires, or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured, 25 per cent ad valorem," etc.

There are millions of dollars invested in this industry at various places in this country and a large number of men employed in the works at this point. The maximum wages have been paid and satisfactory labor conditions have prevailed at all times.

The present tariff on tires is 1¼ cents per pound, and the proposed reduction to 25 per cent ad valorem is a percentage reduction of 64 per cent. We can not help but feel that this is a situation which has not been properly presented to Mr. UNDERWOOD and the other gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee, and this opportunity is taken to inform you of the true facts of the case.

In England and Germany tires are sold at a higher price than are charged by American manufacturers to the railroads in the United States.

Canada and Mexico are practically the "dumping grounds" of Europe for the excess production of these materials by European manufacturers, and it is certain the United States would receive large quantities of these products from England and Germany if the proposed reduction in tariff on tires becomes a law.

England protects its industry by compulsory use of British tires in England and the colonies, while Germany does the same for German manufactures by means of a high tariff.

The tire-manufacturing plants in America have been and still are able to produce these materials largely in excess of the American demand for them, and it was in the endeavor of American manufacturers to dispose of their excess production that they learned of the prices prevailing in Canada and Mexico.

We feel that it is but right and just for us to request the retention of the present duty on wheels and tires, for the purpose of conserving to this country the manufacture and sale of products for which, as above stated, this country is already oversupplied with producing capacity.

In submitting the inclosed petition, therefore, we ask you to use all the means at your command to prevent any reduction whatever in "Wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, etc., or railway tires, or parts thereof, etc.," as a matter of justice to American tire manufacturers, as well as the protection of the large number of workmen employed in this industry.

Respectfully submitted.

JACOB C. PFEIFFER.

PULLMAN, ILL., *April 18, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, residents of your congressional district, hereby respectfully call your attention to the matter of the proposed reduction in the tariff on "Wheels for railway purposes and parts thereof, * * * and other railway tires or parts thereof, etc.," now pending before Congress.

The proposed reduction in the tariff on the above-mentioned products would seriously affect one of the most important industries as carried on by the Railway Steel Spring Co., in the town of Pullman, and would positively result in the cessation of that company's activities at Pullman. It is well known to you that the Railway Steel Spring Co. is one of the best wage-paying factories in Pullman, and upon its operation a great many workmen and their families depend.

We therefore earnestly petition you to use all honorable means at your command to prevent the proposed reduction in the tariff on the above-mentioned products.

Edward F. Bryant, Marcus A. Aurelius, Claude R. Egan, Donald R. Bryant, Paul E. Pearson, Allan M. Summers, Paul N. Dahlin, A. C. Caldwell, E. M. Sweeney, 11313 Forest Avenue; F. W. French, 11419 Prarie Avenue; T. A. Kennedy, president Kennedy Laundry & Supply Co.; F. Wolff, 26 Arcade Building, Pullman; P. B. Tireau, 237 East One hundred and thirteenth Street, Chicago; J. C. Ferrin, 28–30 Arcade Building; C. A. Gillespie, 11110 Indiana Avenue, Chicago; L. H. Jahn, 11339 Stephenson Avenue; Charles H. Meir, 11340 Prairie Avenue, Chicago; L. J. Johnston, 11340 Prairie Avenue, Chicago; W. H. Armund, 10–11 Market Building, Chicago; Julius Spamer, jr., 11224 Stephenson Avenue, Chicago; O. G. Lindberg, 367 East One hundred and seventeenth Street; E. E. Thompson, Market Building, Pullman; A. J. Hoetestra, 11313 Cottage Grove Avenue; James B. McLachlan, 11201 Cottage Grove Avenue; H. J. Donahue, 11450 Michigan Avenue; Louis Crouse, 11445 Michigan Avenue; F. T. Loucks, 11439 Michigan Avenue; Martin R. Lynn, 11855 State Street; J. H. Walsh, 11401 Michigan Avenue; L. W. Kahn, 4710 Grand Boulevard; C. M. Hanan, 11400 Michigan Avenue; H. W. Hoffman, 12109 Butler Street; Robert Elliott, 11541 Stewart Avenue; Isidore Frank, 11403 Prairie Avenue; Louis A. Schmid, 11324 Michigan Avenue; Charles Lauer, 11233 Michigan Avenue; Nels O. Larson, 11320 Indiana Avenue; Charles Peorie, 115 West One hundred and eleventh Place; F. C. Bendl, 11420 Prairie Avenue; I. J. Stram 10733 Carty Avenue; H. Holm, 233 West One hundred and tenth Street; Emil Wumerberg, 11156 Curtis Avenue; H. B. Ludwig, 11334 Curtis Avenue; George J. Phillips, 11138 Michigan Avenue; John G. Deckelman, 48 West One hundred and twelfth Street; H. Hagel, 114 West One hundred and thirteenth Street; A. Hammerstrom, 11144 Curtis Avenue; R. A. Dean, 625 East One hundred and twelfth Street; Frank O. Ernst, 11410 Indiana Avenue; J. C. Wares, 11333 Prairie Avenue; Jos. W. Cannon, 11333 Indiana Avenue; Albert Holmbery, 11328 Prairie Avenue; Wm. Guthardt, 59 West One hundred and thirteenth Street; Ben Budka, 236 West One hundred and thirteenth Street; Wm. I. Sherwood, 302 West One hundred and twelfth Place; Elmer E. Carlson, 11254 Michigan Avenue; G. Z. Carvier, 29 West One hundred and fourteenth Street; Paul F. Neidhardt, 11820 Eggleston Avenue; John J. Kunst, 20 East One hundred and twelfth Place; Thomas J. Ryan, 29 East One hundred and twelfth Place; Glenn G. Perry, 11824 Lowe Avenue; Jos. Gannon, 11214 Stephenson Street; C. Wm. Akerman, 11421 Prairie Avenue; George J. Scheifla, 120–121 Lowe Avenue; Michael Fox, 3247 Ninety-first Street; M. J. Ryan, 11118 Curtis Avenue; J. Van Brugge, 61 West One hundred and tenth Place; George Noble, 1101 Michigan Avenue; Herman Pott, 245 West One hundred and fifth Place; John Johnson, 21 West One hundred and twelfth Place; Joe Zukouski, Block E, Room 14; E. A. Frazin, 11717 Parnell Avenue; George Lind, 10738 Stephenson Avenue; G. Ritz, 135 East One hundred and thirty-fifth Place; S. Benschof, 11311 Eggleston Avenue; C. Appel, 126 East One hundred and fourteenth Place; John Ahearn, 7331 Greenwood Avenue; Alfred Eckborg, 56 West One hundred and twelfth Street; Wm. Zellinger, 346 West One hundred and ninth Street; Frank W. Lounsbery, 9322 Washington Avenue; Jacob C. Pfeiffer, 11322 Prairie Avenue; John Holck, 12046 Wallace Street; August Orne, 10530 Erickson Avenue; John Doodeman, 11624 Yale Avenue; Albert Crouse, 21 West One hundred and tenth Place; H. C. Knudsen, 11120 Indiana Avenue.

ATLANTA, GA., *April 12, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES R. MANN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This will advise that the writer was requested some months ago, by some personal friends interested in the manufacture of car wheels and car-wheel springs, to file an argument and brief before the House Ways and Means Committee and call attention to certain baneful consequences which would probably result if any change was made in the tariff duties on these products.

This the writer proceeded to do, and said brief and argument was filed with the Ways and Means Committee on or about February 7 last.

I quote for your information extract from customs-tariff act of August 5, 1909, covering the rates of duties on these products:

"PAR. 171. Wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, made of iron or steel, and steel-tired wheels for railway purposes, whether wholly or partly finished, and iron or steel locomotive, car, or other railway tires or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured, 1¼ cents per pound; ingots, cogged ingots, blooms or blanks for the same, without regard to the degree of manufacture, 1 cent per pound.

"*Provided*, That when wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, of iron or steel, are imported with iron or steel axles fitted in them, the wheels and axles together shall be dutiable at the same rate as is provided for the wheels when imported separately."

I understood at the time that certain changes in these duties were under consideration by said committee, and it was to lay the matter properly before the committee that the argument was filed.

I am advised that the principal foreign competing manufacturing plants are located in England and Germany, and I am further advised that the German tariff on the imports of these products into that country is expressly prohibitive, and that this was done to prevent competition from American-made goods.

I am further advised that in England there is a law which requires the users of these products to purchase the same from manufacturing concerns located in England or her colonies.

These two very important points were amplified in my argument before the committee, and it seems to me should have been conclusive on the subject matter.

As a result of the situation growing out of said laws in England and Germany, it is not a question of rates of duty so much as it is to protect the American manufacturer against foreign laws evidently passed for the purpose of preventing importation of these goods and competition from America.

I respectfully call your attention to my argument, which you will find in the printed reports of the committee under the iron and steel schedule.

I am now advised that there is a company of considerable size manufacturing these products in your district, located at Pullman. For that reason your constituents are interested in this particular matter, and I call it to your attention with the earnest request that if it meets with your approval you do what you can in Congress when this phase of the tariff bill comes up for consideration to properly present the above facts to the entire Congress, as they strike me with great force, and, in my judgment, are controlling on the subject matter, as stated above.

* * * * * * *

Very truly, yours,

H. N. RANDOLPH.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PALMER. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. FARR. I should like five minutes.

Mr. PALMER. Then I will make it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, for the purpose of getting information—I shall not object to the request—what

is the intention in reference to the evening, and if we have an evening session, as to the time of taking the recess?

Mr. PALMER. I understand that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] desires to recess from half past 6 until half past 7, and then complete the metal schedule to-night.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that last night, with the recess an hour and a quarter long, there was nobody in the House when we reassembled, and I think a recess of an hour and a quarter is a little too short.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I do not want to cut off anybody in the House. I want this bill to have full opportunity to be discussed, and I know it is natural that we should get into political debates on a tariff bill. If the gentleman is willing to urge his friends on that side of the House that after supper we shall confine our remarks to the schedule, I will do the same, and I am willing, when this 10 minutes' debate is over, to take a recess.

Mr. MANN. This side of the House has not violated the rule in that respect as much as the other side has.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think both sides have wandered into the realm of politics.

Mr. MANN. It might keep them from wandering some, but I think no one can criticize the action of the minority on this bill where we could delay or force the gentlemen on the other side of the House to bring in a rule.

Mr. PALMER. Except where they want the discussion reported when they have been out to lunch and have not heard it. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no criticism to make of the gentleman's side of the House. I am allowing the bill to be read for their benefit, as we have largely made up our minds on it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is allowing us to read the bill in order to escape the criticism of bringing in a rule to encourage the gentleman from New York to say how liberal you have been. I do not criticize the gentleman for taking that attitude.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think if we brought in a rule on our side of the House without at least giving the minority an opportunity to fairly consider the bill we would be subject to just criticism. If, on the other hand, a situation was forced upon the House so that we could not get the bill through, I would not hesitate to bring in a rule.

Mr. MANN. I understand the situation, I think, on both sides of the House. Politically speaking, we would rather have you bring in the rule, but, on the other hand, we have no desire to take an unfair advantage or force a rule as long as there is a reasonable amount of debate allowed. It seems to me that after we use up these 10 minutes we might easily take a recess until 8 o'clock.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would ask the gentleman if we could not "swap tobacco between lines" and hold the debate down to the schedules?

Mr. MANN. I have not indulged in any of it. I have discussed only the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Except when the gentleman was referring to me. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I was discussing the car-wheel proposition entirely. [Laughter.] The gentleman from New York did not know anything about it, and I was trying to give him information. Of course it was useless. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. Will not the gentleman from Alabama make the time 15 minutes before closing debate on this paragraph? I would like 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing to let the debate run 15 minutes if we can come to an understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama modifies his request, and moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] may lead some gentlemen to believe that I was assuming to be the special representative of organized labor, and that there were only two or three of us who were capable of representing labor. I would like to say for his information, and for the information of others, that I have not been officially connected with organized labor for about eight years. I served as an official of organized labor for a number of years, and I tried to serve them well.

I took the position with reference to organized labor then that I take now—that organized labor's interest and the interest of honest, legitimate business and capital are one. The position that I take in representing labor in Congress is that anybody that does anything that is useful is doing labor. I do not confine the labor to those that work with their hands only. Those that are working in their own business; that are working with their brain, doing clerical work or working in any capacity, doing useful work, are, from my point of view, working people.

The Democrats who controlled this House in the Sixty-second Congress, and a number of those elected on the Republican ticket, demonstrated that they were in sympathy with the demands of organized labor by passing legislation requested by the representatives of organized labor that had been defeated by the Republicans, who had been in the majority of the House for the last 16 years. The Democratic House responded to the appeals of organized labor because they were reasonable and only asked for just and equitable legislation. Some of the measures passed by the House died in the Senate and some were vetoed by the Republican President. Labor is hopeful now of securing the passage of remedial legislation for the working masses, because the Democratic Party is in full control of Congress, and we have a real people's President in the White House.

When you talk to me about "labor's interest" and about "capital's interest," as though they were different and distinct, I say to you that the great problems confronting the people will not be solved until they are considered from the point of view of the best interests of the whole people, because honest legitimate business and commercialism can not be separated from the interests of labor. The people of this country are suffering from the burdens of financial and commercial piracy, which has resulted in floating on the industries of this country about $40,000,000,000 of watered stock, or fictitious and counterfeit capital, which is bearing heavy on the shoulders of the great masses of the people.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman will observe that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] admitted that under this high protective system the insane asylums of the country are full of men who are out of work.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman certainly does not mean to say that.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have not the time to yield, as I have only five minutes. Those who know the industrial conditions know that the drift of industrial conditions is such as tend to impair the physical and mental ability of the working people of the country, because the so-called captains of industry through their greed for profit on counterfeit capital and fictitious valuations have disregarded the rights and interests of humanity.

Mr. Chairman, I was elected to this Congress on the Democratic ticket, and was elected on a platform declaring for a reduction of the tariff or a tariff for revenue only. In my district I am well known to be opposed to the protective-tariff policy, and favor a tariff for revenue only to obtain revenue for the expense of the Government economically administered. I do not try to deceive anyone in regard to my position, and if they do not know it, it is not because I have not stated it plainly and bluntly. The trade-union people of the country by their associations and exchanges of ideas are better educated than those who have not organized in the country, and in my opinion the large majority of them are opposed to the protective-tariff policy. The party that is advocating that policy had refused, when it was in power in this Congress, to give them the remedial legislation that they asked and worked for for so many years. The Democratic Party, however, having pledged in its platform that it would pass legislation for the eight-hour day and other legislation that the trade-unions required for the protection of the rights and interests of the wageworkers, has fulfilled its promise and has passed about every measure that has been asked by representatives of the great organized labor movement of this country.

I insert here an article published in the Chicago Record-Herald of May 1, 1913, written by Stoughton Cooley, who is an able student of economic conditions:

(By Stoughton Cooley.)

Seldom have justice and expediency been in closer accord than in the plea of American seamen for relief from antiquated rules and regulations that govern modern seafaring life.

It has puzzled a great many persons to know why the American merchant marine, protected and hedged about as it is by all the laws its friends could devise, should have failed to prosper along with other industries. American tonnage in 1800 was half as great as that of Great Britain—970,000 and 1,856,000 tons respectively—and continued to grow by leaps and bounds until in 1860 America had 5,350,000 tons, while England, including her colonies, had barely 5,713,000. Yet, in 1910 the American tonnage had fallen to 5,058,678, while that of England had mounted to 19,012,294 tons.

TONNAGE ON DECLINE.

Nor do these striking figures convey the full measure of our shipping's decline. Less than one-sixth of the tonnage flying the Amer-

ican flag, or 782,517 tons, is engaged in the overseas trade, the remaining five-sixths being employed in the coastwise trade. Our navigation laws absolutely prohibit foreign vessels from engaging in the coasting trade.

In 1860, 69 per cent of our exports and imports were carried under the American flag; in 1870 the proportion had fallen to 35 per cent; in 1880, to 18 per cent; and in 1911, of our foreign trade, the greatest in the world and amounting to $3,576,546,304, less than 9 per cent was carried in American ships. With but four steamships to Europe and four to the Orient flying the American flag we have come to a pitiable pass.

TARIFF FURNISHES ANSWER.

What has brought this once great industry to this condition? Why should other enterprises advance while the shipping industry decays?

The answer lies in that much discussed and still unsolved question, the tariff. When protection to the iron industry raised the price of rails and locomotives the increase was added to the freight rates and the shipper paid it. He had no other choice. But when this higher priced iron was used in a ship the freights could not be advanced to cover it, for the reason that the shipper had an alternative; he could employ English ships.

But American shipping was not allowed to decay without efforts on the part of Congress to revive it. Many investigations were made and a multitude of laws proposed and discussed.

FREE SHIPS, FREE MEN.

The sum total of these investigations seems to have established the fact that an American ship costs more to build than an English ship. To remove this handicap it has been proposed to allow American shipmasters to buy ships abroad.

The friends of the tariff say this would be ineffective for the reason that the difference in the wages of seamen makes it more expensive to operate an American ship. To meet this condition they have asked that the Government aid the shipbuilder, the shipmaster, and the seamen by means of a large subsidy. But the people will not submit to a subsidy. Nor are they content to see the flag disappear from the high seas.

But the key to the situation is unexpectedly put in the hands of Congress by the sailors. To the plea for free ships they add a plea for free men. Free ships and free men will restore the flag to the high seas.

SEAMEN UNDER "SLAVERY."

That free ships will equalize the cost of ships is plain; that free seamen will overcome the difference in the cost of operation will be apparent upon a moment's reflection.

The navigation laws of nations maintain a species of slavery among seamen that has come down to us from the rude age when the line between buccaneering and legitimate commerce was shifting and indistinct.

Serfdom on land has long since disappeared, even in Russia; but serfdom on the sea remains. The man who ships on a vessel is bound to her by all the power of the Army and Navy. He must sign a contract, and should he attempt to quit his job, even when the ship is safe in port, he is seized like a felon, put aboard in irons, and held till the ship goes to sea.

Naturally, such a law has been abused. Human nature could not resist the temptation. It has been abused to such a degree that the American seaman has disappeared along with the American ship.

MEN DEMAND JUSTICE.

Self-respecting men now go to sea only when no other means of livelihood is to be found, so that the few ships we still have are manned for the most part by foreigners.

For years the American seaman has been appealing to Congress for relief. Last February a bill was passed repealing the compulsory servitude laws and otherwise ameliorating conditions in the forecastle, but it failed of Mr. Taft's signature and will have to be reenacted.

Justice alone demands that the men be granted this relief. But in this, as in all other cases, justice turns out to be the most expedient. The law that permits the shipping of a crew in a foreign port where wages are low and prevents them from leaving the ship in a port where wages are high puts it in the power of the foreign shipmaster to underbid the American shipmaster.

NAVY NEEDS DEFINED.

But grant the men the right to quit when the ship is in port. Then a ship coming to our ports with a cheap crew would be unable to leave until it paid American wages. And rather than submit to this trouble and delay the shipmaster would pay American wages all the time. With ships and crews at equal cost, would the American shipmaster need anything more to induce him again to unfurl the flag on the high seas?

We talk of a larger Navy, but of what use are ships without men to man them and colliers to coal them? When our battleships made their spectacular voyage around the world they were coaled by foreign ships. And had hostilities broken out suddenly not one of the 27 colliers would have dared approach the fleet. Our Navy is already short of officers and men, and it is becoming more and more difficult to man the ships. Is this a thing to be treated lightly?

SEAMEN'S BILL URGED.

It was the Navy that performed indispensable service in 1776 and saved the country from complete annihilation in the War of 1812, and it was the Navy that made possible the preservation of the Union in 1861. But in those times the seas fairly swarmed with American ships and sailors, the best ships and the best men to be found under any flag, as was proven time and again in actual clash of arms.

What a pitiable showing we should make to-day if suddenly called on to meet such an emergency!

The seamen's bill is drawn with a view of making life at sea as tolerable as life ashore. It provides that the Government, instead of the shipowners, shall issue the certificates of efficiency to the men; that a certain percentage of the crew shall be composed of efficient seamen; and that the seaman shall have the right to leave his ship when it is safe in port.

With free ships and free men there is no doubt as to the future of the American merchant marine.

The argument here contained can not be successfully denied. The wage workers of the country have the scum removed from their eyes and the cobwebs from their brains, and they will no longer permit the agents of the tariff barons of the country to deceive them by their old threadbare worn argument that the tariff protects the workingman. Such argument is a delusion and a snare and is an insult to the intelligence of the working people.

The tariff, from its historical origin and even in its name, is a survival of piracy, and the object and purpose for which it has been maintained since the War between the States has been for the industry of the Republic to hand over an increasing proportion of its earnings to a group of men organized in a more or less conscious conspiracy to promote their own aggrandizement at the expense of their fellow citizens.

Naturally, the people think that a tariff is necessary to raise public revenue; but the people of the country have paid annually about two thousand millions of dollars more for the things they use and consume than they would have been required to pay for the same in a free market. The greatest share of revenue accruing to the Government in any one year under the tariff system and from the tariff was approximately $333,000,000. The difference between this sum received by the Government and the total cost of the system to the people, approximately $1,615,000,000, has been the annual tribute levied upon industry by tariff beneficiaries, and this sum has come largely from the class whose industry produced the small return, the laboring man, who is not, has not been, and can not be protected by any form of tariff, and the farmer, who could derive no benefit from the tariff.

Twenty years ago 50 per cent of our international commerce consisted of agricultural products in one form or another, which total international commerce constituted about 5 per cent of the total commerce of the Republic; therefore, 2½ per cent, or one-fortieth of our total commerce, determined commercial prices for our entire circle of exchange. The tariff on the statute books, ostensibly for the benefit of the farmer, became a nullity at the customhouse, since the volume of our agricultural surplus was disposed of in free markets abroad, which determined the value of domestic consumption. The price of wool, cotton, packing-house products, and other farm and agricultural products were determined in the great consuming centers abroad.

We were exporters and still are exporters of such produce and not importers. However, the natural laws of trade form themselves, regardless of human interference and the penalties borne by the farmer for the last two generations, have begun to impose their vengeance on the Republic in the shape of a high cost of living, with men driven out of agriculture by its excessive penalties under the tariff which compels them to sell in the free markets and buy under tariff protection. It has driven men out of agriculture and into employment of a different kind until the margin of surplus of agricultural produce beyond consumption has about reached the vanishing point.

It is difficult to speak temperately of a system which has produced such diabolical results. It is even more difficult to speak temperately with reference to the infatuated blindness of a people that has permitted it.

The necessity of a tariff as a matter of protection to American industry has long since disappeared. The cost per unit of production of articles manufactured in America is appreciably less than that of the same commodity in any other country. The actual basis for the demand for a tariff is not the necessity to cover the difference in wages between America and other countries, but in order that form and substance may be given to an inflation of American securities. An industry, the total value of which in invested capital amounts to practically $5,000,000, is by a process of concentration, amalgamation, and combination capitalized at about $25,000,000, and in order to float it—move it in the exchanges—it is necessary to show dividends on the exaggerated capital; therefore it begins by the prevention of competition to raise the market prices for its products and to lower the cost of its manufacture both in the price of material and in the cost of labor. It will be cheerfully admitted that much of the artificial and fictitious capital now paraded on the stock exchanges of the country as solid values will disappear when the power to levy unearned tribute is destroyed.

Aside from the economic evils which have accompanied like a shadow the abuses of the system, the social and moral consequences are even more deplorable and enduring. The people may recover from a period of industrial stagnation, but they can not so easily overcome the results of moral degeneration. Whenever a citizen is allured by the prospect of sharing the loot into supporting the iniquitous system, becoming thereby a participator in the crime itself, the transition for spoliation of the innocent general public to the appropriation of individual properties is very natural and easy. It is an established principle that whosoever secures something of value for nothing, and without equivalent return, is economically and morally a thief; and there is a class of minds developed under the stress

and strain of economic pressure, a natural consequence of the artificial system, which naturally believes that any form of injustice may not only be legalized, but sanctified by act of Congress.

The eagle was the emblem of Roman genius and is the emblem of American spirit. It may not have occurred to those who chose this symbolism that the later history of the Republic amply justifies the selection of this royal bird as its emblem. It is the habit of the eagle to lie in wait until the osprey by vigilance and industry shall have captured a supply of food, which capture is the immediate signal for activity on the part of the eagle, who darts from his lofty perch and seizes upon the fish caught by the osprey. Under our magnificent system our captains of finance find it much more simple, instead of creating wealth themselves, to wait until others have created it and then, by artful processes legalized under our system, to appropriate it to their own use.

It is doubtful if any argument, statement of facts, tabulation of statistics, social, moral, or industrial deductions from our experience as a people will have weight or power to change opinions already fixed. The only hope is that by the agitation of the question there may be an increasing number who are not the official exponents, but rather the coefficients of public opinion, whose ideas may be developed along the lines of justice and truth.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, we are discussing the paragraph with reference to car wheels. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has illustrated how the interest of labor is involved in this paragraph. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] complains because we insist upon calling attention, as these rates are reduced, to the danger of loss of employment and reduction of wages to the American workingman, and while he is complaining because we do call attention to the danger which the workingman is in owing to this legislation he insists that we have no interest in the welfare of the laboring man. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] is going to vote for this bill. No one will ever know, I assume, what are his views as to the particular paragraphs and items in the bill, for he has transferred to his agents, the Committee on Ways and Means, authority to act for him, and eventually he will vote as the caucus bound him to vote. This is what he will vote for. He calls himself a friend of labor, and I think he is a friend of labor, and a sincere friend of labor, but he is not the only one on earth, I will suggest to the gentleman. This is the bill he is going to vote for, a bill that on the showing made by its proponents, its authors, is to transfer at least $146,000,000 of production from our shores to foreign shores.

Based upon the ordinary percentage of labor entering into production, that means transferring at least one hundred to one hundred and twenty-five millions annually of opportunity to labor from our country to foreign shores, and at the end of three years, when the free-sugar provision goes into effect, it means the transfer of at least $75,000,000 more of labor opportunity to foreign shores. Will the gentleman from Illinois kindly inform us what he expects the men to do who are now engaged in those gainful productions which are, according to report of the majority on this bill, to be transferred abroad? Where are those men to find employment when they lose it by the transfer of production to foreign shores, as the committee has said they will if this bill becomes a law?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I can not yield at this time. The gentleman knows as well as any man on this floor that this is a fact, that whatever else you may say of this bill there is not a man under the flag, there is not an enterprise in the country that expects to have an additional wheel turn, an additional machine operate, an additional opportunity for a day of labor through the passage of this bill.

No laboring man in America believes that the passage of this bill will increase his wages. I doubt if there is a man anywhere laboring in a mill or in a mine, or in a factory or on the farm, who has the slightest idea that the passage of this bill will give him an additional day's work or increase the rewards of his labor. The most you can hope for and the most you can promise is that by impoverishing the farmers of the country you may be able to make the living of the laboring man in the city a little cheaper. That is all anyone can promise under this legislation, and even that promise can not be fulfilled without bringing distress to a large portion of our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I hope the general apprehension as to the effects of this bill on the country will not be realized. I am certain that as a Republican I shall not want anything to happen to this grand country. It is no compensation to have our industries and their employees injured by the enactment of this bill. I have a case here for which I can appeal to those who specially appeal for labor. It is an opportunity to save an industry that employs male labor——

Mr. AUSTIN. May I ask the gentleman if he is not a member of a labor organization?

Mr. FARR. I am a member of a labor organization. The industry to which I now refer employs male labor. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] I know is sincere concerning labor, and he speaks of the pathetic conditions that prevail, I regret to say, in some industries; yet by his vote he is willing to stop the wheels from turning in this country and have those go in foreign countries, where wages are one-half and less than they are in this country and the cost of living on the same standard just as much.

If industrial conditions are bad in places in this country, how must they be across the ocean, where wages are so much lower and hours longer? Shall we benefit industrial conditions in this country by permitting foreign-made tires and other goods coming into this country and taking the labor away from our people? The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], which I would have offered had he not, to retain the present duty, the duty in the Payne bill in this new bill—the Underwood bill—ought to prevail. I am sure the gentleman could not have seriously considered this schedule and reduced the percentage 64 per cent, inviting serious injury, if not destruction, to this industry. We are selling these tires in this country for 3½ cents per pound. They are sold in Germany at 4 cents a pound and in England at 4 cents a pound. We can not ship any of our goods over to Germany on account of the high tariff, and we can not sell to England on account of some compulsory rule that forces English consumers to use English-made goods, and they dump those goods in Canada, and our people can not go into Canada on account of the preferential duty in favor of England. We have developed splendid industries for the making of these tires in Pennsylvania, Missouri, Illinois, New York, Michigan, Tennessee, and other places. Let us maintain it and help its further upbuilding.

Mr. HARDWICK. What is that rule of which the gentleman speaks?

Mr. AUSTIN. And some in Tennessee.

Mr. FARR. Yes. The rule adopted by England protects its industries by the compulsory use of their products in England and their colonies.

Mr. HARDWICK. Where does the gentleman get that?

Mr. FARR. It is in this petition. So, gentlemen, if you want to favor labor you should retain this duty and continue this industry, and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee ought to give this subject additional consideration. Officers and employees of the industry in Scranton have signed an urgent petition against this heavy reduction in the tariff on tires. I know they would not have done so but for their earnest belief that there was danger to that industry. Now, we talk about labor in this country. I am a labor man. I served my time and worked hard in a printing office, passing from newsboy, devil in the office, and afterwards printer and a city editor. There is no country on God's footstool that offers the opportunity that this glorious Nation does to the working people, and there is no country where such consideration is given to human welfare and the happiness of men and women and children as in this country.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. About how many men work in this shop?

Mr. FARR. About 8,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. If you will stop some of the immigrants coming in here——

Mr. FARR. How would the gentleman have been here himself if they had stopped his parents from coming here?

I shall submit as a part of my remarks a statement made before the Ways and Means Committee by a representative of the Scranton Railway Steel Spring Co., relative to the present tariffs on the products under discussion, to wit, iron and steel wheels for railway purposes and tires, as follows:

The investment in this business in the United States is approximately $25,000,000. The plants are located in the States of Illinois, Missouri, Pennsylvania, New York, Michigan, and Colorado. It is estimated that employment is given 8,000 men in this industry.

If any change is made in the existing tariff of a material nature, it would not be possible for the manufacturers of these products in the United States to compete with importations of similar products from Europe. This is proven by the fact that they are now unable to successfully compete with the European manufacturers for the exportation of these articles to Canada, where the opportunities for securing this

business are equal, and the deciding factor should be one of price only. At the present time the United States manufacturers are unable to secure any business except when the demand is urgent and it is impossible to await delivery from Europe.

Investigation will show that prices for home consumption of these products in Europe are higher than the prices charged by American manufacturers of these same products to home consumers. In England and Germany tires are sold at upward of 4 cents per pound; in the United States at from 3 to 3½ cents per pound, and in no case as high as 4 cents per pound. Canada and Mexico are practically the dumping grounds of Europe for the excess production of these materials by European manufacturers, and it is certain that the United States would likewise become the dumping ground of these same products from the same sources if any material reduction was made in duties.

England protects its industry by compulsory use of British tires in England and the colonies, and Germany by high tariff. At the present time the production of these materials from the plants in the United States is largely in excess of the American demands. This fact has already reduced the price which these manufacturers can obtain for their goods to a much lower basis than the importance of the business demands and would justify, and if, in addition to this, they were confronted with the surplus products of the European manufacturers, it would have a very disastrous effect on the business and capital invested in these plants; particularly so when England has shut off any possibility of competition in the British Isles and her colonies, and Germany by high tariff.

We feel that we have a right to request simply a retention of the present duties on these materials, for the purpose of conserving to this country the manufacture and sale of products, for which, as above stated, this country is already oversupplied at the present time with producing capacity, with consequent low prices to the consumers, due to competitive conditions.

The foreign plants manufacturing these materials are located principally in Germany and England, there being but 3 plants in France, as against 8 in Germany, 10 in England and Scotland, and 3 in Belgium. Thus it will be seen that the greater majority of the foreign manufacturers are protected from importations from this country, or practically so, and if these duties were reduced they could send their surplus products here with practically no chance of retaliation by the home manufacturers.

If competition is a desirable thing to bring about, it certainly should be reciprocal, and a one-sided competition, where the American manufacturers have no chance to get into the foreign markets on account of the facts above stated, certainly ought not to be desired. Moreover, as stated, these products are already selling in this country, due to local competition, for considerably less than these same products sell in the foreign markets, and naturally the foreign manufacturer does not desire to reduce the price in this country any lower than prevailing prices, because he can sell his products already for a higher price at home, and he would only avail himself of our markets with his surplus product or when there was a dullness in his home markets.

Here we have a case, therefore, of an American industry in which a very reasonable amount of capital is already invested and one in which the business has been created in various parts of the country by the ingenuity and ability of our people, and a large number of our citizens obtain employment and a livelihood; where, if any material changes are made in the tariffs, it would probably result in the partial destruction, if not the very serious impairment, of the entire business.

For these reasons it is earnestly asked that no change be made in the duties on these specific items.

The facts above stated can and will be verified by the testimony of competent witnesses, if desired, and witnesses thoroughly familiar with this business in all its details; the particular facts stated being taken from information furnished the undersigned by one of the leading experts in the business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

145. Aluminum, aluminum scrap, and alloys of any kind in which aluminum is the component material of chief value, in crude form, aluminum in plates, sheets, bars, and rods; barium, calcium, magnesium, sodium, and potassium, and alloys of which said metals are the component material of chief value, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 39, line 6, by striking out "25 per cent ad valorem" and inserting in lieu thereof "7 cents per pound."

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to debate that amendment after recess.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. STEDMAN, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for 10 days, on account of illness in family.

REPORT ON CONCENTRATION OF CONTROL OF MONEY AND CREDIT.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate concurrent resolution No. 1, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 1.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 6,000 additional copies of House Report No. 1593, Sixty-second Congress, on the "Concentration of Control of Money and Credit," of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room and 4,000 copies for the use of the House document room.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, how much is there to this report?

Mr. FINLEY. Well, the Senate concurrent resolution provides for the printing of 6,000 additional copies.

Mr. MANN. Does this report contain all the evidence?

Mr. FINLEY. It does.

Mr. MANN. How much is there of it?

Mr. FINLEY. The cost will be $1,003.80.

Mr. MANN. How much of a volume is it or how many volumes are there?

Mr. FINLEY. I will tell the gentleman frankly that it came over only a little while ago, and I have not had time to investigate that.

Mr. MANN. If it is a valuable report, some of the gentlemen now on the floor will know how long a report it is. I am frank to say I have not read it. It is not a book of that size if it contains all the evidence taken.

Mr. FINLEY. That work is still under way, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will permit me.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the gentleman from South Carolina will permit, I will say that I have heard they took three or four thousand pages of testimony. I can not vouch for the accuracy of that. It will probably be three or four volumes.

Mr. MANN. I was trying to ascertain whether all the testimony that was taken was to be included in this report. We had the privilege of reprinting in large numbers all the testimony that was taken. So far as printing the report is concerned, we never object to things of that kind.

Mr. HARDWICK. We could not print all that evidence in a report for $1,000.

Mr. MANN. Probably not.

Mr. FINLEY. This will cost within a fraction of $1,000—a little over $1,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question is on agreeing to the Senate concurrent resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR EVENING SESSION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair assigns the gentleman from Connecticut, [Mr. REILLY] to preside as Speaker pro tempore to-night.

RECESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now take a recess until 7.45 p. m.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until 7.45 p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

At 7.45 p. m., the recess having expired, Mr. REILLY of Connecticut, Speaker pro tempore, called the House to order.

LABORERS AND JANITORS.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the following privileged report from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] offers a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 56 (H. Rept. 8).

Resolved, That the Clerk be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint three laborers and three janitors, who shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, compensation at the rate of $60 per month; and also a stenographer to the Journal clerk, who shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, compensation at the rate of $1,000 per annum.

With committee amendments, as follows:

Amend line 2 by striking out the word "three" after the word "appoint" and inserting the word "four" in lieu thereof, and in the same line, after the word "and," strike out the word "three" and insert the word "two."

Mr. LLOYD. There is another amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the other amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Also, amend, by striking out all of the resolution after the word "month," in line 4.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the resolution reported as it would be if the amendments are agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution as it would read if amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint four laborers and two janitors, who shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, compensation at the rate of $60 per month.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman if these are to be session employees or permanent employees?

Mr. LLOYD. Session employees.

Mr. MANN. The resolution does not so state.

Mr. LLOYD. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. These are to be permanent employees.

Mr. MANN. And the stenographer?

Mr. LLOYD. That is not provided for. That is taken out by the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Why was that taken out, may I ask?

Mr. LLOYD. That was taken out because the Journal clerk and the bill clerk concluded that they could get along without the additional stenographer during this session of Congress. We may ask for it at the next session of Congress if it is needed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the Journal clerk of the House is new, and thus far probably has not had any very great difficulty in handling the Journal of the House. I think myself that ordinarily the Journal clerk ought to have a stenographer.

Mr. LLOYD. The Journal clerk and the bill clerk have conferred, and by arrangement between them the Journal clerk has the present stenographer the greater part of the time.

Mr. MANN. I am not violating any confidence now when I say that I feel very certain from what was said to me in a former Congress that that arrangement was not very satisfactory to the former Journal clerk.

Mr. LLOYD. I may say that it is satisfactory to the present Journal clerk. These officers are kind enough to try to get along without this additional stenographer if they can, and if they do so this additional one will not be needed.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire what particular work these laborers are doing?

Mr. LLOYD. The janitors are expected to care for all the offices of the Clerk; that is, the Clerk's office proper, and the office of the Chief Clerk, and the office of the disbursing clerk, the bill clerk's office, and the Journal clerk's office. There are 16 rooms in all that they are expected to take care of.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is doing this work now?

Mr. LLOYD. There is a messenger who is doing janitor service, and part of the time the Clerk pays for having this work done out of his own pocket.

Mr. FOSTER. Has this messenger been doing janitor work and taking care of 16 rooms thus far during all this Congress?

Mr. LLOYD. He has done part of that work a part of the time, and the Doorkeeper has furnished help a part of the time, and at other times the Clerk has been obliged to employ help himself.

Mr. FOSTER. In order to keep these rooms clean?

Mr. LLOYD. To keep these rooms in order, yes.

Mr. FOSTER. At the beginning of the Sixty-first Congress were these laborers discharged, or is this an additional force to what was on in the Sixty-first Congress.

Mr. LLOYD. Nearly all the Clerk's force was cut off at that time. In the Sixty-first Congress they had plenty of messengers, janitors, and additional clerks, and the force was cut just about half at the beginning of the Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is taking care of the rooms of these committees for which the janitors and messengers were appointed last year?

Mr. LLOYD. These men are not taking care of any rooms that are now occupied by Members of Congress. There is another resolution that will provide for that. In the last Congress we had two janitors to take care of the rooms in this building that are occupied by Members of Congress.

Mr. FOSTER. It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that if these men have been able to do this work in the last two years, I do not understand why it is necessary to have additional men at this time.

Mr. LLOYD. There is additional service, too, that is needed, that was not rendered in the last Congress but that was rendered in previous Congresses. There ought to be some messenger provided to deliver the bills from the document room to the various chairmen of committees who have no janitors immediately upon the receipt of the bills.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the gentleman think that for $60 a month we can supply a person to do that sort of work?

Mr. LLOYD. The Clerk advises us that he can. I do not know whether he can or not.

Mr. PALMER. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman will find that the chairmen of committees send their own clerks and messengers to the document room for bills. That is a universal practice, and we cut that place out purposely because the committees did send their own clerks and janitors after bills.

Mr. LLOYD. It is also true that the Clerk has no messenger to send to the Journal clerk's room, the enrolling clerk's room, the disbursing clerk's room, or to send over to the stationery room. He needs a messenger to send to these various places. He insists that he ought to have a messenger at the stationery room. There is no one there to receive or deliver stationery. There are just the two men in that room. We took out of the stationery room, and very properly, I think, all the help which had formerly been provided there except the stationery clerk and the assistant.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, with the bills going to the Clerk's room after being introduced and referred to the committees, I do not believe it is necessary to have a messenger to carry those bills around. All of the great committees have clerks and messengers, and they can go to the document room after bills.

Mr. LLOYD. If the gentleman will allow me——

Mr. FOSTER. Just a moment.

Mr. LLOYD. I want to explain just at this point.

Mr. FOSTER. All these larger committees which have a great many bills referred to them, like the Judiciary, Pension, and Post Office Committees, and other committees of that class, have janitors or messengers who can get these bills without much trouble when the clerks are busy; but it seems to me that in the case of these minor committees their clerks are not so busy but that they are able to go and get these bills without the expense of hiring some one to carry them around to them.

Mr. MANN. Will my colleague yield for a suggestion?

Mr. LLOYD. There are nearly 20 committees that have no janitors. It is not necessary to furnish bills to the Appropriations Committee, or the Ways and Means Committee, or any of the large committees that have janitors.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that, but as far as I am concerned I should object to the employment of an additional person to deliver these bills around to these committees.

Mr. LLOYD. These messengers are not to be assigned to any particular duty. They are placed under the control of the Clerk, and he is to use them wherever they are necessary. The Clerk insists that he needs this additional force to do the messenger and janitor service in his department.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood from the gentleman from Missouri that one of these men was to be assigned to that duty.

Mr. LLOYD. No; I beg your pardon. There is no assignment to any particular place.

Mr. FOSTER. That the intention was to use one of these men for this purpose.

Mr. LLOYD. As I understood, you asked what these men were expected to do, and one of the things that one of them was expected to do was to deliver bills to the committees that have no janitors.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman what is the process now by which the Senate bills are delivered to the committees?

Mr. LLOYD. I do not know that I can answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. FOSTER. I think Senate bills are referred to the Clerk's room just as House bills. They go there and get them.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether that is the way; I think it is a haphazard way. Formerly there was a clerk whose business it was to deliver the bills, to deliver Senate bills, taking the receipt in each case out of a book of the chairman of the committee. In the last Congress several times Senate bills were lost. I have no doubt they were lost because that method was no longer pursued.

Mr. PALMER. And in former Congresses also.

Mr. FOSTER. Receipts are taken for all bills now just as they were in former Congresses.

Mr. MANN. I do not know what the process is now. Nobody seemed to be able to locate some bills in the last Congress, and I supposed they were lost in that manner.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman a question. What is the necessity of a bill-distributing messenger?

Mr. LLOYD. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I have not stated that there would be any messenger assigned to distribute bills. He is a messenger to perform any and all duties that are to be performed in any way.

Mr. COX. I do not think there is any necessity for a messenger of that kind at all, and I will state why. My little committee, the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, has bills sent to it by mail by the Clerk, and also copies of all bills that I have introduced. I have no complaint on

earth to make about it. Every bill introduced here I presume reaches its final and proper destination. The Clerk of the House furnishes me with a copy of all bills going to my committee. I have on file in my office a copy of every bill introduced by any Member referred to my committee, and also a copy of every bill I have introduced going to any other committee. Here is what I am afraid of, with all due deference to the chairman of the Committee on Accounts. We cut out a lot of jobs two years ago, and criticized gentlemen on the other side for their practice of having extra employees for four or five years.

Mr. MANN. You know more now.

Mr. COX. We had a lot of useless employees that we cut out. And I am wondering in my mind whether there is an attempt here to get some of these employees back.

Mr. LLOYD. I can assure the gentleman most positively that there is no attempt to get employees back. There is nothing of that kind.

Mr. COX. These are new employees.

Mr. LLOYD. They are new; but they are not such employees as were in the office before. The men in the Clerk's department received $1,500, $1,800, and $2,250 a year. We are providing for messenger service that is necessary to be performed under this resolution at the rate of $60 a month. Another thing: You must take into consideration that there is additional work for the clerks to perform. Instead of having 392 Members we have now 435 Members, and that makes additional work for the Clerk to take care of in the accounts of all these Members. It does not occur right now.

Mr. COX. I think the gentleman does not attach much importance to the increase of membership.

Mr. LLOYD. The Clerk says it will make an additional burden.

Mr. COX. I can not concur in that statement. I do not think so.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says this resolution does not put back any employees who were cut out in the resolution that was passed in the beginning of the Sixty-second Congress. I call his attention to the fact that one of the employees who was theretofore carried on the rolls was a messenger in the Clerk's office, whose sole duty it was to carry bills from the document room to the various committees when referred.

Mr. LLOYD. And he received a salary of $2,250 for performing that duty.

Mr. MANN. And he earned it.

Mr. PALMER. The fact is that the employee did little or nothing, because the committees sent for the bills themselves and the Members got all of their own bills.

That was on the theory that every bill that is worthy of consideration by a committee will have a Member behind it who will see that the committee gets it, so that place was cut out; and I hope the gentleman from Missouri will not in a small House suggest that we shall to-night attempt to put back on the rolls of the House any official who was cut out after careful investigation and full consideration by a practically unanimous sentiment of the majority Members of this House in the Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who himself offered in the last House a resolution which would have restored $22,500 in salaries.

Mr. PALMER. I did that at the beginning of the Congress, with the statement that as to those particular places we had some doubt, and we wanted to be perfectly fair. We did not press the resolution, because in the Sixty-second Congress we thought that the House organization, as we had framed it up, was amply competent to take care of the business of the House, and the gentleman knows that we did not press that resolution. This is not big enough to fight seriously about, and I think the gentleman ought to go slowly in the matter.

Mr. LLOYD. It is big enough that the Clerk of the House should have the service he needs to perform the duties of his office, and he insists that he wants this additional assistance. Now, with reference to the notification clerk, we are not restoring him. There is no attempt to restore the notification clerk. We have not a messenger who is to distribute these bills. It may be that the individual chairmen of these committees would rather have them mailed and get them later in the day——

Mr. COX. I did not say that; I simply had no complaint to make of——

Mr. LLOYD. If they have a messenger that will settle it at once.

Mr. MADDEN. If I may be allowed to interject a word, if there is any trouble about the distribution of these places you can send them over here.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, just one word and I am through. I think if the gentleman from Missouri is providing by this for people to take care of these rooms—janitors, which are necessary—as far as I am concerned, I shall have no objection; but I do think the gentleman from Missouri ought not to bring in here, as suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a provision for any help for the employment of this notification or bill clerk, as you may call it, to mail bills around, and if there is one person now performing that service I shall object at this time.

Mr. LLOYD. The Committee on Accounts has carefully investigated this resolution, and it is a unanimous report of that committee. I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. FOSTER) there were—ayes 52, noes 9.

So the resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 55 (H. Rept. 7).

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint two janitors for committees, located in the Capitol, during the sessions of the Sixty-third Congress, compensation at the rate of $60 per month for each janitor to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, said appointments to begin the 1st of April, 1913.

Mr. MANN. I understood that the other resolution carried two janitors.

Mr. LLOYD. The other provided janitors for the Clerk. This provides janitors for the various committees, including Mr. Cox's committee, Mr. HAMLIN'S, and various committees over this building where they have no janitor.

Mr. MANN. Does the Clerk need two new janitors?

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, these janitors have nothing whatever to do with the Clerk, and the Clerk has nothing to do with them. These two janitors take care of 8 or 10 rooms.

Mr. COX. We have janitor service now.

Mr. LLOYD. Certainly; and that is what we want to provide pay for, and what we are seeking to do is to provide for the janitors that the gentleman has now.

Mr. COX. Are the janitors now doing janitor work—the same men that worked last year?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it can not be possible that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] wants a janitor. I supposed, with his economic turn of mind, that he took care of his own room.

Mr. COX. No. The only thing that I know about that is that a janitor comes in every morning and cleans up. I was inquiring whether that was a new position.

Mr. LLOYD. We are providing for these janitors and not providing any new assignments whatever.

Mr. HARDWICK. In other words, we are giving the Members with committee rooms the same service that they get in the Office Building.

Mr. LLOYD. Exactly so.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, if necessary, I would ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana be permitted to take care of his own room, so as to get rid of the janitor. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ATTENDANT, LADIES' RECEPTION ROOM.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 54 (H. Rept. 10).

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint an attendant for the ladies' reception room of the House during the sessions of the Sixty-third Congress, compensation at the rate of $75 per month to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Is this the usual rate of compensation?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Seventy-five a month?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes; just the same as a page.

Mr. HARDWICK. The same old thing in the same old way.

Mr. LLOYD. The same person and the same pay as last session and the preceding session.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MARY S. MANN.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 61 (H. Rept. 9).

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized to pay, out of the contingent fund, to Mary S. Mann, widow of Charles H. Mann, late superintendent of the reporters' gallery of the House, a sum equal to six months of his salary as such employee and an additional amount, not exceeding $250, for the funeral expenses of said Charles H. Mann.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the tariff bill, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], and, without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection, and the amendment was again reported.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to continue the present duty on aluminum. There are two aluminum companies in the United States—the Aluminum Co. of America and the Southern Aluminum Co., the latter a new company, being in the South and at this time having in course of erection its plant in North Carolina. Aluminum is made from bauxite, and that ore is found only in the South. It is located in the districts represented by Mr. LEE, of Georgia, Mr. MOON, of Tennessee, Mr. BURNETT, of Alabama, and Mr. TAYLOR, of Arkansas.

We are now producing in this country 45,000,000 pounds of aluminum per annum, and we are importing from France and other countries 12,500,000 pounds per annum. If the provision now placed in the Underwood bill becomes a law, we will increase our importations in value from $1,857,000 to $2,500,000, making an increase in importation over and above the present importation of $643,000.

The cost of producing aluminum in the way of labor amounts to 60 per cent of the cost of production. Sixty per cent of $643,000 is $385,800 in labor. In other words, we increase our importation of aluminum and we deprive American wage earners of $385,800 per annum that they are now receiving. In four years we would take from these wage earners engaged in this industry $1,543,000. Our present duty on aluminum is 7 cents per pound, and to show you that it is low enough, the figures of the Treasury Department show that the French and other makers of aluminum have been able to ship into this country and successfully sell in competition with the aluminum made in America 12,500,000 pounds per annum.

Our greatest competitor in the production of aluminum is France, which produces annually 40,000,000 pounds. They use 6,000,000 pounds, and have a surplus of 34,000,000 pounds to sell to other countries. There is a duty of 7½ cents a pound on every pound of aluminum imported into France and sold in competition with aluminum made in that country. The average wage per day in the aluminum plants of our competitors abroad is 80 cents as compared with $2.50 a day in this country. Now, is it for the best interests of America, will it advance and promote the interests of the four States in the South that have the only known deposits of bauxite in this country out of which aluminum is made, to reduce our duty to practically 2½ cents per pound and permit the French people, with a surplus of 34,000,000 pounds a year to enter this field in competition with aluminum made from southern bauxite?

Oh, I know the gentleman who has charge of this bill [Mr. PALMER] will say that the Aluminum Co. of America is a monopoly in this country. Yes; and I say to him that there is a legalized pool and an Aluminum Trust in France and in the other foreign countries where our competitors are engaged in this business. If there is a pool or a monopoly there why should not the American Congress prefer an American monopoly or an American trust, which voluntarily reduced the price of aluminum from $8 per pound to 17 cents per pound, in preference to a foreign trust or a foreign monopoly? Why should we seek by legislation to take business from the aluminum mills of America and money from the wage earners in the American aluminum plants? Why should we attempt by legislation to take in round numbers over a million and a half dollars per annum and turn it over to foreigners, to plants operated in Europe that pay no taxes to the American Government or any State in it, or who do not employ a single American wage earner?

I submit for the consideration of this House an appeal from the business organizations of Knoxville, Tenn., in the interest of this great American industry.

The appeal is as follows:

Resolution adopted at a special joint session of the boards of directors of the Board of Commerce, Commercial Club, Manufacturers and Producers' Association, and Traffic Bureau, of Knoxville, Tenn.

Whereas the aluminum industry of the United States, being fostered and stimulated by patents on the process of manufacture and by a duty of 7 cents per pound on foreign aluminum, has during the last 20 years grown from practically nothing to an output of 40,000,000 pounds per annum, while the price to the consumer has fallen from $4 per pound to 18 cents per pound; and

Whereas said patents have now expired, leaving nothing but the tariff of 7 cents per pound to secure to the American manufacturer the home market; and

Whereas it is far more expensive to produce aluminum in this country than in France and other foreign countries because of the fact that foreign bauxite is richer than that found in America, and because in foreign countries bauxite, coal deposits, and water power for generating electricity are found in close proximity to each other, while in this country they are found far apart; and because it is far more costly to develop the water powers in this than in foreign countries and because the American manufacturer must pay much higher wages to labor than his foreign competitor; and

Whereas there are thousands of American citizens dependent upon the aluminum industries for support and millions of American capital invested in the business, both of which would suffer if the American market should be turned over to the foreign producer of aluminum; and

Whereas bauxite, from which aluminum is made, is found only in the Southern States, and there are also found in the South vast coal deposits and undeveloped water power possibilities, both of which are essential in the production of aluminum; and

Whereas these advantages have attracted the manufacturers of aluminum in this country and abroad to such an extent that the Aluminum Co. of America and the Southern Aluminum Co. have each recently secured extensive water powers in the South with a view to their immediate development for use in the manufacture of aluminum, which development would, in the opinion of this body, be retarded and delayed, if not entirely prevented by any tariff legislation which would make it easier for foreign producers to sell their goods in this market and harder for the American manufacturer to obtain reasonable returns on the capital invested in the aluminum business; and

Whereas we believe that there is no demand coming from the consumers of aluminum goods for a lower duty, but that the cry for a lower tariff on aluminum comes solely from the manufacturers in their own interest and is not made in the interest of the consumers: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Board of Commerce, Commercial Club, Manufacturers' and Producers' Association, and Traffic Bureau, of Knoxville, Tenn., That we deem it prejudicial to the best interest of the South to reduce the tariff on aluminum below 7 cents per pound, and we therefore urge our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their influence to prevent such reduction.

J. W. BROWNLEE,
President Board of Commerce, Knoxville, Tenn.
G. E. BRADFORD,
President Commercial Club, Knoxville, Tenn.
W. A MORERLY,
President Manufacturers' and Producers' Association, Knoxville, Tenn.
JESSE THOMAS,
President Traffic Bureau, Knoxville, Tenn.
CHAS. KIMMICK,
Secretary Joint Meeting.

KNOXVILLE, TENN., *February 6, 1913.*

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, if there is any rate in all the length and breadth of this bill which is entirely and absolutely justified by the facts, it is this rate on aluminum, which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] would seek to change. The fact is that his constituents, the interests for whom he is speaking here in this matter, do not care particularly about this tariff rate upon aluminum. The gentleman applies his remarks to the aluminum paragraph, but what he has back in his head is what the Aluminum Co. of America has in its mind—the fact that we have put bauxite, the raw material of the Aluminum Co. of America, on the free list. That is what is frightening them, and for a very peculiar and interesting reason. The gentleman from Tennessee talks about the compe-

tition that the Aluminum Co. of America is suffering now and is liable to suffer because of this decreased rate. There is not a particle of competition in the aluminum business in this country or anywhere else on God's earth. There is an absolutely country-wide monopoly in America possessed by the Aluminum Co. of America, and, as the gentleman says, there is a trust abroad as well, and the Aluminum Co. of America is the founder of that trust and the biggest part of it.

Mr. Davis, the general manager of the Aluminum Co. of America, testified before the Ways and Means Committee in January that he went to London and wrote the agreement on behalf of his Canadian company, owned by the Aluminum Co. of America, which fixed the price and divided the market all over the world for aluminum. Now, the only reason we left a rate upon this aluminum at all was because the Aluminum Co. of America is not big enough, giant though it has become, it has not secured a sufficient number of water powers which are necessary for the manufacture of aluminum, to entirely supply the American market, and it must permit its foreign associates, companies associated with it under the agreement that Mr. Davis wrote, to send into this country something like $1,800,000 worth of aluminum per annum. Upon that aluminum we levy this tax of 25 per cent in order to raise revenue for the Government.

It is not to give the Aluminum Co. of America competition, because there is no competition. The price is world-wide, and in this country larger than the foreign country by the amount of duty, making an even level of price the world over. The gentleman refers to another aluminum company as if the trust really did have some opposition and competition in this country. It is not so. But some venturesome Frenchmen have come over into this country and have undertaken to build an aluminum plant down in one of the Carolinas.

They have invested a large amount of money, although they have not got to the point of making any aluminum itself. The Aluminum Co. of America, the American Aluminum Trust, owns all the commercial bauxite in America, most of which is located down in the section of country represented by my friend from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. There is none of it in my district.

Mr. PALMER. Well, in that section; and with the Aluminum Trust's grip on bauxite, these Frenchmen can not give them any competition unless we put bauxite on the free list; so that we are getting revenue upon this item by putting a 25 per cent rate on aluminum, and getting 25 per cent of the nearly $2,000,000 worth of aluminum which will come into the country, and we are making it possible for this world-wide trust to have actual competition by depriving it of its monopoly in the ownership of the bauxite beds.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 39, line 3, by inserting after the word "bars" the word "strips."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

146. Antimony, as regulus or metal, antimony ore, stibnite and matte containing antimony but not containing more than 10 per cent of lead, 10 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That on all importations of antimony-bearing ores and matte containing antimony the duties shall be estimated at the port of entry, and a bond given in double the amount of such estimated duties for the transportation of the ores by common carriers bonded for the transportation of appraised or unappraised merchandise to properly equipped sampling or smelting establishments, whether designated as bonded warehouses or otherwise. On the arrival of the ores at such establishments, they shall be sampled according to commercial methods under the supervision of Government officers, who shall be stationed at such establishments, and who shall submit the samples thus obtained to a Government assayer, designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall make a proper assay of the sample and report the result to the proper customs officers, and the import entry shall be liquidated thereon, except in case of ores that shall be removed to a bonded warehouse to be refined for exportation as provided by law, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make all necessary regulations to enforce the provisions of this paragraph; antimony, oxide salts, and compounds of, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, in paragraph 146 I move to strike out the last word. It relates to the duty on antimony.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to strike out the last word in paragraph 146.

Mr. MANN. I call the attention of the Members to this letter:

INTERNATIONAL NAIL CORPORATION,
Chicago, January 9, 1913.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MANN:

* * * * * * *

As you are aware, some time ago you procured for me statistics on antimony, which were very valuable to me at the time, and on the strength of that knowledge I formed, with a number of my friends, a corporation several years ago for the smelting of antimony, and only now, after spending in the neighborhood of $120,000, we are very close to smelting.

I can intelligently say that the reason that there has been no antimony smelted in this country for several years last past is because of the cheapness of the production of antimony and the oxide from the other side, accompanied with a very low duty, such as the regulus, carrying 1¼ cents a pound duty, and the oxide of antimony, carrying 1¼ cents a pound with an additional 25 per cent a pound ad valorem; and stibnite and matte, containing antimony and not containing more than 10 per cent of lead, 1 cent a pound on antimony contained therein. That, you will see, is so low that it is pretty nearly prohibitive for the American public in the West where these mines are for them to go ahead and mine and smelt this antimony.

My visit through the West several months ago caused me to call through the extreme south of California and up to the extreme northwest of Washington, stopping at all the known places where antimony has been mined and can be, and I can truthfully say that there is an awful pile of it, but the same old howl is there. We would be pleased to mine and smelt, but the duty is too low for us to compete with the foreign business, as far as the price of antimony itself is concerned.

As this antimony proposition has taken five years of hard labor to put it where it is, as far as I am concerned and all the money that I could get myself and the friends that I have interested in with me, I feel as though I ought to communicate with you in time and place the matter before you as I have, and am satisfied that you will do what a lot of other people could not for me. If that duty can not be raised, for "the love of Mike" let it stand as it is.

I would be pleased to hear from you regarding your ideas in this matter, and if you found it essential for me to be in Washington before this explosion takes place kindly advise me, and I will be pleased to come, as we can not afford to fail in this effort.

Yours, as ever,
FRANK NOWAT.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MILLER. I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] a question. It is this: What is antimony used for in the arts?

Mr. PALMER. It is used in the manufacture of type metal, Babbitt metal, for ball bearings, and so forth.

Mr. MILLER. Is there any such monopoly with respect to that metal as there is with respect to aluminum?

Mr. PALMER. Not that I know of.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that, in view of his statement regarding the Aluminum Trust in the United States and abroad being practically controlled by the same parties, it was thought wise to put a duty on the importations of aluminum, the local monopoly not being able to supply the local demand, so that a tax on the importations is simply a tax on the trust.

Mr. PALMER. Yes; the last reason being the controlling reason. The fact that they are not able to supply the local demand makes it necessary to let importations come in, and we get the revenue.

Mr. MILLER. As I understand, the amount of the duty will be simply that much taken from the trust for revenue for the benefit of the United States Government.

Mr. PALMER. That is it.

Mr. MILLER. Would not the gentleman think it wise to retain that duty at 50 per cent instead of dropping it down to 25 per cent if the total amount is to be collected from the trust anyhow? I notice from the tables that have been prepared that the expected importations will cause a slight reduction in the amount of the revenues to be derived from aluminum and a slight reduction in the amount of the revenues to be derived from antimony. For instance, of one form of antimony there was received in the year 1912, in round numbers, $74,000, and it is expected that $50,000 only a year will be received under this bill. On another antimony item $148,000 was received in 1910. Now it is expected to receive under this bill $80,000. On another item $27,000 was received and it is expected to receive $20,000, and so on down through the list. Especially is this falling off of revenue to be found in the aluminum paragraph. In 1912 we received in duties on aluminum products $1,047,000, and it is estimated by the committee that we will now receive under this bill only $625,000. It seems to me that if the amount to be collected in duties on aluminum is to be simply a tax upon the trusts, it might be wise to make

that tax as high as possible. This bill appears to fatten the Aluminum Trust to the extent of $400,000 each year.

Mr. PALMER. I would be glad to do that if it were not for the fact that, of course, a certain proportion of the tax can be, and is, passed on in the price of the article which is made by the Aluminum Co. of America. While there is this world-wide agreement, it is maintained with due regard for tariff duties. The price of aluminum in this country is to-day 7 cents higher than the foreign price, or it was until recently. That is to say, the duty is added to the foreign price to make the American price; and I would not be willing to write into this law such a rate as would continue the possibility of the Aluminum Co. of America adding as much as 7 cents a pound to its crude prices, or 11 cents a pound to its finished aluminum, at the expense of the consumer.

Mr. MILLER. Then the gentleman does think there exists some relationship between the amount of duty collected and the cost to the consumer of the finished product.

Mr. PALMER. I have many times said, and everybody else has said, that the consumer pays the tax.

Mr. MILLER. I understood from the gentleman's statement that the trusts were paying this tax.

Mr. PALMER. It comes out of the trusts primarily, of course, into the Government coffers.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I notice that the price of imported aluminum is shown by the report of the committee to have been 24 cents a pound in 1905, and 12 cents a pound in 1912. That shows a very amiable disposition on the part of the Aluminum Trust, I take it, that with the tariff duties stated as 7 cents a pound during all this period, they now charge only 50 per cent, practically, of the price which they charged seven years ago on imported aluminum.

Mr. PALMER. The fact is that even under the falling prices which the Aluminum Co. of America have maintained—because they were the sole dictators as to what the price should be—their profits were so enormous that they would have been afraid to maintain any higher price to increase those enormous profits.

Mr. MANN. But if this is a world-wide trust, without any competition, I should say that it indicated a rather generous disposition on the part of that monopoly in this case. In the course of seven years it has cut the price 50 per cent.

Mr. PALMER. It was not generosity or philanthropy which prompted that. It was the fear that if out of a common article of necessity of this kind they continued to make such enormous profits as they made some years ago, they would so incense the public mind that attention would be drawn to their unconscionable activities, and as a trust they would be wiped out of existence.

Mr. AUSTIN. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that aluminum was selling in this country for $80 a ton, and they were the sole people who owned or controlled it. They have put the price down from $80 a ton to 17 cents a pound.

Mr. MANN. That is, under the influence of a protective tariff the price was cut in two in the course of seven years.

Mr. AUSTIN. The protective tariff enabled them to develop the industry.

Mr. PALMER. The price of aluminum has come down on account of the inventions, improvements, and discoveries which have been made in the methods of its manufacture and the uses to which it can be put, but to which it was never put when aluminum was $80 a ton. At that time it was not a commercial article at all.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is it not a fact that the American Aluminum Co. extended the use of aluminum, built up this business from the very start, and that it has very greatly reduced the price from that day up to this?

Mr. PALMER. That is a fact.

Mr. AUSTIN. Give them credit for it!

Mr. PALMER. I give them credit for it. It is a fact also that on an actual investment of something less than $2,000,000 they are to-day declaring dividends upon their stock, which amount to nearly 200 per cent on all the money they have invested as original investment, and with the present comparatively low price of aluminum they are making enormous profits. They are entitled to credit for their success, but their large profits show that the reduction in aluminum to American consumers resulting from this decrease can come from their profits without undue injury to the industry.

Mr. PAYNE. Is it not true that no aluminum was produced in the United States practically until we put a protective tariff upon it?

Mr. PALMER. I do not think that had anything to do with its production here.

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly not, according to the gentleman's idea. These gentlemen came here and asked for a tariff on it in order that they might go into the enterprise. They did go into the enterprise, and they have reduced the price steadily from that time to this, and they have built up the industry.

Mr. PALMER. The business has been built up largely, as stated before, because of the control of the one concern of the patent on the discoveries connected with the methods by which it was made. The largest reason why the price has gone down, besides the fear of prosecution of this trust if the enormous profits continued, was the fear of competition on American soil.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, it is true they were protected by patents as well as by the duty in the first place, but they did not make any and did not get any patent on the invention or invent any new process until the protective tariff was put on the article. Then they went to work and invented a new process and took out patents under the laws which we all believe in, and they were protected in that as well as the tariff.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman claims that the protective tariff stimulated invention?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly it does set them to work and gives them a chance. I wish the gentleman from Pennsylvania would get that into his head, and the more he studies it the more he will appreciate it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not see why this company should fear local competition, because the gentleman from Pennsylvania has stated that this company owns an absolute monopoly of all the raw materials.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

148. Bronze powder, brocades, flitters, and metallics; bronze, or Dutch-metal or aluminum, in leaf, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to ask a couple of questions. What did the committee find in regard to bronze powder as a reason for changing the tariff to 25 per cent ad valorem, practically a reduction of about 20 per cent?

Mr. PALMER. I will say to the gentleman from Connecticut that bronze-powder manufacturers came to Washington protesting vigorously against this reduction. They saw me in conference and told me the prices they were paying for labor in this country and the prices they were paying abroad; and after we had gone all over it with them it developed that this rate exactly equalized the difference in their cost of production, according to their own statement. We did not think, on any theory, they made much of a case for us to raise it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Has the gentleman got the figures of the total amount of business in bronze powder? The point I want to make is that about one-half of the bronze powder was imported under the Payne tariff law, and by the reduction of this duty it will practically allow all the bronze powder business for the other side.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is not that all right? Did not the gentleman from Connecticut vote for that?

Mr. DONOVAN. I want to know if the gentleman's figures show that one-half of the bronze powder was imported under the Payne law?

Mr. PALMER. I have not the figures at hand, and if that was so it would not scare me any.

Mr. DONOVAN. I was not familiar with the situation, but I supposed the committee had treated this in an intelligent manner.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. PALMER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I notice in this paragraph the committee has proposed to reduce the tariff rates on flitters. Does the term "flitters" refer to the gentlemen on the other side of the House who will be out of it after the tariff goes into effect? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

150. Gold leaf, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the paragraph and insert in lieu the following:

"150. Gold leaf, 35 cents per 100 leaves. The foregoing rate applies to leaf not exceeding in size the equivalent of 3⅜ by 3⅜ inches; additional duties in the same proportion shall be assessed on leaf exceeding in size said equivalent."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, it may be conceded at the outset that gold leaf is not eaten by the poor. Ordinarily it is in the luxury class, but the rate of duty has been reduced in this bill. The amendment I have offered attempts to restore the rate to what it was under the act of 1909. The amendment is offered at the suggestion of both the employers and the employees, numbering about 3,000 in this country, whose business and employment is affected by the proposed reduction.

In support of their contention, I desire to present this extract from a statement prepared by both sides, employers and employees:

The wages are $12 to $15 per week for men and $5 to $7 for women, and any change in duty, however small, would of necessity be taken off the present wages, as Germany now lays down gold leaf in this country at less than the cost price even at these wages, already low as compared with other skilled trades. The German wages are $6 to $7.50 for men and $3 to $5 for women, being 50 per cent less than American wages. In Germany each man works with several apprentices; the net result is greatly in excess of 50 per cent less than in this country.

I desire to say this change is evidently not in the interest of revenue, because it is an advance of only 5 per cent over the Wilson bill rate. The Wilson tariff of 1896 collected only $766 of duties upon gold leaf. Under the Payne act, where the ad valorem equivalent is 37.77 per cent of protection, the imports enabled the collection of duties to the extent of $13,514 in 1912. Hence it would appear that this reduction from the Payne rate is not in the interest either of the poor, who do not eat gold leaf, nor of the Government, for which it is expected to obtain revenue.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the remark does not apply to this particular amendment of my distinguished colleague as well as to some others, but it may as well be made now. The gentleman from the Philadelphia district has been, ever since we started the consideration of this bill, bringing in amendments to restore the Payne rates, or to continue the Payne rates. He finds his mind led toward that desire so strongly that even in a case like this, where we have simply reduced the rate from 37 per cent to 35 per cent, he feels that he must put back the old Payne rate, and increase it from 35 per cent to 37 per cent. I simply want to take this occasion to call to the attention of my colleague, the gentleman from Philadelphia, the fact that every platform of every political party which was promulgated in the State of Pennsylvania in the year 1912 demanded a downward revision of the tariff. The Republican Party in Pennsylvania condemned the Payne law in its State platform and demanded a revision downward of that law.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. And it seems to me that it is about time the gentleman from Philadelphia woke up and discovered what the people in this country decided last fall. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Just a moment. I commend to him the example of his distinguished leader, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], who knows that the American people have condemned his law because he is here with a new Schedule K, reducing his own Schedule K very materially.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. And I expect the gentleman from Philadelphia is opposing it.

Mr. MOORE. Can the gentleman point to a single Republican platform in State or Nation that does not declare for protection to American industries?

Mr. PALMER. I can point to the Republican platform in the State of Pennsylvania, and that is what I am talking about—the platform of the party which elected the gentleman from Philadelphia—which condemned this Payne law, and which the gentleman now seeks to restore.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman presume to say that it is not within the province of a Member to stand up for any particular industry in his district or against a great combination for which a special rate was fixed in the matter of ferromanganese?

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I will say in answer to that that if the gentleman from Philadelphia could say that he was here trying to save an industry from destruction there might be some logic in his position; but he is here because he is such a standpatter that he can not allow the rate on gold leaf to be reduced from 37 per cent to 35 per cent, and he knows that that small reduction will not have any effect upon gold-leaf manufacturers either in his district or elsewhere.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to close all debate on this paragraph.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield once more? Is not the real difference between the gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself this, that I am standing pat against a loss of employment to men engaged in the industries, while the gentleman is sponsor for a bill which——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The gentleman from Alabama moves to close all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

155. Lead dross, lead bullion or base bullion, lead in pigs and bars, lead in any form not specially provided for in this section, old refuse lead run into blocks and bars, and old scrap lead fit only to be remanufactured; lead in sheets, pipe, shot, glaziers' lead, and lead wire; all the foregoing 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 40, line 23, at the end of the line insert the words "or of tinsel wire, lame, or lahn, and India rubber."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. I also offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 40, line 24, after the word "threads," insert the words "not specially provided for."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Has this item been passed? Has paragraph 152 been passed?

Mr. PALMER. I was waiting for the Clerk to read.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit me to make a suggestion about the amendment just adopted?

Mr. PALMER. I have not taken the floor. The amendment has been offered and agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I notice everywhere else in the bill "not specifically provided for in this section." While it is not important, it might be advisable to have the same language.

Mr. PALMER. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be modified by adding the words "in this section." [Applause on the Republican side.] I do that to show that the gentleman really has somebody following him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to modify the amendment last agreed to by adding the words "in this section" to the amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. PALMER. Did I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania to now move to strike out the last word which the gentleman from Illinois put in?

Mr. MOORE. No; the last word of the paragraph of the bill. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, however, which is the raw material and which is the finished product in this paragraph 152? If the gentleman from Pennsylvania would please give as much attention to the House as to the platforms of his party, perhaps he would answer my question.

Mr. PALMER. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. MOORE. I want to find out what difference the committee allowed as between the raw material and the finished product in this paragraph.

Mr. PALMER. Well, there are very many different raw materials which come in at different rates.

Mr. MOORE. They are jumbled together in this paragraph. The raw material comes in at 30 per cent ad valorem and the finished product at 40 per cent ad valorem. Is not that the fact?

Mr. PALMER. Some raw material comes in at 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. But chiefly tinsel as raw material comes in at 30 per cent and the finished product at 40 per cent, so that the American manufacturer is given an actual protection of 10 per cent. Is not that the fact?

Mr. PALMER. There is a differential between wire and tinsel of 20 per cent and between tinsel and the fabric of 10 per cent.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman regard these articles as luxuries?

Mr. PALMER. Some are and some are not.

Mr. MOORE. Some are Christmas ornaments and are made very cheaply in Germany in competition with the United States. The gentleman offers 10 per cent protection to the American manufacturer, whom he taxes 30 per cent for his raw material. Now, with reference to this paragraph and with particular reference to what the gentleman said a moment ago, I desire to say that the difference in political opinion between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] and myself is this: Platforms of a party are sometimes written by an individual or a combination of individuals. Notwithstanding this the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] stands for the maintenance of industries of the United States which are progressive in an economic sense and which give employment to labor in the United States at an American wage, while the other gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], by his performance, writes out of business not only the industries of his Commonwealth, but puts out of employment men who are engaged in those industries, and this in the interest of revenue for the Government which is being collected now under the Payne bill, which he condemns.

Mr. PALMER. If the gentleman his finished his short sentence, would he mind——

Mr. MOORE. I made it as pointed as I could so that the gentleman could understand the difference between himself and myself.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman has excused the repudiation of his party platform in Pennsylvania because of the fact that it was drawn by an individual or a combination of individuals of whom apparently he does not approve. Would the gentleman mind stating, for the information of the House and for the RECORD, in order to keep history straight in Pennsylvania, where it would be important and interesting, what individual or what combination of individuals really control the Republican Party in Pennsylvania and write its platforms? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman tell me who wrote the Government-ownership plank of the Democratic platform? Will the gentleman tell me who wrote the waterways plank in every one of the national platforms of last year? Will the gentleman tell me——

Mr. PALMER. I asked you for information.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman tell me who dictated the Democratic platform of Pennsylvania last year? I wish the gentleman would rise up and answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

153. Hooks and eyes, metallic, snap fasteners and clasps by whatever name known, trousers buckles and waistcoat buckles made wholly or partly of iron or steel, steel trousers buttons and metal buttons not specially provided for in this section, all the foregoing and parts thereof, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 41, strike out the last two words in line 3 and the words "buttons and metal buttons" in line 4 and insert the following:
"Nickel bar buttons and trousers, buttons of steel and other metal."

Mr. CALDER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] had such good fortune in presenting an amendment to the last section of the bill, which the committee evidently overlooked, that for the same reason I have the temerity to present this. In examining the provisions affecting buttons I find that in the Payne Tariff Act they were dealt with largely in Schedule N, in paragraph 427. I have not sought to raise the duty or to interfere at all with the duty on this particular item of metal trousers buttons, but sought to put under that classification the same items that came under it in this paragraph, to which I have referred, in the Payne bill.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. You are seeking to add a new kind of metal button?

Mr. CALDER. That is right.

Mr. PALMER. And which you do not find in this bill at present?

Mr. CALDER. That is right.

Mr. PALMER. But the gentleman will note the language of the bill, "not specially provided for in this section," will cover the new metal button.

Mr. CALDER. That will leave the question open.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no; it will not. I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER], so that he may save time, that that particular language was written in there by a Treasury expert, who prepared the proposition. There are two items in reference to buttons in this bill. All the buttons were pulled out and put in Schedule N, except metal buttons, and this was prepared especially by an expert of the Treasury Department to cover all metal buttons, and there is no question about it.

Mr. CALDER. Those who have given the subject some thought have considered that the nickel bar buttons might be considered in Schedule N, to which the gentleman referred.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman need not have any doubt, because all trousers buttons and metal buttons not specially provided for, which means all other metal buttons, are covered by this paragraph.

Mr. MANN. That would depend on whether it would be considered they were provided for under the sundries amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There are none provided for under the sundries amendment. My friend from Illinois evidently has not read this paragraph or he would not ask that question.

Mr. MANN. I have read the paragraph; certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It says: "Steel trousers buttons and metal buttons not specially provided for." That covers all the buttons that you could make.

Mr. MANN. It does if they are not specially provided for elsewhere.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment makes the whole thing clear, so that you do not leave open in future the question for the determination of any board of appraisers or any customs court. There is no question about it if my amendment is adopted. Otherwise there may be.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think so. If the gentleman's amendment prevailed it might cloud some other provisions as to metal buttons that are now clear.

Mr. CALDER. In the Payne Act all these buttons were in the same classification.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 41, line 1, after the word "eyes," insert the words "other than those used in the manufacture of boots and shoes."

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment, I take the position that in view of the fact that the committee that wrote this tariff bill has been kind enough to the shoe-manufacturing industry of this country to simply put the product of the shoe manufacturers on the free list and not attach any penalties to it [laughter on the Republican side], they would perhaps give sufficient consideration to that industry to allow the shoe manufacturers to receive without a duty the hooks and eyes which they use in the manufacture of shoes, which now must be sold in free and open competition with the rest of the world if this bill becomes a law.

I have been thinking that possibly the gentlemen who prepared this bill would be considerate enough to allow the shoe manufacturers to use these hooks and eyelets without being obliged to pay a duty on the same. The position assumed by the Committee on Ways and Means, as explained on this floor by the distinguished chairman of the committee, if I understand it correctly, is that the tariff duties in the future shall be levied in such a manner as to put all lines of manufacture on a competitive basis.

I have been trying to point out that this cure-all in tariff legislation is not a proper cure. It will put a premium upon dishonesty and upon the lack of thrift and the lack of economical manufacture, and will impose a penalty upon thrift, economy, and honesty. By that I mean to say this, making just this one illustration: During the debates to-day and yesterday you heard repeatedly that the duties on various articles have been placed at the point where they now appear because the importation of those articles has been either extensive or, perhaps, not extensive; and duties as high as 55 and 60 per cent have been imposed upon articles in which the labor cost is not over 75 per cent of the cost of the articles themselves.

In the shoe industry of the United States the labor cost on the average price of shoes manufactured is 25 per cent of the wholesale cost. There appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means a committee of shoe manufacturers, who pleaded with the committee earnestly, and put the proposition up to

them, and told them that this industry will suffer, and suffer severely, if the little duty of 10 per cent that was retained by the Payne bill is now removed.

It is useless to go into these details. I can not begin to think of doing it in the five minutes allotted to me. But permit me to say, Mr. Chairman, that the injustice of this thing lies in the fact that the shoe manufacturers of this country have been in open and free competition with each other, there being over 1,300 American shoe manufacturers in existence. They have been in such fierce and open competition that it has been necessary to practice the greatest economies possible in the minutest details of manufacture, and the manufacturers have succeeded in giving to the country and the people of the United States such a line of goods that, notwithstanding the fact that a duty of only 10 per cent was kept on the statute books, it has been impossible for foreign manufacturers to come in and compete. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed at the end of 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, the remarks to which we have just listened from my distinguished friend, the Member from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER], furnish a striking illustration of what has been going on in this country with respect to tariff legislation under the Republican régime for many years. My friend comes here, and in the Congress of the United States, though sent here to represent 200,000 people in the great State of Pennsylvania, he makes a plea to you to put money into his own pocket; for the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania is not alone a boot and shoe manufacturer, but if I am not mistaken is the president or ex-president of the American Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association. Now, I ascribe to him no improper motive, but it does seem to me that it is a striking illustration of the habit of thought which has got into the minds of American manufacturers, that they can and should come here and plead with American Representatives that taxes be laid upon the American people in order to add profit to the special interests which they represent. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman speaks of this small item of hooks and eyes. I am not a shoe manufacturer, and I do not know what proportion exactly hooks and eyes bear——

Mr. KREIDER. There are 30 items which go into the manufacture of shoes which are not on the free list.

Mr. PALMER. I do not know what proportion of the value of a shoe the hooks and eyes amount to, but I am certain it is an infinitesimally small part of the value of the shoe. The gentleman's amendment would simply throw these hooks and eyes into the basket clause and increase the rate. But, passing that by, I will say to him that we did reduce this duty from 45 per cent under the present law to 15 per cent on these articles, so that, though we do have boots and shoes upon the free list, the great boot and shoe industry is not going to suffer very much by reason of the fact that it must pay simply 15 per cent upon hooks and eyes, an industry which is able to produce in this country nearly $600,000,000 worth of product and export more of its product than any country on the face of the earth exports into foreign markets.

Mr. KREIDER. I beg to differ. The gentleman is misinformed.

Mr. PALMER. Perhaps the gentleman misunderstood me. What I say is that the American boot and shoe manufacturer exports more than any other country in the world exports.

Mr. KREIDER. The gentleman is misinformed.

Mr. PALMER. Oh! but it is absolutely true. And the boot and shoe manufacturers who came before the Ways and Means Committee confirmed that statement. The gentleman knows Mr. McElwin, I think, the head of the biggest boot and shoe manufacturing establishment in the country, and he showed that we exported, I think it was, $17,000,000 worth of boots and shoes, against a little less than that amount exported by Great Britain, so that here is a great industry which faces a foreign competition of less than $200,000, with a production of nearly $600,000,000, sending its shoes all over the world, underselling the foreign manufacturer at the very door of his own factory, asking us to remit the duty of 15 per cent on hooks and eyes.

Mr. KREIDER. Will the gentleman allow me to reply?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be heard on this question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not care to go into the question of boots and shoes at this time. We will reach them later. I prefer not to debate this bill all over it.

Mr. MANN. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that debate on this paragraph has already been closed by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the committee debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto is closed. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KENNEDY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 41, line 5, after the word "thereof," strike out "15" and insert in lieu thereof "25."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

154. Lead-bearing ores of all kinds containing more than 3 per cent of lead, one-half cent per pound on the lead contained therein: *Provided*, That on all importations of lead-bearing ores the duties shall be estimated at the port of entry, and a bond given in double the amount of such estimated duties for the transportation of the ores by common carriers bonded for the transportation of appraised or unappraised merchandise to properly equipped sampling or smelting establishments, whether designated as bonded warehouses or otherwise. On the arrival of the ores at such establishments they shall be sampled according to commercial methods under the supervision of Government officers, who shall be stationed at such establishments, and who shall submit the samples thus obtained to a Government assayer, designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall make a proper assay of the sample and report the result to the proper customs officers, and the import entries shall be liquidated thereon, except in case of ores that shall be removed to a bonded warehouse to be refined for exportation as provided by law. And the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make all necessary regulations to enforce the provisions of this paragraph.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, line 8, page 41, by inserting, after the word "lead," the words "one and."

[Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, in reply to what was said by my colleague in reference to the glass factories, I want to inform him that the glass factories went out of business in Oklahoma immediately after the adoption of the Payne-Aldrich bill, and the price of lead in the county went down as low as it has been for years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVENPORT. Yes.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. The largest glass factory in Oklahoma is located in Ponca, and that was located there after the enactment of the Payne law. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I did not undertake to answer for the district of my Republican colleague [Mr. McGUIRE], but I was speaking of mine, as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] has referred to it. The Ponca City one is not making very great progress at present, as my colleague will admit, and the lead mines in Oklahoma do not need any protection greater now than they have had for years, and they are not clamoring in my district for that protection.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

We have in northern Idaho about 12,000 people dependent directly or indirectly on the operation of our lead mines, which produce over 30 per cent of the supply of the United States. Nearly $5,000,000 yearly goes to the railroads for freights in transporting the products of the mines and the mills, and merchandise needed by the communities which are sustained by this industry. In addition, the wages of the miners, supplies, rents, and so forth, amount to nearly $10,000,000 per year. This industry has been built up under a protective tariff of 1½ per cent on lead ore. In addition to the mines in operation, there are a great many prospective mines which are being developed at great expense and this development will be abandoned in many instances if lead miners are compelled to enter the market in competition with Mexican ores. The latest statistics compiled by the census report shows that out of 2,185 mines reported, only 154 were producing mines. The total capital invested was

$72,738,889, 44 per cent of which was invested in prospective mines, all of which would be a total loss if the lead producers are not to have the benefit of existing protective laws. I can not understand how any man who loves his country and who is interested in the happiness and welfare of his neighbors could support a measure which would place them on a par with the cheap labor of Mexico, who receive one-fourth of the wages received by the miners in Idaho.

Note the comparison between the wages paid in Idaho and Mexico:

	Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.	Mexico.
Miners	$3.50 to $4.50	$0.75
Muckers	3.00 to 3.50	.50
Laborers	3.00 to 3.50	.50
Timbermen	3.50 to 4.00	.75 to $1.00
Pumpmen	4.00	1.00
Engineers	4.50 to 5.00	1.00
Shift bosses	5.00 to 6.00	
Track and pipe men	3.50 to 4.00	1.00
Blacksmiths	4.00 to 5.00	1.00 to 1.25
Blacksmith's helpers	3.50 to 4.00	.75
Machinists	4.50 to 5.00	1.00
Millmen	3.50 to 4.00	.65
Average	3.60	.80
Day's work	8 hours.	10 to 12 hours.

Who would be benefited by the proposed reduction of the duty and the suspension of the lead-mining industry in the United States? Why should we send our money out of the country for those things that are now being produced by ourselves? [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER], on this side of the House, offered an amendment relating to hooks and eyes used in boots and shoes, and made an observation concerning boots and shoes being on the free list. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], who prepared this schedule, and who is in charge of it, endeavoring to reflect upon his colleague from Pennsylvania, stated that he was surprised that a gentleman on the floor of the House would make a proposition to the House which might affect his own pocket or his own business, and that it was improper, or words to that effect, for the president or ex-president of the United States Shoe Manufacturers' Association to propose an amendment upon the floor of the House affecting the shoe business.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose next we will be told that gentlemen in this House who own farms or who are interested in agriculture have no right to propose amendments or to vote upon propositions affecting the tariff upon agricultural products; but think of a speech of that sort coming from one of the older Members of this House, when the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] who introduced the bill affecting the tariff upon iron and steel products is himself an iron and steel manufacturer!

Think of a gentleman making that observation relating to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER], saying that it was improper for him to propose an amendment affecting the tariff upon boots and shoes when he was the president of the Shoe Manufacturers' Association, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania himself secured iron ore free, the principal user of which is located in his district! [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, and the gentleman might have added that they were also making 20 per cent profit on the investment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has brought me personally into this question.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman, if he will permit me, that I did not do it with any reflection upon the gentleman from Alabama. The gentleman from Alabama does not need to defend himself upon the floor of this House, so far as this tariff bill concerns his own business, and no one has ever charged him with attempting to use his official position to improperly advantage himself in his private business. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for what he says, but the only business in which I am interested is the pig-iron business and the iron and steel business in my own district. There is not an item in it that has not been reduced in this bill. So far as the Birmingham district is concerned, its great iron supply has been put upon the free list, for the benefit of the country generally.

The coal that it produces has gone to the free list. The greatest manufacturing plant in the district is a steel-rail mill, and rails have gone to the free list, because that industry is controlled by a monopoly. The next greatest plant in the district is a wire plant, and a part of their product has gone to the free list. I do not mean to say that I would have advocated putting these articles on the free list if I thought that they ought to bear a revenue tax. The item in this bill that I am more interested in than any other is pig iron, and although the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] cut the rate on pig iron from $4 to $2.50 in his bill, in this bill we cut the rate from $2.50 specific to 8 per cent ad valorem, which, at $15 pig iron, would mean $1.20 a ton, or a cut of 50 per cent. If I could not represent my constituency and at the same time represent the people of the United States without involving myself in a question of feeling I had to be a special pleader for interests that happen to be located in my district, I would be unworthy to occupy the position I hold in this House and unworthy to bear a commission from the great Democratic Party of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I have no criticism of a gentleman who comes here to represent the interests of his constituency. I have no criticism of the gentleman from Pennsylvania who desired to lower a duty on a product that he buys and at the same time contends for a raise of a duty on the product that he sells. I do not question the gentleman's motive in the case, but I contend this—that when Representatives of the American people stand in this House and exercise the power to tax the people of this country and lay on their backs burdens of taxation, at least it is not becoming for gentlemen to display a selfish interest in these matters. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The time has passed when the laws of this country shall longer be written for special interests [applause on the Democratic side]; when men may come to this Congress and ask for legislation that shall convert the dollar from the pockets of the American people into their own pockets that they may grow rich as the result of that legislation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

152. Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, made wholly or in chief value of gold, silver, or other metal, 10 per cent ad valorem; bullions and metal threads, made wholly or in chief value of tinsel wire, lame or lahn, 30 per cent ad valorem; fabrics, ribbons, beltings, toys, or other articles, made wholly or in chief value of tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal threads, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 42, line 7, by inserting, after the word "remanufactured," the words "all the foregoing, 2½ cents per pound." Also, amend line 9 by striking out the words "25 per cent ad valorem" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "2½ cents per pound."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I have already spoken generally upon this subject, and I merely want at this time to make one or two observations that it seems to me are pertinent to consider when we are considering the question of reducing the duty upon lead imported into this country. I think that the Coeur d'Alene region of Idaho may be taken as a very fine example of a region where the laborers are benefited by a protective duty. That is a region of country in which almost all the laborers employed are American citizens. In fact, under the laws of Idaho no corporation may employ laborers who have not at least taken out their first papers as the first step looking to their naturalization. [Applause on the Republican side.] The average wages paid to laborers of the Coeur d'Alene is $3.60 per man, and I would compare that with the average wages paid to the laborers in the mines of the Republic to the south of us, where the average is 80 cents per man. The miners in the Coeur d'Alene receive from $3.50 to $4.50 per day for their labor, while the miners in the mines of Mexico receive 75 cents per day. The muckers receive in the Coeur d'Alene from $3 to $3.50 for their labor, and the muckers in Mexico receive 50 cents per day. The blacksmiths employed in connection with mine work receive from $4 to $5 per day in Idaho, as compared with $1 to $1.25 per day in Mexico. And so you can go down the list, and you may compare the wages received by the various classes of workmen in the mines of the region that produces nearly one-third of the

lead of the United States and almost 10 per cent of the lead of the world, and you will find that the wages received on the average are more than 400 per cent of the wages received by the laborers in similar mines in the country immediately adjacent to the United States. More than that, let me say this:

The lead produced from the mines in the Coeur d'Alene region would not pay the running expenses and the freight to convey the lead to the markets of the world if it were not for the by-product of silver that is produced in connection with operating the mines of that region. The very fact that we are able to produce silver alongside of the lead enables our miners to work these mines and operate the same at a profit and pay good wages to the laborers in this country. If you were to insist upon reducing the schedule of duties upon lead imported from foreign countries into the United States anywhere near the ratio suggested by the bill you are considering at this time, it will mean that our miners will be compelled to accept lower wages than they are receiving at the present time or else the mines will cease to be operated.

Possibly both of these results will in part obtain, and I have no doubt but that so far as development work is considered in that region and other regions of the great West it will in large part cease or be retarded, because it will not seem to be a profitable business in which to engage. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

156. Metallic mineral substances in a crude state, and metals unwrought, whether capable of being wrought or not, not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem; monazite sand and thorite; thorium, oxide of and salts of; gas mantles treated with chemicals or metallic oxides, 25 per cent ad valorem; and gas-mantle scrap consisting in chief value of metallic oxides, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 42, line 14, after the word "gas," insert the words "kerosene or alcohol."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to call the attention of the House to a communication relating to mantles, and so forth, carried in this bill, as follows:

LINDSAY LIGHT CO.,
Chicago, January 31, 1913.

JAMES R. MANN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We respectfully urge that no change be made in the import duty under paragraph 183, Schedule C, tariff law 1909, which has particular reference to monazite sand, thorium, incandescent gas mantles, and gas-mantle scrap.

To support this request we submit the following facts: That there are no agreements of any kind pertaining to the sale of incandescent gas mantles; they are sold in open competition and without regulation of price.

Ninety-five per cent of the materials used in manufacturing gas mantles is dutiable under act of 1909 with 40 per cent and over, and the remaining 5 per cent is dutiable at 25 per cent.

All materials used in the manufacture of gas mantles cost us 30 per cent to 85 per cent more than the German manufacturer.

Our average wage rate is from $1.10 to $1.75 per day, and in some branches of the work more, against an average wage rate paid in Germany of 50 cents to 62½ cents per day.

We know that the German manufacturer has an advantage in lower cost of labor and material, conservatively estimated at from $18 to $22 per thousand mantles.

Mantles of foreign manufacture are offered at extremely low prices, varying from $25 to $50 per thousand; present rate of duty adds $10 to $20 per thousand, and in reality the difference in cost is $18 to $22 per thousand.

We manufactured last year 8,600,000 mantles. We have no bonded indebtedness. We have no watered stock and conduct our enterprise in the most economical manner possible consistent with good manufacturing.

Our net profits for last year on gas mantles were $32,473, which figures $3.77 per 1,000, or a trifle more than one-third of a cent per mantle profit, which would be totally eliminated if any reduction in duty takes place.

Any reduction in the duty is not going to benefit the American consumer, for the reason the consumer's prices on gas mantles are 10 cents, 15 cents, and 25 cents, which at these figures will give the dealer profit varying from 40 per cent to 100 per cent. The dealer does not give the benefit possible to the consumer, and even if the public did get the benefit of this saving it would only be about $300,000 for the entire United States, and for this the American industry, paying $1,800,000 for labor, would be placed in a serious jeopardy.

We doubt very much if the proposed reduction on thorium will benefit the American manufacturer, for the reason that this particular item is controlled in Europe by a syndicate who would immediately take advantage of the new condition by raising their prices, and this then would go to Europe in place of the American manufacturer as reduced cost.

We sincerely hope that you will do everything possible to assist us. We are in favor of leaving the tariff as it now stands on gas mantles. If it is consistent with this to procure a reduction on thorium, we would welcome it.

Your attention is respectfully called to printed petition presented to the members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Very truly, yours,

LINDSAY LIGHT CO.,
J. M. SHERBURNE,
Secretary.

The Clerk read as follows:

158. Pens, metallic, 8 cents per gross; with nib and barrel in one piece, 12 cents per gross.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This afternoon I endeavored to point out some of the paragraphs in which the duties had been increased in the present bill over the Underwood bill of the last Congress. Gentlemen complained because I pointed out only the increases. I now desire to point out one of the decreases in this bill. Under the Payne law metallic pens, with nib and barrel in one piece, were dutiable at 15 cents per gross. Under the Underwood bill of the last Congress they were made dutiable at 25 per cent ad valorem, a duty equivalent to 47 cents per gross, or 200 per cent more than the duty of the Payne law. I congratulate the gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee on having discovered this error and having reduced this duty to 12 cents per gross. However, I rose to direct the attention of the committee to another matter. The present law, paragraph 186, reads as follows:

Pens, metallic, except gold pens, 12 cents per gross.

The language "except gold pens" is stricken out in the present law. In paragraph 187 there is a proviso which reads as follows:

Provided, That pens and penholders shall be assessed for duty separately.

That has been stricken out of the bill, so that gold pens, if the laws remains in its present form, will be dutiable under paragraph 158 at the rate of 12 cents per gross, a duty very much lower than that contained in the present law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Has the gentleman read paragraph 159?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have read paragraph 159.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman is talking about gold pens, is he not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Paragraph 159 reads:

Penholder tips, penholders and parts thereof, gold pens, fountain pens, and stenographic pens.

Mr. ANDERSON. That paragraph applies only to pens and penholders attached, and unless the ambiguity is corrected gold pens without holders attached will be dutiable under the other paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman will have to learn some constructions from the new customs court, I guess.

The Clerk read as follows:

162. Type metal, on the lead contained therein, and new types, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee). The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, line 13, strike out the words "on the lead contained therein."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I also offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, line 13, strike out the word "new."

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to put in the RECORD that that paragraph, 640 of the free list, provides for type fit only to be remanufactured, so that the word "new" is stricken out here because it is practically covered by the two clauses thus together.

Mr. MANN. Should it not also provide:

Not otherwise provided for in this section.

Mr. PALMER. I think not. The Treasury experts say not. Types to be remanufactured are to come in free.

Mr. MANN. It is proposed to strike out the word "new" and make it "type."

Mr. PALMER. To make it "type," so that all type comes in at this rate with the exception, of course, that the free list provides for old type, fit only to be remanufactured.

Mr. MANN. But there would be a plain conflict then, because this would include the other.

Mr. PALMER. The other is "old type, fit only to be remanufactured."

Mr. MANN. But if you strike out "new" here, this would carry all type at 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Provided it were fit only to be remanufactured.

Mr. MANN. There is no "provided" about it. The question is whether, unless you insert something else, that would not conflict with this.

Mr. PALMER. I offered that amendment at the suggestion of the Treasury Department, which, in the interest of the clear interpretation of the language in accordance with the intent, said that that word "new" ought to come out.

Mr. MANN. I agree with that part of it; but I think it would be a little safer to put the other language in, which could not harm anything.

Mr. PALMER. It may be so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

164. Zinc-bearing ores of all kinds, including calamine, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 44, lines 18 and 19, strike out the paragraph and insert the following in lieu thereof:

164. Zinc-bearing ore of all kinds, including calamine, containing less than 10 per cent of zinc, shall be admitted free of duty; containing 10 per cent or more of zinc and less than 20 per cent, ¼ of 1 cent per pound on the zinc contained therein; containing 20 per cent or more of zinc and less than 25 per cent, ½ of 1 cent per pound on the zinc contained therein; containing 25 per cent of zinc, or more, 1 cent per pound on the zinc contained therein: *Provided*, That on all importations of zinc-bearing ores the duties shall be estimated at the port of entry, and a bond given in double the amount of such estimated duties for the transportation of the ores by common carriers bonded for the transportation of appraised or unappraised merchandise to properly equipped sampling or smelting establishments, whether designated as bonded warehouses or otherwise. On the arrival of the ores at such establishments they shall be sampled according to commercial methods under the supervision of Government officers, who shall be stationed at such establishments, and who shall submit the samples thus obtained to a Government assayer, designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall make a proper assay of the sample, and report the result to the proper customs officers, and the import entries shall be liquidated thereon, except in case of ores that shall be removed to a bonded warehouse to be refined for exportation as provided by law. And the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make all necessary regulations to enforce the provisions of this paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this is an industry in my district, and I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. MANN. There are two other gentlemen who desire time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say 15 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DECKER] states that he desires five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will make it 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] modifies his request and asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph close in 20 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is recognized.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of continuing the zinc ore mining industry in the United States, and especially in my own district.

It is proposed to reduce the ad valorem rate from an average of 50 per cent to 10 per cent.

With apologies to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], I state that I own no stock in any ore mines anywhere. But I am interested in those men who are employed in that industry in my district. The industry is carried on by individuals. Men group themselves together, put their capital together, and go down into the earth to get the ore. The ore production in that section of country is not under the control of any great combinations of capital, but is carried on by individual efforts, and the men employed by these men are dependent upon that industry for their livelihood and for their prosperity.

I have seen those men lose their employment as the result of competition with old Mexico in the production of zinc ore under free trade. I have seen the same men find employment again as the result of the protection given to the zinc-ore industry in 1909 by the present law. The men were out of employment as the result of competition with Mexican miners, who get from one-fifth to one-ninth of the wage that is paid to the laborers in Kansas. The reason the laborers in Kansas were out of employment in the zinc-mining industry was because they could not live upon the same wage that the men in Mexico were getting who were supplying the smelters in my district with zinc ore.

I urged a duty then to protect them from that competition. I am urging now a duty high enough to protect the laborers employed in that industry, to the end that they may have an opportunity of supplying their families with the necessities of life and the opportunity of living in the manner in which they have been accustomed to live. That is all that is asked. They can not do that if Mexican peons mine the ore that supplies the smelters of the United States. In 1910 and 1912—I have not the figures for 1911—there were imported 41,750,564 pounds of zinc ore, for which the United States paid $747,554. There was imported free of duty $354,442, making a total of $1,097,996 of American money that was paid for Mexican ore, money that should have been paid to American laborers in our own country at a wage of from five to nine times as high as that which is paid to the laborers in old Mexico for mining ore. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Gentlemen upon this floor represent districts the people of which are mightily interested in this section. I am wondering what they will do. I am wondering how they will vote upon this amendment. I trust that they will vote to continue employment for the thousands of laborers in their districts and for the prosperity of the communities in which they live. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. We have discovered in four or five of the counties of eastern Tennessee a very valuable zinc ore, and during the last six months more than one-half million dollars have been invested in purchasing these zinc lands, building houses, and so forth. A very large and expensive plant is now in course of construction in Knox County, and the contractors are building 150 houses for the operatives of that plant alone.

Since the passage of the Payne-Aldrich bill Boston or eastern capital has been developing the zinc business in Jefferson County. If this duty written in the Underwood bill becomes a law, that promising industry in eastern Tennessee will be at an end or a suspension of operations until the Republican Party comes back into power four years from now and writes protection for the zinc industry of America.

Not only is Tennessee interested in zinc ore, but Arkansas, Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma are interested in it, and the Democratic Member [Mr. DECKER] who represents the Joplin (Mo.) district will, I have no doubt, bear testimony to the fact that thousands of dollars are invested in the zinc industry in his district, and more than 50,000 people in that State are affected directly and indirectly by the growth and prosperity of that industry.

Now, gentlemen, why did you cut this duty to this small amount? Did you do it in the interest of Missouri zinc, Tennessee zinc, Kansas zinc, Oklahoma zinc, or Arkansas zinc? Be honest and tell us if you did not do it in the interest of the New Jersey Zinc Co., which, I understand, has large holdings of zinc lands in Mexico, and its smelter is located on or near tidewater in New Jersey?

I know the Ways and Means Committee, on page 7 of its report, attempts to justify its course in putting coal, iron ore, and bauxite on the free list, and zinc, lead, gypsum, and barytes practically on the free list, under this paragraph of said report:

REDUCTION OF RESOURCES.

That the speedy exhaustion of many natural resources is to be feared unless access to a fresh supply is gained no one who considers the subject from an unbiased standpoint can doubt. This is noticeably true in the case of such articles as timber, ores, minerals, and other substances whose supply can not be increased, and whose exhaustion is merely a question of the rate at which they are taken from their original sources.

Now, listen to this declaration in the Democratic national platform of 1912:

OUR MINERAL RESOURCES.

We rejoice in the inheritance of mineral resources unequaled in extent, variety, or value, and in the development of the mining industry, unequaled in its magnitude and importance.

If that plank in the Democratic national platform about our resources being unlimited is true, why do you propose to go to Mexico for our lead and zinc, to France for our bauxite, Nova Scotia for our coal, and Cuba, Sweden, and Spain for our iron ore?

Oh, you can depress and injure this southern and western industry. You can do it in the interest of American smelters which own cheap ore lands in foreign countries. You may talk here about the "vested and special interests" of this country, and you may criticize the manufacturers of America, but you do not make a single complaint or criticism of the agents and importers who are the representatives of every foreign manufacturer fighting before your committee for a reduction of duty for the benefit of the "vested and special interests" on foreign shores.

Why should not an American manufacturer who puts his capital into the development of our resources, to give employment to our people, to furnish transportation to the railroads, and wages for the laboring people, appeal to the law-making body of this country for a hearing on legislation which affects his business and the interest of the men he gives employment to at the highest known wages. The importers are given hearings. The importers of the great city of New York, seeking to flood the country with foreign goods at the expense of American mills and factories, are heard and heeded. Every line of the bill shows that it is written in the interests of the manufacturers and wage earners across the sea. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Chairman, the greatest zinc-producing country in the world comprises part of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. In my district there is also a large agricultural section made up of a loyal and intelligent and patriotic citizenship. For the honor which I have of occupying a seat in this body, I am indebted in a large measure to men engaged in the mining of zinc ore, and especially am I indebted to the men who do the actual work of mining zinc ore. About 14 years ago I went from law school to the city of Joplin, and from that day to this my best personal, professional, and political friends have been the brave men who every morning when the whistles blow go down into the ground with their lamps on their caps and their picks in their hands to dig for their daily bread.

And if I should fail in doing what I think to be for their best interests I would be unworthy of their friendship and their confidence. I told the farmers of my district at the schoolhouses. I told the merchants and the business men in the agricultural towns, I told the miners at the mouths of the shafts, I told them in their homes, I told them in the halls where they assembled to hear me speak, that I was a Democrat, that I did not believe it was the province of Government to tax one man to make another prosperous. I reminded them also that it was the consumer who paid the tariff and that the vast majority of consumers were made up of laboring men; that I believed in a tariff for revenue only; but I told them each and all that so long as the revenue to run this Government was raised by means of a tariff and so long as the brave miners of my district paid a tariff tax to the Federal Government on the hats on their heads, their underclothes, their coats, their pants, their socks, their shoes, the lumber with which they built their homes, their furniture, and the food upon their tables, I would insist that the people of other parts of the United States should also pay a revenue tariff on the only thing which the miners of my district produced.

I did not promise them that in order to get what I thought was the proper tariff on zinc ore I would join with and vote with men who believed in placing exorbitant and prohibitive and unjust tariffs on commodities produced in other parts of this country. I told them plainly that I would not do so, but that I would present their case from the Democratic standpoint of fairness to all the people, and here and now I wish to say that I have kept my pledge.

Since my election I have worked to carry out this pledge. In the Underwood bill of two years ago zinc ore was placed upon the free list. Before the opening of the last session of the Sixty-second Congress, at my own expense, I went to Birmingham, Ala., to place my views before the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. In season and out of season, publicly and privately, I have presented those views to the other members of the Ways and Means Committee and to the members of the Democratic caucus. The Ways and Means Committee have agreed in part to my views—I do not mean entirely on account of my arguments—and have placed a revenue duty of 10 per cent ad valorem on zinc ore. This was only part of what I asked. I believe I was right when I advocated a higher duty, and I have not changed my views. And I do not apologize to any man—Republican or Democrat—who may differ from me on that proposition. But the great Democratic Party, to which I belong and in whose principles I believe, has been commissioned by the people of this country to revise the tariff, and revise it downward, and I also believe that two-thirds of the Republicans and Progressives believe in a downward revision of the tariff. This bill we are about to pass will affect directly or indirectly over ninety millions of people. If all those people could assemble here for the purpose of writing this bill, there could not be found two out of the ninety millions who would agree in every particular. If out of all the people of this country two men were given authority to make this bill, they could not agree in every particular. And whether this bill were written by ninety millions of people directly or by two people, it would have to be the result of concession and compromise. The only practical way yet devised for the enactment of such a law is for those representatives of the people who believe in the general principles of revision downward to meet together in a caucus, which caucus, after giving a free, fair, and full discussion and vote upon different items, becomes binding.

Gentlemen of the committee, I participated in such a caucus and that caucus after full, fair, and free discussion and vote upon different items has reduced the tariff tax which the miners of my district must pay upon the things which they consume; that caucus has reduced the tariff on hats and pants and socks and shoes, on furniture and on food and lumber, the things which the miners of my district consume, and it has also made a reduction in the tariff tax on zinc ore, the thing which these same miners produce. And while I have not changed my views, and while I still believe that this reduction in the tariff on zinc has been greater than is wise, yet I participated in this caucus and I am going to abide by this caucus. And when the miners of my district understand what I have done and why I have done it, as I will give them to understand, I believe they will approve my course.

I am going to vote for this bill, not only because it has the indorsement of the great Ways and Means Committee, in which the country has confidence, not only because it has been indorsed by this Democratic caucus of which I speak, but also because I believe as a whole it is a good bill and because, in spite of all the Republican prophecies of calamity and distress and in spite of temporary disturbances necessary to readjustments in business, I believe the patriotism of the people of this country is stronger than partisanship, and because I believe that this bill after being passed and perhaps modified and improved by a Democratic Senate, a coordinate branch of this Government, and after being signed by a great Democratic President, will receive the ultimate approval of a benefited people. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CAMPBELL), there were—ayes 60, noes 98.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

165. Zinc in blocks, pigs, or sheets, and zinc dust; and old and worn-out zinc fit only to be remanufactured, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 20, strike out the paragraph and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"165. Zinc in blocks or pigs and zinc dust, 1¼ cents per pound; in sheets, 1¾ cents per pound; in sheets, coated or plated with nickel or other metal or solutions, 1¾ cents per pound; old and worn-out, fit only to be remanufactured, 1 cent per pound."

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, the reduction made in the Underwood bill upon the products of the zinc smelter is greater than the reduction made on almost any other industry. There is no labor employed anywhere in the country that works harder than the labor employed in the smelters. They get about four times the wage that the zinc-smelter workers receive in any other country that competes with them in the production of zinc products. They have not been able to compete with the labor that is thus paid a less wage with the rates of duty that are provided even by the present law, for in the last three years great quantities of zinc spelter and zinc sheets and blocks have been imported into the United States, amounting in the aggregate to 31,508,276 pounds, for which the United States paid $1,550,554. There was an ad valorem rate of 32.37 per cent on zinc spelter and blocks so imported, and that rate of duty was paid upon the importation of over 31,000,000 pounds of zinc products for which the United States paid over a million and a half dollars. The reduction is from 32.37 per cent to 10. That will encourage a vastly larger importation of zinc products than we have had heretofore. Zinc ore can be

mined in old Mexico, as I stated a moment ago, for from one-fifth to one-ninth of what it can be mined here, taken to Belgium, smelted there, and sent back to Pittsburgh, Pa., the State represented by the gentleman who prepared this schedule, at a less freight rate than zinc spelter can be taken from my district to Pittsburgh, Pa., and I will state here that the State of Pennsylvania, that has large steel industries, consumes 95 per cent of the zinc spelter produced in the United States.

I have sometimes wondered if these great reductions in zinc in all its grades from the zinc ore to the product of zinc ore has been made for the purpose of giving a compensation to the steel industry for the reductions that have been made in the products of that industry in the United States.

Is this a sort of sop to the steel industry? While you take off duties on products of the steel industry you give practically free trade in one of their raw materials. Was that the purpose of reducing the duty on zinc spelter? Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania answer? Why was the reduction made? The people who are interested in the manufacture of zinc spelter have large investments in the industry. The industry will be destroyed, and the factories will undoubtedly close when their product comes in competition with the importations that will come from other countries under the advantages given to imports by this bill. The hundreds of men employed in these industries and their families will suffer. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DECKER], who spoke in apology for the vote which he intends to cast against the welfare of the people of his district, gave a thrust at some of the laborers whom he says are employed in my district. He stated there were coal miners there who were there under contract. I challenge him or any other man to designate a single coal miner who is employed in my district under improper contract. He stepped out of his way to make a gratuitous charge against the coal miners in my district he can not sustain. The men of whom he so sneeringly speaks are honest and industrious and are engaged in hazardous employment in which they contribute a large share to the common welfare. Democrats pose as the friends of laboring men, but that friendship is not shown in this bill or by what is said by Democrats in defense of it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished young friend from Missouri [Mr. DECKER] who made a very eloquent speech a moment ago, in a way congratulated himself, and I think possibly is entitled to congratulation, that he had gotten the Ways and Means Committee to add 10 per cent ad valorem tax on zinc ore, that is produced in his district. Evidently when he had secured this increase from the bill of a year ago his zest cooled, because I find that in the Underwood metal schedule bill of a year ago, while they put zinc ore on the free list, the manufactured product from zinc ore was put upon the dutiable list at 15 per cent ad valorem, while this year, owing to the effort of my distinguished friend from Missouri possibly, they have put zinc ore on the dutiable list at 10 per cent and reduced the duty on the zinc sheets to 10 per cent ad valorem, and where before the raw material was free and a 15 per cent rate put upon the finished product, owing to his endeavors they now put the same rate of duty on the raw material and the finished product, which will probably result not only in the closing of the mines where they produce zinc ore but in the smelting establishments where they produce zinc sheets and blocks and pigs. I congratulate him upon his success. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman want to speak on this paragraph?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, they produce zinc in the district of the gentleman from Kansas, and therefore I think the gentleman from Kansas owes an apology to the gentleman from Alabama for advocating a duty on zinc, because, if I correctly understood the gentleman a moment ago, the doctrine he now pronounces and stands for is that any Member rising on the floor of the House for the purpose of protecting the labor and the industry of his district is thereby a special pleader for special interests and not worthy of a place in the House. To me that is a rather remarkable doctrine. Our sophomoric young friend from Missouri [Mr. DECKER], who did scratch through with a bare majority, admits that he told the people in his district that he would stand for a duty on their products so long as there were duties on other products. I shall leave it to the people of his district to decide whether or no he has kept his word. He cooed mildly here this evening as compared with the way he roared in the caucus, if he is correctly quoted, for there it is said, or has been said by the newspapers, that the gentleman went so far as to criticize a coordinate branch of the Government which holds the veto power for having had too much to do with this tariff, and he insisted that the rate now carried in the bill for which he now proposes to vote would be injurious to the people of his district.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. If the gentleman will yield to me for a moment, I wish to correct an injustice in that respect that was done to the gentleman from Missouri. I was present in the caucus, and no such attack was made by the gentleman from Missouri as was quoted of him in the newspapers.

Mr. HENSLEY. I will say to the gentleman that no reference to the President was made in his speech.

Mr. MANN. If you had an open caucus they would not have had it wrong. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. I hope the newspapers will apologize to the gentleman from Missouri. I simply made the statement as it was made in the public press, the best evidence available, as the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] suggests. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], pronouncing the new doctrine that we are not to stand for the labor and industries in our districts, referred to the industries in his district by way of illustration—to the industries of his district where rates had been reduced. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has said, the gentleman from Alabama is not called upon to defend himself relative to his action in regard to this bill. However much we disagree with his views and opinions, no man here will and no man elsewhere ought to question his sincerity and his honesty, and I think no one does. And yet I think the gentleman from Alabama would scarcely say that he has placed a rate in this bill that he believes would be destructive of an industry in his district. Down in Alabama they work black men, and they work them mighty cheap, and down in Alabama the coal is on one side of the hill and the ore on the other. And down in Alabama, as the gentleman from that State has told us, they make pig iron cheaper than anywhere else on earth, and, therefore, no rate that the gentleman could fix could injure the industries of his district unless it was absolutely and totally destructive of the industries of the entire balance of the country.

While we all realize and appreciate the fact that the gentleman has not, in framing this bill, attempted to give an industry in his district a rate more than it needs, I repeat that the gentleman from Alabama certainly will not say that he has placed any rate so low that he believes that an industry in his district will be destroyed or seriously injured by that rate. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] I do not think fully appreciated what I said. I stated awhile ago, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania had offered to put on the free list, or started to put on the free list, an article in which he was interested, and at the same time contended for a higher rate on another article in which he was interested, that I did not impugn his personal motives in the matter, but I thought he had put himself in a rather contradictory position in this House. Now, I do not for one minute contend that any man on the floor of this House, on either side, ought not to represent the constituency that sends him here. But I did say, and I say it now, that he ought not to represent the special interests of his district, whether he is a part of them or whether he is not. That is the distinction. The man who comes here with an open and a free mind and votes what he believes is for the interest of the people of his district and abroad at the same time, and votes for the interests of all the people of the United States, is free to stand here and vote as he pleases without any man having the right to say yea or nay. But when a man stands on this floor from any district in the United States, coming here with the selfish purpose of representing a special interest in his district or in the country and not the interest of the great masses of the people of this country, I say the time has come in the American Congress when this House is not large enough to hold him in the future. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MONDELL. I understand the gentleman to say that any Member is justified to stand for in a proper way and uphold the industries of his district, and no man has the right to say him nay. How about the caucus—the secret and binding caucus?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The difference between some gentlemen on that side of the House—not the gentleman from Wyoming—

and men on this side of the House is this: Individualism has broken loose in the ranks of the Republican Party, but not with the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. He is an organized soldier. We believe in party government. We believe that the great principles that should govern this Nation can only be written on the statute books by virtue of a united and great party standing for those principles and maintaining them, and for that reason we surrender our individuality to the wisdom and the cohesive strength of a great party, founded on principles that have not only been the foundation of our Republic, but the keystone of the liberty of the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On that side of the House your organization is broken. You once believed in party government; some of you—my friend from Wyoming still believes it—but there are few on that side of the House that are bold enough to stand out and say to-day that they believe in the government by the Republican Party instead of individualism.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has been able to fix the exact date on which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] became such enthusiasts over an open caucus? It must have been very recent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I will not try to analyze the gentlemen on that side of the House, because you and I know where they stand. There are two that we can be sponsor for on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

167. All steam engines, steam locomotives, printing presses, and machine tools, 15 per cent ad valorem; embroidering machines, and lace-making machines, including machines for making lace curtains, nets, or nettings, 25 per cent ad valorem; machine tools as used in this paragraph shall be held to mean any machine operated by other than hand power which employs a tool for working on metal.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. PAYNE. For a great many years in the various tariff bills there were a number of articles that came in under what we called the "catch-all" clause—articles not otherwise provided for—and they escaped in each revision of the tariff without much notice being taken of them and without Members looking through to see what articles came in under that clause. When they had the Wilson bill of 1894 under consideration that paragraph passed without any amendments and without any inquiries being made in regard to it, although our friends on the other side were then, as now, making a tariff bill. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

I take considerable pride in the fact that four years ago the Ways and Means Committee inquired into the various articles that were coming in under that paragraph. They were not enumerated in any way in the Government reports except as "other articles not otherwise provided for." We did not know what they were.

I remember that we had to send for witnesses from the customhouses in the country to find out what articles were coming in under that "catch-all" paragraph, and we got a list of them, as far as we were able. Then, we proceeded to separate them, and thereupon we laid the foundation for paragraph No. 167 of the present bill, now under consideration.

I remember that instead of putting a duty of 45 per cent on steam engines and locomotives and printing presses and machine tools, we put a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem on them. We took off a third of the duty.

By the way, it was pretty difficult to get much account of these articles, as to their comparative cost in this country and foreign countries; but we went about it, and made the best revision we could. Then we took up the question of linotype and typesetting machines, sewing machines, typewriters, and so forth, and reduced the duty to 30 per cent ad valorem.

Then we came to the question of machines for making embroidery. Some few had been imported into the United States, and there was quite a little industry here in connection with them. But it was not what we ought to have in making these machine laces in the country, and so we drew a provision, keeping the duty of 45 per cent on the machines, none of which were made in this country, but providing that until January 1, 1911, they should be on the free list—for two years after the bill went into effect.

The result was that factories were built, these machines were introduced into this country, and this industry was started up and has grown into a great and prosperous industry.

We put the limit of time on it in order to hurry up the starting of the industry. We also enacted a provision that if they did not do it within two years the duty would go back again. We believed that of course it would enable them to start the industry quickly, and that at the same time it would be a sort of protection to the machines that came here. We got enough of them at that time to cover the industry, and now I see that my friends have put a duty of 25 per cent on these lace-making machines. Probably that is a sufficient duty.

We put on printing presses a duty of 30 per cent. The Democratic Congress put them on the free list a year ago. They had them again on the free list when this present bill now under consideration was first reported in the newspapers this year. They put them on the free list, I say, along with paper for printing newspapers and magazines. Of course it was only a coincidence that it happened to be that that was a proper thing to do in a revenue tariff bill. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Type were also put at a lower rate of duty on this bill, and that was only another coincidence. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.] Perish the thought that the gentlemen who fixed these duties had any idea that they were going to get special favors for their people or for themselves or for their party in consequence of putting these things on the free list! [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.]

We put print paper on the dutiable list because we thought the manufacture of print paper was an industry that ought to be protected, and we are protectionists. We left this duty on printing presses because we thought the manufacture of those presses was an industry that ought to be protected in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to have one more minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New York will proceed for one minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, the gentlemen in the committee and in the caucus changed the item and took printing presses suddenly from the free list one day and put on them a duty of 15 per cent. Of course they did not do it for the sake of protecting the industry! Oh, no! I was receiving every day copies of letters sent to the chairman of the committee protesting on the part of the manufacturers of these presses that the industry would be wiped out unless they kept on the duty of 30 per cent. They restored at least half the duty, but that action had no connection with the action of the committee or the action of the caucus, and did not even soften the rigorous mind of the President of the United States. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Oh, no!

Mr. PAYNE. Not at all. It was a proper revenue duty at 15 per cent, and they even dared to brave the anger of the daily papers and the muckraking magazines and all that sort of thing. But what I want to do is to call the attention of that side of the House, as I have for the last two days, to the fact that the Payne bill was a revision downward on these articles; and I have called attention now to different items in the bill, enough to convince any man with an open mind and an honest mind, so that he will admit the fact that it was, as it proved to be from the statistics for the last four years, the greatest revision downward ever made in any tariff bill in the United States. [Applause on the Republican side and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Alabama a question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I received a letter a few days ago inquiring about steam pumps. A gentleman who manufactures them wants to know whether they would be classified under section 167, at 15 per cent, or under 169, at 25 per cent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They have always been in the basket clause, 169, at 25 per cent.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I am very much obliged to the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The duty on the basket clause has been reduced from 45 to 25 per cent, and steam pumps fall in that catalogue.

I desire to occupy the time of the House for a few minutes only on the question of machine tools.

The bill which we reported last year had machine tools on the free list. The Payne bill carried them at the rate of 30 per cent ad valorem.

There are about $50,000,000 production of machine tools in this country, of which $5,000,000 are exported abroad. A portion of these exports of machine tools go to Germany, where they pay an 8 per cent tariff duty to get into that country after paying the freight.

When the committee first considered this question they believed that an industry that could send one-tenth of its product abroad, pay a tariff rate to get into another country, and compete there needed no duty here and that we could not get revenue from it. On further investigation we found out that the facts I have stated were absolutely true as to the highly organized machine tools; but we also found that there were some lower grades of machine tools that to a slight extent were now imported and that would probably be imported under a low rate of duty. We considered the question of endeavoring to differentiate between the highly organized machine tools and the low-grade machine tools. There was no point where we could establish a dividing line, and therefore, in order to be on the safe side of the question and levy a rate that would produce some revenue, and believing that this 15 per cent on machine tools would produce some revenue, we concluded that we would be conservative in the matter and cut the rate in the Payne bill from 30 per cent to 15 per cent.

I have no apology to make for the committee changing its rate from the bill of last year to the rate of this year. If the Ways and Means Committee should make up its mind that it could not err and should never change, it would undoubtedly be disqualified for performing the functions that are imposed on it by this House; and although I have some doubt myself now as to whether this industry really needs this 15 per cent, or as to how far it will be competitive, I think it was safer to put the 15 per cent rate in and try it out and see the result, although I am doubtful as to whether they would have been seriously hurt if we had put them absolutely on the free list.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he was undecided still as to whether this machine-tool industry needed this 15 per cent protection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I did not say I was undecided. I said I was in doubt.

Mr. COOPER. As to whether this industry needed this 15 per cent protection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not say protection. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman said whether the industry needed this 15 per cent—for what?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. For what?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman from Alabama said he was undecided as to whether this machine-tool industry needed this 15 per cent. What did he mean?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not mean "what."

Mr. COOPER. If the industry needed 15 per cent, it meant 15 per cent protection, because the industry would not get the revenue.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will tell the gentleman. I was in doubt as to whether we should make this reduction gradually by cutting it in half, or put it absolutely on the free list, and I am free to say that I am in doubt now as to which would be the proper position; but we resolved the doubt in favor of 15 per cent.

I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

168. Nippers and pliers of all kinds wholly or partly manufactured, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Nippers and pliers in this paragraph carry a duty of 30 per cent and machine tools in the former paragraph a duty of 15 per cent; they were free in the former Underwood bill. These tools are all of a somewhat similar character, so far as their manufacture is concerned. I do not understand why the gentleman from Alabama had difficulty in determining whether machine tools needed 15 per cent duty when he has seen fit to place 30 per cent duty on nippers and pliers, and I am wondering if the manufacture of one of these two articles constitutes what the gentleman from Alabama refers to as a special interest.

The gentleman, a few moments ago, somewhat modified his statement made earlier as to what it was proper for us to do in defending the labor and industry of our district. He now suggests that it is proper to do that, and our duty to do it, except that we must not stand for special interests. I am anxious to know when I am right and when I am wrong. I want to analyze his theory from the standpoint of my own district.

About half the people in my district and State are interested one way or the other, directly or indirectly, in the growing of sheep and wool—in the prosperity of the industry. I have no interest in it personally at all. Is that a special interest? Perhaps 25 per cent of the people in my district are more or less interested in growing cattle and horses. I own a Shetland pony and a few milk cows. Otherwise I have no personal interest. Is that a special interest? We mine coal in the State of Wyoming, and we are the only State except West Virginia that is hard hit by this bill through placing coal on the free list. I have no interest in coal mines. Is that a special interest?

We are looking forward to the time when we can have sugar-beet factories. We have them in the neighboring States. I have no sugar-beet land, and have no personal interest in the growing of sugar beets. Is that a special interest?

The difference between the gentleman from Alabama and myself is that I assume that I was sent here as a Representative of my district to do those things that I can honestly do and do in accordance with my declared purpose, and in accordance with the policy outlined and declared by my party to aid in the development of my State and in the maintenance of favorable wage conditions among my people and do it openly, while he seems to believe that the proper thing to do is to disavow any effort on behalf of his own people. I think he will hardly claim that he really intends injury to come to them.

I do not understand that these interests of my people are special interests, and if they be they are my special interests and it is my special duty here to protect them so far as I am able to do so, and consistently with the interests of all. I do not stop at the boundaries of my State, but I stand as ready and willing to give the same adequate protection to the labor and industry of every other State that I ask for the labor and industry of my State. It will be a sad day for the American people when it shall be held that it is not proper for a representative of the people to stand here and protest when they believe in their hearts that proposed legislation is not only going to injure them but it is going to be injurious to the entire body of the people. The Republican doctrine of protection is not a haphazard thing, striking here and helping there and protecting and building up one region and industry and withholding needed protection elsewhere, but a mosaic of prosperity and plenty, a beautiful picture of fair rewards to every industry and every labor under the flag. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to enter into any controversy with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, nor did I mean to reflect in any way in the statement I made this afternoon in reference to the employment of labor in the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co., in the great State of Alabama or the city of Birmingham.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to object to the gentleman's speaking; in fact I invite it, and I hope the gentleman will have the privilege extended to him by the House; but I call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Kentucky has been speaking on a subject in which he is interested and has convictions upon three times already without addressing himself to a paragraph in the bill.

I had the privilege of speaking twice. He and I had a little colloquy respecting some of the remarks he chose to make. I am not averse to continuing that. I shall be pleased to continue it. I invite it, but I do ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], if the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] is to have this additional time, to not object to giving me the courtesy of 10 minutes—5 minutes that he has already used and 5 minutes that he proposes to use now—in order that I may present my side of the case.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I give notice now that I shall insist upon the enforcement of the rule in reference to the pertinency of debate until 11 o'clock, and after that I hope we will adjourn until to-morrow.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to make any speech or any reference to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]. I have put the facts in the RECORD, and that is all that is necessary.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reply to those figures that the gentleman put in the RECORD.

Mr. STANLEY. I decline to be interrupted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized and will proceed in order.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that the statements I made were from the sworn testimony of Mr. Harrison, of the Sage Foundation——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order at this time of the night that the gentleman is not proceeding in order.

Mr. STANLEY. I hope the gentleman will indulge me half a minute. I am not going to make a speech.

Mr. MANN. I withhold the point of order for half a minute.

Mr. STANLEY. They were made by Mr. Harrison, of the Sage Foundation, from his own personal observation, giving the number of convicts in mines, the offenses for which they were committed, the place from which they were taken, the circumstances under which they were held, and he states they were there for petty misdemeanors committed in the county in which the city of Birmingham is located, and he gives the number of them and the character of their imprisonment, and the persons in charge of them, and so forth. I will ask to put Mr. Harrison's statement in the RECORD, not as contradicting the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] but as showing the authority from which I quoted. I would not desire to enter into any discussion with the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that I did not challenge his statement to-day that there were convicts working in the mines or that there were men convicted of criminal offenses in my county, just as there are in every other county in the United States; but the gentleman from Kentucky stated that these great iron factories were being worked by convict labor.

Mr. STANLEY. Oh, no; I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is what the gentleman stated, and that they were dragneting the streets of Birmingham—and he referred to the district of the gentleman from Minnesota in the same way—for the purpose of gathering together this labor to produce these iron products. I would state to the gentleman—I do not like to say it again, but I said it before—that there never has been a convict worked in any of these foundries or factories. In some coal mines that do not produce anything but coal for domestic purposes there are convicts working, but they are not working in these blast furnaces; and the thing I objected to in the gentleman's statement was that it was a reflection on my constituency, and that the statement, whether it comes from the gentleman who is named in that book or otherwise, does not represent truthfully the condition in my district.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to raise any question as between the gentleman and myself upon that point. I simply wish to put the authority for my statements in the RECORD, as he purported to speak from his own personal knowledge. He may be very incorrect. I do not know, but in justice to myself I wish to have my authority for the statements put in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has the authority under the leave to print.

The CHAIRMAN. The leave to print is upon the bill.

Mr. MANN. I stated before that I would object to any special leaves to print in the House, when general leave has been granted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair of course does not know whether it would be construed to be on the bill or not.

Mr. MANN. I presume the gentleman could get it in the RECORD if he furnished it to the proper parties.

Mr. STANLEY. It is only a page or two.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has general leave to print, and there will be no special leave granted.

The statement referred to by Mr. STANLEY is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SHELBY M. HARRISON.

The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. In connection with what Mr. Reed has just said I have tried to be especially careful in going into this very question not to produce witnesses who have had an obsession on the subject or who were prejudiced or who had any grievance against the corporation, because I hope, above all things, to present a cool, unimpassioned account of this condition as it exists.

When Mr. Fitch was on the stand he said something about having submitted his book and other papers from which he quoted and from which Mr. Brandeis quoted to the Steel Corporation and its officials. Do you know whether your report, about which I shall ask you later, was submitted to the Steel Corporation and its officials?

Mr. HARRISON. I do. It is the policy of the magazine. Of course, as you know, one of the editors of the magazine is a man who was a director of the Pittsburgh Survey under which these other investigations were made, Mr. Fitch's being one.

It is the policy of both the magazine and the Pittsburgh Survey to submit any articles or manuscripts for books which would be critical of any particular company or particular person to that person or company before publication, for several reasons, one being to give an opportunity for the person or company criticized to correct any misstatement of fact.

The purpose of the investigation was to correct conditions that might be viewed by the public as unwholesome. It would not be working along any scientific method toward the solution of these problems if a misstatement of the problem were made. So the first purpose of the Survey was to be sure of its facts.

It, of course, did not always expect the people to whom the manuscripts were submitted to agree with the interpretation of the facts or with the conclusions drawn from the facts. That was a matter of opinion. It did expect, however, that the people to whom the manuscripts were submitted would agree to facts which were facts and which they could not disprove.

So Mr. Fitch's manuscript for his book was submitted to the president of several of the subsidiary companies in the Pittsburgh district who were directly mentioned in the book or in the manuscript. I am of the opinion that it was submitted to some of the New York men. I am not quite sure of that. I know that in his recent articles they have been given to Mr. Bolling in the New York office.

My article in manuscript form was submitted to George Gordon Crawford.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is he?

Mr. HARRISON. He is president of the Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co.; to Mr. George B. McCormick, president of the Alabama Coal Operators' Association; Mr. James G. Oakley, president of the Board of Convict Inspectors of Alabama, and a number of other people who would view it from a different side. These were employers.

Of course, I submitted it, then, to the men who might know the prison and crime problem purely from a crime-problem side and not from a labor side.

* * * * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. Who are connected with this Charities Publication Committee? Who are the people who are behind this matter for whom you are working; do you know?

* * * * * * *

Mr. HARRISON. Robert W. De Forest, chairman, New York. Other members of the committee: Jane Addams, Chicago; Ernest P. Bicknell, Washington; Robert S. Brewster, New York; Charles M. Cabot, Boston; O. K. Cushing San Francisco; Edward T. Devine, New York; Arthur F. Estabrook, Boston; Lee K. Frankel, New York; James M. Glenn, New York; William Guggenheim, New York; William E. Harmon, New York; Joseph Lee, Boston; Julian W. Mack, Washington; Simon N. Patten, Philadelphia; Jacob A. Riis, New York; Graham Taylor, Chicago; S. W. Woodward, Washington; Frank Tucker, treasurer, New York; Paul U. Kellogg, secretary, New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever made a personal investigation of the labor conditions in any subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. HARRISON. I investigated the handling of criminals in the State of Alabama, and it touched on the labor conditions in the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co., inasmuch as they hire some city and county convicts.

The CHAIRMAN. Under what auspices were you acting at that time?

Mr. HARRISON. Under the auspices of the Survey Magazine.

Mr. REED. Did you say that they "hired" convicts, or that they hire them now?

Mr. HARRISON. At the time I made my investigation they had in their employ State and county convicts.

* * * * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. What number of convicts were then in the employ of the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co.?

Mr. HARRISON. They, of course, vary almost from day to day, because as fast as men are convicted they are brought into the camp, and of course men are continually serving out their time and going away, but the average was about 360 State convicts and 240 county.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. Did the witness fix the time of this?

Mr. HARRISON. In May and June.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. Of last year?

Mr. HARRISON. Of last year, 1911; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of the convicts, county and State, were there who were employed in all the mines about at that time?

Mr. HARRISON. For the last five years the total number of convicts in the State, the average per year throughout the State, was about 2,500 State convicts and 700 county convicts. About 200 of these were men who were not able to work, mostly tubercular convicts, who were in the prison at Wetumpka, which is practically a tuberculosis camp, leaving 3,000, and, roughly, 1,500 of those were contracted out into the coal mines, which means they went into the Birmingham district, because that is where all the coal mines are located.

The CHAIRMAN. What per cent of this 1,500 who were utilized as miners did the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co. secure at the time you were there?

Mr. HARRISON. Three hundred and sixty and 240 makes 600; 600 would be 40 per cent of 1,500.

Mr. BEALL. Did the 1,500 represent the State and county convicts?

Mr. HARRISON. Together; yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Let us understand right here what you mean by State convicts and county convicts.

Mr. HARRISON. The distinction is—at least it is supposed to be—that the State convict is a man who has committed a more serious crime than a county convict, a felony, whereas a county convict is a misdemeanant.

Mr. BARTLETT. The county convicts are those who are tried, probably in the inferior courts, for misdemeanors or small-grade felonies, and the State convicts are those who are tried in the courts having exclusive jurisdiction of felonies, or where people are convicted of felonies in the higher courts.

Mr. HARRISON. That is my impression. I am not certain of the legal side of the matter entirely. I know that the county convicts are men who are convicted of lesser crimes.

The CHAIRMAN. Of lesser crimes than a felony?

Mr. HARRISON. Of lesser crimes than a felony; yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. State convicts are those that are sentenced by the court to the penitentiary or to such public works as the superintendent of the penitentiary or those having charge of it may direct, and the county convicts are those who are hired out—I suppose that is so in Alabama; it has been so in Georgia—by the county authorities, who are convicted and subjected to the payment of a fine or alternative imprisonment. Is that about right?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. And in the first case the State gets the pay or the hire, and in the other it goes to the county authorities?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Right at this point, speaking of the offenses for which these county convicts are sent up: It is an offense punishable by fine or imprisonment, is it not, to do such things as shooting or hunting or gaming or card playing, playing at cards or dominoes or racing, whether for money or not, on the Sabbath day? Those are offenses punishable by a fine of from $10 to $20 or imprisonment in the State of Alabama?

Mr. HARRISON. If you are reading the statement I made there?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. That is true. I have not all of that quite at my fingers' ends. That statement is true.

The CHAIRMAN (reading). Any person or persons who play or engage in the playing of any baseball, or foot ball, or tennis, or golf on Sunday in any public place where people resort for such purposes, is guilty of a misdemeanor and may be fined from $20 to $50.

Mr. HARRISON. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. It is against the law to walk on the right of way of a railroad?

Mr. HARRISON. I understand that men have been arrested and sentenced to prison for doing that in the past, but that the authorities have been a little more lenient in the last year or two because of one very unfortunate incident where a small boy, or a young boy, had been arrested for trespassing on the railroad track, and sent up for 60 days; and he was sent to the mine. He knew nothing of mining and nothing of its dangers, and he got in the way of a car and had his leg cut off, and was crippled for life for this very small offense. That has been, so I am told, more or less of a lesson, and they have been a little less strict in enforcing that law since.

Mr. BARTLETT. Do you mean that the misdemeanor convicts in Alabama, the county convicts, as you have designated them, were worked in the mines, Mr. Harrison?

Mr. HARRISON. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. There was an accident occurred in one of those mines a short time ago, was there not?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; there was an explosion at the Banner Mine.

The CHAIRMAN. Was anybody hurt?

Mr. HARRISON. One hundred and twenty-three men were killed.

The CHAIRMAN. Were any of these the county convicts, sent up for these petty offenses, like playing golf on Sunday, walking on the railroad tracks, and so on?

Mr. HARRISON. I have a statement here of the percentage. Perhaps I might best read that paragraph:

"Last April 123 negro convicts working in the Banner Mine, operated at that time by the Pratt Consolidated Coal Co., were instantly killed by an explosion. Seventy-two of the convicts were from Jefferson County, in which Birmingham is located; 21 out of the 72, or 30 per cent, were convicted of offenses so minor that their sentences, aside from costs, did not exceed 20 days—mainly for carrying concealed weapons, gaming, assault, vagrancy, or violating the prohibition law. Five others were serving sentences of 30 days, and 1 man was within 3 days of his release when he was killed. Another had been convicted only 5 days before the explosion. One hundred and twenty-three persons in the custody of the State, without voice as to the nature of their work, lost their lives in serving their sentences."

Those were county convicts. That gives some indication of the type of the offenses.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is true that in a majority of these cases of what you call misdemeanor convicts, they are sentenced to pay a fine, or, in default thereof, to be punished as they are punished?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. The fine is imposed, and in default of that they must work it out?

Mr. HARRISON. They must work it out; yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. In the mines, according to the law of Alabama?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. You understand that not all men are sent to the mines, however.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is what I am trying to get at.

Mr. HARRISON. No. I say that 50 per cent of the convicts are sent to the coal mines, and that some of them are sent to the turpentine camps. The State has a farm where it has a couple of hundred, and they have a stove factory where some of them are employed.

* * * * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. How are these convicts sent up for misdemeanors procured? In what way are they obtained? How does the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co. and these other companies get hold of them? That is what I want to know.

Mr. HARRISON. The contracts are advertised, and the companies bid for them. They are let to the highest bidder.

The CHAIRMAN. These people are just put up and sold to the highest bidder?

Mr. HARRISON. They contract for the convicts for a certain length of time, and they take all that the county has; that is, of course, they keep coming as fast as they are convicted.

The CHAIRMAN. They agree, in advance, to take the supply, whatever it may be?

Mr. HARRISON. They do.

The CHAIRMAN. No matter what they are convicted for, how long or how short the term, if they have any term of imprisonment, they take them and work out that term, is that it?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Whether they are old or young, black or white, convicted of a felony or anything else?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How do they get these people into these mining camps? Does the State or the county send them there, or do they get them?

Mr. HARRISON. The State brings the State convicts, and mining camps—the companies—send a man to the county seat where a man is convicted, and bear the expense of the man, of course, that they send, and the convicts to the camp, and upon his release they send him back to his county seat, bearing the expense, and sending a man with him.

The CHAIRMAN. After these people are procured and gotten into these camps, how are they retained there?

Mr. HARRISON. Of course they have a prison, something, at least, that is called a prison, with a wall around it. The men are kept in prison when they are not at work. When they are at work they are in the mines, where the guarding is very easy, and escape is rather difficult there.

* * * * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. What do they pay for these convicts, county and State?

Mr. HARRISON. The State convicts are paid more or less on a piece basis. I mean to say that the companies pay by the month for men in the different task groups. The average comes somewhere near the common labor rate for State convicts.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what they pay for State convicts? Those guilty of a felony?

Mr. HARRISON. I know what the Tennessee Co. pays.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the Tennessee Co. pay?

Mr. HARRISON. The Tennessee Co. made a contract several years ago in which it agreed to pay $46 per month per man in the first class, and there was a gradual lowering of the rate down to a man in the fourth class for which it paid $10.50. They also, at the same time, agreed to a sliding scale in practice which would slide upward and not downward; that is, any increases in the wage paid to free labor in the district would cause a proportionate raise of payment for the convicts; and since this contract went into effect there have been increases in the free labor in the district which have brought the payment for men in the first class from $46 to $50.70 per month, for men in the fourth class to $11.57.

The CHAIRMAN. What do they pay a month for these county convicts, the young fellows?

Mr. HARRISON. They vary between different companies, but the average was estimated to me by the president of the Alabama Coal Operators' Association as $12.50 per man per month; I should say per person per month, as that includes men, women, and youths.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they feed these county convicts? Does the company do it, or does the State do it?

Mr. HARRISON. The company does.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what it costs to feed those convicts per day?

Mr. HARRISON. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know about what it costs?

Mr. HARRISON. I know what it costs to feed the men in the county jails before they are sent to the camps. That cost runs from 7 to 10 cents, depending upon the number of men.

Mr. BARTLETT. Per day.

Mr. HARRISON. Per day, depending upon the number of men. I should say that the convicts in the camps are fed better than that. My guess would be—if you care for a guess?

The CHAIRMAN. An estimate.

Mr. HARRISON. About 15 cents a day.

The CHAIRMAN. About 15 cents a day to feed them?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

* * * * * * *

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. Who provides the lodging?

Mr. HARRISON. The company.

The CHAIRMAN. I was going to take that up.

They are also provided with lodging?

Mr. HARRISON. By the companies—the company owns the prison.

The CHAIRMAN. What sort of lodging do they get? How are they housed, bedded, and so on? Just describe those places in which they keep them at night.

Mr. HARRISON. The prison consists, usually, of a frame building.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is this the Steel Corporation that he is talking about?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; this is the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co., alone, that I am talking about.

Mr. YOUNG. I understood the witness to be talking about conditions generally, there. Is not that correct, Mr. Harrison?

Mr. HARRISON. I was talking with regard to the food—about conditions in general; yes.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. You understand I did not go down there to investigate the Steel Corporation convict system as a system. I investigated the whole system of handling criminals in Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you see the food as it was prepared in the kitchens, or anywhere, of the Steel Corporation?

Mr. HARRISON. I saw food that was being prepared in the prison at mine No. 12 of the Tennessee Co. That prison, however, housed the State convicts that were employed by the Tennessee Co. I was told there by the men who were preparing the food what was the customary daily ration.

The CHAIRMAN. For both county and State convicts?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell me about how they are housed in the barracks or prison, or whatever you choose to call it, of the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co. there in Alabama; how these convicts are provided for, at night.

Mr. HARRISON. They are housed in prisons, as I say, which are made up of large cells; they call them cells; they are really large rooms, which accommodate from 30 to 60 men. The sanitary conditions in those that I saw were good. The beds were double beds, two men sleeping in a bed.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men in a bed?

Mr. HARRISON. Two or three.

The CHAIRMAN. How are these beds made? What do they consist of? Are they oak bedsteads, or brass bedsteads, or what kind of bedsteads do they sleep in?

Mr. HARRISON. They are rather simple bedsteads. I do not think they are oak. I think they have a pine framework, with some kind of strapping underneath, ropes and canvas.

Mr. BARTLETT. Bed cords?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; with a tick and blanket and pillow.

The CHAIRMAN. What is in the tick?

Mr. HARRISON. I can only say that my impression is that it is straw. I did not open any of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn. All debate upon this paragraph is closed by order of the committee a few moments ago. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MANN. There was no order of the committee in regard to this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is mistaken.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I regret exceedingly to weary the patience of the committee at this hour by making any further reference to a subject that has already been discussed to-day. I fear, however, I have been guilty perhaps of an injustice to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr.

STANLEY], and I desire this opportunity to express my exceeding regret that I have possibly been placed in that attitude. I have perhaps done that injustice to him because it may have been assumed in something I have said that he was not intending to be fair. Whatever may have been his habitual conduct heretofore in this respect I am quite sure his conduct to-day has entirely disproved any such suggestion I might possibly have erroneously indulged in, because he had generously, completely, beautifully, and magnificently placed in the RECORD a table of figures which absolutely disprove the statement he made and absolutely prove the contention that I put forth.

The gentleman started with his fundamental proposition that nine-tenths of the men who work in the mines of Minnesota, particularly specifying the Mesabi district, were a coming-and-going crowd of individuals who did not stay there for a period of five years. I quote from the table which he has placed in the RECORD to substantiate his position, and I find that in the Mesabi Range from that record there were 13,289 American citizens [applause on the Republican side] born in America and only 17,310 of foreign birth, and I ask and invite the gentleman's attention to the further fact that if it shall be considered those of the 17,000 who have been naturalized, more than 75 per cent are American citizens to-day swearing allegiance to the American flag. [Applause on the Republican side.] He said that not 5 per cent had been in this country five years, and yet the table that he submitted shows that more than 12 per cent had been there for more than 10 years, practically dating from the time of the beginning of the development of that region, and that 32 per cent had been there for a greater period of time than five years. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the table which he submitted bears this astounding fact, that of the 10,000 employees of the Steel Corporation included in that report, 30 per cent are American citizens of the Lake Superior district entirely. I said 30 per cent American citizens, I mean 30 per cent American-born people, and the number naturalized is not included; and if we will extend that and include those who are naturalized you will find that 70 to 75 per cent is a fair estimate. From the men who are engaged in those mines, who, with skilled hands, managed the steam shovels that dug that ore, were taken the men who for the last five years have dug the Panama Canal, and the world does not furnish their superior. That skill which enabled them to perform that part in that great international epoch-making work they learned in the ore mines of Minnesota, and their brethren left there are their equals in skilled strength, American courage, manhood, and spirit. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I want to call the gentleman's attention to a further fact, that these miners, from their earnings, each stepped up when work was over, with his candle in his hat and his begrimed suit of oilcloth on his person, and dropped into a common fund from his hard earnings the sum that built the first monument ever erected by human hands to the memory of the martyred President of the United States, William McKinley. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Can I have two minutes more?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to indulge the gentleman, but, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that all debate on the paragraph be now closed.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

169. Articles or wares not specially provided for in this section; if composed wholly or in part of platinum, gold, or silver, and articles or wares plated with gold or silver, and whether partly or wholly manufactured, 50 per cent ad valorem; if composed wholly or in chief value of iron, steel, lead, copper, nickel, pewter, zinc, aluminum, or other metal, but not plated with gold or silver, and whether partly or wholly manufactured, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HEFLIN, and Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] is recognized.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, paragraph 169, on page 45, line 20, by striking out the figures "25" and inserting the figures "45."

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in speaking on the amendment which I have offered I speak at the request of constituents whom I do not know, but they say to me that they voted the Democratic ticket in November last, and probably they did not vote for me.

Mr. MANN. They never will vote the Democratic ticket again.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. In North Attleboro there are 104 men who supported the Democratic Party during the recent electoral campaign who asked me to use my good offices against any reduction in the rate of duty now levied upon jewelry, silverware, and kindred products should changes in tariff rates be contemplated. They speak of the necessity of maintaining the present schedules on account of North Attleboro being entirely dependent upon the industry of the manufacture of jewelry and the large variety of ornaments, buckles, and many of the specialties included in the metal schedule. As I have said, there are 104 men who claim that they voted the Democratic ticket, and not one of them do I know personally.

I also have a petition from the Democratic town committee of North Attleboro, a committee elected by Democratic voters of the town at the election in November, in order to promote the best interests of the Democratic Party, and they make a request of a similar nature to me, and they ask me to prevent any changes from those existing in the present law.

I also have a petition from the board of trade of the town of North Attleboro, which, of course, is entirely nonpartisan.

I also have a petition from the Democratic town committee of Attleboro, a committee elected by the Democratic voters of that town to promote the best interests of the Democratic Party, to the same effect as heretofore stated, and also a petition from the Democratic town committee of the town of Norton, which is in the district which I have the honor to represent, and the petition is of the same nature as those to which I have heretofore referred. I have not spoken to a single Democrat in either one of these towns in regard to any measure, unless they were present when I carried on my campaign last fall for nomination and election upon the Republican ticket. On each of these occasions I announced myself as a Republican who believed in protection to American industries and American labor, and as one who had stood upon every Republican platform from the time of Abraham Lincoln down to the present time [applause on the Republican side], and stated that I had voted for every Republican candidate for President.

And I also informed them that I had voted for the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act, which I believed was the most beneficial act for the people of the district which I had the honor to represent that had ever been put upon the statute books. I made no apology to anybody for anything I thought or said, but I said if any Democrat wanted to vote for me, he must not vote for me thinking there were any Democratic ideas in my mind. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I received a number of Democratic votes, although I did not agree with the principles of the voters of that party, but I believed that those who would vote for me believed at least I was honest in my views. So I appear here to-night on the request of the Democrats of the district I represent, men who are interested in the jewelry business, probably some of them as owners and others as workers in that industry. There are more than 130 jewelry factories in these three towns above referred to. Consequently the metal schedule is of vast importance to them, and all the work they do requires great skill to prepare for the market the great varieties of goods which their employers find a market for. They do this work for the purpose of maintaining the life of the towns, and they say distinctly that if this bill as prepared goes into effect it will work very injuriously to their material interests. I appear here as a Representative upon this floor entitled to speak in behalf of constituents, certainly, to whom I owe no obligation, and who owe none to me. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The following are the petitions to which I referred in the foregoing remarks:

NORTH ATTLEBORO, MASS., *December 30, 1912.*

To the COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIRS: In view of the proposed legislation on the customs tariff, the undersigned, who one and all supported the Democratic Party during the recent electoral campaign, take the liberty of asking you to use your good offices against any reduction in the rate of duty now levied upon jewelry, silverware, and kindred products should such reduction be contemplated.

As you are aware, the Attleboros practically owe their existence as manufacturing towns to the establishment and maintenance of the great jewelry and silverware industries, which are possible only under a tariff which will equalize the difference in the cost of labor and overhead charges between the United States and foreign countries. In these lines the difference is so enormous that even with the present duty of 85 per cent the competition has been exceedingly keen, and we are informed that even with the seemingly high duty the imports have greatly increased over those of preceding years.

A reduction in the tariff even to a small degree would therefore mean greatly increased foreign competition, with consequent lessening of our output and scarcity of work.

It is a fact that under the construction put upon the present paragraph relating to our products, by which the duty has been reduced, whole lines of articles have been discontinued, and we greatly fear and

believe that any further reduction will result in the curtailment or, indeed, the actual closing down of our factories, with enforced idleness and distress.

It is unnecessary to point out to you how vital this matter is to us as workmen in these factories, and we urge you most earnestly to do your utmost to prevent any reduction in this duty.

John J. Soper, Albert Green, Wm. B. Maloney, John H. McCann, J. F. McDermott, Daniel T. M. Cartien, Joseph Gormley, Henry Carr, Henry C. Horessins, D. O. Leary, William H. King, James D. Fulton, James J. Brennan, Joseph A. Drenen, Jack M. Douglass, J. E. Genriss, James McLuhlin, Walter T. Barrows, Joseph P. Kelly, Charles A. Heath, John R. Wilson, William J. McNally, D. F. Carroll, Frank P. Roddy, James Lavere, Alvin Barrows, James J. McGowan, William T. Soper, Edward McAvoy, W. F. Corrigan, Denniss A. Flynn, jr., Joseph C. Doran, John Kiernan, John E. Devlin, Geles Paquet, William G. Moore, Ernest Toothill, Ed. E. Ostenholm, David Hanna, George Raubeault, Samuel P. Totten, Wm. Donnelly, Anthony P. Viard, Dennis J. Murphy, Joseph McKeon, Henry Kelly, Frank Edwards, Daniel Kelly, Maurice H. Kiley, George O'Neill, Edwin E. Nelson, J. L. Donnelly, Walter W. Cooke, George B. Loughlin, Aug. Schilling, F. N. Averill, Fred Viard, J. D. Fontain, T. G. Issler, Mike McQueeney, Walter Grimley, Fred A. Roessler, A. C. Roessler, George A. Fataygler, Y. Daborowski, Joseph Boisvert, Euclide Boisvert, George Braitshau, E. Payson Bennett, John J. Morse, William Wynne, John Bauman, William Cassidy, Walter Etter, George Coutona, William Pierce, Joseph L. N. Lemay, Peter Cahbot, Arthur G. Letourneau, Enset Pineult, Ubald Sde Carufel, James Flynn, S. E. Gardner, Owen Dolan, Joseph W. Brennan, Pat J. Stemfard, Hugh Gormley, Arthyr Sde Carufel, P. Gentilotti, J. E. Lambert, Paul L. Pratt, J. N. Sweet, E. M. Allen, Charles Benoit, B. A. Bennett, Cyril J. Lecompte, Eugene Austin, William B. Lincoln, Corad Lamarre, Mathew Cook, John G. MacDonald, Robert Picken, Martin H. Maguire.

—

NORTH ATTLEBORO, MASS., *January 27, 1913.*

The COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIRS: In connection with the proposed tariff legislation at the coming session of Congress the Democratic town committee of North Attleboro, a committee elected by the Democratic voters of the town to promote the best interests of the Democratic Party, has instructed me to forward to you a copy of the following resolution passed by them on January 27, 1913:

Whereas the customs tariff law is about to be revised by the United States Congress; and

Whereas this committee recognizes that the welfare and prosperity of the town of North Attleboro is practically dependent upon its jewelry and silverware industries, which in turn are made possible only by an adequately protective tariff against the low-priced labor of foreign countries; and

Whereas the committee has been informed and believes that even under the present rate of duty on similar goods the imports are steadily increasing: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this committee record its disapproval of any reduction of duty upon jewelry, silverware, and kindred articles, and that it urge upon Congress the necessity of maintaining the present rates; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this committee be, and he is hereby, instructed to forward to the Ways and Means Committee of Congress, to the Representatives of this district, and to the United States Senators of this State a copy of this resolution.

D. M. E. VAUCE, *Chairman.*
A. FRANK LYNCH, *Secretary.*
HENRY P. REYNOLDS.
FREDERIC R. WHITE.
FRANK A. BROWN.
JAMES L. MARRILL.
THOS. F. COADY.
DENNIS E. O'NEILL.
JAMES E. SMITH.
GEORGE A. WARREN.

—

NORTH ATTLEBORO, MASS., *January 16, 1913.*

The COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIRS: In connection with the proposed tariff legislation at the coming session of Congress, the Board of Trade of North Attleboro, a board organized to promote the best interests of the town of North Attleboro, has instructed me to forward to you a copy of the following resolutions, passed by them on January 16, 1913:

Whereas the customs tariff law is about to be revised by the United States Congress;

Whereas this board of trade recognizes that the jewelry and silverware industries are the only industries of the town of North Attleboro and that the people of North Attleboro are, therefore, dependent upon these industries, which in turn are made possible only by an adequately protective tariff against the low-priced labor of Europe and other countries;

Whereas the board of trade has been informed and believes that even under the present rates of duty on jewelry and silverware the imports are steadily increasing; and

Whereas this board has further been informed and believes that many improper classifications under the present tariff act to the serious disadvantage of the jewelry and silverware industries are due to the inclusion of the words "gold," "silver," and "platinum" in the final paragraph of the so-called metal schedule: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this board of trade record its disapproval of any reduction in the rates of duty upon jewelry, silverware, and kindred articles, and that it urge upon Congress the necessity of maintaining the present rates; and be it further

Resolved, That this board record its disapproval of the inclusion of the words "gold," "silver," and "platinum" in the same paragraph with iron, steel, tin, lead, etc., and favor a special paragraph either to precede or follow the paragraph referring to the cheaper metals, and in this new paragraph the same rates be approved as are approved for the so-called jewelry paragraph; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this board be, and he is hereby, instructed to forward to the Ways and Means Committee of Congress, to the Representative of this district, and to the United States Senators from this State a copy of this resolution.

Respectfully, yours,

CARL A. HEMPEL, *Secretary.*

—

ATTLEBORO, MASS., *January 27, 1913.*

The COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIRS: In connection with the proposed tariff legislation at the coming session of Congress the Democratic town committee of Attleboro, a committee elected by the Democratic voters of the town to promote the best interests of the Democratic Party, has instructed me to forward to you a copy of the following resolution passed by them on January 27, 1913:

Whereas the customs-tariff law is about to be revised by the United States Congress; and

Whereas this committee recognizes that the welfare and prosperity of the town of Attleboro is practically dependent upon its jewelry and silverware industries, which in turn are made possible only by an adequately protective tariff against the low-priced labor of foreign countries; and

Whereas the committee has been informed and believes that even under the present rate of duty on similar goods the imports are steadily increasing: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this committee record its disapproval of any reduction of duty upon jewelry, silverware, and kindred articles, and that it urge upon Congress the necessity of maintaining the present rates; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this committee be, and he is hereby, instructed to forward to the Ways and Means Committee of Congress, to the Representatives of this district, and to the United States Senators of this State a copy of this resolution.

WILLIAM J. KENNEY, *Chairman.*
CHARLES P. PREHAN, *Secretary.*
JOHN W. CODY.
FRANK B. KINNEY.
GILMAN L. BATES.
THOMAS F. KEENE.
HUGH GAFFNEY.
JAMES F. SIMMS.
T. FRANCIS DALY.
FRED S. COBB.

—

NORTON, MASS., *January, 1913.*

The COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIRS: In connection with the proposed tariff legislation at the coming session of Congress, the Democratic town committee of Norton, a committee elected by the Democratic voters of the town to promote the best interests of the Democratic Party, has instructed me to forward to you a copy of the following resolution passed by them:

Whereas the customs-tariff law is about to be revised by the United States Congress; and

Whereas this committee recognizes that the jewelry and silverware industries are the chief industries of Norton, and that the people of that town are therefore largely dependent upon these industries, which in turn are made possible only by an adequately protective tariff against the low-priced labor of foreign countries; and

Whereas the committee has been informed and believes that even under the present rate of duty on similar goods, the imports are steadily increasing: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this committee record its disapproval of any reduction of duty upon jewelry, silverware, and kindred articles, and that it urge upon Congress the necessity of maintaining the present rates; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this committee be, and he is hereby, instructed to forward to the Ways and Means Committee of Congress, to the Representative of this district, and to the United States Senators of this State a copy of this resolution.

C. H. MAKEPEACE,
Chairman Democratic Town Committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate on this paragraph in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. I desire 5 minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. I also would like 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I regret we can not progress faster. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. REILLY of Connecticut having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 2973. An act making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, May 1, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 4477) to grant compensation to letter carriers and post-office clerks injured in the performance of their duties; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 4478) to authorize the completion of the unfinished portion of the Government road between Hoopa Valley and Blue Lake, Humboldt County, Cal.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 4479) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal, and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912; and also amending an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 4480) to reimburse certain fire insurance companies the amount paid by them for property destroyed by fire in suppressing the bubonic plague in the Territory of Hawaii in the years 1899 and 1900; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOBSON (by request): A bill (H. R. 4481) to create educational parental courts; to the Committee on Education.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4482) to provide for the education of deficient children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4483) providing compulsory education in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4525) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CURLEY: A bill (H. R. 4526) to regulate employment of substitute clerks and carriers in offices of the first and second class of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: A bill (H. R. 4527) providing for the improvement of the Harlem River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Resolution (H. Res. 82) requesting the Postmaster General to advise the House of Representatives as to the names and number of men employed as post-office inspectors; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NEELEY: Resolution (H. Res. 83) directing the Attorney General to collect a certain sum of money from the Missouri Pacific Railroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS: A memorial of the Legislature of Massachusetts relative to an amendment of the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the practice of polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL of California: A bill (H. R. 4484) granting a pension to Josephine W. Heap; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4485) granting an increase of pension to Laura Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4486) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Charles R. Stevens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 4487) for the relief of George P. Plowman; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4488) for the relief of the heirs of Philip S. Fulford, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRYAN: A bill (H. R. 4489) for the relief of W. F. Crawford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 4490) granting a pension to Eveline H. Wheeler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 4491) granting a pension to Myron Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILL: A bill (H. R. 4492) to restore Capt. Harold L. Jackson, retired, to the active list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4493) for the relief of Leo Metze; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 4494) granting a pension to Sadie M. Jungerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4495) granting a pension to Mary C. Barnum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4496) granting a pension to Thomas J. Mullin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4497) granting an increase of pension to John F. Stallsmith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4498) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Shrieves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4499) granting an increase of pension to Maria A. Sinclair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4500) granting an increase of pension to John Ricksecker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4501) granting an increase of pension to William A. Barrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4502) granting an increase of pension to Gabriel B. Andrews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4503) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Arntz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4504) granting an increase of pension to Adam J. Sherman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 4505) granting a pension to Katherine Hempen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 4506) granting an increase of pension to Joel Benjamin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4507) granting a pension to Willis Mollohan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4508) granting an increase of pension to George W. James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 4509) granting an increase of pension to Josephine R. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4510) granting a pension to Jennie L. Tate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 4511) granting an increase of pension to Abner H. Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4512) granting a pension to Gertrude Ballou; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 4513) for the relief of William E. Farrell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 4514) for the relief of Jaime W. Overton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 4515) granting a pension to Caroline Bast; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4516) granting a penson to William A. Pfaff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4517) granting a pension to Rachel M. Diebold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4518) granting an increase of pension to Wilder E. Walling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4519) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4520) granting an increase of pension to William E. Beymer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4521) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. McKim; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4522) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Koons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4523) granting an increase of pension to Emma C. Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4524) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe Morrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4528) for the relief of the estate of Perry P. Benson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 4529) for the relief of Robert C. Schenck, late paymaster, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4530) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Loker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4531) for the relief of the estate of George Lloyd Raley; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 4532) granting a pension to Dana A. Smally; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4533) granting an increase of pension to Jane Cramer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4534) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4535) for the relief of Erskine R. Hayes; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Missouri, against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of Ferdinand W. Schleuder, of Hermann, and J. G. Hildenstein, of Warrington, Mo., against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of the council of the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation for acquiring Government ownership of all telephone and telegraph systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of E. D. Murphy, of Antwerp; Andrew S. Burt, of Van Wert; S. P. Wannemocher, of Cloverdale; Oscar C. Wyatt, of Drover Hill; and Clarence C. Bowyer, of Paulding, Ohio, against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Will F. Frary and J. E. Snider, of Burbank, Ohio, and Charles H. Beck, West Lafayette, Ohio, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petition of sundry citizens of the twenty-second congressional district of Illinois, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL of California: Petition of Mrs. Mary Jones, of El Monte; 431 other beet growers, farmers, and other citizens of the following towns in the State of California: Alvarado, Arroyo Grande, Artesia, Betteravia, Colusa, Compton, Chino, El Monte, Hynes, Irvington, Huntington Beach, Marysville, Meridian, Moss, Oceana, Oxnard, Pacific Grove, Pleasanton, Salinas, Santa Maria, San Francisco, Soledad, Spreckels, Watsonville, Woodland, Anaheim, Downey, Garden Grove, Gilroy, Laws, Monterey, Santa Ana, Westminster; and the following firms and companies of San Francisco, Cal.: Wright Wire Co., A. J. & J. R. Cook (Inc.), S. F. Bowser & Co., Stauffer Chemical Co., Paul Rieger & Co., the Robert Dollar Co., Carlson Currier Co., Gantner & Mattern Co., Pacific Oil & Lead Works, Steiger & Kerr Stove & Foundry Co., and the Pacific Wire Rope Co., of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRODBECK: Petition of 35 citizens of the twentieth congressional district of Pennsylvania, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNETT: Petition of Herman Weil, W. O. Davenport, and R. E. Lee against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of Fox Croft Grange, No. 1220, of Downington, Pa., and citizens of West Chester, Pa., favoring the passage of legislation giving international protection to all migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Trainer, Pa., favoring the passage of legislation to prevent the opening of the Panama Exposition on Sundays; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of sundry citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the hand window glass manufacturers of Pittsburgh, Pa., relative to brief filed by Simon Bache & Co., of New York City, regarding the duty on window glass; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Waltham Piano Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., against any duty being placed on ivory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petitions of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. A. Slade, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Stewart Hess Co., of New York City, against the clause prohibiting importation of feathers, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of F. L. Holt, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the clause prohibiting importation of feathers, etc., and opposing the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILMORE: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Amherst, Wolaston, and Uxbridge; of Granville R. Farrer and other citizens of Abington; Mrs. J. Malcolm Forbes and other citizens of Milton and Boston, Mass., favoring the repeal of the clause exempting American vessels from the payment of tolls in the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of Edward J. Graeb and Spencer Lathrop, against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Braid Manufacturers' Association, of New York, N. Y., favoring assessment of all braids, under paragraph 369, with laces, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Butler-Ward Co., of New York, N. Y., against the reduction of the duty on bound books; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Standard Importing Co. and Austin Nichols & Co., of New York, N. Y., against assessment of fee for filing protests against assessment of duties by the collector of customs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Cloak, Suit, and Skirt Manufacturers' Association, of Cleveland, Ohio, against the same rate of duty on finished clothing as upon woolen cloth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Van Wie Pump Co., of Syracuse, N. Y., against the removal of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Syracuse Gardens Co., of New York, against any change in tariff affecting products of the soil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of sundry citizens of the twenty-third congressional district of New York, against taxing mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of the Passaic Board of Trade, of Passaic, N. J., against any change of the tariff schedules affecting the wool, cotton, handkerchief, chemical, metal, and paper industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of the National Business League of America, favoring the retention in the Consular Service of officials of demonstrated efficiency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Cigarmakers' Union No. 301, Akron, Pa., protesting against any reduction of the tariff on tobacco and cigars imported from the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILL: Petition of Mario Catavi, Hoboken, N. J., and John R. Parsons and 2 other citizens of Jersey City, N. J., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of the Columbia and Snake River Waterways Association, protesting against the repeal of the free-tolls portion of the Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Fred R. Haas and 375 other citizens of San Francisco, Whittier, Moss, Chino, Compton, Artesia, Alvarado, King City, Buena Park, Betteravia, Salinas, Oxnard, Gilroy, Watsonville, Los Alamitos, Sargent, Spreckels, Pleasanton, Castroville, Hollister, Meridian, Santa Ana, and El Monte, all in the State of California, protesting against the proposed reduction in the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Walnut Street Business Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the proposed increase on personal-baggage exemption of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MITCHELL: Petition of John D. Brooks and other citizens of Natick; Dr. Horace Bumstead and other members of the Harvard Congregational Church, Brookline; and President Ellen F. Pendleton, Prof. Mary Whiton Calkins, and others of Wellesley College, all in the State of Massachusetts, favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls or the arbitration of the question at issue with the British Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOTT: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 4469) granting a special pension to Ella M. Becker; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, against the reduction of duties on cotton goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry chocolate workers of Fulton, N. Y., against the reduction of the duty on chocolate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: Petition of Charles Debold, Bernhard J. Osmer, Frank Emmett, Conrad Haaren, L. Eyring, A. H. Fersch, J. Wadsworth, and Conrad W. Brech, against the reduction of the duty on cocoa and chocolate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Walter S. Rapelji, Irving S. Roney, C. S. Findlay, Adolph Celtz, John Lamerdin, Frederick J. Brittner, sr., Miss M. Estelle Lifhtbouren, J. A. Armstrong, Daniel A. Dolan, Julia E. Carpenter, F. J. Bittner, Joseph Hartel, John W. Farmer, Charles Herman, Joseph Sommers, C. A. McConnell, H. H. Wallace, J. C. Goumig, Lowell M. Palmer, Warren E. Burrows, and Willis F. Taplin, all of New York and Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Richard McCormick, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against any reduction of the tariff on bound books; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Miss A. Dunn and Miss Lillie Oberglock, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against any reduction of the tariff on all lithograph work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William E. Lynn, Henry F. Reining, Joseph B. Lomax, Frank R. Treasure, Mrs. M. Buckley, and James D. Ackerman, all of New York, N. Y., protesting against placing Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Moehle Lithograph Co., Mrs. T. A. Reilly, and Louis Reilly, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against any reduction in the tariff on lithographic work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Charles Ainsworth, H. T. Daniels, Richard P. Boucher, Edward Everett Rice, Nathan E. Moore, and George F. Troy, all of Providence, R. I., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Miss Alice Hall Walter, Providence, R. I., favoring the passage of legislation preventing the importation of feathers and plumes of wild birds for commercial purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Low-Taussig-Karpeles Co., Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of legislation to collect a filing fee on each protest against the assessment of illegal duties or for reappraisement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of Roger Pierce, Myrom Richardson, and other business men of Boston, and the Samuel B. Capen's Men's Class, Central Congregational Church, Jamaica Plain, favoring the repeal of the clause exempting American vessels from the payment of tolls in the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of sundry citizens of California, favoring the passage of legislation compelling concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute their portion of the funds for the development of the local community, town, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Connecticut, against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of Dr. Edward Waldo Emerson and other citizens of Concord; President Clara H. Nash and members of the West Acton Woman's Christian Temperance Union, all of Massachusetts, favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls or the arbitration of the question at issue with the British Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Eastern Millinery Association of New York, N. Y., against the clause prohibiting the importation of aigrettes, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of different towns in New Jersey, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Petition of 46 citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of Paul Rieger & Co., San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the proposed increase of duty on materials for the manufacture of perfume; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Globe Grain & Milling Co., Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against an increase of the duty on jute burlap; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco, Cal., protesting against an import duty on wheat, oats, and barley; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pacific Oil & Lead Works, San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the placing of coconut oil on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Standard Underground Cable Co., Los Angeles, Cal., favoring a differential duty on pig lead and lead-covered wires and cables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Warren & Bailey Manufacturing Co., and 7 other companies of Los Angeles, Cal.; Carlson Currier Co., and 4 other companies of San Francisco, Cal.; and the Holt Manufacturing Co., Stockton, Cal., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of sundry citizens of the thirty-seventh congressional district of New York, against taxing mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of the glove manufacturers of Gloversville, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the provision in House bill 3321 to charge a filing fee on protests against the imposition of duties or appeal for reappraisement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the thirteenth district of New York, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of the Rural Letter Carriers' Association, Hardin County, Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation for Federal aid for the improvement of public roads, and against a 1 cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *May 1, 1913.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday last was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 2973) making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll and then proceeded to call the names of the absentees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that the amendment to Rule XII simply applies to a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I should like to have the rule that was adopted read, if the Chair please.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read Rule XII.

The Secretary read as follows:

RULE XII.

VOTING, ETC.

1. When the yeas and nays are ordered the names of Senators shall be called alphabetically, and each Senator shall, without debate, declare his assent or dissent to the question, unless excused by the Senate; and no Senator shall be permitted to vote after the decision shall have been announced by the presiding officer, but may for sufficient reasons, with unanimous consent, change or withdraw his vote. No motion to suspend this rule shall be in order, nor shall the presiding officer entertain any request to suspend it by unanimous consent. (Jefferson's Manual, Sec. XLI.)

2. When a Senator declines to vote on call of his name he shall be required to assign his reasons therefor, and having assigned them the presiding officer shall submit the question to the Senate, "Shall the Senator, for the reasons assigned by him, be excused from voting?" which shall be decided without debate; and these proceedings shall be had after the roll call and before the result is announced; and any further proceedings in reference thereto shall be after such announcement. (Jefferson's Manual, Secs. XVII, XLI.)

3. Immediately after and before the result of each roll call is ascertained and announced the Secretary shall call the names of the absentees. (Amendment of April 28, 1913.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair's ruling is that the amendment to the rule applies only to a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Regular order, Mr. President.

On the roll call the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Bacon	Gallinger	Overman	Smoot
Borah	Gronna	Owen	Stephenson
Bradley	Hitchcock	Page	Sterling
Brady	Hollis	Penrose	Stone
Bristow	James	Perkins	Sutherland
Bryan	Kern	Pomerene	Swanson
Burton	Lippitt	Ransdell	Thomas
Chilton	Lodge	Robinson	Thornton
Clark, Wyo.	McCumber	Root	Tillman
Crawford	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Townsend
Cummins	Myers	Sheppard	Warren
Dillingham	Nelson	Sherman	Weeks
du Pont	Norris	Simmons	Williams
Fall	O'Gorman	Smith, Ga.	Works

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty Senators have answered to the roll call, and there is a quorum present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Territorial Legislature of Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA,
JUNEAU, ALASKA.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Territory of Alaska, ss:*

I, William L. Distin, secretary of the Territory of Alaska, do hereby certify that the annexed copy is a full, true, and complete transcript of House joint memorial No. 2 of the Alaska Territorial Legislature.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of Alaska, at Juneau, this 16th day of April, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] WM. L. DISTIN,
Secretary of Alaska.

House joint memorial 2.

Whereas more than three-fourths of the civil litigation in Alaska, calculated on a basis of the number of cases brought, is disposed of by the United States commissioners acting as ex officio justices of the peace and probate judges, and practically all the criminal litigation is either disposed of or initiated before these officials, by virtue of which facts and the additional facts that they also discharge the functions of recorders and coroners and various other public duties, they are, under the present governmental system in Alaska, by far the most important functionaries in the Territory, coming in their official capacity in closer, more frequent, and more varied contact with the mass of our citizens than any other officials, and being thus of more importance to the good order, peace, and general well-being of the community than any other officials; and

Whereas these commissioners, under the present system, are dependent exclusively on fees for their remuneration, which fees are in the larger number of cases inadequate as recompense for the services rendered, and in many precincts are altogether insufficient to enable the commissioner to devote himself exclusively to his official duties for a livelihood, and such fee system affords constant temptation to the commissioners to encourage litigation, and to that extent is a menace to the conscientious discharge of the duties of the office, and although there may be no case in which a commissioner has been induced by the hope of more fees to act otherwise than as his sense of right and justice dictated, such officials are, by virtue of said fee system, especially in criminal cases, placed under suspicion by the public that their acts are influenced by a desire to augment their remuneration, a suspicion which in itself tends greatly to hamper these commissioners in the discharge of their varied duties; and

Whereas it is deemed urgently necessary, as a most essential step in the improvement of governmental system for Alaska, that these commissioners be placed upon a salary affording them a reasonable and suitable income sufficient to support a family and sufficient to induce men of intelligence and ability to accept appointment to such offices: It is

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, urgently requested to enact a law placing the said commissioners upon a salary of at least $2,000 per annum, and that all fees collected in civil and criminal cases be turned into fund "C" of the district court of the respective divisions in which the precinct is situated, to be expended for the benefit of the court in the same manner as other moneys belonging to such fund.

Passed the house March 21, 1913.

EARNEST B. COLLINS,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

BARRY KEOWN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Passed the senate April 3, 1913.

L. V. RAY,
President of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution adopted by the Territorial Legislature of Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint resolution 4.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska (the Senate concurring), that—

Whereas since the discovery of gold at Cape Nome, in 1899, there has been produced and shipped to the United States from Nome upward of $72,000,000 of gold, inclusive of the sums sent out by mail; no record, of course, has been kept of the gold privately and personally taken out, but the amount is undoubtedly large. That during the same period there has been shipped to the city of Nome upward of $10,000,000 worth of commodities; that the development of dredge mining on Seward Peninsula and the rapidly increasing volume of business at Port Nome renders it absolutely necessary for a safe harbor. That this increasing business has made it necessary to operate a large fleet of small vessels to and from said port of Nome plying to various places along the coast of the Bering Sea, and the largely increasing trade of our merchants with Siberia, and the number of such vessels is increasing; and

Whereas there is no safe anchorage for such vessels at said port, and because of the want of such anchorage there has been a loss to our marine service and to the people of Nome during the period aforesaid of upward of $950,000 caused from marine disasters, due to a want of a safe anchorage from storms; and

Whereas a safe anchorage and breakwater can be constructed in the mouth of the Snake River at said city and the losses for the future due to the causes aforesaid be largely obviated:

The Congress of the United States is hereby urgently requested to appropriate $25,000 for a survey of the mouth of Snake River and a site for a breakwater in front thereof, and if found feasible by said survey that Congress then provide for the construction of a breakwater and such other works as may be needed to secure a safe anchorage at said point.

Passed the house March 20, 1913.

EARNEST B. COLLINS,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

BARRY KEOWN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Passed the senate April 3, 1913.

L. V. RAY,
President of the Senate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Territory of Alaska, ss:*

I, William L. Distin, secretary of the Territory of Alaska, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 4 of the Alaska Territorial Legislature.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of Alaska at Juneau this 16th day of April, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] WM. L. DISTIN,
Secretary of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Territorial Legislature of Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 10.

To the President of the United States and the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, do most respectfully and earnestly represent that—

Whereas the city of Juneau, situated on the southeast coast of Alaska, is one of the oldest and most permanent towns in the Territory of Alaska; and

Whereas the said city of Juneau, owing to the opening up and developing of quartz mines in its immediate vicinity and surrounding said city, and the mining and milling of extensive ore bodies, has increased in population within the past two years from 1,500 to over 3,000 people, and is destined to continue increasing in population steadily for several years to come by reason of the permanency and stability of the well-known quartz mines now being operated and worked and the milling of the ores therefrom; and

Whereas at this time immense milling plants for the purpose of treating and milling the ores from mines in the immediate vicinity of Juneau are in the course of construction; and

Whereas the mines and mills aforesaid, together with the other industries and business enterprises which are now growing up and will continue to increase for years to come, insure a city of vastly increased population than at the present time; and

Whereas at the present time the public-school building in Juneau is entirely inadequate to accommodate the children of school age attending and desiring to attend said public school, which said public school can only accommodate, conveniently, 160 scholars; and

Whereas the number of scholars at the present time attending said public school is 250, an increase of more than 65 since September, 1912; and

Whereas owing to the said schoolhouse being inadequate to accommodate the number of school children attending the public school in Juneau, it has become necessary to rent a store building for the purpose of teaching the said children, and that more than 60 school children are compelled to go to said store building for instruction, and 2 additional teachers are engaged to instruct said school children in said store building; and

Whereas the present school building in Juneau is not only inadequate to accommodate the school children residing in Juneau, but is an old frame building and unfit for present and future use; and

Whereas it is estimated that it will require the sum of approximately $50,000 to erect, construct, and equip a schoolhouse sufficiently adequate to meet the present and future requirements of the city of Juneau:

Therefore we, your memorialists, do hereby most respectfully urge and solicit that the Congress of the United States pass an act permitting the city of Juneau, Alaska, to issue bonds for a sum not to exceed $50,000 for the purpose of erection, construction, and full equipment of a schoolhouse sufficiently adequate to meet the present necessity, as well as the future requirements, by reason of the steady increase in population of said city of Juneau; and

That on account of an emergency existing we particularly solicit and urge that the Congress of the United States pass the act referred to above with all expediency possible, compatible with public business; and

We, your memorialists, as in duty bound will ever pray.

In order to further carry out the object and purpose of this memorial we respectfully transmit herewith for consideration of the Congress of the United States a draft of a proposed bill, the terms of which are thought sufficiently comprehensive to cover the emergency existing as described in this memorial.

Adopted by the senate April 4, 1913.

L. V. RAY,
President of the Senate.

Concurred in by the house April 11, 1913.

EARNEST B. COLLINS,
Speaker of the House.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Territory of Alaska, ss:*

I, William L. Distin, secretary of the Territory of Alaska, do hereby certify that the above is a full, true, and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 10 of the Alaska Territorial Legislature.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of Alaska at Juneau this 16th day of April, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] WM. L. DISTIN,
Secretary of Alaska.

An act relating to affairs in the Territories, and authorizing the town of Juneau, Alaska, to issue bonds for public-school purposes, and prescribing the method of issuing bonds for such purpose.

Be it enacted, etc., That the incorporated town of Juneau, Alaska, is hereby authorized and empowered to issue its bonds in any sum not exceeding $50,000 for the purpose of constructing and equipping additional public schools in the said town of Juneau.

SEC. 2. That before said bonds shall be issued a special election shall be ordered by the common council of the town of Juneau, at which election the question whether such bonds shall be issued shall be submitted to the qualified electors of said town of Juneau whose names appear on the last assessment roll of said town for municipal taxation. Thirty days' notice of any such election shall be given by publication thereof in a newspaper printed and published and of general circulation in said town before the date fixed for such election.

SEC. 3. That the registration for such election, the manner of conducting the same, and the canvass of the returns of said election shall be, as nearly as practicable, in accordance with the requirements of law in general or special elections in said town, and said bonds shall be issued only upon the condition that a majority of the votes cast at such election in said town shall be in favor of issuing said bonds.

SEC. 4. That the bonds above specified, when authorized to be issued as hereinbefore provided, shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 6 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, and shall not be sold for less than their par value with accrued interest, and shall be in denominations not exceeding $1,000 each, the principal to be due in 10 years from date thereof: *Provided, however*, That the common council of said town of Juneau may reserve the right to pay off such bonds in their numerical order at the rate of $5,000 per annum from and after the expiration of 5 years from their date. Principal and interest shall be payable in lawful money of the United States of America at the office of the town treasurer of the town of Juneau, Alaska, or at such bank in the city of New York, in the State of New York, or such place as may be designated by the common council of the town of Juneau, the place of payment to be mentioned in said bonds: *And provided further*, That each and every such bond shall have the written signature of the mayor and clerk of the said town of Juneau and also bear the seal of said town.

SEC. 5. That no part of the funds arising from the sale of said bonds shall be used for any purpose other than specified in this act.

SEC. 6. That said bonds shall be sold only in such amounts as the common council shall direct, and the proceeds thereof shall be disbursed under the limitations hereinbefore imposed and under the order and direction of said common council from time to time as the same may be required for the purposes aforesaid.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a memorial of members of the Merchants' Association of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on sugar, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the National Drainage Congress, favoring an appropriation for the prevention of floods and the abating of malarial diseases, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented a telegram from N. C. Newerf, president of the Pacific Protective Society, relative to the validity of the Clayton-Bulwer and Hay-Pauncefote treaties, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of members of the Utah Chapter of the American Mining Congress, relative to the production of gold and silver in connection with western lead ores as affected by the duty on lead, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the conservation committee of the Daughters of the American Revolution, relative to the transfer of any part of the public domain to the individual States, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Concord and Oxford, in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the pending tariff bill exempting from taxation the proceeds of all life insurance policies and life insurance funds, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRONNA presented resolutions adopted by the Farmers' Local Society of Equity, of Ramsey County, N. Dak., favoring the creation of better markets for farm produce, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Commercial Club of Lisbon, N. Dak., favoring the reduction of the rate of postage on first-class mail matter to 1 cent per ounce, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Commercial Club of Lisbon, N. Dak., favoring the retention of the duty on wheat, flour, and barley, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Local Society of Equity of Ramsey County, N. Dak., relative to the materials used in the construction of good roads, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WILLIAMS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Merigold, Michigan, Blackwater, Indianola, and Laurel, all in the State of Mississippi, praying for a reduction of the duty on sugar, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TILLMAN. I present a number of telegrams from the Darlington Manufacturing Co.; the W. S. Gray Cotton Mills, of Woodruff; J. M. Geer, of Easley; Ellison A. Smyth, president of the Belton Mills, of Greenville; Alexander Long, president of the Aragon Cotton Mill and Arcade Cotton Mill, of Rock Hill; Ellison A. Smyth, president of the Pelser Manufacturing Co., of Greenville; J. A. Smyth, jr., president of the Watts Mills, of Greenville; the Woodside Cotton Mills, of Greenville; J. A. Smyth, jr., president of the Dunean Mills, of Greenville; Aug. W. Smith, of Spartanburg; the Excelsior Knitting Mills, of Union; the Monarch Cotton Mills, of Union; and a letter from J. I. Westervelt, president of the Carolina Mills, of Greenville, and J. I. Westervelt, president of the Brandon Mills, of Greenville, all in the State of South Carolina, remonstrating against any reduction in the duty on cotton. I move that the telegrams and letters be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a petition of sundry citizens of Strawn, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of Piqua, Kans., praying for an adjustment of railway mail pay consequent to the enactment of the parcel-post law, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. McCUMBER presented a resolution adopted by the Commercial Club of Lisbon, N. Dak., praying for the retention of a duty on wheat, flour, and barley, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Commercial Club, of Lisbon, N. Dak., favoring the reduction of the rate of postage on first-class mail matter to 1 cent, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. BURTON. I present a telegram, in the nature of resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati, Ohio, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *April 30, 1913.*

Hon. T. E. BURTON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

By unanimous vote the board of directors of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce at a meeting held April 29 adopted the following resolution, which is respectfully submitted for your attention:

Whereas the Underwood tariff bill imposes a duty of 10 cents per bushel upon foreign wheat and admits duty free the foreign-milled products of such foreign wheat; and

Whereas this discrimination in favor of the foreign manufacturer is in contradiction alike of all accepted economic doctrine of the established tariff policy of all political parties and of all nations, and in effect pays a bounty to the foreign miller on all products of wheat sold by him in the markets of the United States; and

Whereas if American flour millers have to pay a tax upon foreign-grown wheat, then a simple justice requires that the foreign-milled products of such wheat shall pay an equivalent tax; and if foreign-milled wheat products are admitted duty free, foreign wheat should be admitted duty free: Therefore be it

Resolved, That, believing the proposed legislation would inevitably destroy one of the most important manufacturing industries in the United States, and that it would further result in most serious injury to the American farmer, the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, through its board of directors, records itself as unalterably opposed, and earnestly urges upon the President and Congress of the United States the necessity of placing both wheat and its products upon terms of absolute equality.

Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded immediately to the President of the United States, Senators and Congressmen from Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky, the members of the Senate Finance Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

CINCINNATI CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.
W. C. CULKINS, *Executive Secretary.*

Mr. SAULSBURY presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Delaware, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the closing of the gates of the Panama Exposition on Sundays, which was referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

Mr. WARREN. I present a memorial of the National Consumers' Home Industry League, by its president, William S. Brewer, favoring the creation of a permanent tariff commission. I ask that the memorial be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL OF THE NATIONAL CONSUMERS' HOME INDUSTRY LEAGUE.
(By its president, William S. Brewer.)

WASHINGTON, D. C.

To the Congress of the United States:

Respectfully represents your petitioner, president of the National Consumers' Home Industry League, of Washington, D. C.

Believing that the policy of taxation and representation and the fostering of home industries and the promoting of the same by our tariff

system has become the fixed policy of our Nation, and as such has invited capital and labor to enter into competition in our home markets and the markets of the world upon a basis of investment and a standard of living never heretofore reached by any other nation of the world; believing that the vested rights of the wage earner and the employer are inherent rights and that as such they should not be changed excepting after a scientific investigation which shall show such changes to be of benefit to all, and therefore necessary, we do respectfully petition that during the present session of Congress you will consider a joint resolution substantially as follows:

1. That a joint committee be appointed consisting of the chairman and the ranking member of the minority of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the chairman and the ranking member of the minority of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, who shall select and appoint a permanent commission of experts, not now in the Government service, who shall inquire into, collect, procure, tabulate, and collate information relative to the importation, exportation, manufacture, and sale of all goods, wares, and articles of merchandise which may be or become matters of trade between the United States and any foreign country, with all tariffs thereon affecting the same, for the purpose of supplying information to the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, on which to base recommendations for tariff legislation which shall provide revenue for the support of the Government and safeguard our home industries against such foreign competition as will tend to reduce the American standard of living and wage.

2. That for this purpose said commission be authorized, by subcommittee or otherwise, to sit at such times and places as they may deem advisable; to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to summons and compel the attendance of witnesses, and to employ such clerical, expert, and other assistance as shall be necessary.

3. That all executive departments and their various bureaus shall at all times furnish said commission with such information as they shall possess, and all United States consuls in foreign countries shall furnish such information relative to the growth, manufacture, and value of such commodities as may become articles of export from those countries to which they may be accredited direct to said commission.

4. We believe tariff legislation, no matter how well intended, when based upon party lines or subject to party or local influences, is a menace to the prosperity of our Government, as well as to our institutions, and particularly to our home industries and its employers and wage earners.

Business, which has just enjoyed the greatest prosperity ever known, is at this time checked and, in many instances, threatened with annihilation by tariff legislation which imperils their existence on account of their inability to meet foreign competition because of the cheaper wages in foreign countries, where they have a lower standard of living.

After interviewing some of the most able men of affairs in and from all parts of the country and of all political beliefs, we find them agreed that the needs of all of the people, both producers and consumers, whatever their political views may be, should be the only basis for any change in the tariff, and that no political party should be permitted to decide this great question to the exclusion of those interests represented by the minority.

5. Employment and business is disturbed by each national election, greatly to the detriment of all citizens of the country and against the very principles of our Government. This uncertainty is due principally to the anticipation, whether justified or not, of the tariff and revenue policy to be enacted, or changes which may follow upon partisan lines, and not based upon a scientific analysis of the requirements both for revenue and the safeguarding of our home industries by a compensatory tariff.

A concrete example of the benefits to be derived from a tariff which fosters home industries is illustrated at the Challenge Cutlery Corporation's works in Bridgeport, Conn. This industry was established in England about a century ago. The tariff system prevented their exporting to this market. They built a factory here. Their workmen followed. These men receive about three times the wages here that they received in England. They are satisfied with their employment and consider their condition and wages here, upon an American standard, far more desirable than their former circumstances in England. A reduction in the tariff on purely partisan lines, as at present outlined, would encourage the closing of this and similar industries and the transference of the business to England. It is the consensus of opinion among all fair-minded American citizens that the status of this industry and many others similarly situated with respect to tariff legislation affecting their welfare should be changed only after a most thorough and scientific investigation.

The petition of the National Consumers' Home Industry League, which is annexed, has been circulated by every possible means at our command, with the request that for the above reasons every person receiving the same sign and return it as early as possible to our home address. Many labor, agricultural, economic, and other societies have joined and are aiding us in the work.

For these reasons we believe that tariff legislation upon purely nonpartisan economic principles, revising schedules as exigencies demand, will insure confidence in all lines of business, keep labor employed, and continue our home industries on full time.

And your petitioner will ever pray.

WILLIAM S. BREWER,
President National Consumers' Home Industry League,
619 Bond Building, Washington, D. C.

ENROLLMENT AND PETITION.

To the National Consumers' Home Industry League:

By my signature I authorize you to enroll me, without any charges or dues, a member of the National Consumers' Home Industry League.

I favor every honorable way of reducing the high cost of living, so long as it does not interfere with the continuance of home industries, and believe that this should be done.

I favor a just and necessary tariff for every American producer—workingman, agriculturist, or manufacturer—against cheaper foreign production which would injure home industry.

In order to conserve the welfare and interests of all and not to impose unjust taxation upon the consumer and to make business more stable, I favor the employment by the Government of a permanent body of nonpolitical tariff experts to recommend, in conjunction with the Ways and Means Committee, safe and scientific tariff laws based upon their findings as to what is the lowest tariff needed to support the Government and to safeguard our established home industries and their employees against idleness or wages on a basis that will humble the American laborer's home and family, thus removing the tariff from constant political strife to a basis of national patriotism and pride.

As a constituent and member of the National Consumers' Home Industry League, I instruct you to use my name and influence in petitions and otherwise to the President or the Congress or my Congressman urging tariff legislation upon this basis.

Name, ——— ———; occupation, ———; street, ———; date, ———; city, ———; State, ———.

Sign the above enrollment and petition and give to our representative, or mail at once to the National Consumers' Home Industry League, Washington, D. C.

T. E. MONTGOMERY, *Secretary.*

Mr. WARREN presented a memorial of the Wyoming Stock Growers' Association, remonstrating against placing live stock and meat products on the free list, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Wyoming Stock Growers' Association, favoring the transfer of the control of the semiarid unappropriated grazing ranges to the Government, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. OLIVER. I present a short telegram, in the nature of a memorial from 33 workers in decorated glass, employees of J. M. Kase & Co., Reading, Pa., which I ask to have read and inserted in the RECORD, omitting the signatures, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

READING, PA., *April 24, 1913.*

HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

American workers in decorated glass have hard struggle for existence even with present tariff. The proposed reduction constitutes a serious menace to our employment, and the sweeping exemptions under paragraph 659 mean our ruin. We, skilled workmen and artists employed by J. M. Kase & Co., art-glass makers, respectfully protest against such action.

Mr. PERKINS presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Stockton, Cal., remonstrating against the imposition of a duty on wheat, oats, and barley, if flour, oatmeal, pearl barley, etc., are admitted free, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Trades and Labor Council of Vallejo, Cal., favoring the adoption of an amendment to the eight-hour law, extending its provisions so as to apply to all grants or franchises granted by the Government relating to natural resources, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of Granville R. Farrar and 21 other citizens of Abington; Dr. Horace Bumstead and 20 other members of the Harvard Congregational Church, of Brookline; and of Dr. Edward Waldo Emerson and 13 other citizens of Concord, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

TARIFF DUTY ON LEAD.

Mr. BORAH. I present a memorial adopted by the Silver-Lead Producers of the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico, assembled in formal conference at Salt Lake City, Utah, April 3 and 4, 1913, remonstrating against any change being made in the duty on lead in ores. I ask that the memorial be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL FROM THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN LEAD-ORE PRODUCERS TO THE SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, SPECIAL SESSION.

To the President, to the Senate, and to the House of Representatives:

The lead producers of the Rocky Mountain States respectfully present for your consideration the following facts relative to their industry:

The entire population of Utah, Nevada, Colorado, Arizona, Idaho, and Montana is dependent on the mining industry, of which lead mining forms a very important part.

The output of gold and silver is largely associated with and dependent upon the production of lead, much of the gold and silver ore being smelted on the lead basis. Restriction of the output of lead will therefore reduce the output of the precious metals.

The men employed in the lead mines receive the highest wages paid to mining labor in the United States. Almost all are native-born or naturalized citizens of a high average of intelligence.

Of the total traffic of the railroads of the Western States, it has been shown by railway statistics that over 80 per cent is furnished by mineral products.

All of the lead ores of the Rocky Mountain States contain some precious metal. Without these precious metals the lead could not be produced, because the cost of production exceeds the value of the lead alone. Crediting the value of the precious metals, such as gold and silver, against the cost of producing the lead, the average profit does not exceed one-half a cent per pound of lead, at the price of 4.4 cents, which is the average price for the last five years. This profit is in most cases less than 5 per cent on the capital invested, which is inadequate, in view of the risks involved in all mining enterprises.

The present duties on lead have produced for the last 10 years an average annual revenue of $734,638, which is approximately 80 per cent more than the revenue as estimated in the bill introduced in the last Congress (H. R. 18642). It is clear, therefore, that the present duties are not in any sense prohibitive, but, on the contrary, are competitive and revenue producing.

It may be admitted, however, that there is a disparity between the duty on lead in ore and the duty on lead in pigs, bars, and bullion, and that the latter might be reduced to the same basis as the lead in ore without any serious detriment to the lead producers. But the protection afforded by the duty on lead in ore is absolutely essential to the maintenance of the lead industry in this country. The fact that, even with the present duty of 1½ cents per pound on lead in ore, the margin between cost and selling price is less than one-half a cent per pound leaves no room for argument as to its necessity.

Under the rate of duty proposed last year revenue would be decreased if the quantities imported remained the same, or, in order to produce the same revenue as at present, the quantities imported would have to be increased 80 per cent. Such an increased importation could only be absorbed in our market by displacing the equivalent quantity of domestic lead. In such a case the Government would be no better off in the matter of revenue than it is now, but a part of our own lead industry would be cut off, and the money that should go to the development of our own resources would go to develop those of Spain and Mexico, our chief competitors in the production of lead.

The mining communities of the Mountain States afford the principal market for much of the agricultural product of the West. Anything that destroys or curtails mining must react to the injury of the farmers.

The development and growth of the Western States have been coincident with the development of mining. Whatever retards the latter must inevitably check the development of all other industries in the mining States.

For the foregoing reasons the lead producers of the Rocky Mountain States, through their representatives in conference at Salt Lake City, do respectfully request that no change be made in the duty on lead in ores, and that it be allowed to remain as at present—a specific duty of 1½ cents per pound on the lead contained—and that the duty on lead in pigs, bars, and bullion be reduced from the present rate of 2½ cents per pound to 1½ cents per pound, placing it on the same basis as lead in ores. We believe that so far as lead is concerned this would be a substantial compliance with the promises of the Democratic Party to revise the tariff downward. It would be a reduction of 29.4 per cent in the duty on lead in pigs, bars, and bullion, the form in which most of our imports are made, while leaving to the domestic producers of the raw lead ores the present measure of protection, which they need to insure the continuance of their industry.

It is respectfully urged, also, that the form of the duty be not changed from specific to ad valorem. An ad valorem duty affords the least protection at the time it is most needed; and in the case of lead it would be exceedingly difficult to determine the proper amount of the duty, and certain grades of ore could be imported and escape the payment of duty, for the reason that the lead in such ores would have no value at the port of entry.

Adopted by the Silver-Lead Producers of the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico, assembled in formal conference at Salt Lake City, Utah, April 3 to 4, 1913.

JAS. F. MCCARTHY,
President of the Conference.
GEO. W. RITER, *Secretary.*

TARIFF DUTY ON SUGAR.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, a few days ago I had printed in the RECORD a letter from Right Rev. Henry B. Restarick, bishop of the Espiscopal Church in Honolulu. I have now another letter from Bishop Restarick, which is a sort of supplement to the one which I presented. As it is very brief I ask that it be read.

There being no objection, the letter was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

HONOLULU, HAWAII, *April 17, 1913.*

The Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
Senator from California, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WORKS: May I add a few words to the letter which I sent you in regard to the sugar tariff? Mr. Roosevelt said to me in Washington in 1903, "I am absolutely opposed to orientalizing any American territory." I replied, "Mr. President, Hawaii was orientalized before it became American territory. You must remember that in dealing with the islands.

We have in Hawaii some 80,000 Japanese, and large numbers of these are married and mean to stay here. If the sugar industry here is ruined by the serious reduction or abolition of the tariff, these islands will be given over to the Japanese. With a Japanese manager on a sugar plantation instead of a white man, with Japanese engineers, blacksmiths, sugar boilers, overseers, etc., and by cutting the wages of workers in two, sugar might be grown on certain plantations at a small profit. But the white people would have to go elsewhere. The United States Government has insisted that the island policy should be to get Europeans. The planters have spent enormous sums to carry out this policy; free sugar would drive nine-tenths of the white population other than United States troops from the Islands. Many Americanized Hawaiians and Part-Hawaiians would have to leave. Anyone who knows will tell you that I am not exaggerating when I write this.

Hawaii pays into the United States Treasury over and above what is spent on it (of course not counting the Army and Navy, etc.), some $1,200,000 a year in duties collected. Of course in former times these duties belonged to Hawaii. The islands have well paid the United States Government as an investment. The planters have honestly tried to bring white labor here; the Government threatens to destroy its own policy and hand over the islands to orientals.

Respectfully, yours.

HENRY B. RESTARICK,
Bishop of Honolulu.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 540) for the relief of Joseph Hodges, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 27) thereon.

Mr. WORKS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 488) to authorize the sale and issuance of patent for certain land to H. W. O'Melveny, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 28) thereon.

Mr. BRADY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 653) for the relief of William O. Mallahan, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 29) thereon.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. OVERMAN. From the Committee on Rules I report Senate resolution No. 4 with amendments.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet I should like to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment how soon we may expect a report upon the resolution I introduced some weeks ago in regard to the civil service? I am receiving many letters about the matter from all over the country, and I should like, as soon as possible, that we have some report from the committee upon that resolution.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, because of other engagements I have not been able to call the committee together, but I hope to do so very early in the coming week.

I may say while I am on my feet that I have had in preparation another resolution, the object of which perhaps is the same as that of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], but calling for more specific data. I intended to present that resolution to-day, but it has not as yet been completed in the form in which I desire to present it. I want to say that I shall do that out of no spirit of hostility to the civil-service law, but I shall do it because of a desire to have a real civil-service law administered according to both the spirit and the letter of that law. It is my belief that in some of the departments of this Government there has been an honest effort to so administer the law. I am satisfied, on the other hand, that in other departments there has been a deliberate purpose to disregard it. It may be that my information is not exactly reliable in all particulars, but when information comes to me to the effect that about 95 per cent of the employees in given departments are of one political faith I am at a loss to understand just how that can be in view of a belief I have that when it comes to mental capacity and proper equipment to perform the duties of office there is not a very great difference between the members of the several political parties in this day.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. POMERENE. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. Has the Senator from Ohio made any personal investigation in reference to the proportion of Democrats and Republicans in the departments?

Mr. POMERENE. Well, when the Senator says "personal investigation" I may reply that I have not gone personally to these departments, but that I have, for instance, information to the effect that in one division of the Railway Mail Service the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, and 18 chief clerks are all Republicans, that 39 out of 40 other clerks are Republicans, and that 680 out of 720 clerks on the railroads are Republicans.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, that seems inconceivable, and yet the Railway Mail Service is a very small division of the public service.

I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that for a great many years the Civil Service Commission has been a Democratic commission—two militant Democrats and one very mild Republican constituting it. It seems to me extraordinary, in view of that fact, that the service can be packed with Republicans to the exclusion of Democrats. I can not understand it.

Mr. STONE. Who are the militant Democrats?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator from Missouri knows them. One is from Louisiana—Mr. McIlhenny—and the other is from Illinois—a well-known Democrat, who has held office pretty much during his lifetime as a Democrat.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I want to say that I will show the Senator from New Hampshire how the civil-service law has been administered, and I have no doubt it will be astonishing to him. I stated on the floor here the other day that it had been charged—I did not charge it—that the law as to-day administered was a fraud. I do not charge that now, but I do charge that its administration has been a deception; that Congress has been fooled; that the people of this country have been fooled. They ask for an investigation, and I ask the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] to make an investigation. I say that his committee can do no better thing for this country and for the people of this country than to make an investigation of the civil service.

The President of the United States, through his Economy Commission, has made an investigation. I have tried to get their report, and I shall have the report. I only have a partial

report to-day, Mr. President, but I ask Senators to listen to this report as I read it, which shows that the civil service is a cloak for the spoils system. We had better have a spoils system than to have what is known as a civil-service system not carried out upon the principles of the law as enacted, but in order to put certain favorites upon the rolls.

Why, Mr. President, I am told that in one city they have at election times put 250 roundsmen, ward heelers, on the laborers' list, and in a few months promoted them over efficient clerks, one man having been given a $3,000 salary, another man eighteen hundred dollars, and another twelve hundred dollars.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator whether they were Republican or Democratic cities where this was done?

Mr. OVERMAN. They were Republicans, I understand, who were put in.

Mr. GALLINGER. Appointed by Democratic mayors and other officials?

Mr. OVERMAN. Oh, no; they were put in by Republican customhouse officers. Now, if the Senator will listen to this report made to President Taft by his own Economy Commission, I think he will be astonished, as I am, as to the manner in which the law has been administered.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator knows, Mr. President, that I am not infatuated with the civil service——

Mr. OVERMAN. I know the Senator's views as to that.

Mr. GALLINGER. And I certainly shall welcome a careful and impartial investigation of the whole matter. I have no disposition to obstruct the proposed investigation in the least; and yet some statements have been made to-day that have struck me as being inconceivable; for instance, that so large a proportion of Republicans can be in office under the civil-service law as compared with Democrats. I know that the appointments in my own State, not very numerous it is true, have been absolutely without reference to political considerations.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the Senator says the men who preside over the Civil Service Commission are Democrats. I do not know their politics, but if they have administered the law as this board says they have, whether they are Democrats or Bull Moosers or Republicans, they ought to go.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator says he does not know the politics of the members of the commission. The Senator knows the politics of Gen. John C. Black, and surely the Senator knows the politics of Mr. McIlhenny, the commissioner appointed from Louisiana.

Mr. STONE. I know that Gen. John C. Black voted the Republican ticket.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, I never heard of that, but I hope he was wise enough to do so on occasions.

Mr. STONE. I understand that he did.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. KERN. I desire to ask a question of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will yield for a question.

Mr. KERN. I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether the Democrats who are on the Civil Service Commission are Democrats who voted the Democratic ticket?

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, I am not going to try to distinguish between the various shades of Democrats any more than I would of Republicans. It has always been understood that Gen. Black was a Democrat of Democrats, and the gentleman appointed from Louisiana, the proprietor of a noted condiment, has always been known as a Democrat, and was confirmed by the Senate with the understanding that he was a Democrat.

Mr. OVERMAN. He was a Rough Rider.

Mr. GALLINGER. He was a Rough Rider and a Democrat; nobody questions it; and nobody has ever heretofore, to my knowledge, questioned that the Civil Service Commission, or a majority of the members of that commission, have been Democrats for a great many years. I have never found any fault with that.

Mr. KERN. I submit that it has been known throughout the country for years that the Civil Service Commission is made up of men who are not Democrats, but who were appointed to office by Republican Presidents as a reward for their infidelity to the Democratic Party.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is a serious charge. The Senator surely does not make that charge against the member of the commission from Louisiana, does he? If not, it must be aimed at Gen. John C. Black, the brave old Democratic soldier.

Mr. KERN. I have not the honor of the acquaintance of the commissioner from Louisiana; but I understand that he was an associate of President Roosevelt, one of his intimates, and that he was appointed on that account, and not because he was a Democrat.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the Senator from New Hampshire will agree with me that sometimes when a Republican President appoints a Democrat, or vice versa, when a Democratic President appoints a Republican to office, the appointee becomes the meanest kind of a partisan.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not think that can be so. I do not think gentlemen of standing, as these men are, change their politics because a Republican President chances to appoint them to office. I have too good an opinion of Democrats to believe that.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let us see what a board appointed by a Republican President says about that. I ask Senators to listen. I want to get the full report, and I expect to have it. This is only a partial report.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, before the Senator begins with that, of course the Senator is aware that under the law it is provided that not more than two members of the commission shall be of the same political party.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes; that is true. Here is what the Economy Commission says:

> After an exhaustive study of the records of the Civil Service Commission——

Mr. THOMAS. Will not the Senator give the date of that report?

Mr. OVERMAN. This is a report made to President Taft just before he went out of office. I presume it is not over three months old. I do not know exactly when it was made, the date not being given here, but it was a short time ago. It was made, as I have stated, by what is known as the Taft Economy Commission.

> After an exhaustive study of the records of the Civil Service Commission and of the evidence which was obtained from the departments (the results of which are shown in the pages that follow), the President's commission has come to the conclusion that the interpretation which has been given to the act by the Civil Service Commission has been such as practically to defeat its primary purpose; that instead of giving to applicants the benefit of competitive examinations, and instead of giving to the service the benefit of rules adopted for "testing the fitness of applicants," instead of making available to the Government persons who had by the rules established been given a rating of superior merit, every "condition of good administration" has been made subordinate and subservient to demands that can find no explanation except a desire to continue a system which the law was designed to supplant.
>
> The spoils system——

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, if the Senator will permit me——

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think I can see the reason for that finding on the part of the commission. The law provides that civil-service appointments shall be equitably apportioned among the States. I never believed in that principle; and the fact is that in many instances men and women making the highest rating, the highest percentage, are denied appointments for the reason that the quota, as they say, of the States from which they come is full. I think very likely there have been instances of that kind, but the Civil Service Commission has been compelled by statute law to make such appointments. I can not believe, I repeat, that the Civil Service Commission, a Democratic commission, has deliberately done anything to exclude Democrats from getting office when they have passed satisfactory examinations.

Mr. OVERMAN. This is a Republican commission that has reported on a Democratic commission—have it that way, then.

Mr. GALLINGER. Have it that way, then; but I do not see that the Economy Commission, as quoted by the Senator, has anything to say about politics, has it?

Mr. OVERMAN. There is no politics in it. They are trying to find the truth, and they give the truth in this report.

Mr. GALLINGER. But the point that was made which attracted my attention—I should not have said a word had it not been made—was that 95 per cent of the employees in many of the departments are Republicans. I do not see that the Economy Commission, whether it has made a good showing or a bad showing in other directions, has had anything yet to say about politics.

Mr. OVERMAN. There is not a word here about politics, except they say the effect of the administration of the civil-service law has been to bring back to us by this means, cloaking deception and deceit, the spoils system. The "spoils system" means putting into office men that belong to the party in power. That, reading between the lines, is really what this report finds.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit just a word, I for one will await with a great deal of interest and some degree of anxiety the report of the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] is the chairman on

all phases of the civil-service law. I trust particular attention will be given to that question, because the Senator made the charge on the authority of somebody as to the political complexion of civil-service appointees. It has been represented to me over and over again that Republicans have not been getting a fair show in the departments, even under Republican administrations.

Mr. OVERMAN. Why, Mr. President, I have letter after letter saying that the fact is just the other way. I do not know whether the statements they contain are true or not, but this information has come to me because I have introduced the resolution. I have not been seeking information. I have letter after letter stating that in every department of the Government three-fourths of the employees are Republicans. I have not made any partisan fight about this matter. I want to get at the truth.

Mr. GALLINGER. About nine-tenths of them have not any politics. They do not go home to the States to vote as they used to do before the civil-service law was enacted.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is true.

Mr. GALLINGER. They are political somethings—I do not know what. I was going to use a word that I will not use. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. I would suggest, to settle this controversy, that the Senator station tellers at the entrances of the departments, and ask every clerk who enters whether he is a Republican or a Democrat.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not think that would do any good, for the reason that a good many would say they are Democrats who never have been Democrats.

Mr. SMOOT. Perhaps they said before that they were Republicans when they were really Democrats.

Mr. OVERMAN. Perhaps they did; but I am sorry this matter is taking a partisan turn. Let me continue reading this report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. OVERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I will say for the benefit of my Republican friends that during the past six years I found that the great body of the men in the departments with whom I came in touch were Republicans, but since the election they are nearly all Democrats. [Laughter.] There would be very little satisfaction derived from putting tellers at the doors, because they have all changed their politics.

Mr. WARREN. And a great many of them, when they went into the service, went in as Democrats, changed their politics with the change of administration, and will do so again in the future.

Mr. OVERMAN. There may be a few who have done that. I will not make any wholesale charge against the clerks in the departments.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not care whether they are Republicans or Democrats. I do care, however, to know whether the Civil Service Commission is violating the law. I should like the Senator from North Carolina to read again the part of the report which alleges a violation of the law, and interpret it, and advise the Senate in just what respect the Civil Service Commission, headed by the distinguished general, John C. Black, is violating the law of the land.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I have not finished reading the report. I will read again what I had read when I was interrupted and will read further. I am glad to furnish the information. I wish to say to the Senator from Iowa that I have not the full report. I expect to get it soon. I am only quoting now the statement made by the President's Economy Commission. They say here that they give later the facts upon which they base the statement.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know something of the work of the Economy Commission. I have collaborated a little with that commission in certain phases of the civil-service administration. I was not aware that the Economy Commission charged that the Civil Service Commission was violating the law. I was perfectly aware that the Economy Commission was of the opinion that the civil-service law is inadequate, as everybody who has read or studied the law must admit. It is very inadequate with regard to promotions in the service. But this is the first time I have ever heard that the Civil Service Commission fraudulently admitted men or women to the service contrary to the provisions of the law.

Mr. OVERMAN. Before I finish reading this document the Senator will see that the Economy Commission, before they made their report, brought to the attention of the Civil Service Commission the facts that are stated here, and the Civil Service Commission did not deny them, but evaded the very issue that is raised here—that they were administering the law in such a way as to bring back the spoils system.

Mr. CUMMINS. That, however, is a mere conclusion of the Senator from North Carolina, possibly gathered from the report of the Economy Commission.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let us see whether it is or not.

Mr. CUMMINS. I should like to know the facts. If the Senator from North Carolina alleges that the Civil Service Commission, in holding examinations, has given false ratings to applicants and has thus introduced into the civil service men who were not entitled to enter the civil service under the law, I should like to know it and I should be the first to condemn it.

Mr. OVERMAN. I knew the Senator would; and I knew, as I have said, that he would be astonished when he heard this report from the President's own commission.

Mr. CUMMINS. But the particular complaint made by the President's own commission, as I understand—I have not read it all, but I have talked with some who helped prepare the report—is as to a want of classification in the service, supplemented by the total absence of a system of promotion upon merit. I believe a great many people have been promoted in the service against merit; but that is not the fault of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Economy Commission say that the interpretation that has been put upon the law by the Civil Service Commission has been such as to "defeat the primary purpose of the law." Then, they go on to make other statements. I said that I had only part of the report, but that I would get it all. I am reading the summary of the report of the commission.

Mr. CUMMINS. Very well; but I hope the Senator from North Carolina will not lend the great weight of his influence to a charge of fraud against the Civil Service Commission, with regard to entrance into the service, until he has carefully examined the whole subject.

Mr. OVERMAN. I said I made no charge of fraud. I said there were charges of fraud which I did not make. This report says that the law is administered contrary to its provisions and its true interpretation, and is deceitful and a sham.

Mr. CUMMINS. There are a great many people who help to administer the civil-service law. The members of the Civil Service Commission are not the only administrators of the civil-service law. I do not believe the Economy Commission intended to charge that the Civil Service Commission had been negligent in the performance of its work or had intentionally either violated or evaded the law.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator from Iowa may not put the same interpretation upon this report that I do. I am reading it in order that the Senate may put its own interpretation upon it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. What has become of the morning business?

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I realize that this report is not very pleasant reading for the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to the Senator's reading it, but I should like to introduce the bills that I have been waiting to introduce. The Senator can read the report or anything else he wants to read afterwards.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator can introduce the bills in my time, if he wishes to do so.

Mr. LODGE. If the morning business is finished, of course I have not anything to say, but I did not know that such was the case.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is not finished; but if the Senator rises to make that point, I suppose I can get time later during the morning hour in which to read this paper.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; there is not the least objection to that.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will yield to the Senator from Massachusetts now to enable him to introduce his bills.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think the Senator has it in his power to yield. I can take him off the floor by a demand for the regular order, but I do not wish to make it.

Mr. OVERMAN. Certainly, the Senator can.

Mr. LODGE. I only thought it would be better if we could get rid of the morning business, which many Senators are desirous of transacting.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think this is more important than some of the bills we are going to introduce to-day.

Mr. LODGE. Then, Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is reports of committees.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from North Carolina a question upon the regular order. He rose originally to submit a report of the Committee on Rules. I should like to ask him when the committee had a meeting. I was not aware that the committee had met, or had disposed of the subject concerning which the report is made.

Mr. OVERMAN. The committee met and instructed me to report a certain resolution introduced by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS]. After the suggestions and agreement between him and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK], I made the report that the committee authorized me to make, with the exception that a certain matter was referred to the Committee on Commerce instead of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, which I thought would be agreeable to the committee.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no complaint to make of the Senator from North Carolina. He very naturally came to that conclusion, but some members of the committee desired to be heard before any change was made.

Mr. OVERMAN. Then, Mr. President, I desire to recall the report. It was my mistake.

Mr. CUMMINS. No; I do not ask that. I rise simply to say that when the report comes before the Senate for adoption I shall feel at liberty to make such suggestions as may seem best to me in regard to it.

Mr. OVERMAN. Of course. We had a unanimous agreement in the committee as to what the report should be. There was a division of sentiment on the floor of the Senate as to two things. One was as to waterways, and the other was as to the matter of conservation. In making the report on behalf of the committee I referred one of those items, as suggested by the Senator, and as I thought I was fully authorized to do by the committee, to the Committee on Commerce, and the other to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. One subject was referred to the Committee on Conservation of Natural Resources and another to the Committee on the Territories.

Mr. CUMMINS. The committee has never had under consideration, and has never decided, what part of the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and what part should be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the report.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not ask that, but I want to have it perfectly clear that I had nothing to do with making the report.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to withdraw the report. If there be no objection, consent is given.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, before anything is withdrawn and the subject is disposed of, I desire to say just a few words.

I agree with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] that we are more interested in the proper and honest administration of the law than we are in the personnel of the commission. That should go without the saying. But as to the personnel, I desire to make a remark, somewhat in the nature of a further reply to the observations of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. He said that the Civil Service Commission was universally understood to be a Democratic commission. He said, in substance, that he had not supposed there was any question about that. I, for one, question it. I think there are a great many other people who question it.

It may not be important, Mr. President, and I do not think it is of particular importance, whether a majority of the members of the commission are Democrats or Republicans. Still, since the question has been brought before the Senate, the real facts ought to be known; and I can not permit the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire to go unchallenged.

I do not know anything about the commissioner from Louisiana beyond what has been said here to-day—that he was one of Col. Roosevelt's Rough Riders, a close personal friend of his, appointed by him in furtherance of the general policy of that distinguished President to recognize the valuable services of his Rough Riders.

As to Gen. Black, the chairman of the commission, I have not regarded him, and I do not believe Senators on this side or Democrats generally throughout the United States for some years have regarded him, as a member of the Democratic Party. There was a time when he was a distinguished and valued and important member of the Democratic Party; but we are all familiar with the fact that in the not distant past he abandoned his party organization, and supported the Republican ticket. If he has reallied himself with the Democratic Party since then, he has not given public notice of the fact.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I ask the Chair what is to be the effect of a demand by any Senator for the regular order. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] demanded the regular order, and still we are going right on with the discussion of a matter which may be important to the Senators who are discussing it. There are a great many of us, however, who do not care a continental whether Gen. Black is a Republican or a Democrat, but who would like to introduce our bills and get through with the morning business, and then allow anyone who desires to do so to discuss this subject at length.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, in deference to the very courteous suggestion of my pious friend from North Dakota, I will yield the floor to his demand for the regular order. I hope the Senator will take his seat now, as I do.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am gratified to know that the Senator will do so. A Senator generally takes his seat at his own volition, or upon the direction of the Chair, and not that of any other Senator.

Mr. STONE. I take it, now, upon the direction of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GALLINGER and others. Regular order!

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to give notice that there will be some other calls for the regular order during the present session.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report has been withdrawn by unanimous consent. Reports of committees are still in order.

RETIRED OFFICERS OF THE ARMY.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. From the Committee on Military Affairs, I report back with amendments Senate resolution 35, submitted by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] on April 9, and I submit a report (No. 30) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution. It is a mere matter of inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. If there be no objection——

Mr. GALLINGER and Mr. PENROSE. Let it be read.

Mr. LODGE. Let it be read. I reserve the right to object.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. DU PONT April 9, 1913, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be requested to transmit to the Senate of the United States, as early as possible, the following information:

(1) The nature and character of the duties that retired officers of the United States Army may be detailed to perform under existing laws, regulations, and orders;

(2) The laws, regulations, and orders, if any, that define what is known as active duty on the retired list, and whether such laws, regulations, and orders permit officers on the retired list to apply for such duty; and

(3) The number of retired officers of the Army who have applied for active duty on the retired list since January 1, 1908, and the percentage of those applying who have been detailed on active duty on the retired list during this period.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 10, after the word "duty" and the semicolon, to strike out the word "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 15, after the word "period," to insert a semicolon and the word "and," and add the following paragraph:

(4) The number, rank, and pay of officers now on the retired list, and the avocations in civil life in which they are now engaged.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 1690) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Exeter, in the State of New Hampshire;

A bill (S. 1691) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lebanon, in the State of New Hampshire;

A bill (S. 1692) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Littleton, in the State of New Hampshire; and

A bill (S. 1693) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Claremont, in the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 1694) granting an increase of pension to Lot H. Fleming;

A bill (S. 1695) granting a pension to Edward G. Goodbub;

A bill (S. 1696) granting an increase of pension to Joel Yeager;

A bill (S. 1697) granting an increase of pension to George S. Kendall (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1698) granting an increase of pension to John Marsh (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1699) granting an increase of pension to George W. North (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 1700) for the relief of the heirs of Salvador Costa (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 1702) to change the name of oleomargarine to margarin; to change the rate of tax on margarin; to make margarin and other substitutes for dairy products subject to the laws of any State or Territory into which they may be transported; to afford the Internal-Revenue Bureau means for the more efficient detection of fraud and for the collection of revenues; to repeal an act defining butter and imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine, approved August 2, 1886, with amendments thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1703) for the relief of George P. Chandler;

A bill (S. 1704) for the relief of Edgar B. Strang; and

A bill (S. 1705) to correct the military record of Robert D. Magill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1706) to authorize the provision of accommodations for the United States courts in the Federal Building at Sunbury, Pa., and to increase the limit of cost for said building accordingly; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1707) for the relief of F. B. Schnure; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1708) for the relief of John E. Frymier; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1709) granting a pension to Mary A. Heck;

A bill (S. 1710) granting an increase of pension to Boaz D. Blose;

A bill (S. 1711) granting an increase of pension to Robert S. Miller;

A bill (S. 1712) granting an increase of pension to John Chambers;

A bill (S. 1713) granting a pension to Kate G. Caton;

A bill (S. 1714) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Hoch;

A bill (S. 1715) granting a pension to Mary A. Dunkle;

A bill (S. 1716) granting a pension to George W. Painter;

A bill (S. 1717) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Reese;

A bill (S. 1718) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Bowman;

A bill (S. 1719) granting a pension to Susan Olewiler;

A bill (S. 1720) granting an increase of pension to William D. Martin;

A bill (S. 1721) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Jefferson Morris;

A bill (S. 1722) granting a pension to Sarah Ann Bradford;

A bill (S. 1723) granting an increase of pension to Edward D. Goss;

A bill (S. 1724) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Smouse;

A bill (S. 1725) granting a pension to Mary E. Mathews;

A bill (S. 1726) granting a pension to Philip B. Depp; and

A bill (S. 1727) granting an increase of pension to Peter Bruner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1728) to prevent the desecration of the flag of the United States and to provide punishment therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 1729) granting an increase of pension to John McCrory (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 1730) to create a trade commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 1731) granting an increase of pension to Martin Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 1732) providing for the establishment of a hospital ship in connection with the American fisheries (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 1733) for the erection of a memorial to Col. Edward Dickinson Baker at Balls Bluff, Va.; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 1734) granting an increase of pension to William Box;

A bill (S. 1735) granting an increase of pension to Cordelia R. Bragg; and

A bill (S. 1736) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Bates; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING (for Mr. CRAWFORD):

A bill (S. 1737) granting an increase of pension to William W. Pinkerton (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 1738) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Hubbard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 1739) to reserve certain lands and incorporate the same and make them a part of the Caribou National Forest Reserve; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 1740) to apply a part of the proceeds from the sale of public lands to the support and maintenance of farm-life schools for the benefit of agriculture and to increase the knowledge of farming; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1741) for the relief of the estate of Henry Kizer, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1742) for the relief of W. T. Hawkins; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1743) for the relief of Stanley Mitchell; and

A bill (S. 1744) to appoint Frederick H. Lemly a passed assistant paymaster on the active list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1745) providing for the establishment of a term of the district court for the eastern district of North Carolina at Wilson, N. C.; and

A bill (S. 1746) to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1747) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Reynolds; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S 1748) granting an increase of pension to Mary Salsgiver; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 1749) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Riley Pennell; and

A bill (S. 1750) granting a pension to Henry Swain; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 1751) providing for the presentation of medals to all surviving soldiers of the Battle of Gettysburg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1752) granting a pension to Judson P. Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 1753) granting an increase of pension to Wingate S. Carpenter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 1754) to withdraw from the Yellowstone National Park and restore to the public domain of the United States a certain tract of land lying on the north side of said park and segregated from the remainder of said park by the Yellowstone River and comprising an area of about 2,969 acres; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1755) for the relief of certain nations or tribes of Indians in Montana; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 1756) granting an increase of pension to James M. Carpenter (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 1757) for the relief of the administrator and heirs of John G. Campbell to permit the prosecution of Indian depredation claims; to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 1758) for the relief of Warren E. Day; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

LEGISLATIVE JOURNALS IN THE MAILS.

By Mr. BRYAN:

A bill (S. 1701) to admit legislative journals of State and Territorial legislatures to the mails as second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. BRYAN. The bill is short, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill (S. 1701) to admit legislative journals of State and Territorial legislatures to the mails as second-class mail matter.

Be it enacted, etc., That legislative journals of the several State or Territorial legislatures, not exceeding 100 copies to each member of any such legislature, when mailed from the State or Territorial capitals during legislative sessions, shall be accepted as second-class mail matter.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment relative to the enforcement of the antitrust laws, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCUMBER submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the Glacier National Park, Mont., from $100,000 to $250,000, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $2,000 to print a report of the proceedings of the National Convention of State Railway Commissioners, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. OWEN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $10,000 for settling land suits in eastern Oklahoma, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CUMMINS submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. STERLING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURTON submitted four amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OLIVER submitted four amendments intended to be proproposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SAULSBURY presented two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS UNDER MARCUS P. NORTON'S PATENTS.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. There was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads the bill (S. 1269) for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under joint resolution of July 14, 1870, authorizing the Postmaster General to continue in use in the postal service Marcus P. Norton's combined postmarking and stamp-canceling handstamp patents or otherwise, which both the author and the committee think properly belongs to the Committee on Claims. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Claims. The Chair hears none.

STENOGRAPHER TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Printing be, and hereby is, authorized to employ a stenographer, compensation at the rate of $75 per month, to be paid one-half out of the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided for.

THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. SMOOT. I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 70) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 4,750 additional copies of H. R. 3321, a bill to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, for the use of the Senate document room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah asks for the immediate consideration of the resolution. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I suppose I can rise to discuss the resolution. I was about, before concluding my remarks, to read from the report of the Economy Commission. I will just go on with my remarks on that matter. As the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] requested that I should read over what I had read, I will read the whole paragraph of the Economy Commission report——

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state his inquiry.

Mr. OLIVER. I ask what is the subject before the Senate at present?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

Mr. OLIVER. I submit that the Senator from North Carolina is not talking to the subject.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think under paragraph 3 of Rule VII debate is not in order. The rule provides that—

Until the morning business shall have been concluded, and so announced from the chair, or until the hour of 1 o'clock has arrived, no motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the calendar shall be entertained by the presiding officer, unless by unanimous consent; and if such consent be given——

Which has happened in this case—

the motion shall not be subject to amendment, and shall be decided without debate upon the merits of the subject proposed to be taken up.

I make the point of order that debate is not in order under that rule.

Mr. OVERMAN. Has unanimous consent been given for the consideration of the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is then before the Senate, and is debatable.

Mr. LODGE. At this stage of the proceedings debate is not in order. It is open to the Senator to object, of course.

Mr. OVERMAN. If it is before the Senate by unanimous consent, then I have a right to debate it.

Mr. PENROSE. Not under the rule.

Mr. LODGE. Not under the rule I have read.

Mr. OVERMAN. It seems that Senators do not want to hear the truth. I will bring it out at another time. I give that notice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is well taken. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Utah.

The resolution was agreed to.

WORKS OF ART IN CAPITOL BUILDING.

Mr. GALLINGER. I send a resolution with the accompanying papers to the desk and ask that it be read and that the resolution and the papers accompanying it may then be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The resolution (S. Res. 74) was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved, That the document herewith submitted entitled "Works of Art in the United States Capitol Building, including biographies of the artists," compiled under the direction of the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds, by Charles E. Fairman, be printed as a Senate document.

ALLEGED SLAVERY IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. BORAH. I offer a resolution and ask for its present consideration. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD in connection with the resolution a certain letter which is printed in the National Humane Review for April, 1913.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho submits a resolution which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 71), as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate any and all facts bearing directly or indirectly upon the truth of the charge, publicly made, that human slavery exists at this time in the Philippine Islands, and that human beings are bought and sold in such islands as chattels.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho asks for the immediate consideration of the resolution. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, my attention was diverted. I will ask the Senator what he desires to do? What does the resolution call for?

Mr. BORAH. Facts.

Mr. STONE. From whom?

Mr. BORAH. The Secretary of War.

Mr. WARREN. Is there a letter accompanying the resolution which the Senator wishes to have read?

Mr. BORAH. There is a letter to be printed in the RECORD, signed by the secretary of the interior of the Philippine Islands, alleging the existence of slavery in those islands to be a fact.

Mr. WARREN. I should like to have it read if it is from the Secretary of the Interior, who has charge of the islands.

Mr. BORAH. It is from the secretary of the interior of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. WARREN. Oh!

Mr. ROOT. I should like to have the letter read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary proceeded to read, and read as follows:

The Philippine Legislature has ample power to pass such humane legislation as it sees fit——

Mr. ROOT. Is the Secretary reading a letter which is addressed to anyone written by anyone? He seems to be reading from a newspaper.

Mr. BORAH. It is a letter printed in a newspaper.

Mr. ROOT. Is it addressed to anyone?

Mr. BORAH. It is addressed to some one, and it is also signed by the secretary of the interior.

Mr. ROOT. I merely want to have the whole letter read. I do not know what it is.

Mr. BORAH. That is precisely what has been requested. The part preceding the letter is simply a comment of the paper. That which the Secretary is now proceeding to read is the letter itself. I assume that is what the Senator wanted.

Mr. ROOT. That is what I wanted, but the Secretary evidently did not begin at the beginning of the letter.

The Secretary read as follows:

In a letter from the Hon. Dean C. Worcester, secretary of the interior of the United States Government of the Philippine Islands, written in Manila recently, and addressed to Dr. William O. Stillman, president of the American Humane Association, the following remarkable statement of fact appears:

* * * * * * * *

A portion of Dean Worcester's letter is here quoted, as follows:

* * * * * * * *

The Philippine Legislature has ample power to pass such humane legislation as it sees fit for the regularly organized provinces. The Philippine Commission has the same authority with reference to the so-called special government provinces. So that there is no lack of adequate authority to pass humane legislation covering the entire Philippine Archipelago.

So far as I am aware, the only laws thus far passed by the commission or the legislature which can properly fall under this head are the "Act for the prevention of cruelty to animals" and the "Act prohibiting slavery, involuntary servitude, peonage, and the sale and purchase of human beings in the Mountain Province and the Province of Nueva Vizcaya and Agusan and providing punishment therefor." This act passed by the Philippine Commission under its authority as the exclusive legislative body for the territory inhabited by Moros and other non-Christian tribes is of course applicable only to that territory. Acts similar to or identical with this act have been passed by the upper house and sent to the Philippine Assembly for three consecutive years, and, indeed, are now pending there. Up to the present time the assembly has always refused to pass such an act.

The organic act passed by Congress on July 1, 1912, provides "that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist in said islands." Unfortunately, however, Congress provided no penalty for the violation of this provision, and the supreme court of these islands held, prior to the adoption of the act hereinbefore mentioned, that—

"There is at present no law punishing slave holding as a crime.

"The constitutional provision of the Philippine bill 'that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall exist in these islands,' while operating to nullify any agreement in contravention of it, requires supplementary legislation to give it effect criminally."

We are dealing not with a civil remedy but with a criminal charge in relation to which the bill of rights defines no crime and provides no punishment. Its effects can not be carried into the realm of criminal law without an act of the legislature.

The situation then, so far as concerns legislation prohibiting slavery, peonage, and involuntary servitude, is that there exists ample authority, but that the lower house declines to use its authority in this regard. We have, of course, the provisions of the old Spanish Penal Code against forcible detention, but in the large majority of cases this can not be proven, as the persons involuntarily held are afraid to tell the truth.

The legislative council of the Moro Province has passed an anti-slavery law of its own, but except in the Moro Province, the Mountain Province, Nueva Vizcaya, and Agusan the sale, barter, and purchase of human beings is still lawful in the Philippine Islands.

The Philippine Assembly excuses its conduct by the claim that slavery does not exist in these islands. This is absurd. There are Negrito slaves held to-day in the city of Manila.

DEAN C. WORCESTER,
Secretary of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Idaho.

The resolution was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 73), which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk, at $1,440 per annum, to be paid from "miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

NEGROES IN CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. STONE. I submit a resolution for reference to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment. I ask that the resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Missouri will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 72), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment shall inquire into and report as to the number of negroes employed in the classified civil service, showing the number employed in each department or other governmental establishment in the District of Columbia and at other places, giving aggregate salaries paid, and as far as possible showing the kind of service in which such employees are engaged, so that the Senate may be fully informed as to the premises.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a clipping from yesterday morning's Washington Post setting forth an account of a meeting held in this city the night before by what is known as the National Democratic Fair-Play Association. I know nothing about the association, but there are some very interesting things stated in this report. Among other things the report shows that there are 926 negroes employed in the Treasury Department, 593 in the Interior Department, and so on. I ask that the paper be referred to the committee along with the resolution I have offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution, together with the accompanying paper, will be referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution heretofore submitted by me, I ask the Secretary to read, for the information of the Senate, a marked paragraph in the paper which I send to the desk, and which I had intended to read myself. After it has been read I ask that it may be referred to the committee, together with the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

After an exhaustive study of the records of the Civil Service Commission and of the evidence which was obtained from the departments—the results of which are shown in the pages that follow—the President's commission has come to the conclusion that the interpretation which has been given to the act by the Civil Service Commission has been such as practically to defeat its primary purpose; that instead of giving to applicants the benefit of competitive examinations, and instead of giving to the service the benefit of rules adopted for "testing the fitness of applicants"; instead of making available to the Government persons who had by the rules established been given a rating of superior merit, every "condition of good administration" has been made subordinate and subservient to demands that can find no explanation except a desire to continue a system which the law was designed to supplant. Practically the only effect of the law as interpreted has been to eliminate from the possibility of appointment to positions in the classified service such persons as had entirely failed to obtain any standing whatever; i. e., to obtain an average above the passing mark. This conclusion—that the result has been to defeat the operation of the purposes of the act—is amply supported by the facts which are shown in detail below. (Report submitted as a statement of fact.)

In submitting this report the thought has been that its chief value will lie in statements of fact. In order that controversy might be confined entirely to critical comment and constructive recommendation the statements of fact are entirely separated in the text from that part which is purely descriptive. To the end that all controversy might be eliminated from the descriptive statement this portion of the report was prepared and submitted to the Civil Service Commission on ———, 1912, with the request that it be reviewed and corrected or enlarged upon, if need be, in order that it might be accepted without question or cavil as a basis for discussion. This descriptive text having been returned, after making such modifications as would eliminate every recital concerning which question had been raised, critical comment and constructive recommendations were submitted January 28, 1913. On ———, 1913, the comment of the Civil Service Commission, as an answer to the critical statements and constructive recommendations, was returned (Exhibit —), together with a proposed change in the rules (Exhibit —). To this answer the President's commission filed a reply (Exhibit —) which, in brief, calls attention to the fact that

the answer or comment of the Civil Service Commission avoided the issues which had been raised and that the proposed memorandum, while it was in the nature of an admission of past interpretation and practice that have been adverse to "good administration," does not reach nor correct the evil results that are clearly written on the face of the record as a matter of experience. (Recommendations of the President's commission.)

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, in the same connection I wish to have read a paragraph from a letter which I have received, desiring that it also go into the RECORD and be referred to the committee with the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Now, sir, I happen to be a Federal employee at the New York customhouse for the past year and three months, and if you had but a faint idea of how favoritism and "pull" are worked here you would not ask for an appropriation to conduct an inquiry, but simply demand it in the interest of common decency.

In the division in which I am employed and to which I was appointed from a civil-service list there are three grades of pay—$840, $960, and $1,095 per annum. You are instructed on your appointment that you are advanced from one grade to the higher on your efficiency. After a few months in the service I learned the efficiency meant "pull," and from my acquaintance in the division it looked to me as if illiteracy was a qualification for advancement. Mr. Loeb in 1909 abolished the night inspectors and former customs watchmen, later called customs guards. He demoted day and night inspectors by the wholesale, the majority of whom were Civil War veterans. He had 250 laborers off the scales sworn in as watchmen, ranging in salaries from $840 to $1,095 per annum, placing at their head a deputy surveyor who had been an inspector for a few months (by Executive order) at $3,000 per annum. None of these laborers ever passed a civil-service examination of any kind, but they were all more or less active Republicans, the majority being district captains. All this time an eligible list for night inspector was in existence, but none were taken from it until all these henchmen were well provided for, a good number being appointed roundsmen at $1,200 per annum.

With a few exceptions, all of these laborers have been advanced in salary notwithstanding the fact that some of them have had several charges of a more or less serious nature preferred against them. Some of them are good men, but there are others who are simply a disgrace to the customs uniform. Yet they go ahead, while the civil-service man remains stationary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The papers will be referred as requested.

Mr. ROOT. Was the signature to the letter read?

Mr. OVERMAN. If the Senator insists on it, I will have it read.

Mr. ROOT. I wish the signature read, of course.

Mr. OVERMAN. Of course you will have the writer turned out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Thomas O'Hara, Customs Guard, Room 135, Customhouse, New York.

Mr. BACON. Has morning business closed, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business has closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BACON. If there be nothing further to be presented to the Senate, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 2 hours and 30 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

SPECIAL FISCAL AGENTS.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am directed by the Committee on Finance to report the resolution (S. Res. 75) which I send to the desk. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate approve the appointment of the Right Hon. Sir Edgar Speyer, Bart., P. C., and the Messrs. Henry Oppenheimer, Henry William Brown, Henry Gordon Leith, James Speyer, and Eduard Beit von Speyer, trading under the name, style, and firm of Speyer Bros., at London, England, to be special fiscal agents of the Navy Department at that place, agreeably to the nomination.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. KERN. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate on the 28th ultimo agreed to the amendment of the standing rule of the Senate numbered 12, relating to the calling of the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Notice of the motion will be entered.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 5, 1913, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 1, 1913.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

John W. Martin, of Florida, to be collector of customs for the district of Jacksonville, in the State of Florida, in place of William H. Lucas, superseded.

SURVEYORS OF CUSTOMS.

Warner S. Kinkead, of Kentucky, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Louisville, in the State of Kentucky, in place of J. Frank Taylor, whose term of office expired by limitation January 17, 1913.

Charles R. Kurtz, of Pennsylvania, to be surveyor of customs in the district of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, in place of Perry M. Lytle, resigned.

COMMISSIONER OF CORPORATIONS.

Joseph E. Davies, of Wisconsin, to be Commissioner of Corporations, in the Department of Commerce, vice Luther Conant, jr.

ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER OF THE TREASURY.

Walter W. Warwick, of Ohio, to be Assistant Comptroller of the Treasury, in place of Leander P. Mitchell, deceased.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Louis W. Murphy, of Iowa, to be collector of internal revenue for the third district of Iowa, in place of Michael J. Tobin, superseded.

CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

Edward K. Campbell, of Alabama, to be chief justice of the Court of Claims, vice Stanton J. Peelle, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Andrew H. Hudspeth, of New Mexico, to be United States marshal, district of New Mexico, vice Secundino Romero, resigned.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Mrs. Annie G. Rogers, of Leadville, Colo., to be receiver of public moneys at Leadville, Colo., vice Andrew P. Adolphson, term expired.

SURVEYOR GENERAL OF WASHINGTON.

Richard Roediger, of Tacoma, Wash., to be surveyor general of Washington, vice Edward P. Kingsbury, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Frank B. McCoy, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be colonel from April 28, 1913, vice Col. John S. Parke, Infantry, unassigned, detached from his proper command.

Lieut. Col. Richard M. Blatchford, Infantry, unassigned, to be colonel from April 30, 1913, vice Col. Arthur Williams, Eleventh Infantry, retired from active service April 29, 1913.

Maj. John P. Finley, Infantry, unassigned, to be lieutenant colonel from April 28, 1913, vice Lieut. Col. Frank B. McCoy, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

Maj. Frederick R. Day, Thirtieth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from April 30, 1913, vice Lieut. Col. Richard M. Blatchford, unassigned, promoted.

Capt. Benjamin F. Hardaway, Seventeenth Infantry, to be major from April 30, 1913, vice Maj. Frederick R. Day, Thirtieth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Russell C. Hand, Thirteenth Infantry, to be captain from April 30, 1913, vice Capt. Benjamin F. Hardaway, Seventeenth Infantry, promoted.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Robert S. Griffin to be engineer in chief and Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a period of four years from the 18th day of May, 1913.

Commander Victor Blue to be Chief of the Bureau of Navigation in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of four years, vice Commander Philip Andrews, resigned.

Paymaster John H. Merriam to be a pay inspector in the Navy from the 21st day of February, 1913.

Boatswain William Fremgen to be a chief boatswain in the Navy from the 31st day of January, 1913.

Lieut. Charles P. Huff to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 13th day of February, 1913.

Lloyd Noland, a citizen of Virginia, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 16th day of April, 1913.

The following-named carpenters to be chief carpenters in the Navy from the 19th day of April, 1913:

Robert Morgan,
James P. Shovlin,
John A. Price,
Alfred R. Hughes, and
James L. Jones.

Milton J. Rosenau, a citizen of Massachusetts, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 28th day of March, 1913, in accordance with a provision contained in an act of Congress approved August 22, 1912.

George A. Stowell, a citizen of Oregon, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of April, 1913, to fill a vacancy.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Robert Boyd to be postmaster at Dothan, Ala., in place of Byron Trammell, removed.

Ed. G. Caldwell to be postmaster at Jacksonville, Ala., in place of Dora Crook. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1909.

W. L. Crew to be postmaster at Good Water, Ala., in place of Cicero A. Ross, deceased.

David M. Scott to be postmaster at Selma, Ala., in place of David M. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1913.

J. L. Thornton to be postmaster at Alexander City, Ala., in place of Henry C. Willis. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

ARKANSAS.

Louis K. Buerkle to be postmaster at Stuttgart, Ark., in place of Edward Hall, deceased.

William A. Bushmiaer to be postmaster at Alma, Ark., in place of Thomas B. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

G. G. Dandridge to be postmaster at Paris, Ark., in place of W. M. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1913.

Ernest J. Patton to be postmaster at Cabot, Ark., in place of Samuel P. Beck, resigned.

CALIFORNIA.

C. W. Collins to be postmaster at El Centro, Cal., in place of Ora L. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1913.

Ellis T. Tanner to be postmaster at San Jacinto Cal., in place of George B. Hannahs. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

CONNECTICUT.

Edward Perkins to be postmaster at Suffield, Conn., in place of Edmund Halladay. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1911.

FLORIDA.

Bessie Bryan Simpson to be postmaster at Kissimmee, Fla., in place of Frank Vane Agnew. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1912.

Crawford I. Henry to be postmaster at Apalachicola, Fla., in place of J. F. Warren, resigned.

William Jackson to be postmaster at Daytona, Fla., in place of William C. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1913.

B. P. Morris to be postmaster at De Funiak Springs, Fla., in place of William C. Eddy. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

J. A. Williams to be postmaster at Alachua, Fla., in place of Simeon C. Dell, resigned.

GEORGIA.

B. F. Baker to be postmaster at Woodbury, Ga., in place of Mary E. Hinton. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1912.

W. F. Brown to be postmaster at Carrollton, Ga., in place of Claude E. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1913.

Charles V. Clark to be postmaster at Louisville, Ga., in place of Lewis R. Farmer. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1913.

Mattie E. Gunter to be postmaster at Social Circle, Ga., in place of Mattie E. Gunter. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1912.

Andrew J. Irwin to be postmaster at Sandersville, Ga., in place of Samuel B. Robison. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1912.

Samuel B. Lewis to be postmaster at Fayetteville, Ga. Office became presidential January 1, 1912.

Henry M. Miller to be postmaster at Colquitt, Ga., in place of Henry M. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1913.

ILLINOIS.

Clifford W. Brewer to be postmaster at Knoxville, Ill., in place of Orange L. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Marshall E. Daniel to be postmaster at McLeansboro, Ill., in place of Frank J. Chapman. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Katherine M. McClements to be postmaster at Park Ridge, Ill., in place of William S. Chittenden, resigned.

Thomas Moyer to be postmaster at Paris, Ill., in place of Paul P. Shutt. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Benjamin F. Neal to be postmaster at Toledo, Ill., in place of John F. Ashwill. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

John Odum to be postmaster at Harrisburg, Ill., in place of Thomas S. Reynolds, resigned.

INDIANA.

James E. Burke to be postmaster at Jeffersonville, Ind., in place of Albert L. Anderson, removed.

Charles B. Donovan, jr., to be postmaster at East Chicago, Ind., in place of Moses Specter. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1912.

Daniel Ganz to be postmaster at Odon, Ind., in place of Harry H. Crooke, resigned.

Charles L. Haslet to be postmaster at Chesterton, Ind., in place of Charles E. Hillstrom. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1912.

Charles L. Wood to be postmaster at Albany, Ind., in place of William A. Hayes, deceased.

IOWA.

W. H. Carmody, sr., to be postmaster at Valley Junction, Iowa, in place of Albert S. Burnett, resigned.

Harry F. Chance to be postmaster at Redfield, Iowa, in place of Edgar O. Winter. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

Charles B. Clark to be postmaster at Ogden, Iowa, in place of Clinton L. Zollinger, resigned.

Lloyd Crow to be postmaster at Mapleton, Iowa, in place of S. H. Carhart. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1913.

B. W. De Vine to be postmaster at Livermore, Iowa, in place of Joseph C. Bergen. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1912.

S. A. Douglas to be postmaster at Adel, Iowa, in place of Albert C. Hotchkiss. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

W. H. Dudley to be postmaster at Earlham, Iowa, in place of Eugene M. Crosswait. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

Kaspar Faltinson to be postmaster at Armstrong, Iowa, in place of William Stuart. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1913.

F. M. Finnell to be postmaster at Algona, Iowa, in place of M. P. Weaver. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Thomas M. Fitzgerald to be postmaster at Charles City, Iowa, in place of Lyman H. Henry, removed.

Milton Funk to be postmaster at Lewis, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Reuben M. Gable to be postmaster at Lost Nation, Iowa, in place of Robert M. Willard. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1912.

J. S. Guynn to be postmaster at Traer, Iowa, in place of B. F. Thomas, deceased.

Edwin L. Helmer to be postmaster at Sanborn, Iowa, in place of Richard M. Boyd. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

A. D. Hix to be postmaster at Zearing, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Anton Huebach to be postmaster at McGregor, Iowa, in place of Louis N. Kramer. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Peter Jungers to be postmaster at Hospers, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

A. W. Lee to be postmaster at Britt, Iowa, in place of W. A. Simpkins. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

Ed. McConaughey to be postmaster at Allerton, Iowa, in place of John C. Meredith. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

P. A. McCray to be postmaster at Rolfe, Iowa, in place of Marion Bruce. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1910.

Frank W. Miller to be postmaster at Olin, Iowa, in place of Dennis Bittner, resigned.

Walter Rae to be postmaster at Massena, Iowa, in place of William C. McCurdy, resigned.

C. W. Remore to be postmaster at Northwood, Iowa, in place of Frank Scammon. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1911.

John H. Schulte to be postmaster at Breda, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

William D. Schulte to be postmaster at West Point, Iowa, in place of Robert A. Gardner. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1913.

E. H. Vary to be postmaster at Mechanicsville, Iowa, in place of William L. Comstock. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

KANSAS.

A. F. Achenbach to be postmaster at Soldier, Kans., in place of Benson L. Mickel. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1913.

Gus Charles Buche to be postmaster at Miltonvale, Kans., in place of James Hall, jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1913.

T. J. Doyle to be postmaster at Englewood, Kans., in place of Etta M. Townsend. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1913.

A. Ellingson to be postmaster at Scandia, Kans., in place of Charles C. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

E. P. Epperson to be postmaster at Scott City (late Scott), Kans., in place of James B. Morris, to change name of office.

E. C. Gresham to be postmaster at Bucklin, Kans., in place of Raymond S. Frazier. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Charles Hewitt to be postmaster at Wakefield, Kans., in place of Henry Avery, resigned.

J. R. Lovitt to be postmaster at McCracken, Kans., in place of Clarence P. Dutton. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

C. C. McKenzie to be postmaster at Morrill, Kans., in place of Ulysses S. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1913.

J. W. Niehaus to be postmaster at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., in place of Guy A. Swallow. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

Claude Rowland to be postmaster at Protection, Kans., in place of W. C. Monticue, removed.

Leonard Shamleffer to be postmaster at Douglass, Kans., in place of George W. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired April 30, 1912.

A. B. Smith to be postmaster at Robinson, Kans., in place of Harry M. Leslie, resigned.

J. H. Stanberry to be postmaster at Attica, Kans., in place of Elva B. Hilton. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1913.

J. H. Weltmer to be postmaster at Claflin, Kans., in place of Bert Fancher. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1913.

KENTUCKY.

Cleo W. Brown to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Ky. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Charles M. Griffith to be postmaster at Russellville, Ky., in place of Jacob B. Coffman, deceased.

Orrin Derby Todd to be postmaster at Shelbyville, Ky., in place of Mike Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1913.

LOUISIANA.

Cary E. Blanchard to be postmaster at Boyce, La. Office became presidential October 1, 1912.

Mary Hunter to be postmaster at Pineville, La. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Adah Rous to be postmaster at Lake Providence, La., in place of Adah Rous. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1913.

Will A. Steidley to be postmaster at Kinder, La. Office became presidential October 1, 1912.

Theodore Tate to be postmaster at Eunice, La., in place of Hiram Fuselier. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1912.

MAINE.

Frank T. Clarkson to be postmaster at Kittery Point, Me., in place of Horace Mitchell, resigned.

S. H. Frost to be postmaster at Pittsfield, Me., in place of Charles B. Haskell. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Benjamin R. Gifford to be postmaster at Woods Hole, Mass., in place of George C. Look, resigned.

William J. O'Brien to be postmaster at Kingston, Mass., in place of Samuel Atwell. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912

MICHIGAN.

Carl L. Farwell to be postmaster at Barryton, Mich., in place of James L. Campbell, removed.

John C. Hoopingarner to be postmaster at Berrien Springs, Mich., in place of Guy C. Mars. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

Berend Kamps to be postmaster at Zeeland, Mich., in place of William Glerum, resigned.

Ray Maker to be postmaster at Bear Lake, Mich., in place of Charles W. Glover. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Leonard J. Patterson to be postmaster at Tawas City, Mich., in place of William B. Kelly, deceased.

Mortimer D. Snow to be postmaster at Standish, Mich., in place of Louis H. Tovatt. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

MISSISSIPPI.

E. S. Chapman to be postmaster at Utica, Miss., in place of Alexander Yates. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Ollie O. Conerly to be postmaster at Gloster, Miss., in place of Jennie D. Ligon. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1913.

C. S. Summers to be postmaster at Charleston, Miss., in place of William Quarles, jr., resigned.

R. Parrish Taylor to be postmaster at Oakland, Miss. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Dora E. Tate to be postmaster at Picayune, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1912.

MISSOURI.

Charles C. Crickette to be postmaster at Queen City, Mo., in place of William H. Funk. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

Abel F. Daily to be postmaster at South St. Joseph, Mo. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

M. W. Daugherty to be postmaster at Ironton, Mo., in place of Adrian Steel. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1912.

Edward T. Duval to be postmaster at Skidmore, Mo., in place of George Stoolfer. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Patrick C. Gibbons to be postmaster at Edina, Mo., in place of Edwin S. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1913.

T. B. Hardaway to be postmaster at Jasper, Mo., in place of George B. Wade. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Hugh B. Ingler to be postmaster at Republic, Mo., in place of Martin L. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1912.

J. Lee Johnson to be postmaster at Flat River, Mo., in place of John A. Knowles. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Meredith B. Lane to be postmaster at Sullivan, Mo., in place of John H. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

Harvey Morrow to be postmaster at Buffalo, Mo., in place of Robert A. Booth, resigned.

De Witt Wagner to be postmaster at Memphis, Mo., in place of Robert D. Cramer. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1910.

William Warmack to be postmaster at Greenville, Mo., in place of Abner Barrow. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1913.

MONTANA.

Alice Hensley, to be postmaster at Moore, Mont., in place of Patrick H. Tooley, deceased.

Charles Lepley to be postmaster at Fort Benton, Mont., in place of George W. Crane. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1913.

George S. Miller to be postmaster at Deer Lodge, Mont., in place of Ithel S. Eldred. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

T. A. Rigney to be postmaster at Laurel, Mont., in place of Edward L. Fenton. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1913.

NEW JERSEY.

Patrick J. Ryan to be postmaster at Elizabeth, N. J., in place of Palmer H. Charlock. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1913.

William J. Wolfe to be postmaster at Chatham, N. J., in place of Ezra F. Ferris. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1913.

NEW YORK.

Harry A. Inglee to be postmaster at Amityville, N. Y., in place of Frederick B. Powell. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

Alfred J. Kennedy to be postmaster at Flushing, N. Y., in place of Thomas B. Lowerre. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1913.

William F. O'Connell to be postmaster at Andover, N. Y., in place of Arthur B. Burrows, deceased.

Frank D. Wade to be postmaster at Addison, N. Y., in place of Charles L. Crane, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA.

L. B. Hale to be postmaster at Fayetteville, N. C., in place of Alexander L. McCaskill. Incumbent's commission expired June 7, 1910.

Russell A. Strickland to be postmaster at Elm City, N. C., in place of Jesse D. Sharp. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1912.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Nicholas Johnston to be postmaster at Aneta, N. Dak., in place of William T. Cameron. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

OHIO.

David H. Heiby to be postmaster at Ohio City, Ohio, in place of Sidney J. Winney, resigned.

OKLAHOMA.

T. H. Hubbard to be postmaster at Cordell, Okla., in place of Carlos C. Curtis, resigned.

W. P. Madden to be postmaster at Cheyenne, Okla., in place of Maud A. Falconer. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1913.

W. F. Parker to be postmaster at Davis, Okla., in place of Charles B. Ramsey, resigned.

Samuel R. Staton to be postmaster at Cushing, Okla., in place of A. H. Holland, resigned.

OREGON.

August Huckestein to be postmaster at Salem, Oreg., in place of Squire Farrar. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1910.

Harry M. Stewart to be postmaster at Springfield, Oreg., in place of Byron A. Washburne. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1913.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Allen A. Orr to be postmaster at Lewistown, Pa., in place of William F. Eckbert, jr., resigned.

J. Frank Patterson to be postmaster at Mifflintown, Pa., in place of Andrew C. Allison. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

George B. Richardson to be postmaster at Knox, Pa., in place of Joseph M. Brothers, deceased.

C. J. D. Strohecker to be postmaster at Zellenople, Pa., in place of Clarence L. Dindinger. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1913.

RHODE ISLAND.

Thomas H. Galvin to be postmaster at East Greenwich, R. I., in place of Nathaniel H. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

George M. Anderson to be postmaster at Ninety Six, S. C., in place of Julis E. Deloach; name changed by marriage.

TENNESSEE.

William Brewer to be postmaster at Woodbury, Tenn., in place of Andrew N. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1913.

Clarence W. Moore to be postmaster at Smithville, Tenn., in place of James H. Christian. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1913.

Charles E. Rodes to be postmaster at Manchester, Tenn., in place of Finis R. Sharp. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1912.

TEXAS.

Mina Daughtry to be postmaster at Chillicothe, Tex., in place of John W. Hedley, resigned.

James W. Davis to be postmaster at Alvord, Tex., in place of Henry L. Sands, deceased.

T. A. Fuller to be postmaster at New Boston, Tex., in place of Richard B. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1910.

L. E. Haskett to be postmaster at Childress, Tex., in place of U. S. Weddington, removed.

Frank W. Kirkland to be postmaster at Mount Calm, Tex., in place of Lucius C. Guin. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

T. E. Van Landingham to be postmaster at Lone Oak, Tex., in place of George L. Johnson, deceased.

VIRGINIA.

Hoge M. Brown to be postmaster at Radford, Va., in place of Warner J. Kenderdine. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1913.

George V. Cameron to be postmaster at Louisa, Va., in place of Codrington D. Flanagan, resigned.

Charles E. Clinedinst to be postmaster at New Market, Va., in place of Charles W. Wickes. Incumbent's commission expired May 13, 1912.

E. L. Wade to be postmaster at Vinton, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1912.

J. R. Williams to be postmaster at Brookneal, Va., in place of Bezer Snell. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1912.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1, 1913.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION.

Alexander R. Magruder to be secretary of Legation at Copenhagen, Denmark.

COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND FISHERIES.

H. M. Smith to be Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries.

GOVERNOR OF ALASKA.

J. F. A. Strong to be governor of Alaska.

COMMISSIONER OF LABOR STATISTICS.

C. P. Neill to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

Pearl Berkheimer, Augusta.
T. G. Robinson, Marvell.

COLORADO.

Thomas Ryan, Salida.
Eva B. Hamilton, Stratton.

GEORGIA.

D. P. Philips, Lithonia.
W. B. McCants, Winder.

ILLINOIS.

W. H. Chapman, Clifton.
William Twohig, Galesburg.
G. A. Griffith, sr., Rankin.

KANSAS.

L. D. Cassler, Canton.
J. O. Ferguson, Independence.
F. M. Cook, Jamestown.
G. W. Barker, Minneapolis.
J. J. Wilson, Moran.
Agnes H. Gallagher, Summerfield.
L. G. Wagner, Sylvia.

LOUISIANA.

Overton Gauthier, Jennings.
Mattie D. Boatner, Vidalia.

MICHIGAN.

Theophilus Belanger, River Rouge.

MISSISSIPPI.

Henrietta Welch, Carrollton.
J. C. Jourdan, Iuka.
W. M. Noah, Kosciusko.
Lillie W. Nugent, Rosedale.
Truman Gray, Waynesboro.

MISSOURI.

A. L. Galloway, Cassville.
J. S. Fowler, Cole Camp.
A. P. Beazley, Eldon.
R. J. Ball, Gallatin.
John Hetrick, Laclede.

C. B. Bacon, Marshall.
T. A. Dodge, Milan.
A. H. Martin, Perry.

MONTANA.

R. M. Corley, Stevensville.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

D. V. Cahalane, Charlestown.

NEW JERSEY.

A. L. Williams, Vineland.

NEW YORK.

John Soemann, Lancaster.
P. M. Giles, Le Roy.

NORTH DAKOTA.

John Galyen, Belfield.
A. L. Menard, Welton.

OKLAHOMA.

Sam Flourney, Elk City.
D. M. Hamlin, Newkirk.

OREGON.

L. F. Reizenstein, Roseburg.
R. E. Williams, The Dalles.

PENNSYLVANIA.

T. H. McKenzie, Barnesboro.
Hugh Gilmore, Williamsport.

TEXAS.

J. R. De Witt, Brackettville.
S. D. Seale, Floresville.
J. B. Phillips, Howe.
N. A. Burton, McKinney.
J. W. White, Uvalde.

VIRGINIA.

A. W. Sinclair, Manassas.
J. E. Rogers, Strasburg.

WEST VIRGINIA.

J. W. Dingess, Huntington.
T. H. Buchanan, Wellsburg.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *May 1, 1913.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal Spirit, God over all, we come to Thee in prayer because spirit can meet spirit, be exalted, strengthened, purified, ennobled by the contact.

"Behold, I stand at the door and knock. If any man hear my voice and open the door I will come in to him and will sup with him and he with Me." Happy is the man who shall open the door of his heart that the King of Glory may come and be his guest and partake with him of the bread of life. Help us to open our hearts to that Spirit that we may be the better fitted for the duties of this new day, and all praise we shall give to Thee. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time of the adjournment yesterday there was under discussion the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE]. If there be no objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, paragraph 169, on page 45, line 20, by striking out the figures "25" and inserting the figures "45."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendemnts thereto be closed in 15 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman state how that time is to be divided?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want 5 minutes for this side. I am willing that gentlemen on that side may have the remaining time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Which section is referred to?

Mr. MANN. Paragraph 169.

The CHAIRMAN. The last paragraph under the metal schedule.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I should like 5 minutes under that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman desire to offer an amendment?

Mr. MOORE. This being the basket clause, there ought to be more discussion than 15 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say that unless amendments are offered I shall have to try to limit debate. I am willing that gentlemen who have amendments may discuss them.

Mr. MANN. Of course there are a great many things covered by the basket clause. Gentlemen wish to discuss the provisions of the bill.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will make it 20 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Let us get it by unanimous consent, and see how the time is to be divided.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will let the Chair divide the time. I want 5 minutes on this side.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to have 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will make it 25.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will let the debate run, but I give notice that I intend to close it in a few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw his request?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If there is objection.

Mr. MANN. Make it 25.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I consent this time, but I intend to push the consideration of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE METAL SCHEDULE.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, this is the end of the metal—the iron and steel—schedule, which provides for the rates of duty upon more articles that enter into consumption in the life of the Republic than any other. I am glad to see that this committee has so materially reduced the tariff rates in this particular schedule, because it is shown by the testimony of those who are mainly engaged in the production of the articles covered by this schedule this manufacturing business requires less protection than any other in the bill. The officers and men connected with the United States Steel Corporation so testified in the investigation carried on for a year by a committee of this House, and the man who is said to have had more information on that subject than any other man in America, or probably in the world—Mr. Schwab—testified that this industry did not need the tariff.

We have here a schedule on the basis of which rests in a great measure the prosperity of the country, and we are dealing with a subject the product and sale of which have made those engaged in it the most prosperous people in the country. They are the people of all others who do not need, who are not entitled by reason of such need, to one particle of protection. I do not say this at mere random. I do not say that we have gone beyond the principle of enacting a tariff which will provide for the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

I do not, as a Democrat, concede the right of the American manufacturer to have any such thing in his favor. I stand here as a Democrat in favor of a tariff in preference to direct taxation, but when that tariff is levied, I want to see it levied for the purposes of revenue, and I never shall vote for a tariff that is levied for the protection of an industry beyond the point where it will raise the necessary revenue of this Government when economically administered. That has been the faith in which I was born, the faith in which I was reared, the faith in which I have lived in public life, and it is the faith in which I propose to conduct myself as a Member of Congress.

It is said we are to bring into competition with American labor the cheap product of European labor in this particular branch of industry. The United States Steel Corporation is the most gigantic industrial giant on the face of the globe to-day. The evidence before the Ways and Means Committee, the publications in the magazines, and the evidence before a committee authorized by this House to investigate its affairs show that it claims to have a capital of nearly $2,000,000,000. The very first president of that corporation, in giving evidence before that committee, stated to that committee that at the present time that corporation did not need the tariff to protect it from European manufacturers. He stated that even taking into consideration the lower scale of wages paid in Germany and England and other countries, that corporation, nevertheless, could manufacture iron and steel and their products more cheaply than could any country on the face of the globe. I shall put into my remarks the evidence of Mr. Schwab, the first president of this corporation, for whose capacity and knowledge of the business in every detail the present president of this corporation, Mr. Farrell, on last Wednesday vouched. Mr. Schwab appeared before that committee on August 4, 1911, and I will quote a statement which is to be found on page 1303 of the hearings before that committee to investigate the steel corporation. Mr. Schwab had previously stated that they could manufacture iron and steel products more cheaply than any country in the world, a statement that rather startled the Republican members of that committee. Mr. DANFORTH asked him:

Even with the added load of labor?

He replied:

Yes; I think the reason for that is because we manufacture in such large quantities; we manufacture under the economic conditions that I speak of, and our tonnage is so great.

Though pressed and pressed again by the Republican members of that committee to retract that statement, he insisted that what he said was true, but that they needed a tariff, not for the purpose of presently protecting either their labor or themselves in the manufacture of the products of this great industry, but for the future. If, perchance, the manufacturers in Germany and England and other foreign countries should become so efficient in producing the products of iron and steel as we are now, he stated that corporation would then need the protective tariff, but for the present time, in order to produce the products more cheaply than they are produced abroad, it was not necessary to have the tariff. So that we have here an industry represented by this great industrial giant, and this officer telling the country and the Congress that it does not need a protective tariff in order to manufacture more cheaply at home than they can abroad.

What, then, becomes of that great proposition that the Democratic Party by this bill have brought in a bill which is to carry ruin to the American laborer and to destroy industries? Ah, says my friend from Pennsylvania, we by this bill give to the Steel Corporation, which has grown to be the great giant of which I have spoken, advantage over the independents. Well, independent manufacturers sounds very sweet, but the other day, in the inquiry before the same committee to which I have referred to investigate the Steel Corporation, Mr. Farrell, president, said the only difference between the Steel Corporation and the independents was that the independents were not stockholders in the Steel Corporation, but they pursued the same policy and the same methods. That is, they had an understanding, written at times, pools, independents and the Steel Corporation alike, by which they fixed the price of the products manufactured by both, and when it became a little dangerous to have those in evidence they burned up the books and they carried them along under gentlemen's agreements, and when the gentlemen's agreements became dangerous they then resorted to the famous Gary dinners by which to have an understanding. Those are the men engaged in this business so vital to the welfare and interest of our people, who charge that we, the party in power in this House, who have been endeavoring to bring some relief to the people in regard to this most important schedule, which affects the smallest implement of agriculture and household affairs up to the greatest, they charge that we are to bring ruin and destruction upon the labor of the country, these men who by reason of an unnecessary, unwholesome, and vicious protective system have been able to enlarge their business until its proportions startle not only the American people, but attract the attention of the world. For myself, I think that these men who have grown rich and powerful and strong in the commercial world, who thus declare publicly that they do not need the protective tariff to enable them to pay the present prices for labor and to compete in the markets at home and in the markets of the world, should at least have a fair proportion of these taxes, and burdens which have hitherto been borne by the people taken away, and that the people should for once be considered by the House of Representatives.

And when he was asked the question whether or not he needed the tariff in order to produce the articles as cheaply here as they could be produced abroad he said this: That taking into consideration the low scale of wages paid in Germany, England, and other countries that corporation nevertheless could manufacture iron and steel products more cheaply than could any other country on the face of the earth.

That was so startling to Republican members of that committee that they thought he had made a mistake, although Mr. Carnegie had time and time again given evidence to the same effect, and although he had stated previously, when pressed by a Republican member of that committee—he thought he would ask the question and lead the witness into retracting it—whether he could do it even with the added load of labor, Mr. Schwab said:

Yes; I think the reason for that is because we manufacture in such large quantities; we manufacture under the economic conditions that I speak of.

He said they did not need that year before last and would never need it unless, perchance, European manufacturers should by some means become so educated and progressed in the skill of manufacture that they could compete with the American manufacturers in these articles.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING.

Quoting from the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, which reported this bill:

INCREASE IN COST OF LIVING.

Probably the most striking economic change since 1897 has been the tremendous increase in the cost of living—a situation which has attracted the anxious attention of economists the world over. The following figures represent the relative advance in living costs that has taken place during the critical part of the period in question in the United States:

Relative wholesale prices, and per cent of increase over 1897.

Commodity.	Price, 1897.	Price, 1900.	Increase over 1897.	Price, 1910.	Increase over 1897.
			Per cent.		*Per cent.*
Farm products	85.2	109.5	28.5	164.6	93.2
Food	87.7	104.2	18.8	128.7	46.7
Clothing	91.1	106.8	17.2	123.7	35.8
Metals and implements	86.6	120.5	39.1	128.5	48.2
Drugs and chemicals	94.4	115.7	22.5	117.0	23.9
House furnishing goods	89.8	108.1	18.1	111.6	24.2
Miscellaneous	92.1	109.8	19.2	133.1	44.5
All commodities	89.7	110.5	23.1	131.6	46.7

From this table it will appear that the wholesale prices of metals and implements, such as are embraced in this schedule, have increased from 86.6 in 1897 to 120.5 in 1900, or 39.1 per cent; and to 128.5 in 1910, or 48.2 per cent over the prices of 1897.

Now how have wages increased in the corresponding period?

The following table, taken from Bulletin No. 77, from the Bureau of Labor, published in 1908, will in a measure show the per cent of increase in wages up to 1908. These are the latest available, but my information is that wages since 1907 do not show any considerable increase.

Per cent of increase in wages per hour in 1907 as compared with the average for 1890–1899, by industries.

Agricultural implements	30.9
Bakery, bread	28.9
Blacksmithing and horseshoeing	26.4
Boots and shoes	24.3
Brick	22.7
Building trades	44.6
Candy	24.4
Carpets	17.1
Carriages and wagons	18.3
Cars, steam railroad	24.4
Clothing, factory product	15.8
Cotton goods	57.5
Dyeing, finishing, and printing textiles	11.3
Electrical apparatus and supplies	22.6
Flour	16.9
Foundry and machine shop	21.4
Furniture	27.1
Gas	7.7
Glass	20.4
Harness	25.5
Hats, fur	26.4
Hosiery and knit goods	33.4
Iron and steel, bar	40.4
Iron and steel, Bessemer converting	32.6
Iron and steel, blast furnace	19.8
Leather	11.8
Liquors, malt	32.9
Lumber	27.6
Marble and stone work	25.7

Paper and wood pulp	33.3
Planing mill	24.6
Pottery	13.8
Printing and binding, book and job	31.0
Printing, newspaper	22.6
Shipbuilding	20.9
Silk goods	16.9
Slaughtering and meat packing	16.0
Streets and sewers, contract work	45.7
Streets and sewers, municipal work	21.6
Tobacco, cigars	32.4
Woolen and worsted goods	31.9
All industries	28.8

It will be observed that this table merely shows the per cent of increase in wages per hour, not the per cent of increase per day or week.

From this table it will appear that in the iron and steel business from 1897 to 1907 the increase has been as follows: Iron and steel, bar, 33.4 per cent per hour; iron and steel, Bessemer converting, 40.4 per cent; iron and steel, blast furnace, 19.8 per cent. So in no case has the increase of wages kept pace with the increase in prices.

I call attention to a recent report of the Bureau of Labor just published showing the cost of living in 1912 as compared with the years 1890 and 1896, which is found in the New York World of May 1, 1913, and is as follows:

COST OF LIVING REACHED HIGHEST POINT IN 1912.

WASHINGTON, *April 30.*

During the latter part of 1912 the cost of living in the United States was higher than at any other time during the last 23 years. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has just issued a report on retail prices from 1890 to 1913.

The lowest cost was reached in each of the geographical divisions and in the United States as a whole in 1896. From that date to 1912 the total increase in the cost of living per year for a workingman's family, by geographical divisions, was: North Atlantic, $166; South Atlantic, $152; North Central, $187; South Central, $186; and Western, $152.

The approximate cost of a year's food supply for an average workingman's family at average prices of each year, by geographical divisions, for 1890, 1896 (the low year), and 1912 was:

Divisions.	1890	1896	1912
North Atlantic	$319	$300	$466
South Atlantic	274	265	417
North Central	299	276	463
South Central	260	255	441
Western	309	277	429

I have taken the pains to present in a concise form the great business done in the iron and steel manufacture during the last year, showing the immense amount of export to foreign countries and the inconsiderable imports from foreign countries; also a table showing, article by article, the difference in the rates in the Dingley bill and the Payne bill and the bill now under consideration. I do that so that the country can see the great reduction made in the rates in these articles and that the people of America shall get what they are entitled to—relief from these unnecessary burdens of taxation which for years and years have been placed upon the importation of these articles, not for the purpose of bringing revenue to the Government but for no purpose in the world but to add to the already full and overflowing coffers of the men in this industry. In my judgment this tariff bill on this particular schedule—and I do not believe upon any other—will not have any deleterious effect upon the men engaged in it, because the chief head of this great industry, the men who have organized the Steel Corporation and know more than anybody else about it, have said under oath that they did not need a tariff of any sort upon these articles in order to manufacture more cheaply than they can abroad, or to enable them to successfully compete with the world; and then when they pay the wages they do in comparison with the low wages at home and abroad. I present the following analysis of the iron and steel trade for the past year, as shown by the imports and exports, and a comparison of the rates contained in the Dingley, Payne, and the pending bill. From these I am confident it can not be truthfully maintained that this industry needs any protective tariff, and that rates fixed by this bill are both just and fair to the manufacturer and, at the same time, will bring relief to the American consumer from unjust and burdensome taxation, which has heretofore been imposed mainly for the benefit of those who did not and do not now need it, and under which the most gigantic financial corporation and trust in the world has been organized, flourished, and prospered. [Applause.]

Our export trade of iron and steel and manufactures in 1911 and 1912, as taken from the Monthly Reports of Commerce and Finance and Imported Merchandise entered for Consumption in the United States, issued by the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Exports of iron and steel.

Items.	1911	1912
Iron ore	$2,496,291	$2,806,636
Pig iron	2,475,009	2,658,428
Scrap and old iron	794,686	1,196,409
Bar iron	691,770	577,898
Wire rods	729,204	1,416,271
All other bars of steel	4,486,705	5,395,652
Billets, ingots, and blooms of steel:		
To England	2,983,876	3,939,099
To Canada	1,113,957	1,200,710
To other countries	1,739	14,412
Steel rails for railways:		
To Canada	1,168,000	2,360,894
To Central America	460,009	416,611
To Mexico	1,854,484	893,758
To West Indies	902,000	1,260,691
To South America	2,009,699	3,882,126
To Japan	1,467,337	1,118,942
To other Asia	2,341,650	866,155
To other countries	424,139	326,869
Total steel rails	11,377,444	12,134,446

In 1911 we imported $107,567 and exported a value of $11,377,444. In 1912 we imported $87,392 and exported $12,134,446. The present bill is right in placing steel rails on the free list.

Sheets and plates.

	1911	1912
Iron	$6,545,585	$11,320,829
Steel	8,563,840	12,327,561
Tin	2,489,094	6,269,325

In 1912 we imported $277,805 worth of sheets and plates of iron and steel and $288,014 worth of tin plate and exported $29,916,715 worth of the three sorts combined.

Structural iron and steel.

	1911	1912
To Canada	$3,096,033	$5,150,353
To Mexico	1,653,228	358,716
To Panama	.....	2,416,388
To Cuba	814,697	548,593
To South America	664,645	787,955
To Japan	476,727	807,803
To British Oceania	288,774	184,857
To Philippine Islands	185,746	107,890
To other countries	1,104,001	719,602
Total	8,683,851	11,082,133

In 1912 we imported a value of $123,642 of building forms at from 23 to 35 per cent tax.

Wire.

	1911	1912
Barbed	$4,643,391	$5,469,398
All other	5,556,577	6,511,490
Total	10,199,968	11,980,888

We imported in 1911 and 1912 as follows: Barbed wire, 1911, $4; 1912, $7. All other wire, 1911, $1,166,277; 1912, $1,401,793.

Builders' hardware and tools.

	1911	1912
Locks, hinges, and other builders' hardware	$7,759,509	$5,703,223
Saws	1,137,787	1,471,384
All other tools	8,167,517	10,430,434
Total	17,064,813	17,610,041

In 1912 we imported $1,992 worth of hammers; files, $62,094; nippers, $67,410; saws, $37,040, against an export of $17,610,041.

	1911	1912
Car wheels	$367,453	$327,285
Castings	3,213,737	2,964,471
Cutlery	1,083,891	1,162,203
Firearms	2,916,217	3,358,419

Machinery, machines and parts.

	1911	1912
Adding machines	$845,802	$928,878
Brewers' machinery	175,461	321,955
Cash registers	3,224,886	3,585,192
Electrical machinery	8,024,628	8,444,863
Metal-working machinery	9,626,965	12,151,819
Laundry machinery	1,233,613	1,132,782
Mining machinery	7,017,486	6,869,591
Printing presses	2,854,210	3,050,372
Pumps and pumping machinery	3,562,438	4,031,933
Ice-making machinery	616,187	830,678
Sewing machines	9,039,840	9,947,312
Shoe machinery	1,633,670	1,911,824
Steam engines, locomotives	3,953,648	3,298,182
Stationary engines	4,042,793	750,581
Traction engines	3,627,837	906,882
All other engines	4,424,303	4,256,371
Sugar mills	2,590,739	1,782,504
Electric locomotives		88,902
Stationary gas engines		393,683
Gasoline engines		9,014,665
Typewriters	9,778,498	11,423,691
Wind mills	1,929,991	1,876,164
Woodworking machinery	1,827,963	2,368,578
All other machinery	24,497,774	25,913,213
Total machinery	104,528,732	115,406,132

In 1912 our imports of machinery were:

Cash registers, at 30 per cent	$4,836
Embroidery and lace machines, at 45 per cent	494,720
Other embroidery machines, free	125,016
Linen-making machines, free	11,628
Jute machinery, at 30 per cent	51,514
Machine tools, at 30 per cent	154,786
Printing presses, at 30 per cent	31,390
Sewing machines, at 30 per cent	70,146
Steam engines, at 30 per cent	183,539
Typesetting and linotype machines, at 30 per cent	148
Typewriters, at 30 per cent	401
All other machinery, at 45 per cent	6,025,149

Thus we have a total import of machinery having a value of $7,129,977, against an export of $115,406,132. In other words, our exports are 16 times our imports and, as will be seen from the comparative table following this, many of these items of machinery have been very properly placed on the free list in the Underwood bill.

Nails and spikes.

	1911	1912
Cut	$434,788	$472,217
Wire	2,363,671	2,865,980
All other	737,131	811,751

All these have been carrying a duty of about 15 per cent, but in the present bill are carried to the free list.

	1911	1912
Pipes and fittings	$10,735,167	$13,063,737
Radiators	268,654	306,885
Safes	496,437	481,531
Scales and balances	1,061,388	1,074,630
Stoves and ranges	1,582,387	1,862,732
All other manufactures	22,982,480	24,506,663
Grand total of all iron and steel manufactures exported	230,725,352	268,154,262
To which add agricultural machinery	35,973,398	35,640,005
Our entire imports were	34,205,968	26,551,040

Our imports are a mere bagatelle compared with the immense value of our exports, and justify every reduction shown in the following comparative table:

Comparison of the Dingley and Payne laws with the Underwood bill on iron and steel.

	Dingley.	Payne.	Underwood.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
Iron ore	17.84	5.72	Free.
Pig iron	27.95	16.87	8
Spiegeleisen	16.72	12.44	8
Both together	23.36	15.64	8
Wrought and scrap iron	28.94	8.72	8
Ferromanganese	12.28	6.97	15
Chrome metals	20	20.26	15
Ferrosilicon	8.17	19.59	15
All other pigs	23.29	16.44	15
Slabs, blooms, etc.	15.62	23.66	8
Muck bars		14.74	8
Bar iron	14.80	10.64	8
Bars or shapes of rolled or hammered iron	11.93	11.20	8
Round iron	20.47	15.67	8
Square iron	16.42	10.39	8
Charcoal bars	32.89	20.76	8
Beams, girders, etc.	32.78	31.72	12

Comparison of the Dingley and Payne laws with the Underwood bill on iron and steel—Continued.

	Dingley.	Payne.	Underwood.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
All building shapes	32.78	32.75	12
Boiler plate	43.11	42.99	15
Sheets	40.52	28.53	15
Sheets, cold rolled	40.67	33.36	20
Crucible plate steel			15
Circular saw plates	27.89	23.08	15
Anchors	38.18	27.47	15
Forgings	35	30.47	15
Antifriction balls	36.04	42.21	35
Hoop iron	30.35	25.01	12
Barrel hoops		29	Free.
Cotton bands			Free.
Bands, cut to lengths for hay, etc.	60.32	36.26	Free.
Railway bars	34.73	17.40	Free.
Railway fishplates	35.52	21.23	10
Galvanized plates, sheets, or strips	23.48	34.37	20
Galvanized hoop, band or scroll	28.95	38.36	20
Layered sheets	34.33	33.70	20
Pickled sheets or plates	37.06	24.98	20
Bands or sheets, cold rolled		35.84	20
Plates or sheets, hammered	57.58	30.24	20
Tin and terne plate	53.12	43.20	20
Steel ingots, blooms, or slabs	20.37	21.77	10
Mill shafting	20.37	21.77	10
Other sheets and plates	22.67	20.86	15
Steel wool		40.00	20
Grit, shot, and sand		75.01	30
Iron and steel wire rods	20.51	14	10
Round wire of iron or steel	42.31	38.43	20
Iron bars, cold rolled	17.41	14.96	10
Wire covered with cotton, silk, etc.	44.99	35.42	20
Wire tempered cold	60.56	36.92	20
Barbed wire		7.77	Free.
Wire coated	16.84	37.92	20
Heddles of wire		85	20
Manufactures of wire	46.11	43.81	20
Telegraph and telephone wire	40	40	20
Wire rope	50.64	46.10	30
Anvils	30.33	30.88	15
Galvanized wire for fencing			Free.
Wire for baling hay			Free.
Automobiles, finished	45	45	45
Automobile chasses			30
Bicycles	45	45	25
Motor cycles	45	45	40
Axles	20.83	15.30	10
Tools	19.05	17.66	10
Bolts, nuts, etc.	23.73	19.21	15
Spiral nut, locks, and washers			35
Card clothing	64.09	60.06	40
Cast-iron pipe	18.52	18.10	12
Cast-iron andirons, etc.	15.42	10.87	10
Castings of iron		26.16	10
Castings of malleable iron	18.67	13.76	10
Cast hollow ware, coated or otherwise	35.71	20.01	10
Chain	46.93	48.85	20
Tubes, pipes, flues, or stays	34.81	29.97	20
Furnaces	36.01	44.98	20
Pen knives, pruning knives, etc.	79.50	76.51	35 to 55
Razors	54.54	71.34	35 to 55
Scissors and shears	52.53	52.10	30
Sword blades	34.98	46.35	30
Table knives, etc., without handles	50.20	43.26	25
Table knives, etc., with handles	50.20	43.26	30
Files	67.93	68.06	25
Muskets, shotguns, and rifles	25	25	15
Breech-loading guns	51.01	46.53	35
Table utensils, enameled or glazed	40	40	25
Needles	34.71	41.93	25
Fishhooks, rods, reels and baits	45	45	30
Engraved plates, electrotype, etc.	25	20.60	15
Lithographic plates of stone			25
Rivets, studs, and steel points	27.58	39.95	20
Cross-cut saws, mill saws, etc.	25	20	12
Band saws	30	25	12
Screws	63.01	54.76	25
Umbrella ribs	50	50	35
Wheels for railways	55.85	48.80	25
Aluminum scrap	33.36	47.56	25
Antimony	11.05	22.61	10
German silver	25	25	15
Bronze powder	41.36	39.95	25
Copper plates	11.28	9.68	5
Sheathing copper	14.74	10.97	5
Gold leaf	38.71	39.61	35
Silver leaf	126.83	94.50	30
Tinsel wire	12.41	10.28	10
Bullions and metal thread			30
Manufactures of tinsel ware			40
Hooks and eyes	46.85	36.94	15
Lead-bearing ore	88.18	63.12	(1)
Lead sheets, pigs, or bars	58.99	46.88	25
Gas mantles	36.75	40	25
Crude metallic minerals			10
Nickel	17.20	15.41	10
Pens, metallic	49.50	49.19	(2)
Pens, with nib and barrel in one piece			(3)
Penholder tips	25	23.85	25
Gold pens	25	25	25
Fountain pens	30	30	25
Pins	38	35	20

[1] One-half cent per pound. [2] Eight cents gross. [3] Twelve cents gross.

Comparison of the Dingley and Payne laws with the Underwood bill on iron and steel—Continued.

	Dingley.	Payne.	Underwood.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
Quicksilver	15.07	12.95	10
Type metal	42.90	36.40	15
New type	25	25	15
Watch movements	53.36	53.51	30
Jewels for watches and clocks			10
Enameled dials			30
Zinc in blocks	29.15	32.44	10
Zinc in sheets	28.08	25.45	10
Zinc ore		36.37	10
Bottle caps	49.70	50.24	30
Decorated bottle caps			40
Steam engines and locomotives	28.93	29.96	15
Printing presses and machine tools	45	30	15
Embroidery machines	45	45	25
Nippers and pliers	58.04	59.74	30
Other machinery	45	45	25
Carriages	45	45	25
Aeroplanes	45	45	25
Jute machinery	30	30	25
All other iron	44.95	45	25
Hoop iron cut to lengths	36.09	15.96	Free.
Barbed wire and all other fence wire		7.77	Free.
Cut nails	17.74	17.76	Free.
Horseshoe nails	12.88	12.08	Free.
Wire nails	6.64	17.70	Free.
Spikes	16.64	25.87	Free.
Nuts and washers	21.02	4.34	Free.
Horse and mule shoes	17.91	4.72	Free.
Cut tacks and brads	14.68	14.68	Free.
Tungsten ores		10	Free.
Cash registers	45	30	Free.
Linotype machines	45	30	Free.
Typesetting machines	45	30	Free.
Sewing machines	45	30	Free.
Typewriters	45	30	Free.
Tar and oil spreading machines		Free.	Free.
Bauxite	20.10	21.60	Free.
Shoe machinery	45	45	Free.
Shotgun barrels	Free.	Free.	Free.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I am certain that Mr. Schwab could not have had the making of pumps and pumping machinery under consideration when he stated, as is alleged by the gentleman from Georgia, that we could make these articles and sell them against foreign competition without the tariff. The testimony before the Ways and Means Committee indicated that the cost of materials is about the same in foreign countries as it is here. The cost in the making of pumps in this country is in the labor, that amounts to 77 per cent of the cost of the product as against one-half of that in foreign countries. We have an industry of this kind in the city of Scranton, and I know that to-day it is in financial distress, and if the tariff is lowered it will greatly lessen the chance to reorganize the works and give their workmen an opportunity to earn their livelihood.

I simply want to quote the deadly parallel as regards the wages of the two countries. I will not do that in detail now, except to say that where men in Germany, France, England, and Belgium get $8 or $9, our men, for similar work, get twice and sometimes two and a half times.

All over this country we see along railway lines—notwithstanding the feeling shown on the majority side against manufacturers—great signs asking manufacturers to locate in towns, sites free. I know in Scranton our anxiety is to have more manufactories, and particularly those industries employing male help. All through this Schedule C, my friends, you are displacing male workers. Reference yesterday was made to the clause covering tires for wheels for railways, which will displace male workmen.

And so will this section, with respect to ironworkers, displace large numbers of male help in many of the States of this Union. In many cities in those States are industries making pumps and pumping machinery; and where we have been able to sell abroad it has been largely due to some specialized machine whose merits for particular purposes create a demand.

Now, we talk a great deal here about human welfare, and about our interest in the welfare of women, and shorter hours of work for the women, and better conditions for them, and against child labor. I agree fully on these propositions, and no country is doing quite so much for its women and children as this country is doing. But here you propose to legislate out of existence industries that employ male labor. I ask the gentlemen on that side this question: With the men out of work, what are we going to do for the women and children? [Applause on the Republican side.]

I now ask your attention to this detailed statement of wages paid in pump works in this country and foreign countries:

Comparative statement of wages per week.

	Laidlaw, Cincinnati, Ohio.		Snow, Buffalo, N. Y.		Worthington, Harrison, N. J.		Blake, East Cambridge, Mass.	
	Minimum.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Maximum.
Fitters (bench department)	$16.50	$18.00	$15.40	$20.62	$10.80	$17.28	$13.75	$20.00
Turners	15.00	18.00	13.75	20.62	10.80	19.98	13.75	23.65
Pattern makers (wood)	17.70	21.90	16.50	23.37	15.10	27.00	16.50	22.55
Blacksmiths	17.10	21.00	18.25	22.00	20.25	25.12	16.50	24.20
Laborers	9.60	14.40	9.07	10.45	9.10	10.80	9.35	9.35

	England and Wales.[1 2]		Germany.[3]		France.[4]		Belgium.[5]	
	Minimum.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Maximum.
Fitters (bench department)	$8.00	$9.00	$6.50	$8.00	$6.00	$7.20	$4.93	$5.70
Turners	8.00	9.00	6.75	8.25	6.00	7.02	5.12	6.08
Pattern makers (wood)	8.50	9.50	6.37	7.50	6.37	7.43	4.89	6.00
Blacksmiths	8.00	9.00	7.12	8.25	6.29	7.93	5.02	6.12
Laborers	4.50	5.50	4.50	5.50	3.89	4.79	3.22	4.06

[1] British Board of Trade Report Cd. 5609, 1911.
[2] The wages in England in February, 1909, were about 1½ per cent higher than in 1905.
[3] British Board of Trade Report Cd. 4032, 1910.
[4] British Board of Trade Report Cd. 4512, 1909.
[5] British Board of Trade Report Cd. 5065, 1910.

I shall include in my remarks the following communication:

HAZLETON, PA., *April 2, 1913.*

Hon. J. R. FARR,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We understand that the tariff will be the principal business taken up at the present session of Congress, and as manufacturers of machinery here in Pennsylvania we are very much concerned regarding any reduction in the present tariff on machinery such as we manufacture, which at the present time carries a duty of 45 per cent, and is under the basket or omnibus clause of Schedule C, "Metals and manufactures of." In the tariff bill passed by the House and Senate last year the duty on steam pumps and other machinery such as we manufacture was reduced from 45 to 25 per cent. This bill was vetoed by the President, and we are fearful that the new tariff bill proposed will carry the same reduction.

At the hearing before the Ways and Means Committee on the 14th of last January Mr. Walter Laidlaw, a representative of our company, appeared and presented data and endeavored by his testimony to show the Ways and Means Committee that no reduction in the duty on machinery such as we manufacture should be made. By consulting his testimony, which can be found in "Tariff schedule 8½, hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, on Schedule C, metals and manufactures of," January 14, 1913, you will find that Mr. Laidlaw presented exemples showing that on machinery such as we manufacture the percentage of labor to shop cost is as high as 77 per cent, and that the duty in some cases should be as much as 62 per cent, and that it is necessary to maintain the present duty on machinery such as we manufacture in order that we may keep the wages of our workmen up to the present high standard and that the standard of living of the American workmen will not be reduced.

We find from our own investigation, and from reference to official Government reports, that European manufacturers of machinery similar to that manufactured by our company pay at the most one-half the rate of wages that we pay to the same class of workmen here in Pennsylvania, and in several of the European countries less than one-half of our wage rate, notwithstanding the fact that in some of the European countries, particularly in Germany, the efficiency of the workman is fully as high as that of the workman in this country. Prices of material in Europe and material in this country are practically the same, so that the only protection we need is for the benefit of the American workmen.

A reduction in the tariff will enable the European manufacturer to take the business in our home markets, and in order to protect our investment we would then be obliged to reduce the wages of our workmen so that we can hold the business in this country.

Therefore, as manufacturers of machinery from the State of Pennsylvania our purpose in writing to you is to endeavor to enlist your support in preventing any reduction in the tariff on machinery such as we manufacture, so that the wages of our workmen will not be reduced and that the standard of living of our American workmen will be maintained.

Thanking you in advance for your assistance in connection with this matter, we remain,

Yours, very truly,

THE JEANESVILLE IRON WORKS CO.,
A. B. JENNINGS,
Vice President and General Manager.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention again to the amendment offered by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] last evening in behalf of an industry in his district. I stand alike for all the industries of Massachusetts, and therefore I wish to ask the adoption of the amend-

ment which he offered in behalf of jewelry employees, whom you will recognize, from the petitions he presented and the introductory remarks he made, as good and regular members of the Democratic Party. I particularly want to urge the adoption of that amendment because it is directly along the line affecting the particular industry of which I wish to speak, and for which I offered an amendment yesterday afternoon.

Now, we have heard a good deal said here by the distinguished leader on the opposite side of the aisle in reference to "special interests." I do stand for just such a special interest as I referred to here yesterday, namely, the workingman. At this time I particularly speak in behalf of the workingmen in the wire mills of my district who have asked me to urge a continuance of the present tariff rates affecting their industry. This same purpose will be accomplished if you adopt the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. GREENE], increasing the rate in the basket clause from 25 per cent to 45 per cent.

Now, that kind of a "special interest" is one which it seems should not be advocated by a Representative in Congress, if I correctly understand the attitude taken by the gentlemen on the other side. We tried to get an explanation last evening through the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] as to just what "special interests" are. But I consider a proper special interest in my district to be especially the employees in that district. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, just another word, my friends. I realize that I am a new Member of this body, and I do not wish to intrude either personally or officially on our friends on the other side, who are in the great majority over there and who are against us here, but I do stand for the workingmen in my district, and I think when I put a clean-cut proposition to the leader of the committee who was in charge of this matter yesterday, I should have received at least the courtesy of a reply as to why the duty on Fourdrinier wire or bronze wire cloth was reduced from 45 per cent to 25 per cent. There was no kind of a reply vouchsafed in any shape or manner. I do ask that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] extend at least that courtesy to me, not personally but as representing an industry in my district, as to why that change was made. And in that connection I want to say that I stand here for the preservation of that industry as well as other local and general industries.

In reply to the gentleman whom he designated as coming "from Philadelphia," which is an honor in itself, although it would be a still greater honor if he were designated as coming from the State of Pennsylvania, he answered last evening in these words—and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 731:

> Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I will say in answer to that that if the gentleman from Philadelphia could say that he was here trying to save an industry from destruction there might be some logic in his position.

That is exactly the logic for which I stand here to-day.

I am trying to the best of my ability as a representative of that industry to save it from destruction, and we want to save it from destruction for the benefit of the employees in that line of industry. If the votes on this side will do it, and will save, likewise, from destruction the industries represented by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] and the rest of the industries of Massachusetts, then I know these industries will be saved. That is the logic of the situation in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE], and that is the logic of our attitude toward all our industries. [Applause.]

The words of the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore last year, and the further explanation by the Democratic candidate, now President, made in a speech at Pittsburgh on October 18 last, although they have already appeared in a speech by a Republican Member during this debate, are especially appropriate at this time as directly bearing upon my argument.

The platform says:

> We recognize that our system of tariff taxation is intimately connected with the business of the country, and we favor the ultimate attainment of the principles we advocate by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry.

Mr. Wilson said:

> I welcome the opportunity of stating what I believe to be the well-considered position of the Democratic Party with regard to the tariff. It is absolutely essential that we should be entirely frank with one another in the discussion of this fundamental question. The Democratic Party does not propose free trade or anything approaching free trade. We favor the ultimate attainment of the principles we advocate by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry.

I respectfully ask, How do these statements made before the election harmonize with the conditions to-day, six months after election, in this very industry, as evidenced by the testimony of the wire weavers of Massachusetts? I submit similar evidence is available from the workingmen in many other industries, not only in Massachusetts but throughout the United States.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, this is the basket clause of the metal schedule and carries a rate of 25 per cent. In the Underwood bill of last year the basket clause carried in it shoe machinery, made almost exclusively by the United Shoe Machinery Co. When the bill was up for consideration last year I made some inquiries of the gentleman from Alabama as to why shoe machinery, the product of a trust, was put into this basket clause and carried a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem, and at that time the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] gave an explanation of why this shoe machinery carried that duty of 25 per cent, and this was the explanation. He said:

> Now, as to not putting this machinery on the free list, the reason it was not put on the free list was because it would have been of no avail. It is a patented article; it is a monopoly by reason of the patent rights. It can only be made where the owners of the patent desire it to be made. A tariff will not protect it, because the patent protects it. A reduction of the tariff would not have helped anybody, because the patent protects the owners of the article, so that it would simply have been a matter of absurdity to take that article out of the basket clause, where it happens to fall, because it is not fixed in the bill, and place it on the free list, and then gone to the country and said we had done something. That would be merely fooling the country, and we did not want to do that.

That is what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] said about shoe machinery being put upon the free list last year, that if they did it they would be merely fooling the country. I am sorry the gentleman is not in the room, because I would like to ask him whether in putting this machinery upon the free list now they are fooling the country, as they said they would be doing if they had done a year ago what they have now done in this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] last night stated with dramatic gesture and still more dramatic effect that his colleague, Mr. MOORE, had been guilty of such conduct in proposing protective duties on some of the articles mentioned in this schedule that he blushed for shame for the people of his State. If there is any occasion for anyone in the State of Pennsylvania blushing for shame with reference to the conduct of any of her Representatives—and I say it not in any invidious sense, but merely by way of comparison—if there is any occasion for any blushes here, it is because a Representative of the State of Pennsylvania, in making up this schedule, has so prepared it that it will drive out the small manufacturer or put him entirely at the mercy of the trusts.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. If under American policy, as we understand it, as it is taught in the common schools of the land and as it is authorized by law, it is proper for a man to engage in an industrial enterprise, in the construction of a building or a mill, would not the gentleman "blush for shame" if a lawmaker in Congress should undertake by an act of Congress to drive that man out of business without any consideration whatever?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield for just one more question? I have been bowled out of time this morning, and on behalf of one of my constituents who employs a large number of people I should like, in the gentleman's time, to introduce a letter showing the effect on labor of the policy of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER]. May I introduce the letter in the gentleman's time?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman may.

The letter referred to is as follows:

R. H. HOOD CO.,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 30, 1913.

The Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: I desire most earnestly to protest against the tariff bill now before Congress. If it should pass, it will ruin my business and throw my men out of employment. If this is not the result, my men will have to consent to work at a greatly reduced rate of wages.

The proposed bill reduces the tariff on manufactures of metal from 45 to 25 per cent. While the tariff may have been too high on some commodities, it certainly never was too high on machinery.

I make fine comb circles for machine wool combs, also faller comb bars, which work in connection with the same machinery. These are all fine machine parts, involving a great deal of skill and a high labor cost. I submitted a small sample of our work to the Ways and Means Committee and filed a brief.

I think it is a shame that men in my business, whose mechanics are far superior in skill than, say, the building trades mechanics, do not receive anywhere as large wages. No builder in this country, were he subject to foreign competition, could maintain such a standard of wages unless he had a tariff of over 100 per cent.

Even postmen in America receive three times the wages that the same men do in England; yet our Congress wants to reduce men employed in the machinery trades away below the wages of the postman or hod carrier.

Everyone knows who knows anything about Europe that mechanics are cheap there. I have English and Italian mechanics in my employ who acknowledge that they receive wages here from two to three times as much as what they received in the old countries. Yet the proposed

bill is giving us only 25 per cent to compensate for this vast difference in wages.

However slow Europe may be on other lines they are not slow in the manufacture of machinery. They make good machinery, and make it very cheaply, and 25 per cent will not even make competition, but it will surrender our market to them.

If it were possible for us to make machinery in competition with Europe on this 25 per cent basis, no one would be more delighted than I to do so; but it is a physical impossibility, unless, as I have said before, there occurs a sweeping reduction in the price of labor.

On going over the various schedules of the proposed tariff I find on certain goods a tariff of 40 per cent. These goods do not have anywhere near as large a labor cost as the goods which we manufacture. I will instance one class of goods as an illustration. The one I have reference to is card clothing, which cards the wool on the machine, while the goods which I manufacture combs the wool after it is carded preparatory to spinning it into worsted yarns. I am prepared to prove to anyone that the labor cost on the goods that I make is greatly in excess of the labor cost on card clothing. Yet in the old tariff they had 65 per cent, while we had 45 per cent, and a discrimination equally as gross is proposed in the new.

Trusting you will use your influence in an endeavor to defeat this bill, I remain,

Ever truly, one of your constituents,

R. H. HOOD.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the manufacturers of brads, of tacks, of cut nails, of wire nails, of barbed wire, or galvanized fence wire find, when they come to purchase the materials they must use in their factories, that a tariff has been put upon them and that the Steel Trust holds control over those substances.

When they come to sell their products, after they have taken them into their factories and put the work of American laborers upon them, they find they must market them in a market which is entirely unprotected, for all of those articles are put upon the free list. And why are these articles upon the free list? Is there any scientific reason that can be given therefor? No. No matter what you say about how this tariff schedule ought to be prepared, nobody would claim anything of the kind. It is simply economic blundering. They are put there solely for political effect. As the gentleman from Wisconsin has intimated with reference to some other items, they were put there for the purpose of fooling the farmer and the producer, and that is the reason why this schedule is made up in this manner. And yet they will not fool the farmer nor will they fool the producer; they will find simply that the small manufacturer will be compelled to go out of business and that the trust is enabled to keep up its prices. The consumer will gain nothing by having these articles put upon the free list. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania said something about platforms. Neither the gentleman from Pennsylvania nor any of his party is in a position to talk about platforms in connection with this tariff schedule. Why, the Democratic platform declares a protective tariff to be unconstitutional. Will the gentleman think when he comes to vote for a protective tariff upon wool and hair of the Angora goat, and cloth made from it, that it is in accordance with his platform? Does the gentleman think, when he puts a tariff on raw material and makes the finished product free of duty, that it is in accordance with his platform? Does he think, when he puts a duty upon the partly finished product that must be used in a certain line of manufacture and takes it off or makes it lower upon the completed product, that that is in accordance with the provisions of the platform that say they intend to injure no legitimate industry? If that is so, what are legitimate industries? I leave it for the gentlemen to answer. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] has taken unnecessary pains in his expression of the thought that I, as a Pennsylvanian, should blush for shame for anything that has been done in this steel and iron schedule. I want to say to him that I have been as deeply in the fight for tariff reform in Pennsylvania during the last four years as has any man in that State. I think I know the feeling of our people in the great industrial State of Pennsylvania upon this tariff question, and I assert it as my deliberate judgment that there is no State in the Union where the demand for a reduction in the burdens of tariff taxation is greater or louder to-day than in our State. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is evidenced by the fact that in the year 1912 no political party in our State had the nerve to write into its platform a demand for a continuance of the high protective rates. Every political party which wrote a platform in our State that year contained a demand for a reduction of the Payne rates and a demand for the lightening of the burden of tariff taxation. I come from one of the great industrial districts of the country. We have some of the largest industrial plants in the United States within that district. We have the greatest cement mill in the world, the great Atlas Portland Cement Mill, at Northampton, which took the enormous contract for nearly 5,000,000 barrels of cement for the Panama Canal. We have the Bethlehem Steel Works, employing nearly 15,000 men. We have 90 per cent of the slate mined, manufactured, and produced in the United States. All of these things have been highly protected in the Payne law as in previous laws. We have gone into that district with the fight for lower tariff taxes. This tariff question has been the issue in many a hard-fought battle, waged from corner to corner of that district, and upon that issue the present Representative has been returned by such majorities as conclusively prove that our people believe in a reduction of these tariff taxes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the noes seemed to have it.

Upon a division (demanded by Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 54, noes 80.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE D—WOOD AND MANUFACTURES OF.

170. Briar root or briar wood, ivy or laurel root, and similar wood unmanufactured, or not further advanced than cut into blocks suitable for the articles into which they are intended to be converted, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill where briar root or briar wood or laurel root are obtained in the United States.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My information is that this wood is almost entirely, if not entirely, grown in foreign countries. I can give the gentleman the information as far as I have it:

Briar root or briar wood is the root of white heath, which often grows to large size. The roots are gathered extensively in the south of France and in Corsica for the purpose of being made into tobacco pipes commonly called briar-wood pipes.

Mr. MOORE. That is the foreign wood. But I was asking where it is obtained in the United States.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is imported.

Mr. MOORE. There is none in the United States?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. None of which I know.

Mr. MOORE. I have been advised that in North Carolina they undertake to develop brierwood.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman's information is entirely incorrect. I never heard of it.

Mr. MOORE. You think my information is entirely incorrect?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the gentleman will find it in his hearings of four years ago.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I was reading from the notes on the Payne bill, to give the gentleman the information. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. That was before we had the hearings. When we had hearings we paid attention to them. That was made up a year before the hearings.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman ought not to deny his own authority.

Mr. PAYNE. You will catch up in five years.

Mr. MOORE. What I want to say in connection with this question of duty on brierwood is this: It is in the interest of brierwood raisers in North Carolina, and I am glad of it. Ten per cent is imposed; and in addition, unmanufactured amber and amberoid, which enter into the manufacture of pipes, are taken from the free list and put on the dutiable list, the apparent purpose being to raise revenue. I would say that most of the users of the pipes made from brier root and brierwood are of the poorer classes. Many of them are from the South, and some of them being Congressmen, smoke their brierwood pipes here in Washington with a great deal of pleasure. Hereafter, instead of obtaining the pipes as cheaply as before, the users of the pipes in the United States will pay the duty, and the price to the consumer, who likes to smoke his old-fashioned pipe, will not be reduced. In other words, in this particular instance the committee has raised the price to the consumer rather than to reduce the cost.

The Clerk read as follows:

171. Sawed boards, planks, deals, and all forms of sawed cedar, lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods not further manufactured than sawed, 10 per cent ad valorem; veneers of wood, 15 per cent ad valorem; and wood unmanufactured, not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 3, strike out the word "other."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 7, after the words "ad valorem," insert the words, "shingles, 30 cents per thousand."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to restore the present duty upon shingles—shingles being on the free list in this bill.

There are about 440 shingle mills in the State of Washington that cut shingles alone. A large number of shingles are also cut in the mills that cut lumber as well. The 440 straight mills are mostly small and mostly situated in the country. The shingle mills in the State of Washington employ about 15,000 men and pay them about $15,000,000 annually in wages. These men are all white and nearly all American citizens.

Their direct competitors, separated from them only by an imaginary line, are the orientals working in the shingle mills of British Columbia. More than 75 per cent of the labor employed in the shingle mills of British Columbia are Hindus, Chinese, and Japanese. This oriental labor works for far less than the white labor of Washington. They live differently from the white labor of Washington.

Yesterday I received an affidavit, which I hold in my hand, from a man who has recently inspected 16 shingle mills in British Columbia. These mills are typical of all the mills in this Province. This affidavit shows that 75 per cent of the men employed in those mills are Chinese and 5 per cent are Hindus; or, in other words, 80 per cent of the labor working in the shingle mills of British Columbia is oriental.

Here are the latest figures that I have been able to obtain showing the difference in wages in British Columbia and my State:

	Cents.
Sawing, per 1,000, in British Columbia	12
Sawing, per 1,000, in Washington	19
Packing, per 1,000, in British Columbia	7
Packing, per 1,000, in Washington	10

A common laborer in British Columbia receives $1.50 a day.
A common laborer in Washington receives $2.50 to $3.25 a day.
Filers in British Columbia, $6 per day.
Filers in Washington, $9 per day.
Price of logs in British Columbia, $8 to $9 per 1,000.
Price of logs in Washington, $11 to $14 per 1,000.

Owing to the character of the timber, it also costs more to work it than it does the timber of British Columbia. Mr. J. H. Bloedel, who is one of the foremost millmen of the State of Washington and who owns shingle mills both in British Columbia and the State of Washington, has testified that the labor cost in British Columbia is 25 cents a thousand. In the State of Washington it is 55 cents a thousand.

Is it expected that American labor shall compete with this oriental labor, or shall the shingle mills of Washington close? One result or the other is inevitable.

In the State of Washington the shingle mill is largely the scavenger of the forest. It cuts what the sawmills leave. It takes the stumps and pieces of logs generally charred and blackened by fire. In British Columbia the oriental labor cuts mostly clean and green timber. Not only does the shingle mill in the State of Washington give employment to labor at high and living wages but it also conserves our forests by largely cutting timber stumps, tops, and parts of logs that would otherwise rot or be burned clearing the land.

In order that the House may understand more fully the character of the labor in British Columbia that the Democratic Party proposes that American labor should directly compete with, I will show a few pictures taken at the mills in British Columbia.

Here are the photographs of British Columbia mills taken only a few days ago. [Exhibiting pictures.] In this photograph you see the Chinaman and in this one you see the Hindu. I ask the Democratic majority, Do you intend to bring American labor in the State of Washington into direct competition with this oriental labor, with the Hindus and the Chinese? And that is precisely what this bill will do if you pass it. If you pass this bill and compel American labor in the State of Washington to compete with oriental labor just across the national border, then I hope no gentleman on the Democratic side will again attempt to mislead the House and the country by making speeches against oriental labor, as has recently been done by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

The Democratic Party is welcome to any glory that it can obtain by bringing American labor into contact with this oriental labor. And what reply has the Democratic Party made to the American laborer working in the shingle mills in the State of Washington? What consolation has been given him? The Democratic Party, speaking through President Wilson, tells the American workman in the State of Washington that he will have the high privilege of whetting his wits in competition with oriental labor.

The Democratic Party gives the American workingman in my State the privilege of whetting his wits until he can live as the Japanese live, until he can live on the pay that the Japanese receives. The Democratic Party gives him the privilege of whetting his wits until he can live as the heathen Hindu lives. The Democratic Party gives the American workingman the high privilege of whetting his wits until he can live as cheaply as the Chinaman lives. [Applause on the Republican side.]

There are 300,000 voters in my State that live directly upon wages earned in the forests that, by this competition with oriental labor will have their wits so sharpened that they will demonstrate at the next opportunity that they are not so stupid as to vote the Democratic ticket. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Admitting shingles free into the State of Washington will not lower the price to the consumer. In Canada they have a Shingle Trust. No attempt is made to conceal the fact. The Government does not attempt to prohibit it. They permit only so many machines to be run. Each community is allotted its number, and can not operate any more. This is avowedly done for the purpose of keeping up the prices. When we have free shingles, the prices will only be lowered sufficiently to get into our market. As soon as our mills close prices will be increased. The Canadian is selling his shingles in our country not for our advantage but for his own. We know by experience what they will do. We do not have to guess. At one time Canada sold to us 5,000 carloads in a single year; but the American consumer did not get his shingles for any less. Our mills were closing six months in the year, while the mills across the line were busy. The work and wages were simply transferred from Washington to British Columbia—from the American workman to the oriental. But the American consumer still paid the same price for his shingles.

The history of the shingle industry is the history of every industry in America that has been protected from the destruction of cheap foreign labor. Every time we buy a bale of shingles from British Columbia we take just that much work and that much labor from the Americans and give it to the foreigners.

The result of this bill will be to again largely transfer the shingle industry from the State of Washington to British Columbia. It will mean that $10,000,000 annually in work and wages will be taken from American labor in the State of Washington and given to the oriental labor across the line. It means that the Democratic Party will take the daily bread from 60,000 men, women, and children in the State of Washington, and in the name of free trade, low prices, and college statesmanship give it to the Hindu and the Chinaman and the Japanese.

They may give us cheap prices. They did once before. We had a "Prof. Wilson" then as we have a "Prof. Wilson" now that was the high priest of Democracy and the anointed prophet of free trade. Yes; prices were low—so low that you could get a good meal in many cities of the United States for 5 cents. That this bill may bring again those splendid days of Democratic cheapness I admit. There is no reason for placing shingles upon the free list but a sectional one and a political one. If it were a little peanut industry in the South, it would be protected as rice and peanuts are protected. If the shingle industry was located in Pennsylvania or Indiana or Minnesota or in any State that had a Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee, it would have been protected. It is sacrificed for political purposes only, because it is a Pacific coast industry. This bill will destroy this industry as it will many others, but there is no hope of amending it, so let it be enacted quickly. Let the tragedy be perpetrated at once in order that the people may the more quickly have the experience and the more quickly determine, as they will, to wipe the sectional monstrosity from the statute books.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this schedule—I understand that gentlemen all want to talk about lumber—close in 35 minutes, and that 25 minutes of that time go to the other side.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. FALCONER] wishes to talk on an amendment that he will offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has the floor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing to agree about the length of the debate on this schedule, but I do not want a prolonged debate.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not wish to cut off Members who desire to offer amendments to the lumber schedule?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no; all gentlemen who desire to do so can offer amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The Asiatic, oriental proposition that is involved in admitting the lumber of British Columbia is the most important question now before the people of the United States. It overshadows the whole tariff bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. I am going to object to the limitation of time suggested by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I shall be very glad to see if we can make an arrangement with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] if other gentlemen will keep quiet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the matter can be accommodated much more readily if gentlemen will be in order. All gentlemen will please be seated.

Mr. MANN. Now, let us see if we can come to an agreement. How many gentlemen on this side desire time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I desire time.

Mr. MANN. That will be 5 minutes.

Mr. POWERS. I desire time.

Mr. MANN. That will be 10 minutes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I desire 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. That makes 15.

Mr. FALCONER. I desire 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. That makes 20.

Mr. FORDNEY. I desire 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. That makes 25.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I desire 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. That makes 30.

Mr. MOORE. I desire 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. That makes 35.

Mr. LANGLEY. I desire 5 minutes

Mr. MANN. That makes 40. On this side there are gentlemen who desire a total of 40 minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Make it an hour.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on Schedule D—the lumber schedule—conclude in 50 minutes—40 minutes to go to that side of the House and 10 minutes to this side of the House—and that all amendments may be pending and voted on at the conclusion of the debate.

Mr. MANN. Make it so that gentlemen may offer their amendments to be voted on when the paragraphs are read.

Mr. FORDNEY. You will have to dispose of a million dollars a minute. There is $40,000,000 involved in this.

Mr. GARNER. We can do that. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that all debate on Schedule D close in 50 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I understand there will be 50 minutes' debate. The 50 minutes does not include the reading of the paragraph or the offering of amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. No; 50 minutes' debate—40 minutes to go to the minority side of the House and 10 minutes to the majority, the time to be controlled by the Chair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Chair may make the recognitions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, 65 per cent of all the wooden shingles consumed in the United States are made in the State of Washington. One-fourth of all the men in British Columbia are orientals, and there are few oriental women. Nearly 80 per cent of all the workingmen in British Columbia are either Chinese, Japanese, or Hindu. The shingle industry in the State of Washington can not go against this competition. I desire to read to you a short telegraphic dispatch printed in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer under date of April 22, this year:

VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA,
Monday, April 21, 1913.

Under the terms of the Anglo-Japanese treaty, recently ratified by the Canadian Government, and going into effect May 1, 1913, the Japanese have practically an open door to Canada.

Prominent Japanese recently in Vancouver are authority for the above statement. The McBride government has recently ratified the action of the Dominion Government.

The Anglo-Japanese treaty prohibits any action being taken by the provincial governments.

Now, then, in order that this may be thoroughly understood, I desire to make a few explanatory statements of the immigration laws of Canada.

First. Natives of India—that is, Hindus—are British subjects, and under the law of Great Britain and Canada have the right to enter the latter Provinces and work there, provided that they pass a medical examination and have sufficient money on their person at the time of entering the country to insure their not becoming a public charge until they have had reasonable time to find employment. The sum of $25 on his person is a passport for the Hindu into British Columbia.

Second. The Chinese are permitted to enter and work in British Columbia on payment of a head tax of $500 in each case and the passage of a medical examination.

Let me say here that I want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] for the introduction into the RECORD of the paragraphs from President Wilson's books, showing the mechanical ability of the Chinese, and I propose to place in the RECORD, if my searchers now at work in the Congressional Library can find copies of the speeches made by the present Secretary of State, William J. Bryan, concerning the Japanese, at the time when he declared that imperialism was the paramount issue.

To revert to the head tax, and treat it from an economical standpoint, it costs $500 and traveling expenses to put a Chinese workman into a lumber job in British Columbia. That $500, borrowed at 6 per cent interest, amounts to a yearly cost of $30, or about 10 cents per working day. Therefore the present difference between the cost of obtaining Chinese labor and other labor in British Columbia is fundamentally 10 cents per day.

Third. Under a treaty between Great Britain and Japan, which goes into effect May 1, Japanese subjects have a right to freely enter British Columbia and to work therein in the shingle industry, the lumber industry, the lime industry, and nearly every other industry. Perhaps Vancouver, British Columbia, will become the shoe center of the United States.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman state how he accounts for the fact that 50,000 American farmers have crossed the line to Canada, seeking homes, if this horde of laborers is about to deluge Canada?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. These hordes have not crossed the divide yet; they are still west of the Cascades clearing timber, grubbing 2 feet to get to the ground before they can get to agriculture. This shingle bill will stop our people from clearing the land that they are going to live on.

Mr. KEATING. It will keep our people at home, will it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I can not yield any further. The gentleman and myself can talk it over when we reach the schedule of agriculture.

Vancouver, British Columbia, lies close to our territory, and if the old "fifty-four forty or fight" had prevailed, as our fathers hoped for, Vancouver should now be an American city, with, thank God, the Chinese barred and the Japanese restricted, while the Hindus could be run out of there just as we ran them out of Grays Harbor, my home.

Fourth. While Japanese may enter British Columbia freely, there is, however, what might be termed a gentleman's agreement between some of the officials of the Dominion of Canada and those of the Japanese Empire, by which Japanese immigration is limited as occasion requires. A similar policy prevails as to the Chinese.

The Chinese head tax is used as a sliding scale, letting Chinese coolies in when there are openings for them and excluding them by raising the head tax when there are no labor opportunities. In other words, the Dominion lets Chinese labor in or shuts them out just as it regulates the shipment of wood pulp into the United States. I have very little time in which to go into the dangers of Asiatic immigration across the boundaries of the State of Washington. Bubonic plague, riots, and all those troubles are with us. In the city of Bellingham, Wash., the white race recently lined up against the Asiatics. The papers are full of California's struggle against the Japanese. In passing I would like to say, "How would you like to have your little 6-year-old daughter sit in school beside a 25-year-old Japanese fresh from the manure pile?"

Mr. Chairman, I desire to reintroduce into the RECORD some remarks on the necessity for lumber and shingle duties made a few years ago by my illustrious and honored predecessor, Francis W. Cushman, who on this floor sacrificed his life as truly as any soldier on any battle field to the cause of the Constitution, the flag, and the state. [Applause.]

I will also introduce the timber laws of British Columbia, showing the terms by which that Province gives Crown grants, special leases, and how they print the United States tariff schedules on lumber in their Timberman's Guide for the benefit of their lumbermen. Oh, if we had only had a tariff commission to do as much for us. Then perhaps we new politicians

would not be obliged to dodge the name of Payne as if he were the ghost that pursued Tam O'Shanter.

I desire to introduce into the RECORD the text of the Anglo-Japanese alliance, and I commend to every member of the majority this book, The Valor of Ignorance, by Homer Lea.

I want to also introduce into the RECORD the protest of the Shingle Weavers' Union and statements against reduction on shingles and protests from many civic organizations with regard to the jeopardizing of our industries in the West by continuing the lax so-called gentleman's agreement between the high officials of the United States and those of Japan.

I want to prove to you by actual reports that British Columbia shingles, after paying a duty of 50 cents a thousand, sell in the New York market to-day at just exactly 10 cents higher than our shingles.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a district which has a thousand miles of shore line—enough to reach from Boston, Mass., to Charleston, S. C. I have an interest in that shore line. My district has two great forest reserves, two gigantic national parks; one-half of the district is conserved, and in the remaining territory there are about 60,000 Republican voters of all varieties, and I represent them. There are about 15,000 Democratic voters in all of that great district of 20,000 square miles, and I represent them, as well as 60,000 Republicans of various degrees. There are about 200 shingle mills in my district, and I represent them, although I have no interest in any one of them, and after this bill is passed I would not accept the whole 200 as a gift.

I can almost regret that in all the great Northwest not a single Democrat came to Congress to sit in that secret "caucus Congress" which framed this bill. A single Democrat from our great section could have told that caucus some startling things. But I need not worry, for your great Democrat, your peerless leader, W. J. Bryan, the Secretary of State, will come back from the Pacific in a few days with information that will startle the President of the United States, who wants to match wits with the world.

How can the sizzling solon from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] in the last month of the last session of Congress vote against a battleship program, and in the first month of this Congress cry out on the floor these words: "If we must have war or submit to this indignity, I am for war." How can he vote for this tariff bill in view of this statement?

And my far-sighted friend, the gentleman from Alabama, Capt. HOBSON, who knows all these facts, how can he vote for this bill? Will the income tax alone be enough to build the battleships that he knows we must have? [Applause.]

I will print as a part of my remarks the following:

To the CONGRESSMAN SECOND DISTRICT, WASHINGTON:

Twenty-five thousand organized workmen in State of Washington vigorously protest against reduction of tariff on lumber. We do not want our wages reduced.

CHAS. PERRY TAYLOR,
Secretary Washington Federation of Labor.

Also the following telegrams:

ROCKPORT MILL CO.,
Seattle, Wash., April 15, 1913.

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If you want to put the hundreds of little shingle mills, that give employment to thousands, out of business, then help take off the tariff on shingles.

It is absolutely a question of a living with us, and we should be protected and for at least 50 cents a thousand.

We use timber that would be a complete waste were it not for this industry.

Now, all we can do is to ask your help in our protection.

Yours, very truly,

ROCKPORT MILL CO.,
By GEO. C. LEMCKE, *President.*

ABERDEEN, WASH., *April 15, 1913.*

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON, *Washington, D. C.:*

Realizing that any material reduction of the duty on shingles would throw vast quantities of British Columbia shingles, manufactured by cheap oriental labor, into competition with our shingles, and thus practically kill this industry in Washington, the Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce earnestly request you to exert your utmost power in procuring the same provision in the new tariff law as is now in effect.

N. P. BRYAN.

HOQUIAM, WASH., *April 16, 1913.*

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

One thousand men living in Chehalis County, earning $4,000 per day, and $6,500,000 invested in cedar mills and timber, demand protection from cheap oriental timber and oriental labor. If you remove shingle tariff you kill American shingle business.

HOQUIAM COMMERCIAL CLUB.
W. L. ADAMS.
J. A. LEWIS.
THOS. HUTCHINSON.

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 9, 1913.*

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON, *Washington, D. C.:*

When we had a 30-cent duty on shingles British Columbia mills with oriental labor shipped 5,000 cars annually into United States. Western Washington mills now cut and ship 35,000 cars a year, supplying 65 per cent of shingles consumed in United States; most of these shingles are cut from low-grade cedar from stumps, broken and burned cedar, and windfalls by white labor. Much of the credit for the agricultural development of Washington is due to the small Washington shingle mills utilizing what would otherwise be an economical waste. Free shingles will give British Columbia mills our American markets and cause great suffering and loss to citizens of Washington. We should at least have a 30-cent duty, and we urge and expect your untiring efforts to that end.

PACIFIC COAST SHIPPERS' ASSOCIATION.

RAYMOND COMMERCIAL CLUB,
Raymond, Wash., April 18, 1913.

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As the tariff revision is to be undertaken by the present Congress, and as this section of the country depends upon the lumber industry almost entirely for its prosperity, we earnestly urge that the duty on lumber and shingles be at least maintained and if possible advanced.

We believe that by voting for the protective tariff on lumber and shingles that you will be carrying out the wishes of the majority of your constituents.

Very truly, yours,

RAYMOND COMMERCIAL CLUB,
Per W. W. HAYS, *Secretary.*

Mr. Chairman, I have hundreds of other protests, with which I will not burden the RECORD. I thank you.

STATEMENT NO. 1.

As an appendix to the book of Homer Lea, entitled "The Valor of Ignorance," will be found the Anglo-Japanese alliance, adopted at the time of Japan's war with Russia. A copy of the new Anglo-Japanese alliance, by which the Japanese receive additional favors in Canada, will soon be available for this record. In this connection read Homer Lea's The Day of the Saxon.

STATEMENT NO. 2.

I desire to take from the appendix of the book of Homer Lea, entitled "The Valor of Ignorance," the following statements concerning the first expression of the anti-Japanese sentiment in California, and I desire to add that an anti-Chinese sentiment has existed in the State of Washington since before the State was admitted to the Union in 1889 and prevailed to such an extent that Chinese were not allowed to remain among us:

The first expression of anti-Japanese sentiment did not occur until 1900, when a mass meeting was held in San Francisco.

In 1904, at the twenty-fourth annual session of the American Federation of Labor (2,500,000 members), resolutions were passed to permanently exclude the Japanese from the United States and its insular Territories. These resolutions were reaffirmed at the annual sessions in 1905 and 1906. During 1905, 12 great national conventions indorsed and adopted the same resolutions, as did 539 other organizations, comprising civic, fraternal, political, and labor associations.

* * * * * * *

In 1908 there was established in general convention the Asiatic Exclusion League of North America, the outgrowth of the Japanese-Korean Exclusion League of 1906. This league has branches in all of the Western States.

STATEMENT NO. 3.

Memorial of the First Convention of the Asiatic Exclusion League of North America in a regular session held in Seattle, Wash. They entered requests and protests as follows:

Request the immediate passage of a law which will exclude, absolutely and emphatically, all Asiatics from the mainland and insular possessions of the United States; and your memorialists do hereby emphatically

Protest against the administrative and executive officers of the United States entering into any agreement which will permit the ruler of any foreign country to make stipulations as to what class of persons, and in what numbers, shall leave said foreign country for the purpose of immigrating to the United States; and your memorialists

Declare that any such agreement with a foreign power is a subversion of the traditions and policies of the United States and a betrayal of the rights of American citizens. Your memorialists further

Protest against the employment of Asiatics on board vessels flying the American flag to the exclusion of American seamen and in violation of American law; therefore, your memorialists

Pray for the speedy enactment of a law which will prohibit the employment of Asiatics upon all vessels flying the American flag, or in any branch or department of the public service; your memorialists again emphatically

Protest against the continuance of Asiatic immigration upon the exalted grounds of American patriotism, for the reasons—

First. That these Asiatics come to the United States entirely ignorant of our sentiments of nativity and patriotism, and utterly unfit and incapable of discharging the duties of American citizenship.

Second. The introduction of this incongruous and nonassimilable element into our national life will inevitably impair and degrade, if not effectually destroy, our cherished institutions and our American life.

Third. These Asiatics are alien to our ideas of patriotism, morality, loyalty, and the highest conception of Christian civilization.

Fourth. Their presence here is a degrading and contaminating influence to the best phases of American life.

Fifth. With their low standard of living, immoral surroundings, and cheap labor, they constitute a formidable and fierce competition against our American system—the pride and glory of our civilization—and unless prohibited by effective legislation will result in the irreparable deterioration of American labor.

Sixth. The living in our midst of a large body of Asiatics, the greatest number of whom are armed, loyal to their Government, enter-

taining feelings of distrust, if not of hostility, to our people, without any allegiance to our Government or our institutions, not sustaining American life in times of peace, and ever ready to respond to the cause of their own nations in times of war, make these Asiatics an appalling menace to the American Republic, the splendid achievements wrought by the strong arms and loyal hearts of Caucasian toilers, patriots, and heroes in every walk of life.

I desire to quote Senator LODGE in commenting upon the anti-Japanese movement in a speech at Boston as saying:

Such a movement of people as this is in itself a historic event of great magnitude, deserving the most careful consideration; but what we are concerned with is its effect upon and its meaning to the people of the United States and the future of our country.

STATEMENT NO. 4.

I wish to present a statement prepared and presented to the House of Representatives by my lamented and honored predecessor, Francis W. Cushman, as to the position of our lumber industry in relation to Canada:

Look at that part of the chart that deals with shingles. In the year 1908 Canada sent into the United States 329 times as many shingles as we sent into Canada in the same year. And yet we boast that we believe in protecting home industries and home labor. Any American who has any red corpuscles left in him can not look at that chart and not blush. The American tariff on shingles ought to be raised from 30 cents to 60 cents a thousand, and then we would begin to manufacture our own shingles at home, and the price to the consumer would be little, if any, greater than it is now.

I will add another table of figures showing the shingles and lumber exported and imported between the United States and Canada during the past five years:

Shingles imported into the United States from Canada and exported from the United States to Canada.

	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908
Imported...	770,372,000	758,725,000	900,806,000	880,903,000	987,266,000
Exported...	7,009,000	6,867,000	8,005,000	2,013,000	2,955,000

Total imports shingles for 5 years from Canada..... 4,298,072,000
Total exports shingles for 5 years to Canada..... 27,809,000

Excess imports over exports..... 4,270,263,000

In 5 years 158 times as many.

Valuation of shingles imported and exported between the United States and Canada.

	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908
Imported...	$1,602,998	$1,581,421	$1,852,512	$1,939,791	$2,376,394
Exported...	14,186	13,212	16,377	4,265	8,873

Total value shingles imported 5 years from Canada..... $9,353,071
Total value shingles exported 5 years to Canada..... 56,913

Excess imports over exports..... 9,296,158

In five years value one hundred and sixty-four times as much.

Please note the steady increase in the quantities of the stuff that Canada is sending to us and the steady decrease of similar products we are sending to her. If that chart were a little wider and contained the record of a few more years, the United States would be clear off the commercial map.

STATEMENT NO. 5.

I also desire to present the following affidavit of Charles C. Hone, who was employed by the Pacific Coast Shippers' Association, of Seattle, Wash., and the Red Cedar Manufacturers' Association, also of Seattle, in which is set forth the relative number of Chinese, Hindus, and whites employed in the shingle mills of British Columbia which he investigated. I would like to direct particular attention to the wages paid Asiatic employees working in these shingle mills.

The statement of Fred A. Traill, treasurer and manager of the Red Cedar Shingle Manufacturers' Association, sets forth the scale of wages of the white employees in the shingle mills of the State of Washington. This statement follows the statement of Mr. Hone.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, *County of King, ss:*

Charles C. Hone, being first duly sworn, on oath deposes and says:

That he was employed by the Pacific Coast Shippers' Association, of Seattle, Wash., and the Red Cedar Shingle Manufacturers' Association, of Seattle, Wash., to inspect shingle-manufacturing plants in western British Columbia, and to investigate and determine the capacity of said plants and the number and races of the employees of each of said plants.

That he personally inspected, from April 15, 1913, to April 18, 1913, inclusive, plants of the following concerns:

Robertson & Hackett, Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.
Robert McNair Shingle Co., Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.
Albert Cotton, Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.
Thomas Kirkpatrick, Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.
Imperial Shingle Co., Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.
Joseph Chew Lumber & Shingle Co., Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.
Lulu Shingle Co., Eburne, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.
Westminster Mill Co., New Westminster, British Columbia, on April 16, 1913.
Royal City Lumber & Shingle Co., New Westminster, British Columbia, on April 16, 1913.
Brunette Saw Mill Co., Sapperton, British Columbia, on April 16, 1913.
Cascade Mills (Ltd.), Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 17, 1913.
Thurston Flavelle Lumber Co., Port Moody, British Columbia, on April 17, 1913.
Port Moody Shingle Co., Port Moody, British Columbia, on April 17, 1913.
New Ladysmith Lumber Co., Nanaimo, British Columbia, on April 18, 1913.
Victoria Lumber & Manufacturing Co., Chemanius, British Columbia, on April 18, 1913.
Victoria Shingle Co., Victoria, British Columbia, on April 18, 1913.

As the result of my personal investigation and inspection I found that the number and races of the employees engaged in and about the plants of the above-named concerns were as follows:

	Chinese.	Hindus.	White.	Total.
Sawyers	58	.....	12	70
Packers	69	.....	.....	69
All other employees [1]	94	5	53	152
Total	221	5	65	291

[1] Covers bolt passers, cut-off men, block pilers, hand sawyers, clipper men, refuse movers, band nailers, car loaders, and common laborers.

From these figures the percentage of white employees compared with the percentage of oriental employees engaged is as follows: Asiatic employees, 80 per cent; white employees, 20 per cent.

On inquiry as to the wages paid Asiatic employees by the above-mentioned concerns, I have arrived at the following averages:

Shingle sawyers (Asiatic employees), 12 cents to 13 cents per thousand.
Shingle packers (Asiatic employees), 6 cents to 7½ cents per thousand.
All other (Asiatic employees), $1.40 to $1.70 per day.

CHAS. C. HONE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of April, 1913.
[SEAL.] JOSEPH B. ALEXANDER,
Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, Residing at Seattle.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, *County of King, ss:*

Fred A. Traill, being first duly sworn, on oath deposes and says that he is treasurer and manager of the Red Cedar Shingle Manufacturers' Association, an organization incorporated under the laws of the State of Washington, composed of about 200 shingle manufacturers who manufacture about 65 per cent of the shingle output of the State of Washington.

That I am entirely familiar with the wages paid shingle sawyers (white employees), shingle packers (white employees), and all others (white employees) in the shingle manufacturing plants on the Puget Sound, State of Washington.

The following is the scale of wages:
Shingle sawyers (white employees), 16 cents to 19 cents per thousand.
Shingle packers (white employees), 9 cents to 10 cents per thousand.
Knee bolters (white employees), $3.50 to $4.50 per day.
Drag sawyers (white employees), $3.50 to $5 per day.
Common laborers (white employees), $2 to $2.50 per day.

F. A. TRAILL.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of April, 1913.
[SEAL.] JOSEPH B. ALEXANDER,
Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, Residing at Seattle.

I am in possession of fully 1,000 letters and telegrams protesting against the destruction of the shingle industry, but as no opportunity has been given to present these in a hearing on the lumber schedule, and as no Democrat has voted otherwise than directed by his leaders, it seems useless to carry them in the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Let me, in conclusion, add a condensation of the British Columbia timber laws and taxation rules. Notice the simplicity and the low price for leasing:

STATEMENT NO. 6.

All land in the Province of British Columbia not the subject of private ownership is subject to the disposal of the provincial authorities, save the lands in the railway belt. The railway belt is a strip of about 20 miles on each side of the Canadian Pacific Railway as far west as Port Moody, the statutory terminus. The timber on provincial lands up to the present time has been disposed of either by Crown grant, lease, or license.

Crown grant or patent gives absolute ownership in fee simple to land and timber thereon, and on the timber taken from land covered by deeds issued prior to the 7th of April, 1887, there is a tax of from $1 to $4 per 1,000, which is refunded if the logs are manufactured into lumber in Canada. On all timber cut on deeded Crown-grant lands issued since the 7th of April, 1887, and prior to the 12th of March, 1906, there is a royalty of 50 cents per thousand and no tax. Both these classes are exportable.

On any timber cut from Crown lands or from Crown-granted lands deeded since the 12th of March, 1906, there is a royalty of 50 cents per thousand, but the logs are not exportable until manufactured.

Dominion leases give the holder the right of all the timber on the land held under lease until cut. The charges on the same are as follows: A ground rent of 5 cents per acre per year in advance and a stumpage or royalty of 50 cents per thousand when cut. There is a charge for fire dues, which is too small to take into consideration.

Prior to 1905 the provincial government, which controls all the timber of British Columbia outside of the Canadian Pacific Railway belt, issued leases covering timberlands, which gave the holder of such leases the right to all the timber on the lands covered by the lease for a period of 21 years, with a ground rent of 10 cents per acre per year and 50 cents per thousand stumpage when cut. These leases can be surrendered at any time and renewed for another 21 years under existing laws in force at time of surrendering.

The provincial government up to 1908 issued special provincial licenses for 21 years from date of issue, which gave the holder the right

to all the timber on the land for 21 years, at a ground rent of $140 per annum per section of 640 acres and 50 cents per thousand stumpage when cut.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the committee's attention to the fact that on page 46 cedar lumber is put on the protected list at 10 per cent ad valorem, and on page 128 cedar shingles are put on the free list. It costs twice as much in labor and other expenses to convert a thousand feet of cedar logs into shingles as it does to convert a thousand feet of logs into lumber. You have therefore put a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem on lumber when imported into this country which sells at about $25 per thousand feet, or $2.50 a thousand feet protection, and you can not truthfully call it anything else, and you have put the product of that thousand feet of logs in shingles on the free list. Shingles are made out of many kinds of wood—cedar, redwood, cypress, pine, fir, and many other kinds of timber.

The gentleman will say that this is cabinet wood. You have made no distinction between Spanish cedar and British Columbia cedar, or any other cedar; so that cedar lumber will come in under that paragraph and pay a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem, and you put shingles on the free list. Show me the consistency between the two when one costs twice as much as the other.

Again, gentlemen, you forget. Remember now this is a special interest. I have got some personal interest and therefore I should not be permitted to talk on the subject. If I do I may be subjected to severe criticism as was my friend from Pennsylvania yesterday when he talked about shoe eyelets. I am a lumberman; I am not a shingle manufacturer. My wife had an uncle whose cousin had a brother married to a girl whose uncle was in the shingle business. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What relation are you to her?

Mr. PALMER. Can the gentleman describe that again and get it the same way? [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. There are 49,000 saw and shingle mills in the United States, employing 800,000 laboring men. These men and their families get their bread and butter from that industry. Talk about monopoly! The Bureau of Corporations spent half a million dollars and five years time in trying to find a monopoly or a trust in the manufacture of lumber and shingles in this country, and then reported their absolute failure to do so. My friends, you are striking a blow at an industry the product of which last year amounted to $40,000,000, one-half of which went into the pockets of the men who were employed in that industry, not including the men in the lumber camps. I am speaking of the men in the saw and shingle mills of this country. You are going to do this. You are going to put shingles on the free list and lumber on the free list. Lumber is now on the protected list and pays the smallest rate of duty of anything mentioned in the protective law, with the single exception of fish. You are going to take away that little morsel of protection, when everything that the manufacturer of lumber and shingles uses in the way of tools, machinery, clothing, food supply, everything that is used in the sawmill or in the lumber camp, is on the protected list. You propose now to give them free potatoes and free pork——

Mr. RAKER. And free beef?

Mr. FORDNEY. Beef! Oh, granny's nightcap! Cattle on the protective list and beef on the free list! Another inconsistency from the Democratic side of the House—raw material on the protective list and the finished product on the free list. Not protection. Do not use the word "protection," for your life. Revenue, revenue—cattle on the protective list because we need the revenue, and we are going to get it, too. So it goes all down the line. But gentlemen on that side of the House forget when putting shingles on the free list that the industry in the Northwest, where the great bulk of the shingles come from, needs that protection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman, it was my intention to offer an amendment to the amendment; but when this Ways and Means Committee can dispose of $40,000,000 in 40 minutes, I will say that they are moving too rapidly for me, and I will not offer the amendment.

I want to submit, however, that 54 per cent of the standing timber in the United States is in the States of Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho, and Montana, and yet the men who are at the head of affairs in this House have not seen fit to put one man from any of these States on the Committee on Ways and Means.

In your reckless revelry of tariff tinkering you are putting an industry in the State of Washington out of business. I am not here to talk for a duty on lumber; that is a different matter. But I do say that any man who stands up on the floor of this House and says that shingles should be put on the free list has a very crazy idea of the economics that affect much of the territory in the northwestern part of the United States.

Labor! You Japanese, Chinese, Hindu lovers! [Laughter on the Republican side.] I hope the gentleman from Illinois who talked for the laboring man yesterday will vote right this morning. He says he is a man who was elected for the welfare of and to protect the labor interests. Any man who has an ounce of brains in his cranium knows that he is putting the labor interest in the shingle industry in this country to the bad, and so far to the bad that men engaged in it will be looking for other employment inside of the next two years. What are the conditions obtaining in the shingle industry?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALCONER. Yes; briefly.

Mr. RAKER. Does the gentleman know what percentage of Japanese, Hindu, and Chinese——

Mr. FALCONER. Yes; 80 per cent are working in the shingle mills of British Columbia, and I will file an affidavit of an investigation showing that.

Mr. RAKER. I mean in Oregon and Washington.

Mr. FALCONER. Less than 1 per cent. [Applause on the Progressive side.] More than 99 per cent of the men in the shingle industry in the States of Washington, Oregon, Montana, and Idaho are American citizens, or eligible to be so.

Mr. MANN. And the gentleman from California will vote for the Chinese, Japanese, and Hindus who work in British Columbia.

Mr. FALCONER. I have not time to yield more.

Mr. RAKER. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it is the Republican Party that is responsible for the Chinese, Japanese, and Hindus up to the present time.

Mr. FALCONER. The gentleman and his party are trying to let in the Japanese now.

Mr. RAKER. And you have never raised your voice——

Mr. FALCONER. Your party is trying to put them in California—you and your President, who is a master of fine phraseology, but who knows nothing about the economics involving the shingle industry——

Mr. RAKER. Your President recommended that——

Mr. FALCONER. This is not a question of anyone's President or party. I am dealing with the item involving the shingle industry. Mr. Chairman, these gentlemen who are so enthusiastic in protecting the Chinese, Hindus, and Japanese, are the men who are working for the special interests; special interests that control certain lines of industry and who make a vast amount of money importing just this kind of labor, and you know it and the gentleman from Chicago who spoke yesterday knows it.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. FALCONER. I am not going to yield. We do not allow Chinese to stay in Snohomish County or any of those counties in Washington where shingles are made. With regard to the gentleman from California who persists in interrupting, I will say that he demonstrates the fact that when you get a Democrat started on the wrong road—and he is wrong on this subject—he does not know when to stop, and he exhibits his inconsistency now on the floor of this House.

What does it mean to labor? You talk of the exclusion of the Chinese. Eight thousand Chinese went into British Columbia in two years. There is supposed to be a tax of $500 per capita to enter. They do not pay $500 per capita. The Dominion of Canada has a "gentleman's" agreement with the Japanese Government that only 500 a year shall have passports to British Columbia; and the fact of the matter is that 11,000 came in 1907 and 1908.

I have been in the shingle business, not, however, for 10 years. I now have no interest, either directly or indirectly, but I do know the business, gentlemen, and I want to say that I or anyone, if shingles are placed on the free list, together with the opening of the Panama Canal, can ship shingles from British Columbia, in foreign ships through the canal, to every seaport city in the United States. Under the present conditions of 50 cents duty, Canada has imported about 6 per cent of the shingles used in the United States. Why take the duty off now? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FALCONER] has expired.

Mr. FALCONER. I wish to extend my remarks and include a clipping from the Everett Morning Tribune of April 22, and the following affidavits:

[From the Everett Morning Tribune, Apr. 22.]

JAPANESE NOW HAVE OPEN DOOR TO CANADA.

VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA, *April 21, 1913.*

Under the terms of the Anglo-Japanese treaty, recently ratified by the Canadian Government and going into effect May 1, 1913, the Japanese have practically an open door to Canada.

Prominent Japanese recently in Vancouver are authority for the above statement. The policy of the McBride government has apparently been against oriental immigration, but only recently it ratified the action of the Dominion government.

The Anglo-Japanese treaty prohibits any action being taken by the provincial governments.

—

STATE OF WASHINGTON, *County of King, ss:*

Charles C. Hone, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says:

That he was employed by the Pacific Coast Shippers' Association of Seattle, Wash., and the Red Cedar Shingle Manufacturers' Association of Seattle, Wash., to inspect shingle manufacturing plants in western British Columbia and to investigate and determine the capacity of said plants and the number and races of the employees of each of said plants.

That he personally inspected from April 15, 1913, to April 18, 1913, inclusive, plants of the following concerns:

Robertson & Hackett, Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Robt. McNair Shingle Co., Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Albert Cotton, Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Thos. Kirkpatrick, Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Imperial Shingle Co., Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Jos. Chew Lumber & Shingle Co., Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Lulu Shingle Co., Eburne, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Westminster Mill Co., New Westminster, British Columbia, on April 16, 1913.

Royal City Lumber & Shingle Co., New Westminster, British Columbia, on April 16, 1913.

Brunette Saw Mill Co., Sapperton, British Columbia, on April 16, 1913.

Cascade Mills (Ltd.), Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 17, 1913.

Thurston Flavelle Lumber Co., Port Moody, British Columbia, on April 17, 1913.

Port Moody Shingle Co., Port Moody, British Columbia, on April 17, 1913.

New Ladysmith Lumber Co., Nanaimo, British Columbia, on April 18, 1913.

Victoria Lumber & Manufacturing Co., Chemanius, British Columbia, on April 18, 1913.

Victoria Shingle Co., Victoria, British Columbia, on April 18, 1913.

As the result of my personal investigation and inspection, I found that the number and races of the employees engaged in and about the plants of the above-named concerns were as follows:

	Chinese.	Hindus.	White.	Total.
Sawyers	58	.....	12	70
Packers	69	.....	.....	69
All other employees [1]	94	5	53	152
Total	221	5	65	291

[1] Covers bolt passers, cut-off men, block pilers, hand sawyers, clippermen, refuse movers, band nailers, car loaders, and common laborers.

From these figures the percentage of white employees compared with the percentage of oriental employees engaged is as follows: Asiatic employees, 80 per cent; white employees, 20 per cent.

On inquiry as to the wages paid Asiatic employees by the above-mentioned concerns, I have arrived at the following averages:

Shingle sawyers, 12 cents to 13 cents per thousand.

Shingle packers, 6 cents to 7½ cents per thousand.

All others, $1.40 to $1.70 per day.

CHAS. C. HONE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of April, 1913.

[SEAL.] JOSEPH B. ALEXANDER,

Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, Residing at Seattle.

—

STATE OF WASHINGTON, *County of King, ss:*

I, Fred A. Traill, being first duly sworn, on oath depose and say:

That I am treasurer and manager of the Red Cedar Shingle Manufacturers' Association, an organization incorporated under the laws of the State of Washington, composed of about 200 shingle manufacturers, who manufacture about 65 per cent of the shingle output of the State of Washington.

That I am entirely familiar with the wages paid shingle sawyers (white employees), shingle packers (white employees), and all others (white employees) in the shingle manufacturing plants on the Puget Sound, State of Washington.

The following is a scale of wages:

Shingle sawyers (white employees), 16 cents to 19 cents per thousand.

Shingle packers (white employees), 9 cents to 10 cents per thousand.

Knebolters (white employees), $3.50 to $4.50 per day.

Drag sawyers (white employees), $3.50 to $5 per day.

Common laborers (white employees), $2 to $2.50 per day.

F. A. TRAILL.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of April, 1913.

[SEAL.] JOSEPH B. ALEXANDER,

Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, Residing at Seattle.

—

STATE OF WASHINGTON, *County of King, ss:*

I, F. D. Becker, being first duly sworn, on oath depose and say:

That I am secretary and manager of the Pacific Coast Shippers' Association, an organization incorporated under the laws of the State of Washington, composed of wholesalers and manufacturers of lumber and shingles, whose combined output is approximately 70 per cent of the rail lumber trade of western Washington, and about 80 per cent of the rail shingle trade of western Washington.

That I employed Mr. Charles C. Hone on April 14, 1913, to inspect British Columbia manufacturing plants; that the said Charles C. Hone is the same person who has testified to the foregoing affidavit.

F. D. BECKER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of April, 1913.

[SEAL.] JOSEPH B. ALEXANDER,

Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, Residing at Seattle.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, *County of King, ss:*

I, Fred A. Traill, being first duly sworn, on oath depose and say:

That I am treasurer and manager of the Red Cedar Shingle Manufacturers' Association, an organization incorporated under the laws of the State of Washington, composed of about 200 shingle manufacturers, who manufacture about 65 per cent of the shingle output of the State of Washington.

That I employed Charles C. Hone on April 14 to inspect British Columbia shingle manufacturing plants, and that the said Charles C. Hone is the same person who testified to the foregoing affidavit.

F. A. TRAILL.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of April, 1913.

[SEAL.] JOSEPH B. ALEXANDER,

Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, Residing at Seattle.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Par. 172½. Rough lumber, $1.25 per thousand feet board measure.
Par. 172½. Railroad ties, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to be heard upon this amendment at any great length. The Democratic Party has determined to pass the Underwood bill without amendment, and for the purpose of putting before the general public one of the ablest speeches I have read for a good while I shall read into my remarks a speech made by former Senator Chauncey M. Depew before the Montauk Club, of Brooklyn, at a dinner given in celebration of the seventy-ninth birthday of Mr. Depew. His speech, published in the New York Evening Mail in its issue of April 28, 1913, is as follows:

"MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN: With each recurrence of these anniversaries I am more impressed with the permanence of friendship. The proof is here to-night. For 22 years the members of this club in celebrating my birthday added to the pleasure of the first meeting an original compliment. In 22 years several generations of club members come and go, but there is always a central phalanx of veterans to keep up principles and traditions of the organization.

"I have been greeted to-night by fathers who have brought their sons, and by sons who have brought the grandsons of those who welcomed me within these walls 22 years ago. The political revolutions which have taken place in the country and in the State, the financial crises which have for a time paralyzed our industries, and the agitations which seemed revolutionary, but disappeared, have neither interrupted nor impaired our numbers or the pleasures of our anniversaries.

"Lucian, the famous gossip of antiquity, the predecessor and originator of the immortal Pepys, in one of his stories says that he called upon a famous centenarian named Gorgias, who lived at Corinth 1,700 years ago, anxious to put the questions to which every centenarian has been subjected ever since, and probably before, for there is nothing new under the sun.

"ATE THE HERRING ALONE.

"Lucian called upon Gorgias to find out the secrets of his extreme age. He said to him, 'You have just had your one hundred and eighth birthday and are enjoying splendid health, vigor, and vitality. Now, to what do you ascribe it?' Gorgias answered, 'To the fact that I never have accepted an invitation to dine out.' One of our centenarians a few days ago, answering the same question at 103, said in his case it was due to the fact that he had eaten a red herring every day. I think the American had the better time. He certainly did not eat that herring alone, and it created a thirst which led to companionship in quenching it.

"What a ghastly century was that of Gorgias who had never dined out. The brilliant men of his period, the sculptors who are the despair of our artists, the architects whom we can never equal, the philosophers and poets who have been models of all succeeding generations, the orators, statesmen, and soldiers whom subsequent history has never eclipsed, all were visitors during his long life to beautiful and artistic Corinth, and he might, at the dinners which were invariably given them, have enjoyed the pleasures of their society and left an autobiography of personal reminiscences of incalculable value to posterity.

"I have met most of the distinguished men and women of my time in this and other countries, and with scarcely an exception the best I ever knew of them occurred at dinner. An evening with Gladstone was a liberal education. He possessed the most comprehensive mind of his generation and was gifted with the most graphic power of expressing his opinions.

"A formal interview with him was of little value, but in the confidences and intimacies of a long dinner at a friend's house Gladstone could be more eloquent, more impressive, and more delightful than in his best efforts in the House of Commons. It was possible on such occasions to study the workings of that marvelous mind and get an insight into the sources of his magnetic power.

"BROWNING CHARMING AT DINNER.

"To read Browning's poems was one thing, but to hear Browning talk at dinner was much more human, informing, and charming. He said to me that when at the request of the Government, the Duke of Sutherland gave a dinner to the Shah of Persia at the Stafford House, he was one of the guests. In order to impress this semisavage monarch, every one was requested to wear all their regalia. The Prince of Wales and members of the royal family, the dukes, marquises, and earls came in all the medieval splendor of their rank and order, and with all their jewels, real and paste.

"Mr. Browning said that, having no rank, he came in the crimson gown of an honor man of Cambridge University. Diamonds did not impress the Shah, because the buttons on his coat were real stones as big as horse-chestnuts. The ermine and tiaras produced no impression upon him, because he and his suite were arrayed in more barbaric splendor. But his wild eye roving around the table came upon this crimson Cambridge robe at the foot, where, as a commoner, the poet sat.

"The Shah instantly said, 'Who is that great man?' 'Why, that is Mr. Browning.' 'What is he?' 'He is a poet.' 'Command him to come here and sit beside me.' So a royalty or a prime minister was displaced and the embarrassed poet was put beside the autocrat. The Shah said, 'I understand you are a poet, a great poet,' which Browning modestly admitted. 'Well, then,' he said, 'I want you to stay here with me, because more than the fact that I am the supreme ruler of Persia, I am a great poet myself.

"Mr. Browning assured me that the story was true; that the Shah said to the then Prince of Wales, afterwards King Edward VII, 'This is a magnificent palace.' The prince said, 'Yes; this is the finest palace in Great Britain.' 'Well,' said the Shah, 'let me give you a little piece of advice. When one of my nobility gets rich enough to live in a house like this, I cut off his head and take what he has. It is very simple and saves a great deal of trouble.'

"DOLLAR FEASTS DELIGHTFUL.

"But the night will not permit an enumeration. I have learned more state secrets from cabinet ministers abroad in the confidences of the dinner table than I could have had in years of residence, and under similar circumstances the armor of reserve has dropped from Presidents of the United States and their troubles, their anxieties, their wishes, their ambitions, their friends, and their enemies have been an open book.

"'Ah, but,' says the philosopher who is eternally denouncing the opportunities of wealth, 'dinners are all very well for you, but how about the rest of us?' Why, my dear sir, the dullest, most stupid, and most boorish dinner I ever attended cost $100 a plate, while my most delightful evenings have been with a bohemian coterie, where a dollar was the limit. The cost of the dinner, the rarity of its wines, and the brand of its cigars are of no account unless about the table are men and women of mind, of individuality, of versatility, of something to give which is worth receiving, and a willingness to listen to the message which you think is worth delivering.

"Senator Hoar, who in his long, brilliant, and most distinguished career had met everybody worth knowing, told me that no gathering, however small or however large, equaled in wit and wisdom, in flashes of genius, in things always to be remembered and never to be forgotten, the weekly luncheons at Parker's, in Boston, where Longfellow, Hawthorne, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Theodore Parker, and others, and Judge Hoar, the brightest of them all, met for a week-day luncheon.

"Judge Robertson, of Westchester, and I were invited by Secretary of State Seward to dine with him in Washington on our way to the Republican national convention which renominated President Lincoln. That dinner changed the Vice President from Daniel S. Dickinson, of New York, to Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee, and made a different chapter in American history.

"The newspapers, which tell us everything, say that the present tariff and income-tax bills were perfected at a dinner at the White House. This brings us in immediate and acute contact with the most interesting of current events.

"NO EXCITEMENT OVER TARIFF.

"In my 57 years in public and semipublic life I have participated in many political revolutions, and in none of them have these changes, especially of the tariff, been received with so little excitement and scarcely a suggestion of passion. There are no editorials or flaming speeches predicting direful disasters or indignation meetings resolving that we are on the brink of financial and industrial ruin.

"These tariff propositions, going as they do to the very foundation of our financial and industrial system, and the manner in which they are received are high indications of that much-abused word 'progress.' We have become a deliberative and contemplative people. Without inherited prejudices or partisan bias we can calmly weigh measures and policies and arrive at individual conclusions as to results when they crystallize into law. We all recognize that at some time these theories must be tried. We have all recognized that at some time the theorists must have devolved upon them the responsibilities of government.

"There has been no period since the Civil War when experiments could be tried with less danger than now. The country was never so prosperous, employment was never so general, wages were never so high, the farmer was never so rich or receiving such returns for the product of his field and his live stock, the output of the manufactories was never so great, the expansion of our credit and the amount of our exchanges were never so large, and our imports and exports never reached such a volume.

"The fly in the amber, or, to put it more seriously, our irritation and discontent under these otherwise happy conditions, is the high cost of living. The laws which our new rulers are putting in force will affect equally all the people; therefore it is the duty of all of us to wish them Godspeed and good luck. It is the hope of all of us that the realization of their dreams, which some of us have feared, will be in the line of their most sanguine hopes. Their problem is a difficult one. In simple form, it is how to reduce the cost of living without impairing opportunities of earning a living. In that is the whole crux of the situation.

"AMENDMENTS TO CONSTITUTION.

"It has been our habit to touch lightly and, if possible, informingly upon the things that have happened since our last gathering. The Constitution of the United States has not been amended in over 100 years. The fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, which were passed after the Civil War, were really not amendments, but simply declarations of principles which were in the Declaration of Independence and in the spirit of the original instrument.

"But after over 100 years of satisfaction with the Constitution, within this year two amendments have been added, one an income tax, the other for the election of United States Senators by the people. I am not going to discuss these measures. They are here to stay. But when the history of their passage comes to be written it will be disclosed that there are some curious phases of human nature.

"When the amendment to the Constitution of the United States for an income tax came before our New York Legislature, it was defeated by a message from Gov. Hughes. That message did not oppose an income tax, but clearly stated that the needs of our Commonwealth were growing so rapidly and the sources of State taxation were so limited that the income tax should be left to the States, and the General Government, with its infinite possibilities, could raise revenue from other sources.

"When the income-tax amendment was under discussion in the Senate, I had a heart-to-heart talk with a group of Senators from the Western States who were urging its adoption. I said to them, 'Our revenues at present are furnishing a surplus; we never will need to resort to this method of taxation except in a great emergency. Then why do you want it now?' Their answer was, 'Because with an income tax we can collect one-half of the expenses of the Government from your State of New York and the other half from New England, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois.'

"The exemption of $4,000 a year in the present bill shows that these gentlemen control this legislation, because very few in their States have an income of that size. It is an interesting question in legislation of this kind, since in no country in the world where they have an income tax is the exemption equal to $1,000, whether in order to have the whole people alert, inquisitive, and critical upon the expenses of government and in checking extravagance, the largest possible number should not have their attention called to those expenditures by contributing something toward the support of the Government.

"BECAUSE BRYAN WANTS IT.

"When the income-tax amendment was before our New York Legislature I said to a man who as much as any other controlled that body, 'Did you think Gov. Hughes was right?' He said, 'Yes.' I then told him what these western Senators had said to me. He said, 'That I believe, too.' I said, 'Then why are you urging the adoption of this amendment by our State?' His answer was, 'Because Bryan wants it.'

"When the amendment for the election of the United States Senators by the people was so framed that the United States Government had the power to see that all the people voted and that none was disfranchised, I said to the Senators from the States

where the negro is disfranchised, 'Do you see danger of a force bill if this amendment is adopted? Don't you think that as crises arise, and they will arise, where a majority of the States feel that certain measures in which they are interested could be passed if all the people, including the negroes, in your States voted, they will pass laws under which the Government will see that they do vote, at least for United States Senators?' They said, 'Yes; we see all those dangers.' I said, 'Then why are you voting for it?' Their answer was, 'Because Bryan wants it.'

"This brings us to a horizontal view of one of the paradoxes of our American life. We are rushing with unprecedented rapidity for us, for we are a conservative people, toward the breaking down of the safeguards which are in the Constitution against hasty and inconsiderate action by the people. We are proceeding upon the theory that leadership no longer does or ought to exist, that all matters should originate with and be decided upon by the people as a mass on the passion or emotion of the moment and without the intervention of representative bodies or interpretations by the courts, and yet there never was a time when leadership counted for so much as it does to-day.

"There never was a time when leaders asserted themselves with such confidence and autocratic authority. More than 4,000,000 Republicans followed Col. Roosevelt in the last campaign, not because they wanted to break up the Republican Party, not because they adopted all the doctrines of his platform or of his speeches, but because they believed in Roosevelt and wanted for President of the United States a strong, militant, aggressive, and audacious leader.

"CALLS FOR LEADERSHIP.

"The national convention of the Democratic Party at Baltimore was swayed by Mr. Bryan. It was recognized that the great mass of his party recognized him as a supreme leader whom they were willing to follow wherever he chose to go. For the first time in 123 years the President of the United States leaves the Executive Mansion and appears at the Capitol to impress upon the legislative branch of the Government his views upon pending legislation. These are not symptoms, but facts. With all the shouting and the trumpeting for a pure democracy, the exactions of our busy, hurried, rapid, nervous life call for a leader in every department more than at any other period in our history.

"The same is true in the industrial disorders which are now so acute. In their more revolutionary phases they are governed by a leader with very few assistants, whose power is unlimited, whose authority is unquestioned.

"Another curious phase of this trend to pure democracy is that its leaders are opposed to majorities. Ten per cent of the voters initiate a number of radical measures. They are submitted to a referendum at the next election, and a plurality of the votes cast make them laws or insert them in the Constitution. In the history of these referendums the vote has averaged about 20 per cent of the total vote at any election. The measures have been adopted by the petitioners who constitute one-half, and many times more than one-half of those voting carrying the day because the majority of the electorate have not cast their ballots.

"When it is proposed that no law by referendum shall become a law and no amendment shall be attached to the Constitution unless it receives a majority of all the votes cast at the election when it is submitted, without exception the reformer cries 'No'; reforms must be carried not by the unintelligent mass, but by the few who understand the needs of the people.

"BELIEVES IN TRADE-UNIONS.

"I believe in trade-unions and trade organizations. In the railway world I have been their best friend, but there is a new movement now progressing all over the world and forging to the front with us with lurid exhibitions of its power. As a student all my life of every idea which has captured any considerable number of people, whether upon religious, or social, or industrial, or economic questions, I bought the book which gives the most authoritative and vigorous exhibition of syndicalism by one of its ablest and most eloquent writers.

"It is very interesting, though not yet very alarming, except in its fierce and bloody riots to compel other unions to join. He says:

"We have in the United States to-day nearly 500,000 organized fighting soldiers. In the whole world we have 7,000,000. We are comrades with a common purpose. The cry of our army is 'No quarter.' We want all you possess. We will be content with nothing less than all you possess. Here are our hands. They are strong hands. The able-bodied workers would not have to labor more than two or three hours every day to feed everybody, clothe everybody, house everybody, and give fair measure of little luxuries to everybody.

"Then he goes on to say:

"When all these things are accomplished, then all the world will be impelled to action—scientists formulating law, inventors employing law, artists and sculptors painting canvases and shaping clay, poets and statesmen serving humanity by singing and by statecraft. Our intention is to destroy present-day society as a fact, and also to take possession of the world with all its wealth and machinery and government.

"Here are a few of the bunkers over which this army must successfully propel its bomb: There are about 8,000,000 people, men and women, in this country who own their own homes and will fight to retain them. There are over 4,000,000 who own their own farms, other millions who get their living from farms, and none are so tenacious of their rights as the farmers. There are about 11,000,000 who are engaged in various industries in a way that interests them to a point where they will not tamely surrender their rights in raising stock, or as florists, or horticulturists, or nurserymen. There are the millions of small shopkeepers everywhere whose living and the future for their families are in the goods in their stores.

"A NATIONAL CONSCIENCE.

"Our eyes are so blinded by the increase in the capitalization of great corporations like the steel or tobacco or sugar that we lose sight of the fact that there never were so many small manufacturers with limited capital, employing few men, among whom the proprietors are the hardest workers, scattered all over the United States. The foundations of our society are deep in the selfish interests, in the ambitions, in the hopes, and in the affections for their offspring of 99 per cent of our people. Besides all that is the national conscience, with an irradicable sense of right and wrong, based upon respect for the property and lives and liberties of others, for which every church, every common school, every agency of education and instruction, every fraternal lodge, is a recruiting station.

"Now, the crux of that idea is that when this millennium has been brought around nobody will have to work over 2 hours in 24. During the rest of the day everybody will be happy because industrially occupying their time in creating or making or producing things which are useful and helpful to their fellows. A distinguished philosopher has said that the mainsprings of action are ambition, necessity, and greed. It may be growing out of what happened in the Garden of Eden that effort requires a spur. Every one of us knows that in our own experience. There is no one at this table here to-night who would be what he is unless there had been a motive to accomplish something for himself. There is no truth more self-evident than that this selfishness has in it also the elements of patriotism.

"The man who forges ahead and in his advance creates continually larger opportunities for others to get on is selfishly a climber and unselfishly a philanthropist. The curse of the youth of our country is idleness. Our hooligans, our gang men, our gunmen, our young criminals are all the products of idleness. The ambition of the boy at school is aroused first by competition with his fellows. As he advances to the high school or the college it is for the honors which can be achieved.

"IDLE MEN NOT HAPPY.

"I look back over 60 years of continuous effort, and when I try to differentiate the causes of my health and happiness I come back always to work. I never yet knew an idle man who was a happy one. I mean an idle man who was such from choice. Every man I ever knew who was doing the best he could in the line of his talent and equipment, and who became fond of his work, and who outside of his regular occupation had some fad which interested him, and who could on occasion play as hard as he worked, was healthy and happy himself and radiated happiness and inspiration to every one about him.

"We are all workingmen, but I have known thousands of what are known as laboring men—that is, those who earn a living by the work of their hands—who in their little gardens found repose and recreation, who in their church, or in their lodges, or in their social work discovered never-ending sources of education in broadmindedness, in higher ideals of citizenship, and material, spiritual, and intellectual advancement.

"It is an old charge that republics are ungrateful. Perhaps that is a mistake, and they are only forgetful. I recall on this question three of my late colleagues in the Senate, who were among its most distinguished and useful Members and are now in private life.

"When the case for the expulsion of Senator Lorimer, of Illinois, was tried before the Committee on Privileges and Elections a large majority of the committee, though they knew that the newspapers generally demanded Mr. Lorimer's expulsion, and such was the sentiment of a majority of the people, yet acting as judges they could not find in the testimony sufficient warrant for a verdict against him.

"SENATOR BEVERIDGE'S CASE.

"Senator Beveridge, one of the most brilliant Senators of his term in the Senate, made a minority report and led the fight against Lorimer. He had often before proved himself to be an accomplished and brilliant debater, but he never was so able, resourceful, and eloquent as in this battle. It was on the eve of his fight for a reelection to the Senate, and he and his friends felt that his reward was certain. He made one of the most thorough and able canvasses of Indiana that any candidate ever did, and yet he was beaten.

One of the most useful and able Senators in my time was Norris Brown, of Nebraska. Mr. Brown believed that nine-tenths of the people of his State were in favor of a constitutional amendment for an income tax. He introduced the amendment and gave his time, energy, and remarkable diplomacy to secure its passage. I am quite certain from my own familiarity with the course of that legislation that except for Mr. Brown's advocacy and support the amendment would not have passed the Senate. When he came before his people for the approval of his course, he was beaten.

"My captivating friend, Jonathan Bourne, of Oregon, was the author of most of the so-called reforms which have substituted the initiative, the referendum, and the recall in Oregon for representative government and made the governor and the legislature rubber stamps. In season and out of season, in the Senate and on the platform and in the press, he portrayed the merits of this return to a pure democracy and this recovery by the people from an obsolete system of their full rights.

"It is said that the placing of one of his greatest speeches on this question in the hands of every voter in the newly admitted State of Arizona led to the adoption of the most radical constitution ever known. We all thought that whatever might happen to the rest of us, the call for reelection of Jonathan Bourne was to come with a unanimity never known before by a grateful people. Yet he was beaten.

"It is an interesting study in politics whether people are ungrateful, which I do not believe, or forgetful, which may happen, or whether their tribune is not sometimes mistaken in thinking that he knows just what they want.

"DOES NOT LAMENT THE PAST.

"It has been the fashion in all ages for elderly people to lament the good old times and long for their recall. I do not share in any way in this desire. Solomon repudiated it, but then Solomon had more things than all his predecessors put together, including the family, and notwithstanding his hundreds of wives and thousands of concubines, seems to have been very happy in his domestic relations. George Washington, on the other hand, thought that the times as they were in the few years preceding his death far worse than in earlier days, and that they gave little hope for the future.

"As I look back over 57 years of intense activity in many departments of life, of a full share of both successes and failures, of hard knocks and compensating triumphs, of sorrows and joys, I come to the conclusion that while one year may be very bad, very miserable, and very hopeless, yet take time by decades every 10 years as a whole is infinitely better than all the preceding ones.

"Still, there are some things which seem to be permanently lost, and are to be greatly regretted, for the enjoyment of life. One of them is conversation. The most charming volumes in history are made up of the conversation of agreeable talkers, but it is a general complaint that now conversation is a lost art. Some say it is because bridge whist has so shortened the dinner as to make it a feed instead of a function, and the craze for gambling in bridge whist has destroyed the freedom from care and elasticity of mind which are necessary for the interchange of thought, of humor, of anecdote, of argument, and of raillery. We ought to be grateful, therefore, to anyone who can help in the restoration of that most charming, I almost say indispensable, medium for the enjoyment of friends and acquaintances—conversation.

"WILSON'S 'NEW FREEDOM.'

"President Wilson is happily contributing to this end. He is advocating in a series of brilliantly written magazine articles what he calls 'The New Freedom.' There is intense curiosity to know what the 'New Freedom' means. This century and a quarter of unexampled and unparalleled growth and prosperity under our Constitution and laws has given us the freedom so gloriously expressed in the Declaration of Independence. The Declaration of Independence was a philosophic statement of liberty, but the Constitution of the United States crystallized it into law. Jefferson's idea of liberty was that governments are based upon the individual and that he must have the largest freedom with the fewest possible restrictions and the least possible legislation.

"President Wilson now has an opportunity of which he must avail himself of putting into law his 'new freedom.' We are told by the press, always so Argus-eyed and so truthful, that at a conference at the White House a few days since the President agreed with the chairmen of the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives which have charge of appropriation bills that the one now passing should have on it a rider exempting labor unions and farmers' associations from the restrictions and penalties of the Sherman antitrust law. They get a liberty which no one else enjoys and become a privileged class. Now, this is practical. It is a new freedom.

"The first restraint ever put since the adoption of our Constitution in 1787 upon the activities of the individual when acting in great combinations was by the Sherman antitrust law. Under prosecutions commenced by Cleveland and continued by McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft these combinations have been relentlessly pursued because violating the Sherman antitrust law. Some of them have been put out of business, and many of them have been dissolved. Decisions have been rendered in these cases which bring every great combination within the restrictions of this law. Now a new freedom is to be given by legislation to labor unions to do as they please and farmers to form associations and combinations for the marketing of their products.

"PRACTICAL DEMONSTRATION.

"There is no suggestion that those who are engaged in iron or steel or tobacco or oil, in hats, shoes, or clothing, or printing, or anything else shall be relieved from the beneficent restrictions of the Sherman Act, in which I think most of us heartily believe. But labor unions and farmers can club together and by the processes which are so successful in protection Germany, and called cartels in free-trade England, and called combinations in protection America, and called trusts, can have—the one in doing what it likes and the other in raising the price of bread and meat—all the advantages of the freedom which everybody had before the Sherman antitrust law.

"Now, this practical demonstration of the new freedom has led to more conversation everywhere than anything which has occurred for many years. It is an enlightening, illuminating, and instructing conversation. It raises that one topic of intense interest at all times where everybody is affected, 'Who will next receive the new freedom?'

"Vice President Marshall is a charming gentleman and a delightful speaker. I have heard him on many subjects upon which he talks so well, and none better than upon brotherhood in Masonry, he and I being both brethren of the thirty-third degree. Two weeks ago to-night he attended the Jeffersonian banquet in New York. He there delivered an address which was as novel as it was original. He claimed that the inheritance of property from one's parents is not a natural or a constitutional right but purely a privilege granted by statute, and so to prevent accumulations of property all that the legislatures have to do is to repeal the laws of inheritance, and then whatever a person acquires will go not to his natural heirs but to the State.

"Of course if such a law was passed there would be no accumulations afterwards, because the main incentive for saving money is to take care of those who are dependent upon us; in other words, our wives and children. There would be people so masterful and with such genius in that line that they could not help making money. If they were not to have the pride and joy and comfort of its enjoyment in the benefits it would give after their death, they would squander it.

"The first line in which a man begins to squander money is self-indulgence. Drunkenness would become the attendant of prosperity, and the prohibition States, which are now doing fairly well in restricting the consumption of liquor, would discover that their laws were universally nullified. The new view of life would be 'Let us eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow we die.'

"This speech was delivered on Saturday night two weeks ago and published in the Sunday morning papers. It made conversation all over the United States. When I came out of church and met the people of all the other churches I was stopped dozens of times, not to talk about the sermons which had been heard, but to discuss the speech of Vice President Marshall.

"CONVERSATION REVIVED.

"I lunched with some friends and dined with others that day, and both functions were prolonged far beyond the usual time by an animated discussion of Brother Marshall's deliverance. If Eugene Debs had said this it would have passed unnoticed because expected. It is the unexpected which inspires conversation. So from the new Vice President of the

United States it became a matter of interesting talk in every gathering, private or public.

"Well, these things have helped in bringing into activity again the almost lost art of conversation. Still, these subjects are not so fine as those which prevailed in the good old times. We used to long for a new novel by Dickens or Thackeray and talk over the old ones until the new ones came, and then the new ones until others were published, until David Copperfield, Micawber, Capt. Cuttle, Jack Bunsby, Dora, Becky Sharp, and Col. Newcome were intimate members of our families. They inspired and radiated the home.

"We eagerly discussed Hawthorne's latest novels and what Whittier, Lowell, Emerson, and Dr. Parker, Dr. Storrs, or Henry Ward Beecher had contributed to the wisdom and enjoyment of the world. John Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer had their audiences and their admirers, and the Shakespeare and Browning societies found opportunities in every hamlet in the country.

"I am at a loss to know why there are no writers of equivalent reputation and equivalent consideration contributing now to the cordiality and camaraderie of us all. Why, we carry the shop everywhere and talk of either what we want or what we have or what the other fellow possesses and how he got it. It is very depressing.

"But, my friends, I do not despair. On my doctrine of decades I isolate this 10 years. I avoid the calamity howlers. I expel from my reading desk and my mind the preachers of disorder or destruction or despair. I place my trust, my hope, my optimism in that fine, discriminating, cordial, loving association of the people with each other and of their trust in and courage for the rights and the liberties of all."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 4, after the word "sawed," strike out "10 per cent ad valorem" and insert "15 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the strange political philosophy of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] would provide through this bill for the increase of factories to manufacture cigar boxes in Cuba. We have a large concern in my city which is engaged in the business of taking sawed cedar which comes up from Cuba and the former Spanish-American possessions and turning it over to American workmen, who at American wages shape it into cigar boxes, and I wish we had them in Florida, or in Georgia, or in South or North Carolina, nearer the supply of the raw product. They would all be worthy of protection, but that is not the proposition in this bill. According to the gentleman's philosophy, instead of encouraging a man to invest his capital here or to employ Americans in the manufacture of cigar boxes of raw material coming from Cuba to Pennsylvania, we are to encourage the men in Cuba to retain their cedar wood and build factories and employ cheaper labor there to make cigar boxes for us.

It seems to be the philosophy of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] not to attempt to do any business in the United States, not to encourage anyone to rear a factory and employ labor, but to let this be done in foreign countries. This bill proposes that the man who does rear a factory in the United States shall pay a duty on the raw material of 10 per cent, and then it removes from him the protection he gets on the product that is finished here. We have asked in this instance that the duty which enables the American workman to manufacture cigar boxes in competition with Cuba be restored. We have asked that the Democratic majority shall see the error of its ways and adopt this amendment.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield just a moment?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. He probably did not catch the tenor of this paragraph. By striking out the word "other" it means the cedar wood would come in at 10 per cent.

Mr. MOORE. I think the amendment contemplated changing from 10 to 15 per cent in order to protect sawed cedar.

Mr. PALMER. There was not a question of changing the rate to protect anything. It was in order to get rid of that very question as to what cedar should come under the 10 per cent rate, and there would come in free under the paragraph as now changed cigar boxes, and cedar wood would come in free when manufactured; and unmanufactured, in the shape of logs, it comes in free.

Mr. MOORE. That is the very point I am making, namely, that the gentleman has increased the opportunity to manufacture in Cuba and reduced the opportunity to manufacture here.

Mr. PALMER. It is just exactly the contrary.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to offer an amendment to this lumber schedule, because I realize that it is useless to do so. Nor is it my purpose to take up but two or three minutes of the time of the committee in discussing it, because I realize that is also useless for this side to discuss it further.

We have not the acute situation with reference to oriental competition in my State that the gentlemen from the Northwest who have spoken have, but we sympathize with them. We are interested in the lumber industry in Kentucky. We have thousands of men employed in that industry and hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in it. I wish the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and those who are helping him in this assault upon the lumber industry could take a look into the humble homes of the men who are earning their daily bread for themselves and their families. They would realize that this question about cheaper lumber for the home builders is a two-sided one. In every race I have made for membership in this body in that district I have contended that if Democracy obtained the power to do so it would injure the lumber industry and the coal industry. I have contended also that the party is utterly opposed to the principle of protection in any shape. Many Democrats in that district who are interested in the development of the great resources that we have there have denied that proposition. I am glad that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] and other leaders of the Democracy have made it perfectly clear now that I was correct when I said that they are opposed entirely to the policy of protection. It will relieve me of the necessity of rearguing that question when I run again.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Does the gentleman say that he will not make an occasional casual reference to it in the course of his campaign?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; I guess I will; and I will also have my distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] come down there and help me do it. He does it so handsomely. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, mind what I tell you, when this bill goes into operation the lumber industry and the coal industry will suffer. Leaders of Democracy in Kentucky contend that taking the duty off of coal will not reduce the price to the consumer, and putting lumber on the free list will not reduce the price to the consumer. If that is so, then why take the duty off of these articles and give up that much revenue, which you say you were after in framing this bill? In the name of the people——

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LANGLEY. No. The gentleman never yields to me, and I take great pleasure in declining to yield to him. [Laughter.]

In the name of the great industrial district which I represent, which is just now starting on an era of prosperity that will be almost unparalleled if they are let alone, I desire to protest against this lumber schedule as well as many other schedules in the Underwood bill that will deal a staggering blow to my district and State. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative of the State of Washington, I desire to say something on this shingle schedule.

Now, to begin with, I want to make perfectly plain the fact that as far as I am concerned, speaking for myself alone and for nobody else, I believe in the substantial immediate reduction of the tariff schedules. I believe in revising the tariff schedules downward, and I believe it is the duty of this Congress to reduce these schedules generally, and the statute that is passed by this Congress ought to show that kind of legislation. I do not believe it is the movement of the Democratic Party or the Progressive Party; I do not believe it to be the movement of any party. I believe it to be a movement that has the backing of the great body of the American people, and I believe if this Congress did not substantially reduce these tariff schedules there would be almost a revolution in this country. I believe the people have demanded it, and I believe it is the duty of every Congressman sitting on the floor of this House to cooperate in endeavoring to reduce generally the tariff schedules that have been forced on the people for all these years.

I believe they have been essentially wrong in almost every instance. But I desire to say to you that this question of the shingle industry of the State of Washington presents a special problem. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, yes! [Laughter.]

Mr. BRYAN. That is all right. I am willing to stand for a reduction in all the schedules and a reduction in the rate on shingles, but I do not believe that this Congress ought to wipe out all of those duties. You have not wiped them out on all of the various articles. You have, in a number of cases, maintained

a duty, and here we have a duty of 50 cents a thousand that you are wiping out entirely, and putting shingles on the free list. I say to you that the shingle industry is situated differently from the lumber industry.

Mr. FARR. Of course. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BRYAN. I do speak for the shingle industry, and the argument that is made on behalf of the shingle industry in this House ought to appeal to every honest and sincere man as he studies the situation in the State of Washington. I will not repeat the figures already presented by my colleagues from the State of Washington. If you put shingles absolutely on the free list, if you cut off entirely the duty on shingles, I am sure that the competition that has been suggested here from oriental labor will interfere, not with any great industrial enterprise so much as with the many small mills of my State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. I have no time to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BRYAN. These mills are located on the shores of Puget Sound and on the little streams that empty into the Sound, and the men who work in these mills are right close to their homes, and they are working there in the mills, and I say they ought to be maintained in that work.

These mills are located on the shores of Puget Sound and on the little streams that empty into the Sound, and the men who work in these mills are right close to their homes, and they are working there in the mills, and I say they ought to be maintained in that work.

I say that the particular situation with respect to British Columbia labor does affect us more than any other industry, perhaps, that has been referred to here. I believe the committee ought to take this up. So far as I am concerned, I would like to vote for this bill. I want to see the tariff reduced. I am sincere about it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of my colleague to the fact that there was not a single Democrat from the great Northwest in the caucus-congress held here for several weeks by the majority—not an individual to point out to the men making this bill this terrible and desperate situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. I yield to no one. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BRYAN. I do not care by what party name a man be called in this controversy. This is not a controversy of parties. This is a controversy in which the people of this country have spoken. It does not make any difference about the party lines, and it does not make any difference about the catchwords you have been using all these years. You have got to meet this issue and recognize the fact that the people have demanded a revision downward. The Republican platform demanded a revision of the tariff, and it was claimed it meant a revision downward. The Democratic platform provided for a revision downward and the Progressive Party platform demanded a revision downward. I intend to stand for that, and I stand for what I claim all the parties stand for and what the American people stand for; and there is going to be no compromise on that.

But when you come to figure out the various schedules, as explained by the able leader of the majority in this House, you must consider business conditions to a certain extent. You ought to consider this particular industry at this time. There is no reason, there is no ground, for turning this industry over to British Columbia labor. It is not right, and it does not correspond with those principles that are fundamental in the human breast. It does not give the people a square deal or that which is right and just. And I think if you reduce the schedule not more than about 50 per cent, you will comply with your platform and with the demands of the people. I am willing to cut the present duty in two in the middle. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon the paragraph and amendment be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendment thereto be closed.

Mr. MOORE. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman can offer an amendment later. I am moving to close debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FORDNEY. I wish to speak on that amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Two of my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, are very much interested in this matter. They have not had an opportunity to speak, and this means the death of this industry if you put it through.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am perfectly willing that the gentlemen may speak on their own amendments.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, how many amendments on this side will be offered to this paragraph?

Mr. MOORE. I have one.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have one.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] wants five minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of information, will it be in order to offer an amendment at this point to fix a less duty on the next paragraph or on the same paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman could offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all amendments that may be desired may be presented to this schedule.

Mr. MANN. This paragraph?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They all want to speak on lumber. It is all one thing.

Mr. MANN. This is on shingles.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I know. If we can have unanimous consent, I want to close up this schedule. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this schedule be closed in 20 minutes. Is that the amount of time the gentleman wants?

Mr. MANN. They want 20 minutes on the shingle proposition.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I can not agree to that. I insist on my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the debate on this paragraph and amendments be now closed.

Mr. FORDNEY. I want to appeal to the gentleman not to do that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to give the gentleman a chance to offer his amendment.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not want to offer any amendment to any paragraph in the schedule.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Party has gone on record as believing in a tariff for revenue. The shingle business at the present time is to some extent competitive, and we have been getting a revenue from 6 per cent of the shingles that have been used in the United States—these having been imported into this country from Canada.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] in his opening speech to this House said that the Democratic Party was not going to cut the tariff schedules with an ax, but intended letting them down gently with a jackscrew. I would like to know just whereabouts he applied the jackscrew to the shingle industry. It looks to me as though he went at it ruthlessly with an ax or butcher's cleaver, without taking into consideration the nature of the business, the men who were employed in it, and whether or not it was operated by a trust or by small concerns. I think his committee gave this question absolutely no thought. Why should they wipe out an industry that supports from 150,000 to 200,000 people in the United States? There is nobody who can show that in any way shingle manufacturing ever has been in the hands of a trust or monopoly.

Neither has there been any widespread demand for cheaper shingles. Taking the country over, I think shingles have been sold at a very reasonable rate. In the census of 1910 it was shown that the shingles in the State of Washington only brought an average of $1.81 a thousand, and I think that is a very reasonable price for shingles at the factory.

Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for me to go into any extended remarks on this question. Your minds are made up, but I want to say to you that some of these rates are coming back, and some of these things you are doing now will come back to plague you in the future. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] in his report to the House when submitting this bill from the Ways and Means Committee, quoted from the Democratic platform and summarized the basic principles from which the committee worked in formulating this bill, as follows:

(1) The establishment of duties designed primarily to produce revenue and without thought of protection.

(2) The attainment of this end by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry.

Mr. Chairman, has the Democratic Ways and Means Committee in any sense of the word carried out the principles laid

down in these two propositions? I say "no." In article 1 they say:

The establishment of duties primarily to raise revenue for the Government.

Under this bill you wipe out all revenue to the Government from shingles. They were imported into this country in 1912, 508,415,000 shingles of a value of $1,194,113, which paid duty to the amount of $254,222. Under this bill you do not leave any tariff for revenue at all, but relieve Canada of this burden of a quarter of a million of dollars which that country has had to pay this Government for the use of our market. I presume that in thus relieving Canada you were applying the principle that "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

Your Ways and Means Committee does not carry out the idea or plan laid down in article 2 of their basic principles, for therein they say they expect to accomplish this purpose, "The raising of revenue to support the Government by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry." In the face of that declaration you turn around and deliberately place on the free list the shingle industry, which in my State alone employs more than 15,000 American laborers, placing them in direct competition with the Hindus and other oriental labor employed in shingle manufacturing in Canada.

Affidavits are now on file with your committee showing that fully 80 per cent of the Canadian labor is oriental. I suppose we are to judge by this action of the Ways and Means Committee that they do not regard the shingle business a legitimate business, and those who labor in our shingle factories not engaged in legitimate industry. "O consistency, thou art a jewel," but thou dwellest not with the Ways and Means Committee.

You say, in laying down your principles, article 1, "Revenue without thought of protection." You protect the goat industry of Texas by placing 10 per cent ad valorem on the animal and 20 per cent on the fleece. The great Democratic State of Texas raises more goats than all of the rest of the United States combined. Raising goats is a "legitimate industry," hence you did not wish to "injure" it. As Texas is to Angora goats and mohair the State of Washington is to the shingle industry. Washington makes more shingles than all of the rest of the United States, but evidently, as I have remarked before, shingle making is not a "legitimate industry," as you make them duty free. "Oh, upright judge." The same inconsistency permeates this entire joker. As you have treated shingles you have treated about all of the products of the North and West.

One of the farm products extensively raised in my State is oats, and at the present rate of duty on oats my State often has felt the effects of Canadian competition. You have reduced the rate of duty under this bill one-third on the grain and on its finished product—rolled oats, meal, and so forth—you have removed it entirely, so that they come in free, injuring not only the farmer's feed market, but destroying absolutely his milling market and obliterating the oatmeal miller and his employees' chances for remunerative business and labor. O, wise and far-seeing statesman, Canada should sincerely appreciate your generosity!

Mr. Chairman, in a speech I made on the floor of this House in the Sixty-second Congress, when we were discussing the reciprocity measure, I said the name was a misnomer, and that in my judgment it should be entitled "An act of discrimination against certain of our people in favor of Canada." I thought my judgment was good regarding the title of that bill, and I think the same title is even more pertinent to this one. We did receive a little something in return for our concessions to Canada under that ill-advised measure. On a basis of 1910 business we gave Canada about 70 per cent of the best trade, but did receive some 30 per cent (using 100 as a base) in return.

This Democratic Congress is giving Canada vastly more under this bill than it received under that and receives absolutely nothing in return.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] in the House of Representatives, February 14, 1911, speaking on Canadian reciprocity, said:

Now, as to agricultural machinery and meat, I recognize this bill is not well balanced, when you put cattle on the free list and leave a prohibitive tax on meat, as you do in this bill.

Under the Canadian reciprocity bill cattle came in free, and beef paid 1½ cents a pound duty, which would be about 10 per cent ad valorem for the average price of the beef carcass. "Not properly balanced?" The gentleman recognized it. I wonder if he thinks this bill is properly balanced.

It puts the meat, hide, hoofs, hair, and horns on the free list. The only thing that does not come in free is the life, and on that they charge 10 per cent ad valorem. Oh, yes; the gentleman has it properly balanced in Canada's favor and in the Canadian butcher's favor. What do Democratic Ways and Means Committees care for the American laborer in that line, anyway? All they care for is the "consumer." About all we have heard from that side of the House during this debate is the "consumer." They "expect to benefit the consumer."

Mr. Chairman, practically all of our people are both producers and consumers, all acting in one capacity or the other to one another, and if the Ways and Means Committee could realize that, they would be a little more careful in framing tariff measures, realizing that discrimination is bound ultimately to injure all, as all except the idle rich and the genus hobo are producer and consumer alike. We prosper as a whole, or vice versa, but it is not worth while to discourse on economics—that is the last thing, and probably the least thing, within the knowledge of the caucus that agreed to this measure. I do wish, though, that your committee would have shown as much real, genuine solicitude for the American consumer, which embraces all of our people, as you have for the foreign consumers.

Mr. Chairman, I hope when this measure reaches the other end of the Capitol it will receive most careful consideration, and, by amendment, be returned to us more evenly balanced, showing more desire for equality of opportunity than does this misfit, rough-hewn, discriminating, unpatriotic misnomer at the present time.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, first I want to congratulate my new colleague from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] that in his first speech, fresh from the people, newly baptized in righteousness, with the words "Onward, Christian Soldiers," still upon his lips, he classifies himself as one of those speckled and spotted protectionists who wants protection for himself and free trade for everybody else. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

When this schedule was under consideration four years ago I stood here upon the floor of this House and pleaded with the Republicans that they should not reduce the tariff upon lumber; that they should not reduce the tariff upon coal; and that they increase the tariff upon shingles. They did reduce the tariff upon lumber; they did reduce it upon coal; they did increase it upon shingles, and some of my Republican colleagues were almost moved to tears at that time as they thought of the great hardship that would be worked upon the poor man who wanted to buy shingles; but they were comforted by the thought that lumber and coal would be cheaper.

Now, what has been the result in the State of Washington? You reduced the tariff upon lumber, and immediately the price of lumber went up and it has been up ever since. The Government lost the revenue, and no man in the State of Washington or anywhere in the United States has bought a foot of lumber for a cent less.

You reduced the tariff upon coal, and coal immediately went up, and in my country the railroads that owned both the mines and the railroads put the difference of the tariff in their pockets, and no consumer in the State of Washington has ever bought a bushel of coal for a cent less. The Government lost the revenue; that is all. You increased the tariff upon shingles, and what was the result? Immediately the price of shingles went down. Our mills began to run 12 months instead of 6 months in the year. That gave employment to American labor. That increased their wages over $3,000,000 each year, and since the Payne law went into effect the American workmen in the shingle mills of the State of Washington have received over $12,000,000 in wages that otherwise would have gone to the Chinamen and the Hindus in British Columbia, and no man in the United States has paid a penny more for a bale of shingles.

Now, they have a combination over in British Columbia. They restrict absolutely the output of the shingles there. They will permit only so many shingle mills to run in each community. It is an absolute trust, and if you strike down the shingle industry in the State of Washington it will only result in an increase in the price of shingles. The only result of this bill will be that our mills will again stand idle——

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I do not wish to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I must refuse to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY. Then do not comment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman ought not to object if I comment. He is my friend, and I do not want to say anything unkind about him——

Mr. PALMER. You ought not to comment on anybody that you will not yield to.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to give me any instructions. He has strutted around here in his egotistical manner and berated everybody in this House, and it does not become him to be calling anybody to order, because if there is any man in this House that has never been accused of being a gentleman he is one of them.

Now, the result of putting shingles upon the free list will be that a large amount of our product will rot in the forests or be burned that would otherwise be manufactured into shingles. It will transfer the work and wages now given to Americans to the laborers in British Columbia, and it will not cheapen shingles to any consumer. There is no reason that can be given why any industry should be protected, or why there should be a duty on any industry that does not apply to the shingle industry in this State. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PALMER. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Chairman, having heard considerable from the lumbermen, whose remote blood relations we are told are extensively interested in this tariff on lumber, perhaps it is time that a word was said on behalf of the lumber purchasers of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] While I expect, in view of the excoriation which I have just received from the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] I ought to be good and sit silent, I can not allow the opportunity to pass to say a word on behalf of the people of this country, who have been demanding free lumber in tones of a trumpet voice for many years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Washington has a personal grievance against me, but I am surprised that he should display it in the manner in which he has. His grievance grows out of the fact that I led a fight two years ago to cut out the mileage graft, of which he is one of the chief beneficiaries in the House, for he collects out of the Treasury for travel expense by way of mileage something like $4,000 in a single term of Congress. He has ever since been making remarks about me somewhat on the order that he has just made.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman is mistaken as to the amount.

Mr. PALMER. In three sessions of a single Congress, I think the gentleman draws $1,400 each session, which would be about $4,000. What are these gentlemen complaining about? The gentleman from Washington asserts that if we put lumber on the free list the price of lumber will not go down. He points to something in the past to prove that. If that is true, how are you going to be hurt? Your cries in this House and the lumber dealers' loud protests are a sufficient indication that if we put lumber on the free list the price of lumber to the American home builder will go down, and that is the reason we are putting it on the free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] has asserted, and, by the way, I would like to commend to him and to his colleague from Washington, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, the example of those distinguished men whose names they bear, William J. Bryan and Senator LA FOLLETTE, who led the fight from coast to coast for free lumber for the American people. [Applause.] It would be better for them to follow the example of those great patriots than to look to the interests of their own districts alone.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I can not yield now. I repeat, it is as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] has said, if you do not do this thing you will have almost a revolution in America. In 1908 the Democratic Party went out to Denver, and in the very center of the great lumber district of the country they declared to the world that, in behalf of the man who wants to build his home on American soil and rear his children around his own hearthstone, they would remove the tax from lumber. Since that time in the House of Representatives the Democratic Party moved to recommit the Payne bill in order to put lumber on the free list. A revolution within your own party began when you opposed putting lumber on the free list. The demand is widespread and universal. Every party is committed to it, and gentlemen who sit on this side of the Chamber, excepting only those who confessed their interest in the matter, believe that we ought to do this thing, and we propose to do it. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to correct that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I speak on this matter for the purchasers of lumber—the men who consume the lumber. The city of New York, which in part I represent on this floor, during the past 12 years has built over 163,000 buildings, costing over $2,200,000,000. We use more lumber in the city of New York than any three States in the Union put together. Now, when the Payne bill was under discussion four years ago I talked with the lumber merchants in New York as to the effect of free lumber on the price to the consumer. I must confess to having some little interest in the matter, for of the 163,000 houses constructed in New York City in the last 12 years I have built nearly 1,000. I use lumber in my business, and I made it a point to make some inquiries about it. I asked these lumber merchants, "If we reduce the duty on lumber, how much cheaper would the builders of New York City and those who wish to build homes be able to buy lumber?" They said not one penny. "The minute you put lumber on the free list, that moment the Canadian will raise his price." And what happened? We reduced the duty on rough lumber from $2 to $1.25 per thousand, and the next day the Canadian raised the price for his lumber, increasing it to the extent of the amount of duty reduced. I went home a week or two ago and again interviewed our lumber dealers. I told them Congress intended to put rough lumber on the free list and asked how much cheaper can we buy it this winter, and they replied "Not one cent." They informed me that they were making their contracts now with the Canadians to be delivered after the Underwood bill becomes a law, and that these contracts were based on an arrangement whereby the Canadian lumber dealer increased his price to the extent of one-half the duty and the New York merchant got the other half. So, Mr. Chairman, what is the consumer going to get out of it—those of us who buy lumber and cut it up and put it into buildings? I asked that question and was informed, "You are not going to get any advantage, and if you want to place an order for lumber such as you did last spring you can have it for just the same price and consider yourself lucky to get it."

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] then thinks the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] is slightly mistaken when he speaks so eloquently about what he is going to do for the home builders?

Mr. CALDER. I know whereof I speak when I say that the reduction of the duty on lumber is not going to make a bit of difference to the consumer.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDER. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but I can not yield. It is going to make this difference: We are going to take out of the Treasury of the United States the revenue that the lumber producer in Canada puts into the Treasury for duty, and we are going to compel the people of this country in some other way to make that up.

Mr. FARR. Just as we lost the duty on coffee.

Mr. CALDER. Just as we lost the duty on coffee.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman now yield for one brief question?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. If the taking of the duty off lumber and putting lumber on the free list is not going to reduce the price, how will it reduce necessarily the wages to the workingman?

Mr. CALDER. I am not discussing it from that standpoint. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] I am discussing the question solely and purely from the standpoint of the consumer.

Mr. HARDY. That was the question I wanted to ask the gentleman from Washington. It was a simple question.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the speech just made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER], if he be correct in his statements, suggests the necessity for some additional legislation to reach the Lumber Trust, which seems to be operating in New York. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SLAYDEN. If the gentleman will be quick and prompt.

Mr. CALDER. I will say to my friend that he will have to legislate in some way to reach the Lumber Trust in Canada.

Mr. HARDY. And in the United States.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Leaving that aside, Mr. Chairman, I believe that if there is an industry in this country, or a commodity in the entire list of all of the commodities produced in this country, that needs no protection, it is lumber. So far as my observation in my own State and in the adjacent State of Louisiana goes, it is absolutely true that there is no class of manufacturers in the country who are so uniformly prosperous as the producers of lumber. Some of the greatest fortunes in the Southwest—and if newspaper reports be true, one of the greatest fortunes in the entire country—have been made out of the natural increase in the value of that commodity, due to the constantly diminishing supply. Those are factors which will

be uninfluenced by the tariff. I do not know that I entirely agree with the suggestion made by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], that the abolition of tariff duty will reduce the price of lumber to the consumer, at least for any prolonged length of time, but it will have this effect: It will arrest for the time being and cause to come more slowly the inevitable advance in the price of lumber, due to the diminishing supply. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I was told the other day by a constituent of mine, who has made a considerable fortune out of lumber as a merchant and in manufacturing, as a producer of lumber, that within his knowledge 67 producers—I am not sure whether he said corporations or individuals, or both—in the Southwest would go out of business in less than five years because of an exhaustion of their supply. Now, lumber is not an annually renewable crop. We ought to do all we can to encourage its importation from other countries. We ought to conserve our own supply, because it is one of the products that is essential to the comfort and convenience of the human family. For that reason, if for no other, I would be in favor, as I have always been, although not committed at all to the doctrine of free trade, I would be in favor of removing all tariff from any products of lumber in any form, manufactured or unmanufactured. This manufacturer of lumber—this owner of timberlands—told me when I had my conversation with him that he was on his way to complete a purchase of additional lands involving an expenditure of $2,000,000, and that as a producer of lumber and as a lumber merchant he had no objection whatever to the removal of the duty. He said it would not interfere a particle with the general prosperity of the lumber trade of the country, and the reason I suggested, the diminishing supply, was that he said in his judgment it would cause a constantly increasing cost to the producer.

Why, Mr. Chairman, within the last few years I have known timberlands to sell in southeastern Texas at $15 an acre, which at that time was thought to be an exorbitant price, which since have changed hands at $75 an acre. My informant, who has prospered so well in the lumber trade, tells me that in his judgment investments in timberlands at current prices, swollen though they may be in comparison with the prices of less than five years ago, will yield as big a return in the way of dividends on the investment as any enterprise in which any man can engage. Why, sir, I believe that the lumber dealers are engaged in a conspiracy against the interests of consumers, in so far as a conspiracy may be made out from their evident purpose of maintaining a uniform standard of prices. It is notorious that there is only a show of competition. A prospective buyer gets the same prices from all the dealers to whom he applies. At least that is my information, and——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak upon this, unless there is a limitation——

The CHAIRMAN. There is a limitation. All debate upon this schedule is now closed. The Clerk will report the first amendment in the order in which amendments come in the bill, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 4, after the word "sawed," strike out "10 per cent ad valorem" and insert "15 per cent ad valorem."

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 7, after the word "ad valorem," insert "shingles, 50 cents per thousand."

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington) there were—ayes 55, noes 104.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

172. Paving posts, railroad ties, and telephone, trolley, electric-light, and telegraph poles of cedar or other woods, 10 per cent ad valorem.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the amendment of Mr. POWERS.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, after line 10, insert two new paragraphs, as follows:
"Par. 172½. Rough lumber, $1.25 per 1,000 feet b. m.
"Par. 172¾. Railroad ties, 10 per cent ad valorem."

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

177. Porch and window blinds, curtains, shades, or screens, any of the foregoing in chief value of bamboo, wood, straw, or compositions of wood, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem; if stained, dyed, painted, printed, polished, grained, or creosoted, and baskets of like material, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 47, line 15, after the word "baskets," insert the words "in chief value."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that debate is closed.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Does that include the entire wood schedule?

The CHAIRMAN. The entire schedule.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE E—SUGAR, MOLASSES, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

179. Sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75 degrees, seventy-one one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound, and for every additional degree shown by the polariscopic test, twenty-six one-thousandths of 1 cent per pound additional, and fractions of a degree in proportion; molasses testing not above 40 degrees, 15 per centum ad valorem; testing above 40 degrees and not above 56 degrees, 2¼ cents per gallon; testing above 56 degrees, 4½ cents per gallon; sugar drainings and sugar sweepings shall be subject to duty as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscopic test: *Provided*, That on and after the 1st day of May, 1916, the articles hereinbefore enumerated in this paragraph shall be admitted free of duty.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

Mr. FORDNEY. The amendment covers both of the paragraphs, but I would like to have it read now, if agreeable.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out paragraphs 179 and 180, pages 47 and 48, and substitute the following:

"179. Sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75 degrees, ninety-five one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound, and for each additional degree shown by the polariscope test, twenty-six one-thousandths of 1 per cent per pound additional, and fractions of a degree in proportion; molasses testing above 40 degrees and not above 56 degrees, 3 cents per gallon; testing above 56 degrees, 6 cents per gallon; sugar drainings and sugar sweepings shall be subject to duty as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscope test: *Provided*, That every bag, barrel, or parcel in which sugar testing by the polariscope less than 99 degrees is packed shall be plainly branded by the manufacturer or refiner thereof with the name of such manufacturer or refiner, and the polariscope test of the sugar therein contained, accurately within one-half of 1 degree, and a failure to brand any such bag, barrel, or parcel as herein required shall be deemed and taken to be a misbranding of food within the meaning of the act of June 30, 1906, entitled 'An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes.' And the requirements of this proviso shall not apply to any sugar shipped or delivered to a refiner to be refined before entering into consumption.

"180. Maple sugar and maple sirup, 4 cents per pound; glucose or grape sugar, 1½ cents per pound; sugar cane in its natural state or unmanufactured, 20 per centum ad valorem; sugar cane defecated, shredded, artificially dried, or which has been subjected to any manufacturing or other process, 50 per centum ad valorem."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. I may withdraw the point of order, but the gentleman's amendment really covers the whole issue in this paragraph.

Mr. FORDNEY. It covers the whole schedule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It covers the whole schedule, because the other points in the schedule—saccharin and candy—are not really at issue. Would 30 minutes' debate on this paragraph be satisfactory?

Mr. PAYNE. I want to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. There will be several amendments offered to this schedule besides the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. Probably most of the discussion will be disposed of on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, although I think there should possibly be some debate after that. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] intends to offer an amendment, and I may offer one myself.

Mr. MURDOCK. And the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] will offer an amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think there is about 50 minutes' debate desired on that side of the House, as indicated by the gentlemen standing up.

Mr. MANN. A good deal more than that.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman [Mr. UNDERWOOD] if it is not possible for me to get some time, whatever agreement will be made on this schedule. As the gentleman knows, I was not able to secure any time in general debate. I would like to get at least 20 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I must say to my friend that I have refused to let anybody violate the five-minute rule, and I can not do that.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course, this is as important a schedule as there is in the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say this: If the gentlemen on that side of the House are willing to agree to two hours' debate, and allow the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and some one on this side to control the time, and divide it, you can make as long speeches as you desire. You can divide it to suit yourselves. But if we go on under the five-minute rule——

Mr. BROUSSARD. Would the gentleman allow me in his hour——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not surrender the time on our side of the House in opposition to the bill.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I take it that I am acting strictly within the rules of the party to which the gentleman and I belong. The fact that I am opposed to the schedule and acting strictly within the lines of the party ought to give me some consideration on this side. The gentlemen on the other side yielded some six hours to the gentlemen who belong to the Progressive Party and who are also opposed to the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman is opposed to the proposition, and ought to take his time from the opposition.

Mr. MANN. We granted time to certain gentlemen who announced in their speeches that they were supporting the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not recall that.

Mr. MANN. That is the fact, and we have always done that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing to agree to two hours' debate, and the time to be equally divided, and I will give the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] 10 minutes of my time if that is agreed to.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] well knows that in this debate at present the minority side of the House need more time than the majority and should be granted more time. This is rather an important schedule to some districts of the country. I hope the gentleman will be willing to grant this side of the House at least an hour and a half.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinios [Mr. MANN] that on most of the schedules we did grant the minority more time. But this is a vital schedule, and our side of the House is entitled to be represented on it.

Mr. MANN. I do not care how much time you take, but I do not see how we can get along without a good deal of friction with less than that time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will make a proposition to the gentleman. I was going to give 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD], who is on your side. If you will take care of the gentleman from Louisiana, I will agree to 2 hours' debate, 1 hour and a quarter to go to your side and the balance to this side.

Mr. MANN. I will be glad to do that if the gentleman from Alabama will give the gentleman from Louisiana 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will not stand on that proposition. I am willing that you shall have 5 minutes more of our time, so that you would take 1 hour and 20 minutes, and we will take 40 minutes.

Mr. MANN. And you are to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am about to yield you an hour and 20 minutes, and you are to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana. That is your own proposition.

Mr. MANN. No; that was 2 hours' time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I said we would have 2 hours, and we would give you an hour and a quarter, and you were to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana. You said you would not do that and suggested that I should yield only 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana. Now, I am going to give you the other 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I did not understand that. If you will give us an hour and a half, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORDNEY. I hope the gentleman from Alabama will not be technical.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I took the gentleman from Illinois at his word.

Mr. MANN. Oh, do not say that. You did not do that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Illinois said he would be agreeable if I would give the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I will agree, if the gentleman from Alabama will give me 1 hour and 20 minutes, to give the gentleman from Louisiana 5 minutes if the gentleman from Alabama will also give him 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I had already agreed——

Mr. MANN. That is the only proposition I made at the best.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I agreed to give the gentleman from Illinois one hour and a quarter, and the gentleman from Illinois proposed to give him five minutes. That is the best I can do.

Mr. MANN. I do not want to assume the task of dividing up the time with so many gentlemen desiring time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing to leave it with the Chair to divide up the time.

Mr. MANN. That will be still worse. If one man controlled the time, some others would get less than five minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Oh, I don't know about that. I would be willing to risk the Chair. I think myself that he has been pretty fair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, if that proposition is not agreeable, we shall have to read.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is it quite possible that a gentleman will use an hour's time or 50 minutes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is quite a vital question. I think it should be agreeable if we gave all but 40 minutes to the other side.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is not the proposition.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that the debate on this schedule be limited to 2 hours; 1 hour and 20 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], whoever is selected, and the remaining 40 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], at the end of which time all debate on the schedule shall cease.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And a vote shall be taken on the amendments that are pending.

The CHAIRMAN. And a vote shall be taken on the amendments pending.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That may be offered at any time.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that if that arrangement is made I would yield only 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, and would reduce the time among other gentlemen, probably to 3 or 4 or 5 minutes, for them to determine.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. BROUSSARD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether the 10 minutes I desire are coming to me?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I tried to take care of him; and if I can not, then I can not.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I think I should have some time. I have not had any time heretofore. I could talk 5 minutes in sections and be able to get in 20 minutes in four 5-minute talks.

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would couple with his request the proposition that we should have 5 minutes of that time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman from Illinois can arrange that.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Illinois says that if you go to scaling down we might lose our 5 minutes at that rate.

Mr. MANN. I think some gentlemen would be entitled to 5 minutes. If that understanding goes through I will yield only 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD].

Mr. BROUSSARD. Can not the gentleman from Alabama yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wanted to arrange it, but I can not.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the remainder of the schedule before I speak upon this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest that it is in order to read paragraph 180.

Mr. HAYES. Before that is done, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] has proposed an amendment which is, in effect, an amendment to two paragraphs. The Chair does not understand whether the gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that, as has been done before, two paragraphs be considered together.

Mr. FORDNEY. That was my intention.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing to give unanimous consent that there may be a vote upon his amendment as a single amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] asks unanimous consent that the amendment which he has offered, and which has been read at the Clerk's desk, shall be considered as a whole, it being an amendment to two paragraphs—179 and 180. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Of course, that will not affect the offering of further amendments to the first of those two paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. It will not. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered; and the Clerk will read paragraph 180, with the understanding that opportunity will be given later to offer amendments to paragraph 179.

The Clerk read as follows:

180. Maple sugar and maple sirup, 3 cents per pound; glucose or grape sugar, 1½ cents per pound; sugar cane in its natural state, or unmanufactured, 15 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That on and after the 1st day of May, 1916, the articles hereinbefore enumerated in this paragraph shall be admitted free of duty.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] desire to offer his amendment now and have it pending?

Mr. HAYES. I am willing to do so. I will offer it now and have it pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 48, strike out the proviso in lines 11, 12, and 13.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] five minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I offer my amendment for more than one reason, but one particular reason for offering that amendment in its present form is this: When the free-sugar bill passed this House last year and went to the Senate this amendment was known as the Bristow-Lodge amendment to that bill, and when voted upon in the Senate it received every vote cast there with the exception of three, one Senator from Idaho and two Senators from Louisiana, who voted against the bill because they did not believe in any reduction of the duty on sugar.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] frankly and openly stated the other evening in this committee that he believed if the rate of duty proposed in this bill is put into effect at the end of three years the sugar industry of the Southern States—Louisiana and Texas—must die, must go out of existence. Gentlemen, I want to say to you that before the Ways and Means Committee and before the investigating committee on sugar last year—the so-called Hardwick committee—there was not one man, woman, or child who appeared in the interest of any lower rates of duty, or free sugar, with the single exception of importers or the manufacturers of refined sugar who import raw sugar.

The gentleman has said that he is going to put lumber upon the free list for the masses of the people. Not a single soul has been present asking for what he proposes either in lumber or in sugar, but all admit that if sugar goes upon the free list your domestic cane industry in this country must die and the beet-sugar industry of this country will either be crushed or greatly injured. All admit that, and yet to-day you know and I know that the reason for low prices of sugar in this country is because of the keen competition between the domestic manufacturers of sugar, and when our domestic sugar goes off the market—which is about this time of the year or a few days later—the price of sugar generally goes skyward. Then it is furnished to the consumers by the great sugar-refining companies.

I am going to give you this statement for what it is worth: A Member of the House only yesterday told me that he saw in a newspaper—I did not see the article—that in a short time a president of the American Sugar Refining Co. will be elected. It has been stated on the floor of this House that the only independent manufacturer of refined sugar is the Federal Sugar Co., of which Mr. August Spreckels is president. That gentleman appeared before the Hardwick Committee and the Ways and Means Committee asking for free sugar. The newspaper report is to the effect that this gentleman, Mr. August Spreckels, is about to be elected president of the American Sugar Refining Co. That means a merging of the Federal Sugar Co. with the American Sugar Refining Co., if that statement is correct, thus leaving the consumers of sugar in this country—after this bill goes into effect and the domestic sugar industry is crushed—absolutely in the grasp of the American Sugar Refining Co. and the Arbuckle Bros.' Sugar Refining Co., which two companies refine 92 per cent of all the refined sugar made in this country, exclusive of the domestic industry. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I appeal to you, gentlemen, not for this industry alone but for the consumers of this country. Do not put the consumers of sugar in this country absolutely in the hands of what you admit is a monopoly—the great sugar refining companies of this country, three in number to-day, two if the Federal merges into the American, with August Spreckels at the head of the sugar refining company in New York. As I stated, he is in New York and his brother, Rudolph Spreckels, is on the Pacific coast, and between the two the industry will perish. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, there are no beet-sugar factories in the State which I have the honor to represent. We have hoped, however, and have had good ground to hope, that eventually, with the growth and development of this great industry, we would have many factories. But I have a duty to perform here to-day somewhat unusual in its character. The great State of Montana, lying north of Wyoming, has beet-sugar factories. It has localities of wide extent which a prominent Democrat in the State told me the other day would suffer injury from which they would not and could not recover in a decade if this bill passed. That State has no one on this floor who will speak for that great industry. To the south lies the imperial Commonwealth of Colorado. Within her borders are 17 beet-sugar factories. Last year there was paid to her farmers for sugar beets between twelve and fifteen millions of dollars. She has no one here who will speak for her people depending on this mighty and growing industry.

One of the gentlemen hailing from that State will, I imagine, a little later tell you that Colorado is willing to dismantle her 17 sugar factories; that she is willing to have her beet fields sown with ragweed or any old crop, provided he can retain his regularity as a Democrat.

He will tell you that he told the people of Colorado that he would vote for free sugar. He is unsophisticated enough to imagine that his position in the matter of the duty on sugar had any effect whatever on the fact of his being here as a minority Representative of that great Commonwealth. He might have been singing any kind of a song, in the frame of mind that the people of Colorado were in last year, with the Republicans divided squarely in two, and have been elected. Dismantle her factories, destroy one of the most important and valuable crops of her fertile acres, reduce the income of the population of her beautiful sugar-growing sections, and the gentleman will hear from his constituents in no uncertain way.

The gentleman from Alabama has said that in the main this bill has been constructed with the use of a jackscrew and not an ax. Here is a case of dynamiting. Here is a case of confiscation. The sugar factories north and south represent an investment of over a hundred million dollars. These will be actually confiscated. Sixty to sixty-five millions of dollars annually are paid to the farmers of the country for beets and cane, and no man whose opinion is worth paying any attention to, here or elsewhere, can deny the fact that when sugar goes on the free list the sugar industry, beet and cane, is destroyed under the American flag.

There are men on that side honest enough—and I hope in this debate they will say what they have said in private and sometimes almost said in public—that this mighty industry is an expensive luxury and they are willing to destroy it because in their opinion it is in the interest of the American people.

If I was on that side of the aisle and intended to vote for this bill that is the position I would take, for it is the only logical, tenable position in connection with the proposition contained in this bill to destroy the American sugar industry.

What is going to happen is that, after our beet fields no longer produce sugar beets, after our factory wheels cease to turn, the lawbreaking Sugar Trust at home, and foreign combines, will have the American people by the throat and raise the price of sugar higher than it has been for years. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I do not at this time desire to enter into any extended discussion of this schedule. A few days ago I gave at some length my reasons for believing that the tariff on sugar ought not to be reduced, much less should sugar be placed on the free list. I have offered an amendment which is now pending and which will permit this House to vote directly on the question whether or not it is in favor of putting sugar on the free list.

I desire at this time, Mr. Chairman, to ask unanimous consent to withdraw that amendment in order that the gentleman

from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the minority leader, may offer the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MCKELLAR). The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to be allowed to withdraw his amendment which he has offered on the sugar schedule. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is in order to offer an amendment at this time. There is an amendment pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will state, if the gentleman will permit me, that my understanding of the agreement is that these amendments might be considered as pending and then voted on afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the chair was not present when the agreement was made.

Mr. SHERLEY. That was my understanding, that the amendments could be offered during the debate.

Mr. MANN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to perfect the paragraph:

Strike out of lines 11, 12, and 13, page 48, the following language:
"That on and after the 1st day of May, 1916, the articles hereinbefore enumerated in this paragraph shall be admitted free of duty."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has offered an amendment, which will be considered pending.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH].

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, it is always a pleasure, in the discussion of the tariff question, to be able to quote the opinion of some one of the opposite political faith. It is my good fortune at this time to be able to give to you the views of a leading Democratic national committeeman on the subject of sugar. I quote from what Col. Robert Ewing, Democratic national committeeman of the State of Louisiana and owner of the New Orleans States, is reported as having said in the Washington Post February 26, 1913:

There are two industries in Louisiana on which we need protection—sugar and rice. I am a tariff-for-revenue Democrat and have never been any other kind of a Democrat. Sugar and rice must be protected, however, in order that these industries may survive and that we may get revenue from them. Sugar is the only necessary of life, the only staple commodity, that has fallen in price, notwithstanding the duty.

I invite attention now to the next few words that Col. Ewing said:

Free sugar would not mean any material benefit to the consumer. The price might fall for a short time, but it would be only a matter of months when the refiners would put the price back where it was.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell my Democratic friends when sugar will fall in price, and that will be after the 1st day of May, 1916, if this bill becomes a law. If the refiners have any gratitude in their souls to the Democratic Party they will put the price down from that time until after the November election of 1916. To continue what Col. Ewing said:

In other words, free sugar would mean merely that the Government would be playing into the hands of a trust.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that, if he is correctly quoted, the senior Senator from the State of Louisiana, in this morning's Washington Post, confirms every word that I have quoted as coming from Col. Ewing.

Last Saturday night, in this Chamber, the able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] expressed his views on the subject of sugar, and in the course of his remarks said that in 20 years either under this pending bill or under the present law the industry would be wiped out in Louisiana.

In Michigan, as in many other States, we have millions of dollars invested in factories. The farmers have hundreds of thousands of dollars in machinery, and the laboring men, as well as women, are paid splendid wages for the work they do in the sugar fields in connection with the sugar-beet industry of our State. I have no hesitation in saying that the prophecy which the gentleman from Georgia made with reference to Louisiana will be true with reference to the sugar-beet industries of Michigan, Colorado, Utah, and other States. But it will only be in keeping with every other bit of tariff-for-revenue and free-trade legislation that has ever been written upon the statute books since the birth of this Republic. It is not possible for one of you gentlemen to point to any free-trade or tariff-for-revenue legislation in this country under which we have not had results like we had in 1837, in 1857, between 1893 and 1897, and I am frank to say to-day that I would like to have somebody give to the country some consolation and comfort that we can hope that this bill will be an exception to every other tariff for revenue or free trade piece of legislation that has been written on the statute books. [Applause on the Republican side.]

"THORNTON FREE-SUGAR FOE—LOUISIANA SENATOR FIRST DEMOCRAT TO ATTACK PROPOSED SCHEDULE—ASSERTS CUT WOULD PLACE CONTROL OF INDUSTRY IN HANDS OF MONOPOLY OF REFINERS.

"The first outspoken attack on the Democratic tariff bill by a Democrat came yesterday, when Senator THORNTON, of Louisiana, in a public statement scored the sugar schedule. The Louisiana Senator said the sugar schedule was bound to defeat the one object which has been claimed by President Wilson and Leader UNDERWOOD as the primary purpose of the proposed legislation. Senator THORNTON said:

"'I am in thorough accord with the view expressed by President Wilson that a tariff bill should be so framed as to encourage competition and prevent monopoly. But the pending tariff bill, in so far as it concerns sugar, will have just the opposite effect. The provision for free sugar, without doubt, will put the entire control of the sugar industry of the United States in the hands of the big refiners. At the present time they are meeting with very effective competition from the domestic sugar industry. Its effect has been, and now is, to cheapen the cost of sugar to the consumer.

"'The admissions of the refiners themselves under examination before various congressional committees show that for several years they have been annoyed and embarrassed by the rapid growth of this competition, which cuts into the profits from the operation of their refineries for several months each year. They have declared that without tariff they have nothing to fear from the competition of foreign refiners. They are seeking the removal of the only competition from which they have anything to fear.

"'In view of this situation, it is easy to see that free sugar will result only in the destruction of competition and the opening of the way to the establishment of a burdensome and oppressive monopoly, able to impose its will upon the public and to exact higher prices from the consumer.'"

I will also append the following letter:

WAIALEE, HAWAII, *April 10, 1913.*

Hon. SAMUEL W. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Several years ago you very kindly used your influence to try to secure for me the appointment of collector of customs at the port of Honolulu, so that I now take the liberty of asking you to give me another lift. This is not for myself, but for all the people of Hawaii. If you can possibly do so, I should like to ask you to vote against the reduction of the tariff upon sugar, as such reduction will surely spell the ruin of this Territory. The revenue received from the tax upon the sugar industry in Hawaii amounts to 55 per cent of all the revenues. If this industry is crippled, where shall we turn for revenue? A great many will say that we must turn to other crops, but this is impossible on account of the climate, soil, and the countless insect pests which are able to live through the entire year, as we have no cold weather to exterminate them.

Hoping that you may be able to help us, I remain,
Yours, respectfully,

H. M. TUCKER.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND].

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, the peculiar climatic conditions of California make that Commonwealth a State of wonderful and diversified interests. If there is any industry in that great State that will not be injuriously affected if this bill goes into effect, I have failed to find it.

One of the chief industries of California is the beet-sugar industry. We have in that State 13 beet-sugar factories and are to-day the chief beet-sugar producing State in the Union. I want to present a few figures in order to impress upon this House the importance of this great industry to the State I in part represent. We paid last year for beets to the farmers $6,701,582. We paid for labor in the factories and fields over $3,900,000. We paid for fuel oil $500,000. We paid for bags $391,000 and for other supplies $542,000, making the total expenditures due to this industry in the State of California over $14,100,000. The number of acres harvested is 112,000. The tons of sugar beets grown are 1,037,000. The tons of sugar produced are 168,000 and the total investment in factory, land, and equipment in the State of California is over $19,904,823. This is but one of the great industries of California that is going to be disastrously affected by the passage of this law. In the beet-sugar industry alone we employ in California 25,000 men, and it can readily be appreciated that with the expenditure of this vast sum of money and the employment of this number of men that to strike down this industry and close these 13 factories you inflict a severe blow upon California. No doubt the rising generation in California

do not recall the effects of the Wilson law upon the industries of the State, but if this bill is enacted as at present written they will have a bitter experience that will not so soon be forgotten. Not only have we an interest in the beet-sugar industry in our own State but we are interested in the cane-sugar industry of the Hawaiian Islands. We sympathize with those people. The Hawaiian Islands are good customers of California and the United States. The total value of domestic merchandise shipped to Hawaii from the mainland for the 12 months ending December, 1912, was $28,029,240. The total for the same period, 1911, was $21,917,747. The total for the same period, 1910, was $21,637,751. Hawaii's products sold to the United States mainland increased approximately 5½ per cent from 1911 to 1912. Hawaii's purchases from the United States mainland increased approximately 30 per cent from 1911 to 1912. Strike down this industry in Hawaii and this entire country will suffer. Destroy the beet-sugar industry and you play into the hands of the Sugar Trust and do not benefit the American consumer. I shall support the amendment which has been offered to restore the rates upon sugar and to strike out the proviso for free sugar in three years. While I realize that this amendment will not be adopted because of the fact that the majority are bound and gagged by caucus rule, I am glad to go on record. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, I also come from one of the great beet-sugar producing States of this Union. There is more beet sugar produced in my district, I believe, than in any other district in that State. There is more beet sugar produced in my city than in any city in the United States, and I believe, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of this committee, that the effect of this tariff will be to absolutely throttle and destroy this great industry. The Democratic Party, as represented by the membership in this House, proposes not a reduction of the tariff for the purpose of placing the producer of this country on a basis of competition with those abroad, but they propose to enact into law a measure that will absolutely annihilate an industry that represents an investment of more than $100,000,000 in this country, claiming that any industry that can not compete in the open market with a like industry abroad without the benefit of the protective tariff is an illegitimate industry and should be destroyed. Much has been said both for and against this theory in this House in the past week, and I say to you of the majority that when the American farmers and the American laborers realize the fact that you propose to place them upon an absolute basis of equality with the Asiatic and European farmers and laborers, they will have an answer to that argument that will be most displeasing to you. It is a well-known fact, Mr. Chairman, that at such seasons when the beet sugar is not on the market that the great Refiners' Trust of this country absolutely monopolizes the market and fixes the price of sugar. It is also a well-known fact that at such times the price of this commodity is much higher, and I say to you, gentlemen, that if this bill becomes a law, and it will, and if the production of sugar in this country ceases, and it will, that the people of this country will be at the absolute mercy of this great Refiners' Trust. Within the past two years in my home city I have paid 9 cents a pound for granulated sugar. That was at a time when the beet sugar was not on the market.

The excuse offered for the rise in the price of sugar at that time of more than 2 cents was that there was a rumor of a shortage in the beet crop of Germany. Now, gentlemen, there are produced in this country 625,000 tons of sugar annually by the beet-sugar producers. There are something like 350,000 tons of cane sugar produced in this country, and I say to you, gentlemen, that if a mere rumor of a shortage of a crop in Germany would produce a rise in that price of some 2 cents per pound, what rise, in God's name, would an actual shortage of nearly 1,000,000 tons of sugar create?

Gentlemen, there is one schedule in this bill that I would like to vote for. I would like to vote for the income-tax measure, but, coupled as it is with a measure that strikes at the very foundation of all our industrial institutions, I can not support it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question? I do not believe his time has expired.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield my time back to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Was there any time left?

The CHAIRMAN. One minute.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to know why the falling off per acre in the production of beets in your State was so great last year?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I do, sir.

Mr. FOWLER. I see you produced only 6.75 tons per acre last year. I see that California produced 9.1.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I can answer the gentleman. It was due to the climatic conditions in the State. For the past two years the beet-sugar producers in the State of Michigan have lost money on account of having so much rain. In many instances it has been impossible for the farmers to get into their fields to harvest their crops, owing to the wet condition of the ground. I would ask the gentleman to go back further and look at the statistics.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it not true that the forces that make sugar are lacking to an extent, as they are in other States, and prevent you from raising beet sugar?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Absolutely not. The gentleman can find that I am right if he will go back and look at the statistics.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] 10 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has taken occasion to refer to me and my views on the sugar tariff. I appreciate it is just a trifle difficult for the gentleman from Wyoming to believe, in view of the fact that his State has tolerated the representation it has had for the last 10 or 12 years, that the people of the West give intelligent consideration to political problems. The gentleman complains that Colorado has no one on this floor to protest against the removal of the tariff on sugar. The reason for that, Mr. Chairman, is because the people of Colorado at the last election voted to instruct their Representatives to remove the tariff on sugar, and they voted in that way after a most thorough and exhaustive discussion of the question, and they voted that way because they were convinced that the removal of the tariff on sugar would not destroy the beet-sugar industry in that State or in any other State where God Almighty intended that men should raise sugar beets. And I submit that the people of Colorado, who have 17 sugar factories in operation, are better judges of the effect of the removal of the tariff on that great industry than is the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], who has no sugar factory within the boundaries of his State.

I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he has no sugar factory there, not because the people of Wyoming can not raise sugar beets, because in the irrigated sections of Wyoming they can raise sugar beets of as good a quality as they can in the irrigated sections of Colorado or Utah or Idaho, but you have no sugar factories in Wyoming because the Sugar Trust will not permit you to erect sugar factories in Wyoming. Evidently the Sugar Trust has felt that it could depend upon the vote of the gentleman from Wyoming without offering anything to the people in that State.

The reason that the people of Colorado are willing that this sugar tariff should be removed is because they want to save the beet-sugar industry from the malign influence of the Sugar Trust. Let us trace the story of the Sugar Trust's interest in beet-sugar factories.

Ten years ago, during the discussion of the Cuban reciprocity bill, the representatives of the beet-sugar interests came before Congress and declared that if you gave them 10 years more of protection the industry would be able to stand on its own legs. We have given them 10 years more of protection and, as a matter of fact, the industry is able to stand on its own legs. About 10 years ago the men who were then, and are now, in control of the beet-sugar industry in the Western States went down to New York and met with Mr. Havemeyer, of the Sugar Trust, and entered into a deal with him by which they sold to him the control of the beet-sugar industry in this country.

Mr. Morey, the president of the Great Western Sugar Co., and Mr. Boettcher, of the same concern, and a number of other sugar magnates, including Eccles, of Utah, have so testified in the case of the United States against the American Sugar Refining Co. They have told how they went down there; they have told of the price they got for a controlling interest in the stock; and then they have confessed that they entered into an arrangement with Mr. Havemeyer by which they became his western representatives. And the correspondence submitted in that hearing proves that Mr. Morey and Mr. Boettcher and the others were hired at salaries ranging from $10,000 to $15,000 a year to go back to the West and see to it that new sugar factories were not established there.

The correspondence is complete and conclusive. These men were the hired spies of the Sugar Trust. Their own letters prove that they went from point to point where they heard that sugar factories were about to be established, and that they used all their influence to prevent the development of the sugar industry.

When they found that the sentiment of a community was so strong that the people themselves were about to erect beet factories they went in and endeavored to secure the control of the majority of the stock, and in most instances they did secure the control of the majority of the stock.

As late as 12 or 18 months ago an attempt was made in the town of Durango, in the southwestern corner of my State, to establish a sugar factory. The farmers came forward and pledged the necessary acreage. The business men pledged generous subscriptions. A banker in that town undertook to finance the factory, and then the whole deal was called off. According to the sworn testimony which appears in the case of the United States against the American Sugar Refining Co., it appears that the banker was called up by the representative of the Sugar Trust and told to abandon the project. The trust's hired man simply put the screws on the Durango financial interests and prevented the establishment of this factory, which meant so much to southwestern Colorado.

That is only one of many instances. And, my friends, as a result of these experiences the people of Colorado and, I believe, the people throughout all that intermountain country, have come to the conclusion that the only way to put the beet-sugar industry on its feet is to demonstrate that it is a legitimate industry, that it can exist without the protection of a tariff, and that it will return to investors a fair rate of interest upon the investment. And that fact can be demonstrated.

We can raise in Colorado and in Utah and in Idaho and in most of those Western States as many pounds of sugar beets to the acre as can be raised anywhere, and they will average as high a percentage of saccharine matter as beets grown in any country on the face of the globe.

Our farmers get more for these high-grade beets than do the farmers of Germany. If our factories get their beets for as low a price as do the German factories why should not they be able to produce sugar at as low a figure? I know of no reason, and gentlemen have submitted no reason.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. What, in your opinion, will be the effect of this change in the law placing sugar on the free list as to the price in the market to the consumer?

Mr. KEATING. The price to the consumer will drop the full amount of the tariff at once. Out of all this discussion concerning sugar one fact stands out, so that no man can question its accuracy, and that fact is that the tariff is added to the price of sugar and that the American consumer pays $115,000,000 more a year for his sugar than he would if the tariff were not added.

The other day the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] questioned my statement that there were no independent beet-sugar factories in this country, that there was an understanding or trade arrangement or selling arrangement—whatever you want to call it—by which the price of sugar was fixed in every town in this country.

He said that was not true, and I want to submit to him what I consider to be splendid authority, the statement of a beet-sugar man, R. A. Wagner, the president of the Wisconsin Sugar Co. Mr. Wagner also says that my statement is not true, and yet I want to read you his letter and submit it as absolute evidence that my statement is true. He says:

> The price of sugar is higher in Colorado because over three-quarters of the sugar used in this country is imported and refined at the seaboard and must pay rail freight to Colorado.

Think of that statement, when there is not a pound of sugar imported into Colorado, but all that is used there is produced within the State. Why, we export five or six times as much as we use in the State. Yet he says that every pound must pay rail freight to Colorado. Continuing, he says:

> In other words, the price is based on the cost of foreign sugar f. o. b. our seaboard, plus freight to point of consumption. The Colorado sugar producers naturally meet these conditions, and in order to get the business make their quotation a few points lower.

And that is true in every town in the United States. The trust, in determining how much it will charge the American people for refined sugar, ascertains first of all the cost of raw sugar at New York. Then it adds the tariff. Then it adds the cost of refining. Then it adds to that a profit, and then it adds to that the cost of the freight from New York to the point where the sugar is consumed, without regard to where the sugar may be produced. And, as I stated on the floor of this House the other day, the result is that down in Arizona, in the shadow of a sugar factory, where they are producing many times the amount of sugar consumed in the State, the people of Arizona pay $1.34 per hundred pounds freight for the sugar that never saw a box car, in addition to the tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, under section 179 of this bill sugar, both raw and refined, is proposed to be put upon the free list at the end of three years. I have not risen to discuss the effect of the removal of the duty upon the sugar industry of the country for two reasons: First, it would not do much good, and, second, because my colleagues from Michigan and elsewhere have done and will further do so. But what I have risen to inquire about, in good faith and for information, is the effect of the provisions of the antidumping clause in this bill upon this section now under consideration.

As I understand it, practically all the sugar-producing countries of Europe levy an internal-revenue tax upon sugar for home consumption. When the manufacturer of sugar in Germany or any other European country where this internal-revenue tax is imposed invoices his sugar to the wholesaler for local consumption, of course such invoice includes the cost of his raw material, his labor cost, any government charges, organization charges, and profits. Necessarily such price will include any internal-revenue tax levied in those countries on local consumption. Now, the purpose of this antidumping clause, as I understand it, is to prevent foreign countries from selling in our markets cheaper than they sell to their own people. What I want to know is, under the provisions of this antidumping clause, how the sugar refiners of Europe are going to sell in our markets cheaper than they sell at home, and how are we to get cheaper sugar when the price of sugar there for home consumption is equal to or greater than the price of sugar to our consumers here at the present time? If they do sell sugar cheaper here than at home, the antidumping provision puts a 15 per cent duty upon the sugar so imported into the United States. And here is the secret of the whole business as it looks to me: This provision, coupled with the antidumping clause, enables the American refiner to get free raw sugar from Cuba and protects him from the sugar refiner of Europe by a 15 per cent duty.

Mr. HARDWICK rose.

Mr. MANN. Let the gentleman from Georgia answer in his own time.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman from Georgia answer in his own time? That is the only question I have to ask. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understood that the time which was not consumed would not be charged to either of us.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] in his demonstration of the reason that there were not more beet-sugar factories established in the State of Colorado or in Wyoming, it seemed to me that he had convinced me that the sugar-refining interests did not want the sugar factories and that at the present time they are doing what they can to keep them down. That is what I understand was the gentleman's argument. I understand he is about to vote for this bill, and thereby is going to try to strike a terrific blow at the sugar-refining interests. My friends, in striking that blow you are simply putting out of business all of the beet-sugar factories, and the sugar-refining people, instead of thinking that you have struck a terrific blow at them, will simply think that you have given them a slap on the wrist, or it may be a love pat.

The distinguished and affable gentleman from Alabama said that the duties were being reduced with a jack, and as we notice you are letting the sugar interests down with two bumps instead of one, and we are to wait three years to see how hard the last bump will be. As I recollect, in one county of my district—and I believe I have a right to speak here on behalf of the interests of my people—in one county, Huron, there were 10 years ago 6,000 tons a year of sugar beets produced. Now there are better than 96,000 tons a year, and at the same time the valuation of the farm lands has doubled, indicating that the farmer does get some benefit from protection. As I remember that and think of the disaster that is impending over these farmers in that county, it occurs to me that the jack that was instrumental in the reduction of the tariff in this bill was not the jackscrew that the gentleman has referred to, but that guardian angel of the Democratic Party, the blundering jackass. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to presume to discuss further this bill, but I believe it will be proper here in the midst of all these discussions, at least some of them from men

who are assuming their statistics, or at least picking them up out of dusty volumes, that it would only be fair to call to the witness stand for a minute one of the men who has got his living out of the business, trying to make something for himself and his family, and also to afford a market for the manufactures of the cities. Hence, I am going to read this letter from a farmer who is engaged in the production of sugar beets:

CROSWELL, MICH., *April 26, 1913.*

Hon. LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
Representative Seventh District, Michigan.

DEAR SIR: I earnestly beg of you to do all in your power to prevent the removal of duty from sugar. I think I express the sentiments of all the farmers of this beet-growing district.

On Friday, the 18th instant, the report was started that the Croswell plant of the Michigan Sugar Co. had turned down all contracts and was not going to operate the coming campaign. Well, you ought to have heard the "holler" that the farmers and the residents of Croswell put up until they found the report was not true.

Whenever two or more farmers met the question was, "What can we put in to take the place of sugar beets?" And I say nothing will take the place of sugar beets on Michigan farms to-day, on account of the intensive cultivation and deep-rooting system of the sugar beets, as they bring up fertility from the soil that we would get in no other way. It is the indirect benefit we get from the sugar beet that pays us more than direct benefit. We will take my own farm here for example.

When I bought this farm 10 years ago I harvested from 17 to 30 bushels of oats and about 1 ton of hay per acre. Now, after growing sugar beets for 7 years, I get from 50 to 60 bushels of oats and 2½ tons of hay, and from a worn-out farm I have built up a farm as good as any in Sanilac County.

I raise from 12 to 18 acres of beets on my 80-acre farm every year, and it is getting richer all the time—thanks to sugar beets.

As a cash-money crop the beets are ahead of any other crop we can grow. Of course, it costs more to grow an acre of beets than any other crop, but we get paid for it in the benefit it does our land. As for growing them for less per acre than we are getting now, I know there is not a farmer in this neighborhood that would contract for an acre. It costs us $20 per acre to get the hand labor done. This labor is done by the foreigners, and we are making good citizens and good farmers out of these foreigners; in fact, four of the families I have had in the past seven years have bought farms within 2 miles of my farm.

You gentlemen in the city are worrying about your foreign population. Let them go out into the country and help produce what you in the city want to eat.

The letter continues:

Our land has increased in value, in fertility, and we have made good citizens out of these foreigners, and it is all through sugar beets. When the farmer prospers everybody else prospers.

Thanking you in advance for anything you can do to help the farmer, I remain,

Yours, very truly, E. C. WESTBROOK,
Croswell, Sanilac County, Mich.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, by the courtesy of Members on this side of the House I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that, acting strictly within the rules of my own party, formulated and adopted in a Democratic caucus, I should have obtained from the Democratic leader time to present the case of the Democratic constituency that I represent here. I have sought in vain to get recognition which I think I am entitled to receive in a Democratic House. Failing in that, I want to express my appreciation of the courtesy extended to me by the leader of the Republican Party in permitting the constituency which I represent—which was 90 per cent in the last election in the votes of that district—in affording me an opportunity to present their case.

I have no desire to be an obstructionist or to criticize the leader of the Democratic Party, but it seems to me that one or the other thing ought to be done. If I come strictly within the rules of my party, opposing the measure as I do oppose it, I ought to get time from the leader of my own party. [Applause on the Republican side.] And if I can not get the time from him I ought to be excluded from the Democratic caucus, that the people at home may know that the Democratic leadership of this House, without personal reflection on the gentleman who now is here in control of the Democratic forces, may know whether they have friends here in their own party or whether they must appeal to the leaders of the other party in order to secure time to present their cause. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I am not going to deal with the subject at length. My personal relations with the gentleman who occupies the leadership of my party on the floor are very agreeable, and in my estimation he stands as high as does any other Member in this House [applause]; but I do desire to express in behalf of my constituents the thought that at least within the ranks of their party they should be able to get as frank a recognition as they get from the party for which they do not vote.

My time is so limited that I will not deal with that very much, but I make this acknowledgment to the gentleman leading the forces of the minority upon this floor, in order that he may understand not only my appreciation of the courtesy which he has extended to me, but the appreciation of the people whom I represent on this floor.

I want to get to the meat of this subject. I have long contended in this House that the destruction of the domestic sugar industry in this country will lead us back into conditions which existed long ago, when there was no domestic industry, and permit the refiners operating along the coast of the Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf, and the Pacific to dominate the American sugar market. I believe in the little time allotted to me I can demonstrate that the efforts of the gentlemen who are now using their means, their money, and efforts to secure, not free sugar, as some claim, but to secure very low duties, in order that they may, with the destruction of domestic sugar, dominate the American market and raise the price of sugar to the American consumer.

A man working for wages in this city brought me this morning this card which I hold in my hand. He got it from a package of sugar of 20 pounds, refined from cane sugar, coming from the Tropics, which he bought in the market on yesterday for 4½ cents a pound. That sugar was refined by the Spreckels Refining Co., which my friend from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] will at once recognize is the employer of Mr. Lowry, the man who has taken charge of the propaganda for free sugar, and it reads as follows:

Tariff on sugar is an advantage to the Sugar Trust and its allies only. With free raw sugar this sugar would cost you about 2 cents per pound less. Urge your Congressman to insist on the removal of the tariff on sugar.

This card was in a package of 20 pounds of sugar bought by this man, and he brought the card to me. He paid 4½ cents a pound for the sugar only yesterday. Now, let us look the facts squarely in the face. I once before took the position in the House that this refiner, including what he calls the Sugar Trust, which is generally accepted to mean the American Sugar Refinery, the Arbuckles and himself, were in alliance not to put sugar on the free list, but to so reduce the duty as to put the beet-sugar people in the West out of business, and also the sugar-cane people in Louisiana and Texas out of business, in order that together they might dominate the market. Their efforts have been directed, first, to control the beet production in the West by controlling the factories in the West. They have never worried about us. These refiners have robbed us of Louisiana, so far back that no man's memory runneth to the contrary.

They saw the beet industry developing in the West absorbing a large proportion of the sugar being supplied to the American people, and my friend from Colorado [Mr. KEATING], I believe, will agree with me, and they started first by trying to absorb a majority of the stock in the beet industry in the West. They failed in that. The industry developed too fast. In 10 years there was 1,500 per cent of production increase, and they had to abandon that plan of controlling the domestic sugar output. Then they adopted another plan—that of discouraging men from putting money into the development of the sugar industry in the West, in order that they might stop the increased production of sugar in continental United States. They failed in that. Then they appealed to Congress, not to put sugar on the free list, but to reduce the duty on sugar to the extent of destroying the industry, in order that they might again absorb the control of the American market and then lift the price of sugar to the consumer as best suited them. This card comes from Mr. Lowry. It is issued by his employer. It is printed in the same way that numerous articles you have received in your mail, each and every one of you, are printed. I have here a document published by him on the 12th day of April, this year, only a few days ago. In that document at the head of it, as has appeared on every recent document issued by him, including the two that came this morning, he does not advocate free sugar as appears upon this card, but a duty of 0.624 cent; but he advocates and he speaks for Spreckels, because the evidence is before at least three committees of the Congress—the Hardwick, the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and the Finance Committee of the Senate last year—that every bit of the expense incurred in the propaganda which he is conducting is paid out of the pocket of Spreckels, who claims, according to him, to be fighting the Sugar Trust. Mr. Atkins, the vice president of the American Sugar Refining Co., speaking before the Committee on Ways and Means the other day, said he did not want free sugar, but wanted to reduce the rates of duty. The Arbuckles took the same position before the Ways and Means Committee in my presence here recently.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Arbuckles were for free sugar.

Mr. BROUSSARD. They are not, any more than Spreckels is; and right at the head of every document that you receive now that calls for free sugar, as on this card, you will see printed:

The rate we propose, 0.624 cent per pound; raw sugar, 96 test, 0.60 cent per pound.

Sixty one-hundredths cent per pound means that every domestic refiner in this country, every domestic producer in this country, must go out of business. What follows? Domination of the American sugar market by the refiners.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 36 minutes.

Mr. BROUSSARD. May I get 10 minutes more?

Mr. MANN. I will yield the gentleman 10 minutes more in view of his very interesting statement and the courtesy of some Members here. [Applause.]

Mr. BROUSSARD. I thank the gentleman very much; 0.624 puts the domestic producer out of business, the beet and the sugar men in the West and South, and it gives the market entirely of at least 3,600,000 tons of sugar a year into the hands of the refiners. This card of the refiner pleads for free sugar and tells the consumer that he can get 2 cents per pound reduction on his sugar. These circular letters of this same refiner pleads for a small duty, just as the American and other refiners desire. Give just enough duty so we may put the domestic producer out of business and then what?

Let us see, by this document—I take the gentleman's very statement—paid for, printed, and posted, the efforts and time of the gentleman who issues it, paid for by Spreckels, the refiner. What does it show? It was alleged here when Cuban reciprocity was up, when the proposition was a reduction of 50 per cent, that the reduction was to help the Cuban planter. When the proposition of 20 per cent, which finally became law, was under consideration, the argument was that we owed that much to the Cuban planter. The bill had not been law more than 18 months when the Cuban planters were complaining to Congress that the refiners, including Spreckels, the employer of Lowry, was absorbing the entire 20 per cent which Congress supposed they had given the Cuban planter. Now, what appears here in this document? Lowry says this on the 12th of April:

Cuban sugars are to-day selling at 2 cents, cost and freight, and pay a tariff of 1.348 cents. San Domingo sugars (nonprivileged) are offered at 2.06 cents per pound, cost and freight New York, and pay a duty of 1.685 per pound.

We gave 20 per cent, according to this gentleman's statement—and I have verified the statements and I know they are correct—we gave 20 per cent to the Cuban planter. That sugar, bought in bond, upon which the refiner pays 1.348, sells for less than the sugar that is brought from San Domingo that pays 1.685. It is therefore evident to any man who will stop to look into the matter, that the Cuban planter does not get one cent of the 20 per cent reduction. Now, then, does the consumer of this country get the reduction? Will any man get up and say so? This card which my friend handed me gives the difference between the New York price of sugar that come from Cuba and the New York price of the sugar that come from San Domingo. Both sugars once refined sell for the same price to the consumer, and if the Cuban planter sells his sugar cheaper in bond to the refiner, including Mr. Spreckels, for less money—despite the 20 per cent preferential he has—than the San Domingo planter, who pays the full duty, it is evident that the Cuban planter gets none of the benefit of the 20 per cent reduction. On the other hand, if the consumer of this country can not distinguish between the Cuban and the San Domingo sugar after Mr. Spreckels has refined it, but must pay the same price for each, it is evident to any man who will think about it at all that the entire difference between the difference in duty on San Domingo and Cuban sugar is absorbed by the refiner. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The American producer does not get a cent of the 20 per cent reduction. He can not possibly get a cent of it in spite of this card, saying that free sugar would give my friend the same sugar which he purchased only yesterday at 4½ cents a pound for 2½ cents a pound. Besides, note the bunco game attempted upon the consumer. Free sugar, it urges on the card, while to you gentlemen of the House the same sympathetic gentleman tells you daily he does not really wish free sugar, but six hundred and four one-thousandths of a cent, so as to enable him at one and the same time to kill his competitors and permit him to continue to reap the benefits of the 20 per cent Cuban preferential.

As a matter of fact, the refiner buys his sugar cheaper from the man who produces it in Cuba than from the man producing sugar elsewhere, despite the advantage of 20 per cent on the rate of duty fixed in the law; but when he comes to sell it to you and to me he sells both for the same price, and thus absorbs the entire 20 per cent. This is not a novel proposition. Back in 1872 or 1873 this Republic made a treaty with the then Kingdom of Hawaii by which the sugar from those islands should come in free. This was done, so it was claimed, to reduce the price of sugar to American consumers on the Pacific coast. Three years after that treaty was enacted, in 1876, and for the entire term of the treaty this disproportion was maintained, that sugar sold on the Pacific coast at 10 cents a pound, with free raw sugar upon the Pacific coast, as against 7½ cents a pound on the Atlantic coast, with a duty of over 2 cents per pound.

This condition continued for over a quarter of a century until annexation. Nor did this condition cease until beet sugar began to be produced on the Pacific coast, when the refiner was forced to sell his sugars for less. It is the policy of the refiners of the country to destroy the domestic production when they will again dominate this market. Mark what I say. After sugar shall have become free you will find that the refiners in this country will be exerting their influence with whatever party may be in power, for these being in a trust, belong to no party, will be exerting their influence to permit them to have this Government send a party to represent this Republic at the Brussels conference, and when they shall have done that they will exclude from the United States European beet sugar in competition with themselves. Through this instrumentality in 1911, with a dearth of sugar on the American market, the Brussels conference, forbidding Russia to ship to us any portion of her 2,000,000 tons of surplus sugars, enables the refiners to lift the price of sugar to the American consumer to 7½ cents, and Spreckels was the worst offender of them all. They have absorbed the Cuban crop, they have absorbed the Hawaiian crop, they have absorbed the Porto Rican crop, and after they have done that, and they have no further competitors in continental United States and after, with your assistance, they shall have destroyed the beet sugar in the West and the cane sugar of the South, the price of sugar will rise, boosted by the refiners, as it was when they secured Hawaiian reciprocity. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is their purpose, judging from the evidence that appears in the three separate efforts of theirs.

Let me show you how much money they made out of Cuban reciprocity when they told us then, through a similar propaganda, conducted by the American then, much in the way that Spreckels conducts this one now. They have absorbed under that treaty, as I have just shown, and do now absorb, the entire 20 per cent reduction upon the tariff rate. There has been imported into this country since the Cuban reciprocity treaty from Cuba, in round figures, 28,000,000,000 pounds of sugar, and they have declared in dividends, that ought to have gone either to the Cuban planter or to the American consumer, over $96,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I would like to get just two or three minutes more.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BROUSSARD. Thank you.

Now, what does that mean with regard to our trade with the islands which we own and with which we are in treaty relations? Let us take Hawaii. There was exported to Hawaii from the United States in 1911, $21,000,000 of goods. There was imported into the United States from Hawaii $40,250,000 worth of goods, of which sugar formed $36,500,000. Last year there was an increase of 30 per cent in this trade. What will become of that trade? If I am correctly informed by the resolution of boards of trade of Honolulu, Iloilo, and our islands of the Pacific; if I am correctly informed by the gentlemen who are here and have come here to protest against this freeing of sugar after three years, it means that that industry must go. There is no question about the destruction of the Louisiana industry. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], who investigated the Sugar Trust, says frankly that it must go at the end of three years. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has been frank and fair enough in the debates in this House to say that in his judgment it must be abandoned; that $100,000,000 worth of investments in Louisiana must disappear as the result of this policy.

What will become of this trade of Hawaii? I will tell you what will become of it. There are 80,000 Japanese in Hawaii to-day. The moment you reduce this duty to the extent of making it impossible for any but the most favored plantations to continue, the moment you reduce it to the extent that these people must reduce the cost of production in order to be able to compete against the world on this market, that minute the American white man in Hawaii will move away from there

and come back to his native country and engage in some other pursuit. What is left? The Jap is not going back to Japan. He is getting an outpost in the Pacific, 7,000 miles closer to the United States than before.

He will be a dominating influence; he will become the sole laborer. And do not make a mistake about it. The Japs understand the industry. They developed the sugar industry in Formosa after the Jap-Chinese War. They have sent men down to my State to learn from the agricultural college that furnishes the sugar chemists the world over to-day—sent men down there, as I know personally to learn that industry. And instead of continuing importers of sugar, they are preparing, according to our consular reports, to become exporters of sugar.

They will be the people who will handle those plantations in Hawaii, so well favored as to survive this disastrous legislation and to compete with the world with Japanese labor; and instead of that $40,000,000 of trade coming to the United States you will find that trade going to Japan, because the control of the islands will be in the hands of the Japanese, who will stand the cut in wages when the white man shall have been driven from those islands. [Applause on the Republican side.]

What about Porto Rico? Every cablegram, every resolution of every commercial body in the island of Porto Rico, as well as the statements of men whom I have seen here from Porto Rico, assures me that in consequence of the annexation of the island, bringing about American labor and methods of living in Porto Rico, they must go under with free sugar. And yet the trade with Porto Rico is thirty-three and three-quarters million dollars. The importations from the island to the United States are thirty-four and three-quarters million dollars, of which over twenty-five million dollars is sugar.

What else will occur there? We have been able to put our rice—our surplus rice, our low-grade rice, raised in Arkansas and Texas and Louisiana—into Porto Rico in competition with the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROUSSARD. It surely is not 10 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] yielded five minutes to the gentleman the last time.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Can I get a few minutes more—just two minutes?

Mr. MANN. I will yield to the gentleman three minutes. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] is recognized for three minutes more.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Now, the grade of rice that is sold in Porto Rico is not consumed in the United States at all, and the loss of that part of the crop means the putting of that industry out of business in all three of the States I have mentioned. Why do I say that? Under the treaty with Cuba we have a 40 per cent preferential rate on the Cuban market, and the duty on rice in Cuba is more than 3 cents a pound. With 40 per cent advantage on that market we have never yet been able to ship from this country as much as a thousand sacks of rice to Cuba per year.

We are selling now in Porto Rico one-fifth of the entire production of rice in the United States, and of that grade that is not consumed in this country. This proposes to cut the duty 50 per cent. If we can not ship into Cuba, as we believed we could, when Cuban reciprocity was adopted, with a preferential of 40 per cent on 3 cents per pound duty, how can we ship a pound of rice into Porto Rico, with a cut of 50 per cent and a duty of only 1 cent per pound?

We shall lose that market, and not only will those people quit trading with us in rice but they will get their main supply of food from Europe, where they take the brown rice of the Orient, and in fitting it for market in Germany and Spain send their low-grade rice to the West Indies. Not only will we lose that market, so far as the rice produced in this country is concerned, but we will also lose the other part of that market, which represents this $34,750,000.

How about Cuba? We got last year from Cuba $60,000,000 worth of trade, and we shipped into Cuba $110,000,000 worth, of which $81,500,000 was sugar. And this last year there was an increase of 12 per cent, making over $90,000,000 worth of sugar.

The moment sugar is free, which is the basis of our treaty with Cuba, there will be no more incentive to continue the treaty, and of itself it must become inoperative and void. And that trade will go where the Cuban can get the best prices; we will lose most of it. All this trade with Hawaii and Porto Rico and Cuba must be lost absolutely as the result of free sugar at the end of three years.

Now, I did not want to discuss this matter very much further, except as to Cuba. Here is a report which has just been made, on March 24, by one of our consuls to the State Department regarding the sugar crop in Cuba. There is a great increase in the sugar production in Cuba this year, even as there was last year over the previous year. There will be over two million and a quarter tons of sugar produced, and yet the planters are in bad shape, says the consul, because the American refiner has already absorbed the 20 per cent preferential. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want first to answer in my own time the question propounded by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] which he would not let me answer in his time, although his language and matter invited an immediate answer.

The antidumping clause will have no effect whatever on the sugar situation, for the simple reason that if the gentleman will read the dumping clause carefully he will find that it applies only to a commodity upon which a duty is established, and it applies to no commodity that is on the free list, and so far as free sugar is concerned, it could have no effect.

It is possible that the dumping clause might have an effect during the three years of reduction, but my own belief is that when the Treasury Department construes the dumping clause in regard to refined sugar during these three years, it will be bound to hold that local taxes, in the nature of consumption or internal revenue taxes, will not be considered a part of the retail price in foreign countries.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Would it not be better to amend the bill in harmony with my suggestion?

Mr. HARDWICK. No; I rather think not. I do not think it is necessary. Of course the main question is what the effect of the antidumping clause will be upon free sugar. It will have no effect whatever upon that, as I have explained, and gentlemen can form their own conclusions as to effect during the three-year period when we will have a duty that is reduced 25 per cent.

I want to cover, if I can, in my own way, some of the facts in reference to the sugar situation, and I am not trying to make a speech about it. But before I start to do that I want to say that if gentlemen will withhold their questions until I finish developing an idea, I will then yield to them as long as I have a second of time left. I will yield then to any gentleman on either side, so far as the time will permit.

As far as Louisiana cane sugar is concerned, before this debate began to-day many gentlemen on that side and on this side came to me and asked me if during the closing hours of the general debate the other night I did not admit that putting sugar on the free list would eventually put Louisiana out of the sugar-cane business. I did so admit, and I went even further than that, and I now repeat it. Even the present duty, in my judgment from an exhaustive examination of this question, could not keep Louisiana in the sugar business a dozen years.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; if it is a brief question.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Does the gentleman believe that in the three years before sugar becomes free under this bill the sugar industry can prosper, even for one more year or two more years?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not think it can prosper during the three years, and I do not think the gentleman's industry is prospering now, and I will tell him why in a minute. Even if the American consumer would consent to keep the present duty, nobody knows better than my friend from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] that the Louisiana cane-sugar industry can not live anyhow. We are not murdering that industry. We are not sending it to an untimely and unmerited death. The God of nature is sending it there.

This is the best illustration I have ever seen, according to the way I view this situation, of a hothouse industry. The gentlemen in Louisiana have splendid rich lands upon which this sugar cane is grown. When I ask them why they do not plant those lands in cotton, they tell me that if they should plant cotton there the stalks would grow so high that they would have to use stepladders to pick the cotton out of the bolls. They can raise vegetables, grains, cotton, or anything, and they ought to raise something adapted to that climate and that soil, instead of raising this tropical product which they can not raise on even terms with other countries more adapted by nature to its cultivation.

Let us see if the figures do not prove that. The facts which I am going to give you during the course of these remarks are mainly taken from the report of a committee which is unanimous—agreed to by gentlemen on both sides of this Chamber—so there can be no question about its fairness, nor do I think there can be any reasonable question about its accuracy.

In Java raw cane sugar is being produced to-day at 1½ cents a pound, and in the Philippines at 1¾ cents a pound; and one of the greatest experts in all the world, Mr. Prinsen Gerliggs, of Holland, says that in the Philippines, when they get modern machinery there and when they get transportation to the sugar fields, the Philippines alone can produce all the sugar this world can consume at a lower price than any other country on earth. Already Philippine sugar delivered costs 1¾ cents per pound, but they have to pay tremendous transportation charges to get their sugar to the market. In Porto Rico, Cuba, and Hawaii the cost of production is about 2 cents a pound. Now, against that cost of production of raw sugar our friends from Louisiana are here with an industry which they admit can not produce raw sugar for less than 3¾ cents a pound, or almost double the cost. It seems to me that it is our bounden duty to save our Louisiana friends, both politically and industrially, from themselves—from the serious and fundamental mistake they are making—and to do so in the hope that they may soon turn to other industries better adapted to their splendid soil and therefore more profitable. They ask us to continue the policy that has been maintained in this country to the detriment of the American consumer these many years of taxing all the people in order that a few may maintain this hothoused industry. It is undemocratic, it is unfair, and it is unrighteous; and I stand to-day with that great commoner who came out of Virginia and founded a great party, to whom the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRINGER] so eloquently referred the other night as saying, in effect, that it was absolutely unjust and unrighteous to fasten a duty on any product which could not be permanently produced in this country, in the end, as cheap as anywhere else. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Oh, but gentlemen speak of destroying the industry. In a meeting held in New Orleans on the 12th of November, 1912, after our first free-sugar bill had passed the House, there were resolutions adopted and speeches made. Some of those speeches are not very complimentary either to my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] or to myself, but we will let that pass. They did pass a resolution stating the condition of the industry, so far as the capital invested therein was concerned. What did they say? They said that the industry had invested in it $119,000,000, and they itemized it—$70,000,000 in land, $10,000,000 in mules, $35,000,000 in factories, $2,000,000 in farm implements, $2,000,000 in plantation railroads. Now, we are not going to confiscate the land, and it is land on which they can raise better cotton than we can anywhere else. We are not going to do anything with the mules, and as to confiscating the machinery, they can sell that like they would any secondhand stuff.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. BROUSSARD. To whom shall we sell the machinery that is not worth a thing to any man?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not know; you could sell it to Cuba or the Philippines.

Mr. BROUSSARD. No; we could not; their system is different.

Mr. HARDWICK. The gentleman said they came over here and got machinery and learned our methods. But I can not waste time on that minor detail. You can probably get something for it. So they ask us to preserve an industry that represents a total investment of thirty-odd million dollars, and to do it they want to tax the American people $140,000,000 a year. It is not Democratic and it is not right. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Not just now.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Just one question.

Mr. HARDWICK. Very well.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Has the gentleman read Mr. Lowry's statement this morning?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. BROUSSARD. And he says the consumer does not get it; the refiner gets it.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will tell the gentleman before we pass that point that the gentleman's description of what happened when the Cuban reciprocity bill passed is entirely wrong and is absolutely incorrect. Here is what happened: The Cuban reciprocity act passed and the refiners obtained 6 cents per 100 pounds benefit from the Cuban preferential, Cuba 10 cents per 100 pounds, and the American consumer 18 cents a hundred pounds. That is the estimate of the best expert in the country.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Who?

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Wallace P. Willett. The gentleman will admit that Mr. Willett is one of the best sugar experts in the country?

Mr. BROUSSARD. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is what he swore to, and I will refer the gentleman to pages 3551 and 3741 of the hearings of the special committee, and he will find that that is exactly what he swore to. I tell you what I thought would happen when we passed the bill. I thought the Cubans would get right under the tariff wall just as the Hawaiians did, and take the full benefit of the duty against the rest of the world, at the expense of the American consumer. They could not do it. Why? Because the refiners had loaned them money and were pressing them to pay the debt. So that the refiners were able to take from them 24 cents per 100 pounds of the reduction of 20 per cent, leaving to the Cuban planters the remaining 10 cents per 100 pounds.

The refiners would have kept all of this 24 cents if they had been in combination, as the gentleman indicated, but competition was so keen between them that for every 10 cents they kept they gave the American people 18 cents. I did not expect when I voted for the bill to get anything in the way of reduction for the American consumer, but in point of fact did get the 18 cents reduction, as I have stated.

As far as the Hawaiian business is concerned, of course, when we put Hawaii within the tariff walls and kept up that tariff wall against the balance of the world the Hawaiians just said, "You can not buy your sugar from Germany or Java or anywhere else without the duty added, and you will have to pay us the amount of the duty," and that answers the gentleman's whole argument upon that point. The gentleman from Louisiana or some other gentleman spoke about American labor. If he will examine the sworn evidence—I believe my friend from Louisiana made some statement about labor?

Mr. BROUSSARD. No.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am glad the gentleman did not, because if he will examine the evidence in this case he will find that, according to what his own people swore before the special committee, they pay for field labor from 75 to 85 cents a day for men and a dollar a day in the harvest time, and for women 75 cents a day.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Not at this time.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Oh, the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am absolutely accurate in that statement. It is taken from pages 1816 and 1817 of the hearings of the special committee.

Mr. BROUSSARD. But the Louisiana people furnish these people with homes and fuel.

Mr. HARDWICK. In Cuba, where they furnish all these things, too——

Mr. BROUSSARD. Oh, they do not. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I have been there and his committee has not. They sleep in the open—in the cane fields.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not wonder that the gentleman does not want me to emphasize this matter. In Cuba they are paying from $1 to $1.25 a day for the same class of labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BROUSSARD. But the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; but I have not the time now to permit the gentleman to take it all up. Please do not bother me now. In Cuba the factory cost is about the same as it is in America. The labor cost of manufacturing a pound of cane or beet sugar is not very much. It costs about 14 cents a hundred pounds; and I do not think they need any protection, as far as the factories go, either beet or cane, because of factory labor.

Mr. BROUSSARD. That is where the trust comes in.

Mr. HARDWICK. Besides that, in Louisiana the sucrose content of the cane is from 6 to 7 per cent. In Hawaii it is from 14 to 15 per cent. In Cuba it is from 10 to 12 per cent and sometimes 14. In Louisiana they plant almost every year, and they have to cut the cane in October in order to keep the frost from getting it. In Cuba and Java and these other countries the frost never bothers, and they do not have to plant more than once in 10 years. It is perfectly apparent why Louisiana can not continue this industry. It is not the unkindness of the Democratic Party. It is simply the decree of the God of nature. It ought never to have been attempted in that climate. It never has been successful. The only time in its history that it has ever paid was during those palmy days to them, to which the

gentleman referred, when the people were paying 7 and 8 and 10 cents a pound for sugar.

I want to give a moment now to the beet-sugar factories. That is not the situation as far as the beet-sugar factories are concerned. There are not a dozen fairly well organized factories in this country that can not live and make more than 10 per cent on the investment under this law, and I defy any man to disprove it in this Chamber or elsewhere.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Let me call attention to some of the facts and then I will yield. There are 76 beet-sugar factories in the country—17 in the State of Colorado, 16 in Michigan, 13 in California, 6 in Utah, 5 in the State of Idaho, 5 in the State of Ohio, 4 in Wisconsin, 2 in Nebraska, and 1 in each of the following States: Montana, Minnesota, Kansas, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, and Arizona. The total capital of these 76 beet-sugar factories is $141,410,000, according to the last statement they rendered. Their total capacity for slicing beets per day in tons is 63,550. That is the total capacity of them all, and that, according to the admissions of these same men when they were in effect pleading for continued high duties, does not mean a real investment of more than sixty-three and a half million dollars in these entire 76 factories. In the report in which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] agreed with me, we valued them all at sixty million, not quite as much as I have estimated it here to-day.

Say $63,000,000 is the total of factory valuations in this country. So, taking $39,000,000 in cane and $63,000,000 in beet factories you have a total real capital of about $100,000,000 invested in this industry, which every year levies tribute on the great masses in this country under the tariff of from $125,000,000 to $141,000,000, in order that a few may be "protected" at the expense of all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield the gentleman five minutes additional.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman now permit a question?

Mr. HARDWICK. Let me go on; not at present. I will yield later, if possible.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman will yield before his time has expired?

Mr. HARDWICK. If I possibly can. Now, I want to take three of the great beet-sugar companies as examples and show how they are capitalized and organized and why they are pleading for this continued high protection. I will take first the Great Western Sugar Co., one to which reference has been made here to-day. It was started in 1906, chartered under the laws of New Jersey—and that was before the regeneration of New Jersey [laughter and applause on the Democratic side]—with a capital of $30,000,000, one-half common and one-half preferred stock, the preferred representing to a certain extent real value and the common in every instance promoters' profits—water, pure and simple. In five years that company has accumulated on its real investment of about $12,000,000, $9,000,000 surplus, besides paying 12 per cent interest on the real capital invested—7 per cent on the preferred stock and 5 per cent on the common. They have done pretty well. Do you know why? Because they can make sugar there in the best factories of that concern within a few points of the cost in Germany. Let us take another one, the American Beet, a California concern. Our friend Mr. Oxnard, of whom we have all heard in connection with sugar, is at the head of it, or was until recently. The American Beet Sugar Co. has a capital of $5,000,000 preferred and $15,000,000 common; real value according to the slicing capacity of this factory about $5,000,000 and the $15,000,000 common—water—and yet in 1911 it paid 6 per cent profit on the actual investment of preferred stock and passed a surplus of $1,643,659, a dividend of 10.95 per cent on water pure and simple; and in 1912 paid 6 per cent on its preferred and laid up a surplus that would have paid a dividend of 13.5 per cent on its common. So that this common stock, representing no investment save a capitalization of the tariff, paid 10.95 per cent in 1911 and 13.5 per cent in 1912. Let us next take the Michigan Co. The Michigan Sugar Co. was capitalized originally at $9,000,000, one-half common and one-half preferred—one half possible value, the other half certainly water—and the gentleman agreed to that in the report, too. [Laughter.] It was organized in 1906 with a little over 5,000 tons slicing capacity for all these factories, and it has paid during all the time 6 per cent on its preferred stock, representing value, and 7 per cent on the common stock, or water, a total of 13 per cent dividends per year on its actual invested capital; and in 1910, besides paying this dividend, it declared a stock dividend of $2,000,000 and passed $1,000,000 to its surplus.

And if we can believe the American Sugar Industry, a paper published in Detroit, Mich., the common stock, that in the beginning represented nothing on God's earth but water and a capitalization of the tariff, was quoted in March, 1912, at $121 a share, which was $1 more than the value of the preferred stock. [Applause on the Democratic side.] These are the lusty infants that will perish unless we give them protection. Oh, but they say: "We can not stand the foreign competition without a tariff." Let us see. The German cost of production for beet sugar is 2.41 cents a pound; the best factories of the great West, 2.56. Spreckels, according to his own statement—I mean John D. Spreckels this time, and not Mr. C. A. Spreckels, whom they abuse simply because he carries on a propaganda in the interest of the American consumer as well as himself for free sugar. What does John D. Spreckels say on this subject? He says he produces it for 2.70 cents a pound. What else? The best factory of the Oxnard plant produces it for about 2.80 cents; so I say when you remember the German cost is 2.41 cents and when you consider the ocean freight charges and insurance, 14 points, from Germany to New York, and remember that it is not disputed that every one of those factories has about 80 or 90 points in freight-rate protection before any sugar can reach the territory they can supply, you will readily see that these beet factories have "protection" of about 1 cent per pound entirely independent of all tariff duty, which more than equalizes any difference in cost of production between foreign and domestic beet sugar and about equalizes the difference in cost of production between domestic beet and foreign cane.

It is doubtless true that without a duty these beet factories will not be able to continue to pay excessive dividends on vast issues of watered stocks, but they will be able to pay a good dividend on the actual investment, and that without reducing the price they pay to the farmer for his beets, for to-day our beet factories pay the farmer rather less than more than the German factories pay for beets, though the German tariff duty is only about one-fourth as high as the present American duty. But gentlemen insist that the American consumer will get no benefit from the reduction or removal of the duty.

I deny it. I deny it on the authority of history, on the authority of the sworn evidence from the highest protectionists in this land. What happened? In 1890, when you put sugar on the free list in the McKinley bill, and you did not think it was so awful then, according to the sworn testimony of Mr. Willett, sugar went down to the full extent of the reduction in duty—it went down that extent within a few days, and it remained that much lower in price during the time the McKinley bill was in force. Mr. Willett proved by tables that every time the United States has reduced the duty on sugar the price went down just that much. Not only that, but Mr. C. A. Spreckels; Mr. Jameson, of Arbuckle Bros.; Mr. H. A. Oxnard; Mr. Atkins; and every other sugar man examined by your committee gave evidence to the same effect. But it is insisted that after all the duty is removed the refiners will combine and raise the price of sugar——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. I have only a moment. The contention is absurd. The refiners now have no substantial domestic competition, except from each other. The Louisiana cane people have never been competitors of the trust. They furnish it with its raw material and have always been at its mercy and under its thumb. The beet people might be competitors, but the American Sugar Refining Co. owns nearly half of all their stock, and I do not think under those circumstances there is liable to be any serious competition between people who have that sort of business relations with each other. Not only that, but you talk about reducing the total of the world's production of sugar by the destruction of the domestic supply. What is our total domestic production? A few hundred thousand tons out of a total world production of about seventeen and one-half or eighteen million tons. They say competition will be forever destroyed if the amount of sugar that competes for our markets is all the sugar of the world, rather than the small amount, relatively, that we produce ourselves. A most remarkable argument, but one I can not subscribe to; besides, there is no limit to the world's production of sugar in favorable climates. It is the product of sunshine and air, and can be produced in limitless quantity.

So long as the Brussels convention continues to authorize the imposition of a duty of about a half cent per pound on imported sugar in European countries the cane sugar of every tropical country on earth will find in our country their largest

and best market, unfettered by discriminatory duties and open to the sugars of all the world on even terms, and will out of self-interest seek our markets first and will furnish us with an abundant supply of sugar at a much lower price than it can be obtained anywhere else on earth. This means a great saving of many millions of dollars per year to the American consumer. It means sugar about 2 cents per pound cheaper than it could be bought if the duty remained. It means the greatest good for the greatest number, which is or ought to be the one object of American statesmanship. I therefore earnestly urge upon the committee the support of this schedule. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. In the time limited, let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] has not a particle of evidence presented to the Hardwick investigation committee to the effect that there is a beet-sugar factory in the United States that ever produced a pound of sugar below 2.7 cents—none except the factory he referred to in California; whereas in the State of Michigan the average cost of production of beet sugar is 3.54 cents per pound. You speak about the price of sugar being lower in this country under the McKinley law. It is true; but the Government paid 2 cents bounty at that time, and it is true that the consumers of this country received cheap sugar.

You speak about the Michigan Sugar Co. stock being watered. You should tell the gentlemen of this House that when that company was organized in 1906 it purchased eight sugar factories in that State and put in additional money to pay outstanding debts, and new stock was issued for all the new money that had been put into those factories. It was not watered stock. Every dollar of it was money—100 cents on the dollar. Why do you not state the facts? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on the two sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has 8 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. KALANIANAOLE].

Mr. KALANIANAOLE. Mr. Chairman, I will not attempt to go into the facts and figures on sugar, but will say a few words as to the effect of free sugar on Hawaii and especially upon its citizenship. Before we were annexed to this country we were a prosperous nation, and in the belief that that prosperity would continue, Hawaii voluntarily ceded its sovereignty to this country.

Yet, to-day Congress is proposing in three years' time to enact free sugar, thereby annihilating Hawaii's chief industry, the source of its prosperity.

Hawaii, unfortunately, is a one-industry country. The sugar industry was begun 40 or 50 years ago by the missionaries sent there from this country, and since its establishment there has been a continuous growth. Should the sugar industry be wiped out it will be impossible to substitute any other industry in its place.

The effect of this legislation on the citizenship of Hawaii will be to turn Hawaii over into the hands of the Asiatics. No people have done more—and I say this earnestly—since annexation than the people of Hawaii to Americanize that country. Hawaii has expended millions of dollars to bring Europeans into the Territory to replace the Asiatics that are there. And yet when you have enacted this law, placing sugar on the free list, gentlemen, you place Hawaii, the paradise of the Pacific, under Asiatic control. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We Hawaiians have a majority of votes there; and yet, gentlemen, we have brought into that country thousands upon thousands of white people. Why? To stay in that land and make it an American community. To-day you are attempting to stop the further bringing of those white people from Europe through the attempted enactment of new immigration laws. Now, you are jeopardizing our hopes of Americanizing those islands through this radical policy of reduction.

Gentlemen, it is hard for the people of Hawaii, but they are Americans to-day, and they must bear the consequences. We are not grumbling, but we do ask for justice at the hands of the Federal Government. Under the treaty between this country and Hawaii you guaranteed to us justice and a continuance of that same prosperity that we had before we joined our fortunes with this country. We of Hawaii ask for justice. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CURRY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. CURRY] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, the manufacturers of cane sugar are said to be operating under an international agreement, with headquarters at Berlin and a substation at New York. They can take care of themselves under free trade, whether it comes now or three years hence. But the Lord have mercy on the sugar planter of Louisiana that is being betrayed in the house of his friends!

This bill gives the beet-sugar industry of the United States, the only competitor of the Sugar Trust, three years' notice to wind up its affairs and get out of business. It has been stated on this floor that the beet-sugar industry is in the hands of the trust. So far as California is concerned, the trust has nothing whatever to do with any of the 13 factories in that State. They are absolutely independent. They have to fight the Sugar Trust, and they have reduced the price of sugar.

It has cost us on the average during the past three years $2.88½ a hundred to manufacture beet sugar in California, and yet to-day that sugar is transported to New York and sold for $4.06 a hundred. If it was not for the competition of the beet-sugar factories and the beet sugar in this country, the price of sugar would be nearly twice as high as it is at the present time, and the American consumer of sugar would be absolutely in the power and at the mercy of the Cane-Sugar Trust, which is international and has only the beet-sugar people to fear. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, in the minute I have I simply want to utter some words of consolation for the benefit of my friend from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD]. I want to read to him what Mr. Spreckels says about this proposed tariff on sugar. He says:

> I am much pleased with the proposed reduction in the sugar tariff. Personally I would have liked to see free sugar declared at once, as there is no need of protection for the sugar-refining industry.

I call the attention of gentlemen to the fact that this bill is in the interest of the great sugar refiners of this country. Why is it that every time Mr. Spreckels, Mr. Atkins, Mr. Heike, or Mr. Gilmore, the representatives of the great sugar trusts in this country, have spoken they have spoken in favor of free sugar? Why is it, I say? Because they want the beet-sugar industry of this country destroyed so that they can levy their tribute upon every pound of sugar that comes into this country. And then Mr. Spreckels is good enough to say that the only reason why three years is allowed for the tariff on sugar to be done away with is to give the Louisiana planters time to settle up their affairs.

It is pleasant to the farmers who raise sugar beets and sugar cane to have notice that they are to be executed in three years. [Applause on the Republican side.]

On this important subject of the duty on sugar the Fremont Chamber of Commerce recently adopted the following resolutions:

> FREMONT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.
> *Fremont, Ohio.*
>
> Resolutions.
>
> *Resolved by the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Fremont, Ohio,* That we protest against any legislation by Congress removing the duty on sugar; and believing that the beet-sugar industry, recently started and now being developed, is one of very great importance to the people of this country, and that the removal of the present duty on foreign sugar at this time is calculated to and will destroy this important industry and will result in no appreciable benefit to the consumer in the way of cheaper sugar, we therefore most earnestly and respectfully request that the Senators and Members in Congress from Ohio oppose any measure interfering with the present rate of duty on imported sugar, and that they most earnestly oppose any measure or legislation placing sugar on the free list.
>
> *Resolved,* That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to each of the Senators and Members in Congress from Ohio.
>
> The foregoing resolutions were adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Fremont at its meeting held on March 12, 1913.
>
> THE FREMONT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
> By W. G. WAITT, *its President.*
>
> Attest:
> CARROLL COX, *Secretary.*

The Ohio Farmer, a representative agricultural paper of the State of Ohio, has the following editorial in its issue of February 15, 1913:

> FREE SUGAR.
>
> The people of the United States should wake up to the real importance of the attempt to remove the tariff on sugar. The plea is made that this tariff lays a burden on everyone who eats sugar. That means everybody. If the removal of the duty would mean cheaper sugar, the fight would be a just one. But free sugar would not necessarily mean cheaper sugar, while it would mean wiping out the American sugar interests—both beet and cane—and make us dependent upon the foreign producers and the great American refiners—the Sugar Trust—with nothing

to hold them in check. The following quotation from a letter recently received at this office is significant:

"I was in Washington attending the hearing on sugar before the Ways and Means Committee, and it does look like the legislation was bound to go through that will kill the sugar interests of the United States, including both beet and Louisiana cane; and the parties that are doing it are the three sugar refineries of the United States. If the people think that they are going to get cheaper sugar by putting into the hands of these people the entire sugar bill of the Nation, they will wake up some day and find themselves mistaken. Besides all of this, I can absolutely prove that growing beets increases the yield of everything that is grown on the same soil for four years thereafter. * * * The tremendous yields of continental Europe come from the use of a root crop in the rotation."

The beet-sugar makers of the central West have been able to furnish dangerous competition to the sugar refiners, and that is the reason for the powerful attempt to put sugar on the free list. The farmers of the central West are beginning to realize what they can do if they have a sale for the sugar beet. They should bring all of the pressure that they can exert to induce their representatives to kill the free-sugar bill. It would work great damage to the American sugar interests without permanently benefiting the general public.

The Findlay Morning Republican comments editorially in its issue of January 16, 1913, and says:

[From the Findlay Republican, Jan. 16, 1913.]

BEET-SUGAR INDUSTRY.

One of the Ohio and Hancock County industries which is in danger of being hurt by the revision of the tariff by the Democrats, if they carry out their announced program, is the beet-sugar industry. Perhaps no other product of the farm, unless it be wool, is in such imminent danger, and certainly a reduction of the tariff on no other product would bring such immediate and telling results to our community.

The possibilities of this industry are not generally understood by the public, but the records show that Ohio alone consumes $20,000,000 worth of sugar per year, while she produces only about $8,000,000 worth. She now has only 5 factories, but those who are in position to know state that we could support 30 factories, which would mean that Ohio could not only supply her own sugar but could supply the demand from other States which do not produce any, to the extent of $25,000,000 annually.

The five factories now in operation in the State paid last year to the farmers for beets more than $2,500,000, to the railroads for transportation of the product $600,000, and for wages and salaries $450,000. It is estimated that the farmers' profits were from $30 to $70 per acre in addition to the increased fertility of the soil which comes from a proper rotation of sugar beets with other crops. Careful experimentation has demonstrated that by proper rotation of crops the yield of corn has been increased 27.6 per cent, oats 48 per cent, barley 52 per cent, wheat 49 per cent, and potatoes 46 per cent since the sugar beet has been included in the plan of rotation over the yield in former years before the introduction of the sugar beet. If this be true, and it is claimed to have been carefully worked out by experts, then the growing of sugar beets is not only a direct profit producer for the farmer, but indirectly it is the best crop he can grow.

Taking all these facts into consideration, it would be a calamity to remove the tariff from sugar in order to help out the cane-sugar refiners, who largely import their raw materials from Cuba and whose sole object in advocating free sugar is first to check and eventually to stamp out the beet-sugar industry in this country. If they can not get free raw sugar, then they want to get such a material reduction as would crush out the domestic industry, or at least stop the building of additional factories.

This is a vital matter for the farmers of Hancock and surrounding counties, which constitutes one of the most productive fields for the growing of sugar beets.

On April 3, 1913, the editor of the Mount Victory (Ohio) Observer writes as follows:

OHIO CAN GROW NATION'S SUGAR—1 ACRE IN 10 OF IMPROVED LAND WOULD YIELD THIS RESULT—GOVERNMENT IS AUTHORITY—MILLIONS NOW SENT ABROAD TO PAY FOR FOREIGN-GROWN SUGAR SHOULD BE PUT INTO POCKETS OF AMERICAN FARMERS INSTEAD, IT IS DECLARED.

That the average American consumes 82 pounds of sugar each year; that only 10 pounds of this ration are now produced in this country; that vast sums are now sent abroad to pay for imported sugar which should be kept at home and put into the pockets of American farmers; and that Ohio alone could produce all the sugar required by the Nation—and with a tremendous addition to the wealth and prosperity of the State—are some of the striking facts set forth in a recent report of the Department of Agriculture at Washington on the sugar industry of the United States.

That it would be a simple matter for the United States to produce at home the sugar now brought from abroad is shown by the department's report that if 2,000,000 acres of land were devoted to sugar-beet culture the Nation would be entirely free from dependence upon foreign-grown sugar. As the present acreage devoted to this crop is about 500,000, this means that four times the land now utilized for sugar-beet growing should be devoted to this purpose in order to avoid the tribute which the American people are now paying to foreigners for their sugar.

On the other hand the department produces figures to show that there are 274,000,000 acres of improved land in the 19 States in which it has been demonstrated that sugar beets may be grown successfully.

"If one farmer in four in these States," reads the report, "were to plant a 3-acre patch and give it the care that could readily be bestowed upon so small a plot it would be unnecessary for us to buy foreign sugar. Two-thirds of 1 per cent of the improved land in this area is all that would be required to accomplish this result. More than that acreage lies idle, absolutely unused, every year. Any one of the States of Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Ohio could produce all this sugar and then have the beets occur only once in a 10-year rotation; several others could do it alone on a five-year rotation."

In Europe, it is pointed out, the importance of a hoed root crop and of sugar beets as the most desirable of such crops is fully recognized. In fact, in the leases for many German and Austrian farms it is provided that a certain proportion of the land must be planted in sugar beets each year. As showing how the various European governments have done everything in their power to encourage sugar-beet growing, on account of its influence in increasing agricultural production, the report says:

"It will be seen that the culture of the sugar beet plays a very prominent rôle in the agriculture of northern Europe and that it occupies a correspondingly prominent place in the national economy. The industry from its foundation has been fostered by national legislation in every country of Europe. It is thoroughly protected from the competition of the cheaply produced tropical sugars and is by means of excise taxes made to yield large sums for the support of the governments. Europe as a whole derives $200,000,000 per annum from sugar taxes, yet this is a minor factor in its national economy in comparison with the wealth added by the beet-sugar industry, the money saved by the home production of all the sugar consumed, the receipts from heavy exports of sugar, the employment of many thousands of people, and the indirect agricultural benefits which have accrued from beet culture."

Applying the experience of Europe to conditions in the United States, the report continues:

"With due recognition of the fundamental agricultural principles involved and with adequate tariff protection, the conditions in the near future will become favorable for a very rapid expansion of the beet-sugar industry in the United States. If this is to be of the greatest good to the country at large the raising of the beets should not be developed as a specialized business, but should be undertaken in limited acreages by general farmers and in rotation with grains and other crops. The indirect benefits of beet culture can thereby be fully realized."

It is the recognition of the great saving that would result to the American people from growing their own supply of sugar, the widespread benefits of sugar-beet culture in adding to the agricultural wealth of the country, and the vital necessity of increasing the acreage output of American farms in order to halt the rapid rise in the cost of living that has induced officials of the Department of Agriculture, including Secretary Wilson and Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, regardless of politics, to appear before Congress and to urge that no reduction should be made in the present tariff on foreign sugar that would destroy or hamper the progress of the beet-sugar industry in this country.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have 11 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Alabama has 8 minutes remaining in the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has 11 minutes and the gentleman from Alabama has 8 minutes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] has an amendment pending which I would like to have disposed of before the debate is concluded.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, my understanding was that all amendments were to be disposed of after the debate was concluded, but I understand why the gentleman wishes this disposed of at this time, and I have no objection to a vote on it now.

The CHAIRMAN. What amendment is that?

Mr. MANN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. I ask for a vote on that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That only relates to this one amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Let it be reported.

Mr. MANN. I ask to have it reported again. Gentlemen are asking to have it reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. If there be no objection, that amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment of Mr. FORDNEY was read, as follows:

Strike out paragraphs 179 and 180, pages 47 and 48, and substitute the following:

"179. That from and after March 1, 1914, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75 degrees, ninety-five one hundredths of 1 cent per pound, and for each additional degree shown by the polariscope test twenty-six one thousandths of 1 cent per pound additional, and fractions of a degree in proportion; molasses testing not above 40 degrees, 20 per cent ad valorem; testing above 40 degrees and not above 56 degrees, 3 cents per gallon; testing above 56 degrees, 6 cents per gallon; sugar drainings and sugar sweepings shall be subject to duty as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscope test: *Provided*, That every bag, barrel, or parcel in which sugar testing by the polariscope less than 99 degrees is packed shall be plainly branded by the manufacturer or refiner thereof with the name of such manufacturer or refiner, and the polariscope test of the sugar therein contained, accurately, within one-half of 1 degree, and a failure to brand any such bag, barrel, or parcel as herein required shall be deemed and taken to be a misbranding of food within the meaning of the act of June 30, 1906, entitled 'An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes.' And the requirements of this proviso shall not apply to any sugar shipped or delivered to a refiner to be refined before entering into consumption.

"180. Maple sugar and maple sirup, 4 cents per pound; glucose or grape sugar, 1½ cents per pound; sugar cane in its natural state or unmanufactured, 20 per cent ad valorem; sugar cane, defecated, shredded, artificially dried, or which has been subjected to any manufacturing or other process, 50 per cent ad valorem."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment which has just been read.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, we are pledged by the Baltimore platform to place on the free list all articles produced by the trusts of this country.

The people, outraged by the systematic increase of prices by these unlawful combinations, gave us their confidence in the November election of 1912. They gave us an overwhelming majority in this House, a safe majority in the Senate, and placed in the White House a President pledged to this platform. They have commissioned us with ample authority to place on the statute books a law in harmony with our pledges. We are now writing that law, and I maintain that it is our duty to see that no trust-made article is sheltered by a protective duty in our tariff bill when it leaves this House for the Senate. It will not do to say that the Senate will correct our mistakes. Our bill should be free from error, so that the Senate will have nothing to do but to ratify our action.

Mr. Chairman, linseed oil, red and white lead are the principal ingredients of paint, which is used by the home builders of this country to beautify and preserve their homes. Under the prevailing prices of these articles for the last 10 years many of the poor people throughout the land have been unable to paint their houses. High prices have put them to great straits in supplying themselves and their families with a meager and often inadequate supply of food, raiment, and shelter. They have neither time nor means to beautify and no leisure to enjoy the beautiful. Their struggle is for existence.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known that these articles are now and have been for many years produced and controlled by a trust. Prior to the passage of the Dingley bill in 1897 linseed oil and red and white lead were produced in America by many independent companies, competing with each other in our markets and the markets of the world for trade. On December 5, 1898, the American Linseed Co. was incorporated under the laws of New Jersey, with a capital stock of $50,000,000, of which $25,000,000 is preferred and $25,000,000 is common stock. This was the beginning of the Linseed Oil Trust in our country, for it took over at that time 47 independent oil-producing companies scattered throughout the United States, as follows:

1. Crown Linseed Oil Works, St. Louis, Mo.
2. Close Linseed Oil Works, Iowa City, Iowa.
3. Burlington Linseed Oil Works, Burlington, Iowa.
4. Hawkeye Linseed Oil Works, Marshalltown, Iowa.
5. Hall Linseed Oil Works, Chicago, Ill.
6. Mankato Linseed Oil Works, Mankato, Mo.
7. Sioux City Linseed Oil Works, Sioux City, Iowa.
8. Missouri Linseed Oil Station, St. Louis, Mo.
9. Woodman Linseed Oil Works, Omaha, Nebr.
10. Grove Linseed Oil Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
11. Ottumwa Linseed Oil Works, Ottumwa, Iowa.
12. Des Moines Linseed Oil Works, Des Moines, Iowa.
13. Dubuque Linseed Oil Works, Dubuque, Iowa.
14. Kansas City Lead and Oil Works, Kansas City, Mo.
15. St. Paul Linseed Oil Works, St. Paul, Minn.
16. Northwestern Lead and Oil Works, Chicago, Ill.
17. Cedar Rapids Linseed Oil Station, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
18. Evans Linseed Oil Works, Indianapolis, Ind.
19. Topeka Linseed Oil Station, Topeka, Kans.
20. Leavenworth Linseed Oil Works, Leavenworth, Kans.
21. Gilman Linseed Oil Works, Gilman, Ill.
22. Marion Linseed Station, Marion, Ind.
23. Logansport Linseed Oil Works, Logansport, Ind.
24. Leonard Linseed Oil Works, Piqua, Ohio.
25. Detroit Linseed Oil Works, Detroit, Mich.
26. Dayton Linseed Oil Works, Dayton, Ohio.
27. Portland Linseed Oil Works, Portland, Oreg.
28. La Crosse Linseed Oil Works, La Crosse, Wis.
29. Wright & Lawther Oil and Lead Works, Chicago, Ill.
30. Buffalo Linseed Oil Works, Buffalo, N. Y.
31. Emerson Linseed Oil Works, Racine, Wis.
32. W. P. Orr Linseed Oil Works, Piqua, Ohio.
33. Mansfield Linseed Oil Works, Mansfield, Ohio.
34. Cleveland Linseed Oil Works, South Chicago, Ill.
35. Metzer Linseed Oil Co., Toledo, Ohio.
36. Leonard & Daniels, Piqua, Ohio.
37. Douglas & Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
38. Cleveland Linseed & Oil Co., Cleveland, Ohio.
39. Metzer Linseed Oil Co., Toledo, Ohio.
40. Douglas & Co., Minneapolis, Minn.
41. Archer & Co., St. Paul, Mo.
42. Toledo Linseed Oil Co., Toledo, Ohio.
43. Campbell & Thayer, New York City.
44. Dean Linseed Oil Co., New York City.
45. Griswold Linseed Oil Co., Warren, Ohio.
46. Wright & Hills Linseed Oil Co., Chicago, Ill.
47. Western Linseed Oil Co., Minneapolis, Minn.

Since the incorporation of this company it has acquired other interests as I am informed, so that this trust now controls about 90 per cent of the linseed oil produced in America. It is dominated by the Rockefellers, John D. Rockefeller, jr., being a member of the board of directors. In 1909 its net earnings were more than a million dollars. Its president and treasurer, J. A. McGean; vice president, Henry E. Cooper; secretary, W. A. Jones; assistant secretary, R. H. Adams; and assistant treasurer, E. V. Cary, live in New York City, and its principal or general office is located at 100 Williams Street, New York City. It is purely a Wall Street property, controlled by Standard Oil influences—hence a trust.

This tells only half of the story. Paint not only requires linseed oil but lead must be used. To leave lead open to competition would interfere materially with the Linseed Oil Trust in controlling the price of paints. So in January, 1903, Standard Oil influence incorporated in New Jersey the "United Lead Co.," which was a complete union of the Rockefeller-Guggenheim interests and the Whitney-Ryan interests, thereby destroying practically all of the competition in the production, smelting, and refining of lead in this country. Three of the Guggenheims and Thomas F. Ryan were placed on the directorate.

It took over at this time 19 of the leading independent lead companies scattered over the country, as follows:

1. James Robertson Lead Co., Baltimore, Md.
2. Omaha Shot & Lead Co., Omaha, Nebr.
3. Northwestern Shot & Lead Works, St. Paul, Minn.
4. Collier Shot Tower Works, St. Louis, Mo.
5. Bailey & Farrell Shot Works, Pittsburgh, Pa.
6. Markle Lead Works, St. Louis, Mo.
7. Gibson & Price, Cleveland, Ohio.
8. Le Roy Shot & Lead Works, New York.
9. Union Oil & Lead Works, Brooklyn, N. Y.
10. Sportsman's Shot Works, Cincinnati, Ohio.
11. Chicago Shot Tower Co., Chicago, Ill.
12. Hoyt Metal Co., St. Louis, Mo.
13. Tatham & Bros., New York City.
14. Raymond Lead Co., Chicago, Ill.
15. E. W. Blatchford & Co., Chicago, Ill.
16. Thomas W. Sparks, Philadelphia, Pa.
17. Chadwick-Boston Lead Co., Boston, Mass.
18. Lansten Lead Works, Chicago, Ill.
19. McDougal White Lead Co., Buffalo, N. Y.

The capital stock of this concern was fixed at $25,000,000; $10,000,000 is 6 per cent cumulative preferred and $15,000,000 common stock. They have united with other companies until they own and control 28 companies and are allied with 93 corporations and control from 85 per cent to 95 per cent of all the properties engaged in the smelting and refining of lead, with a total approximate capital par value of $201,550,400, with a market value in January, 1904, of $108,460,000.

The Linseed Oil Trust and the Lead Trust are affiliated and controlled by the Rockefellers, Guggenheims, and Ryans, forming one gigantic trust, with no other object than to stifle competition and control the production and price of minerals, oils, and paints. This is the class of men Mr. Bryan denounced at Baltimore, and the Baltimore convention passed a resolution denouncing them as unfit to take part in nominating a candidate for President, and our platform declared that the products of such trusts as the "Linseed Oil and Lead Trusts" should be placed on the free list.

But let us see how they have been dealt with in this bill. Under the present law—Payne-Aldrich law—linseed oil has a duty of 15 cents a gallon. Our bill places it at 12 cents a gallon. This is but a very short step toward the free list for a trust-made product. In fact it is only a society hobble-skirt step. In 1912 the equivalent ad-valorem rate on white lead was 38 per cent. Our bill places the rate at 25 per cent ad valorem. Another feeble effort to carry into effect our pledges in the Baltimore platform.

It will be remembered that linseed oil and white and red lead are placed in the chemical schedule. It will also be remembered that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] had charge of this schedule.

It will also be remembered that he is a great free trader, especially in the press and when out among the people, but when he is a Member of Congress, clothed with authority to revise the tariff, he writes rates on trust-made products, which are approved by the trusts. Here is what the Paint, Oil and Drug Review said in its issue on the 16th of April, 1913, page 27:

> The duty on flaxseed in the Underwood bill is no reduction, because no rebate is allowed on cake, which just about equals the 5-cent reduction in the duty. The reduction in the tariff will have little effect on the flaxseed or oil market, and years when America raises a normal crop of seed we can compete with the world.

There is no doubt that this gigantic oil and lead trust can compete with the world in our markets as long as they are sheltered by these high protective rates.

The Paint, Oil, and Drug Review of April 23, 1913, on page 27, had this to say:

> The reason we favor the Underwood tariff on flaxseed is because it gives the farmers the protection needed and only a nominal advance in duty, and the feature which does not allow a drawback on oil cake appeals to us because the American farmers are just beginning to learn the great value of oil cake as a feed and a fertilizer.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] prepared the chemical bill a year ago, which we passed. At that time I called his attention to the fact that he had made but little reduction in the rate on linseed oil, which was a reduction of only 2 cents per gallon. He then claimed that as his bill could not deal with the duty on flaxseed he was not warranted in making a further reduction in the rate on linseed oil.

A few days ago, while the present bill was before our caucus, I called his attention to the rates now carried in this bill on

flaxseed and linseed oil and suggested that he had an opportunity to lower the rates on each of them. He promised to look into the feasibility of lowering them, but I have heard nothing from him since. It is clear to me that there is a common understanding that the products of the Linseed Oil & Lead Trust are to continue to be sheltered by protective rates. Under the rates proposed in this bill, when white lead sells for 7 cents a pound or $140 per ton, the Lead Trust will receive a protection of $35 per ton. Linseed oil will have a protection of $6 per barrel of 40 gallons to the barrel. This will give this Linseed Oil & Lead Trust a magnificent opportunity to rob the consumers out of millions of dollars annually. I apprehend that the poor man's cottage will still go without a refreshing coat of paint. With these high rates of protection, are not the protectionist journals and dailies justified in predicting that the price of linseed oil and white lead will not be materially lowered, and are they not justified in saying that they like the rates fixed by the gentleman from New York on these articles?

But what will the consumers say and what will they do? Let the gentleman from New York answer this question. He has consumers in his district, I presume, and the chief owners and operators of this trust live in his home city.

It has been claimed by some that linseed oil can not be produced in this country if placed on the free list unless the duty on flaxseed is taken off. Let us see how this figures out under the rate on flaxseed proposed by this bill, which is 20 cents per bushel. One bushel of flaxseed will produce 2½ gallons of linseed oil of 7½ pounds to the gallon, and there will be left a flaxseed cake or oil cake of 30 pounds. This oil cake has a commercial value of $40 per ton. Thirty pounds is worth thirty two-thousands or three two-hundreds of $40, which is 60 cents.

Under normal conditions flaxseed sells at about $1 per bushel. Subtract from this the 60 cents the trust gets for the oil cake and we have 40 cents left per bushel as first cost for the flaxseed, but the trust has 2½ gallons of linseed oil in its hands to balance this item, which would amount to 16 cents per gallon for the oil. Add to this the cost of refining the oil, which is only a few cents, and we get the first cost of the oil—about 18 or 19 cents. It has retailed in my home town for more than $1.25 per gallon.

But let us consider the advantage the linseed oil people will get from the proposed rate on linseed oil, which is 12 cents per gallon. We have already seen that flaxseed has a duty of 20 cents per bushel, and that a bushel of such seed will produce 2½ gallons of linseed oil.

The rate on this oil is 12 cents per gallon, which is equal to 30 cents per bushel. Add to this the 60 cents per bushel it gets for the oil cake and we have 90 cents per bushel and 2½ gallons of linseed oil. Flaxseed costs from $1 to $1.15 under ordinary conditions. It is clear that the original cost of linseed oil per gallon will not exceed more than from 6 to 10 cents, if the proposed rates are enacted into law. This looks very small as compared with the retail prices which we have been compelled to pay in our home towns. Who will claim that a rate of 12 cents per gallon is not a protective rate, even though a rate of 20 cents per bushel on flaxseed should be retained?

But when we consider the production of flaxseed in America, we will be driven to the conclusion that 20 cents per bushel is a protective rate. Flaxseed is produced in this country in Minnesota, the Dakotas, and in a few of the Northwestern States. A normal crop ranges from 20,000,000 bushels to 30,000,000 bushels. While we usually import more or less flaxseed, yet ordinarily we export more than we import. The Argentine Republic produces more flaxseed than any other country in the world, most of which is exported, and America comes next. The following table, furnished by Mr. Ennis, gives the world's flaxseed crop for one year under average conditions:

Country.	Production.	Exports.	Consumption.	Imports.
United States	$36,000,000	$2,000,000	$24,100,000	$100,000
India	16,000,000	15,000,000	1,000,000	
Russia	17,000,000	1,425,000	15,575,000	
Argentina	30,000,000	29,500,000	1,500,000	
Uruguay	5,000,000	4,800,000	200,000	
England			18,800,000	
France	500,000		7,000,000	6,500,000
Germany			18,500,000	18,500,000
Holland	300,000		7,800,000	7,500,000
Denmark	325,000		650,000	325,000
Total	95,125,000	53,725,000	96,125,000	32,925,000

While this table gives the figures in dollars, it is based on the assumption that the seed costs $1 per bushel, and the table can be read in bushels as well as in dollars.

The following table is taken from estimates made by the Department of Agriculture. It reveals that under ordinary conditions we produce more flaxseed than we consume. For the last three years our crops have been short, and we have imported considerably more than we have exported, but when we examine this table closely it will be seen that for the last two decades our imports exceed our exports only in a few instances. This being true, the duty on flaxseed could have been reduced much lower. It yields about the same income per acre as wheat, yet the rate on wheat is reduced by this bill from 25 cents per bushel to 10 cents per bushel. With equal propriety the rate on flaxseed might have been reduced to 10 cents per bushel. I now submit the table for your inspection:

Flaxseed: Quantities produced, 1886 to date, and amounts imported, exported, and retained for consumption, 1886 to date.

Years ending June 30—	Production.	Imports.	Exports.		Retained for consumption.
			Domestic seed.	Foreign seed.	
	Bushels.	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*
1886	13,000,000	1,634,576		30,914	14,603,662
1887	10,000,000	415,179		44	10,415,135
1888	10,500,000	1,793,964	37,265		12,045,699
1889	9,000,000	3,259,460		25	12,259,435
1890	[1] 10,250,000	2,391,175	14,678		12,626,495
1891	8,500,000	1,515,546	144,848	1	9,870,697
1892	19,000,000	285,140	3,613,187		15,671,953
1893	11,104,440	112,615	1,837,370		9,379,685
1894	10,000,000	592,829	2,047,836		8,544,984
1895	7,500,000	4,166,222	1,224		11,664,998
1896	15,000,000	754,507	80,453	90,478	15,583,576
1897	17,402,000	165,222	4,713,747	19,892	12,773,583
1898	12,500,000	136,098	257,228	2,172	12,376,698
1899	16,460,000	81,053	2,830,991		13,650,962
1900	[1] 19,979,492	67,379	2,743,266		17,303,605
1901	17,902,000	1,631,726	2,755,683	21,112	16,446,331
1902	25,319,000	477,157	3,874,033	64,748	21,857,376
1903	29,284,890	129,089	4,128,130	20,211	25,265,638
1904	27,300,519	213,270	738,379		26,755,401
1905	23,400,534	296,184	1,338	3	23,695,377
1906	28,477,753	82,240	5,988,519		22,541,474
1907	25,576,146	90,358	6,636,310	2,044	19,028,148
1908	25,851,000	67,419	4,277,313	11,391	21,630,715
1909	26,805,000	293,608	882,899		25,815,709
1910	[1] 19,512,764	5,002,495	65,193		24,450,067
1911	12,718,000	10,490,227	976		23,716,251
1912	19,370,000	6,841,305	4,323	21,919	26,185,564

[1] Census figures.

NOTE.—Production figures for years 1902–1912, inclusive (excepting census year 1910), are estimates of the Department of Agriculture; those for prior years (excepting census years 1890 and 1900) are commercial estimates.

Mr. Chairman, I insist that linseed oil and white and red lead ought to be placed on the free list and remain there as long as they are controlled by a trust, and that the tariff on flaxseed should be reduced to 10 cents per bushel. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] has given us no sound reason for maintaining the protective rates which he has fixed on these articles; in fact, he has given no reason at all.

Mr. Chairman, it is said that the mills of the gods grind slowly but surely. Can not as much be said of the mills of the trusts? Yea, more. High protective rates stimulate them to grind day and night at a rapid rate, and they are surely grinding the people all the time. Thou shalt not furnish the trusts with human grindstones; neither shalt thou furnish power to turn such stones to wear away human flesh and human energy.

Mr. MANN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, if the proviso was stricken out of this provision, the bill would not be so bad. If the proposition without the proviso stood alone, I would vote for it. The proviso puts raw sugar on the free list in three years. Few Members of this House realize what this schedule means to the people of Porto Rico, Hawaii, the Philippines, Louisiana, and the people engaged in the sugar beet industry in other States. In Porto Rico and Hawaii the people are being held by the throat by the Sugar Trust to-day for money with which to harvest their crop. They are constantly under the control of the Sugar Trust.

This schedule is in the interest of the Sugar Trust and not in the interest of the consumers of sugar. There is not a consumer in the United States to-day who buys raw sugar that is made free after three years under the provisions of this bill. The Sugar Trust is the beneficiary. Raw sugar is their raw material, and they are the direct beneficiaries. Before the

refined product reaches the table of the consumer every particle of the reduction that is made will be absorbed by the refiners or the trusts and the dealers in sugar. But the sufferers will be the men in Hawaii, in the Philippines, in Porto Rico, and Louisiana, in the sugar-beet raising States, who are paying the American scale of wages to men employed in growing cane and beets and making these products of the farm into sugar.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] concedes that the proviso will destroy the sugar industry in Louisiana. He might also concede that it will destroy the industry in Porto Rico and Hawaii and in the beet-sugar States. Everyone knows the supply of sugar, and not the tariff, controls the price to the consumer. We produced last year 500,000 tons in Hawaii, 160,000 tons in Louisiana, 340,000 tons in Porto Rico, 606,033 tons of beet sugar in 1911. When you destroy that American production of sugar you put the American consumer absolutely at the mercy of the sugar grower of other countries and of the Sugar Trust, that will then import its raw material free of duty and sell its refined product at its own price, unaffected by the addition to the world's sugar supply of what our own country could produce. You will not raise revenue, and in the end sugar will be as high as now or higher.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 47 strike out lines 24 and 25, and also lines 1 to 5 on page 48, including the word "proportion," in line 5, and insert:

"179. Sugars, tank bottoms, sirups and cane juice, melada and concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, 1.4 cents per pound on the sugar content thereof; the sugar content shall be determined by tests which shall be made according to regulations which the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the provision in the bill follows the classification that has usually been in the sugar schedule from time out of memory. Commencing with 75-degree sugar at a certain rate it advances in this case six-thousandths of a cent on every degree up to 96 or 97 degree sugar. This results in an injustice to the producer of raw sugar and results in a better differential, a larger differential, to the refiner of sugar. For instance, take the Underwood schedule. Seventy-five-degree sugar is seventy-one one-hundredths of a cent a pound duty. Under what I propose it would be ninety-five one-hundredths of a cent a pound duty. It would look at the first blush as if mine was the higher, but when we add the fact that practically all of the importations of sugar are over 92 degrees by the test, and that these duties more nearly approach each other when we get up to 92 degree—for instance, in the Underwood bill 92 degree sugar is 1.152 cents and in mine 1.288 cents—on 97 degree his would be 1.282 and in my proposition 1.358, or seven-hundredths of a cent more in my proposition than his. While we start out with raw sugar at a higher rate, when we get into the refined sugar my proposition would be 1.4 cents, and his leaves a greater differential. That difference has run all through tariff bills up to this time and is continued in the Underwood bill. But what I want to get at is to get the exact duty per pound on the sugar content of that pound, whether it is 75-degree sugar or whether it is absolutely pure sugar.

While the rates are not far different, very nearly approaching each other and less than the present rate, they are better and more just and more equitable. I have not said anything in my amendment about striking out this proviso making sugar free at the end of three years. That is provided for in the amendment contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. But if that proviso is left in the bill, I state, not on the authority of the gentleman from Georgia, not on the authority of what people may claim who are raising sugar beets, but I state it on the admission of gentlemen opposed to these industries, to wit, the sugar refiners, that if you wipe out the duty on sugar you wipe out the Louisiana industry and you destroy the sugar industry in the United States.

Before the Hardwick committee refiner after refiner came and testified that that would be the result, and that was what they wanted. Why? They said that this beet-sugar crop came in every year, came in on top of the Hawaiian crop and the crop from Cuba, and destroyed their markets. It took away the market that belonged to them, cut down the price—and it has cut down the price this year and will cut it down every year as long as they continue to live. If you do this thing, gentlemen, you take out of the production of the world's sugar a million tons produced in this country. You cripple the industry in Hawaii and in our insular possessions, and when you have done that the law of supply and demand begins to work, and the result will be that sugar will go up, because there will be less of it to supply the demands of the market of the world. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, while I shall vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], I shall also ask the House to vote upon the amendment which I offered striking out the proviso which puts sugar upon the free list at the end of three years.

I take it, Mr. Chairman, that it is unquestioned that the beet-sugar industry has not started or thrived in any country of the world without favorable legislation or financial aid in its behalf. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] speaks of a hothouse industry. The beet-sugar industry in all parts of the world wherever it has existed has received the beneficent influence of governmental agency, and there be no man so ignorant to-day, whether in hovel or palace, who does not know that the price of sugar to-day would be from 100 to 300 per cent more than it now is if we had to supply our demands without the aid of this beet-sugar industry in the world. [Applause on the Republican side.] You propose now, however, to strike down the industry in the United States on the assumption that the State aid given by other countries to their beet-sugar industries will keep the price of sugar down for your benefit in the United States. No one else has ever cast such ignominious suspicion upon the authorities of other countries. It is true that we are legislating here without regard to the interests of our own industries, but that is not the case with the legislators of other countries. In other lands, and in this land when the Republicans are in control, the legislators are seeking for opportunities to increase industry, to build new establishments, to start up new lines of work, while you, with the ghoulish glee displayed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] in describing the destruction of "only a hundred million dollars' worth of property," as he said—you seek opportunity and search every corner of the country for the chance to strike down some industry, some machinery you can render valueless except for old iron, some manufacturing establishments which you can close. Make the most of your opportunities. The country is already prepared to say that your tariff legislation is a mistake. The first opportunity it has will be the last opportunity you will have. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. No; I do not think it is worth while.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I was surprised at the statement of the venerable and usually well-informed senior minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means upon that side of the House, if I understood him correctly when he said that the rate on sugar as fixed in this bill amounted to 1.85 per cent.

Mr. PAYNE. I did not say that. I said 1.282 cents on 92° sugar.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The actual rates fixed in this bill on 92° sugar coming from all countries is 1.15 per cent; on 92° sugar coming from Cuba it is 0.992; on 96° sugar coming from the world it is 1.254; coming from Cuba it is practically 1 per cent on 90° sugar.

Mr. PAYNE. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I must have misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. PAYNE. Else I did not read my figures correctly. I had them here.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In other words, the reduction in this bill from the rates in the Payne bill, so far as the polariscope test is concerned, is almost exactly a 25 per cent reduction, or a cut of one-quarter, but the reduction amounts to more than that, because we have stricken out of the schedule the differential that went to the sugar refiner under the Dutch standard, with the result that as the bill stands to-day, and will stand for the next three years, there will be a reduction of forty-six one-hundredths of 1 cent on refined sugar, or, in round terms, there will be a half cent reduction at the customhouse on the duties levied on raw sugar, and at the end of three years' time sugar will absolutely become free, so far as the customhouse is concerned. Now gentlemen on that side are appealing for the protection of American labor in these sugar fields. I hold in my hand a paper that has come to me—the Sacramento Bee, of Saturday, April 5, 1913—which contains a letter in reference to the sugar situation in Sutter County, Cal., and I only read you one paragraph from the letter, because that is the pertinent one. It says this:

This year's crop of beets grown here will be handled by the Alvarado factory of the company. The company has finished planting beets on 3,500 acres of its holdings, and the plants are all coming up in fine shape. Part of the crop has been let to a colony of Japanese for cultivation. The Hindus are also busy on their knees weeding with their little hoes. A number of Mexicans have been brought in and are attending to the irrigating.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

That is merely a news item that has incidentally and accidentally fallen into my hands with reference to the labor on one of these great sugar plantations—not in Hawaii, not in Porto Rico, but in the State of California.

Mr. CURRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I can not yield. Now, the real proposition involved here is not the protection of labor, because I believe as firmly as I am standing here the great beet-sugar industry of the West can produce its beet sugar on an equality with its European rivals, that it is protected in its home market by railroad freight, so that there is no possibility of competition within a reasonable zone, but what these men want and what they are striving after is to tax the American people in order that they may bring their beet sugar to the Atlantic seaboard and drive out all competition. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is all they are after. It is a question of freight rates. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. I ask to have the language reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the proviso in lines 11, 12, and 13, page 48, as follows: "*Provided*, That on and after the 1st day of May, 1916, the articles hereinbefore enumerated in this paragraph shall be admitted free of duty."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois to strike out the language just read.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the noes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 68, noes 160.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers (Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. MANN) reported that there were—ayes 88, noes 186.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

181. Saccharin, 65 cents per pound.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, did the Clerk finish reading paragraph 180?

The CHAIRMAN. Paragraph 180 was read at the time the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan was offered.

Mr. MANN. I think it was not read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman he is mistaken. The Chair ordered the paragraph read.

Mr. MANN. I did not so understand.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman desires to offer an amendment the Chair is willing to entertain it.

Mr. MANN. I move to amend by striking out the proviso to that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the proviso in paragraph 180, which is as follows: "*Provided*, That on and after the 1st day of May, 1916, the articles hereinbefore enumerated in this paragraph shall be admitted free of duty."

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE O—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISIONS.

188. Cattle, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], a member of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 17, page 50, after the word "cattle," strike out "10" and insert "25."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend line 17, section 188, page 50, so as to read:
"Cattle, 15 per cent ad valorem."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to what appears in the report submitted by the Ways and Means Committee. It states that the average price of cattle under the Wilson law was $6.89; under the Dingley law, $14.19; under the Payne bill, $14.20. Under the Wilson bill was the time when a man out in our country, as the story goes, purchased 100 head of cattle for $100, and the man who made the sale was being congratulated. He said: "That is all right, but you do not know all. That old fellow to whom I sold the cattle was a little nearsighted, and so I ran a hundred extra in on him, and he took them away." [Laughter.]

That, gentlemen of the committee, is a part of the much-mooted restoration that you heard so eloquently discussed in front of this Capitol on the 4th day of last March—a return to $6 cattle. Now, assuming the figures to be accurate which the committee has furnished, I want you to notice this especially, that the value of imports of cattle during 1912 was $4,486,306. The forecasted value for the first year of that divine charter of the "new era" is to be $5,570,000. That is an increase of $1,083,694, but there is an attendant loss of revenue to the Treasury of $457,481. There will be, therefore, paid by the Treasury, in effect, by foregoing the collection which is proper under the present law, the sum I stated, namely, $457,481, which amounts to a subsidy for importing every additional dollar's worth of cattle of 42 cents. This side for years has been in favor of so levying duties that they might encourage competition among stock dealers and raisers in this country; but here is a bald proposition to practically pay out of the Treasury 42 cents for the purpose of bringing in $1 of competition to be furnished by the foreigner.

I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, what the peculiar disposition of the Ways and Means Committee is that they would prefer to forego 42 cents out of the Treasury for the purpose of bringing in $1 worth of additional importations to the country. I wondered if they thought so much more of the Mexican greaser than they did of the Texas ranger. I believe in this country that everything that Americans produce should be moderately protected against every competing article, wherever it may be produced. I am not in favor of prohibitive tariff, but I am in favor of giving the long end of the lever in every market, whether it be from farm, factory, or mine, to the American producer. In the interests of that proposition I ask that cattle be given a duty of 15 per cent. If I were inclined to argue it from the other standpoint, from the standpoint of a competitive tariff, I would say that the more they reduce this the more they pay out or lose for the slight importation. Therefore the reduction should be greater. To make a competitive tariff, as I understand it, the rule is, first, to ask, Is there any importation? Second, What is the source of importation? Has it increased during the last few periods or has it decreased? In other words, is there an increase of the units, increase of the values, increase of the duties? All three are present here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I believe that the Committee on Ways and Means, when it reduced the duty on cattle and on sheep and placed meats on the free list, acted in compliance with the express pledge made to the people of the United States in the platform adopted in the national convention of the Democratic Party in Baltimore and repeated in every congressional district during the last campaign. Personally I felt that in considering cattle schedules they might have gone further and placed cattle on the free list as they did beef and mutton and other meat supplies. And in answer to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN], who demands an increase in the proposed duty on cattle, I want to read an article that was printed on Saturday last in the Hudson Observer, a leading newspaper published in my home county. It quotes from a pamphlet issued by Swift & Co., one of the three constituent companies which go to make up the Beef Trust, and is a complete answer to his argument in favor of an increase in the duties on cattle. I read:

THAT DUTY ON FOOD ANIMALS.

President Wilson's attention is respectfully called to the pamphlet issued this week by Swift & Co., of Chicago, a copy of which has been sent to his secretary, Mr. Tumulty, together with the announcements that Representatives KINKEAD and BEHMNER, of New Jersey, have de-

cided to bolt the Democratic caucus and vote against the proposed 10 per cent duty on cattle and other food animals.

Why should the 10 per cent duty be imposed? In their pamphlet Swift & Co. show from the records that in 1912 the cattle raisers sent to market 560,265 fewer animals than in 1911. There was also a decrease of 18 pounds per head in the cattle marketed, or a total decrease for the year of 704,498,365 pounds.

This was not a temporary diminution in the supply. Though the population of the United States increased about 16,500,000 in the decade ending last year, the number of cattle in the country had decreased 7,468,000 in the same period. Unless the people eat something else—rice, for instance—and the slaughter of calves is stopped, the price of beef must go to prohibitive figures the packers say.

When it is so frankly confessed that the producers of the United States can not supply us with beef, why should any impediment, even a 10 per cent obstacle, be put in the way of the free importation of cattle on the hoof?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Why does not the gentleman offer an amendment striking out that 10 per cent duty?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I will state to my friend from Minnesota that I am moving in what I consider the most practical way. I believe and I hope that this duty will come off in the Senate, and when the bill comes back here I am sure that every man on this side of the House will vote for free cattle, as I will, although I am sincerely doubtful as to the attitude that you gentlemen will assume toward the amendment.

I continue from the editorial:

All duties are laid either by Republicans to "protect home industry from competition" or by Democrats for the purpose of raising revenue. Obviously an industry which can not supply the demand needs no protection, and the customhouses have never yielded from the importation of cattle enough to buy gasoline for the President's car.

But we are told by the consul at New York from that country that thousands of cattle are slaughtered on the plains of Argentina, in the luscious grass of the best grazing land in the world, for their hides and horns, the meat being left to rot because it is shut out of the United States by the tariff. Mexico and Canada also stand ready to provide us with the beef we need if we will let them.

Why, then, a 10 per cent duty on cattle? Is is true that the beef barons and not the cattle raisers asked for and secured this tariff? In any event, why does not President Wilson join the New Jersey Congressmen in the demand that this chief necessary shall be put in the free list? One message from him before the Underwood bill leaves the House might accomplish wonders.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the statements that are made in this editorial demonstrating the justice of admitting cattle free of duty, in view of the pledges made during the last campaign to reduce the cost of living in this country, I hope that the House will refuse to pass the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN]. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Do three gentlemen on the other side want to speak?

Mr. LANGLEY. I want two minutes only.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 20 minutes on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, it appears from the statement made by the chairman of this committee [Mr. UNDERWOOD] at the opening of this discussion that we are legislating through an irrevocable proxy. I do not hope by anything I may say to change a single vote upon that side of the Chamber, because by the chairman's own statement every man on his side of the Chamber is bound and gagged to vote against every amendment offered by this side, no matter how meritorious.

Since you refuse to take advice from Republican sources, I want to bring to you on that side of the Chamber the words of a distinguished Democrat who knows something of the agricultural schedule, and particularly of stock raising in the United States. I refer to Judge Cowan, who, in an article published in an agricultural paper, says he feels it his duty "as a citizen who seeks no office to call attention to the real grave and supreme danger confronting the stock-raising and agricultural interests." That article is as follows:

COWAN SOUNDS WARNING TO CATTLEMEN AND FARMERS.

"We now have the tariff bill before us," said C. H. Cowan, attorney for the Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas and the American National Live Stock Association, "and within it sufficient evidence that a serious blow to the live stock and farming interests of the United States has been struck. It needs no explanation or argument to show it.

"Manufacturers organized as they are and labor organized as it is may have looked after their interests sufficient to secure a reasonable preference in our home markets wherever they needed it for their output and to force us to work for them on the lowest level, but it is certain that the live-stock raisers and farmers have not successfully looked after their interests. Like 'snipe hunters' they are left with the bag to hold.

"This bill with free meats, free flour, free wool, free sugar, free potatoes, and other free-list farm products, together with duties so low on many others as to amount to nothing, manifests the intent to place the stock raisers and farmers of this country on a world-lowest level of prices for what they raise and reduce the meager profits by free competition with the cheapest labor and land and cheapest method of living of the countries which we invite to invade our markets, while nothing is demanded in return. The majority of the people of the United States surely are not in favor of that, and there ought not to be a single farmer or stock raiser so dense as to favor it.

"If we had the referendum independent of politics, every State west of the Alleghany Mountains would vote overwhelmingly against the free-trade scheme. The time has come for stock raisers and farmers to rise up and express themselves and get their friends to do likewise. The man who neglects to register his protest to his Senators and Congressmen and in the press, is by his silence acquiescing in this plan for his own undoing which will surely follow. The agricultural interests will be the increasingly greatest sufferers, for, as the opening of our great markets will invite production in other countries to supply us and take the place of what we should and would produce, it will in the end bring our stock raisers and farmers to a level with them. Thus we turn our trade—our home market—over to those who do not support our Government, pay taxes, support our institutions, perform the duties of citizens, or protect it in time of war.

"A fair preference in our home markets should be demanded. Congress is giving it to some, denying it to others—especially to farmers and stock raisers. If it turns out as intended it will impoverish our farmers and reduce their capacity to buy from the work shop or other producers and reach every avenue of trade. If it does not reduce prices, then those from the center of population who are forcing this thing upon us while keeping a preferential duty for themselves, will not get cheaper farm products which they seek.

"Every other important agricultural country in the world has a tariff designed to encourage agricultural pursuits. Why should we, the greatest in agriculture, deliberately discourage it by inviting the surplus producing countries to our markets free? The matter is in the hands of the stock raisers and farmers, and those interested in agriculture, to prevent this calamity by asserting themselves so that their voices are heard. He does not have to be a high protectionist to do this, he simply subscribes to fair play and acts in righteous self-defense against free trade.

"For over 26 years the attorney for the Cattle Raisers Association of Texas and many years for the American National Live Stock Association, acquainted with the business and conditions surrounding it, I feel it my duty on that account and as a citizen who seeks no office to call attention to this real grave and supreme danger confronting the stock raising and agricultural interests, and to urge each individual to act direct for himself.

"We have never had a tariff that enabled the producer to get unreasonable profits on live stock or other agricultural products. We have done nothing to demand punishment; we could not monopolize; we ought not to be selected for sacrifice just because we have not been able to make others afraid of us or produce.

"A general demand by each individual stock raiser and farmer will bring the result."

But my good friend, Judge Cowan, forgot that the literature circulated in the cities in the congressional campaign of 1910 by the Democratic congressional committee pledged the Democratic Party to enact a tariff law that would reduce the cost of food articles to the bankrupt prices of 1896. The Democratic committee in that year distributed to the thousands of voters in the cities of this country a circular entitled "The high cost of living." The following is a copy of that circular:

Voters and householders read the within carefully. How to save your money. Take into booth with you when you vote. Vote for your families. High cost of living facts. Read carefully. Ponder well. Vote right.

1896—PRICES—1910.

The Republican Party has been in complete control of every department of the Government since 1896—President, Senate, and Congress. They have given you a government of trusts—Beef Trust, Sugar Trust, Flour Trust, Clothing Trust, and the "daddy" of them all, the Tariff Trust. See the result below:

St. Louis prices.

OCTOBER, 1896—TWO WEEKS' STORE BILL.		OCTOBER, 1910—TWO WEEKS' STORE BILL NOW.	
2 pounds salt pork	$0.10	2 pounds salt pork	$0.40
5 pounds pork chops	.50	5 pounds pork chops	1.25
5 pounds pork ribs	.30	5 pounds pork ribs	.75
4 pounds smoked shoulder	.30	4 pounds smoked shoulder	.54
2 pounds sausage	.15	2 pounds sausage	.35
5 pounds lard	.35	5 pounds lard	.85
5 pounds corned beef	.25	5 pounds corned beef	.62½
4 pounds butter	.40	4 pounds butter	1.20
2 dozen eggs	.20	2 dozen eggs	.50
1 pound cheese	.13	1 pound cheese	.25
1 barrel flour	3.50	1 barrel flour	5.65
4 pounds chicken	.40	4 pounds chicken	.72
21 pounds sugar	1.00	21 pounds sugar	1.16
2 pounds steak	.20	2 pounds steak	.35
5 pounds roast beef	.50	5 pounds roast beef	1.00
	8.28		15.59½
LOOK AT THESE TWO STORE BILLS.		VOTE TO PROTECT YOUR POCKETBOOK.	

Your table bill has doubled; have your wages doubled? You pay 100 per cent more for your clothing, blankets, and household goods; has your salary kept pace with the increased cost of living? Your rent is higher and your fuel is higher; how much higher is your weekly wage check? Don't you think you had better help put the trusts that have doubled the cost of living out of business? Congressman GOOD'S vote helped to make the bill $15.59½ instead of $8.28.

In this circular you on that side of the House pointed to the prices of 1896 on farm produce as ideal prices, and you promised to enact a tariff law that would bring back those prices. If that is not the implied promise, what was the purpose and

object of the circular? The first article named in this circular, and the price you promised to the consumer, is 2 pounds of salt pork for 10 cents. Think of it, Mr. Farmer, salt port at 5 cents per pound. Hogs are selling to-day in the Chicago market for $8.70 per hundred pounds, and yet you promised to enact a tariff law that would bring to the consumers of this country pork at 5 cents per pound. You gentlemen on that side who represent farming interests find that a caucus rule, for which you voted, absolutely binds you to support this program. But how will your farmer constituents like the result?

Let the Members of this House who are farmers, or let the farmers of the country take this Democratic document and analyze it, taking each article separately, and ascertain how much the farmer will obtain for his produce if the prices above given on farm products should prevail.

Yesterday cattle in the Chicago market sold for $8.90 per hundred pounds, but this Democratic circular promises to the consumer that he should buy his beefsteak at retail at 10 cents per pound. I think I am reasonably safe in asserting that when salt pork and pork chops are selling at retail at 5 and 6 cents per pound live hogs will bring not to exceed $2.75 or $3 per hundred pounds. That when beefsteak sells at retail, allowing for packers', jobbers', and retailers' profits, at 10 cents per pound fat cattle will sell at not to exceed $4.50 or $5 per hundred pounds. Gentlemen on that side may be willing to return to the low bankruptcy prices for farm products and live stock that prevailed in 1896, but the Republican Party believes that the prosperity of the farmer should go hand in hand with the prosperity of the manufacturer and the laborer and every other industry in this country, and that our tariff laws should give that degree of protection that will measure the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

Mr. Chairman, recurring to this Democratic circular, what fair inference can be drawn regarding the duties levied by the Payne law upon the articles named? The ordinary reader would fairly infer that the Payne law greatly increases the duty upon those things. Now, what are the facts? The facts are that the Payne law did not increase the duty on a single article on the list. Here is a table showing the duty on those articles in the Dingley law and the changes made in the Payne law:

Table comparing duties in Dingley law and Payne law.

Articles named in circular.	Duties in Dingley law.	Duties in Payne law.	Decreases Payne law.
			Per cent.
Salt port[1]	25 per cent ad valorem	25 per cent ad valorem	
Pork chops	2 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	25
Pork ribs	....do	....do	25
Smoked shoulder[1]	25 per cent ad valorem	25 per cent ad valorem	
Sausage[1]	....do	....do	
Lard	2 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	25
Corned beef[1]	25 per cent ad valorem	25 per cent ad valorem	
Butter[1]	6 cents per pound	6 cents per pound	
Eggs[1]	5 cents per dozen	5 cents per dozen	
Cheese[1]	6 cents per pound	6 cents per pound	
Flour[1]	25 per cent ad valorem.	25 per cent ad valorem.	
Chickens[1]	3 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	
Sugar	$1.95 per hundred-weight.	$1.90 per hundred-weight.	2½
Steak	2 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	25
Beef	....do	....do	25

[1] No change.

No increases under Payne law.
Number of decreases under Payne law, 6.

Here we have a concrete statement of the changes made in the Payne tariff on these articles. Of the 15 articles named, the duty on 9 was not changed. On the remaining 6 articles the duty on 1 was reduced 2½ per cent, and on the other 5 articles the Payne law reduced the duty 25 per cent. We are told by this campaign circular, which is a lie upon its face, that the Payne law increased the price of pork chops 150 per cent, when in fact the Payne law reduced the duty on pork chops 25 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, in the name of the honest and hard-working farmer, I protest against the lies that are now being circulated about his industry. We ought to encourage farming and stock raising. We should induce the men and women who are annually flocking to our shores to leave the overcrowded cities and take up agricultural pursuits. But if you on that side can not say a good word for the farmer, you should at least quit lying about his industry.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day I said I was not going to take up any of the time of the committee, because I knew it was useless; but as we proceed step by step in this bill you are rubbing it in so hard on many of the industries of the district which I represent that I am bound to say a few words more.

Cattle raising is one of the great industries of our State. To my mind it is an economic absurdity to put a duty on cattle and then put on the free list that which cattle are converted into. The effect of it, as I view it, is to bunco the farmer and whipsaw the packing industry of the United States and the laboring men employed in that industry. Watch the price of cattle go down after this bill goes into operation.

Mr. Chairman, I shall say nothing further at present, but I want to have read in my time a resolution adopted at a recent nonpartisan mass meeting in the city of Buffalo, attended by about 2,500 citizens, in which they expressed their views upon this matter. I send it to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

APRIL 26, 1913.

Hon. JOHN W. LANGLEY,
House of Representatives, City.

DEAR SIR: The city of Buffalo is up in arms over the provision——

Mr. LANGLEY. I only asked to have the resolution read.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Read it all.

Mr. LANGLEY. I have no objection to the Clerk reading it all.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. LANGLEY. My request was that the Clerk read the resolution adopted at that meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas we, the citizens of Buffalo, in a mass meeting assembled this 23d day of April, 1913, upon consideration of the proposed changes in tariff schedules now pending in Congress as affecting wheat, oats, wheat flour, cereals, live stock, and dressed meats, by which all raw materials in each case would be left subject to a substantial tax, while the finished products of such materials would be admitted to this country free of duty; and

Whereas we are advised and believe that the certain effect of such legislation would be to destroy live stock, milling, and packing industries in this city and elsewhere now engaging vast amounts of capital and employing thousands of workmen; and

Whereas we believe that the Congress of the United States would not wittingly enact such disastrous legislation if the situation were thoroughly understood: Therefore be it

Resolved, That if flour, cereals, and meats are admitted free, then the raw materials—wheat, oats, and live stock—should also be admitted free; and be it further

Resolved, That we do earnestly protest against legislation that imposes a duty on wheat, oats, and live stock, while permitting free entry to this country of wheat flour, cereals, and dressed meat, and we beseech Congress to give further serious consideration to the far-reaching effects of such legislation, and not to pass a tariff bill containing such unjustifiable and disastrous measures.

Mr. LANGLEY. I commend these resolutions to the prayerful consideration of the distinguished gentleman from Buffalo.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I do not suppose I ought to say anything about the meat schedule, because I am interested in the meat business. I am a cattle feeder and a cattle breeder on a considerable scale. To my mind the Democratic Ways and Means Committee made a serious mistake in not putting cattle on the free list, and I am going to move to amend the bill to that effect. Our pasturage in this country is well taken up to-day. We all know, if we are experienced in the cattle-raising business, that in most parts of the country it is a great expense to carry the breeding cow through the winter. This is one of the heaviest costs in raising cattle. Northern Mexico is a wonderful place for cheaply producing calves and young cattle. They can there be started much cheaper than in most parts of this country, and provided they can be taken out and brought to a northern climate where they will make good growth the result is a great cheapening of our meat supply.

The difference between a 3-year-old steer in Arizona, New Mexico, or Mexico and his brother sent north as a yearling is at least 300 pounds. Therefore, as a citizen hoping for a more adequate meat supply, I believe in free cattle, and as a cattle raiser and cattle breeder I am in no fear of damage to my business or the wages of my employees from free cattle.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a lot of misinformation in this House concerning the packers. For 25 years I have been up against the Chicago packers. I know what they have taken that did not belong to them, and how much they have taken that did not belong to them, but to-day they have a very small influence on the cost of the best meat. Their charges for handling a standard steer are, I believe, less than $3, possibly a little over $2. That on an animal that is worth $110 is a small percentage. This talk of the farmer being wrecked and ruined by the advent of free meat from Argentina and other places is the veriest nonsense.

The proof of that is in Panama, where Col. Wilson, living in a free-trade market, where he can get Argentine meat, prefers to stock his commissary with the more expensive corn-fed cattle from the Middle West, as it is better stuff and can be handled without much waste. He furnishes the best porter-

house steak at 20 cents a pound, and he gets rid of all unconscionable distributing charges that are common in the butcher shops throughout the country. I do not blame the butcher; he is not getting rich; he is wasting too much and he is paying out money in rent and all sort of delivery charges. The great trouble with us to-day is this waste in distribution.

I am selling upward of 5,000 corn-fed cattle a year and a good many grass cattle. I wish to state frankly that I am not afraid of the influx of cattle or beef from other countries. It is not going to hurt anybody or do anyone much good. The world demand for meat is greater than the supply. I have in my office the statement of a great concern in England which handles frozen meat; this statement shows that our American export has dropped off to almost a negligible quantity. Almost every country in Europe is trying to import frozen meat. It is being kept out of France by ridiculous agrarian legislation. Even Switzerland is importing meat. Meat is a luxury and always will be. It will never be cheap again, and beef is the most costly of meats. It is our obvious duty to conserve the grass and to study cheaper methods of feeding that we may produce as reasonably as possible.

A mere statement of costs of feeding shows the extravagant nature of beef as a human food.

It takes 56 pounds of corn to make 4 pounds of beef with 2 pounds of pork as a by-product. With high-priced land we can not produce corn-fed beef at prices below what means luxury. We ought to save in the cost of the calf; we must mature our meat more cheaply. There is no sense nor logic in a duty on cattle. There is no danger to anyone in free meat or untaxed imports of live cattle.

Mr. Chairman, I move to amend to the effect that cattle be put on the free list.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out "15 per cent ad valorem" and inserting "free of duty."

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, I know full well that it is believed that the only thing I know in regard to this tariff is the sugar schedule. As a matter of fact, I have given more study personally, theoretically, and as a concrete proposition, to the meat question than I have given to the sugar question. The tariff on beef and meat has not now, and never has had, anything to do with the price of meat in this country. I have been in Sonora, Mexico, on the Couchiverrichi ranch, where I have a camp, at different times, and last year when the Madero revolution was in force in Mexico—the undivided one-half of that ranch being owned by an American friend of mine—I obtained permission from the Treasury Department to transfer from that ranch, which runs up to the international line—the line along Arizona and New Mexico—several thousand head of cattle, and they were permitted to enter this country upon a bond being furnished to return them within six months. These steers were transferred and they lived among the cattle in Arizona and New Mexico for six months. Then, as I recall it, I obtained a further extension of time under the law from the Secretary of the Treasury, which permitted them to stay for six months longer. They had finally then to be brought back onto the Couchiverrichi ranch.

The result of all this was that when they brought these steers back into Sonora, across the line from Douglas, Ariz., the owners, I am informed, as I know was done with other cattle in Sonora, killed the steers in order to sell the hides in this country, and they let the meat rot on the field. This is a fact. I bought meat—and I have been under contract for the last five years to buy half a steer twice a week at my camp—for 25 Mexican cents a kilo, which is approximately 4½ cents a pound. The other half of the steer is brought to Douglas, Ariz., and the duty there is paid upon it and the meat is then sold for 35 cents gold a kilo. I paid 4½ cents in my camp in Sonora and the American consumer at Douglas, right across the way, paid 35 cents for the other half of that same steer. No man can contradict that statement, because for four years that has been my experience. It is 34 miles from the border. Half of the steer came into my camp at 4½ cents and the American consumer—and I and my men were consumers of this meat—paid in Douglas 35 cents a pound from the retailer—the restaurant man. What did the duty have to do with that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I can not consent to an extension of this debate. I would like to, but if I do it for one gentleman, I would have to for another.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent and the gentleman may object if he desires.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to object.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MONDELL. I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that debate has been closed upon this amendment by unanimous consent of the committee.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the committee for five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to object to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has objected. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, what is the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California to place beef upon the free list.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONDELL. Is all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto closed?

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto, by order of the committee, has been closed. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 13, noes 99.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting as a new paragraph, at the end of line 17, page 50, the following:

"Fresh beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and venison, and other game, except birds, 25 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph which I have offered restores the present duty on fresh meat. I believe that the present law, so far as the duty on cattle and on fresh meats is concerned, is practically a competitive duty, as described by the gentleman from Alabama. In 1907, during the eight months ending with the month of February, there were imported into this country 12,513 head of cattle. During the eight corresponding months of last year there were imported into this country 222,000 head of cattle, upon which the duty of 27½ per cent ad valorem was paid. I realize that the cattle industry and the live-stock industry has undergone some great changes in the past six years. There is to-day a shortage of more than 15,000,000 head of cattle in the United States, and other countries have noted that shortage and desire to take advantage of it. I hold in my hand the Daily——

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Not at present.

Mr. GOULDEN. Just a simple question.

Mr. GOOD. By reference to the Daily Consular and Trade Reports of January 23, 1913, I find this quotation:

Australian meat has been put on sale at San Francisco, Cal. The ship which has just brought the trial order left 300,000 pounds of beef and mutton at Honolulu for the Army in the Hawaiian Islands.

Also, in the issue of the Daily Consular and Trade Reports of August 19, 1912, is found an item relative to prices on meats in Peru:

Lima does not suffer from high cost of meats. The ruling prices in the central market are 12, 20, and 25 centavos (5½, 9½, and 12½ cents American) a pound, the latter for choice loin cuts, and it is excellent beef at that.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Will the gentleman permit an interruption there?

Mr. GOOD. I can not; I have not the time. The gentleman can get time. To show that this bill has been framed in the interest of the Beef Trust, I want to say that gentlemen on that side of the aisle—Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee—have said they did not experience any difficulty with the West in reducing the duties on cattle and meat products, but they experienced their difficulty in the East. Well, I guess that is true. The western farmer realized that you were opposed to his industry, and they are willing to submit

this bill to the test of actual experience. The difficulty you encountered was Wall Street, and that difficulty was met by putting beef on the free list and a duty on cattle. The Daily Consular and Trade Reports of May 18, 1912, states:

It is reported that work has been commenced on the new freezing works that are to be built at Zarate. The concession for these works belongs to one of the Beef Trust companies. * * * The report of the directors of the River Plate Fresh Meat Co. for 1912 shows a net profit of $279,000, out of which a dividend of 10 per cent is recommended, $50,000 placed to reserve, and $41,000 forward.

Beef Trust plants located in Argentina and Australia can under this bill bring in their meats free of duty, but this bill denies to the independent packers, whose only plants are located in this country, the right to bring their cattle in free. Yes; you met your trouble down East unquestionably; you met it by yielding to these trust magnates who receive these large dividends.

The big four are already firmly established in South America. Swift & Co. control the La Plata Cold Storage Co. (Ltd.), at La Plata, which is just south of Buenos Aires, and also operate a plant at Montevideo, Uruguay. Morris & Co. control the Sociedad Anonima La Blanca, in which for the present Armour & Co. are interested. Armour & Co. also have a plant now in course of construction in South America. Schwarzschild & Sulzberger Co. have men on the ground now building a plant in Buenos Aires.

The voice of the lowly farmer could not reach the Ways and Means Committee and secure the protection which his industry demands. It required greater influence, and that influence put meats on the free list and gave to the Beef Trust a great advantage over the independent packer. It is to be regretted that the spirit of fair play did not prevail to the extent of writing in this bill a fair protection both on cattle and on meats. But our Democratic friends are unfair to the farmer and dishonest with his industry. The fact is that during the past decade prices have been advancing the world over, and in no place have they advanced more rapidly than in free-trade England. The Dingley law became effective in 1897, and the Payne law wrote scarcely a single increase in the duties on agricultural products. Hence the increase in prices on farm produce that has taken place during the past 10 years can not be charged to the tariff. It is traceable to some other cause.

The finding of the commission appointed by Gov. Dix to investigate the cost of living is most instructive. It gives this incident showing the relation between prices received by the farmer for his product and the prices the consumer is obliged to pay for the same article. A farmer on Long Island sent to the New York market 25 bushels of string beans. At the end of 10 days he received a check for 76 cents for his product. The commission also found that at the time of this transaction string beans were sold at retail in New York City at 10 cents per quart, or $3.20 per bushel. I suppose our Democratic friends will claim that the tariff on string beans was the cause of the high price which the consumers of New York were compelled to pay for those beans, but they will have great difficulty in convincing the farmer who received 76 cents for his 25 bushels of string beans that the tariff cut very much figure in the transaction.

Our Democratic friends claim that the tariff is responsible for all the evils in our body politic. If prices are too high, they assign the evil to the tariff. If the prices are not high enough, the tariff is responsible. And so, to correct the existing evils, they propose to tear down, to destroy industry. I submit that if this bill shall become a law the sober sense of the American people will record its verdict in favor of a policy to regulate and not destroy, to protect and not to kill American enterprise and American industry.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have heard of some animals that move backward, and I have discovered in this tariff debate that there are some mentalities that move backward. When you hear it announced on the floor of this House that legislation is in favor of a great monopoly when you put the article that that monopoly makes on the free list, it is mental gymnastics that I am not able to grasp. But, as a matter of fact, the gentleman's party, when they reduced their rates under the present law to ad valorem rates, were in exactly the position that this bill is in except their rates were higher. The duty to-day on cattle, on an average, is 27 per cent. This bill reduces it to 10 per cent, or cuts off 17 per cent of tax. The duty on fresh beef, reduced to an ad valorem, is about 17 per cent. The legislation in this bill is to reduce it to no per cent, cutting off 17 per cent.

Now, I do not say that those mathematics on the part of the Ways and Means Committee were intentional, but, as a matter of fact, the rate produced the result, and the rate on cattle and the rate on beef are both reduced by just 17 per cent of a cut. Now, I can not see where the gentlemen on that side of the Chamber can find, if it is merely a question of adjusting these duties to similar rates, any great amount of criticism, because the balance remains as it is under the present law, except under this law the American people will have free meat and a very great reduction on cattle.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not yield. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] talks about sausage meat, I suppose.

Mr. GOOD. That is one of the items contained in your bill.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not yield now.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] overlooked the fact that so far as his criticism in reference to that proposition is concerned, both swine and swine meat are placed on the free list in this bill. He forgot that in his argument.

The whole proposition, though, is this: That this party on this side of the House promised to the American people free bread and free meat, and we are keeping our promise to the American people to-day as we have done in the past. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment be now closed.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma, Mr. MONDELL, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. MANN rose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am closing it on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. MONDELL. Is the gentleman proposing to close debate on the paragraph?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On the new paragraph offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. It is already closed on the main paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have entered into an agreement with the House as to debate on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that debate on the pending amendment be now closed.

Mr. MANN. This amendment is to place meat on the dutiable list. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McGUIRE] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] are both very much interested. Will not the gentleman make it 10 minutes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to make it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be closed in 10 minutes.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will not the gentleman make it 15 minutes, so that I can get 5 minutes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; I will.

Mr. GARDNER. Will not the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] yield to a question before he sits down?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let us get through with this first.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be closed in 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be yielded to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McGUIRE], 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama may have time sufficient to answer a question. The gentleman stated that the duty of 1½ cents a pound, which is the present duty on beef, was the equivalent of 17 per cent. At what price per pound does he calculate his meat?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not make the calculation. It is the calculation of the Treasury Department for the year 1910, and the Treasury Department says the unit of value for that year was 8.4 per cent.

Mr. GARDNER. That is what I made it. I wanted to show that it was calculated incorrectly on beef that was worth less than 9 cents a pound.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I refer the gentleman to the Treasury Department.

Mr. GARDNER. That was in 1910.

[Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Oklahoma is the most conservative man I know. He has placed the number of lies told about the Payne bill at only 1,000,000.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I mean the number of liars.

Mr. MONDELL. Still more conservative.

This bill places meats on the free list. It has retained a 10 per cent duty on cattle. That means that the gentleman from New Jersey can assure his people that meats are going to be cheaper, while the gentlemen from Texas and Missouri can assure their people that the placing of meats on the free list is going to make no difference, because cattle are still taxed.

The fact is there is no logic whatever in placing meats on the free list and taxing live animals; and if the gentlemen were entirely honest in their endeavor to reduce the price of beef in this country, and were willing to sacrifice the American farmer to do it, they would put both cattle and meat on the free list. You say to the dwellers along the seaboard that you are going to give them cheaper meats, and if you do, you place all the cattle growers of the country in competition with the Argentine and Australia, and at the same time you refuse to allow the cattle growers to secure their stock at a lower price from the only country where we can secure it in any large numbers, to wit, Mexico. But Mexico happens to lie adjacent to the empire State of Texas, hence the duty of 10 per cent on cattle and no duty on meats. Open the gates of Texas to the cattle of Mexico without a duty and the cheapest yearlings grown on earth will come in to feed on the grasses of Texas and the country to the north, where the great ranges lie. While the cattle raisers would suffer from the lower price for meat, owing to free importation of meats, they would at least have the advantage of lower raw material. While the men in Kansas and Nebraska would suffer by the lower price of meat at the seacoast, they might gain something through cheaper cattle coming into the range country from Mexico to be there grown and then shipped to the corn States to be fed.

But you could not carry out a logical proposition. The geography of your party is such that you can not do it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I have only five minutes. You could not carry out a logical proposition like that, which would lower the price of meat in the United States somewhat with the least possible injury to the American stockman; but you have a combination here which no one can defend, which has no logic in it, under which you propose to keep out the cheap young stock grown in Mexico and at the same time put the American farmer in competition with the frozen meat from abroad.

But if you gentlemen want to be consistent, and you honestly want to do what you claim you want to do, you will put cattle on the free list along with meat. If you want to give the American farmer and ranchman the opportunity he is entitled to, to grow and fatten the best meats in the world for the American people, you will place neither meats nor live stock on the free list.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, I started out a while ago with the statement that the duty on cattle does not affect the price of meat in this country so long as the prevailing quarantine laws continue in force, and owing to the shortness of my time I was unable to finish my argument.

I had this proposition presented to this Government by the Government of Spanish Honduras: Can we ship cattle into the United States and break down the price of meat? I took the trouble to go from Puerto Cortez, a ride of 360 miles, to Tegucigalpa, the capital, where I talked with the then President of the Republic, and he secured the signatures to an assent to deliver to me 300,000 four-year-old steers, fat and ready for market, at $20 Honduran money, which, being at the rate of 40 cents on a dollar, meant $8 apiece. At that time steers of that character were selling in Chicago at over $40 apiece. I came back here not with a view of getting the contracts, but I wanted the slaughterhouses in the city of New Orleans, of Mobile, of the coast cities, to get these 300,000 head of steers and bring them from Honduras, the cost of transportation by water being $3.75 apiece, making $11.75 for steers that were selling in St. Louis and Kansas City for nearly $40 apiece. They appealed to me to present the matter to the Secretary of Agriculture. I went to him and he said that there might be some disease among them. The Government of Spanish Honduras put up the money and had two experts sent by the Secretary of Agriculture. They went down there and found nothing the matter with the cattle except that they had ticks. Now, the ticks abound from the 36th degree of north latitude, which includes North and South Carolina and California, and the 36th degree of south latitude, which includes a part of Argentina, where the British get their meat.

There are ticks everywhere between these lines. We ship cattle from Louisiana, North Carolina, Texas, and Tennessee into the markets of Kansas City, Chicago, and East St. Louis; we ship them for immediate slaughter, and no objections are urged to them under the quarantine laws. And yet these 300,000 steers could not be brought into New Orleans, Galveston, Beaumont, or anywhere along the Gulf coast or on the Atlantic seaboard to be slaughtered immediately as they do in Chicago with southern cattle, because the Secretary of Agriculture said they had ticks.

You could kill the cattle and bring them into the country, bring the hides with the ticks on them in, bring the meat into the country, because ticks do not affect the meat, and yet the influence of the Meat Trust was such that these 300,000 steers are still in Honduras dying of old age or being slaughtered for their hides, and the American people are still demanding cheap beef. The gentlemen in charge of this bill have never investigated the subject and are not willing to permit these cattle to be brought into the country and compete with the Meat Trust. These are the facts. The Government of Honduras paid the entire expenses, and the report was in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, a copy of which is in my office, and yet these cattle can not be brought into this country so as to permit competition with the Meat Trust.

You talk about the meats from Argentina and your meat being made cheaper by having this bill passed. I will tell you that you will not cheapen meat at all until cattle from Chihuahua and Sonora and Guatemala and Costa Rica and Honduras, millions of them, can be brought into this country in the tick territory for immediate slaughter. We have a large tick territory in this country, as they have in Mexico and South and Central America, and yet gentlemen say taking the duty off will cheapen meat; but I tell you that it never will until you have regulated that proposition. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired; all time has expired; and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting, after section 188, a section to be numbered 188½ and to read as follows:
"All meats, including fresh beef, pork, lamb, veal, and all prepared or preserved meat, including ham and bacon, 15 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that a tariff will not in any way affect the price of beef or cattle. If that be true, I see no occasion for this session of Congress or for the modification of this particular schedule. I do not believe that it affects this to the extent that a great many people claim. I want to call the attention of the committee to this one fact: The purpose of this bill is largely shown in Schedule G, where the greatest reductions are made. The reductions amount to twice as much in Schedule G as they do in any other schédule—directed against that 60 per cent of the area of the United States lying in the West. I want to call the attention of the committee to this fact: On page 3 of this report, at the head of the many alleged evils that are to be corrected by this bill, stands this most elevated target: Farm products, increase from 1897, 93.2 per cent. I take it that it is the admitted purpose and claim of this bill to do away with those profits. They did not say anything about that out West. We hear a good deal about it here. I want to tell the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that if he had gone throughout the West and had had Members upon that side declare that they would have free meats and cereals and other farm products there would not have been a Member elected from the great Northwest to sit upon that side. They did not talk about that; and while I am talking about the membership from the Northwest, I want to state this particular fact: We are protectionists in that great Northwest.

I have looked over the returns of the elections in every district of the United States, and I find those who were opposed to protection have carried a majority vote in only 211 congressional districts of the United States, while in 224 districts of the United States the protection votes were in a majority. [Applause on the Republican side.]

There is a great deal of misinformation leading to this sort of action, and some of it comes from exceedingly high authority. I have in my hand a copy of a speech that was delivered on September 12, 1912, in Albany, by a man who has been elevated to high authority in this country. This is what he said:

Take the price of meat, for instance, and the price of meat is at the heart of the business, for it is meat that makes the red blood and makes work easier. The price of meat has gone up 30 and 40 per cent in 10 years in this country, and the price of American meat has not gone up a fraction of a cent per pound in the London markets.

If he means by that that wholesale meat has not gone up in the English markets, I will call the attention of the Congress, and of the gentleman himself, to the actual facts of the price

of American meat imported into the United Kingdom for the last 14 years, and I will give an authoritative statement:

Average annual price per hundredweight of all American beef shipped into the United Kingdom.

1899	$10.06
1900	10.25
1901	10.30
1902	10.98
1903	10.35
1904	10.40
1905	10.45
1906	10.45
1907	10.35
1908	11.08
1910	10.88
1911	11.08
1912	12.00

Increase of price of United States beef imported into the United Kingdom for 1912 over 1902, more than 9 per cent.

Average price for last 5 years over average for first 5 years above quoted, nearly 8 per cent.

The increase in the price of United States beef imported into the United Kingdom in 1912 from 1902, which fixes the period he had in mind, was 9 per cent. The average price of 1910, 1911, and 1912, as compared with 1900, 1901, and 1902, was an increase of 7 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I read this letter to show some of the inconsistencies of this bill:

EAST BUFFALO LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION,
East Buffalo, N. Y., April 17, 1913.

To Members of the Senate and House of Representatives:

It appears to be the determination of the present Congress and of the President to enact a tariff law admitting meats duty free. This we believe to be a grievous mistake, against which we most earnestly protest; but assuming that meats will be so admitted we respectfully urge that provision be made for the admission of live stock on an equal basis. Otherwise, the producers of meats in this country, which means not alone the so-called "Beef Trust" or "big packer," but the raisers of grass and grain, the farmers, feeders, and stock raisers, as well as the independent butchers and slaughterers, big and little, to the number of several thousands throughout the country, will suffer from such unjust discrimination.

The "big fellow" can take care of himself, either here or abroad, but, while striking at him what is only an imaginary blow in this country, the free admission of meats with a 10 per cent duty on cattle, is but a play into his hands, assisting him in the extension of his operations abroad by opening to him our markets for his foreign productions, with increased profits to himself, to the detriment of actual home producers, the probable throwing out of employment of thousands of workmen, and with no benefit to the consuming public through cheaper meats. The fact is, that the large packers, four in number, constituting the so-called "Beef Trust," already have numerous large plants in Canada and in South America, of which they would immediately avail themselves, and ultimately there would be created and built up a genuine and real world-wide beef trust; and if we really want a beef trust better plans could scarcely be devised for the permanent establishment of such.

With the free admission of meat animals, however, still assuming that meats are to be free, conditions would be more nearly equalized. The farmer, grazier, and feeder could obtain thin stock for raising and fattening, and the home butcher would be on an equal footing in the purchase of supplies. Competition would be on an equitable basis, the law of supply and demand would have a fair opportunity of asserting itself and if benefits are possible they might be realized.

The following, quoted from an interview with Mr. A. J. Shamberg, vice president of the National Live Stock Exchange, appearing in a recent issue of the New York Journal of Commerce, is indorsed and commended to your earnest consideration:

"When the hearings are held in Washington a delegation will be present to present the argument that the raising of the duty on dressed beef while leaving a duty on live cattle will not tend to the reduction of the price of meat. The placing of a duty of 10 per cent on live cattle and allowing dressed beef to come in duty free will further assist the so-called Beef Trust to kill off smaller packers throughout the United States and also to throttle the foreign raisers of live stock, some of the reasons for which are as follows:

"(1) Only very large corporations can maintain killing plants throughout the world and successfully meet keen rivalry.

"(2) Nobody can import live cattle for slaughter in the United States and sell beef thereof in competition with imported dressed beef if the rate of duty is to favor the dead article 10 per cent.

"In consequence, the foreign live-stock raisers will be forced to sell to those interests which have the slaughtering facilities in foreign lands, as they neither can slaughter at home nor ship here alive in competition, owing to such duty discrimination.

"Also our smaller slaughterers throughout this country will not be able either to import the live cattle, owing to duty discrimination against live cattle, nor establish slaughtering plants in foreign countries, owing to the large capital necessary for such.

"As a matter of equity, and to eliminate monopoly, sure to establish itself, the rate of duty should be in favor of the importation of live cattle for the following reasons:

"(1) Because the expense of feeding and shrinkage of carcass is eliminated in transporting beef in competition with transporting live cattle.

"(2) Because the business of importing live cattle would be open to hundreds of persons, the competition among whom in selling would produce cheaper meat (despite extra handling expense) than would the importation of dressed beef handled by comparatively few firms.

"(3) Imported dressed beef will not create the demand for labor, being the finished article, that would be created with importations of live cattle which are to be slaughtered and manufactured into beef, thus creating industry at home.

"Briefly, to tax live cattle and let in dressed beef will place the meat industry in a few hands, encourage foreign industry of slaughter, permit monopolists to dictate prices they will pay for cattle abroad, and the prices meat must sell for here. Legislation of this sort will, I believe, meet strenuous opposition and have to be altered.

"Again, our farmers will be confronted with the importation of meats and not be able to bring in thin stock for feding purposes, and, in time, this would mean the reduction in corn raising, 85 per cent of which great crop is being now used in feeding live stock.

"My hope is that live cattle will be allowed in free, thus creating industry for the farmer, a market for his grains, and stimulus to animal husbandry which supplements the fertility of his soil. Meat should pay a duty of at least 1 cent per pound as a protection to home producers and in the indirect interests of consumers as well."

Respectfully,

EAST BUFFALO LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just taken his seat made the statement, as I understood him, that if the Democratic Party prior to the last election had declared in the West and in the Northwest that they proposed in this bill to give to the people of this country free meat and free bread we would not have elected a single Representative in the entire West or Northwest. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska to the bill on which we made our campaign. On the 8th day of May, 1911, we passed through the House a bill which provided for free beef, free veal, free mutton, free lamb, free pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner, bacon, ham, shoulders, lard, lard compound, and lard substitutes, sausage and sausage meats coming from any foreign country with which the United States has a reciprocal trade agreement and which shall admit from the United States free of duty cotton, wheat, oats, corn, cattle, and hogs, buckwheat flour, cornmeal, wheat flour, semilina, rye flour, bran, middlings, and other offals of grain, oatmeal, rolled oats, and all prepared breakfast foods.

That is the proposition upon which we made our campaign, and this bill passed the Senate and was vetoed by the President of the United States on the 18th day of August, 1911. We gave to the country fair notice that if the Democrats controlled this body and controlled the Senate and controlled the Chief Executive of the Nation we proposed to do these very things. The President vetoed this bill. Is not the fact that we have elected so many Representatives in the Northwest on this sort of a platform due to the fact that we declared in favor of these free foods, and especially due to the fact that the President vetoed this bill, thereby placing the Republican Party in a position of opposition to it all?

Now, they say that the small tariff we have retained on live cattle will prevent the importation into this country of live cattle from the Republic of Mexico, and yet last year when the tariff upon live cattle was nearly three times as much as we have placed it in this bill, when the tariff amounted to 27 per cent ad valorem, and we have placed it now at 10 per cent, we brought into the United States 330,000 head of cattle. Now, when we have lowered the tariff to 10 per cent, when we have made it about one-third of what it was, does it follow and is it logical that fewer cattle will come across the boundary from the Republic of Mexico? Why, instead of 27 per cent——

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman has stated the number of cattle that came in at the higher rate. I presume the gentleman wants more to come in. Does not the gentleman think that more cattle would come in if they were free than at the 10 per cent rate?

Mr. RAINEY. I do not think the nominal rate of 10 per cent ad valorem will make any material difference in the amount of importations from Mexico from what the importations would be if cattle were free, but it will result in additional importations. We have not kept this 10 per cent ad valorem on cattle for the purpose of protecting the farmers of this country. The gentlemen who are talking upon the other side can not make the farmers of this country believe in a high duty on cattle. They want cattle in their industry. Why, it is to the interest of the farmers of this country——

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. I can not at present. It is to the interest of the farmers of this country to get their free raw material from Mexico just as cheaply as they can get it.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just taken his seat is an expert on the subject of this agricultural schedule, and especially with regard to meat. Now, I hold in my hand the Democratic campaign document that I referred to a moment ago, which was circulated either by the Democratic national committee or the Democratic congressional committee, entitled "The High Cost of Living," quoting the prices on meats for

1896 and pointing to those prices as the ideal price, and I want to ask the gentleman this question: If this bill shall become a law, as it now appears, with free meats and a duty of 10 per cent upon cattle, with free hogs and free pork products, how much will that reduce, in the gentleman's estimation, the price of meat to the consumer?

Mr. RAINEY. I will say to the gentleman, we put swine upon the free list now. The gentleman seems to be objecting. Last year we brought in 994 hogs. What difference does that make?

Mr. GOOD. I would like to have the gentleman answer my question. How much will this bill, if it is enacted into law, reduce the price of meat to the ultimate consumer?

Mr. RAINEY. I do not know how much we will be able to reduce the cost of living in this country.

Mr. GOOD. I am not asking that.

Mr. RAINEY. But if under Democratic administration we will be able to check the increased price of living that has been growing under Republican administration, then we will have accomplished much.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman answer what is in the campaign circular, or state that it is absolutely false——

Mr. RAINEY. I do not know anything about the campaign circular.

Mr. GOOD. I will be glad to show the gentleman a copy of it, because I went to the expense of having some of these campaign circulars printed and circulated among the farmers in my district. I want to know how much will the enactment of this bill into law reduce the price of meat to the consumers. I want the gentleman to be honest with Members of the House at least.

Mr. RAINEY. The gentleman can not expect the gentleman from Illinois to be a prophet. In this case we are trying to reduce the cost of living in this country; in this case, the cost of meat. We promised to do it, and we are going to do it.

Mr. GOOD. How much will be the reduction?

Mr. RAINEY. How much does the gentleman think it will take?

Mr. GOOD. How much do I say? I say you will give all the reduction to the Beef Trust, every bit, by putting a duty upon cattle.

Mr. BUTLER. That is wrong.

Mr. GOOD. Now, I ask the gentleman, as he is an expert and I am not——

Mr. RAINEY. The gentleman will not get many men to agree with him on that proposition.

Mr. GOOD. Will it reduce the price 5 cents a pound on beefsteak?

Mr. RAINEY. I hope it will reduce it as much as the present tariff raised it, if the present tariff has raised it.

Mr. GOOD. Has the present tariff raised it?

Mr. RAINEY. I do not know whether it has or not.

Mr. GOOD. Will the enactment of this law reduce the price? By putting swine and pork on the free list, will that reduce the price of salt pork and of fresh pork?

Mr. RAINEY. It will only affect the importation of 500 hogs. We took that off of the dutiable list because it is one of the Republican absurdities.

Mr. GOOD. But you put on the campaign circular by means of which Democrats obtained places in this House a list of 13 articles, among them salt pork, pork chops, pork ribs, and lard. You put all of those in your campaign circular, and said that the enactment of the Payne law increased the cost of them 50 per cent to the consumer, and now you say the repeal of the Payne law will not amount to a single penny to the ultimate consumer. Did you tell the truth when you issued that campaign circular, or do you tell the truth when you admit that the enactment of this law will not reduce the price to the ultimate consumer? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Unless some other gentlemen wish to speak on this amendment, I move that the debate close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] moves that debate on this amendment close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is recognized.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I presume it would be well for us to consider the object of these proposed reductions. It has been stated over and over again that their object is to give to the consumer cheaper prices on food products. There has never been on the floor of this House one single fact stated upon which an argument could be based that would show that these reductions that you propose on these farm products will bring to the consumer cheaper food prices. A few years ago the Secretary of Agriculture made an investigation regarding the prices that were paid by the ultimate consumer of farm products, and he found that the ultimate consumer was paying about 100 per cent higher prices than the farmer was receiving for his products. If you really desire to consider the interests of all the people, as you say you do, would it not be more practical statesmanship for you to suggest some measure by which 100 per cent of the cost to the ultimate consumer is consumed by transportation and middlemen's profits and the combinations that are affected, both in the cities and out, in the disposition of these farm products? It has been stated here by gentlemen over and over again that these reductions in tariff rates will not make one particle of difference in the cost to the ultimate consumer of food products.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I can not yield, I am sorry to say.

If that be true, I will say to the advocates of this bill you are wasting your time; if that be true you are only trying to delude the ultimate consumer with these promises. In fact, that is what you are attempting to do. It was what you did during the last campaign. You went to those men in the East, to the workingmen, and you said, "It is true you are receiving high wages. We do not propose to reduce them, but we do propose to reduce the cost of living one-half." And you went to the farmers of the West and said, "Do not be frightened about taking off the duties on your products. It will not make a particle of difference. You never received any protection. You will get as much for your products after we have gone into power and passed our bill as you ever did, but the benefit will be to you in that you will get a large reduction on everything from the East that you are compelled to purchase."

So you made the East believe that they could sell everything they had to sell high, and you made the West believe they could sell everything they had to sell high, and you made both of them believe they could buy everything they had to use low. The proposition is, as these gentlemen put it, and are now making it, that the same people can sell everything they have to sell high and purchase everything they have to use low.

And that is the foundation on which this argument is now based in this House. I consider that this proposition made here, if it shall be judged on the declarations of these men who favor these reductions in farm products—a declaration made this afternoon—is absolutely unreasonable and inconsistent. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

190. Sheep, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 50, line 21, after the word "sheep," strike out the words "10 per cent ad valorem" and insert in lieu thereof "$1 per head."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment in the confident hope and fond expectation that it will be adopted. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

But I have offered it particularly for the purpose of calling attention to one of the absurdities in this bill. As has been pointed out already here, the purpose of this bill seems to be particularly to strike a blow at the farmer. Substantially everything that the farmer produces is either placed upon the free list or has the rate of duty upon it greatly reduced.

The item under consideration is no exception to that rule. As in the case of one of the other items that has just been discussed, however, to speak frankly, unless amendments shall be made to other sections of the bill it would not amount to anything at all to change this rate from 10 per cent ad valorem to $1 per head, or to any other figure, as is the case with the proposed duty upon cattle.

This item here, to speak frankly, is nothing more nor less than "bunc," in order that Democratic Members from agricultural districts may have something to talk about to their farmer constituents. For example, take the duty upon cattle, that we have been discussing. What difference does it make to the farmer, Mr. Chairman, if beef cattle and sheep are taken from the free list and placed on the dutiable list, as they are under the terms of this bill, when beef, mutton, veal, lamb, wool, and hides are placed on the free list? What difference will it make with respect to the price of the farmer's sheep while that item remains in? None at all. It gives him no protection whatever, yet compels him to buy protected clothing.

Every possible product that the foreign sheep raiser can bring into the country is put on the free list. Wool is put on the free list and mutton is put on the free list and sheepskins are put on the free list and mutton tallow is put on the free list. But as it is inconvenient and disagreeable and undesirable for Democratic Members who happen to come from agricultural districts to have to go to the farmers and say, "Everything you raise is on the free list," therefore, in order to let Members from Missouri or Texas, we will say, save their faces with their farmer constituents, a fake duty is placed on sheep of 10 per cent ad valorem, and a similar duty is placed on cattle.

Of course, as they have already discovered in the examination of this bill, it is a great thing if there can be somebody on the committee to look after these "special industries" that were discussed yesterday. On the subject of sheep and on the subject of wool we find that a wise discrimination was made by certain able gentlemen in order that the goat industry might be fully protected, while wool and mutton were put on the free list; and then, in order to pull the wool, or the goat hair [laughter], as the case might be, over the eyes of the farmer, an item is put in here, so that the Democratic Members running for reelection in agricultural districts can go to their constituents and say, "We stood up for your rights. We have a duty here on sheep of 10 per cent ad valorem." [Laughter on the Republican side.] So that it does not really make very much difference whether there is any tariff at all on sheep, if you put everything that can be produced by the sheep raiser on the free list.

I have introduced this amendment largely to call attention to that ridiculous and unfair provision in this proposed law. It is simply "bunc" and nothing else. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate on this paragraph and all amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves to close debate and all amendments thereto.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

191. All other live animals not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall not offer an amendment to this paragraph further than the formal one to strike out the last word. I have not offered an amendment to any rate in the bill. I do not intend to offer any amendment to any rate in the bill. I have voted for most of the amendments offered on this side. I have not offered any amendments because I realize how utterly futile it is to do so with the gentlemen on the other side pledged to resist all amendments.

In order that some future historian may not misunderstand what has been going on here and assume that there are many or a considerable number of items in these schedules that are not opposed because amendments are not offered to them, let it be written now that there is no hope of any amendment offered on this side being adopted; and, therefore, while there is scarcely a rate in the bill that we on this side approve, many of them are passed over because it is entirely useless to offer amendments.

As I said a moment ago, there is neither rhyme nor reason in the proposition to place meats on the free list and retain a duty on the live stock, and the only purpose there can possibly be, in my opinion, for doing that is, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] has just stated—and I desire to emphasize that statement—that the gentlemen from the cities may be able to say to their constituents, "We have reduced the price of meats; we have made meat free," and to enable the gentlemen from the country districts to say to their constituents, "We have retained a duty on your products."

If, perchance, any of your constituents in the country precincts should suggest that that is not logical, you appeal to their prejudices by saying that it is the product of the Meat Trust that you are placing on the free list, while the product of the farmer remains protected.

With meats on the free list there is not any sense on earth in retaining in this bill any of these items of protection of meat-producing live animals. On the contrary, if you are honest in your efforts to reduce the price of meats, and if you are willing in so doing to reduce the returns of the flockmaster, the herdsman, and the farmer, you must place live animals on the free list as you have placed meats on the free list, in order that the live animals may be imported, to be grown, fed, and fattened here. You will at least be logical if you do that. Though, to be fair to the farmer and stock raiser, neither meat nor live stock should go to the free list.

The gentleman from New Jersey has indicated what will probably happen at the other end of the Capitol—live animals will also go to the free list. That will save the faces of the gentlemen from the bucolic districts on that side of this House, for they can go home and say that they voted here for a bill that retained a duty on the farmers' live stock, but the wicked Senate struck it out; and when they voted for the conference report, of course they had to vote for it in toto up or down, and therefore they could not defend the industries of their farmer constituents, much as they desired so to do. "Bunc," says the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS]. Not only bunc, but buncombe, and heaps of it. But the American people will not be permanently fooled, all or a majority of them. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I move to close debate on the paragraph and amendments in five minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not care to debate my amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. All right. Then I move to close debate now.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, debate on the paragraph and all amendments will be closed.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 23, page 50, strike out "10" and insert "25."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. STEENERSON. It is to come in as a new paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 23, page 50, insert a new paragraph, as follows:
"191½. Potatoes, 25 cents per bushel of 60 pounds."

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, the alleged reason for placing potatoes on the free list is to cheapen the cost of living. Now, I want to call your attention to the history of this industry, to show you how unreasonable that proposition is. The production of potatoes has been advanced and improved, by reason of the invention of modern machinery, to such an extent that the production of potatoes in the United States has increased very rapidly, so that last year we produced 376,000,000 bushels. It is one of the things that goes into the daily food consumption, and this food supply has constantly increased. At the same time that this great increase of production has been going on the price has been reduced. Now, it was alluded to a while ago that the Democratic campaign circular said that they wanted to go back to the prices of 1896 so far as pork was concerned. Go back to the prices of 1896 for potatoes and you will find that they were 80 cents a bushel, according to the table printed in the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, whereas in 1912 the average price in the United States of potatoes was only 52 cents a bushel.

What can you accomplish when 99 bushels out of 100 are sold through the dealers and middlemen, and when they reach the consumer sell for 50 cents a bushel? How much cheaper do you want them? That means that the farmer, after paying the freight, gets about 25 or 30 cents a bushel on an average. What will it effect if you put potatoes on the free list? These men who are engaged in the modern industry of raising potatoes have invested in expensive machinery, in potato diggers, potato planters, manure spreaders, and machines for spraying, and so forth. They have built up extensive warehouses so that they can handle the potatoes very cheaply, and that is the reason that the price has been gradually going down.

Now, if you put them on the free list, the chances are that the foreign countries will flood the market, reduce the price still further, and after you get our people out of the business and devote the land to other purposes the price will go up. You never had in the history of the country as cheap potatoes as you have to-day. If you want potatoes for nothing, that is another thing. I do not believe there is a man anywhere, laborer or capitalist, who wants the farmer to produce potatoes more cheaply than he does now.

You can buy them in my town for 25 cents a bushel, and in 1912, according to your own table, they were only worth 52 cents a bushel. What are you doing? Here is an item where the duty was not excessive by your own test. It was shown

here by this table that the revenue derived from potatoes has been gradually increasing every year from $175,000 in 1896 to $7,175,375.85 in 1912. You are throwing away a revenue of over $7,000,000 annually to let in foreign potatoes in order to cheapen potatoes below 50 cents per bushel, the average price last year. Will you do it? No; you will discourage production at home and in the end raise the price to the consumer here. I do not believe a single laboring man begrudges the farmer the price he now gets for his potatoes. The consumption of potatoes per capita is less than 3 bushels. One day's work at $3 per day will now buy from 6 to 12 bushels. Two days' work will buy a year's supply for a whole family. [Applause.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on these amendments be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman moves that all debate close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a telegram read which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 30, 1913.*

Congressman SYDNEY ANDERSON,
Washington, D. C.:

The Minnesota Potato Growers and Shippers' Association, representing every potato grower in the State, is very much opposed to the removal of the tariff on potatoes. Can you do anything for us; and what can we do to assist? We believe placing potatoes on the free list will curtail their raising to the degree that eventually the consumer will suffer more than under the present law. There are numerous other perfectly good reasons for the maintenance of the tariff with which you are familiar.

MINNESOTA POTATO GROWERS & SHIPPERS' ASSOCIATION,
GEO. B. HIGGINS, *Secretary.*

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great attention and interest to the remarks of various Representatives from the agricultural districts. I have read the schedule on agricultural products, and I could not help thinking as I sat here that after all the items appeal to others than those from the agricultural districts, as the schedules contain articles that are the necessaries of life for the great wage-earning population of this Nation. Last summer I happened to be in a community which I believe is within the district of the gentleman from Ohio. I found that the farmers are further advanced than their Representatives in some degree. I went into 37 counties of Pennsylvania last summer, one of the largest agricultural States in the Union, having one of the greatest agricultural counties, old Lancaster, and I found the farmers were making no such arguments as have been made here on the floor of the House by Representatives. They were denouncing the Payne law in unmeasured terms and demanding relief. I want to say to you that the farmers of Pennsylvania and Ohio are in some degree advanced enough to know that they can not hope to get advantage by special privileges which drain the pockets of others. They are not trying to get their hands in the pockets of others half as much as they are trying to keep other hands out of their pockets. I find, as I said in my speech in general debate, that special privilege in whatever form always fights for the advantage of the few at the expense of the many. That statement is responsible, I suppose, for this editorial which was handed to me a moment ago.

After a half column devoted to the superlative merits of my distinguished predecessor, the editorial closes as follows:

Mr. Dalzell's seat is occupied in the Sixty-third Congress, but it is not filled. His district has a Representative, but it is not represented.

This is an editorial from a paper published in Pittsburgh and owned by Mr. GEORGE T. OLIVER. It is a statement that I desire to have placed in the RECORD, for perhaps it explains why the privileged few are always linked together to betray and pray upon the common people of this Nation. I have said on the floor of this House only that which I am willing to stand for and maintain at any place or time. Perhaps, too, there may be something in my opposition some years ago, as a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature, to the gentleman, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, to account for this editorial. I said then and I say now that his golden windfall of millions is the only thing by which he can claim advancement to place or station, and to my mind such qualifications are not all sufficient.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing potatoes. [Laughter.]

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I want to say one thing further, that I have no desire to fill the sphere of my distinguished predecessor, nor shall I attempt it. I have no desire to be known as the high priest of protection. If I might choose a title I would far rather be known as the high priest of the unprotected.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MONDELL. To discuss the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for one minute. There is one minute remaining of the time.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I prefer to speak later.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEENERSON) there were—ayes 52, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

192. Barley, 15 cents per bushel of 48 pounds.

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 50, in line 24, after the word "barley," strike out "15 cents" and insert "25 cents."

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, having consumed an hour the first day of general debate, in which time I confined myself wholly to the agricultural schedule, I had not intended to consume any more time on this schedule, because I realize that it is simply a waste of time to talk against a proposition such as we have here to-day, where a party has already legislated on this matter, and it is impossible to change any of these schedules. But this particular paragraph is so absolutely absurd and indefensible from the position taken by the majority themselves that I thought it might perhaps appeal to them to change it. They have started out with the idea of lowering the cost of living to the people of this country, and I sympathize with any party that attempts to do an act of that kind, even though it may be in the wrong, if they are sincere. This is a proposition that does not come under that head. Anyone who knows anything about barley knows that the ultimate consumer of barley is not the man who eats, but the man who drinks. That man is not going to be benefited by the lowering of the duty on barley. Last year the farmers in our State sold barley for 90 cents a bushel. This year they got 35 cents a bushel, and still you will find that the beer that has been made out of the barley during those two years was sold for the same price exactly. The only people who benefited from this at all would be the brewers and possibly the saloon keepers, who might buy at wholesale a little bit cheaper.

Mr. PAYNE. But does not the gentleman know that they all vote? The gentleman does not understand the principle of this bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. HELGESEN. They do. There is a very good reason why I want to appeal to you on this schedule. You have said the reason you want to reduce the duty on grains that go into food products was because we are not raising enough of them in this country. One reason why we are not raising as much wheat as we ought to raise and as we could raise is because of the fact that when you raise wheat a certain length of time the ground will get foul with weeds, and the best way we know of out there to eradicate the weeds is to sow it to barley. Now, it is a very important thing for the farmers of the Northwest to have a crop of barley that is profitable to raise and not one that is a losing proposition, and it seems to me that if you want to benefit this country, if you want to reduce the cost of bread even, the proper thing is to leave a sufficient duty on barley so it will make it a profitable crop for the farmer to raise. By doing so you are going to enable him to clean his land and eradicate the weeds so as to increase the yield of wheat; and if you increase the yield of wheat per acre, you are making a larger volume of wheat and thereby benefiting the consumer. But to cut the barley duty in two is absolutely not going to benefit anyone. Of course, I realize that the Democrats are not in sympathy with the farmer. It is very evident they are not from the speeches made in this House. These speeches indicate exactly where they stand on this proposition. But it seems as if they have inadvertently done something that is not going to benefit anyone except the brewers and saloon men, and being in that condition, they might, even though they have no particular love for the farmer, correct that mistake. Now, if you want to know how the Democrats stand as against the farmers, during the time of the discussion of the Canadian reciprocity proposition several speeches made in this House indicate plainly where the Democratic Party stands as against the farmer. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], in discussing the Canadian reciprocity bill, had this to say on February 13, 1911:

The recent election, bringing about the first overthrow the Republicans have sustained in many years, was freighted with one great demand—the demand of the people of our congested cities to take the taxes off from food and clothing. In response to that mandate we are now taking the first step. From the east side of New York City a million voices are raised in appeal to you that you should make this bill a law. From every city in the East they cry out to you.

Speaking on the woolen bill, on July 30, 1912, he said:

This Democratic Congress was sent here by the consumers of the country, and not by the producers. Your Tariff Board report to which you make reference is a producer's report. It deals exclusively with the difference in the cost of production, if any, here and abroad.

Hon. William Sulzer, of New York, on August 5, 1912, speaking on the tariff question, said:

The Democrats must keep the tariff to the front. It will never be settled until it is settled right—and it will never be settled right until it is settled by the friends of the consumers.

Hon. Oscar W. Underwood, of Alabama, on June 10, 1912, said:

I believe in relieving the men who work in the factories and in the foundries and have to purchase their daily bread. * * *

What further evidence is needed to convince anyone that the farmer has nothing to hope for from the Democratic Party?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, it had not been my purpose to occupy the time of the committee by participation in the debate upon the bill now before the House, my advent into this body being a matter of such recent occurrence and my experience so limited that I might well leave the expression of the views of my party to those of my colleagues whose knowledge and experience so much better fit them to the task. But after listening for more than a week, with much interest, to the frank and, I believe, sincere pronouncements by our Democratic friends of the policy which this bill is not only calculated, but intended to put into effect, and after reflecting upon the degree of departure of the policy declared from the policy by which the American people have seen fit to be guided in the past, I have been unable to forbear the temptation to take advantage of the rule under which the House is now proceeding to make a few observations upon the subject and the situation.

I am controlled in this respect not only from a consideration of the importance of the question itself but from a consideration of the causes which have made this radical change possible. The history of the American people bears striking evidence of their high degree of efficiency in the art of self-government. Throughout most of their political career we find practical acknowledgment not only of their willingness to submit to the will of the majority in matters of public concern, but of their keen perception of the necessity of so doing.

But the American people are not always infallible; indeed, they are not always wise. We stand to-day confronted by a spectacle the like of which has been rarely witnessed in our political career. A great commercial policy, inaugurated nearly a century ago, crystallized and developed through more than half a century of highly successful application, relinquished by a clear and controlling majority of the people while believing in its efficacy and its wisdom, and the privilege and power yielded to a minority to substitute another policy which is in every fundamental respect its antithesis. Controlled by considerations in a degree laudable in themselves, some of the majority have permitted themselves to lose sight of the common tie which bound the whole into efficiency of purpose and action. United they have refused to stand; divided their fall was inevitable. It remains for the future to determine whether reflection following in the wake of experience will bring wisdom; whether those whose common political faith is grounded on the time-vindicated principles and policies of the Republican Party will realize that in unity and tolerance lies the hope of reestablishing the things for which they stand and rebuilding the house of their country's prosperity.

The motto upheld by the Republican Party throughout all of its magnificent career has been that the American people must produce all that they consume; that, being blessed with a wealth of resources almost ample to feed and clothe the world, there is no rational excuse to be found in the economy of trade why we should buy the commodities which we can produce here from those who produce like commodities abroad.

The Republican Party has been constant in its advocacy of the protective policy because its membership believed that if the great opportunities of this country were to be conserved for the benefit of the American citizen and the welfare of their common country the oppressive competition of the labor of the Old World must be restricted. The Republican Party has been constantly for the protective policy because it believed that we could not constantly buy a large portion of the things we consume abroad without robbing our own citizens of their national and natural right to produce and sell those things at home.

The Democratic Party has been constant in its advocacy of the doctrine that the markets of the United States ought to be open to the world with the least possible restriction; that the products of the world's labor ought to be free to enter our markets at all times regardless of the effect upon our own production. The Democratic Party has affected to believe that we could maintain our present standard of living and compensation for labor, and at the same time buy a large portion of the things which we consume abroad, and thereby expose American labor to the full force of competition with the labor of European and Asiatic countries, notwithstanding that the labor of these countries receives on an average of less than half the American wage. In the report upon the present bill the Committee on Ways and Means has said that they believe that the pledge of the Democratic platform of 1912 contains two essential ideas: First, the establishment of duties designed primarily to produce revenue for the Government, and without thought of protection; and second, the attainment of this end by legislation which will not injure or destroy legitimate industry.

It is the pretense of the majority that it has conformed its action to these essential ideas in framing the present bill. We must concede that the bill has been formulated with little thought of protection, except upon a few apparently favored industries. But as to its injurious effect upon legitimate industries, Republicans entertain some very positive notions. It would be a waste of time, however, to attempt to modify or change the conviction of the real apostle of free trade. The present generation of that school must learn as did the generations which preceded them—by the experimental process. It may not be a waste of energy, however, for those who have been believers in the protective policy in the past to carefully note the effect of the law which is to be enacted not only upon the various industries of the country when considered individually but upon the country and its prosperity as a whole.

The great agricultural section of the country from which I come has enjoyed a fair degree of prosperity under the protective policy in this country during the last 16 years. Its inhabitants have deserved all that they have received. It will be well and wise for them to understand now at the outset that they are to pursue their various avocations and conduct their business for a number of years to come under a commercial policy widely different from that under which they have operated in the past. This condition is brought about not by their choice nor as the direct result of their votes. Every State of the great Middle West north of the Mason and Dixon line cast its vote for protection. The people of those States believe in protection, and always have so believed. They are now, however, to experience the full force of an adverse policy. Practically every article produced by the western farmer is placed in open competition with like products from all other countries in their own markets. The great transportation and market facilities which the western farmer has built up and developed during the last half century are now to be utilized to bring the products of foreign lands to his markets for the purpose of competing with him.

The weak pretense is put forth that the farmer need have no fears; that, notwithstanding the fact that the protective duties are taken off his products, no material increase of importation will follow. To illustrate: The importations of barley in the year 1912 amounted to 2,768,474 bushels, under an import duty of 30 cents per bushel. The present bill reduces that duty to 15 cents per bushel, and yet the Committee on Ways and Means in its report upon this bill estimates future importations to be 2,000,000 bushels per year only. They offer no explanation for the assumption that cutting the present duty in half will decrease the importation of the commodity. I am at a loss to understand just why the reduction of the duty on barley from 30 to 15 cents per bushel will tend to restrict the flow of that commodity into the markets of the United States. I also notice that in this report prepared by the Committee on Ways and Means it is estimated that the duties will be decreased from $830,542 to $300,000 under the pending bill. I had assumed that this revision of the tariff was to be accomplished in a way that would bring a revenue into the Treasury of the United States, but I am unable to understand why gentlemen on the other side of the aisle so adjust the duties on this commodity as to reduce the revenue from $830,000 to $300,000. But, in my opinion, the duties will not be reduced. Importations of barley will not be reduced; on the contrary, there will be a great increase in importation. This is especially likely when we consider that the railroad rates from Canadian territory are so adjusted that the Canadian barley can reach Minneapolis markets at a rate actually less than the barley produced in a large portion of Iowa and Nebraska.

What is true of barley is likewise true of the wheat and oats items. Referring again to the report of the committee on this bill and to the quotation for the years 1910 and 1912, and comparing those figures with the figures of previous years, we discover that the importation of wheat into the markets of the United States has been increasing very rapidly during the past few years. In 1912, 2,684,381 bushels of wheat were imported under a duty of 25 cents per bushel. It is now predicted that with the reduction of the duty from 25 to 10 cents per bushel

importations will be decreased to 2,000,000 annually, and that the revenue will be decreased from $352,245 to $200,000. Mr. Chairman, this is mere pretense. Neither the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means nor the majority of the membership of this House can deceive the western farmer nor lead him to believe that a reduction of the duty on wheat, barley, and oats will decrease the importation of these commodities into our markets. The Canadian grain-producing territory is very largely populated by men who have gone from the western portion of our country. These farmers in Iowa, Nebraska, Dakota, Minnesota, and other Western States have sons, relatives, and neighbors who have gone to Canada and who are now engaged in raising these commodities. Intercommunication is constantly carried on between them; they are well acquainted with the conditions across the line, and they know that the Canadian grain of all varieties will seek the markets of the United States in preference to any other market of the world. They understand that the farmer of the West has an acre-unit value ranging from $75 to $200 per acre and must, under the free-trade policy, meet in even competition the products of Canadian lands, the market value of which is less than one-fourth the value of their lands.

There is another weak pretense put out in this bill to mollify the indignation of the western farmer. A duty of 10 cents per bushel is laid upon wheat imported into this country, and it is claimed that that duty will be sufficient to restrict any unreasonable importation or competition. It is clear, however, that this duty of 10 cents per bushel amounts to nothing when we consider that flour, the product of wheat and its competing commodity, is permitted to enter our markets free. But this is not all. The 10 cents per bushel is to be remitted upon all of the imported wheat which is ground by the American miller and exported in the form of flour. In other words, the American miller, unable to meet the influx of free flour from the North, will turn his attention to grinding wheat for the people of Great Britain and continental Europe instead of for the people of the United States. The law will be so framed as to permit him to engage in this industry without hindrance. These men can buy without limit the wheat and other grain products of the Canadian farmer, manufacture that product, and ship it abroad on a basis of absolute free trade. Assuming, then, that the United States is to produce a surplus, her farmers are not only deprived of the benefits of their own markets, but they are deprived of every advantageous facility which they now have to meet the Canadian farmer in the markets of the world.

The Democratic Party is being no more generous to the western farmer with respect to his meat products than with respect to his grain. The meat produced by the western farmer is on the free list; the meat products of Canada, Mexico, and Argentina are given access to your markets without even the restriction of proper and wholesome inspection laws which are applied in this country to our own citizens.

An examination of the bill makes it very clear that the Democratic Party has determined to direct against every product of the farmer the highest degree of competition possible. No duty is laid upon any article produced by the western farmer where the laying of such duty would in any considerable degree restrict importation. The low duty on cattle will not restrict importation of live cattle from Mexico—only that portion of such cattle as are killed and brought in as meat. I say that it will not otherwise restrict the importation of cattle because Mexico has no other place to send her cattle. Mexico has cheap pasture and can afford to send her live cattle across the line under a 10 per cent duty in preference to sending them to any other country.

I have explained why a 10-cent-per-bushel duty on grain will not keep that commodity out of the market. Grain that has been coming in in yearly increasing quantity under a 25-cent duty will not be restricted when that duty is reduced to 10 cents, and besides this, the railways will be very glad to absorb a portion of that duty in order to get the traffic. Now, what is the purpose of all this? Ostensibly to reduce the cost of living to the great consuming public, and especially the laboring class. But the majority of the Ways and Means Committee have not been able to show by facts or figures or course of reasoning how, by reducing the value of the farmer's bushel of wheat or oats or corn the cost of the loaf to the laboring man is going to be reduced. The great mass of the laboring people in the cities buy their bread by the loaf. The price of that loaf does not vary with the rise and fall of the price of wheat. What is true of wheat is true of all other commodities.

The price of meat over the butcher's counter in the city does not rise or fall with the variations of the live-stock market unless the variation be in wide degree. Considering the whole line of necessaries, food products as well as fabrics, I predict that the ultimate consumer will gain very little in lowering the cost of living. Facts brought to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means and to this House clearly indicate that the increased cost that has come about during the past few years very largely lies, so far as manufactured goods are concerned, between the manufacturer and the ultimate consumer; and so far as agricultural products are concerned, between the farmer and the ultimate consumer. It is the increased cost brought about by high profits to the middlemen, and in many instances retailers, that has in large degree increased the cost of living in this country. Our Democratic friends will realize their expectations, so far as the lowering the price of the food products, wool, and cotton at the farm is concerned, but in my opinion they will fall far short of their expectations in lowering the cost of living to the ultimate consumer. On the other hand, opening the American markets to the world, throwing the products of our entire country in open competition with the world and its low-priced labor, will reduce our production, will reduce opportunity for employment, will reduce the standard of compensation for labor; and, relatively measured, the cost of living will go up and not down. The real price of an article is not always measured in dollars and cents. The most serious question to be considered by the American laboring man is, How much can I buy with my day's wage? and, Do I have a fair prospect of getting a day's wage? The question which most concerns the American farmer is whether he shall have the first chance at the American market which he has developed during the last half century, or whether he must sacrifice its advantages, without any compensatory equivalent, to the farmers of other countries; whether the standard of values of his land and other property built up by generations of toil and development shall be equalized with the standard of inferior countries. In the meantime, and as we observe during the next few years the operation of this new policy, or rather this old and discarded one, it may be well for those who believe in the protective policy applied fairly and in a reasonable degree to reflect upon the question of getting together. [Applause.]

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman desire to offer an amendment to this paragraph?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. A new paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph be now closed. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 50, after line 24, by adding a new paragraph, No. 192½, to read as follows:

"192½. Broom corn, $25 per ton."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to close all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to close all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 48, noes 52.

Mr. MURDOCK. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I would like to know if under the general consent that was given on the request of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to extend remarks in

the RECORD, it applies to all speeches that are made under the five-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. It applies to all speeches made on the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

193. Barley malt, 25 cents per bushel of 34 pounds.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to paragraph 193: In line 1, page 51, strike out "25" and insert "45."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

194. Barley, pearled, patent, or hulled, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment by way of a new paragraph, numbered 194½.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 4, page 51, insert a new paragraph, to be known as 194½: "Potatoes, 25 cents per bushel of 60 pounds."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that paragraph has been passed and voted on. A gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] offered an amendment on potatoes some time ago.

Mr. MILLER. I was out of the Chamber for a few moments and was not aware that that had been offered. I move to amend the amendment by striking out "25" where it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "20."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I hope the gentleman will not attempt to delay the consideration of the bill by offering amendments over again. It has been practically passed upon, and the House voted on it.

Mr. MILLER. Has it been discussed pretty thoroughly?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is on the free list, and the gentleman will have an opportunity to discuss it when we reach that part of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

195. Macaroni, vermicelli, and all similar preparations, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend that section by striking out "1 cent" and inserting "1½ cents."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, paragraph 195, line 5, page 51, by striking out the words "one cent" and inserting "one and one-half cents" in lieu thereof.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I have in my home city a manufacturing establishment engaged in making macaroni. When House bill No. 10 was introduced into the House, as fast as I could get copies of the bill I forwarded them to the manufacturing establishments in my district, and requested them to advise me how the bill would affect the industry in which they were interested. I hold in my hand a letter received from the American Macaroni Co., which is rather a large concern, at 1023 Market Street, Camden, N. J., which I will read:

AMERICAN MACARONI CO.,
Camden, N. J., April 11, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM J. BROWNING,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your favor of the 9th instant, would say that we received copy of the new tariff bill as framed by the Democratic Party, and note that the tariff on macaroni products has been reduced one-half cent per pound.

As we said formerly, this will practically mean that many American macaroni factories will have to go out of business, as it is impossible to compete with foreign manufacturers, because macaroni is a product that is used principally by foreigners, and they prefer to buy imported goods, especially if they can buy it cheaper than the American product.

We appreciate your efforts in our behalf, and trust that the party in power will not be able to carry out their bill as outlined, not only in our line, but in many others.

Yours, truly, AMERICAN MACARONI CO.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING] offered this amendment. Had he not done so, I would have had pleasure in offering it myself.

The story is a very simple one. A large number of people, many of them citizens of the United States of foreign birth, are engaged in the manufacture of macaroni and vermicelli in this country. To a certain extent their occupation answers criticisms that have been made upon this floor with regard to people of foreign birth who have engaged in enterprises in the United States. These people are Italians very largely. They learned their occupation in Italy, many of them. They came to the United States to better their condition. They established these factories, and they have undertaken to do business in the American markets, and have done it, so that American wages are now paid to men who formerly received Italian wages, which are only about one-third of those paid in the United States.

Mr. LOBECK. They have bettered their condition, then, have they not?

Mr. MOORE. Unquestionably they have bettered their condition. They came here for that purpose, and that is the whole story. The alien who comes to the United States, and who has been very much inveighed against here during the last few days, comes here to improve his condition, and here is a case in point. Men of lowly foreign birth come in from Italy, desiring to improve their condition. They enter into the same occupation here in which they were engaged there. Here they get three times the wages they got there.

Mr. LOBECK. I will say for the Italians in my town who are in this business that they have made no complaint against this bill.

Mr. MOORE. The Italians in the gentleman's town may have understood full well that the Democratic caucus meant to put this bill through, and knowing the uselessness of protesting, they made no sign to a gentleman who was hopelessly bound by the action of his caucus, and who could not help them if he would do so. But the Italians in my district, who are doubtless the equals of the Italians in the gentleman's district, and all good citizens of the United States——

Mr. LOBECK. Sure.

Mr. MOORE. Have come to me, as they came to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING] in his district, believing that the Members of the House of Representatives who are free from that thraldom to which the gentleman has subjected himself, would urge the Democracy to pass a bill that would really be in their interest.

Mr. LOBECK. I believe they need no coaching, having been to school.

Mr. MOORE. The real question is, Shall we maintain in this country these industries which have been induced to come here or shall we urge them to go back, taking their business with them and such capital as they have accumulated here?

Mr. LOBECK. They will not go back, Brother MOORE.

Mr. MOORE. I do not think they will. They may go back during the time that the Underwood bill is in force, but they will return the minute Republican prosperity returns to the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

A letter from some of my constituents on this question is as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, *April 9, 1913.*

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed herewith find briefs pertaining to macaroni tariffs, of which, no doubt, you are very familiar and which are self-explanatory.

We again beg you to urge the necessity of at least maintaining the present duty of 1½ cents per pound on macaroni, as a reduction in duty of same would, as we see it, in no way benefit the American people, owing to the fact that the majority of the users of the imported article are prejudiced against the American-made product.

We trust, therefore, that you will exert your efforts in upholding this growing American industry.

Thankingly, we remain,
Respectfully, yours,

GUANO & RAGGIOS.
R. DE ANGELIS CO.
LUIGI VERNA.
ANTONIO BICCHIEGGA.
D. CONI.
ANTONIO DI NAPOLI.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma). All debate on this paragraph is closed. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING].

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROWNING. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 42, noes 60.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

196. Oats, 10 cents per bushel of 32 pounds.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 7, strike out "10" and insert "15."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I should like 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Very well; I will make it 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I should like 2 minutes.

Mr. SLOAN. I want 3 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Very well; I will make the request 10 minutes, and that it be divided up in accordance with the requests of the three gentlemen.

Mr. MONDELL. Can not the gentleman make it 15 minutes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let us get along with the consideration of the bill. Mr. Chairman, I will modify my request and make it 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 12 minutes, is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to this example of the extremely scientific manner in which this bill has been prepared. Oats are taxed in this bill at 10 cents a bushel. Rolled oats and oatmeal are on the free list. The fact of the matter is that oats in British Columbia are to-day worth $23 a ton and in San Francisco they are worth $30 a ton. It would seem that that is handicap enough for the manufacturing interests in this country which are quite largely engaged in the manufacture of oatmeal and rolled oats, but it is not sufficient apparently to satisfy our friends on the other side of the Chamber, and so they tax the raw material at 10 cents a bushel and put the product on the free list, which means that the process of preparing oats for human food will be transferred to the Canadian side of the line.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the reduction of this duty from 15 cents to 10 cents can not be alleged as a matter of revenue, and therefore it must be one of the cases where you propose to reduce the cost to the consumer. The question is, Can the farmer afford the reduction? I want to offer a statement from a farmer in my district as to the cost of producing 10 acres of oats, which shows that, not allowing for the years when there is a poor crop, the profit would be $9 on 10 acres of oats. The proposed reduction in tariff would be $17.50; therefore the poor farmer would be the loser to the amount of $8.50 from his crop. [Applause on the Republican side.] I will insert it in the RECORD:

Cost of producing 10 acres of oats.

(By Benj. Wade, Harbor Beach, Mich.)

Rental of ground, at $2.50 per acre	$25.00
Plowing, 6 days, at $2.50 per day (the price of man and team would be more if they were hired)	15.00
Harrowing, 3 days, at $2.50 per day	7.50
Sowing, 1 day for man and team, $2.50; for drill, $1	3.50
For cutting and shocking, 3 men, team, and binder	9.00
Hauling to barn, 3 men and team	7.00
For binder twine, 20 pounds, at 7½ cents per pound	1.50
Thrash bill, 2½ cents per bushel on 350 bushels	8.75
Driving to market	12.50
Total	89.75
10 acres of oats, at 35 bushels per acre, 350 bushels; the farmer receives a usual price of 30 cents per bushel, which is	105.00
Cost of production	89.75
Leaving a balance of	15.25
Less for seed	6.25
Showing a net profit of	9.00

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, further supplementing what was said about the loss of revenue on the oat reduction of tariff rate, I want to call attention to the statement as follows: There is forecasted under this change a reduction of duties 33⅓ per cent and the imports fall 21,037.64 bushels and the values $108,008.96. Duties fall off $138,155.75, making the United States pay by foregoing that which would have come in $1.27 for every dollar's worth of oats stimulated to stay at home and not be imported. Sometimes this inspired charter of the new era pays to bring it in, sometimes it pays to keep it from coming in. If we just knew when it was going to leap forward, balk, or back, it would help some. In regard to what the gentleman in charge of the bill said this afternoon—that he announced to the public last fall that you were in favor of free meats and cereals. The gentleman honored me by delivering about a score of speeches in my district. I took occasion on several of those occasions to have the speech taken down by my shorthand friend, and from the shorthand notes he does not mention free meats, free cereals, or free cattle, or anything of that kind, in any of the speeches he made around in my district.

Mr. RAINEY. I am sorry I forgot it; it was my bad memory.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, just a word in reference to the rates upon oats and oatmeal. The rate has been reduced, of course, upon oats. The equivalent ad valorem now is about 39 per cent and the equivalent ad valorem upon oatmeal and rolled oats about 17 per cent. There is, if you so term it, a differentiation, a difference at least of 22 per cent. That is, the oats carry a higher ad valorem by 22 per cent than the rolled oats. Now, in the reduction which we have made we have placed rolled oats and oatmeal upon the free list and our specific rate upon oats is equivalent to about 28 per cent, so that the difference between the two products under our bill is about 28 per cent, while under the present law it is 22 per cent.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield? Is not that because of the prediction you would lower the people's oats under the coming bill?

Mr. HAMMOND. No; I think not.

Mr. SCOTT. How do you account for it?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Was there not a vote here that all debate should close at a certain time, and has not that time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly; 12 minutes; but the time has not expired.

Mr. MANN. How much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. A mintue and a half.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, under the existing law oats are dutiable at 15 cents a bushel. This bill proposes to reduce the rate to 10 cents a bushel, not a very severe reduction. Rolled oats or oatmeal are now upon the dutiable list—I forget the rate, 1 cent a pound—and has a very large consumption in the United States, as it is one of the main articles of consumption in many families. This is a proposition to put that upon the free list and leave the raw material upon the dutiable list, again exemplifying the wonderful genius of the gentleman who made up the bill, to put the raw product on the dutiable list and the finished material, made from the raw product, on the free list in order to encourage the grinding of oats in Canada instead of in the United States. If you bring a bushel of oats across the Canadian line you pay 10 cents a bushel, but if you do the work over there and employ Canadian labor to do the work of grinding the oats into oatmeal or rolled oats it comes in free of duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting, after paragraph 196, a paragraph to be numbered 196½ and to read as follows:

"Maize, 10 cents per bushel."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph close after five minutes' debate on the amendment.

Mr. SLOAN. I do not care to delay the committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I will ask for a vote.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill—and had had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess until 7.45 o'clock p. m.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 7.45 p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, at 7 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m. the House was called to order by the Speaker.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the

state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill—with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

197. Rice, cleaned, 1 cent per pound; uncleaned rice, or rice free of the outer hull and still having the inner cuticle on, ½ of 1 cent per pound; rice flour, and rice meal, and rice broken which will pass through a No. 12 sieve of a kind prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, ¼ cent per pound; paddy, or rice having the outer hull on, ½ of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There is no rice grown in my district or in the State of Michigan. When, however, so eminent a Democrat as Col. Robert Ewing, Democratic national committeeman from the State of Louisiana, expresses his views upon the subject of rice, I think the same are entitled to respectful consideration. He says:

Rice in Louisiana must have a protective tariff or the industry will be absolutely ruined. We produce more rice in Louisiana than in any other State. The crop will approximate thirty thousand millions a year. Remove the duty and Japan, Honduras, and other countries would send enough rice to the United States to put the rice growers of Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas out of business. Unfortunately, rice is not consumed as much in the North as in the South. It is one of the most nourishing products grown in this country. The entire Nation could subsist on rice if it became necessary. We raise in Louisiana enough rice to supply the entire population, yet we import a considerable quantity for special purposes, which gives us a good revenue.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber are engaged, as they were last fall, in the laudable but brain-racking proposition of trying to convince the farmer that they are going to so legislate that he will continue to receive the same good prices for his products, and the laborer the splendid wages he has been receiving, and at the same time he and the consumer are to receive the products of the farm much cheaper. When the gentlemen have consummated their mastery, we will all be able to lift ourselves by our boot straps.

When this bill was being considered in general debate a few days since, I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] to explain why rice was on the dutiable list. He replied by saying that he was then discussing the metal and the steel schedule, and that he did not care then to answer the question. I would now respectfully ask the gentleman from Alabama if he will explain why rice is on the dutiable list?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has already explained it in his own statement. He has just read a statement in which it is said that on account of large importations of rice it was a good revenue producer, and if the gentleman will carefully read this schedule he will see that rice is cut to about the same extent as the other agricultural products in the schedule, and it is a very much better revenue producer than most of the cereals or any of the cereals that are named in the schedule.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to the gentleman from Alabama before he takes his seat that rice that is cleaned is on the dutiable list at a cent a pound. Rice that is in the hull, not cleaned, is half a cent a pound. Wheat is on the dutiable list at 10 cents a bushel. Flour is virtually on the free list. Why not put cleaned rice on the free list also in the interest of cheaper food for the American people, this being such a grand article of food?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman that cleaned rice is cut from 54 to 33, and now produces $635,000 of revenue. It is estimated that under this cut it will produce $750,000—a very good cut and a very good revenue producer.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand the principle is not to reduce the food to the American people when there is enough of it imported to make any appreciable difference, and the revenue is $635,000.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York desires to be captious.

Mr. PAYNE. Captious?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But he will see that there is a tax on barley and wheat and oats and other cereals in this schedule, and there was no particular reason why rice should be placed on the free list.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, but the finished product.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not disposed to quarrel with the gentleman from New York about putting food products on the free list. I hope the gentleman will move up in that way himself. I do not mean to say that we ought to put them on in a moment, but I think the last thing that we ought to tax is the food that goes into the mouths of the people in order that they may exist. Although this bill does not give to the ultimate consumer free food, it is a very considerable reduction going in the direction of giving American people free food, and I am glad to welcome the gentleman from New York with that column.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I see two gentlemen on their feet, and I suppose they desire to discuss the paragraph. I ask that debate on the paragraph close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is recognized.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama has been particularly interesting and peculiarly edifying in the last few minutes in the formula he has been using. Heretofore if a rate was reduced we did not need the revenue, and if it was raised we did need the revenue. Now all food products must be cheap unless you can raise revenue by making them dear, and then you are justified in making them dear. Rice, the product of Louisiana and Texas, is given a rate of 1 cent a pound, 75 cents a bushel. Potatoes grown in Colorado and elsewhere in the North are placed on the free list. Beans grown somewhere along the merry line of Dixie are assessed at 25 cents a bushel. This is the consistency of this Democratic tariff bill.

Now, the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that if there is an agricultural product that perhaps needs little protection in the United States it is rice. Down in Louisiana and Texas they sow rice as in the North we sow grain—broadcast or with a seeder. They cut it with a reaper; they thrash it with a steam thrasher. There is hardly another place on earth where rice ground is not plowed in the mud, waist deep, by a water buffalo drawing a crooked stick behind him or where the plants are not sown in seedbeds and transplanted by hand. There is not a place on earth competing with these United States in the growth of rice where the actual labor on every bushel of rice grown is not three or four times what it is here. And no matter how illy paid that labor may be, I doubt if there is rice grown anywhere cheaper than it is grown down yonder in the Southland.

Wheat is grown under practically the same conditions the world over—sown broadcast or with a seeder, cut with a reaper, thrashed with a thrashing machine—except in the Far East, where they thrash it on a thrashing floor. And yet wheat is given a rate of 10 cents a bushel and rice a rate of 75 cents a bushel.

Is it because they grow rice down in Louisiana while they grow wheat in Minnesota? Is that why there is the difference that we find in this particular schedule? If not, what is the reason? In my State we grow wheat under irrigation. We are compelled to turn on the water, after having prepared the land at great cost, to irrigate the wheat at great cost, so that we raise wheat under the same conditions of irrigation under which rice is grown in the South. And yet wheat, our great staple, has a duty of 10 cents a bushel, and rice, the southern staple, or the staple of a few southern districts, 1 cent a pound.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman voted for the Payne bill. Why did you put a tax on rice at 54 per cent? You did it by your vote.

Mr. MONDELL. We believe in protection. Under our duty we built up that splendid rice industry in Louisiana and Texas. We made possible the digging of the ditches, the draining of the land——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But the gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. MONDELL. And the time has now come when, under a Republican policy, if we were revising the tariff, we would probably reduce the duty on rice.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Wait a minute and let me ask you a question.

Mr. MONDELL. And doing it, we will do it consistently, and give the rice grower the same protection that we give the grower of other cereals.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But you gave wheat a duty equivalent to 14 per cent, and you put 54 per cent on rice. Now you ask us why we put a higher rate on rice than on wheat? Why did you do it?

Mr. MONDELL. We put a high duty on rice to build up the industry, because we believe in protection. You do not believe

in protection, and yet you leave a high protective tariff rate on a product of a section of the sunny South and you reduce the wheat of the North to a low-revenue basis, placing flour, the product of wheat, on the free list.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. You put a 50 or 60 per cent rate on barley, a product of your own section.

Mr. KITCHIN. Ten per cent more than they put on rice.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] this question: The gentleman said a moment ago that the duty on rice was reduced for the benefit of the consumer. Is it not a fact that you have reduced the duty on broken rice from a quarter to an eighth, when there is no broken rice used by the consumers of this country, when the broken rice is used by the brewers only, for the purpose of making beer? And is it not a fact that this difference goes to the brewers and not to the consumers?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We have reduced the rice schedule all along the line.

Mr. LAZARO. I know; but I am speaking of the broken rice known as the brewer's rice, which has a duty under the present law of a quarter of a cent. Now, you have reduced it in this bill to one-eighth of a cent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We made about the same reduction all along.

Mr. LAZARO. I know; but there is not any of this rice used by the consumer.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. So far as the gentleman and myself are concerned we are not consumers of that product, but other people are.

Mr. LAZARO. But is it not a fact that you are giving this difference to the brewers and not to the consumers?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not intimately enough acquainted with the question to know whether that is a fact or not; but we reduced the rates equitably, both to one class of consumers and to another class of consumers.

Mr. LAZARO. Yet, when you reduced the duty on broken rice from a quarter to an eighth of a cent you gave the advantage to the brewers.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, is it a private conversation that is going on over there? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not tell, but if the committee will come to order he can ascertain. [Laughter.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. As I understand, there is a part of the time remaining unused.

I do not like the criticisms of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] on this subject of the duty on rice. I have believed with him and voted with him on this side, but I think his remarks with reference to this particular item are unjust. This bill was written by 14 Democrats—7 of them being from the South. They have put the southern sugar-cane industry on the free list at the end of three years; they have put corn and corn meal and raw cotton on the free list, which is a southern staple; they have put iron ore on the free list; they have put bauxite on the free list; they have put lumber and coal on the free list; and they have greatly reduced the duty on cotton goods, kaolin, pig iron, and zinc. We have practically given up everything in the South except the Angora goat in Texas and peanuts in North Carolina [laughter on the Republican side], and I appeal to my friend from Wyoming to let this item pass.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I did not offer an amendment at a reduced rate.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, is there any time left?

The CHAIRMAN. There is one minute remaining.

Mr. PAYNE. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that four years ago the rice industry had not been developed as it is to-day. There was some difficulty about getting some way to plug the water, and there was some trouble in Louisiana and Texas about pumping. But since that time they have discovered large rice-producing tracts of land in Arkansas, where the water is very near the surface of the ground and the pumping is very easy and inexpensive.

I want to say to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that if his bill should stay on the statute books for four years, long before that time we shall not be getting a penny of duty on rice, because we will raise every pound of it in the United States, and under better conditions than there are anywhere else in the world, and for less money, because we can use machinery from beginning to end, and they can not use it anywhere else in the world. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

198. Wheat, 10 cents per bushel.

Several Members rose.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Under the practice, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to see if we can agree on time on this wheat proposition.

Mr. MANN. Let us see how many gentlemen want three minutes each.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I took the floor for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think there were five gentlemen rose on that side.

Mr. HAMMOND. I should like four or five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in half an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Will not the gentleman include the request that the recognitions be for 3 minutes instead of 5?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have two gentlemen on this side who would like to speak. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND] said he would like three or four minutes.

Mr. HAMMOND. I would like four or five.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask that the recognitions be for four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, and that the recognitions shall be for 4 minutes instead of 5.

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. LANGLEY. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to point out that there are now over 10 Members on their feet.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We must get along with this bill. They can not all speak at one time.

Mr. MURDOCK. There will be more controversy over this than there will if you let us have the time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will tell the gentleman that if he will not take it he will not get it. I want to move along with this bill, and every man can not speak on every item.

Mr. LANGLEY. The Chair having recognized me for the purpose of offering an amendment, I desire to inquire if I am entitled to the floor for four minutes after this agreement is reached?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that if it is left in the power of the Chair he will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 15, page 51, strike out "10" and insert "25."

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this provision and other similar ones in this bill violate the traditional policy of the Democracy as I have always understood it. At to-day's session I read some resolutions that were adopted by the citizens of Buffalo, in which they asserted that the provision to which these resolutions referred, including this one, would seriously cripple, if not destroy, a home industry in that city, and either drive out of employment or greatly reduce the wages of thousands of laboring people employed therein.

I desire now to read a telegram from the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati along the same line. It is as follows:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *April 30, 1913.*

Hon. J. W. LANGLEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

By unanimous vote the board of directors of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, at a meeting held April 29, adopted the following resolution, which is respectfully submitted for your attention:

Whereas the Underwood tariff bill imposes a duty of 10 cents per bushel upon foreign wheat and admits duty free the foreign-milled products of such foreign wheat;

Whereas this discrimination in favor of the foreign manufacturer is in contradiction alike of all accepted economic doctrine of the established tariff policy of all political parties and of all nations and in effect pays a bounty to the foreign miller on all products of wheat sold by him in the markets of the United States; and

Whereas if American flour millers have to pay a tax upon foreign-grown wheat, then a simple justice requires that the foreign-milled products of such wheat shall pay an equivalent tax, and if foreign-milled wheat products are admitted duty free foreign wheat should be admitted duty free: Therefore be it

Resolved, That, believing the proposed legislation would inevitably destroy one of the most important manufacturing industries in the United States and that it would further result in most serious injury to the American farmer, the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, through

its board of directors, records itself as unalterably opposed and earnestly urges upon the President and Congress of the United States the necessity of placing both wheat and its products upon terms of absolute equality.

Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded immediately to the President of the United States, Senators and Congressmen from Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky, the members of the Senate Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

CINCINNATI CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
W. C. CULKINS, *Executive Secretary*.

Mr. Chairman, our daily mail is filled with protests like this, from commercial bodies, corporations, firms, and individuals, appealing to us to protect them against the results of what they assisted in bringing about when they put the Republican Party out of power and placed our friends on the other side in power. If I desired to be ugly and revengeful about it, I might say that they deserved a few heroic doses of free trade for having brought about that result. I sympathize heartily with the people of Cincinnati in the sentiments which they express through this telegram, although I can not refrain from reminding them that this is what they get for turning out of Congress men like the able, patriotic, and distinguished Nicholas Longworth [applause] and men of that kind, who were their friends and champions, and putting in their places men who are here making assaults upon the industries of the great State of Ohio. I hope the good Lord will give them more light and that they will have the foresight next time to correct the grievous error they made last fall. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the gentleman from the tenth district of Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] has introduced an amendment to raise the tariff on wheat from 10 cents to 25 cents. As a matter of fact, the gentleman knows nothing about wheat, because they do not raise any in his district, and but little corn, the most of which is made into moonshine liquor. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Does not the gentleman like the finished product? [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I admire the products, but not more than the gentleman admires his own products, and I do not use them one-half as much. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. I will leave that to our associates.

Mr. THOMAS. If there is anybody upon the face of this earth that ought to be for free corn and free wheat it is the gentleman from the tenth district of Kentucky, for the greatest use that they make of corn and wheat in that district is to make liquor out of it, and they need corn and wheat shipped into that district for bread, and they ought to get it just as cheaply as possible.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. LANGLEY. Was the gentleman ever in the tenth district in his life?

Mr. THOMAS. Many a time.

Mr. LANGLEY. Then the gentleman did not observe very much.

Mr. THOMAS. And the next time the gentleman runs for Congress I will be up there. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. That is why I got a large majority, and the next time it will be unanimous. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. No; I have never been up there in the campaign when the gentleman was running for Congress, and when I do I will run him out of the district. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, the gentleman will certainly not do it while the moonshine lasts.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS. One at a time.

Mr. SWITZER. I would like to inquire whether the business of making moonshine whisky is a growing business in Kentucky?

Mr. THOMAS. In the tenth district it is. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. We make it to some extent in my district, but it is consumed largely in the gentleman's district, I understand.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, if there is any other Republican over there who desires to interrogate me, let him rise. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I am unalterably opposed to putting any food products of the people upon the tax list. I believe that everything that the American people eat and wear and consume should be on the free list, and I so intend to vote while I am in this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the dangers of a haphazard tariff are very clearly illustrated in the item upon which the committee is now working. The item is wheat, which bears here a 10-cent specific duty. Its product, flour, is given a 10 per cent ad valorem duty. It is my observation, from my part of the country, that nearly all industries, save the flour-milling industry, have concentrated. I have seen many different lines absorbed into the greater units of organization, taken over by the trusts or combinations and put under false capitalization. But it is true of the flour-milling business that it has remained segregated, that it has not moved away, but remains next to the wheat fields, that it is not overcapitalized, and as a rule the millers are not rich, as riches are now counted. Most of them are well-to-do, that and nothing more.

This bill, either by accident or design, or by the exigency of politics, wherein the members of the committee were trying to satisfy the people in the city on the score of the lower cost of living and at the same time pretending to do something for the farmer by giving him a duty, though a lower one than in the present law, on his products, have kept a specific duty on wheat and an ad valorem duty on flour of 10 per cent, which are absolutely unequal, and in this way: If wheat is worth $1 a bushel in Canada, then the duty on the flour made from it would be under this bill 50 cents a barrel, but if wheat should be in Canada 60 cents a bushel, and it has been 60 cents in Canada, then the duty on the flour from that wheat would be 30 cents. This is putting the American miller to a disadvantage of 20 cents. This is not fiction, it is not speculation, it is an actual condition which our millers will have to meet and it will injure miller and farmer. Canada in wheat production is growing. The western part of Canada produced in wheat in 1900, 17,000,000 bushels. In 1912 that 17,000,000 bushels had leaped to 198,000,000 bushels. Canada, in conformity with the idea that the mill stays close to the wheat field, is also developing wonderfully in the milling industry and as an exporter. In that way in 1900 Canada produced 455,000 barrels of flour, and in 1912, that 455,000 barrels of flour had jumped to a total of 2,388,000 barrels of flour. Now, in addition to this fact, it seems certain that on the admission of the flour through this discrimination of duties, the flour imported will enter into the fixation of the price of wheat in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, in the course of this debate I have been impressed with the ominous silence of the gentlemen on the other side of the House who represent districts where farming is the chief occupation of their constituents. The RECORD is little encumbered with their speeches in defense of this bill. The party lash has been vigorously applied during weeks of secret Democratic caucus, and I regret to say that those gentlemen most vigorous in the defense of this measure come from sections and cities where the products of the farm are consumed and not where they are produced. It is my confident belief that the gentlemen on that side have presumed too much on the tolerance of the men who till the soil. You know the farmer is not an agitator. You know that, comparatively, he is the least turbulent of all the elements of American citizenship. He is community loving, flag respecting, and patriotic; and yet you must not assume that he will submit without protest to any punishment you may inflict upon him in your discriminations in favor of the great consuming cities and centers of population. We make requisition upon him more than upon any other class for the moralizing and vitalizing influences of the Republic. He is the foundation rock. He is the greatest guaranty of perpetuity. He is the greatest influence for good and the most powerful restraint against evil. He is opposed to mob violence. He is an enemy of the Black Hand. He very properly has less respect for the criminal rich than he has for the criminal poor. He has little sympathy with the political demagogue, and much less with the demoralizing influence of Tammany methods, whether practiced one place or another. He believes in honest but not in dishonest capital, and will support it when it is employed honestly, but he will fight it to the death when it is employed dishonestly. The supporter and friend of the honest employer, as well as of the honest employee, but the employer who uses his means and capital to oppress the employed looks no better to him than the employed who carries the firebrand in the march of the mob. He is the enemy of both, because both are criminal alike. He is neither a snob nor a toady, but believes in equal opportunity and fair play. He has no sympathy with bigotry or caste, but believes instinctively that men or things are only entitled to consideration in proportion to their intrinsic value. The Decalogue is his guide. He believes in the sentiments expressed in the Declaration of Independence, and cherishes but does not abuse the liberties guaranteed by the Federal Constitution.

You must not overlook that a people of such splendid qualities must be taken into account, else the day of reckoning will come.

They are nearly forty million strong, or more than one-third of all the people of the United States. They are entitled to greater consideration than has been shown them in this bill and to a better defense from that side of this Chamber than you have made for them. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Of the hundreds of amendments introduced by Republicans on this side of the House in the interest of the farmer you have not permitted one of them to pass, and this is conclusive evidence that you gentlemen from the farming districts have been bound hand and foot by your secret party caucus. You are afraid to speak against the amendments offered by Republicans, intended to sustain the price of farm products, because such a course would defeat you at the next election, and you can not speak for them because you have pledged in secret, behind closed doors, where the country can not see or hear you, to vote for this bill at any cost. You will not permit a yea-and-nay vote to be taken on the amendments offered by the Republicans, because such a course would put each of you on record and the people whom you represent would demand that you gentlemen from the farming sections repudiate this bill, and if you refused this demand they would force you out of public life. Your failure to speak for the measure as it affects the products of the farm is conclusive evidence that you know you are wrong. Your caucus rule will not let you speak against the bill and your constituents will not permit you to speak for it. You are having your way now, but the people will have their way later. You are repudiating the farmers now, but they will repudiate you at the ballot box and at the first opportunity. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I am not opposed to party caucus on matters pertaining only to party interests, but you have no right as public officials and as representatives of the people and as the majority party of this House to debate and vote on this bill in secret caucus. The country is entitled to know what you are doing and saying when you are considering matters of public interest. Your constituents are entitled to know how much of this bill you are for and how much of it you are against. They will call upon you to explain why it is that you have kept this measure, so vital to the well-being and prosperity of every American citizen, for weeks in secret debate before it was permitted to see the light of day.

The country will not tolerate this piece of secret legislation, and the only reason you sought darkness rather than light was because your deeds were evil. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In the light of the history of this bill it may be of interest to the House to read briefly from the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, that you may understand something of the confidence that the southern Members have that the southern farmer will vote the Democratic ticket at any cost.

In volume 3 of those hearings there is the testimony before that committee of a gentleman by the name of Cowan, a distinguished citizen of the State of Texas, who was being interrogated. Mr. JAMES, speaking to Mr. Cowan, said:

Do you think free meat would ruin the cattle industry?
Mr. COWAN. It would.
Mr. JAMES. Did not all the Members of Congress from Texas vote for free meat?
Mr. COWAN. I think they all did.
Mr. JAMES. And were they not all overwhelmingly elected?
Mr. COWAN. They were. We vote the Democratic ticket there in spite of politics; in spite of platforms; in spite of anything that is said in the platforms. If the Democratic platform says prohibition, then we vote it. If it says anti, we vote that.
Mr. JAMES. I know that is true.
Mr. COWAN. You know that, Mr. JAMES, just like I do.

Since I have adverted to the cattle industry, I shall indulge a little further in the discussion of prices. The following figures taken from the census report of 1910 and also from reports made by the Agricultural Department will disclose to the farmers of my State and the country some startling facts, these figures being a comparison of the value of some of the principal products of the farm in Oklahoma under a Republican and Democratic administration, respectively.

CATTLE.

The Wilson bill, which ruined the country under the Cleveland Democratic administration, provided for a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on cattle. The present, or so-called Payne law, provides a duty of 27½ per cent ad valorem, and the present Underwood bill, which will become a law, only provides for 10 per cent ad valorem on cattle, or only one-half as much as the Wilson bill, which wrought such destruction to the farmers by the ruinous prices of cattle under it.

In May, 1896 and 1897, the price of cattle on the Chicago market was $2 to $4.45 per hundred. On May 1, or the last of April, 1913, the same grade of cattle which brought only $3 in 1896 and 1897 sold for $7.60 per hundred on the same market.

ROUND NUMBERS USED IN TOTALS.

For the sake of convenience we will use round numbers in giving totals rather than the detailed figures as we get them from the census report.

In the State of Oklahoma there are approximately 190,000 farms, according to the census report of 1910. The same report shows that there are a little less than 1,250,000 head of cattle in the State, an average of about 6 head to every farm. We will take these figures as a basis, and they are as nearly correct as is possible to procure. The Federal census report shows that beef cattle were worth about $30 per head more in 1911 and 1912 under a Republican administration and a Republican tariff than they were in 1896 and 1897 under a Democratic administration and a Democratic tariff, and the agricultural reports show that stock cattle were worth about $15 per head more in 1911 and 1912 than they were in 1896 and 1897, and that the average worth of all cattle under a Republican administration has been and is $20 more than under a Democratic administration and a Democratic tariff.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY DOLLARS' LOSS TO EVERY FARMER.

Taking these figures as a basis, it will be observed that the cattle of my State were worth about $25,000,000 more under a Republican administration and a Republican tariff than they were under a Democratic administration and a Democratic tariff, or $120 to every farmer in favor of the Republican administration.

HORSES.

The Federal census also shows that there were 800,000 head of horses in Oklahoma in 1910, or about 5 to every farm. Agricultural reports show that in 1896 and 1897, under a Democratic administration and Democratic tariff, horses averaged $30 per head. This would make Oklahoma's 800,000 head of horses worth $24,000,000. In 1912, under a Republican tariff, the same reports show that horses averaged $110 per head. Thus under a Republican tariff the 800,000 horses owned by the farmers of my State are worth $88,000,000, or $64,000,000 more than the same horses were worth under a Democratic tariff.

MEANS $400 TO EVERY FARMER.

This amounts to $400 to every farmer in the State. In other words, taking the facts and figures which can not be disputed, every horse owned by an Oklahoma farmer was worth under a Democratic administration just $80 less than the same animal was worth under a Republican administration.

MULES.

We will now take up some figures regarding mules, which are as startling as on other products.

In 1910 there were more than 270,000 mules in the State of Oklahoma, or about 2 to every farm. In 1896 and 1897 mules averaged $40 per head, all in the State being worth a total of about $10,000,000. In 1911 and 1912 mules averaged $120 per head, making the total of Oklahoma's 270,000 mules worth $30,000,000, a gain under the Republican administration of $20,000,000 over what they were worth during the Democratic administration and a Democratic tariff. This amounts to $160 to every farmer in the State; that is, his mules were worth $80 a head more under a Republican tariff than under a Democratic tariff.

Though this indispensable hybrid "can not boast of pride of ancestry or hope of posterity," these figures are quite sufficient to make it hang its head in shame at such treatment from its nearest kin, the Democratic Party, and with such lamentable lack of appreciation of party emblem one can not readily conceive how, in the light of such a record, an honest Democrat can look a mule in the face. [Applause and laughter.]

WHEAT.

Oklahoma produces about 30,000,000 bushels of wheat annually. That 30,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1896 and 1897 was worth 57 cents per bushel on the Chicago market, or a total of $17,000,000, under a Democratic administration. In 1910 and 1911 and 1912 the average was about $1 per bushel. Oklahoma's 30,000,000 bushels of wheat, then, would be worth $30,000,000 under a Republican tariff as against $17,000,000 under a Democratic tariff, or a difference of about $75 per year to every farmer in the State.

TOTAL LOSS TO EVERY FARMER IS $750.

The loss to the farmers of Oklahoma alone under a Democratic administration on only four commodities, viz, horses, mules, cattle, and wheat, is $122,000,000, or $750 to every individual farmer in the State.

This is not taking into account corn, cotton, oats, potatoes, chickens, butter, eggs, and almost innumerable other things produced by the farmer, the difference in price being quite as much as it was on cattle, horses, mules, and wheat.

STILL LOWER IN UNDERWOOD BILL.

There are very few people in my State and, in fact, throughout the country who do not remember the appalling conditions as they were under the only Democratic tariff law that we have had in three-quarters of a century, and it should be borne in mind that the present Underwood bill reduces the tariff still lower than under the Cleveland administration, and it may be well for the farmers of Oklahoma and the whole country to remember that you can not name one single article which you produce on your farm on which the tariff is not reduced. There are some few advances in the Underwood bill, but in not one case are they in the interest of the farmer, and we are told by the gentlemen who are inflicting this bill upon the American people that we are paying too much for the things that we eat, which is but another way of telling the American people that we are paying too much for what the farmer produces. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Within the last half century the country tried you once before and you failed, and the fact that you are in power again does not mean that you have the confidence of the people. On the 1st day of this month President Wilson, your chosen leader, spoke at Newark, N. J., and in the course of his remarks, while flaying his own party in that State, said, in part:

But I want to say a few words about the Democratic Party. I want everybody to realize that I have not been taken in by the results of the last national election. The country did not go Democratic in November. It was impossible to go Republican because it could not tell which kind of Republican to go.

In this connection it may be of interest to quote from another distinguished Democrat, and one who did more to elect Mr. Wilson than any other man in America, not excepting Mr. Bryan. I refer to William R. Hearst, who has the most powerful string of metropolitan dailies in the world. In an article condemning and repudiating this bill and criticizing President Wilson's free-trade policies, his papers, on the 13th day of April, said, in part:

Mr. Wilson's opposition to the protective tariff is not inherently or essentially Democratic.

WILSON AN ENGLISH FREE TRADER.

Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, recognized the principle of protection, and advocated discriminating duties in favor of American shipping and reciprocity treaties in favor of American trade.

Mr. Wilson is fundamentally opposed to the principle of protection, and his idea of radical, ruthless tariff reduction is but an expression of the English free-trade theories of Cobden and Mill.

Mr. Wilson is an English free trader.

He may obscure his utterances, but he can not conceal his acts.

Mr. Wilson's political economy is the political economy of another nation and of another age.

It is the political economy of a nation that is passing and of an age that is past.

Mr. Wilson's theories are the theories of books, and of British books, but of British books that are no longer believed by the patriotic and practical and progressive Englishmen of to-day.

The United States of America have given an example to the world in progress and prosperity, in advancement and enlightenment, in happiness and contentment.

The nations of the world have turned toward this country in admiration and amazement.

The methods and systems and institutions of our country have been studied and imitated in every foreign nation except, perhaps, in England.

FEDERALISTS ALONE IN THE DARK.

England is slow to learn and reluctant to learn, but, nevertheless, she is beginning to learn, and the most advanced and intelligent thought in England to-day is in favor of an imperial federation, with free trade among its component States and colonies, but with a policy of protection toward the rest of the world.

Germany and France have long prospered under protection and through intelligent appreciation and imitation of other American ideas and institutions.

The realization that this country is the greatest country in the world and the appreciation of the causes which have made it the greatest country in the world are almost universal throughout the world except among the few remaining Federalists of the United States of America.

If there is to be tariff modification, the modern American policy should be the original democratic policy of reciprocity and discriminating duties in favor of American products, American manufactures, American commerce, and American trade.

In our tariff we have a weapon with which we can withstand the tariff weapons of other nations, but we must not abandon our weapons until other nations are ready to abandon theirs.

WHAT BECOMES OF RECIPROCITY?

In the reduction of our tariff through reciprocity we have a method by which we can compel the reduction of the tariff of other nations, but of what value will be a policy of reciprocity which does not go into effect until after our tariff reductions have been made?

If we are to make tariff concessions which will be encouraging to the products and valuable to the producers in other nations, we should compel reciprocal concessions which will be equally stimulating to the products, equally beneficial to the producers, to the farmers, to the manufacturers, and the laborers in our own country.

Through reciprocity tariff reduction can be made coincident and coextensive with trade expansion.

Through reciprocity the injury to our manufacturers, to our farmers, to our laborers, through the invasion of our markets by foreign products, would be compensated for by the advantages obtained by our manufacturers, our farmers, and our laborers in the opening of foreign markets to our trade and to our produce.

MOTIVE AN UNSELFISH ONE.

In the advocacy of intelligent reciprocity, rather than reckless and ruthless tariff reduction and commercial destruction, I have no selfish motives.

I have cattle ranches in Mexico, and it is proposed under Mr. Wilson's policy to bring beef free into the United States.

It would advantage me considerably, from a merely sordid point of view, to have Mexican beef allowed free into the United States market.

But, as a patriotic American citizen and a Jeffersonian Democrat, I do not believe that Mexican beef, or any other Mexican product, should be allowed free into the markets of the United States until American goods are allowed free into the markets of Mexico.

Under Mr. Wilson's program it is proposed to allow white paper free into the markets of the United States from Canada.

I use over $6,000,000 worth of white paper every year, and from a merely selfish financial point of view it would benefit me enormously to have white paper admitted free into the markets of the United States.

NATION'S INTERESTS ABOVE PARTY.

But, again, as a patriotic American citizen and a Jeffersonian Democrat, I do not believe that white paper, or any other Canadian product, should be admitted free into the United States until the products of the United States, or at least corresponding products of the United States, are admitted free into the markets of Canada.

The Canadians scornfully rejected our proposals of reciprocity.

Are we in return to give them the full advantages of reciprocity without securing any reciprocal advantages for ourselves?

I am loath to criticize the policy of the Democratic Party, or of any man whom I labored to elect, but I am an American first and a Democrat afterwards, and I can not consider the interests of my party above the interests of my country.

I shall hope to see the Democratic Party fulfill its duty and rise to its opportunity.

I shall support it gracefully when it is right, but criticize it regretfully when it is wrong; and I shall continue to implore it not to be led by a Federalistic fetich away from the fundamental principles of Thomas Jefferson, who was always not only a great Democrat, but a great American.

WILLIAM R. HEARST.

The foregoing remarks coming from any other than a leading and distinguished Democrat would be regarded as most excellent Republican doctrine. But it means that Mr. Hearst has abandoned the free-trade-tariff-for-revenue-only policy of the Democratic Party and confesses that the Republican Party is and always has been right. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, we should not overlook the fact that this splendid word picture of Mr. Hearst, portraying the acknowledged supremacy of the American people among the other nations of the earth, is the direct and legitimate result of the policies and supremacy of the Republican Party in this country. Protection and reciprocity have always been the watchwords of the Republican Party, and as long as we adhere to them the Nation will succeed; and when we abandon them, we will fail. [Loud applause.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 15, strike out the entire paragraph which reads "Wheat, 10 cents per bushel," and substitute therefor the following: "Wheat, wheat flour, and wheat millstuffs, 10 cents per hundred pounds."

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the people living in the tenth congressional district of Kentucky, and for the mountain people generally, I want here and now to deny the charge that it is the hotbed of the moonshiners. If the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] had seen fit to retaliate on Mr. THOMAS, the other Kentuckian making the charge, in all probability he could have said, with much truth in the assertion, that night-riderism runs mad in certain boasted sections of our Commonwealth, but I suppose he believed it to be his duty, and the duty of every Kentuckian, to defend the whole State of Kentucky and leave unsaid those things calculated to hurt or harm any part of it. [Applause.]

Now, a word in regard to this pending amendment. There is not a flour mill in the district I have the honor to represent. The charge, too often bandied back and forth on the floor of this House, that the Representative is speaking for certain interests in his district can not in this instance, at least with truth, be laid at my door.

The people of my district believe in equal opportunity in workshop, mill, factory, and farm, and equal and exact justice before the law. This present Underwood bill carries a duty of 10 cents a bushel on wheat and makes wheat flour and other products of the mill free of duty. Does the Democratic majority suppose that they are going to fool the American farmer by lulling him into the belief that he is being protected by a 10-cent duty on wheat while flour is put on the free list?

The distinguished Member from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], a gentleman for whom I have every respect, said in his speech this afternoon that the country had already indorsed the provisions of this bill, in substance, by indorsing the farmers' free-list bill and by returning to this House an overwhelming Democratic majority. I want to remind the gentleman from Illinois that there is all the difference in the world between making a campaign on promises and performances. The Democratic Party

two years from now will be compelled to make their campaign on actual performances. The old law under which the farmers of this country have had unbounded prosperity and under which they felt secure in the good prices they were receiving is to be supplanted, and this new measure is to be put in its place. What protection is there to the American farmer in the wheat he produces when you put flour on the free list? What protection is it to the American farmer to permit Canada to ship her flour to this country free of duty and then charge her 10 cents a bushel on the wheat she ships? Canada would no longer ship any wheat to this country. She would manufacture it at home and send the flour over, and the flour, when sent here, would have the same depressing effect on the price of the farmer's wheat as if Canada had sent her wheat here in the first instance. You are not protecting the farmers by this process. You can not fool them by this means.

Canada in 1910 produced 95,000,000 bushels of wheat available for export. Her total yield that year was 166,747,000 bushels. She therefore produced twice as much as she needed for her own consumption and actually exported that year 57,000,000 bushels of wheat, much of it coming to the United States.

In that same year the United States exported only 114,000,000 bushels of wheat. This gives some idea of what Canada will do when her 8,000,000 people reach the 100,000,000 point we boast of in this country to-day.

The Canadian wheat lands, of which there are 30,000,000 acres in the Provinces of Manitoba, Alberta, and Saskatchewan alone, average, when in cultivation, 22 bushels of wheat to the acre, while the average yield of the United States is only 15 bushels per acre. Do you suppose that you are going to protect the American farmer in his price of wheat when you let Canadian flour into this country free of duty?

And what has the American miller done to you that you should discriminate against him in favor of the Canadian miller? What have the wage earners in the American flour mills done to you that you should discriminate against them in favor of the wage earners in the Canadian flour mills? When great flood disasters, such as the recent ones in the States of Ohio and Indiana and through the Mississippi Valley, visit our country, destroying life and property and laying waste the land, who is it, through generous contributions, comes to their assistance and relieves their suffering? It is the American mill owners along with other patriotic and whole-souled Americans. Who do we look to to build up and maintain our free institutions, improve our highways, erect our churches, and build up our schools and colleges. It is Americans. Americans ought not to be discriminated against by other Americans and in favor of foreigners.

No doubt Canadian and other foreign newspapers and peoples are giving you much credit in your splendid work in favor of the foreigner, but our own American people will have a reckoning with you one of these days. I want to insert as a part of my remarks a telegram I received from the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce; also a letter from the Washburn-Crosby Milling Co., of Louisville, Ky.; also an editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Post, in its issue of April 14, 1913. The matters referred to are as follows:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *April 30, 1913.*

Hon. CALEB POWERS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

By unanimous vote the board of directors of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, at a meeting held April 29, adopted the following resolution, which is respectfully submitted for your attention:

Whereas the Underwood tariff bill imposes a duty of 10 cents per bushel upon foreign wheat and admits duty free the foreign milled products of such foreign wheat; and

Whereas this discrimination in favor of the foreign manufacturer is in contradiction alike of all accepted economic doctrine of the established tariff policy of all political parties and of all nations, and in effect pays a bounty to the foreign miller on all products of wheat sold by him in the markets of the United States; and

Whereas if American flour millers have to pay a tax upon foreign-grown wheat, then a simple justice requires that the foreign-milled products of such wheat shall pay an equivalent tax, and if foreign-milled wheat products are admitted duty free foreign wheat should be admitted duty free: Therefore be it

Resolved, That believing the proposed legislation would inevitably destroy one of the most important manufacturing industries in the United States and that it would further result in most serious injury to the American farmer, the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, through its board of directors, records itself as unalterably opposed, and earnestly urges upon the President and Congress of the United States the necessity of placing both wheat and its products upon terms of absolute equality.

Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded immediately to the President of the United States, Senators and Congressmen from Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky, the members of the Senate Finance Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

CINCINNATI CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
W. C. CULKINS, *Executive Secretary.*

LOUISVILLE, KY., *April 1, 1913.*

Hon. CALEB POWERS,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have just noted that the Ways and Means Committee has inserted a paragraph in the proposed tariff bill admitting flour and milled products free of duty, at the same time imposing a duty of 7½ to 10 cents per bushel on wheat.

We are addressing this letter to you with a view to soliciting your influence in opposition to legislation of this character for two very potent reasons: First, to admit a manufactured product to this country free of duty while imposing a duty upon the raw material would be legislation without equity or justice; second, such legislation would tend to ruin the milling interests of the United States, an industry that is to-day overdone some three or four times the necessities of the country, and, were the markets available, the United States has milling capacity sufficient to grind all the wheat produced in both the United States and Canada.

It can be readily seen how such legislation would injure the milling industry, because it would open our markets to Canada for the shipment of flour and feed into this country absolutely free of duty, while we as millers would be barred from buying wheat from Canada for the purpose of grinding it into flour.

You will understand that were flour and milled products put on the free list because of the call from certain sections for lower food products, these latter sections would possibly be satisfied, but it would hardly be protection to the farmer, and such action would not benefit the farmer in the end because the shipment of wheat from Canada into the United States in the form of flour would depress the market just as much as if sending in an equal quantity of wheat. The mills of the United States would require less wheat because of the Canadian mills supplying the market with flour. Such legislation would practically ruin the milling industry of the United States, as not only would it open the doors for the shipment of flour from Canada, where a vast surplus of wheat over consumption is raised, but would also open the doors for the possible shipment of flour from Argentina, either direct or through milling in transit in Germany, France, and England, where it could be manufactured into flour and shipped to New York, Philadelphia, Boston, etc.

We will greatly appreciate any efforts you may make with a view to having this paragraph in the proposed tariff bill modified by providing that wheat and its products—flour and mill stuffs—shall be placed upon an equal basis. If it is necessary let us have free wheat, free flour, and free mill stuff, but in order to protect the farmer we think that the duty should be made, say, 10 cents per 100 pounds on wheat, 10 cents per 100 pounds on flour, and 10 cents per 100 pounds on mill stuffs. If 10 cents is too much for some of our friends, make it less, but under all circumstances let the tariff on the raw material and the manufactured products be at least relatively the same.

This is an urgent appeal to you for your assistance in connection with a matter that if put through along the line proposed will certainly do greater harm to one of the leading industries of this country than any other legislation could possibly do.

Can we count upon you for your assistance?

Very truly, yours,

WASHBURN-CROSBY MILLING CO. (INC.),
W. M. ATKINSON, *General Manager.*

[From the Washington Post, Monday, Apr. 14, 1913.]

A WEEK OF THE TARIFF.

The tariff bill, at the end of its first week "on trial before the country," has not stood scrutiny imperviously by any means, but the volume of disapproval does not measure up to predictions, except in New England and the sugar and wool States. The usual difficulty is experienced in fixing upon the precise effect of the changes.

The publication of the bill, as it happened, found prices on a decline in practically all of the markets, financial and commercial, but the downward tendency was not traceable to the tariff appreciably except in the securities of the new industrials. The depressing effect of new issues of railroad stocks on one hand and the flattering reports of crop conditions carried the lists downward at a rate that quite obscured the effect, if any, of the new element of weakness. A lingering belief that the Senate will modify some of the severities favored by the House sustains the feeling of confidence to no small degree, so that until the attitude of the upper body is fully disclosed the final judgment of the people can not be known.

A number of cotton and woolen mills in New England have closed down until the new basis of manufacturing can be more definitely determined, and will remain closed, it is announced, if the outlook fails to brighten. Protests continue to pour in on Congress from all directions, but the work in caucus does not indicate that they are shaking the resolution of the leaders to put the bill through practically intact.

Foreign opinion of the bill runs strongly in the opposite direction, as was to be expected. English manufacturers are overjoyed at the prospect of vastly enlarged markets in America. The trade papers over there look upon the bill as certain to give a great stimulus to our imports, one of the publications declaring that it is the heaviest blow given to protection since the passage by Parliament of the Peel tariff 60 years ago. The German exporters also are on the tiptoe of expectation, and the same buoyancy of feeling prevails in almost all European and many Latin-American countries. Canada will profit proportionately to a greater extent than any of the beneficiaries, with the open door extended to her agricultural, live stock, dairy, manufacturing, and lumber industries.

Mr. RAINEY. The difference, Mr. Chairman, between the Democratic Party, I will say for the benefit of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS], and the Republican Party is this, in brief: The Republican Party makes promises before election and breaks them afterwards, while the Democratic Party makes promises before election and keeps them afterwards. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And that is what we are doing now. Now, 10 cents a bushel does not protect the wheat farmer of this country. They do not need protection against the wheat of Canada. Why, over in Canada they have a population of 7,000,000 while in the United States we have 6,300,000 farms and we have 12,000,000 farmers. We have almost twice as many farmers as they have of men, women, and children in all the Dominion of Canada. Talk about this great Republic crin-

ing before Canada and before this tremendous influx of wheat? Why, we raise in the State of Illinois 25 bushels of wheat every year for every one single bushel of wheat that comes into the United States from Canada, and we are not pretending to be the greatest wheat-raising State by any means.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. In a moment, if I have time. Talk about protecting the wheat farmers of the United States. Why, here are the figures of the present market. On April 29 in Chicago May wheat was selling for 92 cents. In Winnipeg it sold for 94 cents on that day. On the 28th day of this month May wheat sold in Winnipeg at 94 to 94½ cents and it sold in Chicago for 92 cents.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman please yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Not now.

Mr. MILLER. I can suggest something.

Mr. RAINEY. I can not yield now. On the 26th day of April wheat sold in Chicago for 92 cents (this is May wheat) and it sold in Winnipeg for 93 cents. On the 29th day of April July wheat sold in Winnipeg for 95 cents and in Chicago at 92 cents. On April 28 July wheat sold in Winnipeg at 95 cents, and it sold in Chicago at 92 cents. On April 26 July wheat sold in Winnipeg at 94⅞ cents, and it sold in Chicago at 91⅞ cents. And the same thing holds good with reference to September wheat. Why, the farmers of this country, if they want to sell their wheat on the highest market, and that has been the way all through this month, and it is usually that way—if they want to sell their wheat on the highest market they ought to break down the barrier between this country and Canada—induce Canada to repeal its tariff of 10 cents to 12 cents per bushel on wheat—their general tariff enforced against us is 12 cents—so as to let our wheat go there and sell on the highest market. The farmers of this country are not afraid of Canada. Three days ago contracts were made in St. Louis to sell flour ground here in the United States for delivery in Glasgow, where they have port mills, the port mills of England which, they say, threaten the mills of this country.

They were contracting in St. Louis three days ago to grind American wheat in this country and sell it in the port mills of Great Britain. That is the situation. Now I will yield.

Mr. MILLER. I would like to inquire of the gentleman—I suggest to him that if he had been as industrious in this as I know he would have been if he had had time he would find every year for the last 20 years——

Mr. RAINEY. I am not yielding for a speech, but just for a question.

Mr. MILLER. I want to make just a brief statement.

Mr. RAINEY. I can not yield except for a question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. For a question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The sales that were made for July were speculative sales; they were not cash sales?

Mr. RAINEY. That is the trouble. That is the reason why we ought to reduce the tariff on wheat. That is the reason why flour ought always to be free, to prevent the speculation in Chicago and up in Winnipeg. If it is possible to take it across the border either way, they can not tell how or when to corner markets—gamble in wheat. If this gambling could be prevented, it would mean cheaper bread there and cheaper bread here. We impose this tariff for the purpose of revenue, and that is all, and that is the only excuse for any of these rates. We get $200,000 out of it a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair begs the indulgence of the committee to state that because 30 can not be equally divided by 4 it makes it difficult for the Chair to divide the time evenly. The Chair will recognize the next gentleman for two minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the Chair allow me a suggestion? In order to be fair to each gentleman, I ask unanimous consent that the time may be extended to 32 minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take the very short time granted me to say that I am pleased to support the resolution offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY]. I have the honor to represent the greatest wheat-producing State in this Union. Nothing that I may say here this evening, I know full well, will change one single jot or tittle of this Democratic tariff bill. I have, however, during the past week been interested in the discussions that have been had on the different schedules. I have been particularly amused at the statement just made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] that the Democratic Party always has kept its promises. Their concealed promises are about the only promises they have kept in the past, and I sincerely hope that during the next few years in this country they will not keep and carry into effect the kind of promises that our people in North Dakota know they carried into effect when they were given an opportunity to manage the affairs of this Government. We did not have the prosperity in Democratic days that we are now enjoying, and I want to say to my friends on the other side that the farmers of North Dakota did not at all understand the promises that you made in the last campaign, if they are such as are being carried out in this crazy-quilt patchwork of a tariff bill. They did not understand that you intended to throw the farmers' markets of this country open to the world. I am just as confident as that night follows day that these United States in the future are not going to continue as a free-tariff country or a Democratic tariff-for-revenue-only Nation; but that, on the other hand, it is going to continue as a nation of Americans, for American manufacturers, American laborers, and American farmers. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND] is recognized.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has four minutes.

Mr. HAMMOND. I desire to say a word particularly to certain of my colleagues from Minnesota to whom I made a statement the other day. I said that Mr. Crosby, of the Washburn-Crosby Milling Co., had stated to me that he preferred the present rates and provisions in this bill in reference to wheat and flour to free wheat and free flour. I so understood Mr. Crosby to state in a conversation I had with him. I desire to say that I have received a telegram from him in which he states that that is not his position, and that I must have misunderstood him. As he is a gentleman who makes no misstatements, I desire in this public way to correct, in so far as I may, any misapprehension that may have been caused by my misunderstanding of his remarks. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] has given us figures as to the number of barrels of flour made in Canada—in Canada, the great country to the north of us, from which we fear so much. Assuming that his figures are right—I do not know—Canada made, in 1912, a little less than 2,400,000 barrels of flour.

I desire to say that one flouring concern in the city of Minneapolis in six months will turn out that amount of flour and 50 per cent more; so that the amount stated, great as it may appear, is not so great an amount as would disturb conditions. Why, if that one milling concern should shut down for six months, 50 per cent more flour would be deducted from the flour product of the world than the amount given by the gentleman as Canada's yearly production.

Another thing: About 5½ bushels of wheat go into a barrel of flour.

Mr. ANDERSON. Four and one-half. Does the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. The very least amount that goes into a barrel of flour is 4½ bushels and the highest is 5⅝.

Mr. HAMMOND. Well, 5 or 5½ would be a fair estimate, would it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is plenty.

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes. Well, assuming that it takes as much wheat up in Canada to make a barrel of flour as it does in other places, and making the liberal estimate of 5 or 5½ bushels to the barrel, there must be something less than 15,000,000 bushels of wheat ground into flour in Canada if the gentleman's figures are correct. Why, the wheat farmers of the United States furnish to the millers of this country all the flour they want to grind, and then send abroad twice as much wheat as that.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me just one question there?

Mr. HAMMOND. Certainly.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Is not the gentleman aware of the fact that the average daily capacity of grinding in Canada is 111,000 barrels a day, instead of the figures of the gentleman from Kansas? That is a fact, as I am telling you.

Mr. HAMMOND. I will say to my colleague that I do not know the grinding capacity of the mills in Canada, and I do not know the number of barrels of flour ground there last year.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. One hundred and two million bushels were ground last year.

Mr. HAMMOND. Then the statement of the gentleman from Kansas is incorrect, and it was upon that statement that I based my remarks.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Twenty-two million barrels, and that would require 102,000,000 bushels of wheat.

Mr. HAMMOND. I was surprised at the statement. So I went to my friend from Kansas and asked him to show me his figures, and I took them as he gave them to me. But it serves to illustrate, at any rate, the comparatively slight importance of the wheat and flour of Canada as compared with the wheat raised in this country and with the flour made here.

Now, while we may think that it would be better if there were a straight rate upon flour in this bill in place of the contingent rate that is given, nevertheless I am satisfied that there is some advantage to the American miller in the plan proposed, and I believe it will be of benefit both to the raiser of wheat and the maker of flour. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HELGESEN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HELGESEN. I would like to have two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate has been limited by order of the committee. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Is this vote on the Powers amendment or the Langley amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. MANN. I thought it was the other way. That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair said "the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky." He did not call the name.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 59, noes 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment for the increase to 25 cents a bushel.

The CHAIRMAN. It is an amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. NORTON. I demand a division.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 60, noes 115.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to offer an amendment in the way of a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 15, after the word "bushel," insert as a new paragraph:

"198½. Wheat flour and semolina, 45 cents per barrel of 196 pounds."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, that is the exact rate necessary to equalize the duty of 10 cents per bushel proposed in the pending bill. I desire the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] for just a moment, if I may have it, that I may call his attention to a fact related to the prices on wheat that has hitherto escaped his attention; and I am afraid that lack of information is illustrative of many of the reasons why certain schedules in the bill are as they are. He read to us the present prices of wheat in Winnipeg and Chicago, and it was no doubt to his surprise and that of the House that the price in Winnipeg was higher, and upon that he based the statement that we should let down the bars so that our American farmers might sell their wheat in Canada. But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman should learn now that every year for a period of four months, during which time not a bushel of wheat is sold, the quotations at Winnipeg are higher than at Minneapolis, Duluth, or Chicago, and that during the other eight months of the year, when every bushel of wheat grown in Canada or America is sold, the price at Minneapolis and Duluth is from 10 to 14 cents higher than it is at Winnipeg. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I am one who believes that the duty on flour is a protection to the farmer in the matter of his wheat. In round numbers, we raise in this country about 600,000,000 bushels of wheat each year. The mills consume for flour purposes about 500,000,000 bushels. If we strike a blow at the milling business, we certainly do an injury to the best market the farmer has for his flour. Wheat is grown for practically no other purpose but to make flour, and if we injure the milling industry we certainly injure the wheat industry.

Gentlemen have indulged themselves in the statement that wheat is not imported from Canada into the United States to-day in any considerable quantities. I would invite their attention to the fact that during the last season there were imported and shipped to the Duluth market, stored in boats and elevators at Duluth in bond, 22,000,000 bushels of wheat, although it is the first year the great influx has come. Mr. Chairman, if you knock down the duty on wheat still further, so that that imported wheat can pay the duty, instead of being exported out in bond, it will be milled in the States.

I am frank to say that what I am now saying is not for the welfare, perhaps, of the milling industry in my own city, but I believe it is for the welfare of the milling industry in the United States and the farmers of the United States. The miller then would like free wheat and free flour, but I believe in a protective duty on both. It may be easy for some to imagine that by reason of their great capitalization, great organization, and scattered condition over the land, the milling industry of the United States can compete with the world.

That is true when that industry can compete with the world on even terms, but handicap them by duty wheat and free flour and they can not possibly do so. Not in all sections can they compete now.

Mr. Chairman, at the head of Lake Superior there are to-day several mammoth flour mills that have not turned a wheel in 10 years. I do not ask that a duty be placed upon flour to enable those mills to start again. You can not do it. We stand at that point and listen to the whir of the flour mills at Kenora, Canada, across the line, where new mills have been constructed during the past year and many more are projected; but we do ask not to put this handicap upon the milling industry of the United States, that the flour mills in Minneapolis, in Kentucky, in Kansas, in Missouri, in Georgia, may not be like those of Duluth, with cobwebs in the machinery and panes out of the windows.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments close in 10 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. I should like a couple of minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I should like two minutes.

Mr. MANAHAN. I should like five minutes.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I should like some time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, everybody can not talk on every paragraph. I should like to accommodate some gentlemen on this side. I will ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in 20 minutes and that the time be limited to 4 minutes each.

Mr. MANN. That will take care of the gentleman from Minnesota, the gentleman from Oklahoma, the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will modify my request. I ask that debate be closed in 24 minutes and the speakers be limited to 3 minutes each.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate close in 24 minutes, recognition to be for 3 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I regret the poverty of time accorded us on this great question. It does not strike me as fair, but it is as fair as the tariff is to the people of Minnesota. The tax on wheat at 10 cents a bushel with flour free is a fraud. It is dishonest. [Applause on the Republican side.] It is a "con" case, designed to obtain votes by false pretenses. The gentlemen who drew this schedule know that wheat must be ground into flour before it is used. Possibly the prehistoric Democrat used wheat before it was ground, but it only served to develop his teeth and grazing ability, and possibly developed his ears at the expense of his intellect. [Laughter.]

I never realized until this discussion came up the appropriateness of the great symbol of Democracy, represented by the stubborness of the mule. You can not convince these gentlemen on any proposition, and the reason given by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] is that they promised the American people before election they would give them free flour and wheat and they have got to keep their promise, regardless of the merits of the proposition.

It may be good politics, but it is poor patriotism—in fact, it is wicked—to destroy the great industries of a great State for the sake of keeping a promise made for political effect.

Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that I have not the time to show the iniquity of this proposition. I regret it exceedingly, because it is not only dishonest to the farmers of my State, but to the American people. To break down agriculture is the cruelest blow that can be struck against labor, and I am amazed that the Representative from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN], the representative of labor, does not appreciate the great truth that if you make farming so miserable for the farmers and unprofit-

able, and so unsatisfactory to the farmer's boys and girls, they will keep on congregating in the city and making the laborer's lot harder and more fiercely competitive and the farms poorer and less productive and profitable, thus bringing wholesale depression and poverty to the Nation. You have got to have the farmer prosperous in order to have labor succeed, because if the farmers are prosperous the whole Nation is and the demand for labor is heavy. This is a dishonorable tariff as far as the agriculturists of the country are concerned, and an unfortunate tariff for men and women who work. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my opposition to this paragraph and the preceding one.

It matters not what is said on this floor, it matters not what may be said in the future, the farmers of this country understand thoroughly this proposition, and they believe that a reduction of duty on wheat or the placing of flour on the free list will seriously injure their business, and I agree with the farmer.

PETITION FROM OKLAHOMA FARMERS.

I want to present to the House a petition from the farmers of my district. It is as follows:

MOORELAND, OKLA., *April 26, 1913.*

Hon. DICK T. MORGAN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR:

Whereas the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives has prepared a tariff bill for the revision of the tariff; and
Whereas by the terms of the said proposed bill all tariffs would be removed from flour; and
Whereas by the terms of the said bill it is provided that a tariff of 10 cents per bushel shall be maintained upon wheat; and
Whereas it is evident by removing the tariff from flour the price of flour will necessarily be lowered, and in that manner and to that extent will necessarily lower the price of wheat correspondingly; and
Whereas the effect of the removing of the tariff from flour will necessarily be to reduce the price of wheat, thereby reducing the price of the land upon which wheat is grown in the United States; and
Whereas the removal of the tariff from flour will necessarily reduce the price of wheat to an export value and maintain same throughout every month in the year, thus depriving us of our domestic value, which usually is from 10 to 15 cents per bushel higher than export values, and thus putting our wheat in competition throughout every month in the year with the vast wheat-growing countries of the Canadian Northwest, Argentina, and Russia, which countries can not produce anything but wheat, and which countries can produce wheat at a lesser cost of production than we can in our country; and
Whereas the removal of the tariff from flour will necessarily transfer the milling business from the mill centers in the United States to the Canadian mills and other countries producing a surplus of wheat, and in that manner depreciating the value of all milling property, and transferring the labor employed in the milling concerns in the United States to the milling concerns located in foreign countries; and
Whereas we, the undersigned farmers and pioneers of northwest Oklahoma, have helped develop northwest Oklahoma into a wheat-growing country, and the reduction of the price of wheat would naturally affect our accumulation of a lifetime:

Therefore we, the undersigned farmers, do hereby earnestly protest against the removal of the tariff from either wheat or flour, and do hereby urge you as our Representative in Congress to use your best efforts and influence in maintaining the tariff on both wheat and flour, to the end that we may not suffer disastrously from the passage of this bill.

Respectfully,

John J. Bouquot, Geo. Knittel, G. W. Tyford, F. J. Knittel, J. F. Butcher, W. M. Blevins, J. C. Triplett, A. B. Catlett, Albert Geerdet, H. M. Wyckoff, Joe Lowell, W. J. Shaw, Wm. H. Lintner, O. A. White, B. J. Durant, J. E. Taylor, J. G. Carter, Geo. F. Ruttman, O. P. Clifton, R. C. Robinson, A. S. Jenisch, L. E. Bouquot, E. L. Leighton, S. Luellen, D. I. Harper, A. P. Atkinson, M. L. Cobb, A. D. Bailey, M. Matthews.

I next present a letter from Mr. H. K. Schafer, manager of the Canadian Mill & Elevator Co.:

EL RENO, OKLA., *April 28, 1913.*

Hon. DICK T. MORGAN, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: We sincerely hope that the grain producers' interests, together with the milling-industry interests, will be considered when the tariff bill is taken up in the Senate. We understand this bill is designed to protect the consumer of flour by having flour on the free list and to protect the producer of wheat by having a tariff on wheat. In this connection wish to say, however, that the producer gets no protection whatever, from the fact that immediately when flour is imported into this country the producer's wheat must necessarily recede in price to a level that will enable the miller in this country to cope with his foreign competitor, who imports the cheaper flour; and, speaking from the miller's viewpoint, there is no question but what it would be a direct discrimination to have flour on the free list and wheat protected by duty. If the interest of the millers and milling industry would be protected like the interests of other manufacturing industries, the miller should be entitled to free wheat and a duty on flour; however, if this can not be granted, we request that you urge by all means to at least keep flour and wheat and the products from wheat on a parity; that is to say, if wheat bears a duty, let flour and other products of wheat bear a proportionate duty.

We sincerely request that you give this matter serious consideration, and see to it that the producer of wheat as well as the miller gets protection he is justly entitled to.

Yours, truly,

CANADIAN MILL & ELEVATOR CO.,
H. K. SCHAFER, *Manager.*

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *April 15, 1913.*

Hon. DICK T. MORGAN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We notice that the new tariff bill places rolled oats, oatmeal, and oat hulls on the free list. In fairness and justice to the American manufacturer of rolled oats, we believe that Congress should place a tariff on the manufactured products in strict keeping with that of raw material which, according to schedule, will remain practically unchanged.

We believe a duty of 55 cents per hundred pounds on rolled oats and oatmeal and 15 cents on oat feed or oat hulls would be in the right proportions with the proposed duty on raw material, and constitute the measure of protection due the American manufacturer.

Under the proposed act the rolled-oats and oatmeal business of the United States would be wholly at the mercy of foreign competition, more especially with Canada, since the home manufacturer would not have the opportunity of importing his raw material on the same basis as his foreign competitor could ship into the United States his manufactured products.

It seems to us that from such an unjust discrimination between the raw and manufactured products, nothing short of a disastrous end can come to our home manufacturers.

In thus exterminating the home manufacturer, we can see in our imagination such destruction to the home market for raw material as to render the profit to the producer almost, if not quite, extinct.

Anything which you can conscientiously do in defeat of the proposed act, placing this item on the free list, we assure you will be duly appreciated, not only by ourselves and the home manufacturers, but the farmers as well.

Yours, very truly,

CARROLL, BROUGH & ROBINSON,
By J. T. ROBINSON,
Secretary and Treasurer.

EL RENO, OKLA., *April 5, 1913.*

Hon. D. T. MORGAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We received word that the new tariff bill about to be considered in Congress provides a duty of 7½ cents a bushel on wheat, while flour and feed are placed on the free list. We immediately wired you that this would be a deathblow to the milling industry of this country, urging that flour, feed, and wheat all be put on a parity.

We do not know the exact figures, but think on a 10 years' average the farmer receives 2 to 3 cents per bushel above the export price for his wheat. This is due to domestic requirements being so close to production. Domestic consumption, of course, is entirely by millers, and should they be eliminated the farmer would be forced to sell his entire crop for export at a considerably lower price than he has heretofore been getting.

The millers do not ask for any protection or favors of any kind, but they are surely entitled to the same advantage from our Government as the Canadian and English millers. This bill in effect, however, discriminates against us in favor of the foreigner.

Trust that you will see the injustice of this act and will succeed in securing this parity of duty on grain and flour and feed.

Yours, truly,

EL RENO MILL & ELEVATOR CO.,
K. E. HUMPHREY,
Secretary and Treasurer.

Mr. Chairman, upon this matter of a tariff upon agricultural products I like to look at it from a broad national viewpoint. There are 3,000,000 square miles of area in continental United States, 1,908,000,000 acres of land. Eight hundred and eighty-five million acres are included within our farms. Four hundred and eighty-five million acres of that land in farms are improved. In other words, only one-half of our farm lands to-day are improved. Three-fourths of the area of our country is not improved. The men who have given the greatest study to this agricultural question believe in intensifying our farming, in scientific farming, in aiding and developing the great farming interests of this country so as to enable them to produce what is necessary for all our people.

Give our farmers a fair chance, give them prices that will make their labor remunerative, and they will furnish products in abundance for all.

The farmers are entitled to the same protection we give the manufacturers. Competition is no more injurious to the manufacturer than to the farmer. The farmer is entitled to the home market as much as the owners of our manufacturing plants. To open our markets to the cheap farm products of Canada, Mexico, South America, and other countries where the price of labor is often not one-fifth what it costs the farmer in this country is unjust, unfair, and not for the welfare of any class of our citizenship. Farming is not only the chief industry of Oklahoma, but it is the greatest industry of the Nation. If our legislation makes the farmers prosperous, all other classes will share in that prosperity.

The provisions of this bill are also unjust to the millers of this country.

Why should we enact laws that will embarrass or endanger any industry? Why should we legislate in a way that will depreciate the value of the mills in this country? I protest against the provisions of this bill relating to wheat and flour as detrimental to both the farmers and millers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] to answer a question. He has just stated that May wheat was selling in Chicago for 92 cents and on the same day in Winnipeg for 94 cents. Does the

gentleman have reference to the present market and the 1912 crop?

Mr. RAINEY. That refers to the present prices in Chicago.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber, you have been deceived, unless you have made an independent investigation. I trust that this House wants to be fair. I trust that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] wants to be fair, and I want to say to you that the prices of wheat that Mr. RAINEY gave are on a par with a great many other things that evidently have crept in here.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I read those quotations from the Chicago Inter Ocean, a Republican newspaper.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Very good. I am going to relieve the gentleman of the position in which he has placed himself. I want to say it is unfair, and I want to say that no man can take up one of these schedules and digest it within a year, while we are forced to pass upon the entire bill within a week. If we had a proper tariff commission, we would have authentic and unbiased information. I am going to quote to you the actual range of prices covering a sufficient length of time to warrant their use as actually showing the facts. I have here a table contained on page 425 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, prepared by the Tariff Board, which shows the price of wheat in Minneapolis and in Winnipeg for 6 years, and out of the 72 months only six times was the average price higher in Winnipeg than in Minneapolis. Eighteen times it was more than 10 cents higher in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg, and 45 times it was at least 5 cents higher in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg. When you confine yourself to one single year in getting statistics it is not fair. It is misleading, and it shows you have not investigated the subject, and anyone who relies on that statement is depending on information that is not reliable. Let me tell you why the price of wheat in Chicago and Minneapolis to-day is less than it is in Winnipeg. If you will just go out to the great States of North and South Dakota and Minnesota and see what we produced in 1912, you will understand. Out of 621,000,000 bushels of wheat produced in the United States we produced in those three States 263,000,000 bushels. Do you not think that that will affect those markets. We never had such a crop and probably will never have such a crop again. When you are estimating prices do not confine yourself to 1 year. Cover a period of 10 years if you can—the further back the better. When you take an isolated case and base your argument on that to show that the prices in Chicago and Minneapolis are lower than in Winnipeg, I say it is manifestly unfair; and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] should have known it, and especially since he is the member of the Ways and Means Committee having charge of this schedule and upon whom the membership of the House must rely for its information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to some of the remarks of gentlemen on the other side, particularly the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND] and a few others who said that we have nothing to fear from Canada. Evidently they are proceeding upon the theory that when this bill is passed all progress is going to stop, not only in this country but in Canada. Canada is a new country, and I presume there is not a man on that side of the House who realizes that you can draw a line through the city of Winnipeg north and south, and that the Canadian territory west of that line will support the entire population of the United States. They do not realize that Canada is in the near future going to raise more wheat annually than the United States has ever raised in all its history, and that, Mr. Chairman, means that we will have something to fear, providing they can raise the wheat more cheaply than we can. On the subject of the price of wheat, let me illustrate: A neighbor of mine last fall took two samples of wheat from my home town to Saskatchewan, where some of his relatives live. One sample was graded as No. 1 northern in my town and the other was graded as No. 2. When he got to Saskatchewan, for the No. 1 northern he was offered No. 4, and the other, our No. 2, they would not grade at all.

Now, the way they grade their wheat in Canada, No. 1 hard is quoted at a high price, but no wheat is ever sold or scarcely any at the No. 1 price. The price they do sell their wheat at there is such that were they to cross this line they would get from one to four grades higher on this side than on the other. If you take that into consideration, my friends, there will be a vast difference in our favor between the Canadian price and the American price, and when you talk about their milling capacity they have more water power than we have, so that they can extend their milling capacity without limit. If you think for one minute they are not going to remove the duty on flour that goes into Canada in order to get the benefit of free flour there you are assuming they are a lot of idiots, and they have demonstrated in the last few years that there is no more capable, intelligent business men on earth than the Canadian, and they are going to remove the duty on our flour in order that they may enjoy the greatest market the world has got. We consume 20 per cent of all the manufactured products of the world, and you can rest assured it is not long before Canada is going to take advantage of what you are offering them in this bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the position of the committee now, they promised free food in the original bill, and for that reason they put flour on the free list and they heard from the millers of the country. I heard some echoes of that in my own office, and for reason of these loud protests they concluded to break 10 per cent of their promises on flour and report a duty of 10 cents on wheat and 10 per cent on flour. As long as you have broken your promises, why not give a duty that would be proportionate, so there will not be any undue importation of free articles and you will raise the revenue that you are so anxious about. I heard some echoes about buckwheat, and a gentleman came into my office, who lives in my district, who said he had the largest buckwheat mill in the country, if not in the world, perhaps, which ground exclusively buckwheat flour, and they had a meeting of a large number of millers making buckwheat flour, from Pennsylvania, and they sent him down as the buckwheat spokesman. He said he wanted one of two things—either free buckwheat or a duty on buckwheat flour. They have got the buckwheat on the free list. He wanted to know what he should do. I told him I did not have anything more to do with this bill, thank God, than he did, and of all things that have been charged against me I was not responsible for a line of it. But I did tell him where I thought he should go to interview some men, and he seems to have gotten in his work.

I told him that it was an uphill job, because the Member from our State was more interested in some things down about Manhattan Island than in raising buckwheat and making buckwheat flour up in my district, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania had his hands more than full, but he went notwithstanding, and what was the result? Why, to even up things they put buckwheat on the free list as well as buckwheat flour, so you have another thing added to the inharmonious aspect of this bill running through every other line of it. Buckwheat free, buckwheat flour free, wheat on the dutiable list and 10 per cent on flour, but to be free in the end. They make promises and break them, because they know and everybody knows Canada will take off the little duty on flour in order to set to work the mills of Canada, which have the capacity to make 50 per cent more flour than they are making now. Oh, it is a beautiful bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the committee has already determined by a vote to keep the duty of 10 cents per bushel on wheat. By all principles of fairness if there be a duty of 10 cents per bushel on wheat the amendment to place a duty on flour ought to prevail in the interest of having wheat milled into flour in our own country instead of in Canada. I was pleased, however, and somewhat surprised to hear my distinguished friend from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] apparently advocate either a reduction on wheat or a duty on flour. The pending measure carries 10 cents a bushel on wheat and no duty on flour except under certain conditions.

When the duty on wheat was 25 cents a bushel instead of 10 cents a bushel, the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] a year ago voted to place flour on the free list, while 25 cents a bushel still remained on wheat—much more onerous for the miller than the proposition of 10 cents a bushel on wheat and no duty on flour. He not only voted for the bill when it passed the House, but he voted to override the veto of the President after the President had vetoed the bill on the distinct ground that to leave a duty on wheat at 25 cents a bushel and then place flour on the free list would be destructive of American milling interests. And I am delighted and pleased beyond measure that we have gathered to this side of the House the gentleman from Kansas, now in favor of the proposition which he then voted against. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed——

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, has the time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. The time has not expired. There are six minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND] on the frankness

and squareness which characterized the statement which prefaced his remarks a few moments ago. The squareness was like him and worthy of him, and I want to express for myself and my colleagues our appreciation of his action. I only regret that his Democratic colleagues on the committee do not appear as willing to protect the interests of the State of Minnesota as he.

I realize that gentlemen on that side of the aisle will not pay much attention to what we Republicans may say, and so I want to read for your edification a letter which I received from a lifelong Democrat in my district. It is as follows:

PRESTON STOCK FARM,
Preston, Fillmore County, Minn., April 9, 1913.

Hon. SYDNEY ANDERSON.

DEAR SIR: As a lifelong Democrat, but never an office seeker, I want to protest against the financial idiocy that takes the tariff from flour and leaves it on wheat. I am devoted to Democratic principles, and have proven the fact by answering the call of Douglas and Logan to stand by the Union, wearing a blue uniform as a Democrat and remaining one since, while knocking out a living by hard work. This entitles me, in my opinion, to the privilege of protesting against being financially murdered by a bunch of Democratic theorists who never did an honest day's work in their lives. What are the dairy farmers of your district going to do for mill stuff with the mills shut down? We raise no wheat to speak of. Leaving the tariff on wheat and taking it off flour transfers the milling industry to Canada. Any fool can see that. Leave the tariff on both or take it of from both. Can not you make my bonehead brother Democrats see this? Or will the owners of the Democratic donkey have to pull its ears? We who own it are competent to do the job.

What satisfaction will it be to a city consumer to buy Canadian flour after our mills are shut down? Will he get it any cheaper? By no means; he will pay more. After the 10-cent tariff on wheat has closed our mills, consumers will have to pay the penalty that monopoly exacts. When we can not get bran and shorts for our cows, except from Canada, dairy farming will suffer a more severe blow than my fellow partisan, Burleson, has sought to inflict upon us in his oleo propaganda.

Slaughtered in the house of our friends is the legend I suggest for the tombstones of Democrats crushed by a tariff provision that benefits no American, and I wonder what there is in Democracy that goes to some men's heads and makes them foolish. Don't hesitate to read this to my fellow Democrats. I am not an office seeker, only a voting Democrat with calloused hands, who swallowed Greely and offered to carry arms again for Tilden.

I hate a rascal, but a fool is worse, and the men who can not see that a tariff on wheat and none on flour is foolish are simply fools; and you are mighty welcome to tell them so for a Democrat who was a fighting Democrat 50 years ago.

Yours, truly, M. T. GRATTAN.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment——

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, has all time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. There are three minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, we have been reminded by some gentleman on the other side of the aisle that the United States has nothing to fear from wheat production in the Dominion of Canada. I want to remind them that in the year of 1910 Canada produced 166,745,000 bushels of wheat. Canada had available for export in that year 95,000,000 bushels of wheat. The United States in that year——

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman permit me to state how much the United States produced in that year?

Mr. POWERS. What is that?

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman permit me to state how much the United States produced in that year?

Mr. POWERS. I have no objection.

Mr. RAINEY. It produced 621,338,000 bushels.

Mr. POWERS. While that is true, the United States exported in that year only 114,000,000 bushels of wheat, and Canada exported in that year 57,000,000 bushels of wheat, a good deal of it coming to the United States. And I would remind them further——

Mr. RAINEY. There could not be more than 1,000,000 bushels come to the United States.

Mr. POWERS. I said 57,000,000 bushels of wheat.

Mr. RAINEY. You just said that 1,000,000 came to the United States in that year.

Mr. POWERS. Canada exported in the year 1910, 57,000,000 bushels of wheat, a good deal of it coming to the United States.

Mr. RAINEY. Does the gentleman object to my stating how much came to the United States in that year?

Mr. POWERS. I have only three minutes.

Mr. RAINEY. One million one hundred thousand bushels came to the United States in that year.

Mr. POWERS. Canada has 3,000,000 acres of wheat land. She produces on an average of 22 bushels per acre, while in the United States we are only able to produce on an average of 15 bushels per acre.

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman permit me to state what the wheat acreage was in that year? According to the Canadian Year Book it was 9,299,000 acres.

Mr. POWERS. Canada, nowithstanding the fact that she is producing this enormous quantity of wheat, and notwithstanding the further fact that she has 30,000,000 acres of wheat lands available for the production of wheat, has a population of only 8,000,000 people, while the United States has a population of about 100,000,000 people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division on that.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 73, noes 113.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

199. Biscuits, bread, wafers, cakes, and other baked articles, by whatever name known, when combined with chocolate, nuts, fruit, or confectionery of any kind, and without regard to the component material of chief value, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 51, line 17, after the word "articles," insert the words "and puddings."

Mr. MANN. You will be a pudding for us!

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] presents a committee amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 51, line 17, strike out the words "when combined with" and insert the word "containing."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

200. Butter and butter substitutes, 3 cents per pound.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, line 21, page 51, by striking out "3" and inserting "3½."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the item refers to the duty on butter.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, has that paragraph been read?

Mr. MANN. Yes; it has been read.

Mr. GOOD. The bill places the duty at 3 cents per pound. The amendment which I have offered places the duty at the rate carried in the Payne law of 3½ cents.

Mr. MANN. It is given here as 6 cents in the Payne law.

Mr. PAYNE. According to this print it is 6 cents.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a circular, circulated in the cities of the United States in the campaign of 1910, a part of which reads as follows:

Voters and householders, read the within carefully. How to save your money. Take it into the booth with you when you vote. Vote for your families. High-cost-of-living facts. Read carefully and ponder well. Vote right. Eighteen hundred and ninety-six prices—1910. The Republican Party has been in complete control of every department of the Government since 1896—President, Senate, and Congress. They have given you a government of trusts—Beef Trust, Sugar Trust, Flour Trust, Clothing Trust—and the daddy of them all, the Tariff Trust.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

See the result below.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], the expert on this committee, made a statement a few moments ago to the effect that the difference between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party lay in the fact that the platform pledges of the Democratic Party were redeemed when that party got in power. Let us examine the facts with regard to this schedule.

The Payne law did not alter the duty on butter at all. The duty on butter under the Dingley bill was 6 cents a pound and, if the gentleman is correct, it was 6 cents a pound in the Payne bill. The statement which your committee sent out in 1910 is that butter in 1896 was 10 cents a pound, and you say that the price in 1910 was 30 cents a pound, an increase of 300 per cent, resulting from what? From not doing a single thing with regard to the tariff on butter, but by leaving it just as it was.

Mr. RAINEY. The Elgin Butter Trust.

Mr. GOOD. Now, I want to ask the gentleman if the action of that Congress in not changing the duty on butter, in not lowering or increasing it at all, increased the price to the ultimate consumer 300 per cent, how much will the reduction of 40 per cent proposed in the bill increase the price to the ultimate consumer?

Mr. RAINEY. The price of butter has been increased by the Elgin Butter Trust.

Mr. GOOD. How about the millions of farmers who are making butter and selling it in the markets?

Mr. RAINEY. They do not make that kind of butter.

A MEMBER. They make better butter.

Mr. RAINEY. Before the gentleman qualifies as a farmer——

Mr. GOOD. Perhaps they make a better kind of butter.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the price of butter now?

Mr. GOOD. I am not an expert on that. The gentleman who prepared that campaign document perhaps can tell what it is.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Forty cents.

Mr. RAINEY. It keeps getting higher and higher. It will commence to get lower now.

Mr. GOOD. How much lower will it commence to get after this bill passes?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the committee and of the gentleman from Alabama to the report on this bill, page 162, butter and substitutes therefor. The duty is reduced from 6 cents a pound in the Payne bill to 3 cents a pound in the Underwood bill, presumably for the purpose of raising revenue, which is reduced from $60,000 under the Payne bill to $39,000, estimated, under the Underwood bill. But as to the cost of living, the unit value of butter under the Payne bill is given at 23 cents a pound, and under the Underwood bill, the duty being reduced, at 25 cents a pound. I should like to ask whether that is a typographical error? The price of the commodity to the consumer seems to be raised under this system. Before the gentleman answers that question I will call his attention to cheese and substitutes therefor, reported on the same page. There is a reduction of duty there from 32 per cent ad valorem under the Payne bill to 20 per cent under the Underwood bill.

The duty, of course, is reduced for the purpose of revenue only, but the price of cheese to the consumer, this being an article very much needed by the poor consumer, is apparently raised from 18 cents in the Payne bill to 19 cents in the Underwood bill. This may also be a mistake. It may be purely typographical; but it would appear on looking at eggs, page 165, that the duty on eggs in the Payne tariff bill was 5 cents a dozen, and the duty is to be reduced to 2 cents a dozen in the Underwood bill. The unit value of the eggs in the Payne bill is given at 13.7, and in the Underwood bill, the duty being lowered, the price of the eggs is increased to the consumer to 14 cents a dozen. Now, it may be that these are all clerical errors and that the committee has made a mistake. It would seem so, because the purpose of the committee, as I understand it, is to take the duties off in order that the price of living to the consumer may be reduced.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman will allow me to refer to rose plants and things of that kind, I think I can show that throughout this series of tables as the duty is taken off and the opportunity to the producer to obtain a fair profit for his commodity is reduced the price to the consumer, whoever he is, is increased, as proven at least by the figures in these three tables I have quoted. It is an interesting study in statistics, and might possibly be explained by the philosophers on the other side who are teaching us how to keep wages up and prices down.

Mr. GOOD. Perhaps this campaign circular disclosed what is meant on that subject.

Mr. MOORE. I have heard the gentleman refer to that several times, and I am inclined to think that campaign circular was one of those 1,100,001 lies that were circulated so successfully through the newspapers and handbills that they completely deceived the people in the last campaign as to the real intent of the Democratic Party to reduce the cost of living.

Mr. GOOD. With regard to eggs, they propose by the same reduction——

Mr. MOORE. To raise the price to the consumer.

Mr. GOOD. Reduce the price 15 cents a dozen to the consumer.

Mr. MOORE. When the poor consumer gets his end of it, as he will in the course of time, he will understand the circular which the gentleman has read.

Mr. GOOD. First they propose to reduce the duty 3 cents a pound on butter and they propose to reduce the price to the consumer 10 cents a pound.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman represents the producer in butter, and I represent the consumer. The gentleman says his producers are going to be hurt, and I say the price to the consumer is going to be increased. That is true Democratic philosophy. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

201. Cheese and substitutes therefor, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, we produce in this country under this paragraph and the preceding one dairy products amounting to $250,000,000 worth a year. It so happens that the amount of consumption is practically the same equivalent, around the figures of one-quarter of a billion dollars every year. Of course, the purpose of our Democratic tariff blacksmiths is to increase importations of these articles and all others that they have made these great reductions of the tariff upon.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a number of blacksmiths in my district, and on behalf of those blacksmiths I object. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. They stated that as a governing principle forming the basis of their reductions, they have no regard for protection. In the second place, they make such reductions as will lead to a material increase of importations. They have not favored the country with a statement of what the total amount of increased importations is to be. They have in some respects. As to articles left on the dutiable list, they have estimated that the imports will be $39,000,000 more than in 1912, but they have taken off the dutiable list and put on the free list articles of value imported in 1912 to the amount of $102,000,000. It goes without saying that if you take articles off the dutiable list and put them on the free list the quantity of importations will very much increase.

Take the sugar question. Sixty million dollars in round figures of beet sugar is grown in this country, and it will in time under free trade come near disappearing entirely. The nearest we have had to an estimate from these responsible gentlemen who are rearranging the tariff, was when the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] was addressing the House, and I asked him what was their estimate of the probable increased importations, and after consulting at his elbow the gentleman from Alabama, my understanding of the estimate was that in round figures it amounted to $286,000,000. That is a very great disturbance in the amount of consumption of American products. What is to become of the equivalent of the goods of American products to be displaced by that amount of foreign goods? They say that this tariff is made for the consumer. The Republican tariff was always made for the producer. Our idea is that if you can keep everybody a producer the country is growing wealthy, and every man worth his salt is a producer as well as a consumer. It is only the idle rich and the weary Willies, who count the ties on the railways, that are not producers. We do not make tariffs for those people. What are you going to do with the labor and the products that are to be displaced by the $300,000,000 worth of foreign goods to take the place of the American manufactures? One of two things must happen, either that much production must cease or else that much of production must find a market abroad.

The schoolmaster from New Jersey occupying the White House assured us that by sharpening up our wits and by allowing these people to come in and compete with us and take a portion of our market we will be able to drive them out of some other market, and in conformity with the same theory the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] says, in his report, that, in his judgment, the future of American commerce will be found across the seas. Evidently it will not be found at home, and if the gentlemen who have suggested this marvelous proposition about sharpening our wits by allowing foreigners to come in and drive us out of our own markets will suggest a way whereby we may drive them out of their markets there would be some hope in the proposition. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

202. Beans, not specially provided for, 25 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 24, after the word "beans" insert the words "and lentils."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 24, after the word "for," strike out the figure "25" and insert "45."

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for this reason: The amendment, if adopted, would restore in this bill the rates in the Payne law. The State of Michigan is one of the great States of the Union in the production of beans, covered by this paragraph. A normal crop of beans in the State of Michigan is about 15,000,000 bushels a year. The importations of beans last year, as given in the handbook, were valued at $1.76 per bushel. That is the foreign value. The estimated value of beans under the new proposed tariff law would be $1.60 per bushel. A reduction of 20 cents a bushel to the farmers of Michigan means $3,000,000 a year. I submit that on that single crop alone it is a rather high price for the people of the State of Michigan to pay for Democratic rule. This is one of the important crops of the State. Michigan lies along the border of Canada. Canada is the greatest bean-producing country in the world.

The Michigan farmers, therefore, would be more affected than the farmers of any other State in the Union except the States in the Northwest. Therefore I submit it is unfair to reduce the duty on this product. If it does not lower the price 20 cents a bushel, then the farmer is not in any way injured, and neither is the consumer benefited, but the Treasury of the United States would be deprived of just that much money in duties to which it is justly entitled under such circumstances. If by reducing the duty 20 cents a bushel the price is brought down from $2.21 duty to $1.85, under the figures given in the handbook, I submit it is rather a high price for the people of Michigan to pay for their own folly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

203. Beets, 10 per cent ad valorem; sugar beets, 5 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Some time ago the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] read an excerpt from an article in a California newspaper in reference to the labor conditions on the beet farms in Sutter County. The truth of the matter is that some time ago the Alameda Beet Sugar Co. contemplated erecting a beet-sugar factory in the town of Meridian, in Sutter County. They contemplated spending $2,000,000 on the factory and in the acreage. They have $45,000 worth of steel on the ground now, but knowing that this bill will be enacted into law, the construction of that factory has been abandoned.

There are in California 25,000 people engaged in the beet-sugar industry. Of that number less than 500 are orientals, and most of them are employed on the beet farms. We do not want the orientals. California has recently shown to the world that she is willing to go to the limit of her constitutional authority to stop the immigration of orientals into this country. We want the help of the people of the United States, for this country always has been and is now, and, I pray God, always will be a white man's country, enjoying a white man's civilization, which is the result of the best thoughts and best efforts of the best minds that have inhabited and benefited the earth by right living and exalted thinking.

While the desire for liberty is as old as the aspirations of the human heart for higher and better conditions, the liberty we enjoy is a new thing in government, and dates practically from the Revolutionary War. It cost unnumbered precious lives and untold treasure. It is our obligation to transmit it to posterity as pure as we received it from the founders and preservers of the Republic, who suffered so much and mutually pledged their lives, their fortunes, and sacred honor in order that they and we might be free. The people of a republic can only maintain their liberty as long as the people are homogeneous, speak the same language, and occupy contiguous territory, worship the same God, and are intelligent, law-abiding citizens who love liberty and are willing to defend it. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman desire to speak on this paragraph?

Mr. MANN. About three minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in three minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph provides for a rate of duty on sugar beets of 5 per cent. The committee this afternoon voted to place sugar on the free list at the end of three years, although this duty of 5 per cent on the beets from which the sugar is made would still remain. I would like to know upon what theory it is proposed to put beet sugar on the free list and retain the duty on sugar beets from which it is made. If anybody can explain that theory I take off my hat to the gentleman if the explanation is satisfactory. [Applause on the Republican side.] You are proposing—I am not appealing to the intelligence of some of the gentlemen on the other side, because I know how vain an appeal would be to their intelligence. [Applause on the Republican side.] You propose to take off the duty on sugar, thereby rendering probable the closing of the sugar-beet factories, and at the same time say that the raw material from which they make the sugar shall remain upon the dutiable list. Upon what theory? Is it protection or revenue? What revenue do you expect to derive from 5 per cent duty on sugar beets? If it is not for revenue, is it protection, and when did you become protectionists? Now, I defy gentlemen to give a sensible or reasonable explanation of the self-apparent contradiction. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The Clerk read as follows:

204. Beans, peas, prepared or preserved, or contained in tins, jars, bottles, or similar packages, including the weight of immediate coverings, 1 cent per pound; mushrooms and truffles, 2½ cents per pound.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, in line 202, page 51, I move to strike out the figures "25" and insert "45," and upon this question I would like to be heard for a brief time.

The bean crop is one of the most important in the State of Michigan, as well as in the sixth congressional district of that State. This bill reduces the tariff on beans from 45 cents per bushel to 25 cents per bushel. If the bill is permitted to become a law in its present form, I fear that Canada, whose border line is just across the river from Michigan, and produces beans in great abundance, will take possession of the Detroit and other markets, as she did under the Wilson-Gorman bill, and greatly injure, if not practically ruin, the industry in Michigan.

Michigan raises 70 per cent or more of the bean crop of the United States, or more than 6,000,000 bushels out of the ten million or more bushels raised in the United States. The farmers of Michigan receive a handsome return annually, aggregating between ten and fifteen million dollars each year for their bean crop.

Scattered along the railways at many stations throughout my district one can find bean houses, where many women are employed at splendid wages. I fear that if this bill becomes a law that not only the farmers and local buyers will be greatly injured, but that the splendid wages which have been paid to women for work in the bean houses will be greatly reduced.

In the consideration of this bill it is worthy of note that the Japanese beans are making greater and greater inroads upon our shores every year, and that when the Panama Canal is opened, as is expected in the near future, this will allow the Japanese to raise and carry their beans direct to the best markets in this country in their own vessels.

This question is of unusual importance in my district, and especially to the farmers in the counties of Livingston and Genesee, and in portions of Oakland, Wayne, and Ingham Counties.

Some of our farmers have been engaged in raising sugar beets, and if it is your determined intention to destroy this industry in the next three years, then the farmers of Michigan will have lost two great and profitable industries—beans and sugar beets—and as a result will not have as wide a field in which to diversify their crops, but will be limited to corn, oats, potatoes, and wheat, which on the whole is no longer very profitable to the farmers of Michigan; so I hope that this bill

will not be enacted into law in its present form, but that the duty will remain at its present rate.

Mr. Chairman, I want to avail myself of this opportunity to point out conditions as they existed in this country in the closing years of the tariff act of 1846.

It has been asserted more than once in this debate that legislation similar to this which we are about to enact has heretofore been successful in this country. I want to assert, without fear of successful contradiction, that such is not the case, and that every tariff for revenue or free-trade act that has been passed in this country since its birth has been a failure, and if time and opportunity permitted I could cite many instances. At this time I want to call your attention to an article which appeared in the New York Tribune in December, 1854.

THE PROPHECIES FULFILLED.

On December 18, 1854, the New York Tribune published a collection of facts which showed the dreary and prospectively desperate condition of industry and commerce. It showed that the chief industries necessary to the life of the Nation were partially or wholly collapsed through the influences and effects of the British free-trade doctrines put into operation here by the tariff of 1846; that our people had been brought to a condition which in Europe is attendant upon revolution; and that in every occupation and branch of business the depression was so terrible that one-half or more of all employees had been thrown out of employment. The Tribune added:

"What a picture is here presented! We have supported European manufacturers and artisans and middlemen to the neglect, loss, and destruction of our own men of industry and talent, of whatever kind, and that is the sole reason of our difficulty."

One year later, January 15, 1855, the New York Tribune printed the following pathetic article, which explains itself:

"Who is hungry? Go and see. You that are full fed and know not what it is to be hungry—perhaps never saw a hungry man—go and see. Go and see thousands, men and women, boys and girls, old and young, black and white, of all nations, crowding and jostling each other, almost fighting for a first chance, acting more like hungry wolves than human beings, in a land of plenty, waiting till the food is ready for distribution. Such a scene may be seen every day between 11 and 2 o'clock around the corner of Orange and Chatham Streets, where charity gives a dinner to the poor and soup and bread to others to carry to their miserable families.

"On Saturday we spent an hour there at the hour of high tide. We have never seen anything like it before. Upward of a thousand people were fed with a plate of soup, a piece of bread, and a piece of meat on the premises, and in all more than 1,600. On the same day 1,130 portions of soup were dealt out from Stewart's 'soup kitchen,' corner of Reade Street and Broadway. At the rooms on Duane Street for the relief of the poor, on the same day, they gave food to 2,256. In the sixth ward alone over 6,000 persons were fed by charity on Saturday, January 13. And this is only one day in one ward. Meanwhile scenes of a like nature are being enacted all over the city.

"The cry of hard times reaches us from every part of the country. The making of roads is stopped, factories are closed, and houses and ships are no longer being built. Factory hands, road makers, carpenters, bricklayers, and laborers are idle, and paralysis is rapidly embracing every pursuit in the country. The cause of all this stoppage of circulation is to be found in the steady outflow of gold to pay foreign laborers for the cloth, the shoes, the iron, and the other things that could be produced by American labor, but which can not be so produced under our present revenue system. The convulsion would have come upon us sooner but for the extraordinary demand in Europe for breadstuffs, growing out of huge famines and big wars, and but for the dazzling and magnificent discovery of gold mines in California, by which hard money, sufficient to buy an empire, has been called into existence and exported to Europe. If we could stop the import of the foreign articles the gold would cease to flow out to pay for them, and money would then again become more abundant, labor would then again be in demand, shoes, clothing, and other commodities would then again be in demand, and men would then cease to starve in the streets of our towns and cities. If it be not stopped the gold must continue to go abroad, and employment must become from day to day more scarce, until where there are now many thousands we shall see tens of thousands of men everywhere crying: 'Give me work! Only give me work! Make your own terms—my wife and children have nothing to eat!'"

As one reads the above, are they not forcibly reminded, especially if they lived during those days, of another Democratic tariff-for-revenue, free-trade period—the dark days from 1893 to 1897, under the Wilson-Gorman bill? During both of these periods there were similar experiences—the soup houses, factories closed, thousands of honest but idle laboring men who were willing to work, but there was no work for them. Listen to the cry of the laboring man in a land of plenty like this, or, at least, where there ought to be sufficient for all to eat and plenty of work to do: "Give me work; only give me work; make your own terms; my wife and children have nothing to eat."

I wonder that in the debate upon this important legislation that no Democrat has sought to explain these conditions as they have occurred from time to time under legislation similar to that which you are about to enact. Can you not give us some hope or consolation for the future, pointing out specifically where we can expect that the results will be different than they have been heretofore under similar tariff acts?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto now close.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from California was shut out before.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We must make progress on the bill. I did not start until gentlemen insisted on continuing political speeches. I want to say that if gentlemen want to debate the paragraphs in the bill they must confine themselves to the subject matter of the paragraph. I ask unanimous consent to close debate on the paragraph in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate be closed on the paragraph in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYES. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that the State of California has for many years grown a very large quantity of beans and we come in direct competition with the Orient. Until five years ago we had no competition from Asia, but beginning then we began to receive beans from Japan and Manchuria and during the last few years the average importation from the Orient of beans has averaged over 100,000 bushels per year. If with the tariff at 45 cents per bushel this competition has constantly increased, what will happen to the bean producers of the Pacific if the tariff is reduced to 25 cents per bushel? Now, in spite of the conditions that have existed the price of beans has not been excessive and during the past four or five years they have never gone above 3½ cents a pound. One county in my district has half its arable acreage planted in beans each year—the county of Ventura.

Those beans are generally lima beans. And not only are we menaced with the competition from the Orient, but beans have been coming from South Africa in the last few years to compete with our farmers of the Pacific coast. Under these circumstances I can not understand upon what theory the Committee on Ways and Means proceeded when reducing the tariff on beans from 45 to 25 cents per bushel.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

205. Vegetables, if cut, sliced, or otherwise reduced in size, or if parched or roasted, or if pickled, or packed in salt, brine, oil, or prepared in any way; any of the foregoing not specially provided for in this section, and bean stick or bean cake, miso, and similar products, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In July, 1911, an act was passed by the Congress of the United States known as the reciprocity act——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order; that is not on the paragraph.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not desire to hear the gentleman on the point of order, and he will proceed in order.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is somewhat of a mind reader if he knows what I am going to say.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I knew what the gentleman was saying, and it did not pertain to this paragraph.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I propose to discuss this paragraph, and I intend to keep nearer in order than the gentleman was for half an hour yesterday in discussing his personal interests in this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this bill we have here before this committee, upon which I wish to make some remarks if the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] will permit and not indulge in political speeches himself, permits practically every product of the fields, the forests, the mines, and the waters of Canada to come in here free of duty or at a greatly reduced rate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not confining himself to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. These provisions have been enacted without asking anything whatever from Canada in return. We have taken off the duty entirely on flour, on potatoes, and they have reduced it in a large number of particulars as to agricultural products. They have taken it off of sawed lumber without, as I have said, asking for anything whatever in return.

Now, I would like to know of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] what justification he can give for this and the other reductions in the duties which are made by this bill without asking anything from foreign nations?

Some time ago, about two years—and the gentleman from Alamaba can interrupt me, if he desires, and I will stop if he does not like to hear it—this House passed what was known as the Canadian reciprocity act. It was one of the most unpopular provisions among the farmers of this Nation that ever went through this House, and it contributed more than anything else to the defeat of the Republican candidate for Presi-

dent. I have always wondered, Mr. Chairman, why it was when this agreement was so advantageous to the Canadians that they rejected it, but I can understand it perfectly now. They knew the gentleman from Alabama, leading the Democratic hosts here in this House, would give them everything they had by that provision of reciprocity, so called, and a great deal more in addition, and ask nothing whatever in return for it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending paragraph now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that all debate on the pending paragraph be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

207. Cider, 2 cents per gallon.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Now we have something very important. I wonder who is the author of this great reduction. Cider in the present law, which, by the way, is imported at the price of $1.02 a gallon, carries the enormous duty of 5 cents a gallon, very nearly 5 per cent, and the distinguished authors of this provision—and I hope the authorship is scattered around among the whole 14 members of the majority—has seen fit to relieve the cider drinkers in the United States by reducing this 5-cent duty on a gallon down to 2 cents a gallon. I wonder if any of them figure out and are able to say just how much that would relieve the man who drinks a glass of cider out of this gallon when it comes into the United States. Why, we have reached to-day, Mr. Chairman, a condition of microscopic things in the revision of the tariff duty. What a wonderful reduction this is! How welcome it will be to the consumers of the United States to reduce the duty on cider from 5 cents a gallon to 2 cents a gallon!

Oh, it is another illustration of the wonderful mechanism displayed in regard to this bill, which was said a few moments ago to have been made by blacksmiths. [Laughter on the Republican side.] But that is a mistake, for blacksmiths do not use jackscrews in their work to a very alarming extent. [Laughter on the Republican side.] It was a microscopist that did this thing [renewed laughter on the Republican side], and it was the smallest, finest kind of a microscope. Oh, the man that conceived that—what a statesman he would make! [Laughter.] He ought to be President of the United States.

Mr. BLACKMON. He may be. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. He will be a president if the country ever discovers [applause on the Democratic side] the mind that is responsible for the authorship of this bill. They will make him president [renewed applause on the Democratic side] of some village debating society in one of the rural counties of some backward State. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

208. Eggs not specially provided for in this section, 2 cents per dozen; eggs frozen or otherwise prepared or preserved in tins or other packages, not specially provided for in this section, including the weight of the immediate coverings or containers, 2½ cents per pound.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the numeral "2," in line 17, and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "3," so that it will read "3 cents."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 17, strike out the figure "2" at the end of the line and insert in lieu thereof the figure "3."

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I assume that the reason a reduction was made from 5 cents a dozen to 2 cents a dozen was to reduce the cost of living. The price of eggs has been reasonably high for the last 15 years, and during that time the farmers of the country have reaped a very large benefit from their poultry yards. The average income to the farmers for the last two or three years has been in the neighborhood of $322,000,000 for eggs.

Now we are about to enter upon an era of low prices, low cost of living, and cheap things, and I take it that you want to make eggs just as cheap as possible. There never was a time within my recollection when eggs were as cheap as they were the last time the Democrats made a tariff law.

Mr. MANN. They sold then at 5 cents a dozen.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And there was a duty of 3 cents a dozen on eggs under the last Wilson bill. If the importations that are invited by this bill to come into the country displace the products of American labor, and therefore displace American labor itself, to the amount of over $300,000,000, there will be a lot of men out of work in this country who will need things just as cheap as they can get them.

They will need the flour just as cheap as you can make it, and if they can make flour cheaper in Canada than in the United States under the provisions of this bill the people who are out of work will need it. So that, after all, I am not so sure but that many of the provisions of the agricultural schedule are in perfect harmony with the rest of the bill as it has been prepared, because you are getting ready to feed the idle men that you are going to deprive of work by the provisions of this bill and by cheapening the things that the farmer raises to sell to the people of the country who are employed. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Two things are essential to a country's prosperity, namely, steady employment at the highest possible wage to the American laborer and good prices for the products of the American farmer, and you are making both of these conditions absolutely impossible during the time that the provisions of this law shall remain in effect. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and pending amendments close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] moves that all debate on this paragraph and all pending amendments thereto close in five minutes. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, the argument of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is a typical Republican argument. He outlines the theory upon which the Republican Party revises the tariff. A Republican revision is always in the interest of the trusts. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The gentleman attacks this very paragraph, and makes an amendment that would not help the farmers any if it went through, but which would be of immense value to these fellows who run cold-storage warehouses in the great cities. The farmer always sells his eggs on the lowest possible market, when eggs are the cheapest, and these cold-storage warehouses store them up, and the gentleman does not want eggs to come in from any other country to interfere with the cold-storage trust in this country.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; I will.

Mr. MANN. Does that argument apply also to the 2-cent duty that is carried in this bill?

Mr. RAINEY. No.

Mr. GOOD. It takes 3 cents to make that argument apply.

Mr. RAINEY. Let us see what the gentleman from Kansas is going to do. He raises the duty on eggs and makes it 3 cents, and he leaves in this paragraph frozen eggs at 2½ cents per pound. Now, the effect of the gentleman's amendment, if it should prevail, would be this—and it is a typical Republican way of revising the tariff, and that is the reason the people rebelled against the Republican Party, and that is the reason so few of them are found on that side of the House now. [Applause in the galleries.]

The CHAIRMAN. The galleries will refrain from any manifestations of approval or disapproval.

Mr. RAINEY. The frozen-egg industry is just commencing. They bring in frozen eggs from Manchuria. They break the eggs and put them in containers, and freeze them and bring them over here. Frozen eggs in this country are a by-product. When eggs are broken in transit in this country they freeze them and sell them in that way.

Now, the gentleman proposes to raise the tariff on shell eggs until it is higher than the tariff on frozen eggs, and by doing that he excludes from this country the only kind of eggs that can compete with the cold-storage warehouses, and he invites into this country these broken eggs from which the shells are removed, which come into the country from Manchuria. That is what he is trying to do, and that is a typical way of revising the tariff, and that is the theory upon which the Payne-Aldrich tariff was built all the way through.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Was that in the Wilson bill tariff of some 16 years ago?

Mr. RAINEY. In those days they did not have the frozen-egg industry.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Oh, they did not!

Mr. RAINEY. And if the gentleman knew anything about the industry he would know that.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman think they freeze eggs in cold storage?

Mr. RAINEY. Oh, the gentleman did not catch my argument at all; but that is not my fault.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

209. Eggs, dried, 10 cents per pound; eggs, yolk of, 10 per cent ad valorem; dried blood, when soluble, 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to obtain some information with regard to this agricultural schedule. I should like to get some information as to the theory on which it is constructed, without being accused of playing politics. In all earnestness I want to ask the gentleman how much he proposes to reduce the cost of eggs to the consumer by the reduction that is proposed in this bill, both dried eggs and fresh eggs? If the gentleman can not answer the question, here is the handbook of the Democratic party in 1910 on that subject, if he wants to refer to it.

Mr. PAYNE. Read it to him.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman in his handbook in 1910 said that the price of eggs was 10 cents a dozen.

Mr. RAINEY. I will state, if the gentleman wants me to answer his question——

Mr. GOOD. And that the tariff had increased the price to 30 cents a dozen.

Mr. RAINEY. If the gentleman will permit me to answer his question—the gentleman knows about as much about the tariff as the average Republican tariff maker. Dried eggs are not used in food at all. They are used in the industries.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman answer my question as to fresh eggs? How much does he propose to reduce the cost to the consumer?

Mr. PAYNE. Let us see what he knows about it.

Mr. GOOD. I want to know what the gentleman knows about it.

Mr. RAINEY. How much do you think it will reduce it?

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman said I did not know anything about it. I am coming now to the source of all information.

Mr. RAINEY. The gentleman can wait and see. We will all find out.

Mr. GOOD. Well, does the gentleman know how much it will reduce the cost of eggs?

Mr. RAINEY. If I did not know more about the tariff than the gentleman who is interrogating me does I would not disclose my ignorance.

Mr. MANN. Keep still then.

Mr. GOOD. It is because I do not know that I appeal to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RAINEY. It is not my fault that the gentleman does not know. The gentleman must not expect me to furnish him too much information.

Mr. MANN. We do not.

Mr. LANGLEY. There is no danger of that.

Mr. GOOD. But can the gentleman furnish me any information at all on the egg schedule?

Mr. RAINEY. We are not running a kindergarten school for the benefit of the gentleman.

Mr. GOOD. I want to know something about this question of the high cost of living and its relation to the tariff as far as eggs are concerned, and if the gentleman knows anything about it I hope he will enlighten me.

Mr. RAINEY. I will say that I do not want to burden the gentleman's apparently limited intellect with too much information to-night. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. No danger of that.

Mr. GOOD. I have appealed to the gentleman time and time again for information in regard to the tariff schedule as far as agricultural products are concerned, and have failed to elicit from him a spark of information or even of intelligence as to the price to the ultimate consumer. I will say that the statements contained in the circular I have referred to are absolutely false. It was circulated by the Democratic committee, and the gentleman knows that it is false. I have appealed to the gentleman, and he refuses to tell the Members of the House what effect this proposed bill will have on the price of eggs or on the prices of any other articles mentioned in the agricultural schedule. Does he know?

Mr. FORDNEY. Silence is consent.

Mr. GOOD. The silence would indicate that the gentleman knows absolutely nothing in regard to this subject.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, I stand for an immediate substantial downward revision of the tariff. I think it only fair to be reasonable and moderate in making the cuts till conditions can adjust themselves. I am printing with these remarks a table prepared and handed to me by Mr. F. R. Hathaway, of Detroit, Mich. It shows the products and the industries of the State of Washington that are affected by the tariff. I am willing for the rates to be reduced in every case where excessive, but I hope the committee will be fair and will make cuts by such degrees as will do the greatest good to the greatest number.

I have listened to the stock arguments of the Republican Party on the various phases of this tariff question till I have come to realize that there is a lack of genuineness of purpose in the things that are said. My friend over there has read from the campaign argument of the Democratic Party about the high cost of living, and his colleagues on the Republican side seem to think they score most convincing points when they show that the cost of living can not be greatly affected by certain reductions in tariff rates under consideration at this time.

To begin with, campaign pamphlets are not reliable and should not be deemed convincing in a discussion of this kind. We all heard of "the full dinner pail" of the Republican Party, and yet under the Republican Party program the poor have grown poorer and the rich richer. The burdens of life have continued to bear harder upon the backs of those who toil.

We know, everybody knows, that relief can not come alone from a revision of the tariff. The laborer and the farmer knows that it will take more than that. The work now being done in this poor and unsatisfactory manner is merely the beginning.

The high cost of living will come down, you can depend on it. The people will take hold of the Government in such way that present methods of revising the tariff will be improved, and finally the people will have their way about that. For my part I am glad of an income tax against the incomes principally of the rich. I know that will help reduce the high cost of living. But there are other things to be considered. Take the great fuel problem. The vast coal deposits of Alaska lie there, the property of the people, untouched, out of reach, while all classes, whether poor or rich, are compelled to pay exorbitant prices for fuel to men who have grown rich and flourished under the Republican rule. We propose to build railroads in Alaska and operate them by Government money. We will open the mines and bring the coal to market over Government rails and let the Government sell it at cost to the ultimate consumer.

Hon. Walter L. Fisher, former Secretary of the Interior, spoke recently concerning the Alaska situation as follows:

> Responsibility for the condition of Alaska rests squarely on the shoulders of Congress and no place else. The necessity for legislation to open up the Territory has been pointed out time after time, but nothing whatever has been done. It seems to me that no candid student of the situation of Alaska who is at all free from personal and pecuniary interest can have the slightest doubt of the propriety of the Federal Government conducting one or more railroads in Alaska to open up that Territory. The Government operation of the Panama Canal Railroad has proven satisfactory and much of the machinery used at Panama can be used to great saving in the construction of the Alaska Railway. There can be no development in Alaska unless the Government constructs a railroad from tidewater to the interior. Private interests might build as far as the coal fields or the copper mines, but no farther.

It is appalling to think how the people of this country have been betrayed by the giving away of the fuel—the coal deposits. We are going to develop and mine and use in our own homes the vast coal and fuel supplies of Alaska.

I hear my Republican friend over there, yes, and my Democratic friend over here, say "Why, that would interfere with private business. It would put the Government into competition with property investments of citizens." Well, what if it would?

I say the cost of living must come down. The people will not accept your answer to their demand for relief that they eat too much, recreate too much, live too high. They have a mind to the fact that your party has permitted the coal deposits of this country to get into the hands of the railroads and into other private hands. They know that the vast timber resources of this country have been worse than squandered, so far as the people's title thereto is concerned. The present commercial value of the standing timber of this country is $6,000,000,000, exclusive of the value of the land on which it stands. The standing timber is estimated at 2,826,000,000,000 feet, of which 2,197,000,000,000 feet is privately owned. The value of this timber has enhanced in the last 10 years almost beyond the dreams of its owners. Why should all these billions of increased value, an unearned increment, go to these few men and be in their hands forever, an added means of extortion from those who must pass through the struggle for existence in ages yet to come? I publish in connection with these remarks some figures which may well startle the reader of them.

Yes; the cost of living must come down. In Alaska, thanks to Gifford Pinchot and his fellow conservationists, the people still own the coal; but the hand of greed stands guard, and all the little dandies here and there who are on the pay rolls of the special interests proclaim that the conservationists have

locked up Alaska. It is the greediest band of cutthroats in the world that now has a strangle hold on the throat of fair Alaska. They tell us they will build the railroad if we will give them the coal. No; a thousand times no. Uncle Sam is strong enough to bring down the high cost of living. Let us have a Government road, bearing Government coal to our fellow citizens at the cost of mining and transportation, instead of a Guggenheim road bearing Guggenheim coal to the people at exorbitant and unjust prices.

Will not the lowering of the cost of fuel help reduce the high cost of living? I hear you laugh and say, "Not much." All right. When we have reduced the tariff and lowered the price of coal, does anyone suppose we will stop there? The high cost of living must come down. The people want the telegraph and telephone lines and the express monopoly done away with right now. I mean what I say. The Government is ready to handle all this business. By a slight development of the parcel post the express business will belong to the people. That will help some more; and the telegraph and telephone lines. There was a time when the people generally were not concerned with these utilities, but to-day it is the consumer alone who is ultimately charged up with the millions of dividends that are enriching the monopolistic owners of the telephone and telegraph. How easy it would be for telegrams to be sent from and received at our post offices. Think of the millions upon millions of the people's money invested in public buildings. Why not use them for the telephone and telegraph business, and thus further lower the cost of living?

That is not all. The people demand the ownership of their local utilities—the traction companies, the light companies, the water and gas companies. Why not? The high cost of living must come down.

Oh, you need not laugh or question; we will not stop there. Already we have started to squeeze the water out of the railroad capitalization, and, if those who own the railroads do not help reduce the high cost of living by lowering the universal tax on everybody for transportation, both freight and passenger, the people will take the railroads of this country and we will have a railroad passenger and freight office in every post office in the land. Yes; and we will supervise the trusts and demand lower prices. We will know what it costs to make a garment or a hat or a pair of shoes, and the Government will tell the great operators and manufacturers how much they can charge the people, and again we will stop unusual profits. Will not this help? Will the Republican Party stand in the way? Then its funeral procession will be told to trot along. Will the Democrats try to fool the people? That party will be brushed away. The Progressive Party can have an enduring future and render service to the people just in proportion as it gets down to the people, studies their wants, and relieves them.

Washington industries and tariff rates.

	Quantity.		Value.	Dingley law rates.	Payne-Aldrich law rates.	Underwood bill rates.
Cereals, etc.:	*Acres.*	*Bushels.*				
Oats	269,742	13,228,003	$5,870,857	15 cents per bushel	15 cents per bushel	10 cents per bushel.
Wheat	2,118,015	40,920,390	35,102,370	25 cents per bushel	25 cents per bushel	Do.
Flour			17,852,944	25 per cent	25 per cent	Free.
Barley	171,888	5,834,615	3,331,930	30 cents per bushel	30 cents per bushel	15 cents per bushel.
Potatoes	57,897	7,667,171	2,993,737	25 cents per bushel	25 cents per bushel	Free.
		Tons.				
Hay and forage	742,137	1,391,664	17,147,648	$4 per ton	$4 per ton	$2 per ton.
Fruits:	*Bearing trees.*	*Bushels.*				
Apples	3,009,337	2,672,100	2,925,761	25 cents per bushel	25 cents per bushel	10 cents per bushel.
Plums	823,082	1,032,077	600,503	....do	....do	Do.
Cherries	241,038	131,392	278,547	....do	....do	Do.
Pears	290,676	310,804	328,895	....do	....do	Do.
	Sheep of shearing age.	*Pounds wool.*				
Wool	295,264	3,135,348	536,708	11 to 36 cents per pound	11 to 36 cents per pound	Free.
Live stock and dairy products:	*Number.*					
Cattle on farms	402,120		12,193,465	$2 to 25 per cent per head	$2 to 25 per cent per head	10 per cent.
Horses and mules on farms	292,930		31,539,551	$30 to 25 per cent per head	$30 to 25 per cent per head	$15 to 10 per cent per head.
Swine on farms	206,135		1,674,927	$1.50 per head	$1.50 per head	Free.
Sheep on farms	475,555		1,931,170	75 cents to $1.50 per head	75 cents to $1.50 per head	10 per cent.
Domestic animals on farms			47,370,775	All on dutiable list	All on dutiable list	Mostly free.
Domestic animals not on farms			7,558,077	....do	....do	Do.
Poultry on farms	2,272,775		1,367,440	3 cents per pound, live 5 cents per pound, dead	3 cents per pound, live 5 cents per pound, dead	1 cent per pound, live. 2 cents per pound, dead.
		Dozen.				
Eggs		16,472,575	4,311,291	5 cents per dozen	5 cents per dozen	2 cents per dozen.
Dairy products			8,745,041	All on dutiable list	All on dutiable list	Milk, free.
		Pounds.				
Butter		6,761,575	1,992,249	6 cents per pound	6 cents per pound	3 cents per pound.
Cheese		52,970	6,787	....do	....do	20 per cent.
	Number.	*Number of wage earners.*				
Manufacturing establishments	3,674	69,120	220,746,000			
Mines, quarries, and wells	170	7,343	10,537,556			
	Number of operators.					
Soft coal	32	6,155	9,226,793	67 cents per ton	45 cents per ton	Free.

EXTRACTS FROM "THE LUMBER INDUSTRY"—PART 1—STANDING TIMBER. ISSUED JANUARY 20, 1913, BY THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR, BUREAU OF CORPORATIONS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Southern pine sold by the Government for $1.25 an acre; much is now worth $60 an acre. Large amount of Douglas fir in western Washington and Oregon which the Government gave away or sold at $2.50 per acre now range from $100 to $200 per acre (p. 18).

The Southern Pacific Railroad, the Weyerhauser Timber Co., and the Northern Pacific Railroad own 238,000,000,000 feet of timber, or nearly 11 per cent of all the privately owned timber in the United States (p. 20).

Present commercial value of the privately owned standing timber in the United States is estimated at $6,000,000,000. This does not include the land (p. 2).

Output of lumber by 46,584 sawmills in 1909 amounted to 44,509,000,000 feet (p. 3).

Total standing timber in the United States is estimated at 2,826,000,000,000 feet, of which 2,197,000,000,000 feet is privately owned. Owned by the Government in forest reserves, 539,000,000,000 feet; by States, Indian reservations, etc., 90,000,000,000 feet (p. 6).

Total timber standing on Pacific coast is 1,512,900,000,000 feet, as follows:

	Feet.
California	381,400,000,000
Oregon	545,800,000,000
Washington	391,100,000,000
Idaho	129,000,000,000
Montana	65,600,000,000

Of this amount 1,013,000,000,000 feet are privately owned (p. 10). Eleven Southern States contain 634,000,000,000 feet, and in Lake States of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota there are 100,000,000,000 feet (p. 11).

Southern Pacific Railroad owns 105,600,000,000 feet, the Weyerhauser Timber Co own 95,700,000 000 feet, and the Northern Pacific 36,200,000,000 feet, all on the Pacific coast (p. 16).

The Southern Pacific, Northern Pacific, and the Weyerhauser Timber Co. own 23.5 per cent of the privately owned timber on the Pacific coast (p. 19).

One-half of the privately owned timber on the Pacific coast is owned by 37 holders (p. 20).

Sixty-seven holders own 39 per cent of the long-leaf pine of the South, 20 per cent of the cypress, and 11 per cent of the hardwood (p. 21).

Six holders have 54 per cent of the standing white pine and Norway pine in Minnesota, together with 16 per cent of the other conifers. In Wisconsin 96 holders have three-fourths of the timber and in Michigan 110 holders have two-thirds (p. 22)

Increase in value of standing timber has been large, as will be seen by the following examples:

	Bought.	Price.	Sold.	Price.
Wisconsin	1891	$5.00	1904	$22.00
Louisiana	1882	1.25	1909	59.50
Washington	1900	11.84	1907	115.00
Idaho	1901	240.00	1909	2,500.00
Washington per acre	1882	20.00	1909	150.00
Oregon do	1886	5.00	1908	108.75
California do	1900	18.00	1909	100.00

In Minnesota the price received for timber on State lands was $1.47 per 1,000 in 1880 and $7.63 per 1,000 in 1909 (pp. 26–27).

Fifty-four per cent of the total timber of the United States is found in the five Pacific Coast States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and California (p. 66).

The 1,013,000,000,000 feet privately owned timber on the Pacific coast are made up of the following species:

	Feet.
Douglas fir	521,900,000,000
White pine	19,600,000,000
Western pine	153,400,000,000
Sugar pine	34,700,000,000
Redwood	101,900,000,000
Red cedar	56,700,000,000
Hemlock	57,400,000,000
Spruce	21,900,000,000
All other species	45,500,000,000

The 634,000,000,000 feet of privately owned timber in the 11 Southern States are made up of the following species:

	Feet.
Long-leaf yellow pine	384,400,000,000
Short-leaf yellow pine	152,100,000,000
Cypress	40,400,000,000
Hardwoods	209,200,000,000

The 100,000,000,000 feet of privately owned timber in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan are made up of the following species:

	Feet.
White and Norway pine	17,700,000,000
Hemlock	26,600,000,000
Other conifers	13,800,000,000
Hardwoods	41,900,000,000

Referring to page 77, there are 17,700,000,000 feet of white and Norway pine in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan. According to the output of these species in the same States in 1909 (p. 88), the supply should be exhausted in 1918. At the same ratio the short-leaf and long-leaf pine (p. 76) should be exhausted in about 25 years (p. 88).

Fifteen holders own 62 per cent of the California redwood; 14 holders three-fifths of the cypress in Louisiana (p. 155).

In Louisiana 37 holders own 48.7 per cent of the total timber (p. 154).

The average stand per acre on the Pacific is 42,000 feet; in the South, 6,100 feet; and in the Lake States, 5,600 feet (p. 168).

No States in the South or the Lake States average 10,000 feet per acre. The average for the country is 11,300, largely made up from the heavy stand on the Pacific coast (p. 169).

Stumpage values per 1,000 feet.

	1899	1904	1907
White pine	3.66	4.62	8.09
Cedar	1.32	1.49	4.63
Cypress	1.58	3.42	4.37
Yellow pine	1.12	1.68	3.16
Redwood	1.06	1.55	2.35
Western yellow pine	.....	.....	1.66
Douglas fir	.77	1.05	1.44

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

210. Hay, $2 per ton.

Mr. GOODWIN of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 52, line 25, strike out, after the word "hay," the figure "2" and insert the figure "4."

Mr. GOODWIN of Maine. Mr. Chairman, this simply restores the duty now carried by existing law, which is $4 a ton. It changes it from $2 in the proposed bill to $4 a ton, as carried in the Payne bill.

I do not want to take the time of the committee to-night at this late hour, but it is the one agricultural product in which the people of my State are the most interested. If it were not for the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], who has charge of the agricultural schedule, is evidently so tired and so much displeased with what has been said to-night, I would like to speak upon this subject, but under the circumstances, and at the request of my constituents, I simply ask that a vote be taken on the amendment.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the few remarks I am going to make will be in order. I tried a moment ago to get recognition to say a word in defense of the American hen, but the gentleman from Alabama cut me off with his motion to close debate. Eggs are a very important product, and valuable product, in my district. The hens down there frequently lay them in the hay; and I think, therefore, that a discussion of the question will be in order upon this hay paragraph. [Laughter.] The hen is a very generous, good-natured fowl, and we ought to be kind to her and protect her. I am reminded of a limerick that went the rounds in the days of Henry Ward Beecher which illustrates the noble generosity of the hen, which ran something like this:

Said a Congregational preacher
To a hen, You are a beautiful creature.
And the hen, just for that,
Laid an egg in his hat,
And thus did the hen reward Beecher.

[Laughter.]

If we want to encourage the egg industry in this country we ought not to be too hard on the hen and her product. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto now close.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address the committee for three minutes upon this subject.

Mr. FORDNEY. And I would like to have two minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in five minutes, three minutes to be given to the gentleman from Minnesota and two minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat confused on first scrutinizing this paragraph to know why hay was reduced in duty to $2 per ton. It did not occur to me then how anxious Democracy is to furnish cheap food for the countless bull moose it needs to pull it through in the next campaign. Two dollars per ton is a "consumers' rate" sure enough, and likely under it "competition," which the Democratic leader urges so incessantly, will result. There will be such political competition, if he has his way, between the elephant and the bull moose as to leave the haystack, in fact the whole pasture, in possession of the mule.

Seriously speaking, however, I protest against the lack of reasons for reducing the rate of duty on hay. The production of hay should be encouraged for broad reasons, comprehending the conservation of the soil of the American people. No farmer properly cultivates his soil unless he rotates his crops and periodically uses his fields for the production of hay. I wish to urge this point earnestly—I do not expect to urge it successfully—to this committee. I repeat that hay ought to be protected and its growth encouraged; prices should be such as to compel farmers, by self-interest, to extend their acreage of hay not alone for the profit to them presently, but rather for the broader and bigger purpose of conserving the American soil for the future Nation.

I shall not dwell upon the importance of this industry as such. The hay crop of the United States and home value thereof, from the year 1895 to 1911, as estimated by the Department of Agriculture, ranged as follows:

	Crops in tons.	Home value per ton.
1895	47,078,541	$8.35
1896	59,282,158	6.54
1897	60,664,876	6.61
1898	66,376,920	6.00
1899	56,655,756	7.27
1900	50,110,906	8.89
1901	50,590,877	10.00
1902	59,858,000	9.06
1903	61,305,940	9.08
1904	60,696,028	8.72
1905	60,531,611	8.52
1906	57,145,959	10.37
1907	63,677,000	11.68
1908	70,798,000	8.98
1909	64,938,000	10.62
1910	60,978,000	12.26
1911	47,444,000	14.64

This production of approximately 60,000,000 tons per annum shows the importance of this item. Hay in considerable quantities has been imported into the United States in spite of the present tariff of $4 per ton. The imports from 1900 to date were, annually, in tons, as follows:

	Tons.
1900	143,890
1901	142,627
1902	48,415
1903	293,112
1904	114,388
1905	46,214
1906	668,540
1907	61,116
1908	10,063
1909	6,712
1910	96,829
1911	336,757

With a rate of $2 per ton enormous quantities of cheap Canadian hay would be imported into this country, and our farmers would have to sell their hay at a loss or let it rot in the stack or stop raising it. With any substantial reduction in prices the farmer could not pay the expense of cutting, baling, and the heavy t ansportation charges to the terminal markets. It is extremely difficult for him to make any money in the business as it is. If the farmer finds himself losing money on his hay crops under this bill, as he certainly will, he will naturally stop raising hay to the serious permanent injury of the land.

The cultivation of hay, potatoes, onions, and similar crops should be encouraged rather than discouraged by law. Too large a production of grain and corn by the farms of the Nation oftentimes depresses prices by overproduction, and also occasions great peril to business generally in the event of a general grain or corn crop failure. Heavy yields of secondary farm produce, like hay, potatoes, onions, and so forth, tend to balance and sustain prices generally, and obviate danger of panic that always waits upon the failure of any of the great staple articles of production. This bill not only strikes a severe blow at hay, an important product of Minnesota, but is even more severe on the potato growers of the country. It is cruelly unfair to our farmers to put potatoes on the free list. The growing of potatoes is precarious, so much depending upon the weather, but there is a very large acreage of land in Minnesota where the soil is poorly adapted to raising any other crop. Minnesota produces an average annual yield of about 17,000,000 bushels. On account of the perishable character of this commodity no part of one season's crop can be held over until the next year. This makes it necessary for the potato growers to dispose of their crop during the season, regardless of prevailing prices, and this tends further to make the business precarious. An examination of the prices at which potatoes have been sold for the past 15 years will show that on an average one year out of every three resulted in an actual loss to the farmer.

Mr. Chairman, there is another element to be considered regarding the rate on potatoes. It has reference to labor. Potato growing gives employment to many men. The average cost per acre of labor in producing and delivering potatoes to the shipping station is approximately $35, some six times as much as in the case of grain. Free trade in potatoes will drive many of our farmers out of that business and consequently throw out of employment a large number of men who will have to compete with toilers in other occupations and thus depress the price of labor generally. This is a great potato-consuming Nation, and it is wiser to have the money we pay for potatoes go to our farmers and laborers on the farms rather than to the farmers and workingmen of other countries.

As I stated, the potato crop is uncertain, and therefore if our potato farmers are put out of business, as to a large extent they will be if this bill in its present form is enacted into law, and there occurs a general potato failure in other potato-producing countries, unreasonable prices will be exacted from the consumers, defeating the very purpose claimed for this bill.

Examination of the prices that have prevailed for years under the present tariff on potatoes shows that the average price to the farmer has been reasonably low. Any exaction of fancy prices from consumers has been by the retailer, and they would have a better opportunity to charge unreasonable prices to consumers if local producers were put out of business and the bulk of our potatoes were imported.

I regret, Mr. Chairman, that my time is limited in this discussion. I would like to state fully and in detail the importance to the people of my State of both the hay and potato crops. All I can do now is to protest, and I do protest earnestly and emphatically against this bill as it stands. It favors cotton and the South; it hits hay and potatoes as well as grain and beef, mutton and wool production in the North. It is a sectional bill, selfishly made by the solid South of the Democratic majority, and I believe like any selfish sectional law it will in time work its own destruction. In the meantime I suppose the farmers of Minnesota and the great Northwest will have to do the best they can to raise their crops and compete with the Old World.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment principally for this reason: The State of Michigan, which I have the honor in part to represent, is a great hay-producing State. The value of that crop in the State ranges annually from forty to fifty million dollars. A reduction of $2 per ton in the rate of duty on between three and four million tons of hay means a reduction on the income of the farmer of from six to eight million dollars a year. I again submit that that is a rather high price for the farmers of the State of Michigan to pay for Democratic rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

213. Garlic, 1 cent per pound; onions, 20 cents per bushel.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 4, after the word "onions," strike out "20 cents per bushel" and insert "35 cents per bushel."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard various learned and interesting disquisitions on various subjects, running from cider to hay and from honey to hops.

I want to submit some observations upon the much abused, yet festive and always fragrant, onion which is produced in such liberal quantities in the district which I represent. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, speaking seriously for a moment [laughter], the rate that is provided in the existing law, together with the existing rates of prices upon onions, disproves absolutely the contention that has been made upon this floor many times since this debate began, namely, that the amount of tariff was added to the price of the product. The existing law provides a tariff of 40 cents per bushel upon onions, and yet if any gentleman wants to supply himself with that odoriferous vegetable, if he will come to the county in which I live he can buy him any quantity, a bushel or 20 carloads, at 30 cents per bushel.

As a matter of fact, onions have been sold in large quantities in the great onion-producing district in Ohio in the past year at less than 20 cents per bushel. That has been less than one-half the amount of the tariff. The effect, Mr. Chairman, if this duty is carried into effect as proposed in this bill, is to ruin the onion farmers. They are men who carry on business upon a small scale. This product is not raised upon great farms, but it is raised upon the small farms by small farmers, and if this bill should be enacted into law it simply means that the farmers of the onion-producing districts of Ohio and the other 17 States in the Union that produce this vegetable will be brought into direct competition with the products of the farms of Spain, the farms of Egypt, and the farms of Bermuda.

The onion farmers of Bermuda appeared before the Ways and Means Committee (Hearings, pp. 2778, 2784) and strongly urged the reduction of our duty on onions. Why are they so interested? Evidently they know who pays the tariff. Apparently the committee was more disposed to favor them than the onion farmers of our own country, for the duties were reduced in accordance with the recommendations of the Bermuda onion growers.

I had always supposed that it was best to legislate in the interest of our own people, not the foreigner; but the majority in control of this Congress takes the contrary view and discriminates against our own laborers and our own farmers. This bill builds up no American industry, gives no increase of wages to any American laborer, makes no market for any American producer. This bill if enacted into law will be good for the foreigner and he knows it, but bad for our own people and they will soon find it out.

What shall we say about the rate of wages? The rate of wages paid in the American onion fields is about five times as much as the rate of wages paid in the fields I have mentioned, at least five times; but to be more exact, in the Spanish onion fields the average rate of wages is about 20 cents per day. The rate in the onion fields of Ohio is nearly ten times that amount, between $1.50 and $2.50 a day. Then another fact that I wish to present, Mr. Chairman, is the freight rate. The freight rate upon onions from the Bermuda fields to New York is only about half what it is from the onion fields of Ohio and Indiana to that same market, so it must be apparent that with that immense advantage in lower wages, with the immense advantage of the freight rate, that if this shall be enacted into law it simply means that this industry will be transferred from this country to another, and that instead of American labor and American ingenuity and American capital being employed the business will be transferred to the foreign farmer.

Then there is another proposition to which I wish to call the attention of the committee, and that is the fact that the tariff upon this particular vegetable has very little to do with the price of it. Men say that they want to reduce the cost of living. I can invite their attention to the fact, as I did a day or so ago when I made some remarks upon the bill, that in the case of this vegetable it has been shown by a careful investigation made by the Department of Agriculture that of the amount paid by the consumer the producer gets less than 28 per cent.

A Democratic farmer friend in Hardin County, Ohio, writes me as follows:

> We are selling onions at from 20 to 30 cents per bushel, are delivering onions in the cities, freight prepaid, at from 30 to 40 cents per bushel, and yet these same onions go to the city trade at $1 per bushel and 20 cents per half peck, or at the rate of $1.60 per bushel. Yet it seems that the farmers are the ones whom Congress proposes to regulate. We are blamed for the high cost of living; yet the fact remains that nearly all our vegetables are delivered by us to the large cities at about 25 per cent of the prices actually paid by the ultimate consumer.

Who gets the profit? The commission man, not the farmer.

The onion growers of Ohio submit the following considerations, which clearly demonstrate the fact that the existing tariff of 40 cents per bushel on onions should not be disturbed.

First. This year's crop of onions demonstrates beyond a doubt the fact that this country can henceforth easily produce all the onions that this country can possibly consume. There is no occasion whatever to open the door for foreign onions. In fact, onions are now being sold in this country at prices below the cost of growing them.

Second. The onion growing in this country is in the hands of farmers in quantities from 1 acre up, from Massachusetts to Iowa, and also in Colorado, on the Pacific slope, and Texas, and to a small extent in Missouri, Kentucky, and Louisiana. Large growers market their crops direct to car-lot buyers and small growers sell to local buyers, who in turn compete with each other and with the large growers in each section, each section competing with other sections, so that there is sharp competition all along the line, and no combination to fix or control prices is possible. Prices will absolutely be fixed by supply and demand.

Third. The present tariff of 40 cents per bushel is necessary to suitably protect the American onion grower from the cheaper grown onions from foreign countries.

A gentleman connected with a very prominent European produce house recently stated that he had personally visited the onion fields of Spain and Egypt. He stated that labor could be obtained for the onion fields in Spain at about 20 cents per day and in Egypt for even a lower price. Here in Ohio and in Indiana from $1.50 to $2 per day of 10 hours is paid for men in the field and women and children in proportion.

The freight rate from Spain to New York City direct is about 36 cents per 100 pounds, and from Egypt about 40 cents. Freight from Ohio and Indiana points to New York is from 22 to 25 cents per 100 pounds. It can readily be seen from these figures that with the tariff removed Spain and Egypt can lay onions down in New York City for a lower price than we can, even if we move them at actual cost of growing. Freight on onions from Bermuda is 14 cents per 100 pounds. We do not know the cost of labor in Bermuda, but it is certainly below the prices paid in this country.

Mexico has recently begun the development of onion industry and promises to be a very important factor in the future, especially if the onion tariff be either removed or reduced.

Fourth. The removal of the onion tariff entirely would strike a deadly blow at the American onion industry, that has grown from small beginnings to its present large proportions, an industry that will continue to grow as fast as the needs of the country demand it. Vast tracts of land now of but little value will be developed into onion farms if prices secured for onions will warrant such development. Any material reduction in the tariff must cripple this industry seriously.

The intensive farming required in growing onions makes necessary large investment of capital in developing the land, erection of suitable buildings and storages and necessary equipment, and the employment of many thousands of men, women, and children, who depend upon this industry for their livelihood, and women and children so employed in the country could not procure employment elsewhere.

The serious crippling of this industry would mean the practical loss of a very large capital invested, as above described, throughout the country, as in such cases the property would be greatly reduced in value and suitable returns for labor and investment could not be secured.

Fifth. We do not contend that with the tariff removed the foreign onion grower could at once fully supply the American market, but the removal of the tariff would cause the foreign production to be rapidly and enormously increased, and enough would in the near future be thrown upon the New York market to drive prices down to a point that would be seriously damaging if not ruinous to the American grower.

New York City practically fixes the prices for the entire East, and with the low prices at the seaboard, onions in western New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio that usually go east would be thrown upon the western and southern markets usually supplied by the onion States west of us, and thus prices in the South and West would also be forced down to nearly or quite the low prices in New York City.

Sixth. If it be urged that the low prices herein suggested will be for the benefit of the consumer, the obvious reply is that the recent amazing increase in onion acreage in this country and the large tracts of land that will be developed and devoted to onion growing in the future, if prices will warrant it, makes it certain that as low prices will rule in the future as the American grower can stand, and that it is poor policy to force prices so low that the grower can not secure cost for his produce.

Seventh. The importations of onions for the two fiscal years 1910–11 and 1911–12 were about 1,500,000 bushels each year. With the tariff removed, the importations will soon be doubled, and therefore, if the tariff be removed, eventually and soon the foreign importations will force American prices to a point below the American cost of growing.

Eighth. If with a reduction of existing onion tariff the cost of foreign onions plus the tariff would be equal to the absolute cost to the American grower, the American grower would be compelled to retire from the business or scale his style of living down to the level of the Spaniard, Egyptian, and Mexican, and surely that can neither be expected or desired.

Why take the risk of strangling or seriously crippling the American industry by removing or reducing the onion tariff, when the only person in the world who would be benefited by it would be the foreign grower?

Mr. MANN. I desire to ask the gentleman from Alabama a question. Was the quantity of the bushel of onions intentionally or accidentally left out? The existing law carries a bushel as consisting of 57 pounds. I notice, and very properly, in most places of the bill it defines the quantity of a bushel, and as the bushel is different in different States I think it would be desirable——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the regulation at the Treasury Department has established so fully that 57 pounds is a bushel of onions that it was not necessary to place it in the bill.

Mr. MANN. Of course the regulation of the Treasury Department would have no effect. It has been the law heretofore that established 57 pounds as the bushel, not a regulation of the Treasury Department.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The established rate is so uniform——

Mr. MANN. They had no occasion to establish it because the law has provided it, and practically in every other place in the bill the gentleman has defined the quantity of a bushel. We had up in the House a proposition to define the quantity of these measures, and it is one I think that should be passed, and we discovered that in many of the States there was a variation in regard to a bushel of onions or a bushel of other vegetables.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think we have done that as a rule in the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say that the gentleman's disinclination to accept any suggestions from this side of the House may lead to confusion in the Treasury Department in the future.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will look into it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and amendments be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and amendments be now closed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

215. Orchids, palms, azaleas, and all other decorative or greenhouse plants and cut flowers, preserved or fresh, 25 per cent ad valorem; lily of the valley pips, tulips, narcissus, begonia, and gloxinia bulbs, $1 per thousand; hyacinth, astilbe, dielytra, and lily of the valley clumps, $2.50 per thousand; lily bulbs and calla bulbs, $5 per thousand; peony, Iris Kaempferi or Germanica, canna, dahlia, and amaryllis bulbs, $10 per thousand; all other bulbs, bulbous roots or corms which are cultivated for their flowers or foliage, 50 cents per thousand.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 11, strike out the letter "s" in "azaleas," and insert the word "indica."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I also offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers a further amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 14, after the word "hyacinth," strike out the comma and insert the word "bulbs."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I also offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 16, after the second word "bulbs," strike out the comma and insert the words "or corms."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I also offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers a further amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 16, before the word "peony," insert the word "herbaceous."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman a question about the last amendment, where he inserted the word "herbaceous." What becomes of the duty on the other peonies?

Mr. PALMER. They go into the next paragraph under nursery stock. The herbaceous peonies are the fine——

Mr. MANN. I know what they are.

Mr. PALMER. And the other peonies are heavier plants, which come in under nursery stock in the next paragraph.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I also offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 18, strike out the word "bulbs."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I also offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 18, insert, after the word "roots," the words "root stalks."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman what the occasion is for all these amendments?

Mr. RAINEY. These are suggested by the Treasury Department, most of them—in fact, all of them—in order to dispose of a lot of conflicting questions there. They have decisions both ways.

Mr. MANN. Of course, if the Treasury Department recommended them, I have no question in regard to it, although, having some practical knowledge of these matters, I think possibly that instead of settling disputes they will be apt to cause them.

Mr. PALMER. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] who says "No" does not know the difference between "dielytra" and "peonies."

Mr. PALMER. Oh, I am an expert on peonies. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. What is "dielytra"?

Mr. PALMER. It would take too long to educate the gentleman. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 11, at the end of the line, strike out the word "or."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 19, after the word "corms" insert the words "and tubers."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have prepared an amendment, which I will present later. I would like to have the attention of the members of the committee for just a moment. Near Bellingham, in the State of Washington, is the only place in the United States that I know of where they raise bulbs. The Government has a bulb farm there, and the authorities in charge of it expect within the next few years to furnish all the bulbs necessary for distribution by Members of Congress.

I have received a good many communications from people in that neighborhood, saying that if they could get bulbs from Holland free, for propagating purposes, it could be made a profitable industry, because that is in the line, as I understand, of the policy of both parties—to bring in bulbs or other seeds for purposes of propagation.

I will suggest to the gentlemen that they consider it, and I will submit to them the question, when we reach the free list, whether they will not see fit to insert an amendment of that character. I do not think it is covered by this language.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Washington that I do not see any serious reason why it should not be adopted, but the committee has not had the opportunity to consider it and see the effect of the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is the reason why I make the suggestion now and ask the committee to consider it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to have this telegram read into the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be inserted.

There was no objection.

Following is the telegram referred to:

BELLINGHAM, WASH., *April 29, 1913.*

Congressman ALBERT JOHNSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Desire tariff removed bulbs imported propagating purposes only. Commercial bulbs to florists and greenhouses remain as now. Impossible start bulb growing in Washington State unless mother bulbs are admitted free. Bulbs grown nowhere in United States save Whatcom County. Expansion commercial bulb industry here demands removal tariff because present tariff precludes possibility. Should not object to tariff being replaced five years. We believe contrary to policy Government to impose tariff which will hinder new enterprise. Acceding to our request would in no manner disturb present bulb business.

BELLINGHAM CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

216. Stocks, cuttings, or seedlings of Myrobolan plum, Mahaleb or Mazzard cherry, Manetti multiflora and briar rose, three years old or less, $1 per thousand plants; stocks, cuttings, or seedlings of pear, apple, quince, and the St. Julien plum, three years old or less, $1 per thousand plants; rose plants, budded, grafted, or grown on their own roots, 4 cents each; stocks, cuttings, and seedlings, of all fruit and ornamental trees, deciduous and evergreen shrubs and vines, and all trees, shrubs plants, and vines commonly known as nursery or greenhouse stock, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 53, line 23, by inserting after the word "rose" the words "Rosa Rugosa."

[Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I have another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois presents another committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 54, line 5, strike out the words "or greenhouse."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, what is the effect of that, may I ask the gentleman? What would greenhouse stock come under if that were stricken out?

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman from Illinois will notice that in the bill now, under paragraph 215, occurs the language, "Orchids, palms, azaleas, and all other decorative greenhouse plants and cut flowers," while paragraph 216 provides for "plants and vines commonly known as nursery or greenhouse stock." Inasmuch as these two paragraphs carry a different rate, there would be a conflict between greenhouse plants and greenhouse stock, it being impossible to distinguish between the two. The object of the two paragraphs is to have greenhouse plants in paragraph 215 and nursery stock in paragraph 216.

Mr. MANN. Well, but a great deal of this greenhouse stock is just as easily distinguished as nursery stock.

The same conflict would exist in reference to that as to nursery stock. Now you propose to increase the rate on greenhouse stock from 15 per cent to 25 per cent, which I believe is the existing rate. A very large amount of this greenhouse stock is necessarily imported.

Mr. PALMER. If the gentleman will observe, nursery stock is not provided for in paragraph 215. That only covers bulbs,

tubers, corms, and greenhouse plants and cut flowers. The words "or greenhouse" are taken out of paragraph 216 in order to avoid the conflict. The conflict is in the present law and has resulted in a great deal of difficulty at the customhouses.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman that the difficulty will still exist, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. PALMER. I should like to know how.

Mr. MANN. Because there will be a constant conflict whether a plant is a greenhouse plant or nursery stock.

Mr. PALMER. No; there will not be any such conflict. Nurserymen say that nursery stock and greenhouse plants are easily distinguished; that they are trade names which are perfectly plain in the trade, however vague the distinction may seem to my distinguished friend from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. I am somewhat familiar with the trade, and I question whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania is as familiar with it, and that is no reflection on him.

Mr. PALMER. I am not expert in the trade, though I am fond of these things and have paid some attention to them; but I am advised by experts in the trade that nursery stock and greenhouse plants are very easily distinguishable.

Mr. MANN. I am unfortunate enough to raise for my own amusement several hundred thousand of these plants a year, and I know something about them.

Mr. PALMER. I congratulate the gentleman on having constantly at his side a source of great happiness.

Mr. MANN. That is the only fun I have, except what I get out of you gentlemen over on that side.

Mr. PALMER. I trust the gentleman gets more fun out of his plants than he does out of this side.

Mr. MANN. Well, I get a good deal out of both.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

217. Seeds: Castor beans or seeds, 15 cents per bushel of 50 pounds; flaxseed or linseed and other oil seeds not specially provided for in this section, 20 cents per bushel of 56 pounds; poppy seed, 15 cents per bushel of 47 pounds; mushroom spawn, and spinach seed, 1 cent per pound; canary seed, ½ cent per pound; caraway seed, 1 cent per pound; anise seed, 2 cents per pound; beet (except sugar beet), carrot, corn salad, parsley, parsnip, radish, turnip, and rutabaga seed, 3 cents per pound; cabbage, collard, kale, and kohl-rabi seed, 6 cents per pound; eggplant and pepper seed, 10 cents per pound; seeds of all kinds not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That no allowance shall be made for dirt or other impurities in seeds provided for in this paragraph.

[Mr. FOWLER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the debate on the paragraph close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the seeds named in this paragraph are collected in the same manner that the seeds are in the existing law—by description and name. I believe in the existing law the description and differential of rates were made largely at the request of the seedsmen. I have no criticism of the gentlemen for following that description, because their attention has probably not been called to the fact that there is no known method of distinguishing between seeds named in the paragraph carrying different rates of duty except by planting them.

Two or three years ago I obtained from the Agricultural Department some 20 different samples of seeds which had been purchased by that department. They came in bottles, and I took out half of each bottle and put them in a number of other bottles, so that when I had finished I had 40 bottles of seed taken from half of those sent me, all carrying distinguishing numbers.

I sent the 40 bottles of seed to the Agricultural Department with a request that they furnish me with a statement as to what kinds of seed they were. In reply they admitted that as to a number they could not tell, except that they were of a character of, say, cabbage seed or belonging to that family. In about one-third of the cases, or nearly one-half, the analytical seedsman of the department differed from the men who had sold the seed to the department.

I then asked the department to take the remaining packages of seed which I had all numbered and plant them as a final test and find out what those seeds were, the one who had bought them not agreeing with the one who had analyzed them. I again found a great variation. An easy illustration is beet seed carried in this paragraph at 3 cents a pound, except sugar-beet seed. The man does not live who can tell sugar-beet seed from market-beet seed, except by planting them and watching the result.

Since the law went into effect there has been very little ordinary beet seed imported, but great quantities of sugar-beet seed imported, which comes in free. The same is true of various other kinds of seed carrying different rates of duty which can not be distinguished.

The Clerk read as follows:

221. Fish, except shellfish, by whatever name known, packed in oil or in oil and other substances, in bottles, jars, kegs, tin boxes, or cans, 20 per cent ad valorem; all other fish in tin packages, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem; caviar and other preserved roe of fish, 30 per cent ad valorem; fish, skinned or boned, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting, after the word "fish," in line 4, page 55, the words "except shellfish."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should offer an amendment which I think ought to be adopted, even on the principle the Ways and Means Committee approve, of admitting all green fish, as we call them, into this country free of duty. Even on that principle they ought to allow a duty on partially manufactured fish. They have, as a matter of fact, allowed a duty of three-quarters of a cent on fish skinned and boned, but they have allowed no duty whatever on smoked and cured fish. If it were not for the fact that I should be afraid of prejudicing the case before the conferees by having an amendment voted down in the House, I should offer an amendment providing for a duty on fish, smoked and cured, of one-half a cent a pound. I wish to call the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means to the effect of this discrepancy, that they recognize one kind of manufactured fish and not the other.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

222. Apples, peaches, quinces, cherries, plums, and pears, green or ripe, 10 cents per bushel of 50 pounds; berries, edible, in their natural condition, one-half cent per quart; cranberries, 10 per cent ad valorem; all edible fruits, including berries, when dried, desiccated, evaporated, or prepared in any manner, not specially provided for in this section, 1 cent per pound; comfits, sweetmeats, and fruits of all kinds preserved or packed in sugar, or having sugar added thereto or preserved or packed in molasses, spirits, or their own juices, if containing no alcohol, or containing not over 10 per cent of alcohol, 20 per cent ad valorem; if containing over 10 per cent of alcohol and not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem, and in addition $2.50 per proof gallon on the alcohol contained therein in excess of 10 per cent; jellies of all kinds, 20 per cent ad valorem; pineapples preserved in their own juice, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama a question in reference to pineapples preserved in their own juice, as to whether this permits any addition of sugar at all?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; the paragraph was drawn so that it would not do that. That was the purpose.

Mr. MANN. I do not just this minute recall, and does the gentleman, what the duty would be where any sweetening material was added?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is provided for in another portion of the bill. I can not tell just where it is now.

Mr. MANN. I remember. I tried to find out yesterday by examining the bill whether it was intended to be covered by—

comfits, sweetmeats, and fruits of all kinds preserved or packed in sugar.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the place where it is supposed to be covered.

Mr. MANN. I am not sure whether that would cover it, or whether it would come in under the basket clause.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the point where the committee intends it to be covered.

Mr. MANN. I do not see how that could be. That provision carries 20 per cent ad valorem.

Fruits of all kinds preserved or packed in sugar, or having sugar added thereto or preserved or packed in molasses, spirits, or their own juices, if containing no alcohol, or containing not over 10 per cent of alcohol, 20 per cent ad valorem; if containing over 10 per cent of alcohol and not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem, and in addition $2.50 per proof gallon on the alcohol contained therein in excess of 10 per cent.

I call it to the attention of the gentleman, and I wish that the gentleman would have it looked into.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I recall that the committee did differentiate between pineapples that were not sweetened and those that were sweetened. It is in the bill somewhere.

Mr. MANN. I am not disposed to say to the gentleman that it is not in the bill, because I accept his statement. However, I have examined the bill carefully for the purpose of endeavoring to ascertain what the rate would be under the bill for pineapples preserved in their own juice with a slight addition of sugar. I do not find any paragraph that seemed to cover it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, unless there is to be some debate on some of the remaining paragraphs in this section, I would like to finish it to-night. If there is to be debate, I will move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. MANN. My impression is there would be some debate on paragraph 225.

Mr. WILLIS. I desire to offer an amendment to paragraph 223.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H. R. 2973. An act making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege. In the Evening Star newspaper this afternoon appears an article entitled "Lafferty ends speech with loud applause—the Representative from Oregon takes advantage of leave to print"——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, May 2, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on examination and survey of Newport Harbor, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 42); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of Matawan Creek, N. J., with plan and estimate of cost of improvement (H. Doc. No. 43); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 4536) to reopen the rolls of the Choctaw-Chickasaw Tribe and to provide for the awarding of the rights secured to certain persons by the fourteenth article of the treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek, of date September 27, 1830; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 4537) prescribing offenses committed in the United States Army and fixing the punishment thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4538) prescribing offenses committed in the United States Navy and fixing the punishment thereof; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4539) providing for a survey for a military and post road from the city of Washington, D. C., to the Naval Academy at the city of Annapolis, Md.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 4540) making appropriation for payment of certain claims in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims, reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts, and under the provisions of section No. 151 of the act approved March 3, 1911, commonly known as the Judicial Code; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 4541) to consolidate the veterinary service, United States Army, and to increase its efficiency; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4542) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to deliver to the town of Ripley, State of West Virginia, for the use of the Carl Shatto Post, No. 28, Department of West Virginia, Grand Army of the Republic, two condemned bronze or brass cannon or field pieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 4543) to amend sections 4924 and 4927 of the Revised Statutes, relating to patents; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 4544) to reserve certain lands and to incorporate the same and make them a part of the Caribou National Forest Reserve; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 4545) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 4546) to abolish the Commerce Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOGUE: A bill (H. R. 4547) for the preparation of a plan and the erection on ground belonging to the United States Government, in the city of Washington, of a memorial or statue, to be furnished by the State of Pennsylvania, of Maj. Gen. George Gordon Meade; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DIFENDERFER: A bill (H. R. 4548) to prevent a combination of firms or individuals from conspiring to raise, or raising, prices of supplies furnished the United States Government, or combining to put up prices for structural work, and providing penalties therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 4569) to amend section 4 of the interstate-commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 4573) authorizing the President to appoint an additional circuit judge for the fourth circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Resolution (H. Res. 84) to authorize the expenditure of balance of fund authorized under H. Res. 587 adopted June 18, 1912; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Memorial of the Legislature of Alaska Territory, petitioning Congress to provide for the building of a bridge across the Chena River at the town of Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Alaska Territory, praying Congress to provide for the immediate development of the coal and railroad resources of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, praying Congress to authorize the city of Juneau, Alaska, to issue $50,000 school bonds; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Alaska, praying Congress to provide a salary for commissioners, justices of the peace, probate judges, coroners, and recorders in Alaska Territory; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Alaska Territory, praying for the repeal of the law of Congress taxing railroads in Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Alaska Territory, praying Congress for a survey and to build a breakwater at the harbor of Snake River, Nome, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Alaska Territory, praying for a reduction of the excessive telegraph and cable charges of the United States military telegraph and cable lines in Alaska; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Alaska Territory, praying for the repeal of the statute entitled "An act extending the time in which to file adverse claims and institute adverse suits against mineral entries in the Territory of Alaska," approved June 7, 1910; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Alaska Territory, praying for better mail service in that Territory; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Alaska Territory, praying Congress to provide an appropriation to pay the deficiency in the mileage allowed members of the Alaska Legislature; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of the Senate of the State of California, favoring the Lever agricultural education extension bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 4549) granting a pension to Edwin V. Butler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4550) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Fortney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRYAN: A bill (H. R. 4551) to authorize the President to appoint Archy Wright Barnes an assistant paymaster in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4552) granting a pension to Annie Neate; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 4553) granting an increase of pension to James Frank Sanderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 4554) granting an increase of pension to William V. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 4555) granting a pension to John L. Churchill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4556) for the relief of May Stanley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4557) granting an increase of pension to John Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4558) granting an increase of pension to Elijah J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4559) granting an increase of pension to John Carley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4560) granting an increase of pension to James W. Tuckerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4561) granting an increase of pension to John Herr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4562) granting an increase of pension to William W. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4563) granting an increase of pension to Harry L. Vance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4564) granting an increase of pension to John C. Ernst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4565) granting an increase of pension to Baker Woodruff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4566) granting an increase of pension to James Hackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 4567) granting a pension to William Feavel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 4568) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Comstock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 4570) granting a pension to Margaret Bretney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4571) granting an increase of pension to Stephen G. Lindsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4572) granting an increase of pension to Ludlow Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 4574) granting an increase of pension to Linda S. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4575) for the relief of the heirs of Lewis E. Parsons, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARLIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 4576) for the relief of George A. Nowland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 4577) granting a pension to Noah Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of sundry citizens of Missouri, against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of the Pennsylvania Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Association, Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against any change in the present national system of forest control; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), petition of J. H. Atkinson, Fulton, Mo., and Webb Strange, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of A. W. Barnett and 4 other merchants of Doylestown, Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation to compel concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute their portion of the funds for the development of the local community, county, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Alvin Rich, Wooster, Ohio, and J. W. Lytle, Uhrichsville, Ohio, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petition of Thomas L. Fekete, jr., and Milo R. Clanahan, St. Louis, Mo., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: Petition of sundry trade-unionists of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the removal of the duty on Philippine tobacco and cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BULKLEY: Petition of the city council of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring Government ownership of the telegraph and telephone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURNETT: Petitions of sundry citizens of Alabama, against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring the retention of the present tariff rates on laces and lace curtains; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 4528) for the relief of the estate of Perry P. Benson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of the Trades and Labor Council, Vallejo, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation to extend the eight-hour law to include labor used by those who receive Government grants and franchises; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Henry Lotz and Schmidt & Co., of New York, N. Y., against the reduction of the duty applying to the lithographic trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Linnæan Society, of New York, N. Y., favoring the feather provision in Schedule N of the tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Progressive Knitting Works, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the reduction of the duty on the sweater, coat, and knit-goods industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Sherer-Gilbert Co., of Chicago, Ill., against the duty on saffron; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Montague Castle-London Co., of New York, N. Y., against placing stained glass on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of Irvy Card, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mary Schwaner and E. Scott, of New York, N. Y., protesting against the placing of Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Baer Bros., New York, N. Y., protesting against the proposed change in the tariff on bronze powder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petitions of sundry citizens of the twenty-third congressional district of New York, against taxing mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of the Railroad Commission of the State of California, favoring the passage of legislation making an appropriation of $4,500 for blanks for the use of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co. and 5 other companies of San Francisco, Cal.; the Stewart Dawes Shoe Co.; the Pacific Wire Rope Co., of Los Angeles Cal.; and the Holt Manufacturing Co., Stockton, Cal., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of W. J. Mulligan, of the National Fuse Co., San Francisco, Cal., favoring a reduction in the tariff on safety or blasting fuses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: Petition of the Navi Chamber of Commerce, Hawaii, against the reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of the Railroad Commission of the State of California, favoring an item of $4,500 in the ap-

propriation bill for blanks for the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the C. E. Floating Society, San Diego, Cal., favoring an increase in the number of chaplains in the United States Navy and to protest against a change in naval code regarding church pennant; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of the fifteenth congressional district of the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVY: Petitions of sundry citizens of New York, against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Woman's Republican Club of New York City, favoring the passage of House joint resolution No. 1, to enfranchise the women of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Sherer-Gilbert & Co., of Chicago, Ill., against the duty on saffron; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Business Congress, favoring reform in banking and currency laws, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the National Business League of America, favoring the retention in the Consular Service of efficient officials, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Miss Sarah Thomas, Hilda Nielson, and H. K. Jedidian, of New York, N. Y., against placing of Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Duralumin Co., of New York, N. Y., against an increase of the duty on duralumin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Montague Craft-London Co., New York City, against placing stained glass on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Butler Ward Co., of New York, N. Y., against the reduction of duty on bound books; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Austin Nichols & Co. and the Standard Importing Co., of New York, against assessment of fee for filing protests against assessment of duties by collector of customs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of manufacturers of pianos of New York, against the proposed 20 per cent duty on ivory tusks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry workers in the fancy feather trade, against the clause prohibiting importation of aigrettes, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of 2 members of National Audubon Society, favoring the clause prohibiting importation of aigrettes, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: Petition of William Dennith & Co., New York, N. Y., favoring the placing of brier root or brierwood and amber or amberoid on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Frank Wacker, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the reduction of the tariff on lithographic goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Madison K. Finley, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the placing of Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Miss Mabel Clark, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Abartemie Eberle, Ludlow Griscom, and other citizens of New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of the legislation prohibiting the importation of the feathers and plumes of wild birds for millinery purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Thomas F. McCook, Lowell M. Palmer, Joseph Kemmere, F. L. Higgins, F. L. Thomas, William M. Reid, Daniel A. Dolan, John J. King, Harry E. A. Gibbs, Morris Altchuler, and Joseph H. Scannell, of New York, protesting against including mutual life insurance in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Andrew Werth, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the placing of a duty of 15 per cent on books; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of sundry citizens of the thirtieth district of New York, against the income tax on life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTERS: Petitions of C. F. Hager and others of Pennsylvania, against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petitions of sundry citizens of New York, against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *May 2, 1913.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer.

Once more, Almighty God our heavenly Father, source of every blessing, we come to Thee for inspiration, wisdom, strength, guidance, that we may go forward without fear doing whatsoever Thou has given us to do. And let us not be weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not, the fruits of righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON USELESS EXECUTIVE PAPERS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the following appointment in the House end of the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Talbott of Maryland and Mr. Kelley of Michigan.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS LEGISLATION.

Mr. DOREMUS. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DOREMUS] rise?

Mr. DOREMUS. To ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to insert in the RECORD a paper prepared by Hon. Richard Olney, Secretary of State under Grover Cleveland, on the question of Panama Canal tolls and the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, recently read in this city at the annual meeting of the American Society of International Law.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DOREMUS] asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a paper prepared by ex-Secretary of State Hon. Richard Olney on the question of Panama tolls. Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan why he does not have that printed as a document?

Mr. DOREMUS. Well——

Mr. HARDWICK. How much will it cost? Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to its being printed as a document, I do not object to its going in the RECORD——

The SPEAKER. Nobody asked to print it as a document.

Mr. HARDWICK. The gentleman was stating his request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not hear the gentleman change it.

Mr. DOREMUS. I have not changed the request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a paper prepared by Hon. Richard Olney, ex-Secretary of State, on Panama Canal tolls. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The paper above referred to is as follows:

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS LEGISLATION AND THE HAY-PAUNCEFOTE TREATY.

"In construing the Hay-Pauncefote treaty it is necessary to remember that there have been several different phases of American opinion and American policy touching the ownership, construction, maintenance, and use of the canal. The canal has always been conceived of as a work of world-wide interest and importance, which all nations without exception or discrimination should be able to use, subject, of course, to all rights of the owner of the canal, including that of charging reasonable tolls. Among the earliest declarations of policy by the United States Government, perhaps the earliest, was an intimation that the work should be accomplished, not 'by the support and unassisted efforts of any one power,' but 'by common means and united exertions'—whether of all civilized powers or of American powers exclusively is not perhaps clear. Secretary Clay's idea that the canal be built by a combination of the powers interested seems never to have taken any real root.

"This first phase was succeeded by the view that the canal should be built by the State owning the route of the canal or by a company or association having from the State the necessary concessions for that purpose. The United States was to assist by appropriate guaranties, and by the treaty with New Granada of 1846, in consideration of New Granada's granting citizens of the United States equal treatment with citizens of New Granada as respects any mode of transit across the Isthmus, the United States guarantied the perfect neutrality of the Isthmus and also New Granada's rights as sovereign and owner of the Isthmus.

"A third phase of American opinion and policy appears four years later in a treaty then made with Great Britain. The United States was moved to enter into it by various considera-

tions—by the improbability of the canal being built by the territorial sovereign, by Great Britain's claim of a protectorate over the eastern terminus of the Nicaraguan route then universally accepted as the most eligible route, and by the natural and reasonable belief that financiers would more readily engage in the canal enterprise if Great Britain joined the United States in becoming sponsor for the safety and neutrality of the canal and for its equal use by all nations. The outcome was the famous Clayton-Bulwer treaty, the essential features of which are these:

"First. A canal built by the State owning the canal route or by its concessionaires.

"Second. A compact by the parties that neither will build nor take part in building the canal, directly or indirectly, nor obtain nor maintain exclusive control over it.

"Third. A specific agreement as to the modes in which both parties may aid in the construction of the canal—as by each using its influence for such construction with local governments and for the establishment of a free port at each end of the canal, and by each undertaking to protect the canal while in process and after completion to guarantee its neutrality, and to thus safeguard the capital invested.

"Fourth. An undertaking by each to enter into contracts with Central American States with the view to carry out the great purpose of the treaty, to wit, the construction of a ship canal between the two oceans 'for the benefit of mankind and on equal terms to all,' and for the purpose of protecting the same.

"Fifth. Enjoyment by the citizens or subjects of each party of the same 'rights or advantages in regard to commerce or navigation through the canal,' charges and conditions of traffic to be approved as just or equitable by the Governments of the contracting parties.

"Sixth. An invitation to all friendly States to join in contributing to the construction of the canal, coupled with the declaration that the equal terms and conditions secured to the citizens or subjects of the contracting parties shall be enjoyed by the citizens and subjects of every other State '*which is willing to grant thereto* (to the canal) *such protection as the United States and Great Britain engage to afford.*'

"The two notable features of this phase of American canal policy are, *first*, the self-denying ordinance preventing the United States or Great Britain from building or controlling the canal, and, *second*, the clear recognition of the right of a State constructing on its own territory an artificial waterway like the canal to dictate the conditions of its use, as by permitting the use to some parties on conditions of their undertaking to protect the canal and denying its use to other parties not willing to undertake such protection.

"The next phase of American canal opinion and policy was foreshadowed as early as 1869, when Secretary Seward officially 'expressed the very deliberate conviction' (1) that 'henceforth neither any foreign Government nor the capitalists of any foreign nation, except the Government and capitalists of the United States, will ever undertake in good faith to build the canal across the Isthmus of Darien'; (2) that 'the neutrality most desirable for Colombia is to be found in a combination of the power, authority, and influence of the United States of America and the power, authority, and influence of the United States of Colombia to protect the canal and make it productive of the largest commercial benefit to all nations'; and (3) that 'not only would the United States be unwilling to enter into an entangling alliance with other foreign nations for the construction and maintenance of a passage through the Isthmus, but also that the idea that other commercial powers could and would consent to enter into a combination with the United States of America for that purpose is impracticable and visionary.' About the same time a convention was actually negotiated at Bogota by which the United States was to build the canal. On various grounds not necessary to state the convention failed of ratification at Washington.

"Meanwhile, and before Secretary Seward's prophetic words were generally accepted as verity, there ensued the de Lesseps attempt to construct the canal over the Panama route. The final abandonment of that attempt in 1889 forced upon the country the conviction that Secretary Seward was right, and that if the canal was to be built it must be built by the United States, both because the United States was the only American power with the necessary resources and because the construction and control of the canal by any European power would conflict with our settled policy respecting European interference in American affairs. President Hayes, in a special message to Congress in March, 1880, justly interpreted American sentiment by declaring: 'The policy of this country is a canal under American control; the United States can not consent to the surrender of this control to any European power or to any combination of European powers.' He condensed the whole argument for the policy into the fewest words by adding that the canal would be 'virtually a part of the coast line of the United States.' President Cleveland, in his message of December, 1885, was equally explicit as to the inadmissibility of any control of the canal by a European power.

"The final phase of American opinion and policy being that the United States must build and control the canal, and that any share in its construction or control by any European power was to be excluded, the first step to be taken obviously was the removal of the obstacle presented by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. That object was meant and thought to be attained by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty of 1901. It clearly permits the United States to build the canal. Does it also debar Great Britain from any control of the canal except such as results from the express provision that the canal shall be open for use to Great Britain and all other nations on terms of entire equality? The answer is to be found in the terms of the treaty itself interpreted according to their true intent. They can be so interpreted only by reverting to the previous relations of the parties to the canal enterprise, to the new relations to the enterprise the parties meant to assume, and to the objects each had in view in making the treaty.

"1. The Hay-Pauncefote treaty of November 18, 1901, it is to be noted, does not merely authorize the United States to build the canal through the territory of some other power, though such would have been a possible construction of the rejected Hay-Pauncefote treaty of February 5, 1901, but the treaty of November 18, 1901, adds a clause not found in the February treaty to the effect that no change of territorial sovereignty of the country or countries traversed by the canal shall affect the obligations of the parties to the treaty, thus assenting in advance to the acquisition by the United States of the territory needed for the canal. Hence, since the United States did afterwards acquire the Canal Zone, the terms of the November Hay-Pauncefote treaty apply to the case of an artificial waterway constructed by a State on its own territory.

"2. It is to be further noted that by way of asserting the exclusive control of the canal by the United States and eliminating any semblance of control by other powers the November Hay-Pauncefote treaty omits article 3 of the February treaty, by which other powers were to have notice of the treaty and be invited to adhere to it.

"3. The facts being, then, that the United States has rightfully built the canal through territory of its own; that besides having become the owner of the canal route, the treaty expressly accords to the United States all the rights incident to construction; and that in undertaking the canal as a United States enterprise the United States did so with the manifest purpose of excluding all foreign control beyond that resulting from the stipulation for equality of terms to all users of the canal—what is there in the language of the treaty to justify the claim that the United States has made a further submission to foreign control by a stipulation which prevents it from allowing the use of the canal by its own vessels or those of its nationals on any terms it chooses to fix?

"4. The one provision possible to be relied upon for that purpose is rule 1 of article 3, declaring that 'the canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules on terms of entire equality * * *.' And the single point is, Are the words 'all nations' inclusive or exclusive of the United States?

"It seems difficult to successfully contend that the United States is included.

"(a) The treaty is a contract by which the proprietor of a canal fixes the terms upon which it grants the use of the canal to its customers.

"(b) It was needed for that purpose only—it was not needed to fix the terms upon which the United States and its nationals—its cestui que trust—should use the canal, because its use without tolls or otherwise, as the United States might choose, is a necessary incident of its ownership of the canal.

"It can not reasonably be argued that, in fixing the terms for the use of its canal customers, the United States looked upon itself as one of the customers.

"(c) The words under construction are in substance the first of a set of six rules adopted by the United States as the basis of the neutralization of the canal.

"But the other five certainly apply only to parties other than the United States, so that there is the strongest reason for holding that the first of them is to be given a like application.

"(d) And if the British construction be correct, instead of liberating the United States from all foreign control of the canal and from all duties to foreign powers in respect to its use—except not to discriminate between them—the Hay-Pauncefote

fote treaty compels the United States to reverse its established policy and to devise a plan for subsidizing its own vessels in order that they may have such free or other use of the canal as the United States may decide to be demanded by United States interests.

"(e) The claim sometimes made that by building and owning the canal the United States engages in a public calling and thereby undertakes to serve all comers without discrimination and at a reasonable rate would seem to have no application to the present case. The principle affects only the users of the public work and only prescribes entire equality as between them—it in no way prevents the owner of the work, or those for whom it holds the work in trust, from using it in any way and to any extent that the legal or beneficial owner or owners may determine.

"Besides, so far as international law on the subject can be regarded as settled, the rule is that 'while a natural thoroughfare, although wholly within the dominion of a government, may be passed by commercial ships of right, yet the nation which constructs an artificial channel may annex such conditions to its use as it pleases.' (3 Moore, 268; The Avon, 18 Int. Rev. Record, 165.)

"(f) Great stress is laid upon the preamble of the treaty and its reference to the neutralization of the canal as defined in article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which, it is claimed, compels the United States to forget that it is the owner of the canal, and, as regards its own vessels, forces it to look upon itself as a canal customer bound to pay for its use the regular tolls. It is elaborately argued that neutralization of this sort is a policy to which the United States has been committed from the earliest times.

"But the argument ignores necessary distinctions and fails to note that 'neutralization' of a canal describes a policy applicable as between the canal owner and customers of the canal, but in no way touches or restricts the canal owner's rights or the canal owner's policy as to the use of the canal by itself. The several phases of American opinion, official and otherwise, respecting the construction and control of the Isthmian Canal have already been pointed out. While merely in the position of a probable user of the canal, the United States always and consistently claimed that the terms and conditions of use should be the same for all comers, but in no way denied or disputed the inherent rights of the canal owner. Those rights, as already shown, are expressly recognized by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which allows the owner to fix terms at will for the use of the canal by States, withholding the protection to the canal given by the United States and Great Britain, and even permits the owner to deny to such States the use of the canal altogether. Since accepting its inevitable rôle of the canal builder and owner, the United States has always and consistently stood on its rights as such, and, beyond agreeing to the neutralization of the canal as between customers, has repudiated the idea of any control of the canal except its own.

"How clearly such is the case is shown by the briefest examination of the neutralization provided for in article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, the principle of which is not to be impaired by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. What sort of neutralization is it? First, the United States and Great Britain are to determine what are just and equitable charges for the use of the canal by their citizens or subjects; second, the canal shall be open on those same terms to citizens and subjects of other states; but, third, the citizens and subjects of other states shall have the benefit of those terms only if such other states grant the same protection to the canal as the United States and Great Britain engage to afford. Now, there is no element of this species of neutralization which the Hay-Pauncefote treaty leaves unimpaired, since the United States alone fixes reasonable and equitable rules for the canal traffic; since the canal may be used by all nations on no other condition than that they observe those rules; and since—as shown by the elimination from this treaty of article 3 of the unratified Hay-Pauncefote treaty of February, 1901—adherence to the treaty by the other powers is not to be invited. If by construing article 8 in connection with other articles of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty any controlling principle of neutralization is to be deduced, it is the simple requirement that the same terms shall be made to all customers of the canal, a requirement restricting the rights of the canal owner to just that extent and no more and not disabling it from treating its own shipping in any way it sees fit. The like result follows from the Constantinople convention of 1888, which is declared to be the basis of the neutralization of the canal and of the rules laid down in article 3 for its navigation. By that convention identical rules are to apply to all vessels using the Suez Canal in time of war or time of peace without distinction of flags, but 'the rights of Turkey as the territorial power are reserved,' together with the sovereign rights of the Sultan and the rights and immunities of the Khedive.

"It has been contended that the Senate of the United States understood the Hay-Pauncefote treaty to mean what Great Britain now claims it to mean, because of the Senate's failure to pass the Bard resolution in favor of American coastwise shipping. But the claim seems to be thoroughly disposed of by proof that the reason of the failure was the opinion of Senators that the resolution was superfluous, that nothing in the treaty prohibited the United States, as the builder and owner of the canal, from exempting its coastwise shipping from tolls. Senator Bard himself has since so stated in a letter which was publicly read in the House of Representatives. He is emphatically corroborated on that point by other Senators.

"It is also contended that American vessels must pay tolls, because otherwise the reasonable and equitable tolls provided for by the treaty can not be ascertained. The contention assumes, of course, the very thing at issue, namely, that in the contemplation of the treaty and by its true construction American vessels are bound to pay tolls. But no other answer seems to be required than that, for the purpose of computing reasonable tolls for the use of the canal, it is not necessary that American vessels should pay tolls, but only that the amount they would pay if they were not exempt should be calculated and used in the computation as if paid.

"To sum up the conclusions resulting from the foregoing considerations it is submitted that—

"1. The United States, as builder and owner of an artificial waterway within its own territory, is entitled to dictate the conditions of its use unless and only so far as it has contracted the right of way.

"2. It has made no such contract, except with Great Britain and by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty and by the clauses of that treaty which stipulate for the use of the canal by 'all nations' on equal terms and for reasonable and equitable tolls.

"3. As the term 'all nations' comprehends not only states, but their nationals, the crucial question is, Are the words 'all nations' inclusive or exclusive of the United States and its nationals?

"4. The principle is well settled that a state conveys away its rights of sovereignty or property only by terms which are clear and express and are not susceptible of any other reasonable construction. If the terms are vague and of doubtful import, the presumption is against the state's intention to part with or abridge its jurisdictional or property rights.

"5. Hence, as the term 'all nations' as used in the treaty may be taken to mean either all without exception or all except the United States, the latter meaning is to be accepted as the true one, because the least restrictive of the normal rights and powers of the United States.

"6. But it is unnecessary to rely upon presumption. The treaty assumes the United States to be the owner of a canal to be built by it on its own territory and must be taken to have had as its natural and legitimate aim the fixing of the terms upon which other nations might use it. Except as necessarily abridged by such terms, nothing in the treaty indicates any purpose to further abridge the rights of the United States as canal builder and owner.

"7. In short, the treaty is an instrument by which the proprietor of a canal fixes and states the terms of use to its customers.

"There is an utter absence of evidence that the United States regarded itself as one of its customers.

"8. The neutralization proposed by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty resembles that proposed by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty only in the idea that the operating charges and rules for use of the canal shall be the same for all nations. It differs, of course, in the vital feature of conditioning such equality of terms upon protection being afforded to the canal.

"9. When five out of six of the treaty rules for the use of the canal do not apply to the United States it is a reasonable conclusion that the sixth also was not meant so to apply.

"10. The different phases of American public and official sentiment respecting the canal are noteworthy and not to be overlooked in construing the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

"While the United States was expecting to be merely one of the users of the canal, it strenuously insisted upon equality of rules and charges for the use of the canal and did not concern itself about the rights of the canal owner.

"When the rôle of builder and owner of the canal was forced upon it, it as strenuously insisted upon complete ownership and complete control, and complete elimination of all foreign participation or control.

"Its purposes and views are completely defeated if the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is to be construed according to the British

contention, and the United States has lost the ordinary and normal right of the canal owner to be exempt from the tolls and charges it makes to customers.

"On the grounds and in view of the considerations above stated, the United States may contend—and it is believed can rightfully contend—that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty of November, 1901, does not, as justly interpreted, prevent the United States from exempting its coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls for the use of the Panama Canal. But to the English contention that the controversy should be referred to arbitration there seems to be no sufficient answer. Both countries are firmly committed to arbitration as the best method for the settlement of international disputes. It may be safely assumed without argument that if the matter in difference is not otherwise disposed of it will be left to an arbitral tribunal. It does not follow that resort must be or should be had to The Hague or The Hague Permanent Court of Arbitration. Our existing arbitration treaty with Great Britain, article 1, expressly excepts from reference to that court differences which 'concern the interests of third parties'—and in the case of the present difference over the meaning of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty the 'third parties' with interests concerned, but without legal standing in respect of them, include almost all the countries of Europe. That the present difference should not go to The Hague Permanent Court is as clear as that the parties are not bound to send it there. International arbitration derives its chief value from confidence in the arbitral tribunal and in its ability and purpose to do justice—an award lacking that confidence is not only likely to work unfortunately as regards the particular case, but also to discredit the cause of arbitration generally—and the fact must be reckoned with that in this country there is a widespread conviction which has been publicly voiced in high official circles that all Europe is interested in the success of the British contention, and that submission of the controversy to arbitration under The Hague convention would be in the nature of a farce. American sentiment on this point is no doubt in part due to the nature of the subject matter in controversy. The claim of Great Britain is, in effect, a territorial claim. The United States possesses no more costly and perhaps no more valuable piece of territory than the Panama Canal, and Great Britain's claim is that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty not only encumbers that territory with equal rights of use by all other nations, but impresses upon it a servitude by which the United States loses the free use of its own canal for its own vessels. It is rights of that nature as to which both countries are especially sensitive and which both countries have been peculiarly careful to safeguard. Thus, for territorial claims the general arbitration treaty of 1897 (perfected as such on the part of Great Britain, but killed in the United States Senate) provided a tribunal of six arbitrators, three of whom should be chosen by each party, and whose award should be final only when made by not less than five arbitrators. The same general idea governed in the case of the Alaska boundary, though the final award might be by four out of the six. A more important difference, however, is that in the case of the Alaska boundary the arbitrators were to consist of 'impartial jurists of repute,' whereas by the 1897 treaty they were to be taken from the judges of the highest courts of the respective countries. That such a tribunal should be made the interpreter of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty if arbitration of its terms becomes necessary and would be greatly preferable to a tribunal constituted as in the Alaska boundary controversy is unquestionable. It would be superior in dignity, in impartiality, and in general competency. It would be infinitely more likely to be regarded as beyond the reach of any but the most correct motives and influences, and the results would be infinitely more likely to command the cheerful acquiescence of both countries."

GEORGIA REFORMATORY.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter from Miss Lathrop, Chief Children's Bureau, relative to the imprisonment of Ollie Taylor in the Georgia Reformatory for stealing a bottle of coca cola. There has been so much publicity in the papers about the matter that in justice to the Georgia prison reformatory I ask to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter from Miss Lathrop touching the case of Ollie Taylor for stealing a bottle of coca cola. [Laughter.] Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

MAY 1, 1913.

MY DEAR SIR: I have just returned from Atlanta, Ga., where I went to attend the Southern Sociological Congress. While there I made personal inquiry into the case of Ollie Taylor, of whom you wrote me. The bureau has also had considerable correspondence with the Georgia authorities. I believe the following to be a fair statement of the facts:

Georgia has a juvenile court law, applicable, however, only in counties so electing. Fulton County, in which Atlanta is situated, has adopted this law and deals with children under it. Unfortunately the procedure and phraseology of the juvenile court follow closely those of the criminal court, and the use of this phraseology is apparently the cause of the wide misunderstanding of the case, although the actual provisions of the law are in line with most juvenile court laws, and section 885 especially states—

"This article (law) shall be liberally construed, to the end that the care, custody, and discipline of the children before the court shall approximate as nearly as possible that which they should receive from their parents and that, as far as practicable, they shall be treated not as criminals but as children in need of aid, encouragement, and guidance. Proceedings against children under this article shall not be deemed to be criminal proceedings, except where the child is committed to trial according to law."

The State of Georgia has a reformatory to which children from other counties are sent, but Fulton County maintains an institution of its own for boys, popularly known as the Fulton County Industrial Farm. It is not a penal institution, the superintendent reports to the State board of education. This farm is about 8 miles from Atlanta and consists of about 150 acres. There are now in the institution about 100 boys, who are in school half the day and at work in various farm occupations the other half of the day. The average length of stay at the farm is stated as about two years.

An agent visits the boys who are sent from the school and keeps the superintendent acquainted with their progress. If they are not doing well, they are brought back. The chief probation officer of the juvenile court, Mr. W. W. Tindall, states the history of Ollie Taylor as follows:

"Ollie was running the streets, idling and loitering, and stealing small edibles from groceries and wagons and hopping on and off moving trains. On his first appearance in court he was put on probation, and for a time he satisfied the probation officer, but on reappearance in court later, under new charges of running the streets and purloining articles indiscriminately, among which was a bottle of coca cola, he was committed to the industrial farm, since he had already been tried on probation, which had failed to reform him, and especially since his father complained that he could not do anything with his son."

While, according to the words of the statute, the child was sentenced, the actual fact seems to be that he was committed to the guardianship of the school during minority, as children are committed in the juvenile courts of other States to quasi-public industrial schools or to State schools for a period not longer than minority, to be placed out or discharged, at the discretion of the superintendent or trustees of the schools.

While in Atlanta, I visited this school and met the superintendent, who has been a professional teacher all his life. He seems to have the boys' interests sincerely at heart, and inquiry showed that he has the general confidence of the community. I saw the boys as they were marching out of the dining room on Sunday, dressed in their gray Sunday uniforms. The atmosphere of the place was that of a school. Some of the boys I spoke with, among them the child in question. He was a bright, cheerful-looking lad of about 13. All the information I gained personally in Atlanta, from my own observation, and from people with whom I spoke about the matter, convinced me that the boy is receiving proper care.

Very respectfully,

JULIA C. LATHROP,
Chief Children's Bureau.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LAFFERTY. To ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes to answer an article appearing in the Evening Star of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY] asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes in regard to an article in some paper. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this with reference to the matter that he has inserted in the RECORD, including the gentleman's biography——

Mr. LAFFERTY. It is.

Mr. FOSTER. And other matters, stating what wonderful things the gentleman has done in Congress?

Mr. LAFFERTY. They are somewhat remarkable, I will admit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman having five minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LAFFERTY said:

Mr. SPEAKER: There appeared in the Evening Star of yesterday an article which would probably be a proper basis for a question of personal privilege, but I do not care to dignify it by asking to reply to it upon that ground. It is headed, "Lafferty ends speech with loud applause" and "loud applause" is quoted. "Representative from Oregon takes advantage of 'leave to print' section." Further along the article states:

The "loud applause" said to have followed this dictum is anonymous. The RECORD discloses naught of its origin.

Now, there has been a great deal said in the newspapers about Members of the House of Representatives inserting printed speeches in the RECORD that were never delivered, and sprinkling applause through those speeches and sending them out to an unsuspecting public. I say that any Member of Congress who would indulge in a deception and fraud of that kind ought to be retired by his constituents at the first opportunity. The speech in question was delivered by me on the floor of this House on last Saturday evening in the presence of nearly all of you whom I am now facing. I spoke for 25 minutes, and the full speech

would have required about 30 minutes. At the conclusion of my remarks, the official stenographer inserted in the speech "Loud applause," in accordance with the facts, and instead of inserting it at the point where my time shut me off, which was a few paragraphs before the conclusion of the speech, he, and not I, inserted that "Loud applause" at the end of the manuscript speech which he had in his possession.

Now, then, I have had considerable experience with the Associated Press, of which Mr. Frank B. Noyes, one of the owners of the Evening Star, is president. I have defied that organization from the time I first announced myself as a candidate for a seat in this honorable body. I defy it now, and I shall continue to defy it so long as I am in public life. The Associated Press boasts that it has nearly 1,000 newspapers in the United States. I have no kind of respect for any Member of Congress who comes here to serve the people and is afraid to speak upon any subject that will not bring forth laudation from the Associated Press, and there are such in this House of Representatives. If you are going to represent your constituents, sooner or later you are bound to defy the Associated Press, the same as you are bound to defy special privilege in all of its forms, for the Associated Press is controlled by special privilege.

I have introduced a bill, which was mentioned in this article, and to which my unsophisticated friend from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] has referred in a deprecatory manner. That bill, to control the Associated Press, appeared in this speech as an appendix, and there is certain correspondence had with Mr. Frank B. Noyes in regard to that bill which I beg leave to insert as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY] asks unanimous consent to insert as a part of his remarks the correspondence to which he refers.

Mr. FOSTER. I object. I think we have had enough of this.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

223. Figs, 2 cents per pound; plums, prunes, and prunelles, 1 cent per pound; raisins and other dried grapes, 2 cents per pound; dates, 1 cent per pound; currants, Zante or other, 2 cents per pound; olives, 15 cents per gallon.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 56, line 1, by striking out the figure "2" and inserting the figures "2½."

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered restores the present rate on figs. Until very recent years the Smyrna fig has had a monopoly not only in the United States, but throughout the world, and it has only been through the persistence and the nerve of Californians that there is to-day a real competitor of the Smyrna fig. California has for many years raised figs, but these figs did not compete with the imported Smyrna fig. Since 1882 private parties in California have been expending large sums of money for the purpose of introducing a fig in California that would be a real competitor of the foreign fig. Not until the year 1900, when a certain insect called the *Blastophaga grossorum*, without which the Smyrna fig can not be successfully produced, was introduced into California, have we produced a fig that is a real competitor of the imported article. Since the House increased the duty one-half cent in the last tariff bill the industry has received an impetus and the acreage set out to fig trees in California has practically doubled. An increased production of this fig will cause the price of the imported product to be reduced throughout the entire country.

In framing this "scientific" tariff revision bill there appears to have been a studied effort to overlook no section or industry of California, and throughout the 58 counties of California there will not be a man, woman, or child who will fail to have brought to his or her attention the full significance of a Democratic attempt to tinker with the tariff.

I realize that probably these remarks will have no effect whatever upon the Members upon the other side of the House, but I want to say that so far as those citizens of my State are concerned who have expended thousands of dollars in placing this industry upon a paying basis, those who have in the last two or three years doubled their fig acreage—and I want to call attention to the fact that it takes six years for a fig tree to become a producer—to these people this item of half a cent is a matter of great importance.

In the northern part of the State of California you have struck at the lumber industry and the wool industry. You have reduced the duty upon citrus fruits. You have also reduced the duty on beans, and you have reduced the duty on olives, and upon olive oil, and you have reduced the duty upon sugar, to the injury of the 13 beet-sugar factories, employing over 25,000 men. In three years sugar will be free, and when you have destroyed the only competitors of the Sugar Trust by closing these beet-sugar factories, the price of sugar will be no lower and an American industry will have been destroyed.

This bill is calamitous, so far as the State of California is concerned, and I am glad at this time to go on record by offering this amendment, although I know it will have no effect upon the other side of the House. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 56, line 3, by striking out the figure "2" and inserting the figures "2½."

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment restores the present duty of 2½ cents per pound upon raisins. Heretofore there has always been a slight differential in favor of raisins as against the Zante currant. The Zante currant is really a seedless raisin, and the one-half cent a pound which this bill removes has been of great benefit to the raisin growers of California. If you vote down this amendment, you make the duty upon Zante currants the same as it is upon raisins, to the disadvantage of the California grower, for Zante currants compete with seedless raisins. The Zante currant is a foreign product.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

Mr. HAYES rose.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Oh, my colleague will excuse me. I did not know he was present. I yield to my colleague, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the figures "15," in line 4, and inserting in lieu thereof "25."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, line 4, page 56, by striking out the figures "15" and inserting "25."

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simply to restore the present duty on olives.

We raise in California about 4,000 tons of olives fit for pickling. As I said in regard to the olive-oil industry, if the present duty could be continued, in time to come, not very far distant, we can produce practically all the olives that are consumed in this country, whether pickled green or ripe.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman intend to restore the present duty?

Mr. HAYES. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. Then you do not quite do it. In the present law olives, in bottles, jars, kegs, tins, and other packages containing less than 5 gallons each, have a duty of 25 cents a gallon; otherwise, 15 cents a gallon. I think the gentleman ought to put that in; otherwise I could not vote for it.

Mr. HAYES. Very well. I will ask that that be included to restore the present law. I have the language right here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 56, line 4, by striking out the words "olives, 15 cents per gallon," and inserting in lieu thereof "olives, in bottles, jars, kegs, tins, or other packages containing less than 5 gallons each, 25 cents per gallon; otherwise, 15 cents per gallon."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to make any extended speech. I only desire to say that in this industry to-day, under the present law, there are no excessive profits; but it is a business that can be carried on by people who live in the foothills, where they have cheap lands, and it is very desirable, from our standpoint in California, that it should be encouraged and allowed to develop, as it will under the present tariff conditions. Much lowering of the duty will destroy it.

Mr. RAINEY. May I ask the gentleman how many tons of olives are produced to an acre?

Mr. HAYES. About one and a quarter tons of olives per acre.

Mr. RAINEY. The brief filed here by Mr. L. J. Hough, of Los Angeles, Cal., shows that the average profits per ton of pickling olives is $39.20; and if they produce a ton and a quarter to the acre——

Mr. HAYES. They are not all pickling olives. Only 25 to 30 per cent of the crop are pickling olives. The rest have to go to the oil press. The pickling olives are only the larger and finer grades, and the poorer ones, those that have any blemishes or that are smaller, have to go to the oil press, so that the figures stated by the gentleman do not represent the profit per acre, nor anything like it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 56, lines 3 and 4, by striking out "Currants, Zante or other, 2 cents per pound" and insert in lieu thereof the following:
"Currants, Zante or other, shall be admitted free of duty."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I introduced various amendments in the discussion of the bill yesterday, but unfortunately a number of them did not meet with the approval of gentlemen on that side of the House. I have now introduced an amendment which I feel confident (?) will receive the support of every gentleman on that side of the House, and I believe when I have explained it it will also receive the support of every Member on this side of the House. As I am informed, this is a product that is not raised in this country at all. The Zante currant can be raised and is raised only in Greece, particularly in the Peloponnesus. This is shown by the statement made by United States Consul A. B. Cooke:

[From the Daily Consular and Trade Reports.]

GREEK CURRANT CULTURE AND CROP.

Greece has practically a world monopoly in the cultivation of currants. Efforts have been made to grow the currant in other countries, but thus far without appreciable success. The Greek currant belongs to the grape family, being a sort of small, seedless, and very sweet grape, growing upon a vine like the ordinary grape. Its cultivation is confined to the Peloponnesus and the lower Ionian Isles and constitutes the chief agricultural industry of those sections.

This duty does not to any degree protect any American industry. It is a tariff that is levied, as I suppose, solely for revenue. I note from the tables that are furnished by the committee that last year some 33,000,000 pounds of Zante currants were imported into this country at a value of $1,500,000, the average price per pound being about 4.7 cents. The duty under this proposed law is 2 cents per pound. It is estimated by those who have prepared this table that the price of these currants will continue to rise; that the price next year will be 5 cents per pound; and the proposed duty is therefore about 40 per cent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is the bald proposition: These Zante currants are not luxuries. They are necessities for the food of the common people. I am speaking for the great host of pie eaters and plum-pudding eaters and for 400,000 workingmen throughout the United States, to whom these currants are a valuable, nutritious, and wholesome article of food. You can not make a good mince pie or a good plum pudding without Zante currants, and in the face of the declaration of gentlemen on that side that they are going to cheapen the poor man's food this bill proposes, ruthlessly and without the slightest excuse, to levy a tax upon the buns and mince pies and plum puddings of this country of $661,000 per year.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman's amendment should give a little better opportunity for that side of the House to get close to the pie counter, does he think there would be any trouble in having it adopted? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIS. I think there would be no difficulty at all. If gentlemen on that side could be assured that they and their constituents could get up close to the pie counter at once, they would all vote for this amendment; but I think they are going to vote for it anyhow. They will have to vote for it, because it is in line with the declaration that has been made here 50 times during this debate, that the purpose of this legislation is to cheapen the poor man's food. And I invite attention to the fact that the Zante currants are used not simply in plum puddings and mince pies. They are used in the poor man's bread and the poor man's cake. There are thousands of laborers in this country whose only approach to luxury is a few currants in their bread; and yet this Democratic majority, made up of this host of the friends (?) of the common people, pledged to see to it that the common people shall have free bread and free meat, are proposing here to say that they will levy on the food of the poor man a tax of $661,000 per year. I want my friends on this side of the House to understand that this duty of 2 cents per pound can not possibly be of any advantage to any American industry, since we have tried to raise Zante currants in this country and failed ignominiously. An attempt was made to raise these currants in California, but it was found that the nature of the vine changed in that climate so that the seedless Zante currants could not be produced.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If I thought these currants were the same they used to make pies of for the harvest hands in Kansas, I would be against the amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAYES. The same kind.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then I am against them.

Mr. WILLIS. I think these are not the same thing. These are the kind they undertook to raise in California and they were not the real thing. This is an amendment in the interest of the people. It reduces the price of food according to the Democratic doctrine; it takes the tax from the poor man's bread and the housewives' mince pies and plum puddings; it does not deprive any American laborer of employment or injure any American industry; and it ought to be adopted.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and paragraph close in five minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. I want a minute.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield the gentleman a minute.

Mr. PAYNE. I will wait until the gentleman from Alabama gets through.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am rather surprised that my good friend from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] should attempt to make a joke of the food of the poor people. He is always interesting and always says some good things, but I did not expect that he would treat the question of giving the poor people of this country free bread and free meat as a joke.

Of course, the committee has endeavored to reduce the taxes on the food products of the American people. As to how far that will be effective in reducing the price no man can prophesy at this time. In regard to some food products, such as sugar, I do not question for a moment that, if this bill becomes a law, there will be a very great reduction in the price. As to the other food products, the probabilities are that it may be infinitesimal.

But here is the difference between currants that are raised only abroad and sugar that is a competitive product. These currants of course are highly competitive. They all, or practically all, come from abroad, and every cent of tax that falls on them goes into the Treasury of the United States to support the Government of the people. But when you come to the tax on sugar—if I recollect right, I saw the gentleman from Ohio the other day walk between the tellers voting against making this reduction on the people's sugar; he is trying to take a revenue tax off of currants, every dollar of which goes into the Treasury of the United States to support the Government of the people, for, as I stated, he walked between the tellers and voted for a tax on sugar that levies $115,000,000 burden on the consuming masses of the American people when only $50,000,000 of it goes into the Treasury of the United States to support the Government, and the other $65,000,000 goes into the pockets of the special interests. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the position the gentleman from Ohio takes in levying these taxes.

Now, you would imagine from what the gentleman from Ohio said, that we had resurrected this tax from nowhere and put it as a burden on these people. There has been a tax on these Zante currants almost from the beginning. Under the Wilson bill there was a tax of 1¼ cents a pound, and the ad valorem equivalent at that time equaled 89 per cent. Under the Dingley bill there was a tax of 2 cents per pound, and the ad valorem equivalent equaled 79 per cent. When the Payne bill became a law 2 cents was retained on the Zante currants, with an ad valorem equivalent of 56 per cent. In 1912 the ad

valorem equivalent dropped to 42 per cent, and this bill still retains the same 2 cents tax on Zante currants. It will produce a revenue of over $600,000 for the Government and, as I say to the gentleman from Ohio, every dollar of that tax goes to the Government and the special interests get none.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIS. Under the gentleman's theory, would he be in favor of a tax on tea and coffee? I am opposed to such a tax.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that there is a broad prejudice against taxing tea and coffee.

Mr. WILLIS. And currants.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But there is more justice in taxing tea and coffee, every dollar of which tax would go into the Federal Treasury, than there is in taxing sugar in the interest of special interests whose hands have never been too clean in the the city of Washington. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I now yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one minute.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I can not say all I want to say in that time. I am surprised at the gentleman from Ohio. He has not delved into the question as he usually does. These Zante currants are nothing more than raisins, and not very good raisins at that. They take the place of raisins.

The 2 cents a pound is a protective duty on them. Of course, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has copied our duty in this bill on Zante currants, as he has copied a good many other things in the present tariff law, and he would have done a good deal better if he had copied more. It is a protection on raisins. He need not have put any duty on raisins. If he had not it would not be proper to put it on Zante currants, but if it is proper to put it on raisins, it is proper to put it on Zante currants, purely as a matter of protection, although this is a food product. Currants are a food substitute for raisins in pies and cakes and things of that kind. I have eaten them both. I commend the gentleman from Alabama for keeping this duty on in order that we may produce raisins here, and with the competition make them cheaper in the markets, as they already are and have been for a number of years. The duty is all right and I shall vote against the amendment. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

225. Lemons, limes, oranges, grapefruit, shaddocks, and pomelos in packages of a capacity of 1¼ cubic feet or less, 18 cents per package; in packages of capacity exceeding 1¼ cubic feet and not exceeding 2½ cubic feet, 35 cents per package; in packages exceeding 2½ and not exceeding 5 cubic feet, 70 cents per package; in packages exceeding 5 cubic feet or in bulk, one-half of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 56, in line 7, strike out all of paragraph 225 and substitute the following:

"Lemons, 1¼ cents per pound; oranges, limes, grapefruit, shaddocks, and pomelos, 1 cent per pound."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in 10 minutes.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I would like two or three minutes.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. I desire to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will ask that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, each gentleman to be recognized for 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall close in 15 minutes and that the recognition be for 3 minutes to each gentleman. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in good faith, to replace the duties where they now are and to remedy an injustice that is being done an industry that has already suffered through the ravages of the frost. I also offer it to call the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means to several items in this proposed paragraph. You have changed from the pound basis to the box basis, and I suppose the reason for this, Mr. Chairman, is to simplify the method of handling the imports by the customhouse by eliminating the necessity of refunds for decay. But the present plan will increase the cost to the Government, because the decay will have to be determined by counting each rotten fruit, rather than eliminating and weighing the decayed fruit as a whole. It has been held by the Board of Appraisers that there should be no allowance for decay where the duty has been levied on the capacity of the packages rather than the contents. This was Treasury decision 32108, but this decision was recently reversed by the United States Court of Customs Appeals, Treasury decision 32570, which holds that decayed fruit is subject to rebates whether the duty is levied on contents or capacity basis. So that this present plan will increase the cost to the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I take it that it was the intention of this committee to fix the duty on citrus fruits at one-half cent per pound, and the committee has done this in connection with the fruit in bulk and in packages exceeding 5 cubic feet. On all other packages it has fixed a duty considerably below one-half of 1 cent per pound by an apparent error in fixing the maximum size of the packages. It provides that in packages of capacity exceeding 1¼ cubic feet and not exceeding 2½ cubic feet there shall be a duty of 35 cents per package. A cubic foot of lemons weighs, on the average, 36¼ pounds, and the rate of 35 cents established is 10 cents below what the committee should have fixed on this package. The importer at present uses a package of 2 cubic feet, but with this maximum of 2½ cubic feet he will immediately enlarge the package and thus take advantage of the provision in this paragraph and save for himself the duty of 10 cents on each such package, thereby escaping the payment of duty on 18 pounds of fruit on each package.

There has been much talk on this floor about the eastern consumer paying the cost of transportation on lemons from California. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the present duty was never intended to equalize the freight rate. It equalizes the difference in the labor and materials entering into a box of American and foreign lemons and nothing more. The foreigners add to the producing cost a complicated series of brokers' and speculators' profits and the growers' profits as well, and compare that with our cost of production; but no tariff duty should ever attempt to protect a group of foreign profits, because the foreign industry can simplify its method whenever business necessities require.

What the Democratic Party denies to American industry it should as scrupulously deny to a foreign industry.

This Congress is asked to reduce the revenues of the Government a million and a quarter dollars annually and to turn that sum over to the small coterie of importers who control the supplies that enter the American ports. It is a stake worth playing for, and is done under the subtle guise of reducing the cost of living. I would not have the assurance to make these remarks if the history of the retail lemon business in Toronto, Montreal, Halifax, and St. John, where foreign lemons, duty free, are used exclusively, did not prove that the retailer there charges the consumer the identical price, or even more, than the consumer pays in the United States.

The low duty on citrus fruits established in this bill violates every principle of tariff making. It makes a rate lower than a competitive rate, it takes no account of the difference in the cost of production, and it reduces the revenue that the Government has collected more than a million and a quarter dollars annually. It will turn the lemon supplies of the eastern consumer into the hands of a few importers, and in the absence of a healthy domestic competition the eastern consumer, like the consumer in Canada, will pay the price of a monopolistic control of the lemon supply.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer another amendment after this amendment has been disposed of.

Mr. HAYES. That is what I desire to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. This does not exhaust debate?

The CHAIRMAN. Not at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This merely disposes of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 12 minutes of debate remaining. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out paragraph 225, page 56, and insert in lieu thereof: "Lemons, 1 cent per pound; oranges, limes, grapefruit, shaddocks, and pomelos, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound."

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, the lemon growers of California believe that they are entitled to a duty of

1½ cents per pound on lemons, and that it will be for the best interests of the American people to have a duty of 1½ cents per pound on lemons. However, this Congress has determined on a reduction.

I came to this Congress and to the previous one believing that many schedules should be reduced, but I can not stand here now, and I have not been willing at any time to stand here, and vote for a reduction in other schedules and not be willing to make a similar reduction in schedules affecting my own district and State. Therefore I offer this amendment in good faith.

Mr. Chairman, nobody to-day really knows what reductions should be made, unless it is upon the wool schedule and the cotton schedule, which have had the benefit of a tariff-board report. I would be perfectly willing, and I think the various industries in California would be quite willing, to take any reduction recommended after deliberation upon a report from an expert, nonpartisan tariff commission. I would vote for whatever the result of that investigation proved would be best for the American people. [Applause.] I believe that 1 cent per pound will help the lemon industry far more than the one-half cent per pound allowed in this bill.

Our lemon growers believe that a reduction to one-half cent per pound will practically ruin the lemon industry. Lemon groves have increased in California near 150 per cent in the last 15 years. In 1903 California furnished about 25 per cent of the lemons consumed in the United States. To-day it supplies something like 60 per cent of the lemons used in the United States.

Los Angeles County alone, which I have the honor in part to represent, has enough land not now planted to fruit trees which is adapted to and available for the raising of lemons to supply the 40 per cent now imported. In the balance of the State 80,000 acres are also fitted and available therefor.

California would like to supply the whole of the United States with lemons. It believes it can do so at prices that will average less than if supplied from abroad.

All I ask is a fair protection for this or any other California industry. It is all that I have ever asked at any time. I am ready to reduce any schedule that should be reduced, even our own. I do not ask for California industries a ratio of protection beyond that which I am willing to vote to industries elsewhere. [Applause.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HAYES. I ask for information, will that cut me out?

The CHAIRMAN. It will not.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear the frank admission from my friend from California that the lemon industry in California has been receiving more protection than it really needed. I know of no industry in the country that has so completely demonstrated at the present time its ability to get along absolutely without tariff protection as the lemon industry of California. Out there 6,500 lemon growers have formed a combination, but in some mysterious way they escape the operation of the antitrust laws. There are a few lemon growers who are not in the association, but not many. These 6,500 lemon growers have organized themselves into 115 primary associations, and those 115 primary or original associations have organized themselves into 17 associations, and these 17 associations have perfected the Lemon Trust of the country, which is known as the California Fruit Growers' Association, and there is nothing like it anywhere in the world. Why, they have a box rate on lemons from San Francisco to New York of 84 cents per box, and they can not land lemons in New York from Sicily for less than that amount; and after the Sicilian lemons get here they pay the tariff before they get on the market. The California Fruit Growers' Association have the right to divert a car of lemons whenever they want to do it, and on account of the perfect organization they have formed, if lemon growers in different sections of California start two carloads of lemons for the same point somewhere in the Middle West or in the East, before those lemons reached that point this splendidly organized association always finds it out and they divert one of those cars of lemons, so there never is and never can be in any territory reached by California lemons the slightest competition between lemons grown in California, and, at present, on account of the perfect organization they have, California lemons are being sold cheaper in New York City than they are being sold in Denver.

They ship lemons from California to Canada and pay the tariff charged by Canada, and then compete there—and compete successfully—with lemons from Sicily. The lemons grown in Sicily and in California are really two different propositions. The California lemons are larger. They are a better looking fruit. The Sicilian lemons are much smaller, but they contain more acidity. There is only one place on this continent where there is any competition in lemons at the present time, and that is in New York City and adjacent sections, and perhaps other large eastern cities. It is only along the Atlantic seaboard that competition is possible between the California lemon and the Sicilian lemon. We have given them the rate they ought to have in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, in line 7, page 56, by inserting after the word "lemon" the words "1½ cents per pound."

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] is something like Josh Billings's goose. He would be better off if he did not know so many things that are not true. [Laughter.] Most of what the gentleman has stated in regard to marketing the California lemons is not true.

Mr. RAINEY. It is all based upon the testimony we took in the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HAYES. The gentleman has misinterpreted it entirely.

Mr. RAINEY. No; I have not.

Mr. HAYES. This lemon growers' association of which he speaks has no authority to fix the price of lemons. They handle only 75 per cent of the lemons grown in California, and a large proportion of this 75 per cent is sold at public auction in this country in open competition with the world. That is the truth. And if they bring less in New York than they do in Denver it is because in New York they have to encounter more competition from the Italian or the Sicilian lemon than they do in Denver. That is all. That is what makes the price. There is no trust. It is an association of lemon growers, formed for the sole purpose of marketing their product to the best possible advantage. They often do divert, if there is liable to be a great dumping of a surplus in one market, a car of lemons that may be consigned to that place, to a place where there will be no surplus. And I commend that sort of thing to all the agriculturists of the country. We would be in a very different situation agriculturally to-day if the growers of agricultural products would follow the example of the lemon growers of California.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is an infant industry in this country in the true sense of those words. Fifteen years ago lemon growing was not known in this country as a large commercial proposition, and to-day we do not grow more than one-half of the product that is consumed in this country. But we have land that is adapted to growing sufficient lemons to supply all of this country and the whole of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. AUSTIN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HAYES. Certainly.

Mr. AUSTIN. Do you not understand that the purpose is for the Democratic Party to give the American voters a free lemon?

Mr. HAYES. As I understand it, the purpose of this provision is to get the Italian vote on the Atlantic seaboard. That is the purpose, and that is all the purpose, there is no doubt. It will not bring a cheaper lemon to the consumer, and nobody knows it better than the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. AUSTIN. The Italian board of trade in New York City requested this?

Mr. HAYES. They sent agents here to appear before the committee and demanded it.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HAYES. I can not yield.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is along the same lines as nearly all of the provisions that affect the agricultural schedule. They are intended to catch the voters. That is what they are for, and there is no scientific or business reason why most of them should be incorporated into our tariff laws.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] has made an appeal to the Members of this House for lower priced lemons for the people of this country.

The gentleman has stated how many men were engaged in the raising of lemons in California. If he had been a member of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1908 he would have heard an abundance of evidence to the effect that 1 cent per

pound was not sufficient protection to protect the lemon orchards of California. He would have heard that lemon orchards were fast being grafted to oranges, it not being profitable to raise lemons. Thousands of trees have been grafted, thus discontinuing to that extent the raising of lemons in California. The gentleman ought to have stated to the Members of this House that Italy and Sicily now supply the whole world, outside of the United States, with lemons, and that from one-half to two-thirds of all the lemons consumed in the United States come from Sicily and Italy.

The gentlemen who appeared before the committee in January favoring a lower rate of duty on lemons denounced the lemon growers of California for the employment of alien labor, foreign labor—Japanese, Chinese, Mexicans, Hindus, and all that sort of people—and assailed those engaged in the sugar industry of California for employing foreigners, stating that they had no other farm labor.

I want to read a statement from a paper published at Yonkers, N. Y.—the Yonkers Statesman—on April 16, 1913. There is a strike on in the establishment of the Federal Sugar Refining Co., where the very men who testified before our committee and criticized California for employing foreigners figure. Here is what one of them says, going on to tell about the strike in the refinery of the Federal Sugar Refining Co., and about protection to be given nonunion labor. I read:

REFINERY OPERATING TO-DAY.

The Federal Sugar Refinery is operating to-day with a force of about 150 men. They are refining the raw sugar that was on hand in the factory when the strike started. Unless this were done the cane sugar would spoil. It is the plan to close down completely when this work is finished, unless there are enough nonunion men to run the plant.

The men working are all nonunion men. A few of them are new employees, who have come in since the strike started. Others were employed as machinists, oilers, helpers, cleaners, and in various other capacities.

Following yesterday's clash between the police and the strikers at the entrance to the refinery, the company has supplemented the guard of policemen with between 60 and 70 special officers, whom it is employing.

Mr. Spreckels said this morning that protection would be afforded to the men at work, even if the Regular Army has to be called out.

"We rely on the city authorities for protection," he said, "and they seem to have the situation well in hand. If the police and special officers are not sufficient to protect the plant and the men who want to work, we have the sheriff of the county to fall back on, and next the militia and the Regular Army. Being citizens of this country, we have this right to protection. I doubt if 10 of the foreigners in the union at the refinery are citizens of this country, and if they riot or incite to riot I think steps can be taken to have them deported."

You will notice this:

Mr. Spreckels said this morning that protection would be afforded to the men at work, even if the Regular Army has to be called out.

Then he adds:

Being citizens of this country, we have the right to protection. I doubt if 10 of the foreigners in the union at the refinery are citizens of this country, and if they riot or incite a riot I think steps can be taken to have them deported.

He says not 10 of the foreigners of that union employed at the refinery are American citizens—employed by Mr. Spreckels and Mr. Lowry, upon whose testimony largely you have made up the sugar free-list bill and imposed a lower rate of duty on lemons, criticizing the Californians for employing foreigners. Now comes the truth of it right in his own factory, where men are now on a strike, not 10 of whom are citizens of the United States. Oh, that is a grand appeal. That is a grand man's statement to listen to in the fixing of rates of duty. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

226. Orange peel or lemon peel, preserved, candied, or dried, 1 cent per pound; coconut ment or copra, desiccated, shredded, cut, or similarly prepared, and citron or citron peel, preserved, candied, or dried, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, at this moment the mail of Members on both sides of the Chamber is heavy with letters from men who are making suggestions as to amendments to this bill, and in actual practice every Member when so written makes invariably the same reply at this stage of the measure. The Member writes his constituents and says that the bill is now closed against possible amendment.

This omnibus tariff bill is closed against possible amendment. This bill has been closed to amendment since it left the Ways and Means Committee. It was not changed much in the Democratic caucus. It was closed there, and it has not been materially changed at all here. It is closed here.

The scene we see here is to us quite different from what it must appear to the people out over the country. The people of the United States believe that here is raging a closely fought battle over the tariff. There is a battle here, but it is a sham battle. Every amendment which is offered from any place, save one place here, is promptly voted down. If an amendment comes from the little table in front, where sits the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], no matter what it is, no matter how trivial or how grave it may threaten to be in its results, it is always voted up. If it comes from any other place, it is voted down. If this debate accomplishes anything at all, it is to outline the policy or demonstrate the lack of policy on the part of the party in power.

Through the whole debate it has become more and more apparent that those in charge of the bill have levied inconsistently a duty with an idea of protection here and with an idea of revenue there. The debate has also revealed, I think, to every one—probably not to the partisan eye, but in reality—that the bill is full of inconsistencies; that in some instances those who have made up the bill have put a duty upon the raw material and left the finished product free, and in other cases they have put a duty on the finished product and left the raw material free. We saw one notable instance in the case of ferromanganese, a product which is absolutely controlled by the Steel Trust, which is part of the raw material entering into a finished product. We saw steel made free and a duty put upon the trust-controlled ferromanganese.

If the debate has served any purpose at all, then, under this five-minute rule, it has been in developing anew the fact that in the framing and presentation of an omnibus tariff bill men can not know what they are doing, and do not know what they are doing.

At the conclusion of this bill there will come an opportunity for the submission of a motion to recommit. In all likelihood I will be precluded from offering that motion to recommit, unless there shall be a special rule allowing two motions to recommit. For that reason and believing as I do that Congress will never successfully revise the tariff justly in the United States unless the revision is schedule by schedule, preceded by data adduced by a scientific nonpartisan tariff commission, I propose, if I am precluded from the motion to recommit, to offer as an amendment to the administrative features of this bill a proposition for the creation of a tariff commission. My proposal is for a real tariff commission, not a sham-efficient or make-believe one, a proposition which will permit a body to exercise power and authority to investigate with thoroughness all factors involved, that it may reach out and get the facts, a power that the late tariff board did not have, a power that I do not think other measures offered give to proposed commissions; and I will now, with the permission of the House, include in my remarks this provision for a tariff commission, which I will offer later as an amendment, so that it may be printed in the RECORD and that all the Members may have a view of it.

It is as follows:

"SECTION V. (a) That there is hereby created a body to be known as the tariff commission, which shall consist of five commissioners, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No person shall be eligible to serve as a member of said commission while holding any other public office of either honor or profit, either by election or appointment, or who is a Senator or Representative elect of the United States. Not more than three of said commissioners shall be members of the same political party. The commissioners first appointed under this act shall continue in office for the terms of 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 years, respectively, and from the first day of July, A. D. 1913, the term of each to be designated by the President, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 10 years, except that any person chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. Any commissioner may, after due hearing, be removed by the President upon proof of ineligibility or of any violation of any provision of this act, or for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. No vacancy in the commission shall impair the right of the remaining commissioners to exercise all the powers of the commission. Said commissioners shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. Each commissioner shall receive a salary of $7,500 per year. The President shall designate a member of the commission to be chairman thereof during the term for which he is appointed. The commission shall appoint a secretary, who shall receive a salary of $5,000 per annum, and such other employees as it may find necessary to the proper performance of its duties and shall fix the salary or compensation of each. Three commissioners shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business as a commission.

"(b) That the principal office of the commission shall be in the city of Washington, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall furnish the commission with suitable offices and equipment thereof and with all necessary supplies. The commission shall, in addition, have full authority as a body by one or more of its members or through its employees, when so authorized by the commission, to conduct investigations at any other place or places, either in the United States or foreign countries, as the commission may determine. Said commission shall promulgate rules and regulations for the safekeeping of all papers, correspondence, tabulations, reports, explanations, and other information gathered by it. All of the expenses of the commission, including all necessary expenses for transportation incurred by the commissioners or by their employees under their orders, in making any investigation in any place other than in the city of Washington, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the chairman of the commission.

"(c) That the commission shall have authority and power, and it is hereby directed to ascertain and tabulate for purposes of comparison the difference in the cost of producing articles of the same or similar quality and kind in this country and in actually or potentially competing foreign countries. The commission shall ascertain and tabulate for purposes of comparison where such tabulation is practicable in connection with the several articles covered by its reports in the United States, and in such foreign countries the wages, hours of service, and efficiency of labor employed and the standards of living of such laborers. The commission shall likewise ascertain the cost and selling prices of raw material, the cost of labor, the fixed charges, the depreciation upon the true value of the capital invested, and all other items entering into and determining the true cost and selling price of the finished product. The commission shall ascertain the market conditions and the prices at which protected products of the United States are sold in foreign countries, as compared with the prices of such products sold in the United States. The commission shall investigate the effect of transportation rates upon the markets and prices of dutiable products, and so far as pertinent to the tariffs fixed upon articles on the dutiable list the control of such markets and absence or presence of free competition in the same, and shall, pursuant to the purposes of this act in so far as practicable, investigate all questions and conditions relating to the agricultural, manufacturing, mining, commercial, and labor interests with reference to the tariff schedules and classifications of the United States and of foreign countries, and shall investigate the capitalization, industrial organization and efficiency, and the general competitive position in this country and abroad of industries seeking protecton from Congress. The commission shall likewise investigate in general and in regard to particular articles the revenue-producing power of the tariff and its relation to the resources of government, and shall investigate the effect of tariffs both of the United States and of foreign countries on prices, on the operations of middle men, on the wages paid for labor, and on the purchasing power of the consumer. The commission shall also make investigation of any particular subject whenever directed by either House of Congress or the President of the United States. The commission shall have the power to call upon any of the existing departments or bureaus of the Government for information on file in such departments or bureaus which it may require in connection with the work which it is authorized to do by this act, and it shall be the duty of every such department or bureau of the Government to furnish such information on request from the commission. It shall be the duty of said commission to hold hearings from time to time at such places as it may designate to determine industrial, commercial, and labor conditions in relation to costs of production and effects and operations of the tariff schedules and classifications in force in the United States and in foreign countries. Such hearings shall be public, except as otherwise herein provided. The commission shall, whenever practicable, give at least 10 days' public notice of any and all such hearings, and at any such hearing any person may appear before said commission, subject to such reasonable limitation upon the amount of and duplication of testimony and arguments as may be provided by the rules of said commission, and be heard or may be represented by attorney and may file any written statement or documentary evidence bearing upon any matter which the commission may have under investigation. The commission may from time to time make or amend such general rules or orders as may be requisite for the orderly regulation of proceedings before it, including form of notices and the service thereof. Every vote and official act of the commission and of each member thereof shall be entered of record. Any of the members of the commission or its secretary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations and to sign notices.

"(d) That to assist the President in securing information as to the effect of tariff rates, restrictions, exactions, or any regulations imposed at any time by the United States or any foreign country upon the importation into or sale in the United States or any foreign country of the products affected, and as to any export bounty paid or export duty imposed or prohibition made by any country upon the exportation of any article to the United States which discriminates against the United States or the products thereof, and to assist the President in the application of the maximum and minimum tariffs and other administrative provisions of the customs laws and in obtaining information concerning the economic results of said laws, the commission shall from time to time make report as the President shall direct, and upon direction by the President shall draft a plan for scientific classification of schedules in aid of administration of the provisions of the customs laws.

"(e) That for the purposes of this act in the case of articles on the dutiable list, and such other articles as the commission may decide or may be directed to investigate, the said commission is authorized to require of any person, firm, copartnership, corporation, or association engaged in the production, importation, manufacture, or distribution of any such article or articles the production of all books, papers, contracts, agreements, invoices, inventories, bills, and documents of any such person, firm, copartnership, corporation, or association and make every inquiry necessary to a determination of the value of such property and necessary to accomplish the purposes for which said commission is created. In aid of its powers herein granted to secure information the commission shall have the power, whenever necessary for the purposes of its investigations, to prescribe and enforce uniform systems of accounting for protected industries, for manufacturers, and producers of commodities protected by import duties. The commission is authorized to require by notice the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all books, papers, contracts, agreements, inventories, invoices, bills, and documents relating to any matters pertaining to such investigation. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing, and witnesses shall receive the same fees as are paid in the Federal courts.

"(f) That the district courts of the United States, upon the application of the commission alleging a failure to comply with any order of the commission with relation to the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence, shall have jurisdiction to issue the necessary process or writs for the enforcement of the orders of the commission, and in case of disobedience to a subpœna the commission or a member thereof may invoke the aid of any one of the district courts of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents within the jurisdiction of such court within which an investigation or inquiry by the commission is being carried on. In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpœna issued to any person or corporation subject to the provisions of this act, any of the district courts of the United States having jurisdiction as herein provided may issue an order requiring such person or corporation to appear before the commission and produce books, documents, and other papers if so ordered and give evidence concerning the matter under investigation by the commission, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. The commission may also order testimony to be taken by deposition in any investigation and at any stage of such investigation. Such deposition may be taken before any person authorized so to do by the commission and who has power to administer oaths. Any person may be compelled to appear and depose and produce documentary evidence in the same manner as witnesses may be compelled to appear and testify and produce documentary evidence before the commission as hereinbefore provided. Such testimony shall be reduced to writing. No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, papers, documents, or other things before the commission or in obedience to the subpœna of the commission whether such subpœna be signed or issued by one or more of the commissioners or the secretary of the commission on the ground or for the reason that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to criminate him or to subject him to a penalty or forfeiture. But no natural person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he may testify under oath or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, before said commission in obedience to a subpœna issued by it: *Provided*, That no person so testifying shall be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

"(g) In any investigation conducted by the commission as herein provided, the testimony of any witness in regard to secret processes or trade secrets not contrary to public policy shall not be reduced to writing, nor shall any documents of like character be copied into the records of investigations or otherwise made a part thereof, and for the purpose of obtaining such testimony or of examining such documents, and for such purposes alone, the commission shall have the power to hold secret sessions and take evidence thereat. All other testimony shall be reduced to writing and, with all other documentary evidence received, incorporated in the records of the commission for the guidance of the commission and for the use of the President and Congress as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That no evidence or information secured for the confidential use of the commission shall be made public in such a manner as to be available for the use of any business competitor or rival of the firm, copartnership, corporation, or association from whom or concerning whom such evidence or information was obtained; *And provided further*, That in case in any investigation authorized by this act the commission shall obtain evidence or information for its confidential use, the commission shall not be required to divulge the names of persons furnishing such evidence or information.

"(h) The commission shall make annual reports to Congress of its investigations and conclusions and such special reports as the President or either House of Congress may direct. The annual reports shall be published and ready for distribution on the first Monday of December of each year. Upon demand of either the President or either House of Congress the commission shall make a report of all testimony and information upon which its reports are based."

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Chairman, I was a little bit amused to hear the remarks of my colleague from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] on this particular point. This morning I picked up the Kansas City Star, which is a progressive paper of 300,000 circulation, circulating over four or five States in the central western country, circulating largely in the State of Kansas and in the district of my friend [Mr. MURDOCK], and a very strong supporter of that gentleman. All of us out in Kansas like VIC personally. He has good red corpuscles in his blood and good red hair on his head, and he is a good fellow; but it does not come with very good grace of him to make the remarks he has just made.

I want to read this editorial from the Kansas City Star, which has supported him on almost every proposition he has made. It reads thus:

THE PROGRESSIVES' CHANCE.

The Wilson administration is offering the country the only effective tariff revision in the interest of the whole people that it has had in 50 years.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

It would be a tremendous pity if the Progressives in Congress should go on record in opposition to this measure.

Undoubtedly, the bill is not perfect. There are some evident inequities in it. But these are of minor importance in comparison with the big achievements in behalf of the consumer, who hitherto has been ignored in tariff legislation.

The removal of the sugar duties and the heavy reductions in clothing, in building material, in steel, in chemicals—in fact, all along the line—show the extent to which the administration has freed itself from the powerful interests that hitherto have controlled. For the first time since the war the general welfare has been considered.

True, the revising has been done with an ax rather than with finer tools. But the——

Mr. MURDOCK. "The excrescences" is what I make that out to be.

Mr. HELVERING. This paper was folded just at that place.

But the excrescences that have grown up needed the ax. The finer trimming can be done later under the supervision of a tariff commission.

To insist that the relief now offered be withheld pending the investigations of a commission would play directly into the hands of the standpatters, who always are for anything that would cause delay.

A commission ought to be established later to supervise the adjustments that will be required. But just now the work in hand is to establish the tariff on a new basis in the interest of the country as a whole.

The Progressives in Congress are not in a position to do anything by themselves. Their only chance is to help whichever party is acting on behalf of the people. If they become mere carpers and critics, they will seem to the country to be playing politics, with the final purpose of getting the jobs. By supporting Wilson at this time they will prove their unselfish devotion to the common good.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I have been greatly interested during the progress of this debate in listening to the universal statement which seems to have come from the other side that the industries of this country are in a state bordering almost upon paralysis. We have had depicted before us lines of men reaching to soup houses and the opening of bread wagons, and so forth, and my interest, Mr. Chairman, has been greatly aroused in the news from the financial centers of the country, when these statements which have been so generally made have reached these centers and have been circulated among the business men of the country. And so this morning I have collected here a few clippings from some of the papers which are of distinctly nonpartisan character; and certainly any opinions which bear on their face the evidence of nonpartisanship, about which we have heard so much during the progress of the debate, should commend itself to the judgment and consideration of this House.

The Review, issued by R. G. Dun Co., April 25, stated:

NEW YORK, *April 25.*

Dun's Review to-morrow will say:

"Notwithstanding the recent moderate reduction in trade and industrial activity, it is significant that confidence still prevails, and in the West and South a spirit of optimism is manifest as to the future—largely based upon the fine crop outlook for both cotton and wheat—which contrasts with the more conservative feeling that exists in eastern centers.

"The work of recovery from the effects of the midwestern floods is progressing, and this gives increasing relief to business. The tariff readjustment continues to inspire caution in the trade circles more immediately affected, but the end of uncertainty is meanwhile not far to see. Weather conditions are distinctly better, and this gives an impetus to building operations but also retail trade and real estate transfers.

"Money conditions are easier, both at home and abroad, and while there is some show of activity regarding the Balkan situation, international conditions, as a whole, are much less disturbing. Pig iron is somewhat more active but at lower prices. The iron and steel mills report business as fully up to normal. Textile lines show abatement in activity. Lumber is more active. Trade in anthracite coal is larger. Reports from the leading western and northwestern cities are very cheerful in tone, and the advent of more settled weather has resulted in larger retail activity."

An Associated Press dispatch says:

NEW YORK, *April 26.*

The past week has seen shrinkage in steel specifications. Some good business has been placed, however. Three thousand additional freight cars for the Grand Trunk and 1,000 steel underframe cars for the Seaboard were ordered. Some good bridge business is under consideration. Conditions in the steel trade, as a whole, are more normal. Premiums are disappearing. Steel men claim that when the tariff is settled a fresh impetus will be given to business.

The outlook for pig iron is better. There is more inquiry and prices are firmer.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are not to judge by these reports that business improvement is altogether confined to the northwest and western districts of this country, but it has even reached the city of Philadelphia, which is probably the last city in the United States that would feel the impetus of business activity. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The Franklin National Bank, of Philadelphia, in its monthly circular on business and trade conditions, says in part:

With business generally so active and money so well employed that none is available for the financing of new concerns or for stock exchange operations, there should be little room for complaint in manufacturing and mercantile lines. Prospective tariff reduction is holding back some lines, but the total volume of business is far above the average for this season. Some declines in imports and in manufactures will be apparent until the tariff bill has been disposed of. If the matter is properly handled by Congress, there need be no upsetting of business, and the effects of such tariff reductions as may be made will soon be dissipated in the increasing business which will naturally result.

Mr. Chairman, not only is this condition of business prosperity not confined to the eastern and the western part of the country, but we find it is general throughout the entire country. The Secretary of Commerce and Labor has just issued a statement in which he says:

The United States has been exporting merchandise at the rate of almost $7,000,000 a day so far this year, as shown by figures announced by the Department of Commerce yesterday. The imports have exceeded $5,000,000 a day. The statistics are for the first nine months of the fiscal year.

Great Britain has bought on an average $1,750,000 worth of goods every day, and Canada and Germany each have bought about $1,000,000 worth a day. The fourth best customer was France, whose purchases in the nine months were $120,786,314.

The total outgoing and incoming trade of the country this year, it is estimated, will reach $4,100,000,000. This would be an increase of 13.5 per cent over 1912.

"The figures," said Secretary Redfield, "for the entire nine months are such as to give just pride to every American. Out of total transactions of $3,300,000,000, there is a balance in our favor of a little over $500,000,000."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish these gentlemen on the other side would come out of the cave of Adullam in which they have been lingering for the past week, and see that the clouds of prosperity are all touched with a golden lining, and that the business people of the country have nothing to fear; that they are only impatient that you gentleman will limit the material that you are getting out for home consumption, which appears in the RECORD, and give the business interests of the country a chance to recuperate.

I read from the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 2, an organ entirely devoted to the interests of protection, that our distinguished friend on the other side, the gentleman from Phila-

delphia [Mr. MOORE] has had himself interviewed in this paper. It says:

OPPOSITION TO END.

To-night there were indications that Republican leaders would not undertake to delay the passage of the bill much longer. Representative MOORE, of Pennsylvania, who has been active in offering minority amendments, voiced this view. He said the Republicans would not attempt to filibuster, and that they had been "hammering away at the Underwood bill for four days without making a single dent in it."

The fact that many who claim their business is affected are asking the Republicans to hasten matters in order that they may "readjust their affairs" is said to be partly responsible for the minority attitude.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

So it seems to me my friends on the other side are between the devil and the deep sea. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it comes pretty near being between the devil and the deep sea to be between prosperity and the Democratic legislation. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, a moment ago the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] announced that he proposed, if opportunity presented itself, to offer an amendment providing for a tariff commission. I take it that the amendment that he has prepared is in substance the bill introduced by various gentlemen on this side of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], and myself, and recommended by the Republican caucus. We welcome eleventh-hour converts to a tariff commission. [Applause on the Republican side.]

When in the last session of Congress the Republicans offered a motion to recommit the wool bill, directing the Committee on Ways and Means to bring in a reported bill in accordance with the Tariff Board report when made, the gentleman from Kansas voted against a bill to be founded on the Tariff Board report. When in the last Congress the Republicans offered a motion to recommit the metal-schedule bill to await the report of the Tariff Board, the gentleman from Kansas voted against the motion to recommit to await the Tariff Board report. At the same Congress the gentleman at the first session voted to pass the wool bill notwithstanding there had been no Tariff Board report. He voted to pass the sugar-schedule bill, although there had been no Tariff Board report. He voted to pass the so-called free-list bill without waiting for a Tariff Board report. At the second session of the Congress he voted to pass the wool bill without waiting for a Tariff Board report, and he voted to pass the metal bill without waiting for a Tariff Board report. He did not vote on the motion to recommit on the cotton schedule, or on the passage of the bill, probably because he was not here. He voted to pass these bills over the veto of the President, although the President vetoed the bills upon the ground that before bills were passed the tariff commission or the Tariff Board should ascertain the facts and lay them before the Congress. On no occasion when votes have been taken in the House has the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] stood for a tariff board report or a tariff commission report until he has been commissioned by Col. Roosevelt to say that we ought to have a tariff commission. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

228, Almonds, not shelled, 3 cents per pound; clear almonds, shelled, 4 cents per pound; apricot and peach kernels, 3 cents per pound.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 56, line 22, strike out the word "clear."

The CHAIRMAN. The queston is on the amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the Democratic side of the House to the fact that this is a committee amendment offered from their side. I do it for the reason that occasionally during consideration of this bill under the five-minute rule it has not always been understood upon the Democratic side that an amendment has been offered by their side. When the chemical schedule was under consideration I remember that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] offered an amendment. A number of gentlemen upon that side of the aisle voted "no." I stepped across the aisle and suggested they were committing treason by voting against their committee. "Why," they said, "we thought that amendment was being offered from the Republican side." [Laughter.] So I simply rise to say that, of course, this amendment must receive the vote of every one of the gentlemen upon that side of the aisle because it is offered by the Democrats, although the same amendment, indentical in form, might be offered by the Republicans, and every one of them would vote against it. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, in explanation of this amendment I might further add to what the gentleman has just stated that it ought to receive all the votes of the Republican side, but it probably will not receive any. The word "clear" was in the Payne bill, and we are striking it out because we are attempting to correct all of these absurdities in the Payne bill. No one has ever been able to determine, so far as the Treasury Department is concerned, what the word "clear" was put there for. Sometimes they have interpreted it to mean that the almonds must be free from dirt or something of that kind. If that is not it, they do not know what it is. All the experts on the tariff have been unable to determine why the word "clear" was put there in this particular clause. We are striking it out at the recommendation of the Treasury officials and because we find it ought not to be there. I suppose all the gentlemen on the Republican side will vote against it.

Mr. MANN. Oh, we have some sense. We vote for good amendments.

Mr. MOSS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it was necessary for the gentleman who has just spoken to explain a very important amendment that was offered by him, because it would go through without that explanation. Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely impossible to frame a tariff bill or to frame any measure of any character unless there is some system connected with it. There is absolutely no system connected with the preparation of the tariff bill that this House has before it. They talk about experts, but surely no experts in all the world can lay before a Ways and Means Committee in three weeks all of the information about all of the products of the world. [Applause on the Republican side.] When it took the Government of Germany five years, with 200 experts, to frame a tariff bill, surely it ought to take our Democratic brethren at least two months to do the same thing. I heartily concur in what has been said by the Progressive leader and by the Republican leader with reference to a tariff commission. I heartily favor that; but we are to have no chance for that, because a secret Democratic caucus has decreed against it. I say that this bill that is offered to the American people is a hodgepodge of inconsistencies, just the same as was the Wilson-Gorman bill, because it was framed in the same way.

And the Wilson-Gorman bill, passed by a Democratic Congress, is the law that the only Democratic President that we have had for 40 years pronounced to be a perfidy and a disgrace.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. MOSS of West Virginia. I have not the time; no, sir. Mr. Chairman, the trouble in the Democratic Party is that they have to make an issue out of something. They say that the people have demanded a reduction of rates, but the people of this country never have demanded and never will demand that American industries be shut down and American laboring men thrown out of employment all for the sake of this so-called free competition and free trade. The American people believe in Americans first and foreigners afterwards, and when they have a chance to express their opinion upon this bill, that is now being pushed through this House by order of a Democratic President and the Democratic floor leader, the gentlemen on the other side will find out that the people believe, as they have always believed, in the protection of American industries. Mr. Chairman, the great trouble, especially in the southern section of this country, is that they are still fighting the issues of 40 or 50 years ago.

SEVERAL MEMBERS (on the Democratic side). Oh, no.

Mr. MOSS of West Virginia. You gentlemen from the South know full well that it is to the best interest of the great Southland, and I speak as a Southerner, that they have protection of American industries in the South. You know that if you would cast aside the feeling you have that you should vote the way your grandfathers voted you would come up here solidly and vote for protection for southern products. [Applause on the Republican side.] Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I believe that after this is over and this bill has been passed and the dire results thereof have followed that when you get a chance to vote next time, gentlemen on the other side, if you ever do again, you will vote for protection to American industries, American labor, and American homes. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to close debate on this paragraph and all pending amendments in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to close debate on this paragraph and all pending amendments in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from California is very much interested in almonds.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Has not the gentleman an amendment pending?

Mr. HAYES. No.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will make it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all pending amendments close in 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I have just listened to the talk of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moss], who, I understand, is evidently a very new and a very fresh Member of this House. [Laughter and applause.] He talks about protection to American labor. He comes from the State of West Virginia, I understand, which is a coal-mining State, and under Republican policies they have protected American workmen to such an extent that West Virginia is now filled with foreigners, competing against the American workmen in the coal mines, and there has been a strike in the West Virginia coal mines for the last 12 months. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Republican policy now is, and has always been, to compel the American workman to pay the very highest protection prices for everything that he consumes, while the people who compete against him are brought from the slums of Europe into a free-trade market. Mr. Chairman, under Republican rule there were more strikes under the administration of Theodore Roosevelt than there ever had been in the history of this country until President Taft took charge of the administration, and the strikes were so frequent that absolutely the Bureau of Labor could not keep an account of how many there were. [Laughter.] And it is impossible at this time to get from the Department of Labor the number of strikes that took place under the administration of Mr. Taft. Mr. Chairman, the other day I heard the hairless wonder from Michigan [laughter]——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Who is he?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. FORDNEY [laughter]—tell about the bank accounts that the working people of this country had. You go to the hearings of the people in this town in Massachusetts, Lawrence, who were down here last year, and you saw them, and they testified before that committee that they did not have meat to eat over once a week. You saw a few days ago——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I always yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Is the Democratic Party opposed to the employment of children in our industries?

Mr. THOMAS. I am opposed to the employment of all children under 16 years of age.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Is it not true that the most flagrant violation of the rights of children in this country has been in those States in which the Democratic Party has been in absolute control for 50 years?

[Cries of "No" on the Democratic side.]

Mr. THOMAS. Will the gentleman name the States?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. South Carolina and Georgia——

Mr. BARTLETT. That is not true about Georgia.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Alabama. Call the roll of States in which the Democratic Party has been longest in power and you will include them all.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. THOMAS. Wait a minute. Sit down. [Laughter.] The conditions in Georgia and Alabama may be bad, but the working people down there have meat to eat more than once a week, which they do not have in Lawrence, Mass. And in Michigan——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS] has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. And they do not have to pay for their drinking water. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. [Laughter.] I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. RAINEY. I will have to object.

Mr. MANN. An agreement was made a few moments ago to close debate in 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS] has used 5 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] is to have 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. HAYES. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The question, then, is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 56, line 22, by striking out the figure "3" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "4"; also by striking out, in line 23, same page, the figure "4" and inserting the figure "5."

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, this bill reduces the tariff upon almonds, shelled and unshelled, 1 cent a pound. My amendment would maintain the present rate. Now, almonds are a luxury. I think the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle will admit that. They are not a necessity. There were imported last year 17,000,000 pounds of almonds, both shelled and unshelled, or thereabouts. So that it is apparent that the present tariff is a competitive tariff, and I should hope sufficiently competitive to satisfy the gentlemen who are the sponsors for this bill. I might point out further, Mr. Chairman, that the extra cent a pound would come in very handy, perhaps, if my amendment should prevail, in assisting the Government in discharging its obligations. And so, upon a Democratic basis, I do not see how our friends upon the other side can fail to vote for this amendment. The present rates are competitive. The article is a luxury, and the increase of 1 cent per pound will increase the revenue on imported almonds $170,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

229. Filberts and walnuts of all kinds, not shelled, 2 cents per pound; shelled, 4 cents per pound.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 57, line 1, by striking out the figure "2" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "3"; and also by striking out the figure "4," line 2, same page, and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "5."

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, like the former amendment, the purpose of this one is to restore the tariff on walnuts and filberts, shelled and unshelled, to the rates in the present law. The conditions are exactly similar as stated by me in regard to almonds. Last year the importations of walnuts and filberts were something like 34,000,000 pounds. The people of California are producing perhaps half of the walnuts that are consumed in this country. We have facilities for producing all, and in time to come—and in the near future if the present rates can be continued and the present conditions maintained—we shall be able to produce all the walnuts that are consumed in this country. But now the present tariff is competitive. As I say, 34,000,000 pounds were imported last year. Walnuts are not a necessity; they are a luxury, and the increased revenue that would come in on 34,000,000 pounds of walnuts and filberts would be no inconsiderable amount. On last year's importations it would amount to $340,000.

Mr. SHARP. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HAYES. I will.

Mr. SHARP. How many States are there in which you can produce these walnuts?

Mr. HAYES. I know of no State in this country except California.

Mr. SHARP. But do you think it would be just for the large mass of the American people living east of the Mississippi River, and especially living far east of the Mississippi River, to be compelled to pay the freight on the walnuts shipped from California, when they can be got at somewhat of a reduction very much more easily from abroad?

Mr. HAYES. Why, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's suggestion would destroy all of this schedule and every other schedule where there is any competition.

Mr. SHARP. I will ask the gentleman another question, if I may. Is it not true that immediately after the rate on lemons was raised in the Payne-Aldrich bill the railroads commenced to raise the freight on that product?

Mr. HAYES. It is not true, Mr. Chairman; but it is true that the railroads undertook to get 15 of the 50 cents that was added to the tariff on lemons. It is also true that the lemon growers resisted that attempt, and the matter was brought before the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission refused to allow the railroads to increase the rate, holding that the present rates were reasonable and sufficiently remunerative. Those are the facts.

Now, so far as walnuts are concerned, as I said, there is no place except in California that I know of where they can be raised; and just the same argument that the gentleman from Ohio has advanced will apply to everything that a tariff is

levied upon. It is no great injustice nor hardship that the people who can afford to spend their money for imported walnuts or filberts should be asked to help, to the extent of 1 cent a pound additional, to defray the running expenses of the Government of the United States. I can not think of any place where it would be better placed than upon a luxury of this kind, and I do not think my friend from Ohio can. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

230. Peanuts or ground beans, unshelled, ⅜ of 1 cent per pound; shelled, ¾ of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to have the Clerk read that so as to have the change made on line 3 as well as line 4, so that both "⅜ of" and "¾ of" would be stricken out, thus fixing the rate at 1 cent per pound.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 57, line 4, after the word "shelled," strike out "¾ of."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment was not reported in full. As the amendment was reported, it only proposes to strike out certain figures in the bill.

Mr. MOORE. I want to strike out "⅜ of" in line 3 and "¾ of" in line 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 57, line 3, after the word "unshelled," strike out "⅜ of," and in line 4 strike out "¾ of."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I presume "the wish is father to the thought" in the mind of every true Representative of the Old Dominion who happens to be on this floor. The people of Virginia, who are very largely engaged in peanut culture, are desirous of having a protection upon their industry, and from my point of view it is not only fair but entirely consistent that a protectionist coming from outside of Virginia should stand by the real, true interests of Virginia that are looking to their own progress and welfare.

I am informed that peanuts, of which we are very large consumers in my section of the country, can be brought in from Japan, over the seas, up to the Allegheny Mountains, almost to the very borderland of Virginia, as cheaply as the people of Virginia, the tillers of the soil, the horny-fisted representatives of that fine old State, can send this product of their soil out to the city of Chicago.

If this is true, the peanut raisers of Virginia suffer a very great disadvantage in competition with the cheap peanut-raising industry of Japan.

I listened a little while ago to my friend from California [Mr. STEPHENS] making his delightful preachment in defense of the lemon duty for California, and I heard him say the woolen and cotton duties might be revised—willing to cut the woolen and cotton industries, but holding to the duty on lemons.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Not now.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. What the gentleman says is not in accordance with what I said at all.

Mr. MOORE. I want to make my statement. If the gentleman does not agree to it, he can take it up in his own time. I am simply calling attention to this inconsistency. It was the kind of philosophy that defeated the Republican Party in the last campaign.

But I want to return to Virginia peanuts and to say I know that I voice the hearts, the minds, the disposition, the inclination, the hope, and the expectation of all true Virginians when I ask for an increase in the duty on peanuts from three-quarters of a cent a pound to 1 cent a pound. The Virginia peanut ought to be protected. [Applause.] It suffers from a competition that is unfair, and if the Virginia peanut is not protected against its cheap Japanese competitor, now menacing it from across the Pacific, the Virginia peanut raiser may have to go out of business. If he will not speak on this floor, I am going to do it for him, even though it offends some of my own peanut consumers in the city of Philadelphia who pay 5 cents a bag, which seems somewhat exorbitant, since they have reduced the quantity that goes into the bag.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. MOORE. Will you speak for Virginia?

Mr. GOULDEN. You will find out when I ask my question. Why does the gentleman speak for a higher duty on peanuts, that he says are of such great use and benefit to his own people? Why does he defend an interest of the people of Virginia instead of caring for his own people? I never knew the gentleman to do that before.

Mr. MOORE. Why, I have seen the gentleman on a ferryboat, on his way from New York to Philadelphia, and on the railroad train, eating peanuts all the way, and I know he is a friend of the peanut.

Mr. GOULDEN. Certainly; but that was because they were cheap and good. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, if I caught aright the remarks of the bewhiskered gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], he stated that this debate would be closed by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] and by myself, in which I would say nothing. Now, I do not like to give advice to Republicans, but you know about this season of the year the dogwood blossoms are in bloom, and that is when we shear sheep, and I would advise the gentleman from Illinois to get shaved. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] talks about Members of this House taking up time. I presume I have taken up about as little time as almost any Member of this Congress who has been here as long as I have, but the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has filled volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with mixed metaphors and insipid nothingness. [Laughter.] I do not know what he has cost this Government, and it would take an expert to make the calculation, but I presume he has cost it $10,000,000 since he has been rattling around over on that side of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NORTON. Is this a continuation of that moonshine debate of last night? [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. What did he say? He said nothing. He may have attempted to say something, but did not do it.

Mr. LANGLEY. If my colleague, who evidently did not understand the gentleman's question, will permit, I will state that so far as my colleague and I are concerned the moonshine incident is closed. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. What did the gentleman from Kentucky say? My colleague from Kentucky seems to have moonshine on the brain.

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, if that is so, it is the only place where any of it has been deposited. Of course it is on my mind, because it has been mentioned a good many times lately.

Mr. THOMAS. And he seems to be replenishing the supply.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman does not need any replenishing.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have heard a great deal from these Republicans here about the secret caucus of the Democrats, because, as we had a right to do, we acted in the interest of political unity. Why did they object to a secret caucus? Because they think we might do something like they would have done if they had had the opportunity. I have heard here the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], the gentleman who sports the sunset locks. [Laughter.] I have heard a great deal from him about this secret caucus. He had a caucus of 13 members—that was enough to condemn it, 13 members—and two days before that caucus met it was stated in the papers in this city that this alleged so-called Progressive Party, which is nothing but a patent medicine advertising scheme [great laughter], would meet and elect Mr. MURDOCK Speaker. Now, I wonder how they knew that two days beforehand if there had not been some secret meeting or secret caucus between Mr. MURDOCK and these other 12 members of this alleged Progressive Party in secret caucus somewhere? [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

231. Nuts of all kinds, shelled or unshelled, not specially provided for in this section, 1 cent per pound; but no allowance shall be made for dirt or other impurities in nuts of any kind, shelled or unshelled.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentlemen of the committee if they have any amendments to offer to this paragraph. I am informed not. The gentleman from Illinois, on a preceding paragraph, moved to strike out the word "clear" with reference to almonds, and said it was a blunder. Evidently he did not know that clear almonds was in the law, and had been for

a good many years. In 1909 a question arose about dirt in nuts, and we went to work before the bill was prepared and had a Treasury expert to aid us in that way. That expert suggested an addition to this paragraph that was not in the previous law, "but no allowance shall be made for dirt or impurities in nuts of any kind, shelled or unshelled." That was the amendment we put in the law, and these gentlemen do not see fit to change it, and it is well they do not for the customs court held under it the construction that the gentleman claims would be the law if you strike out the word "clear." It was a microscopic mind that went before the general appraisers and before the customs court to try to show that the additional language which we put in for a safeguard had anything to do with the rate of duties on almonds. The customs court held that shelled almonds, if they did have some dirt in them, was subject to the higher rate of duty under the law.

Every paragraph that we find as we proceed in this bill generally shows the wisdom of the committee and of the House that passed the present tariff law. There are some things in it that we have criticized that are open to criticism. They have adopted even the new language that we put in this paragraph, and they have adopted language of ours right through the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

233. Extract of meat, not specially provided for in this section, 15 cents per pound; fluid extract of meat, 7 cents per pound, but the dutiable weight of the extract of meat and of the fluid extract of meat shall not include the weight of the packages in which the same is imported.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to a paragraph that has been passed. It is an amendment in regard to fresh fish.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We passed the fish paragraph some time ago, and I can not consent to go back.

The Clerk read as follows:

234. Poultry, live, 1 cent per pound; dead, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 57, line 16, after the word "live," strike out "one" and insert "three," and after the word "dead" strike out "two" and insert "five."

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, my genial friend and colleague from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS] seems to have the impression that moonshine is the chief product of the district I have the honor to represent. I do not know whether the wish is father to the thought or not, but I beg to assure my associates here that it is not the chief product by any means of that district or of our State.

Mr. BUTLER. What is moonshine?

Mr. LANGLEY. I refer the gentleman to my colleague. He probably knows. There are many important industries in the tenth Kentucky district, and among them is the chicken industry. We raise, consume, and sell a good many chickens in that district, not only hens, but spring chickens and roosters, and all classes of fowls, and, as I said yesterday, we have a flourishing egg industry also.

I feel that this provision in the Underwood bill reducing the tariff so radically on chickens dead and living would be an injustice to my district because, if you Democrats are going to reduce the price of chickens and eggs, you will seriously cripple that important industry. For that reason I have offered this amendment to restore the rates provided by the existing law.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, at a late hour last night I attempted to get the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], with regard to the effect which this bill would have upon the consumers of the country, but I was unable to elicit any information from him at all. He appeared very weary, but this morning he seems refreshed, looks intelligent, and several times has shown indication of giving the House some information. I will now ask him how much of a reduction will the ultimate consumer receive in the way of lower prices on poultry, if this provision shall be enacted into law?

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Iowa gets through I will reply to him in my own time.

Mr. GOOD. Can the gentleman tell me how many cents per pound of reduction this proposed duty will effect? This statement which I have in my hand contains 13 items in which the gentleman says the Payne law increased the price from 100 to 200 per cent on meat products. On eight of those meat products the Payne law reduced the duty 25 per cent. If a reduction in the Payne law of 25 per cent on meat products, according to the gentleman's theory, is followed by an increase from 100 to 200 per cent, how much of a reduction now will we have on poultry with this little reduction in the price?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I certainly yield to the gentleman from Philadelphia.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman from Iowa think seriously for a moment that it was the real purpose of the Democratic Party in the last campaign, during which orators penetrated the gentleman's district, to reduce the cost of living? Did they not only want to tell the people about it?

Mr. GOOD. This circular that was circulated in the cities, but very carefully concealed from the farmers, did promise a great reduction, and it promised, as far as farm produce was concerned, that we would return to the prices of 1896. I will ask the gentleman if he believes that we should return to the prices of farm products in 1896? [After a pause.] I am speaking to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I just told the gentleman that when he gets through I will answer him in my own time.

Mr. GOOD. But is the gentleman willing to return to the prices that prevailed for farm produce in 1896, in the interest of the American consumer?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I want to get the attitude of the gentleman from Iowa. Does the gentleman indorse——

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield for an answer to my question.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Does the gentleman indorse the Payne tariff law? [Laughter.]

Mr. GOOD. I yield for an answer to my question.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I would like the people in Iowa to understand the gentleman's attitude toward the Payne law.

Mr. GOOD. I stand for the duties that are levied in the Payne tariff law as against those levied in this bill ten times over.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Does the gentleman indorse the Payne tariff law?

Mr. GOOD. There are things in the Payne tariff law that ought to be changed.

Mr. ALEXANDER. What are they?

Mr. GOOD. A great many schedules ought to be changed, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has offered amendments greatly reducing the duties of the Payne law in the cotton schedule and in the woolen schedule. Some of the duties in the agricultural schedules should be reduced, but we should not attempt this great slaughter of this industry of agriculture, the greatest industry in all the world. You said in this circular that you would return to the prices of 1896. Is the gentleman in favor now of enacting a law that will bring into effect the prices that prevailed for farm produce in 1896?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No; because those conditions were brought about by a previous Republican administration.

Mr. GOOD. Why did you permit the great Democratic Party to circulate that infamous statement? That statement is not based on a single fact, and yet it is a political document upon which Members in cities on the gentleman's side of the House obtained seats in this Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, for a day or two I have submitted in silence to the observations of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD]. I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa that I do not know how much we will be able to reduce the cost of living in this country, but I do know that during the period of the real supremacy of the Republican Party in this country, extending from 1896 down to the present time, they have done nothing in that direction. I know that during all of that period of time the cost of living in this country has been getting higher and higher until all kinds of meat are practically banished now from the tables of the poor; and I know that the gentleman from Iowa, who sits here in this House representing a great district in that State, does not render to the Democratic side the slightest assistance in bringing down the cost of the market basket. On the other hand, on every occasion in this House when an item came up for consideration looking toward lowering tariff taxes, looking toward fewer hungry children in the cities of this country, he has been found voting against it.

Tell me that the farmers of his district, the courageous descendants of the brave men who in the old days came down the long forest avenues in oxcarts, came down our rivers in flatboats, and came across to the State of Iowa——

Mr. GOOD rose.

Mr. RAINEY. I can not yield now. Tell me that they do not feel strong enough, as strong as their ancestors, to do the things that are right. Tell me they are not courageous enough to be in favor of giving the hungry men, the hungry women, and the hungry children of our great cities a cheaper breakfast table, a cheaper market basket? Do the men who live there in his district propose to keep up the tariff walls around their products in order that they can get higher prices and listen to the cry of hunger that comes from our cities——

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. RAINEY. I can not yield.

Mr. GOOD. Just a question.

Mr. RAINEY. No; I will not yield, I have not the time. Does the gentleman represent constituents that are so cowardly that they brush aside such cries as that; will they approve the position taken by their Representative here? I will undertake to say that throughout this broad land from the east to the west, from the north down through the magnolia section of our country to the southern gulf, you can not find many men who will argue as the gentleman does in favor of keeping up the price of bread at the expense of—what? At the expense of the developing muscles, sinews, brains of the coming generation; at the expense of the hunger and suffering of our people who live in the towns and in our great cities. No; we are doing what we can to relieve these conditions. The gentleman from Iowa is doing what he can to keep from relieving such conditions as these. Why, I can not answer the questions of the gentleman from Iowa, the silly questions, the tiresome questions he propounds to me upon this floor. They belong to the same category as the old inquiry, "How old is Ann?" which everybody has been discussing so long. Why, the gentleman comes into this House this morning with a tired expression upon his face. All night long he dreamed about a circular that was at one time——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

235. Chicory root, raw, dried, or undried, but unground, 1 cent per pound; chicory root, burnt or roasted, ground or granulated, or in rolls, or otherwise prepared, and not specially provided for in this section, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable said about just how much the producers would lose by reason of this bill. I want to read something authoritative from a Democratic standpoint. I read from a pamphlet, on page 5—I will announce the document later—as follows:

Estimated value of consumption and estimated saving to consumers which would have resulted from the enactment of the free-list bill——

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman is not talking to the question of chicory roots, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. SLOAN. I will endeavor so to do. Chicory roots, and so forth, are food products and come under the same rule as any other food products, and my statements will conform to that rule. The pamphlet says:

Fresh and preserved meats, estimated consumption, $615,000,000; estimated saving, $66,759,000.

Sixty-six million dollars lost to the farmers of the West, who produce more than their sections consume.

Flour and grist, cereals and bread, estimated consumption, $665,000,000; estimated saving, $75,677,000.

Or a total loss, largely to the Northwest, of $142,336,000, as given out here.

Mr. DONOVAN. A point of order.

Mr. SLOAN (reading)—

These figures indicate that the value of the articles included in the free-list bill consumed in this country during a year amount to $2,760,000,000, assuming that the tariff is effective in increasing prices to the extent of one-half of the rate of duty.

Who is the author? I read from this pamphlet. It is headed "UNDERWOOD'S marvelous record as a majority leader" in the National House of Representatives, and gives a review of his work, and then in front is this splendid picture of a splendid man [applause], who appears suave, urbane, and strong, with a form of steel incased in an armor of velvet, the repository of the consciences of every Member on that side of the House, as he stated the other night when saying the individuality of the Members on that side of the House is surrendered and left to the "wisdom and cohesive strength of a great party," of which he is the all-powerful leader. And beneath that picture is this printed inscription:

OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, Democracy's best asset.

[Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

And I wondered why the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] in charge of this schedule, with thousands of these documents within his reach, did not answer the question and say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] how much he believed the change would be.

Oh, no; we are discussing the agricultural schedule now, and you do not want to make an estimate now lest the farmers would hear it and demand that their Representatives forsake their caucus and stand up for the interests of the districts which send them here. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee within the last hour said that it was difficult to make any reasonable estimate of how much a reduction in price it would be—probably quite infinitesimal on many of these things. I say this so that the producers of this country will know precisely what the philosophy of this bill is, namely, to cut from the prices of their products half the stated rate of revenue. This is the doctrine the author of this bill announced in the East and South when he was running for the presidential nomination. In this day of fulfillment he does not want to look the farmers in the face and say "My bill will cut down the prices of your meats and cereals, practically all you raise, about 12 per cent." That would make a loss of several millions to the farmers and stockmen of my district.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to close all debate on this paragraph.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"236. Unsweetened chocolate and cocoa, prepared or manufactured, not specially provided for in this section, 8 per cent ad valorem. Sweetened chocolate and cocoa, prepared or manufactured, not specially provided for in this section, valued at 15 cents per pound or less, 2 cents per pound; valued at more than 15 cents per pound, 25 per cent ad valorem. The weight and the value of the immediate coverings, other than the outer packing case or other covering, shall be included in the dutiable weight and the value of the merchandise."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman what that change affects?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; this change affects the sweetened chocolate and cocoa. A large amount of sweet chocolate and cocoa comes in here which is really a confection, and it comes wrapped in tin-foil paper and embossed paper and goes on the market as a confection. The only change we make here by this amendment is to leave the unsweetened variety at the rate we have fixed in this bill and give the sweetened variety the confectionery rate.

Mr. MURDOCK. What is the higher rate that you give them?

Mr. RAINEY. The higher rate is that if it is valued at 15 cents per pound or less, 2 cents per pound; valued at more than 15 cents per pound, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is the prepared chocolate which comes in, namely, Swiss chocolate and other kinds?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; if it is sweetened. If it is manufactured and sweetened we give it this higher rate.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. In the original bill, H. R. 10, coconuts were on the dutiable list?

Mr. RAINEY. They have now been placed on the free list.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question? I have a telegram here about sweetened chocolate. You say you increase by this amendment now proposed the duty on sweetened chocolate?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORDNEY. To what rate?

Mr. RAINEY. To the confectionery rate in our bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I suppose this increase is made because of the mistake of putting the high rate on copra, from which cocoa is manufactured?

Mr. RAINEY. This change is made in order to make the bill harmonious.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; that is an answer to my question in the affirmative, to make the bill harmonious.

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; to balance the bill and make it harmonious.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I have taken a little time to examine the 40 or 50 paragraphs, enumerating something like 60 different articles produced by the farmer, and I notice that the reduction is anywhere from 20 per cent to 100 per cent. In some cases all the duty is taken off and the articles are placed on the free list.

Now, I think that this schedule exe...plifies better than any other schedule that I have noticed the theory upon which this bill was written, the theory that was announced by the distinguished leader of the majority on the opening of the debate, and uttered and reiterated often by other Members on the other side of the House, namely, that the purpose of this bill is not to protect anything, but that it is for the purpose of raising revenue and for the benefit of the consumer and not for the producer.

I take it that there is not any doubt on the part of the majority or the minority that the purpose of this bill is looking theoretically to the consumer instead of to the producer, and I think that that is distinctly a wrong principle of legislation. It is not because I happen to be on this side of the House, but because I think it is necessary for you to look to the interests of the man who produces the article to be consumed before it is possible to have any consumption; in other words, that you can not hope to consume anything until you have produced it.

Now, this schedule applies surely to the producer as no other schedule does, for the farmer in this country is the producer. He tills the soil. He produces the food to feed the race. He produces the clothing to clothe the race. He furnishes the necessaries of life to keep up the race. The American farmer produces in a single year, according to the figures of the Secretary of Agriculture, in his report, food products to the value of nearly $9,000,000,000 worth.

This is the fruit of the producer under our scientific methods of production to-day, and I am going to ask the gentlemen on that side of the House what is the meaning of all the expenditure of money on the increase of production on the farm, where you make 1 acre produce double what it once produced, or quadruple what it once produced? What was the purpose of the expenditure of money for garden and field, for laboratory and experiment station, if it was not for the purpose of discovering better methods of production? And I am asking you what is the purpose of legislation if it is not to increase the ability of production? Whenever you look simply to the consumer, without regard to the producer, you are playing the city against the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And what do you do, and why do you do it? Is it possible that there are more votes in the city than in the country? I do not want to charge that, but, notwithstanding, there seems to be some truth in that suspicion.

You say you will reduce the cost of living. Gentlemen, I want to say that you do not reduce the price of living by reducing the protection accorded to the farmer. You reduce the price to the farmer of the article he sells; but are you sure that the consumer who ultimately consumes will get the product any cheaper than before? [Applause on the Republican side.]

You took the tariff off of hides and promised cheap shoes, but shoes have gone up in price. You now take the tariff off of sugar. Sugar will take wings as soon as the price is under the control of an importer. You take the tariff off of wool for the sake of cheap clothing. Watch the process of price reduction. You take the tariff off of flour in order to cheapen the price and give free bread. You thereby feed the flour mills of Canada at the frightful expense of our own mills, to the great advantage of foreign mills, which, when they have accomplished their purpose, can put up the price of flour as in the case of sugar.

There is one almost certain way this bill will reduce the price of foodstuffs. When the effect of this elaborate and skillfully planned assault upon the industries of the country, where existence seems to be an offense, oft expressed by various Members on the other side of this Chamber, when the inevitable crippling of these industries shall displace thousands of laborers or greatly reduce their wages by either an actual cut or reduction of time, thus reducing the greatest factor of consumption in this country, then prices will come down—not because of more production, but because of the destruction of the ability to consume. Here is the viciousness of this proposed legislation. The advocates of this bill openly assail every man who resents the assault upon the business of the country with the charge that he favors the special interests as against the people. This tone has dominated this debate from the very opening day. When we plead for the maintenance of the integrity of business, that our capital may employ labor and thus continue the prosperity now so general, we are met with the open charge that we plead the cause of special interests, while they stand for the consumer—the mass of the people. This is mere claptrap.

Who is the consumer? What does he want? His greatest desire is to be secure in his ability to secure what he needs. This ability is found in a system that concerns itself with the common interests of both the producer and the consumer, not a policy that blindly stifles production in the belief that by so doing it will assist consumption. This Nation will denounce in no uncertain tones any legislation directed against the farmer, the chief producer of the country.

I am bombarded with telegrams and letters of protest against this treatment of the farmer, not only from farmers, but from chambers of commerce, business clubs, and officers of commercial associations. I wish to append a telegram from the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *April 30, 1913.*

Hon. S. D. FESS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

By unanimous vote the board of directors of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, at a meeting held April 29, adopted the following resolution which is respectfully submitted for your attention:

Whereas the Underwood tariff bill imposes a duty of 10 cents per bushel upon foreign wheat and admits duty free the foreign milled products of such foreign wheat; and

Whereas this discrimination in favor of the foreign manufacturer is in contradiction alike of all accepted economic doctrine of the established tariff policy of all political parties and of all nations, and in effect pays a bounty to the foreign miller on all products of wheat sold by him in the markets of the United States; and

Whereas if American flour millers have to pay a tax upon foreign-grown wheat, then a simple justice requires that the foreign-milled products of such wheat shall pay an equivalent tax, and if foreign-milled wheat products are admitted duty free foreign wheat should be admitted duty free: Therefore be it

Resolved, That believing the proposed legislation would inevitably destroy one of the most important manufacturing industries in the United States, and that it would further result in most serious injury to the American farmer, the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, through its board of directors, records itself as unalterably opposed, and earnestly urges upon the President and Congress of the United States the necessity of placing both wheat and its products upon terms of absolute equality.

Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded immediately to the President of the United States, Senators, and Congressmen from Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky, the members of the Senate Finance Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

CINCINNATI CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
W. C. CULKINS, *Executive Secretary.*

Also, a telegram from business men in Springfield, one of the best cities in the country, and in as prosperous an agricultural region as is found in the United States:

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO, *May 1, 1913.*

Hon. S. D. FESS,
Care House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your tariff speech to Congress. Every word is absolutely true regarding Ohio, also the whole country. The Underwood tariff bill is a great injury to farmers. Unless this bill is amended making the duty on foreign flour and wheat products equal the American farmers will lose millions of dollars, and eventually be forced out of growing wheat.

E. H. KELLY,
E. O. BOWMAN,
JNO W. BURKE.

Here is a letter from one of the leading millers of the State. They all tell the same story:

OSBORNE, OHIO, *April 28, 1913.*

Hon. S. D. FESS, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I understand that the Underwood tariff bill will be taken up on the 29th instant, and I hope you will not only vote against the admission of foreign mills' flour duty free, but will use your influence among your fellow Representatives to get them to vote against the bill. I believe when the farmers in the great wheat-growing States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, and the Dakotas realize the apparent protection of 10 cents per bushel upon foreign wheat and the admission of foreign mills' flour duty free affects the earnings of his farm there is sure to be an outcry that will make itself unmistakably heard in Washington.

The truth is, under the present provision of the Underwood bill there will be no tax upon foreign-ground wheat. Foreign farmers working themselves or employing labor at a mere pittance will reap the greatest benefit, for it allows foreign-ground wheat to enter the United States duty free, provided the products are made of a foreign product in a foreign mill. It is easily understood what the result will be. It means an enormous increase in the number and grinding capacity of flour mills in Canada, Argentina, Australia, and other wheat-growing countries, and especially Great Britain, whose flour mills are located upon the docks of her ports, drawing wheat from all over the world. These mills, for example, buy wheat in Buenos Aires, freight it by water to Liverpool or other ports, grind it into flour, ship the flour to New York or some other American seaport market, and sell it at less than 40 cents per barrel lower than the American mill located at New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore could manufacture the same grade of flour from the same wheat or wheat grown in the United States.

The Canadian millers likewise could flood the United States market fully as much as Great Britain by selling below the price the United States miller sells in competition. When it is realized that the average net profit of the flour mills of the United States will hardly exceed 5 cents per barrel on their annual production, the impossibility of competing with the foreign mills under the conditions which this act provides may be clearly realized.

I believe you fully understand the hardship this bill would cause the American farmer and the American miller if it became a law, and I am satisfied that you will do everything in your power, not only by your vote but influence as well, to defeat the bill. Thanking you in advance for anything you may do in the matter, I remain,

Very truly, yours,

TRANCHANT & FINNELL,
Per M. L. FINNELL.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will pardon me, does he want to offer an amendment or just debate?

Mr. CALDER. I want to strike out the last word.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the gentleman to wait until the Clerk has read the paragraph.

Mr. CALDER. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

237. Cocoa butter or cocoa butterine, refined deodorized coconut oil, and all substitutes for cocoa butter, 3½ cents per pound.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CALDER. Following the line of the argument of the gentleman [Mr. FESS] who has just taken his seat, I am very much interested in the discussion of this agricultural schedule and its effect upon the consumer.

I spoke a little bit yesterday of the effect upon the consumer of the reduction of duty on lumber, and I hope very much that these reductions on farm products will affect the price to people in the great city of New York, which is the market place for all agricultural products in our part of the country. And if these reductions do really make the breakfast table and the market basket cheaper, this committee and this House in passing this bill will have accomplished something.

My mind goes back to an incident that occurred last summer. The Democratic governor of the State of New York, Gov. Dix, appointed a commission to investigate transportation and market conditions in the State of New York, and particularly the high cost of living, and I have read a copy of the report of that commission. One particular incident in it impressed me very much. It told of a garden truck farmer on Long Island who sent 25 bushels of string beans to the market. This report says that at the end of 10 days he received for the 25 bushels of string beans 76 cents, out of which he had to pay for picking and trucking to the railroad depot. At that same period string beans were selling in the city of New York to the poor people, who could not afford to buy them except by the quart, for 10 cents a quart. For the same string beans that the farmer got 3 cents a bushel the consumer paid $3.20 a bushel. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the reduction of the duty on string beans in this bill from 45 cents a bushel to 25 cents a bushel will in some way give the poor farmer more than the 3 cents a bushel which he received for the string beans he sold last summer, and will in some way reduce the price to the consumer in the city of New York from 10 cents a quart, I am sure our people will be duly grateful. For the life of me, I can not understand how the reduction in duty will affect the matter at all.

Everybody here knows, and I am sure the sensible people throughout the country knows, that all of this talk to-day about the reduction in the price to the consumer is pure buncombe on the part of the Democratic majority on this floor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to occupy five minutes; but, in view of what has been repeatedly said here about the increase in prices in recent years, I think that certain gentlemen ought to be reminded of the fact that the increase in the cost of living is not confined to the United States of America. This increase is world-wide. It has been very pronounced in England, though not quite so great as in this country. It has been very pronounced also in Germany and in all other countries. Proof of this is found in the consular reports of the State Department issued regularly to Members of the House. In March last I received, as did each Member of the House, one of these consular reports in which appeared a copy of a Japanese report on "Advance in Japanese Prices," sent by Vice Consul Walter Gassett, of Kobe, Japan, from which I will read the following:

ADVANCE IN JAPANESE PRICES.

The table of statistics following, which is similar to one published in Osaka every month, shows the gain or loss in price in January, 1913, of 46 of the principal commodities as compared with January, 1912.

The price of these articles in 1902 is taken as 100, from which the rise or fall is computed. As the average price in January, 1913, was 140, it will be seen that prices generally of the principal commodities in Japan have increased 40 per cent in 11 years.

Compared with December, 1912, 13 commodities showed an advance, 20 a decline, and 20 remained unchanged during the month; but in comparison with a year before the general advance in prices is remarkable.

	January, 1912.	January, 1913.
COMMODITIES ADVANCING.		
Rice, uncleaned	173	215
Eggs	108	110
Wheat	154	181
Sugar	190	192
Small red beans	142	203
Firewood	125	140
Sake	121	127
Japanese paper	107	110
Seaweed	173	210
Copper	116	138
Charcoal	130	150
Rice, cleaned	162	189
Petroleum	131	150
Oats	154	250
Porcelain	101	105
Barley	242	262
French nails	117	119
Soy	144	152
Galvanized iron sheets	98	101
Chemicals and drugs	124	148
Raw cotton	119	140
Japanese medicines	55	60
Cotton yarn	141	151
Vegetable wax	134	144
Dyed yarn	144	147
Fish manure	150	155
Sheet glass	72	78
Antimony	110	113
Towels	102	112
COMMODITIES DECLINING OR REMAINING UNCHANGED.		
Tea	140	125
Coal	107	107
Rapeseed oil	154	125
Matting (for tatami)	121	119
Timber	169	169
Imported iron	103	100
White cotton cloth	130	125
Gassed yarn	140	139
Raw silk	116	116
Habutai	114	114
Silk crape	117	117
Beans	149	149
Dried mushrooms	128	108
Katsubushi	121	98
European paper	101	101
Mousseline	138	132
Hemp	160	157

Is the tariff law of the United States responsible for this most remarkable increase in the cost of living in Japan? Is it responsible for the increase in the cost of living in free-trade England?

Gentlemen should remember that two things may exist at the same time and yet one not be the cause of the other.

When we Members of the House were at school and studied logic, each one of us often had pointed out to him the very common fallacy, "Post hoc, ergo propter hoc"—after this, therefore on account of this.

That argument is one of the most foolish sorts of attempted reasoning. Two things may exist together, or one after the other, and neither be the cause of the other.

It is not the tariff in the United States which has caused the marked increase in the cost of living in free-trade England and elsewhere all around the world.

Mr. Chairman, this great question of the increased cost of living is of the most pressing importance to our people. Without delay there ought to be appointed the greatest commission possible of appointment in the United States, a commission representative of every political faith and creed and of the highest ability, attainments, and character, to investigate and report the facts relating to this world-wide phenomenon of such tremendous importance to struggling humanity. The Congress of the United States and the other national legislatures need these facts to enable them wisely to solve one of the very greatest of legislative and economic problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

238. Dandelion root, and acorns prepared, and articles used as coffee, or as substitutes for coffee not specially provided for in this section, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. McCOY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I was interested in the remarks about the high cost of living which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] indulged in. I have no doubt in the world that the consul in Japan who made the report from which he read is a Republican consul.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. McCOY. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. What he reported was the official report published every month by the Japanese themselves in Osaka.

Mr. McCOY. I would reply to that in the words of the old adage, "Figures do not lie, but liars figure." I do not know how he made up the figures. I will say that if the gentleman from Wisconsin will take the consular reports which we received from our consul in London in 1910 he will ascertain that the consul there reports that the prices of the necessities of life in many instances had gone down in the 10 years prior to 1910, and that only on a few articles which we designate as the necessities of life had prices gone up. If he will conduct his investigation a little further he will find that in these countries that have the highest protective tariffs prices have gone up the most in the last 10 years, and I recommend that he look up the statistics furnished from these countries by our consuls.

The gentleman from Ohio said "Hides were put on the free list," and then he was interrupted. I happen to have some constituents interested in the duty on hides, for they manufacture patent and enamel leather. One of these manufacturers told me the other day that if we had not placed hides on the free list there was a time when, because hides had increased in price for well-known reasons, they would have had to go out of business. It is another one of those post hoc ergo propter hoc arguments to say that because hides were placed on the free list therefore the prices of boots and shoes have advanced. Leather advanced in price because of the scarcity of hides, and the prices of boots and shoes accordingly.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCOY. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Did you not promise that if hides went on the free list we would have cheaper boots and shoes?

Mr. McCOY. I was not here at the time, and so I made no promises. I am telling you what the manufacturer who is interested in hides said—that they would have been obliged to go out of business if hides had not been put on the free list, for the price of hides would have been higher with the duty and too high to permit them to do business.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Do I understand the gentleman to state that this man said that if hides had not been put on the free list they would have been much higher in the United States than they were after they were put on?

Mr. McCOY. I said that they would have been much higher if not placed on the free list, because with the duty the price would have been increased by the amount of the duty.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. That was my question. I asked if the statement of the gentleman was if hides had not been on the free list they would have been much higher in the United States.

Mr. McCOY. Yes; that is what he did say and what I say. Another manufacturer of the city of Newark, N. J., was in my office the other day, and I was glad to hear him make a certain statement. He has enjoyed the benefits of a high protective tariff for years, and has reached the place where he does not have to bother about his income. He said that recently manufacturers of Newark had come to him and tried to get him interested in the Underwood bill and were astonished because he would not get excited over it. They wanted to know why he would not write letters to the Congressmen who represent Newark. He said, "I know that there is something wrong with the present tariff, and I hope that the Democrats have found the remedy in this bill. For my part, I propose to give them a chance to try it." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close on this paragraph in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate close upon this paragraph and amendments thereto in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the gentleman from New Jersey who has just taken his seat that when the Payne tariff bill was being prepared there was a gentleman whose name was Jones, president of the Shoe Manufacturing Association of New England, came before the committee, and in making his plea for free raw hides I asked him if the duty of 15 per cent ad valorem then on hides were removed what difference would it make in the cost of a pair of $3 shoes, such as he was then talking about. Gentlemen will remember that hides which were protected at that time with a 15 per cent ad valorem duty were heavy hides, 60 pounds or over in weight. The gentleman, after figuring for a few moments, replied that it would lessen the cost of such a pair of shoes from 1½ to 2½ cents a pair. I then said to him, "My friend, if raw hides are placed on the free list—the shoes you now sell for $3 per pair—will you sell them for $2.97½ or $2.98 per pair?" He said he would. I doubted the correctness of the man's statement, and told him so. He said I was entitled to my opinion; but what happened? When that class of hides were placed on the free list the shoes then selling for $3 wholesale went up to $3.50 and $4 per pair.

Mr. McCOY. Was it because the duty was taken off?

Mr. FORDNEY. Heaven only knows what caused it; but I know that the price of shoes advanced. He did not state facts when he said that if raw hides were put on the free list he would sell the shoes at 2½ cents per pair less. Neither did the gentlemen in the woolen business tell the truth those days.

They came into the city where I live to a merchant with whom I deal and stated to that merchant they were obliged to put up the price on woolen goods because of the increased duties on wool and woolens placed in the Payne law, for it is true there was not one fraction of a penny increased duty on any item in Schedule K—the woolen schedule—in the Payne law. On the other hand, there were slight reductions made.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. These higher prices of shoes—did they not come under a lower duty on shoes in the Payne law?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; absolutely right the reverse to what the shoe manufacturer said he would do. He said he would lower his price if we gave him free raw hides, and he did not do so.

Mr. HARDY. Under a lower duty on shoes?

Mr. FORDNEY. Under a lower duty on shoes. The duty was reduced from 25 per cent to 10 and 15 per cent.

Mr. HARDY. Post hoc, ergo propter hoc—if that is on that account then the manufacturers ought to want the lowest duties possible.

Mr. FORDNEY. The manufacturer in that hearing was not honest with the committee. They took the advantage on leather goods that the South American cattle growers took upon their cattle hides. They took it for granted when the Government of the United States had placed raw hides on the free list that there was a shortage of raw hides in the world's supply of hides. They immediately took advantage of that situation, and they advanced the price of hides—not to such an extent that it was necessary to add 50 cents to $1 to a pair of shoes that cost only $3.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

239. Starch, made from potatoes, 1 cent per pound; all other starch, including all preparations, from whatever substance produced, fit for use as starch, ½ cent per pound.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask a question of the gentleman in charge of the bill. The tariff on starch made from potatoes is placed at 1 cent per pound, and on all other starch, including all preparations, from whatever substance produced, it is ½ cent per pound. Does that include sago, or starch used in the manufactures in competition with potato starch?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; we understand it does.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. If so, why is not the rate the same—1 cent a pound?

Mr. RAINEY. The starch that is made from potatoes is used altogether, as I understand it, in manufacturing. In the cotton mills it is made out of rotten potatoes and small potatoes.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Oh, no.

Mr. RAINEY. It is made out of potatoes not fit for food.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Made out of small and cheap potatoes, that is true; but not from rotten or worthless stock.

Mr. RAINEY. It is used in the cotton mills as sizing.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. RAINEY. We thought it could stand a tax.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. And sago is used the same way.

Mr. RAINEY. But sago is a food, also.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. But sago for food is free. We do not ask any tariff on that. Sago starch in the manufactures is in competition with potato starch, and it should receive the same rate when it is used for exactly the same purpose and enters into competition with it.

Mr. RAINEY. We think it is used also for other purposes.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. When it is used for the same purpose as a competitive article, ought it not to have exactly the same rate?

Mr. RAINEY. Now, we thought we made the proper cut.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I am not objecting to the reduction, but what I am objecting to is the unfair competition you are placing upon the American producer when you provide for 1 cent on potato starch and only one-half a cent on sago starch used for exactly the same purpose.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. If my colleague will permit me to interrupt this debate, potato starch is a very large revenue producer, and it was on account of the revenue that we were unable to put the rate any lower, whereas——

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. If the gentleman wants revenue, why does not he place the 1 cent on sago? There is none produced in this country.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Because that would be a prohibitive duty on the starch made from sago. At present the present rate is prohibitive, even at our reduction to the equivalent——

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Is not tapioca and sago free for use for food products?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It is.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Admitting that used for food product should be free, why not put on the same tariff when used for the same purpose in manufacture and containing the same constituent material?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. For the simple reason that the same tariff in one case produces revenue and in the other is prohibitive.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I think the gentleman is mistaken, for this reason: Wherever there is a rate of any sort that makes a distinction between the sago that is used in the arts and for food, the rate for manufacturing use is essentially the same as that which is used for the potato starch that is used for manufacturing purposes. If this sago starch contains about the same constituent material for use in the manufacture and if potato starch has a certain value per pound and will bear a cent per pound tariff and yet yield a revenue, sago starch ought to do the same thing, because it has essentially the same value.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him again. At a cent a pound we now get $200,000 revenue on potato starch, whereas at a half a cent we only expect to get $5,000 out of all other starches.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. You would get more than that if you made it a cent a pound. That is what I am objecting to as being the unfair competition which you are subjecting our potato raisers to and our starch makers.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It does not represent a cent a pound, only $6,000 revenue; we have not cut it enough, I am afraid.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. You reduce the tariff on potato starch 33 per cent and starch makers do not object to it, so far as I am informed, but they do object to an unfair discrimination in favor of the starch makers of other countries, and especially of the Tropics, as against ours produced in the small factories in the smaller towns scattered throughout the potato-raising regions of the country.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to impart some information on the high cost of living in England to my valued friend from New Jersey, Mr. McCOY, who represents, I believe, the East Orange district, a Member for whom I have the very highest respect and the kindest of feeling. We have served on the same committee for four years, and I always listen with interest to his speeches upon the floor of this House and, with others, I regret he does not often address the House. I am sure I voice the sentiment of all of my colleagues in the hope he will continue in Congress in spite of any post-office appointments that may be made in his district. Now, he has questioned what a Republican American consul in Japan stated in reference to the high cost of living in that country, and has himself quoted some official as saying that living is cheaper in England than in America. I wish to furnish the gentleman from New Jersey and this House and the country extracts from a letter published in the midst of our campaign last year by the Chicago Daily American, written from Paris, France, on October 8, and signed by William Randolph Hearst, who has a string of Democratic papers reaching from ocean to ocean, and who gave loyal and valuable support to President Wilson and rendered a splendid service to Democracy when he championed the cause of our Speaker for the presidential nomination. Now, listen to Mr. Hearst, high Democratic authority, on the cost of living in England in 1912, the tariff, and the condition of the wage earners in that country:

> Obviously, if the American protective tariff is responsible for the high cost of living which at present prevails all over the world, then undoubtedly our voters owe to their own country and to other friendly nations the humanitarian duty of relieving the oppressive burden of the high cost of living in America and elsewhere by promptly reducing the American protective tariff.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Scientific reduction of the tariff consists rather in judiciously and discriminatingly modifying the tariff in a way carefully calculated to benefit all the people of the United States, be they employers or laborers, producers or consumers. To secure and insure such scientific modification of the American tariff I beg most respectively to suggest to Gov. Wilson the following course:
>
> 1. The abandonment of all old stock free-trade arguments based upon fallacies and upon exploded theories and upon promises which have been proven to be false by the practical and unprofitable experience of free-trade nations like England.
>
> 2. The recognition of the principle of protection of American industries and the wise and just application of that principle to those industries which require and deserve protection.
>
> 3. The modification of the protective tariff on the one hand by reciprocity, which will open the markets of foreign nations to our products in return for the opening of our markets to their products, and on the other hand, by preferential duties which will reduce the tariff on goods imported into the United States in American ships.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> It is useless to talk of a protective tariff properly applied being mainly responsible for the increased cost of living. It is worse than useless. It is senseless.
>
> The cost of living in England, a free-trade country, is quite as great as the cost of living in the United States, a protective country. Indeed, to make an even more convincing comparison, the cost of living in England, a free-trade country, is notably greater than the cost of living in Germany, a protective country.
>
> If, therefore, free trade or radical tariff reduction can reduce the cost of living, why is not the cost of living in free-trade England largely lower than the cost of living in protected United States, or, at least, as low as in protected Germany?
>
> As a matter of fact, even the most radical tariff reduction does not materially reduce the universally increasing cost of living, but it does materially reduce the wherewithal to meet the increasing cost of living.
>
> Radical tariff reduction does force manufacturers out of business and men out of employment, and by throwing a superabundance of labor upon the market does reduce the price of labor, which is wages.
>
> In England the wages paid in most lines of labor are so low as absolutely to shock the American sense of justice and of regard for the general welfare. In every industry that I have had occasion to investigate I have found wages to be 40 to 50 per cent lower in England than in America.
>
> At the time of the recent railway strike in Great Britain I investigated the wages of the engineers and trainmen. I found that the highest salaries paid any railway engineers in Great Britain were less than $15 a week, and that these so-called high wages were paid to only a dozen men who were the star engineers on fast trains meeting the Atlantic liners.
>
> The average engineer received less than $9.50 a week; firemen averaged less than $6 a week; and the average guard, who corresponds to our conductor, received $6.30 a week.
>
> There would be a revolution in America, and a justifiable one, if such wages as these were paid to our competent railway employees. Yet with such wages workingmen in free-trade England are expected to meet a cost of living as high as or higher than ours.
>
> No wonder there are industrial disturbances in England and strikes and riots and men shot down by the soldiery. No wonder there is political and economic discontent and an emigration so great that the steamship lines can not carry all of those who desire to leave England.
>
> The false statement that living in England is cheaper than in America has been made so often that it is believed by those who have not taken the trouble to learn the facts. Living is not cheaper in England than in America. If anything, it is dearer. Food is much dearer in England than in America. Luxuries like fruit and many vegetables are entirely beyond the reach of the average individual.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Let all of us Democrats abandon worn-out and worthless free-trade arguments and frankly admit that a certain amount of judicious protection is a beneficial thing for our country and our people. Then let us seek to apply protection discriminately to develop and maintain valuable industries which require protection and which through the just and proper conduct of their business dealings with the public deserve protection.
>
> Let us realize that the tariff (even an unfair tariff) is not the cause of special privilege, but merely a symptom of special privilege—a useful institution partly corrupted by special privilege.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Let us then modify the tariff and purify the tariff, together with all the acts and operations of government, to meet the requirements of the times, but let us modify the tariff in a way which will benefit our own Nation at least as much as it will benefit competing nations.

In conclusion, I will give some prices from the London Times of September 10, 1912:

WHAT IT COSTS TO LIVE ABROAD.

The London Times of September 10, 1912, gives the following as the London wholesale prices for the commodities named on the day before:

	Cents.
Lard, per pound	16.25
Bacon, per pound	19.00
Butter, per pound	38.00
Ham, per pound	20.00

These are wholesale prices. Retail prices are from 10 to 20 per cent higher, and still higher if there is free delivery. Those who think that the cost of living is lower in Great Britain than in the United States should try it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota make a motion?

Mr. MILLER. I wish, if I can get recognition, to amend the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the only way the gentleman can get recognition.

Mr. MILLER. I have tried to do it two or three times now, in order to offer a bona fide amendment. I move to amend paragraph 239, page 58, by striking out the words "1 cent," after the word "potatoes," and insert in lieu thereof "1½ cents," and the further amendment to strike out from line 9, page 58, "½ cent," and insert in lieu thereof "1 cent."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:

Page 58, line 7, after the word "potatoes," strike out "1 cent" and insert "1½ cents"; line 9, same page, strike out "½ cent" and insert "1 cent."

Mr. MILLER. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that in the application of the jackscrew to the farmer's portion of the tariff bill they squeezed it down so hard that some of the items had the juice squeezed out of them without any rhyme or reason, and this is one of those items. The gentleman has stated, if I understand his position correctly, that they reduced the duty on sago starch, which is the substitute for potato starch, from 1 cent to ½ cent for revenue purposes, and in spite of that I find from the table which his committee has prepared and furnished us for our information and guidance in order that we may vote and act intelligently upon this great bill—those on this side not having had the marvelous opportunity to attend the Democratic caucus, when full illumination was spread upon the various paragraphs—in that table I find it is expected, having reduced the duty from 1 cent to ½ cent, there will be an absolute deficit over the year which has just preceded.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman pardon an interruption?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I think he either misunderstood what I said or is misquoting me, because my argument was directed to explaining the discrepancy between the tax on potato starch and other kinds of starch.

Mr. MILLER. As I understood the gentleman's position, I think it is as he stated. And if by having a 1-cent duty on this they derive $7,000 revenue, and if having ½ cent they derive only $5,000 revenue, wherein lies the argument for reducing the tax?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman from Minnesota was arguing in favor of putting this at the same rate.

Mr. MILLER. Precisely.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. In order to do that we would have had to reduce the rate on potato starch ½ cent, and give up $100,000 worth of revenue, or else raise the duty on sago starch to 1 cent and make it prohibitive.

Mr. MILLER. I do not propose to reduce either of them.

Now, it is easy to assume that the starch manufacturers of the United States are prosperous and easy-going. As a matter of fact, nearly all the potato-starch manufactories in the West—those being the only ones with which I have had anything to do and about which I have any information—are owned very largely by the farmers and the potato growers, and they act simply as a regulator of the produce from the farm. They use in making starch, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] indicated, good potatoes, but too small to be merchantable. When the price of potatoes goes up, why naturally the starch factories close down. Now, if it is proposed by putting potatoes on the free list that the price of potatoes to the farmers is to be so much reduced that they are to become very cheap, then you do not need any duty on starch made from potatoes, because potatoes will be so cheap that the starch factories will all run at full time. But if it is not expected that that great reduction to the farmers is going to occur, then you do need some duty on potato starch. As a matter of fact, the starch factories are not particularly prosperous, but have to eke out a rather precarious existence. And as my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] so clearly pointed out, there is neither logic, economy, money, rhyme, nor reason in putting 50 per cent of the duty on sago starch that is put upon potato starch when both are to be used for identically the same purpose. If we place the duty on sago starch as called for in my amendment, the duty will be the same as in the present law, the duty will be equalized with that on potato starch, and more revenue will be derived for Uncle Sam. I do not say reduce the duty on potato starch. Leave it up that there may be derived the revenue desired by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON]; but I do say raise the duty on sago starch, thus treating potato starch made by our farmers fairly and bringing in more revenue for our Government. Mr. Chairman, the situation is positively pathetic. There is no question about the merits of the amendment to increase the duty on sago starch. The arguments of those in charge of the bill establish its merits, and yet it will not be adopted. The merits of a proposition receive no consideration here. The Democratic majority have decided there shall be no amendments adopted, so no amendments will there be, and injury after injury will be perpetrated upon the people and industries of America. Such legislative obstinacy presents one of the most remarkable spectacles ever witnessed in the history of our country.

But, returning to potato starch, the rates in the bill will injure that industry and result in serious harm to the American farmer. Potato starch is a by-product of potato raising, and if the potato-starch factories be closed the American farmer will lose a market for an important part of his produce. Not content with placing potatoes on the free list, it is proposed by this rate further to strike at the welfare of the farmer. A sad day, indeed, for the agricultural interests of our Nation.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to point out what seems to me to be a want of intellectual consistency in the positions so frequently taken by the gentlemen on the other side. Almost hundreds of times they have argued to us that a reduction of the duty has been or will be followed by a higher price in the product concerned. Just a little while ago we had an argument from the gentleman from Michigan to the effect that when hides were put on the free list they, on that account, went up in price, and that when the duty on shoes was reduced or cut in half, shoes, on that account, went up sensibly in price. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is constantly making the same argument.

Now, we do not believe that they believe that argument, for every time you try them they oppose all reductions in behalf of the interests that want higher prices. Now, despite the argument, post hoc propter hoc, made by the gentleman from Michigan, if he would be honest with himself he would say that whatever cause produced the rise of price on hides or shoes, it certainly could not have been produced by the reduction of the duty. The truth is that no candid man makes the argument, post hoc propter hoc, except as a suggestion, a persuasive suggestion, and unless he can show the connection between the two he never insists upon its cogency or power.

The men who talk about the low prices that prevailed in 1896 being a result of the enactment of the Wilson bill, and who talk about the panic of 1893 being the result of the Wilson bill, have been simply making this post hoc propter hoc argument: That because one thing followed another it was caused by it. They have never been honest in making that argument with themselves or with the country, because they know that the low prices of 1893 were not connected with the bill that was enacted in 1894, and that the low prices that followed were not caused by it, but were only continued under it.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I regret I can not yield to the gentleman. I have not the time.

Now, I want to say that the man who wants to connect cause with effect will, when it comes to the low prices of 1893 and 1894, discover that those low prices existed before 1893 all over the country under a Republican régime, and he will try to discover the cause. He will find that wool, cotton, and every other agricultural product had gone down and had been going down for years. Corn had been burned in Kansas before the Wilson bill was framed; but it is convenient—and it may be without intentional deception—that they omit those facts when they talk about the low prices that prevailed in 1896. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

They know that in 1897 and in 1898, after the passage of the Dingley law, cotton was still selling at 4 and 5 cents in my country, and wool was still down. They know that bankruptcy and failure had existed before 1893, and even before the election of 1892, and even during 1890 and 1891, all over this country. They know further that by the retirement of bank notes from 1882 to 1892, amounting to over $300,000,000, our currency had been greatly contracted, while the volume of our business and of our production had increased. The intellectually honest man will find some connection between falling prices and a decreasing currency with increasing volume of business. They know also that after the election of 1896 the Republicans took warning and very largely stopped the further retirement of bank notes, and authorized the establishment of small banks, which added many millions to our bank notes, and that this, with large discoveries and production of gold, greatly increased the volume of our money, and that was followed by rising prices. And an honest man may find some connection of cause and effect between these two facts.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HARDY. I regret I can not yield to the gentleman in five minutes.

When you discuss the low prices of 1893 and 1894 you should couple with your statement the fact that low prices existed also before 1892 and the fact that for some years there had been falling prices, a greater and greater disparity between the value

of gold and the value of farm and other products. You should give the people those facts, and then you will not go before the country under false pretenses, and you will not charge that anybody expects or has expected to go back to the prices of 1896 with the volume of money as it is now. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the pending paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves that debate on the pending paragraph close in five minutes. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I presume that it will be impossible on either side of the House to claim perfect intellectual honesty in regard to this discussion. I desire, however, in reply to what has just been suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY], charging that the Republicans are guilty of intellectual dishonesty in claiming that the low prices that existed in 1893 and subsequently were due to the tariff, to say that that is not altogether a myth by any means.

I admit that much that the gentleman has said with regard to the conditions that existed prior to 1893 is true, and I have never heard any Republican claim that the low prices that existed at that time were entirely due to the operation of the tariff. But if that were true, you would have a substantial argument in favor of the bill that you now propose, because your oft-reiterated statement is that this bill will bring low prices because it reduces the tariff rates.

Intellectual honesty compels you to say to the people that you are expecting to give lower rates on food products because you are lowering the tariff rates. Some of us have been attempting to show that that was not always true. Some of us have been attempting to show that that did not inevitably follow. I want to call the attention of gentlemen to this significant fact: It is said by the distinguished chairman of the committee having this bill in charge that they must fulfill their promise to the people to give them free bread, which I presume in his judgment means cheap bread. There is only one country in the world that I know of that gives the people free bread, and that is Great Britain. Yet the price of bread in the city of Berlin is 10 per cent cheaper to-day than it is in London, the price in Paris is 14 per cent cheaper than it is in London, and the price in Vienna is 25 per cent cheaper for bread to its people than in London, where they have free trade in bread and free wheat and free corn. And all those cities, with their lower prices to their own people, are in highly protected countries.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TOWNER. I can not yield. I have the same difficulty that the gentleman had.

I want to say, further, that the greatest progress that has been made, both in the raising of prices of wages to their people and in the lowering of prices of food products to them, in comparison with free-trade England, has been made in Germany, and Germany has the highest protection on her farm products of any country in the world.

The result has been that after she more than doubled her tariff on agricultural products in 1906, the stimulus which was given to agricultural production in Germany resulted in a reduction of the prices of foodstuffs to the German consumer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

240. Spices: Cassia buds, cassin, and cassia vera; cinnamon and cinnamon chips; ginger root, unground and not preserved or candied; nutmegs; pepper, black or white; capsicum or red pepper, or cayenne pepper; and clove stems, 1 cent per pound; cloves, 2 cents per pound; pimento, ½ of 1 cent per pound; sage, ½ cent per pound; mace, 8 cents per pound; mustard, ground or prepared, in bottles or otherwise, 6 cents per pound; all other spices not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 58, line 18, after the word "section," insert the words "including all herbs or herb leaves in glass or other small packages for culinary use."

The amendment was agreed to.

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to close debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto in five minutes.

Mr. COOPER. I want to offer an amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask that debate close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, when I arose a moment ago I did not expect to be shot from behind by my colleague from Texas, but I see that such is the case. In regard to intellectual honesty, the gentleman who sat down a little while ago said that he never contended that the tariff bill of 1893 was the cause of low prices in that day. I want to say that a great many protective Democrats have made that statement. I have heard that statement made on the stump by Republicans and Democrats who were leaning toward protection. I do not charge my friend from Texas with a conscious want of intellectual integrity and I may be guilty of an unconscious want of it. It is born with all gentlemen to try to be intellectually honest, but we are not on all occasions. The gentleman from Texas says you are not honest when you say that you do not expect to reduce the price of the producer, while you do to the consumer. If the tariff alone is to be considered, no man intellectually honest with himself has ever said that. We do say we expect to reduce prices very much to the consumer without hurting the producer if by means of tearing down the tariff wall we can prevent the stilted prices being put upon the people by the trusts behind the tariff wall. Where you have no trust, no combination, if you have free, open competition, the producer gets less and the consumer will get the product for less. If you have not open competition, the producers may get little or nothing, and yet the consumers be held up by the trusts. Tear down the tariff wall and you may get competition. Build it up and keep it up and you do not get competition, for inside the tariff wall combination takes the profits from the producer and the consumer alike. The great capitalists store away the profits and pile them into millions and millions of dollars. They build floating palaces on the sea, they build castles in Scotland under the benefit of high protection, while they hold an iron hand of the trusts both on the producer and the consumer alike.

I know that under so-called protection wool sold in Boston substantially for what it sold for in Liverpool year after year and month after month, not because protection might not have enabled them to get a higher price, but because the woolen manufacturing trust held them down. And we know that if there is a world-wide hide trust and a cattle trust, free hides would not have benefited the people and free shoes might not. Combination is becoming world-wide, and the representatives of the people have got to get busy and throttle and break up the trusts. We have not ended our service to the people when we pass a low tariff. That will help us against domestic trusts, but not much against the world-wide trusts. We have got to be like the watchman on the watch tower, every day and every hour faithful, and see that these designing combinations who crave great profits do not maneuver so as to crush the people. These combinations have cut out free trade in everything but labor, but they have had and continue to have free trade in labor, and Puritan old New England is fast being peopled with a foreign population, and all over the land free trade in labor and high prices in trust products prevail. I say, let us start where we may and break down the tariff wall and stop the stilted prices. Let the people get natural and fair and reasonable prices for their products, and let there be no stilted prices for the farmer or the manufacturer. The farmer can live. For 100 years he has been groaning under the burdens of a high tariff, and when we seek to reduce it the hypocritical cry is twofold—save the farmer and save the laboring man! In God's name, when did they ever before care for either the farmer or the laboring man? They care not now and they never cared, but if they can use the farmer as a cat's-paw to pull their chestnuts out of the fire, if they can use the laboring man and his fear that his wages will be reduced as a club in fighting us and preventing us from cutting off some of their profits, they are up and about it. Morning, noon, and night they inject the farmer and the laboring man into this debate. That is the mask behind which they hide their true and hideous face of greed. What we want is simple justice to all, with special privileges to none. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, to comment a little on this paragraph. This is one of the striking cases—only one of many—where the promise made by the Democratic Party not to injure any business is made most apparent and prominent, not in the observance but in the breach. I have a great many letters from people who say that they voted the Democratic ticket upon the strength of

that promise, thinking the party would keep its promise, and now, when they get into power, pointing out the different ways in which they have not done it.

This paragraph on spices in the present law puts all unground, raw spices, so to speak, on the free list, and imposes a specific duty on those spices when prepared for the table, ground and put up in packages. It protects the manufacturer in this country not unduly, because of the ground manufactured spices. We import about $10,000,000 worth annually free of duty, a fair chance for a competitive duty which we hear so much about on that side of the proposition. What does this committee do? They go along here and transfer from the free list absolutely all raw, unground, unprepared spices and put on a specific duty per pound, equal to the duty per pound on those spices ground. There is not anyone within the sound of my voice so insane or so ignorant as to believe that that does not shut up the spice mills of this country. They place the same duty on the imported spices, unground, per pound, that is put upon the manufactured spices per pound. How are they going to grind a pound of it in this country when you consider the labor difference between this country and the countries abroad? We are not grinding the spices to sell abroad. We are not exporting them. We are simply grinding them for our own use. Have they kept their promise? I ask gentlemen on the other side of this House whether they have kept their promise in this respect? You got into power partly on that promise. I have received letters by the hundred from people, stating that they voted for you, because you said you would not injure any business; that you were going to help labor; and they are just hoping for the time to come when they can get at you once more, because of your broken promises. Of course, these things please me. If you are going to do this thing, the worse job you do the better I will like it [laughter], because the sooner the people of this country will get relief. Most of them are bound to get it in the neck, as the boys say. I do not believe in any legislation that is class legislation, especially as against the laboring class and the farmer class. I do not believe in it at all. I want to get around to the point where we can protect them, where we can make good the promise you made not to injure any business in this country. Why do you not keep your promise?

Your President is getting anxious about it. I notice by his talks over in New Jersey that he says you have to keep your pledges. He knows, because he was elected, not by the Democratic Party, but by the division in our party, and by a good many Republican votes, expecting him to keep his pledges, and he is anxious to keep them. But you have been up against it when you went to get some appointments that were dear to your hearts, and he told you plainly how he got there and illustrated how you got there. Why do you not keep your word to the American people put in your platform and proclaimed on every stump? Why do you not do it as you have agreed to do it? Why these broken promises? Why did you encourage these hopes and now break them the first time you have an opportunity by the very first act that you seek to put on the statute books?

Mr. COOPER. I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 58, line 14, after the word "cloves," strike out the words "2 cents per pound" and in lieu thereof insert the words "free of duty."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, cloves are now on the free list. Last year we imported nearly six and a half millions of pounds, a large proportion of which was used in the manufacture of vanillin. Vanillin is a flavoring extract used extensively in the preparation of various foods consumed by the people of the United States. It used to be made exclusively from vanilla beans, all of which, of course, are imported; they are not grown in this country. Under the existing tariff law vanilla beans are on the free list, but the pending bill proposes to put them on the dutiable list at 30 cents a pound.

The vanillin made from cloves is, I understand, practically identical with that derived from vanilla beans and is equally harmless as an edible. But in this connection a most suggestive fact was brought to light last Tuesday during the debate on the chemical schedule, when the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] said that vanillin, which got its name from the vanilla bean, is now being made also from certain coal-tar derivatives. I remember that Dr. Wiley, the former distinguished Chief of the Pure Food Bureau, was bitterly hostile to all attempts to compel the people of this country to eat more and more of articles made from coal-tar derivatives.

Now, these coal-tar derivatives come from Germany. That country has a practical monopoly of their manufacture, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. METZ] made very clear during the debate on Tuesday. He told us that he had to buy these derivatives from manufacturers in Germany or they would shut out his business over here, and that he could not get them except upon the terms fixed by the German trust or syndicate. And yet by the pending bill the rate on vanillin, the finished product, has been reduced 10 per cent to the direct advantage of the German manufacturer and of the importer to this country, while on cloves, now on the free list, the rate has been made 2 cents a pound, and on vanilla beans, now on the free list, the rate is made 30 cents a pound. In other words, vanilla beans and cloves, the raw materials of the American manufacturer of vanillin, are taken off the free list and a high tariff put upon them, while the tariff on vanillin, the finished product of the German manufacturer made from coal-tar derivatives, is lowered 10 per cent.

Through the courtesy of my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], I was this morning handed a letter addressed to him from a firm in Maywood, N. J., from which I will now read some very interesting information as to what such a tariff will do:

The production of vanillin in this country from coal-tar derivatives has been so frowned upon by the Bureau of Chemistry, under Dr. Wiley, that we have stuck to the vegetable supply of raw material, namely, cloves. We could not manufacture from the coal-tar derivative if we so desired, because this material, manufactured in Germany, is so controlled by a trust or syndicate that to ruin the American manufacturer they would at any time withhold supplies. This, therefore, would prevent the organization of a plant for the manufacture of vanillin from this raw material in the United States. We are compelled to use cloves, and to reduce the duty on vanillin from 20 cents to 10 cents per ounce and then add 2 cents per pound to cloves, the equivalent of 20 per cent on our raw material, you can readily understand, spells "ruin."

We call your attention to the paragraph toward the bottom of the first column, page 619, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in which Mr. METZ says: "All these products are bought from the German syndicate. * * * They are controlled abroad by syndicates, and all the syndicate has got to do is simply refuse to sell the American manufacturer and he is out of business." "Products," to which he refers are coal-tar derivatives such as would be necessary in the manufacture of vanillin from this source in the United States. Even if the foreigner would let this product come to the United States, which he will not, they would still be subject to a duty bearing from 15 to 25 per cent, so that, no matter which way the unfortunate American manufacturer turns, he is crowded out by a tariff on raw material, unintentionally levied for the protection of the German manufacturer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Can I have one minute more?

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been closed by order of the committee. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

241. Vinegar, 4 cents per proof gallon. The standard proof for vinegar shall be taken to be that strength which requires 35 grains of bicarbonate of potash to neutralize 1 ounce troy of vinegar.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment in the form of a new paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to limit debate on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests the amendment be reported. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 22, page 58, after the word "vinegar," the following as a new paragraph:

"241½. Until such time as the opinion of a nonpartisan tariff commission has reported upon the agricultural schedule the rates of duty on all articles in this schedule shall be the same as the rates provided for in the act of August 5, 1909."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is subject to a point of order probably, but I have no objection to its being voted upon. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph be limited to 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 20 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Reserving the right to object, is that paragraph 241?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This is a new paragraph; I did not intend it for that. I will ask to close debate and let the gentlemen speak on the next.

Mr. GARDNER. I hope the gentleman will allow some time on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts—241½.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman wish to speak to the amendment?

Mr. GARDNER. No; but my colleague does.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not intend to cut the gentleman's colleague out. I ask unanimous consent that on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts debate may be limited to five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto shall close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] is recognized.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, perhaps more than half of the district in western Massachusetts I have the honor to represent consists of those interested in agricultural pursuits. I may add the other half are interested in the welfare of their brother farmer. I have sat here patiently listening to the discussion of these sections of this schedule without offering any amendment as we came to them from time to time. It seemed to me that the entire schedule was so contrary to the interests of the farmer, not alone in Massachusetts but throughout this broad land of ours, that we ought not to differentiate between one section or one paragraph in favor of another in offering amendments. I have refrained from speaking for another reason also, because I have realized that the Democratic steam roller, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] as chief engineer, has been so carefully and so thoroughly oiled and managed that amendments offered by us on this side of the aisle are treated the way the steam roller crushes the material under its tremendous weight.

But I do wish, Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the farmers of my home section, to protest against the adoption of this schedule until such time as a nonpartisan tariff board can act upon it. They, like other farmers throughout the country, are honest, honorable, hard-working citizens. No class of our citizens labor harder, in my opinion, and obtain less in return than the tillers of the soil. Nothing should be done to lessen their market prices. So I am glad to enter this protest against a change in the protection now afforded them. These protests have come from individuals, agricultural societies, and granges, of which I am proud to be rated as an humble member.

If the cost to the individual consumer is high on produce, as we have heard so many Democratic Members say here on this floor, the reason can not be because the farmer himself is receiving more than is a fair return for the hard toil and labor that he puts into preparing that produce for the market. It is right and fair that this protection should be afforded them. Therefore, as I say, I have kept entirely still during the discussion of this schedule, but I have been thoroughly aroused at the methods you are using in trying to jam down the throats of the American farmer this iniquitous schedule. Give them a fair show, a fair price for their produce, and a fair return for the sweat of their brow. That is all we ask in behalf of our farmer. We ask fair treatment to him by your party. Let this protest of my own constituents go out to-day, as well as the protest on the part of the rest of the farmers in whose behalf others have spoken at the close of this paragraph, and let us be able to tell them that so far as the Republican votes are concerned, we want justice done them through a nonpartisan tariff commission. That is the reason, Mr. Chairman, why I offer this amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Nebraska rise?

Mr. LOBECK. I would like five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been closed by the action of the committee. The question is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division on that.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 46, noes 68.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE H—SPIRITS, WINES, AND OTHER BEVERAGES.

242. Brandy and other spirits manufactured or distilled from grain or other materials, and not specially provided for in this section, $2.50 per proof gallon.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph be limited to 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph be limited to 15 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LOBECK] is recognized.

Mr. TOWNER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TOWNER. As I understood it, the arrangement as to 15 minutes granted to the gentleman from Nebraska and others was that they were to be recognized on paragraph No. 241.

The CHAIRMAN. Two hundred and forty-two.

Mr. TOWNER. That was the last one read, but, as I understood it, time was to be granted for them to speak on the former paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. There was nothing of that kind stated in the request of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. LOBECK. He asked for 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Paragraph 241 was read and passed, and then the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] offered an amendment to insert a new paragraph, and upon that debate was limited to 5 minutes.

Mr. LOBECK. I understood it was 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. It was limited to five minutes. And then a vote was had on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and the Clerk proceeded to read the bill in regular order. Paragraph 242 was read, and the gentleman from Alabama asked unanimous consent that debate on that paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in 15 minutes, and it was so ordered. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LOBECK] is recognized.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, perhaps it would be agreeable to the gentlemen who want to speak to modify that arrangement and make the speeches three minutes long instead of five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] modifies that, and suggests that the recognitions during the 15 minutes be for 3 minutes each. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LOBECK] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak upon this amendment which has just been read. My understanding was that I should have time to speak on the section just previously read.

My object in rising now is to say that I have heard a good deal said in the discussion of this tariff measure about the panic of 1893–1896. I had a good deal of experience in it, personal experience, and in my judgment the tariff was not one of the chief causes of that panic. One of the causes was the fact that the farmers west of the Missouri River who had been buying merchandise from the East could not purchase on account of crop failures caused by drought. Supplies were sent into the district represented by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] and other neighboring districts in Nebraska and Kansas by the people of the East and the people of Iowa and Illinois to help the homesteaders and pioneer settlers of Nebraska and Kansas.

When these Republican gentlemen discuss 1893 to 1896 they forget 1873–1879. In the district represented by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] they had equally hard times from Cedar Rapids west. In every town along the Northwestern Railroad they were having auction sales at that time, for I remember personally about it. In the district represented by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] they had the same degree of hard times, and the same was also true in northwestern Iowa.

We had a high tariff in those days. We were living under a Republican tariff. A Republican newspaper, a copy of which I have in my hand, dated in 1877, namely, the Chicago Inter Ocean, does not ascribe those hard times to the tariff. It ascribes the hard times to the money conditions of that time. The failure of Baring Bros., of London, in about 1890, a world-wide failure, was one of the principal causes of the hard times in this country in the nineties.

In Brother MILLER's State, in Minneapolis, about every man was broke who had been speculating in city real estate. It was the same in St. Paul. It was the same in Sioux City, in Mr. SCOTT's district, and the same in Kansas City and in Omaha. It was overspeculation everywhere and the monetary condition that caused the panic of 1893, not the Wilson tariff.

In my time I have seen hogs and cattle and farm products sold at as low prices under a high tariff as under a low tariff, and I have seen the Chicago live-stock market closed for two weeks to the western farmer and stock shipper under the high-tariff times that prevailed in 1873. I was a shipper at the time, and I know from personal experience.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is recognized.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to commend the majority members of the committee for their action on this schedule.

This is one of the schedules in which we made a great increase four years ago, putting the rates up higher than they had

ever been before, and it has often been cited as a typical part of our program in revising the tariff upward. I always plead guilty to that charge on this schedule on wines and liquors, and have never had any apologies to make for it, either. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, this committee, after considering it, I do not know how long—they say they have been working on this bill for two years, and of course I accept what they say about that—come in here with the schedule exactly as we passed it four years ago, except that they have lowered the duty a little bit on mineral water. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I have contended repeatedly that if the gentlemen would give to the study of these questions the rest of their natural lives, and should pay attention to and avail themselves of such educational facilities as come to them by way of experience, they would eventually get a good deal better tariff bill than has been shown in any attempt they have made at it thus far. This present schedule is an evidence of the advance that they are making.

I hate to have to call these things to the attention of the House even occasionally as they go along. I leave out a large part of the items on which they have done the same things that we did. Of course I am glad of their indorsement, and yet I do not care so much about that, because the facts have come out now about the tariff revision of 1909, and they are so emblazoned in the reports of the Treasury Department during the four years that have passed since the enactment of the present tariff law that the majority on the Committee on Ways and Means no longer ignore them, but indeed print them in their handbook.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. RAINEY. I want to ask the gentleman from New York if it is true, as stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], in opening this debate, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] was against his own bill, and that they forced these items into the Payne bill in opposition to the wishes of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. PAYNE. I can explain that so that the gentleman from Illinois can understand it. We adopted the same rule that the majority members of this committee have adopted, and that the majority members of every Ways and Means Committee adopt. The majority members of the committee always go through the bill, discuss it, agree on the rates of duty by a majority vote, and when they have finally agreed upon it they all support the bill in its entirety. That is what we did. The bill was not exactly as I would have liked to have it. No man ever joined in a report on a tariff bill that was just as he wanted it. Why, you know this bill is not in accordance with the views of the gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of your committee [Mr. UNDERWOOD], not by a long shot, and before you get through with it, it will be more out of the way.

Mr. GARDNER. I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] whether he was in favor of free cattle or not, in his committee?

Mr. RAINEY. I was in favor of free cattle in my committee.

Mr. GARDNER. But you are backing up your committee's report?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. I trust I have answered that question to the full satisfaction of my friend from Illinois, and that he understands now that I did disagree with some portions of that tariff law, and I disagree with them yet; but I simply acceded to the will of the majority, just as the gentleman has done and just as other gentlemen on that committee have done.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, during my absence from the House my genial colleague, the gentleman from the tenth district of Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], delivered a dissertation upon the subject of chickens; and he stated that in his district they raised some chickens and sold a good many chickens. He got his wires crossed. He should have stated that they sold some chickens and raised a good many chickens, because if it was not for the chicken industry in the tenth district there would not be any Republicans there at all. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a good deal of talk from the Republicans of this House about this tariff bill, and they have introduced a good many amendments. Their opposition to the bill and their amendments to it remind me of an anecdote. There was an old negro woman, who went from down in South Carolina up into Mr. MANN's district in Chicago and got a position as a cook in the house of one of Chicago's newly rich. Well, they did not have very much to eat, but they had a great deal of style, and they had it in courses; and in the course of a week this negro woman announced that she was going to resign her position. They wanted to know why she was going to quit. She said: "Well, dar's too much shufflin' ob de dishes for de fewness of de vittles." [Laughter.] That is the way it is with our Republican friends. There is too much shufflin' of amendments for the fewness of the substance of those amendments. [Laughter.]

If I am mistaken, I am willing to be corrected; but I understood the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] a little while ago to animadvert against President Wilson for going to the State of New Jersey and raising his voice in favor of pure elections.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is limited by order of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. I will continue on the next paragraph.

[Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that my distinguished colleague from Nebraska can summon no better argument for this tariff bill than the slander of his own fair State, and especially my district. I desire to say as to my district receiving any comfort or aid from the East in 1894, 1895, or 1896 it is absolutely incorrect. We took care of ourselves then and we are endeavoring to take care of ourselves now, and are asking neither favor nor charity from the East and South. Only plain justice. If anything came to the gates of Omaha, I do not know it. Unfortunately, our crops for two of these years were not good. My friend has not his historical facts on straight. We were not under a Republican tariff law, but were under a Democratic tariff law. The Wilson bill was passed August 27, 1894, and until July 24, 1897, when the Dingley law was enacted, was in effect.

Mr. LOBECK. Did not we have a drought in that time?

Mr. SLOAN. We had no drought in 1896. On the contrary, we had the greatest bumper crop in Nebraska that we had had for 25 years. [Applause.]

Mr. LOBECK. You were defending homesteaders from being foreclosed on mortgages.

Mr. SLOAN. God knows I was. We could get little for our crops, and there was no money to pay mortgage or interest. In 1896 we had a bumper crop of corn. We sold wheat from 25 to 40 cents a bushel under that Wilson tariff law. The report of the Ways and Means Committee on this bill quotes wheat at 35 cents per bushel for 1896. We sold the corn of that bumper crop of 1896, when we could get a market, for 8 to 10 cents a bushel, and also used it for fuel. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

243. Each and every gauge or wine gallon of measurement shall be counted as at least 1 proof gallon; and the standard for determining the proof of brandy and other spirits or liquors of any kind imported shall be the same as that which is defined in the laws relating to internal revenue: *Provided*, That it shall be lawful for the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to authorize the ascertainment of the proof of wines, cordials, or other liquors, by distillation or otherwise, in cases where it is impracticable to ascertain such proof by the means prescribed by existing law or regulations: *And provided further*, That any brandy or other spirituous or distilled liquors imported in any sized cask, bottle, jug, or other packages, of or from any country, dependency, or province under whose laws similar sized casks, bottles, jugs, or other packages of distilled spirits, wine, or other beverage put up or filled in the United States are denied entrance into such country, dependency, or province, shall be forfeited to the United States; and any brandy or other spirituous or distilled liquor imported in a cask of less capacity than 10 gallons from any country shall be forfeited to the United States.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make this remark, that every protectionist is a free trader in everything that he does not sell.

Mr. FORDNEY. That is not true, my friend; and you can not apply it to me. The gentleman is mistaken.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I am going to make it so plain that I will not have to yield.

Mr. FORDNEY. Do not apply that to me.

Mr. DIES. What is the first thing that protection wants? Free labor. You have always stood for an open gate for the cheap labor of Europe to come to compete in your mills and factories with the labor in this country. That was given to you. You had that, and in the progress and growth of time you wanted more free trade. You wanted free trade in raw materials with which you work.

Some, like my friend FORDNEY, were smart enough to know that if they got free trade in labor and free trade in raw materials, the dynamic forces of society would be so great against them that they would be given free trade in everything that they sold. But protection, in its selfishness, not satisfied to demand an open gate for labor, not satisfied to say that a man

who works with his hands in a protective mill shall work in competition with the labor market of the world, has gone a step further now and has said that a man who is engaged in a protected industry shall have free trade in labor, and free trade in the materials with which he works—make every laborer stand and deliver in a free-trade market, and make every producer stand and sell his goods or raw material in a free-trade market, and yet give to you the sacred right to sell that which you make in the protective market.

It is the doom of protection in this country. It ought to be so. You open the gates of labor and let every Italian and every Russian and every laborer from Europe come to compete with the labor of the man who labors here. Then you say to the farmer, "Produce that which you have and sell it in a free-trade market." Do not you know that your laborer, Mr. FORDNEY—do not you know that the laborer and the farmer who produces and sells in a free-trade market will have sense enough to demand that he be allowed to buy in a free-trade market? That is, you say to the farmer in America, "You have got to sell in a free-trade market, and you are not as good as a farmer in Argentina or Australia. There they can sell and buy in a free-trade market, but you have got to sell in a free-trade market and buy in a protected market." That is the mistake that you protectionists are making. Your first mistake was free labor. That was bad enough. Now you demand not only to buy your labor in your free market and sell your goods in a protected market, but you demand of a farmer that he sell his wool and his cotton and his raw material in a free-trade market and then sell him back the same wool and the same manufactured stuff in a high protected market. In other words, thank God, the extreme selfishness of protection is overleaping its own bounds.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman——

Mr. DIES. With great pleasure, to my friend from Philadelphia.

Mr. MOORE. Does it not make any difference to the gentleman that the labor that comes into the United States from foreign countries lifts itself to the American standard of wages when it arrives here?

Mr. DIES. Oh, well, if you bring in labor that is cheaper than ours you will bring down the price of our labor, just as if you bring in clothing in competition with the mills of Pennsylvania that will bring down the price of clothing. You are unwilling to bring down the price of your manufactured stuff in competition with cheap labor, but you are willing to bring down labor itself.

Mr. MOORE. Do we not exalt that labor? Instead of breaking it down, do not we build it up?

Mr. DIES. You exalt foreign labor, but you debase domestic labor.

Mr. MOORE. When it gets here we do raise it to the American standard.

Mr. DIES. He thinks a man who labors with his hands is none too good to have foreign competition, but he believes that a man who manufactures with his capital ought not to have the competition. It is all a difference of the standpoint from which you look.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. With pleasure.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman was saying that New England had always been for free labor.

Mr. DIES. I will say that the Republican Party——

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; it always has. It was founded on that cause.

Mr. FARR. Good!

Mr. DIES. The Republican Party must have stood for free labor, else we would not have had it for 50 years. The Republican Party is standing to-day for free raw material. Why? Because the protectionist is selfishness personified. You want to buy in a free market, and you are selfish enough to demand to sell in a protected market.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, unlike my eloquent friend from Texas, I do not care to discuss this paragraph from a political viewpoint. [Laughter.] There is a moral to be drawn not only from the paragraph but from the schedule we are discussing when we compare it with the schedules we have passed. The hue and cry of the Democratic Party and the bone of their contention against the Republican Party is that the Republican Party stands for the imposition of a tariff upon goods that are imported from foreign countries. It has been heralded from one end of the land to the other that that tariff is "a tax" upon the people. Allen G. Thurman called it a tax upon "everything one wears from the crown of his head to the soles of his feet." But when we analyze this awful "tax" which is now being "imposed" upon the people in a new form by the Democratic Party we find that under the Payne law, which has been so much derided in the course of this discussion, that the entire tariff collections during the year 1912, if apportioned among the 90,000,000 people of the country, would have amounted to $3.15 each. In other words, any gentleman who finds fault with the protective system, that builds up industry and pays wages, can save his portion of the "tax" for a whole year by abstaining from one trip to the theater or by cutting out one-half a box of good cigars or one square dinner for himself and one-half the price of a dinner for himself and friend. This would wipe out the awful burden the Payne law imposed upon him. But I want by contrast to show that, while there is fierce denunciation of the tariff system, which at the worst imposes only $3.15 "tax" per annum upon everybody in the country, there is no word of protest from anyone on the other side of the House, particularly from anyone coming from the State of Kentucky, against the tax that is now being imposed by the schedule which we have under consideration. It will be seen by reference to the figures in the Democratic handbook that the collections at the ports of the United States last year amounted to substantially $311,000,000. This "burden" was so distributed amongst the people of the country that it was imperceptible; but here is a schedule advanced and supported without change by our friends on the other side, without one word of comment, that imposes a direct tax on the people of the United States amounting to $321,000,000 a year, or approximately $3.50 a head, for liquors and tobacco. Why not charge that up to a tariff system?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

244. On all compounds or preparations of which distilled spirits are a component part of chief value there shall be levied a duty not less than that imposed upon distilled spirits.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I shall leave, Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen from Texas to settle the little difficulty among themselves. I want to refer very briefly to a statement that was made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY], however, in his last address, and let me say, parenthetically, during my brief service in this House I have learned to greatly admire the gentleman from Texas. I think there is no more able advocate of this bill upon the floor of this House than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY], and with characteristic frankness he says to the House now that they do not now intend to be guilty of the intellectual dishonesty of claiming that to reduce the price to the ultimate consumer will not reduce the price also of the producer; but he says, if it is necessary, in order to prevent the exorbitant high prices that are charged the consumer by reason of the trusts, that we should invite this foreign competition, and it is upon that proposition that I desire to say a word. Mr. Chairman, there has never been any distinction made in this country, in so far as trust control has been effected, between those who were protected and those who were not protected. The trusts upon nonprotected articles have been just as effective in controlling and raising prices as those upon protected articles. Nor is it necessary in order to control the trusts that you should open our markets to the nations of the world. Our friends are very fond of calling this a tariff wall. For the sake of argument let us so consider it, just a moment, and in this great trade war in which the producers of these United States are called upon to defend themselves behind their tariff wall I judge that if behind the breastworks there shall be a conflict in which one of those behind the breastworks shall assault another it is not necessary to tear down the wall or our defenses to the enemy and allow them to come in to punish those who are guilty of a misdemeanor behind that wall.

I think we can take care of and punish these malefactors themselves, and I will join with those gentlemen, and I think every man on this side of the House will aid, in preventing trust combinations from raising prices to the consumer of protected products or any products. I think it will be more to our credit and a higher statesmanship to look after those methods of control that are not extraneous, but within our borders and by our own laws control unlawful combinations, instead of tearing down our industries and inviting outside help to control this our domestic trouble. Let us make our laws so that these

combinations which raise the price of farm products, or any other production, shall be prohibited by our laws here, whether it shall be a protected article or whether one that is not protected. The fault of the Democratic argument lies first in the fact that to remove the tariff will not aid in our settlement of the trust proposition, and, second, that we can make effective our trust control within our own territorial limits, among our own people, by our own laws, without destroying our protective rates in this country.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that all debate close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to address the committee for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Can not the gentleman take the next paragraph?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and a good many other gentlemen on that side do not understand what the tariff tax means here in the United States. If they do understand, they have not given the House to understand that they do understand. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, speaking of raising $300,000,000 in revenue annually, considers that that is the only amount paid by the American people by reason of tariff taxes. I want to say to the gentleman that by reason of this Payne-Aldrich tariff law, the most obnoxious and oppressive tariff bill ever written, the American people are now paying annually twenty-seven hundred million dollars. This Government has entered upon a policy under the reign of the Republican Party of taxing the American people twenty-four hundred million dollars in order to get $300,000,000 in revenue taxes. Your trusts have sprung up under this protective tariff system. A certain article has 50 cents tax on it, and ceases to come into our country and the Government does not derive one copper on that article. The consumer continues to pay the 50 cents. Where does that 50 cents go?

It goes into the pocket of the trust magnate of the United States. He continues to reap his reward and the consumer continues to bear the burden of a 50-cent tax, although the article ceases to come to our country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] said, "Why do you not be honest and keep your promise to the people? I want to protect the laboring man; I want to protect the farmer." What a strange note that was coming from him. Why, he is the author of this Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, and what he did with the laboring man in that bill and what he did to the farmer in that bill was a plenty. [Laughter.] And when I heard him say to-day, "I want to protect the laboring man and the farmer," I thought of the signs in front of two stores in London. Two fellows were engaged in selling fish, one's establishment just above the other's. The man on the upper floor hung out his sign, "Fresh fish to-day." The fellow just under him hung up his sign immediately below it, "Not so fresh as ours." And it went on until finally the fish dealer above hung out this sign, "We sell eels to the King," and the man just below him hung out this sign, "God save the King!" [Laughter and applause.]

So, my friends, if what you are doing for the laboring man and the farmer in the Payne-Aldrich tariff law is protection, God save the farmer and the laboring man. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

245. Cordials, liqueurs, arrack, absinthe, kirschwasser, ratafia, and other spirituous beverages or bitters of all kinds, containing spirits, and not specially provided for in this section, $2.60 per proof gallon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is recognized.

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

246. No lower rate or amount of duty shall be levied, collected, and paid on brandy, spirits, and other spirituous beverages than that fixed by law for the description of first proof; but it shall be increased in proportion for any greater strength than the strength of first proof, and all imitations of brandy or spirits or wines imported by any names whatever shall be subject to the highest rate of duty provided for the genuine articles respectively intended to be represented, and in no case less than $1.75 per gallon.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, it seems that the little explanation that I have to make must be made in courses. [Laughter.] A little while ago I made the statement that I understood the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to animadvert against Mr. Wilson, the Democratic President, because he had seen fit to go to New Jersey and make a speech in favor of jury reform. If I am mistaken in what I understood the gentleman to state I would like to be corrected.

Now, there is no man in this House for whom I have a higher regard than that which I entertain for the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]. All men must concede that he is a very able man. All men must concede that he is an honest man. And yet, Mr. Chairman, with all that, he is merely a Bourbon standpat Republican, who never forgets anything and never learns anything on the tariff question. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. THOMAS. Of course.

Mr. GARDNER. I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the gentleman he is talking about is not present.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I did not know that.

Mr. GARDNER. I thought so.

Mr. THOMAS. But if he were present it would not make any difference. [Laughter.] And if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] desires he can substitute himself in place of the gentleman from New York. [Laughter.]

Now, I will say that the President of the United States is nothing more than an American citizen, and as an American citizen he has the right to go to New Jersey or to New York or to Massachusetts or to any other place and raise his voice in favor of purity in elections, and if there are any places on the face of God's earth that need something of this character, they are certainly New Jersey, New York, and Massachusetts, if newspaper reports be true. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

So far as I am individually concerned, I want to say that Mr. Wilson is a Democratic President. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I voted for him. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.] I was for CHAMP CLARK for the nomination [applause], but Mr. Wilson is my President, and as a Democrat you are going always to find me upholding the hands of Woodrow Wilson. I thank you, gentlemen. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if there are gentlemen on this side who have amendments which they desire to offer to this schedule? There seems to be none.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. VAUGHAN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. VAUGHAN. Mr. Chairman, being only a freshman here, it had not been my intention to make any remarks during the consideration of this bill. However, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] made statements in his speech which have caused me to address the committee. He said, if I understood him correctly, that they upon that side, the Republicans, are as much opposed as we on this side, the Democrats, to the great trusts and monopolies that control the prices of products in this country, and that they are willing to help toward the enactment and enforcement of a law that will prohibit any organization from controlling the price of such products. In other words, they are willing to be "trust busters."

Mr. Chairman, if it is wrong for people to organize to control the prices of products to the ultimate consumer, or to obtain a monopoly of trade in any product, why in the name of common sense is it not wrong for this Government to lend its aid toward the promotion of any such organization? Why is it not wrong for this Government to enable manufacturers of products of any kind to obtain a monopoly of trade in such products? Why is it not wrong for the Government purposely to so frame the law as to protect anyone against competition? But leaving out the question of right and wrong, if trusts and conspiracies against trade are contrary to sound public policy, why is it not against sound public policy for the Government itself to restrain

trade for the special benefit of those seeking it, that they may obtain higher prices from American consumers of their products?

You on that side pretend to be against trusts and conspiracies in restraint of trade, and yet the very essence of your protection doctrine is that the Government should enter into conspiracies in restraint of trade with the favored classes in this country to enable them to monopolize the home market and obtain higher prices from consumers who have to sell what they produce in the open market against the competition of the world. The cotton raisers, the corn raisers, the producers of other agricultural products—the farmers—have to sell their products against the competition of the world. It is beyond the power of this Government to levy any kind of a tariff upon foreign imports that would protect them against competition, because they have no competition, and whenever you have levied a tariff against the importation of anything from abroad which they produce here, you have done it with the intention of fooling them into the belief that they were being protected when you knew they were not, that they might more tamely submit to your protective system, which has caused them to pay so much higher prices for the things they have to buy.

If trusts and conspiracies in restraint of trade are wrong, then why in the name of common sense is not a protective tariff, the very purpose of which is to restrain trade—why is it not wrong?

Some one behind me says, "He's a free trader." Perhaps so. Yes, Mr. Chairman, if being opposed to any kind of a law that lays tribute upon the masses for the benefit of any class or any mass, if being opposed to tariff for protection upon anything, makes me a free trader, I am, then, a free trader. And I need no better argument in favor of my kind of free trade than the fact that even the Republicans are forced to recognize that trusts and conspiracies in restraint of trade are wrong.

Whenever this Government, by any kind of a law, lends its aid to anyone to obtain higher prices for his goods from his neighbor than his neighbor would have to pay but for such law, it robs the one for the benefit of the other, and it is none the less robbery because done under the sanction of law.

It has been said time and time again during the discussion on this bill that it will ruin the "industries" of the country. What industry will be injured by the passage of this bill? Yes; it may injure some. Every industry that is enabled by the provisions of the Payne-Aldrich bill, under which we are now living, to run its hands into the pockets of the people—of the ultimate consumers—and filch from them higher prices for its products through favoritism of the Government will be forced to take its hands out of the pockets of the people.

I stand for the man who asks no favors of this Government except such as it owes to everyone under the flag. I stand for the great body of the people who only ask that the hand of privilege be taken out of their pockets, and in so far as any industry may be injured by being made to take its hands out of the pockets of the people, it ought to be injured, and this bill will injure it to that extent, and to that extent only.

Those who under the protective system are now enjoying the privilege of putting their hands up to their elbows in the pockets of the consumers, and taking as much as they want, will of course howl about being injured, but the great body of the American people will be benefited by this bill, because it lightens the burden of government upon the great consuming masses and puts it on the shoulders of those upon whom it should rest, and it is as free from protection; it is as low a reduction of tariff taxation as the country can stand at this time without such a shock to the business of the country as should be avoided. Of course it would be bad policy to change absolutely and at once from the system of high protection. It has prevailed too many years; under it the great toiling masses of the country have received such a small share of the wealth they have produced and the favorites of protection have grown so much richer. Of course it would be bad policy to eliminate protection at once. It would be a revolution and revolutions always cause shock and disturbance. But, Mr. Chairman, this bill is a long stride in the right direction. It looks toward ultimate reciprocal free-trade relations with all the nations of the world. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say here that I do not have the fears which my colleague from Texas [Mr. DIES] seems to entertain—that this bill is too long a step to take at one time. If I understood him correctly, he is against protection, but he would eliminate it more gradually. Mr. Chairman, I believe the people have waked up. I believe they are ready for this bill, and whether they are ready for it or not, in my judgment, it is the best tariff law that has been written since before the War between the States. It should commend itself to the American people—to their honesty, to their fairness—and I believe it will. It has the unqualified approval of the President, who received the popular approval last fall, whose position, I believe, the people of the United States understood when they elected him, and who, I believe, is in close and sympathetic touch with the people of the United States, understands their will, and will make their will the law when he approves this bill.

The people of the United States have realized that under the Republican protective-tariff system the money to run this Government is collected from the people, not according to their ability to pay, not according to their wealth, but according to what they eat and wear and consume. They have realized that under this system those who toil for their daily bread and are barely able to support their large families pay as much toward the support of the Federal Government as others who own millions. They realize that the protective system lays a heavier burden upon the poor than they are able to bear and a lighter upon the rich than they should be made to bear. They have realized also that under this protective tariff, while the Government gets millions as taxes the favored few, for whose benefit it is levied, get hundreds of millions. They have realized that they pay taxes every time they buy goods, and that when they buy goods that have been imported, or made out of imported goods, they pay taxes to the Government, and that when they buy goods that have been made in this country they pay tribute to the trusts that have grown up under the protective system.

The Republicans used to tell them that those whom they wanted to protect were "infants," and needed protection. The people know how hard it is to pull a full-grown yearling away from his mammy, and now they realize that they should have weaned the calves long ago. It is to be hoped that this bill will wean them, and that the noise they make about being weaned will not be sufficient to disturb the peace of the country.

The Republicans used to tell the people that they wanted to protect labor, to enable those enjoying protection to get higher prices for protected goods and pay their laborers higher wages. They have seen the protected "infants" import cheap foreign labor to compete with labor here and to take the places of those who join labor unions.

The Republicans tell us we should be patriotic enough to protect the "infants" in order to build up home industries, but the people have found out that the "infants" are carrying their goods across the seas, thousands of miles away, and selling them to foreigners cheaper than they do to folks here at home. They love the foreigner enough to sell to him at a lower price than they do us at home, and then they try to work up within us enough hatred or antipathy against the foreigner, whom they favor, to induce us to so frame the tariff law as to prevent the foreigner from bringing any goods over here that might come in competition with what they have to sell.

No, Mr. Chairman, gentlemen need not be alarmed. I know that those who are enjoying the special privileges of high protection; the privilege of levying tribute upon the people; the kind of special privileges that kings and queens in days gone by sometimes granted to royal favorites—yes; they are going to howl when separated to so large an extent from their privilege of collecting tribute from the people, but the people are not fools, as these Republicans think they are, and they will understand. But, whatever may be the result, be assured that we are right. It may be that the power of those who have enjoyed the benefits of protection at the expense of the masses may be strong enough to produce such a disturbance on account of being separated from their privileges as to cause such a condition, for a while, as may cause the people to think they were wrong in turning away from protection. It is to be hoped such will not be the case. But the people are not wrong in renouncing protection, and if the policy entered upon by the enactment of this bill is steadily adhered to for a sufficient time and given a fair trial, it will bring prosperity to the great masses of the people, and the burdens of Government will bear lightly on their shoulders, and no more heavily on the rich than they are easily able and should, in justice, be made to bear. The policy entered upon should and will ultimately prove successful, because it looks toward the establishment of our taxing system upon the principles of justice and "equal rights to all, and special privileges to none."

MR. Chairman, while I am before the committee I wish to call the attention of the committee and of the country to one feature of this question which has not been mentioned in this discussion. The duties levied by this bill upon imported spirits, wines, and other beverages under Schedule H, now under discussion, are the same as those levied under the present law, the Payne-Aldrich bill, paragraphs 300 to 311 of that law corre-

sponding to paragraphs 242 to 253 of this bill. It is well that the duties are not reduced, for the country should not be flooded with cheap liquor. Liquors are luxuries, not necessaries The man who indulges in their use does not have to do so, and has no right to complain if the Government imposes a tax upon his indulgence in a beverage which, to say the least of it, never benefits him, but often results in his ruin. The consumption of such liquors, therefore, as long as their sale as beverages is permitted at all, is a very proper source from which to derive revenue. But, Mr. Chairman, surely no Democrat will contend that a tariff should be laid upon imported liquors in order that distillers or brewers may have protection against foreign competition, and thereby get a higher price for their liquors. For however much in favor of liquor some of my brethren on this side may be, surely there is no Democrat in favor of a protective tariff for the benefit of the brewers and distillers, for a tariff for protection is certainly contrary to our party faith; and though we have some sugar-protection Democrats, and perhaps some Democrats who may be in favor of protection for producers of some other things, I hope we have no liquor-protection Democrats.

The Republicans, in the Payne-Aldrich bill, raised the tariff on imported spirits from $2.25 a gallon, where the Dingley law placed it, to $2.60 per gallon. Since the internal-revenue tax on such liquors produced in this country is only $1.10 per gallon, it is easy to see that the difference between the two gives protection to the American distiller to the amount of $1.50 per gallon. I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that an examination into the facts will convince the Ways and Means Committee that the American distillers reap the benefit of this differential by collecting from their customers the higher price they are able to collect on account of it. If so, they collect from the American consumers of spirits, over and above ordinary profits and over and above the amount they now pay as internal-revenue tax, which they, of course, get back when they sell, the sum of $1.50 on each proof gallon they sell. If so, Mr. Chairman, this differential is putting about $180,000,000 a year in the pockets of distillers through the higher price they are able to get on account of it, for of the more than 150,000,000 gallons of spirits produced in the United States each year more than 120,000,000 gallons are consumed in the United States; and I see from the report of the Ways and Means Committee which accompanies this bill, on page 189, that there were only 3,061,505 gallons imported last year.

It is easily apparent that the differential of $1.50 per gallon practically prohibits the importation of spirits from abroad to compete with the domestic article, and enables the distiller to collect it from the trade.

I could take up the question as to how the differential between the tariff duties on beers and other similar fermented liquors and the internal-revenue tax on such liquors produced in the United States affords protection to the brewers, and that they get the higher price for their stuff which the differential makes it possible for them to get, and which I am satisfied they do get, and are gathering into their tills by the favor of the Government through this protective differential about $400,000,000. Mr. Chairman, I shall not go into the details now. My purpose in calling attention to the matter is to express the hope that the Ways and Means Committee will report a bill that will take the protection out of Schedule H and make it operate to produce revenue. I have introduced such a bill, and it has been referred to the committee. As a Democrat I am opposed to protection, and, while I believe in taxing luxuries, I am opposed to taxing liquor drinkers for the benefit of liquor makers.

If the internal-revenue taxes on liquors is increased to equal the tariff taxes levied on imported liquors and the differential wiped out, it is safe to say that about $500,000,000 will find its way to the Government Treasury every year which now overflows the tills of the liquor lords of America through the favoritism of this differential. Let this be done, and tariff taxation can be removed from every necessity and every comfort the people would really like to enjoy.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE I—COTTON MANUFACTURES.

255. Cotton thread and carded yarn, combed yarn, warps or warp yarn, whether on beams or in bundles, skeins, or cops, or in any other form, except spool thread of cotton, crochet, darning, and embroidery cottons, hereinafter provided for, shall be subject to the following rates of duty: Nos. 1 to 9, inclusive, 5 per cent ad valorem; Nos. 10 to 19, inclusive, 7½ per cent ad valorem; Nos. 20 to 39, inclusive, 10 per cent ad valorem; Nos. 40 to 49, inclusive, 15 per cent ad valorem; Nos. 50 to 59, inclusive, 17½ per cent ad valorem; Nos. 60 to 99, inclusive, 20 per cent ad valorem; No. 100 and over, 25 per cent ad valorem. Cotton card laps, roping, sliver, or roving, 10 per cent ad valorem; cotton waste and flocks manufactured or otherwise advanced in value, 5 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer to the present paragraph, but it covers several paragraphs; and so, if it is adopted, which it will not be, I shall move to strike out the subsequent paragraphs to which it refers when they are reached.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be not read, in order to save time, and permit me to go ahead and debate it by unanimous consent of some sort.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, of course I should like to have the amendment read for the information of the House before the gentleman debates it; but before it is read I am perfectly willing to see if we can reach an agreement about time on this schedule. I think the cotton schedule is a schedule which, if you amend one portion, you must amend the balance. If the gentleman has a proposition to offer concerning a reasonable limitation of debate, I shall be glad to agree upon it.

Mr. MANN. Let us see if we can reach an agreement. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] covers the first three paragraphs of this schedule—255, 256, and 257. I do not know whether any gentleman on this side desires to offer an amendment to other paragraphs, with the exception of one or two.

Mr. FARR. I do.

Mr. MOORE. There will be others.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish to offer an amendment to the paragraph on laces.

Mr. MANN. Can we get a memorandum of the paragraphs to which gentlemen desire to offer amendments after 257?

Mr. BUTLER. I desire to offer an amendment to paragraph 270 in regard to lace window curtains.

Mr. MOORE. I have one to the upholstery paragraph—263.

Mr. AUSTIN. And I have one to paragraphs 264 and 265.

Mr. MANN. Then, as I understand, gentlemen desire to offer amendments to paragraphs 263, 264, 265, 266, and 270 in addition to the three paragraphs covered by the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts. Can we not reach an agreement as to time for debate on the paragraphs covered by the Gardner amendment in the way of general debate, and then the other amendments, which would be limited?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I suppose gentlemen who offer these amendments can not take more than 5 minutes, so that would be 25 minutes for those. I suggest that we agree on time for general debate on the schedule, and then, if gentlemen do not object, we will vote on all the amendments when we finish the schedule.

Mr. MANN. I suggest that we have, if we can, an agreement for debate of the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, which might be general, and then an agreement that when the other paragraphs are read amendments may be offered and a limit of time for debate on those.

Mr. AUSTIN. I suggest that we agree on a limited time to discuss the schedule and divide it up between those who have cotton mills or cotton industries in their districts.

Mr. LENROOT. I think I should object to the proposition put in that form.

Mr. MANN. We can debate the particular paragraphs when we reach them when the amendments are offered, so that will not be stretched out.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not see how we can do that. If my friends thought that there was a chance of passing the amendments, that might make a difference.

Mr. MANN. When the amendment is offered to the paragraph, the RECORD shows that such a paragraph is read and the amendment offered, and the Member discusses it, and it shows what it is. Without that the amendment does not mean anything to one who reads the proceedings.

Mr. MOORE. May I inquire whether it is the intention of the committee to offer any amendments?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There will be a few committee amendments.

Mr. MOORE. It is not likely that the committee will accept any amendment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; they might offer the same proposition as the committee offered.

Mr. MOORE. In view of the experience we have had in the House, I, for one, am willing to submit the amendments without discussion. I do not want to commit anybody else. It seems to me that this is a schedule that would be affected all along the line by the change made in any one paragraph, and

on the statement of the gentleman that no amendments will be accepted by the committee, I would be willing to forego discussion.

Mr. MANN. Would the gentleman from Alabama be willing to agree to give us an hour or an hour and a half on the pending amendments, in the way of general debate on this side, and then five minutes on each of the five paragraphs?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would be willing to give the gentleman an hour. We have got to have some time ourselves.

Mr. MANN. I think we will do fairly well on the bill if we get through this schedule and another one to-day. It would be a great personal accommodation to me to give us an hour and a half on this proposition and then five minutes on the other paragraphs. There is a great demand for time on this proposition. I do not care how much time is used on the other side.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will agree to that in this way. The sections the gentleman is talking about are 263, 264, 265, 266, and 270.

Mr. MANN. That is all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I understand, the gentleman wants——

Mr. MANN. An hour and a half on the pending amendment, which will be considered in the way of general debate, and the Clerk read the other paragraphs, and we have five minutes on those.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Ten minutes' debate on each side on those paragraphs, and I control the time?

Mr. MANN. Five minutes on our side on each paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, if I do not want to use the five minutes I need not do it, but the gentleman wants an hour and a half general debate on his side. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that there may be an hour and a half general debate on each side on this schedule, and after that is concluded the debate then is to be limited to paragraphs 263, 264, 265, 266, and 270, and that on each of these paragraphs there shall be five minutes debate on each side, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois and the other half by myself.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to object, but let it be understood that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has an amendment to paragraph 270 which he desires to offer.

Mr. MANN. That is included.

Mr. BUTLER. I have one also, and we can not speak in concert.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. One of the gentlemen can speak in the general debate.

Mr. BUTLER. If I am given a chance in general debate that is satisfactory.

Mr. MANN. Is it the same amendment or a different amendment?

Mr. BUTLER. It is practically the same.

Mr. MOORE. I would like to state that there are two other amendments to be offered. Mr. VARE has an amendment he would like to offer.

Mr. MANN. Every paragraph is covered, but of course only five minutes on a side are allowed on a paragraph. I am trying to get the most time that I can.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that there be three hours of general debate upon the amendment now pending, to be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama and one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]; that then there shall be on paragraphs Nos. 263, 264, 265, 266, and 170, 10 minutes of general debate on each paragraph, one-half of the 10 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and one-half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and that at the conclusion of that time all debate on this schedule shall end. Is there objection?

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts about which three hours of debate are to occur?

Mr. MANN. It is an amendment to the first three paragraphs of the schedule.

The CHAIRMAN. It has not yet been reported.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts proposes to offer an amendment to three paragraphs, and that the general debate is to be upon that amendment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The general debate would be upon the entire schedule.

Mr. MANN. At any place in the schedule.

Mr. MOORE. It is not to be limited to what the gentleman from Massachusetts proposes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no. The general debate is on the schedule.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, when the general debate closes the Clerk will read the schedule paragraph by paragraph, and when we reach the paragraphs where the debate is to be we will have the debate.

Mr. MANN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

255. Cotton thread and carded yarn, warps or warp yarn, in singles, whether on beams or in bundles, skeins, or cops, or in any other form, except spool thread of cotton, crochet, darning, and embroidery cottons, hereinafter provided for, not colored, bleached, dyed, or advanced beyond the condition of singles by grouping or twisting two or more single yarns together, shall be subject to the following rates of duty: Nos. 1 to 9½, inclusive, 5 per cent ad valorem; Nos. 10 to 19½, inclusive, 7½ per cent ad valorem; Nos. 20 to 29½, inclusive, 12½ per cent ad valorem; Nos. 30 to 49½, inclusive, 20 per cent ad valorem; Nos. 50 to 59½, inclusive, 22½ per cent ad valorem; Nos. 60 to 99½, inclusive, 27½ per cent ad valorem; No. 100 and over, 32½ per cent ad valorem. Cotton yarns, combed, twisted, dyed, colored, or advanced in manufacture beyond singles in the gray, 2½ per cent ad valorem in addition to the rates otherwise chargeable thereon. Cotton card laps, roping, sliver, or roving, 10 per cent ad valorem; cotton waste and flocks, manufactured or otherwise advanced in value, 5 per cent ad valorem.

256. Spool thread of cotton, crochet, darning, and embroidery cottons in any form shall be dutiable at the same rates of duty as the single yarns from which they are made.

257. Cotton cloth of plain weaves, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or mercerized, containing yarn the highest number of which does not exceed No. 10, 5 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 10 and not exceeding No. 20, 7½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 20 and not exceeding No. 30, 12½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 30 and not exceeding No. 50, 20 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 50 and not exceeding No. 60, 22½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 60 and not exceeding No. 100, 27½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 100, 32½ per cent ad valorem. Cotton cloth of plain weaves when bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or mercerized shall be subject to a duty of 2½ per cent ad valorem in addition to the rates otherwise chargeable thereon.

257½. Cotton cloth of fancy weaves, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or mercerized, containing yarn the highest number of which does not exceed No. 10, 12½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 10 and not exceeding No. 20, 15 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 20 and not exceeding No. 30, 20 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 30 and not exceeding No. 50, 27½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 50 and not exceeding No. 60, 30 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 60 and not exceeding No. 100, 35 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 100, 40 per cent ad valorem. Cotton cloth of fancy weaves when bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or mercerized shall be subject to a duty of 2½ per cent ad valorem in addition to the rates otherwise chargeable thereon.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, this schedule was prepared by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] and by me. No one else is in any way committed to it. We have endeavored to draw a cotton schedule which will come within the four corners of the Tariff Board report. There is only one criticism which can justly be made in respect to its not coming within the bounds of the Tariff Board report. It is a fact that all along the line we allow an additional duty of 2½ per cent to offset the process of coloring and bleaching cloths. Some gentlemen may claim that this duty is not in accordance with the Tariff Board's report. The Tariff Board report was incomplete in its figures on finishing cloths. For instance, it gave us no figures on the foreign costs of finishing cloths, such as ginghams, made by weaving various colored threads. We did not feel justified in saying that finishing mills are entitled to no protection whatever; consequently we allowed a modest 2½ per cent. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, the circumstances have a good deal changed since the report of the Tariff Board was issued, owing to a general rise in pay in the textile industry. The result of our figuring is roughly this: Take cotton cloth, which is the true measure of the whole cotton schedule—under the Payne law the average ad valorem duty for cotton cloth in 1912 was 42.75 per cent. The highest duty proposed under the Green-Gardner proposed amendment is 42½ per cent on cotton cloth, no matter how fancy the weave, no matter how complicated the coloring.

The duties on cotton cloth in the Green-Gardner amendment run from 5 per cent on the cheapest cotton cloth to 42½ per cent on the most highly complicated weaves made from the finest of yarns, whereas the Payne law, on the average, in 1912 was higher——

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will permit a question. You have, according to that, reduced the rate upon the commoner cotton cloth below the pending bill, I understand.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; below the pending bill. I shall explain that circumstance in a minute or two. I have only 10 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. GARDNER. In the first place, Mr. GREEN and I wish it to be understood that if we were drafting a law we should make the duties specific instead of ad valorem. We believe in specific rates for the cotton schedule, but we have drawn this amendment in ad valorem shape so that the House may understand what GREEN and GARDNER think are the proper ad valorem equivalents for the specific duties which they would approve. The criticism may be made that we have lowered the Underwood rates on coarse cotton cloth and raised it on fine cotton cloth, and that coarse cotton goods are made in the South, and that fine cotton goods are made in New England. That is partly true, but it was not for sectional reasons that we made the changes.

As a matter of fact, in the South to-day great quantities of fine goods are made, and in New England plenty of coarse goods are made. Still, it is true, comparatively speaking, that on the whole the Green-Gardner amendment is more favorable to New England than the schedule which the gentleman from Alabama proposes. However, I do not propose to distort this discussion into a sectional dispute.

Mr. BARTLETT. That was not the purpose of my inquiry at all.

Mr. GARDNER. I understand perfectly. Now, Mr. Chairman, the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, at the head of which is Mr. Parker, of South Carolina, presented a schedule to the Ways and Means Committee. Out of 42 rates of duty proposed in the Green-Gardner amendment I believe that only 4 are higher than the corresponding rates proposed in the Parker bill, while 4 of our rates are lower than the corresponding rates of the Underwood bill. On the whole, our schedule is substantially lower than the Parker schedule.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that personally I do not believe that cotton cloths made from yarns up to twenties need much, if any, protection; that is, provided that the cloth is a plain cloth, unbleached, not a fancy cloth or a colored cloth. In my opinion these fancy weaves, these Jacquard weaves, these high-numbered fine yarns, all need a great deal greater protection than is accorded them in the Underwood bill. I support that opinion partly by citing the importations which have actually taken place under the high duties of the Payne law and partly by the report of the Tariff Board.

I shall now address myself to what I believe to be an entirely mistaken classification in the cotton schedule of the Underwood bill. Paragraph 257 allows only 2½ per cent extra duty, no matter how complicated the finish, no matter how wonderful the pattern, no matter how many different colored threads are woven together, no matter what dyes are used. The Underwood schedule allows 2½ per cent duty to compensate for the bleaching of coarse brown cotton cloth like this which I hold in my hand. [Exhibiting.] Yet the Underwood schedule allows only the same compensation for weaving this intricate design in colors, such as the one I am showing you. [Exhibiting.]

In each case the Underwood schedule allows 2½ per cent compensation for the extra work. Could anything be more unreasonable? Consider the vast difference in the labor involved.

This morning I went into Woodward & Lothrop's store and there was introduced to Mr. Mack, the chief of the white-goods department, and Mr. Bussell, who has charge of the department in which ginghams are included. I bought a number of pieces of cloth. They could not tell me the numbers of the yarns out of which these pieces of cloth were woven. However, I had the Tariff Board report with me, and I bought goods like several of the samples investigated by the Tariff Board.

Here, Mr. Chairman, is a piece of what is known as "long cloth." No. 15 of the samples of the Tariff Board report is "long cloth." Now, the Tariff Board's report gives the number of the finest yarn in that sample as 40. As you will observe, this cloth is bleached. If it were unbleached, the duty would be 17½ per cent, but inasmuch as it is bleached, the duty is 20 per cent under the Underwood bill. Here we have a piece of Persian lawn. Sample No. 19 in the Tariff Board report is Persian lawn made from yarns whose highest number is 120. Assuming that this simple white Persian lawn which I hold in my hand is of the same fineness, the duty under the proposed schedule would be 30 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. PALMER. Would I interrupt the gentleman if I asked him a question not exactly on that proposition? He may have covered it, and if so, I would not ask him to repeat it. How does the gentleman's substitute compare with the Hill bill, which was offered last year?

Mr. GARDNER. We are higher than the Hill bill on plain cloths except the coarse kinds. We are lower on the coarsest yarns and much higher on the medium and fine yarns. On fancy weaves and on Jacquards we are higher in the higher numbers and lower in the lower numbers, but on the whole we are higher than the Hill bill.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman does not claim that it does not follow the report of the Tariff Board?

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman claims exactly that. If he has time he will read a telegram in which the chairman of the Tariff Board declares that he has never consented to give his approval to the Hill bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have shown you this Persian lawn, dutiable at 30 per cent, and this long cloth, dutiable at 20 per cent. Now let me show you some singular comparisons in fancy weaves.

This single white cloth here being dutiable at 30 per cent, what do you suppose that the duty is on this other intricate weave of beautiful colors? [Indicating.] This sample here is made out of yarn No. 28 in the warp and yarn No. 20 in the filling. It is known as a Jacquard gingham. It is dutiable at only 15 per cent under the Underwood bill. Here is another Jacquard gingham [indicating], No. 32 in the warp, No. 47 in the filling, and that is dutiable at only 20 per cent under the Underwood bill. Here is another Jacquard gingham, also dutiable at 20 per cent under the Underwood bill [indicating]. Mind you that ginghams, gentlemen, are made by weaving colored threads, a difficult process and a slow process as compared with weaving gray yarns into plain cloth. What are known as "prints," which used to be so popular, are made by coloring the cloth after it is woven. Machinery to make print cloths goes at a tremendous rate of speed, but no such speed is possible when a pattern is to be woven.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is a Jacquard madras. No. 70 yarn forms part of the filling; 13 waste, part of the filling; 13 dyed, part of the filling; and 42 card in the warp. There [indicating] is a very pretty, a very wonderful, and a very complicated fabric. Gentlemen, that splendid product is dutiable under the Underwood bill at a lower rate than that plain white fabric [indicating]. That plain white fabric [indicating] carries a 30 per cent duty, while the fancy weave carries only a 25 per cent duty.

Mr. COOPER. What is the value of those two, respectively?

Mr. GARDNER. I do not know the value of this fancy sample; but I can tell you the retail value of the plain sample, because I bought it this morning. I paid 18 cents a yard for it. This is a half yard of Persian lawn. The price that Woodward & Lothrop paid for it was 12 cents.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I had expected to offer an amendment to paragraph 270, but having had an uncomfortable and unsuccessful experience in my effort to secure the adoption of an amendment heretofore, I shall forego the pleasure of the bowling over which my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] will get when he offers his amendment in behalf of the lacemakers. This paragraph covers lace, window curtains, netting, pillow shams, and so forth. The duty on the articles named in this paragraph is to be reduced.

I do not wish to speak to the amendment, which, of course, will be defeated. It should be adopted because it is intended to benefit and stimulate a great industry. I do not criticize gentlemen on the other side for passing a tariff bill. This much is expected of them. President Wilson, for whom I entertain the most favorable and kindly impression, yesterday said that the country did not go Democratic last year. If it did not, I would like to know the way it did go. [Laughter.] He said it could not go Republican because of political differences in our party which led to division. His warning was in his fear of the future. I believe the country expects the gentlemen of the majority to pass a free-trade bill. The American people did not expect it last fall, but they have now concluded that the majority will pass the bill which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], with the usual candor that he shows in his speech, said is a bill in which the protection idea has been forgotten by the gentlemen who framed it.

Therefore it is useless to speak to an amendment with any hope for its adoption, especially if such amendment contains a bit of protection in it. But I desire to present an humble

protest, not made by what you term the protected interests, but made by the laboring men, the operators employed in the lace mills of Chester, Pa.

It may be unfortunate for their cause, Mr. Chairman, that they addressed this remonstrance to Senator PENROSE and to me, for a cause which we should advocate would be looked upon with suspicion by a free trader. If they had addressed it to the House it might have had, perhaps, a more patient and respectful hearing. The majority here only stares at the petitioner when he holds in his hands a petition for protection. In this protest these men say that they desire Senator PENROSE and me to vote against the recommendations of the Committee on Ways and Means concerning lace and lace curtains.

Well, so far as my vote goes, not to mention that of the Senator, they will not be disappointed. The petitioners further say that the adoption of their recommendation—meaning the recommendation of the Ways and Means Committee—means an increase in foreign competition, and "also means less employment and a reduction in the pay envelope for the undersigned." "Therefore," they say, "we earnestly plead for your support in the retention of the present rates."

I shall place this in the petition basket where it will pass unnoticed and unhonored—to be returned to them by the thin and thorny hand of free trade in about six months from this time.

It is only because of this short, well-pointed, and humble remonstrance that I raise my voice against what seems to me to be a positive wrong. It may not be, Mr. Chairman; when I think of all the different kinds of reformers who participated in the last campaign, I thought of some of them as the philosopher did of the tack upon the floor, most dangerous when pointing heavenward. If this bill will take from these men any part of the pay they have heretofore had, it ought not to pass. Who will deny that?

I do not believe that we are to have a condition in the United States in the business world, such as was described and promised by Democratic orators last fall in their campaign, which would correspond to glories found only in the sky. These same men were promised less expense in their living and more money in their purses. A state of joy treasured in the hearts of angels and hoped for in the breasts of men. While this debate is raging here you admit that your only expectation is to prevent an increase in the present cost of living. You further admit thereby that you do not expect to reduce it. I hope we shall not have disaster. Oh, I sincerely hope that we shall not. I do not predict it, Mr. Chairman. But I am anxiously waiting. I do not wish to see the fulfillment of Republican prophecy. It means distress. Our party can better stand defeated than to be victorious by encouraging disaster.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I believe that gentlemen, sensible men as they are, in making their air castles do not consider for one moment who are likely to occupy them. You have promised us a state of affairs which I believe that you can never supply. I do not believe that it is possible to cheapen an article of commerce without cheapening every element that goes into its production. Therefore, when you cheapen the products of the country, I believe you are bound to cheapen the labor that brings them forth. If your bill justifies your predictions, your lease upon power is indefinite. If it fails, you will retire for a generation. These lace makers did not expect you to convert our customhouses into market places where their product will be put in competition with that of the foreigner at ruinous prices. You did not tell them this last fall, although you propose to do it now.

Upon this lace schedule these petitioners desire me to say to you that the wages on Nottingham lace curtains represent from 45 to 58 per cent of the value; that is, in the manufacture of Nottingham lace curtains the workingmen get from 45 to 58 per cent of the value of the product. Furthermore, in the comparison which they make—and the comparison is made by workers who come from English and Scottish mills—the difference in the rate of wages here is shown to be 61½ per cent over the union rate in Nottingham, and from 164 to 327 per cent over the rate in Scotland. It is not the lack of knowledge but the lack of time which prevents me from making the prediction of conditions which I believe you are designedly working out for these men. They now understand that you propose to increase the importation of curtains by this competitive law which is to be forced through by your forces riding unbridled at the business affairs of all the American people. What explanation will you make when election day comes again? These people expected you to reduce duties, but did not dream that you would destroy business.

These employers desire me to say to the House that the machinery used in these mills is employed only two-thirds of the time, because the demand for the product is not sufficient for their employment a longer time. There is no sale for it. There is no use for it. It can be used for one purpose only, and that is for the manufacture of Nottingham lace curtains. When you are through, what will become of it? [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, everything I have to say will be entirely technical, but I hope there are some gentlemen on this and on the other side who wish to learn something with reference to the technicalities of this schedule.

Last year and year before, if I remember right, a cotton bill was introduced by the Democratic majority of this House. The bill now before us differs from it in some very important particulars. In some respects it has been improved, and in other respects I think the action of the committee has been for the worse. The industry of manufacturing cotton is so important, creating as it does a product in excess of $228,000,000, of which something like $24,000,000 worth of cloth are exported, that it demands, it seems to me, the most careful attention of the House and ought to have a schedule as well framed as it can be under the information that we have before us.

When the Democratic bill was introduced last year yarn up to No. 50 bore a 10 per cent rate. That was the lowest rate that was given in the former bill. The present bill has a lower rate of 5 per cent. In that respect it is an improvement, and agrees with the rates which have been introduced by myself and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. The former bill also gave as its highest rate on yarn 15 per cent. The new bill gives as the highest rate only 25 per cent ad valorem and makes no allowance whatever for finishing. That is, the yarns in gray are the same as the cable laid, mercerized, gassed, or advanced in any way by additional processes.

This, in my judgment, is a serious mistake. As a matter of fact, in yarns above No. 40 about 4 per cent of our whole production is now imported, and in yarns used in this country above that number about 19 per cent is now imported. That is to say, there are about 6,700,000 pounds above No. 40 imported, and something like 35,000,000 pounds produced in this country. But this yarn so imported was admitted at a rate on lower numbers of about 24 per cent, and runs from that up to 38 per cent. They must be imported simply because they can be bought in those countries cheaper than they can be by the manufacturers produced by the parties who wish to turn them into cloth.

For that reason it would seem that the present rates which I have given are now on a competitive basis, and yet this bill would greatly reduce them, and, as I am satisfied, turn the manufacture and production of these yarns above 40 entirely over to foreign manufacturers, unless the American manufacturer reduces the wage scale.

With regard to cloth, I wish to supplement the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] at the outset in saying that 90 per cent of the cloth produced in this country, approximately 90 per cent, is in the numbers below 40 thread in making it up. So that the provisions of this schedule in reference to plain cloth are by far the most important, so far as quantity and value are concerned, of any found in the bill. It seems to me that there have been some very serious mistakes made in preparing this schedule. The report of the Tariff Board so far as plain cloths were concerned, especially those on the lower numbers, showed that practically all of them were made and sold at the mill doors in this country for as low or lower price than they were made in Europe and sold there at the mills. These plain cloths, therefore, need but little, if any, protection. In the proposed rate given by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and myself we have on the lower numbers of yarn put a rate of 5 per cent, which possibly is not needed at all, but is only a nominal rate.

As graded by the bill which we have here, the protection on the coarse grades of cloth is very much higher than there is any necessity of its being, in my judgment. It can be, and I think it ought to be, reduced to the rates which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has presented, and it is possible that even those, so far as the coarse grades are concerned, that are below the twenties, might also be reduced from the figures we have given. But that is not really the most serious trouble respecting the rates and provisions of this schedule with reference to cloth. The very highest grade given

in this bill on the cloth is 27½ per cent ad valorem. This is advanced, when it is colored, stained, painted, printed, Jacquard figured, or mercerized, by 2½ per cent. The greater amount of the importations into this country are goods that are made either upon what is called dobby looms or Jacquard looms or some other kind that weave fancy cloth. This bill does not distinguish in any manner between the fancy woven cloth and the ordinary plain cloths, except that Jacquard cloths are now included and advanced 2½ per cent, whereas they were entirely overlooked in the bill which we voted upon last summer. As pointed out by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], the process of mercerizing, or the ordinary courses of finishing, according to the report of the Tariff Board, costs no more in this country than it does in Europe, so that we added only the nominal amount of 2½ per cent for it, and 2½ per cent will be added under this bill; but if a manufacturer produces one of the most expensive kinds of complicated weaves, such as have been shown by Mr. GARDNER, and some of which are simply fancy woven cloths and not Jacquard cloths, then, however complicated they may be, made by dobby loom or Jacquard loom, no matter what figures may be put in or what kind of threads, the same advance is made. It is all lumped together, all thrown together with an advance of 2½ per cent only, which will not anywhere near cover the difference in labor cost between that of this country and abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I wish to have a couple of minutes more.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of demonstrating this, I will call attention to two samples mentioned by the Tariff Board. One of these is duck, in which it will be found by examination that the labor cost is less than 5 per cent. Turning then to No. 57 of the Tariff Board report, in the table of 100 samples given, is a fancy woven cloth in which the labor cost is 39.82 per cent of the whole cost of material, or what we may practically call 40 per cent of the whole cost. In other words, the labor cost in this kind of fancy woven cloth is eight times what it is in duck, and yet there is no difference made in this bill, and which we are asked to approve, except 2½ per cent. In the bill which was introduced last session by our Democratic friends a 5 per cent difference was made. This is an improvement in some respects, but it will not near cover the difference between the plain weaves and Jacquard weaves, or even some of the dobby weaves, some of which involve processes costly as the Jacquard weaves.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I assert that this schedule has not received the attention which it ought to have received. This bill is drawn upon wrong lines, and the rates are incorrect and erroneous and find no justification in the facts or the report of the Tariff Board.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have reserved for considerable amplification in the RECORD my statistical and detailed observations upon this schedule of the tariff, and I therefore desire at this time merely to offer a few general observations upon this great question. Yesterday a gentleman from my own part of the State called upon me—and I assume that my Democratic colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS], on the Ways and Means Committee, had a similar interview—he brought me samples of cloth which he manufactures in his mill, showing the product from the earliest stages right up to the final stage in which the cloth is ready to be sold across the counter.

He said: "How much do you suppose my mill gets for this beautiful piece of finished cloth?" I guessed very far from the mark. He said: "Twenty-five cents a yard." He then asked me, "How much do you suppose that retails for across the counter?" and I guessed 75 cents a yard. He said: "That retails for $1.50 or more per yard." Now, gentlemen, I say to you that you are attacking the wrong place on this tariff proposition, in so far as it relates to these duties in the cotton schedule. You are attacking the end of the business where neither profits nor wages are unduly high, and yet you are allowing to go absolutely unscathed the middleman—the jobber, the wholesaler, the retailer—to do what they like with the price, and allow it to go skyward, to soar to the zenith, if you please, and get whatever they can from the ultimate consumer. It is the intermediaries who get the large profits, much larger than the manufacturer, and yet the former are absolutely unaffected by this tariff reduction.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I have only five minutes, and I have a good deal of ground to cover.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I wish the gentleman would indicate how we can do that.

Mr. ROGERS. I must decline to yield; I have only five minutes. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is the fashion in certain sections of the country to charge that the cotton manufacturers of New England are robbers of the consumers, but the fact is that in Lowell, for example, the average yearly dividends of our 10 or 12 cotton mills for the last eight years has been less than 4½ per cent. We in New England were much edified by a remark made on the floor of this House two years ago by a Democratic Member, then and now on the Ways and Means Committee, the Member from North Carolina—you will recall it, those of you who were here at that time—who said, "We of the South intend to make your mills in the North come down to us or else go out of business." That is the idea with which the members of the Ways and Means Committee approached this problem when they were framing this tariff and which they are now attempting to enact into law. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE].

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that the cotton schedule in the Wilson bill adopted by the Democratic Congress in 1894 was prepared after full and free consultation with delegations from the State of Massachusetts, comprising representatives of both the manufacturers who owned the cotton mills and of the different labor organizations representing the operatives who were employed therein. Had the remainder of the schedules of the Wilson bill been written with the same care and discretion, the Democratic Party possibly might have been retained in power in 1896.

The cotton schedule was unchanged when the Dingley law was enacted in 1897, and it was changed only to a very slight degree when it was reported to the House of Representatives by the Committee on Ways and Means in 1909 in the bill known as the Payne bill.

After the Payne bill reached the Senate there were some modifications made in the bill which resulted in severe condemnation being visited upon the Republican Party and the framers of the final tariff bill known as the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act. And while I believed then and believe now that many of the criticisms were unjust, I wish to call your attention to the fact that no representatives from either the manufacturers or operatives in the district which I have the honor to represent appeared before the Senate Finance Committee and asked for the changes in the bill which seemed to meet with such severe condemnation. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, during the 15 years that I have been a Member of this House no manufacturer or operative has ever approached me personally or by letter asking me to secure any changes in the cotton schedule.

Since the introduction of the Underwood bill, however, protests by telegrams and by letters have been insistent and severe in their denunciation of the cotton schedules which are contained in said bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to offer any amendments to the bill, because I realize that, owing to the fact that there is a large majority of Democrats on the other side of the House, all or most of whom are pledged to vote for the passage of the bill without amendment, it would only take up the time of the House needlessly, without accomplishing any beneficial result.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to the remarks made by the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS] this morning in regard to his willingness to vote for a reduction in the tariff upon the cotton and wool industries, but he believed that there ought to be a tariff on the productions of California, and I do not forget when there was a proposition made by the Democratic majority last year to take the duty off of lemons the gentleman from California, after voting himself for all the propositions that had been submitted by the Democratic majority to reduce the tariff, rose in astonishment and almost with tears in his eyes and besought the gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House to reverse their action, and reminded them that he had voted with them on every proposition they had submitted and now they ought to vote with him on the question of lemons. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Now, gentlemen, I do not know anything about the lemon industry, but I want it to enjoy the prosperity which it has long enjoyed. I do not regard the industry as so sacred that it should be entitled to especial consideration, while those who so regard it announce their willingness to join in the destructive onslaught on the cotton and woolen industries. I listened to the amendments proposed here by Mr. GARDNER, my colleague from Massa-

chusetts, and also the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] with some astonishment.

I express my astonishment, for the reason that I think, as good men as they are in many respects, they are wholly unfamiliar with the cotton industry. Some of the remarks made to me by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] as he sat behind me this afternoon, and the questions he propounded to me, convinced me that he is not acquainted with the first rudiments of the cotton industry. I do not blame him for putting in whatever amendments he pleases individually; but I want to say in regard to the cotton schedule and the report of the Tariff Commission or Tariff Board, everyone knows that the Tariff Board did not complete their investigations regarding the cotton industry in all of its details, and they plainly stated that in view of the complex nature of the industry that there was room for a wide difference of opinion in calculating and estimating the varied phases of the cotton industry; and there is no living man, no matter how capable he may be in other lines, who can take up the cotton industry in all its details without devoting very much more time than the Tariff Board were able to devote to it. It certainly would require very much more time than these two gentlemen on this side of the House have devoted to the amendments that they have presented here this afternoon to enable them to qualify as experts in proposing legislation with the view of having their conclusions enacted into law, which might seriously affect the vast number of persons employed in the industry and the large amount of capital invested therein.

I do not pretend to be a cotton expert myself, for I am not. I do not own a share of cotton-mill stock, and have not owned any since 1878. So I do not come here as a cotton expert. But I have always lived in a cotton-mill town and city, and consequently I partake somewhat of the atmosphere of this important industry. I am interested in the cotton schedule not alone from the standpoint of the manufacturers, but I am interested also in behalf of 40,000 people who are employed in the mills in the city of Fall River, where I reside, and who have families dependent upon them. They represent more than two-thirds of the population of my own city. I also speak in behalf of the cotton industry of the entire State of Massachusetts, the State that produces more cotton goods and consumes more cotton than any other State in the Union. For more than 100 years they have been making cotton goods in the city where I reside.

The industry was started upon coarse grades of goods, and some of the early pioneers in this country brought some of the first looms and spinning machinery into this country, taking the same from England and bringing it into this country in parts and assembling those parts here, and beginning the manufacture of cotton goods. And they have built up a wonderful industry, which now comprises many of the finer grades and varieties of cloth. I want to give you a little illustration of how it has been built up within the last 48 years. I call your attention to the number of cotton spindles that were in my city in 1865, as compared with the number that are there to-day. In 1865 they had 265,328; in 1866, 403,624; in 1868, 537,416; and then going on until these later years, in 1910, when there were 3,931,464 cotton spindles, and there has been no material increase there since that date. Directly surrounding the city in which I live, and the other portions of the district which I have the honor to represent, are considerably more than one-quarter of all the cotton spindles in this country, and there is not a more complicated schedule in the bill than the one pertaining to cotton.

I am deliberately and unalterably opposed to the Underwood bill, because the rates proposed are not high enough to protect American industries and American labor, and, further, because the hearings held by the Committee on Ways and Means were not considered with care, nor with any other purpose than to make the people believe they were using care, but with the result in view of providing foreign competition, which, in my view, could only result in reducing wages or throwing American laborers out of employment and destroying capital invested in the cotton industry. I am deliberately and unalterably opposed to the amendments proposed by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and my colleague from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] because they were prepared without the requisite knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say further that when the proposition was made in the form of an amendment by Mr. Hill, a former Member from Connecticut, last year, it was brought into this House very much in the same manner as the amendments of Messrs. GARDNER and GREEN are brought here to-day. Mr. Hill's bill came in as an entire surprise, as these amendments have come to my attention here to-day. I did not vote for the proposition put in by Mr. Hill, of Connecticut, last year, because, while I am willing to acknowledge that he is an expert on the woolen industry, I do not admit that he was familiar enough with the cotton industry without devoting more time to the work, and I shall not vote for the propositions put in by my colleagues to-day. The number of yards produced in the mills in the city where I reside amount to nearly 1,200,000,000 yards of cloth per annum, and the wages amount to nearly $300,000 per week, or nearly $15,000,000 per annum. The whole industry of that community will be injured by the propositions which these gentlemen present here; and when the dull times come, as come they will in the cotton industry, and they are present to-day, when the dull times come and the mills do not find a market for their product, there is always sure to be a loss in wages and a reduction in the prosperity of the communities in which these industries are located, because when the mills do not find it profitable to run their plants the workmen can not draw their pay. And any such complete change in the tariff schedules as is proposed in the Underwood bill, or was proposed last year—and the present Underwood bill is more drastic than the one presented last year—should not have the consideration and approval of the membership of this House.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. Can the gentleman say whether or not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] in any way comports with the partial report of the Tariff Board?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I am not able to say, but the report of the Tariff Board certainly was not complete. It was not fit to be taken as a basis upon which to prepare a bill, and it was stated distinctly by both of these gentlemen who have presented these amendments that, after careful consideration, they had decided that they could not prepare a bill with any justice to the manufacturers or operatives based upon the uncompleted report of the Tariff Board without much longer deliberation.

Mr. MOORE. Then the gentleman does not consider the amendments scientifically drawn?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I do not. I consider the amendments unscientifically drawn.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman is mistaken in saying that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] and I could not agree on a bill that was just. I said that the committee could not agree.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. While two men might agree upon something they do not know anything about, I am satisfied that the gentleman himself, while he is acquainted with fish and many matters affecting his own district, does not know anything about preparing a schedule relating to cotton goods.

Mr. BUTLER. We should not have any division among ourselves.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. You do not want any division, but it is necessary to exercise common sense. I do not propose to stand here and allow an industry that has been established in my city more than 100 years ago to be destroyed or injured and not register my protest against the methods pursued by the gentlemen in the preparation of these amendments.

Mr. STEENERSON. What does the gentleman want?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I want to be let alone, unless time enough can be allowed to assemble facts and present conclusions upon which legislation may be framed which will prove helpful rather than harmful to the capital invested and the vast number of men and women employed in the industry. I append herewith a letter which I received to-day from Walter H. Langshaw, of New Bedford, Mass., relating to the cotton-tariff schedule, which is worthy of careful perusal:

Letter on the cotton tariff schedule to the Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from Walter H. Lanshaw.

NEW BEDFORD, MASS., *April 29, 1913.*

The honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

I feel it my duty to make one more attempt to induce Congress to pass a cotton schedule that will meet the requirements of the situation without entailing serious loss to those who, in a measure or entirely, depend upon the cotton industry for a livelihood.

The proposed bill is wrong from any intelligent point of view. The reduction is too great, in some classes the rates are out of proportion, and a strictly ad valorem tariff is not suitable as a protective, competitive, or revenue tariff because of the fluctuations in cotton.

I do not believe that the apparent desire on the part of the public for revision of the tariff on a lower basis means or necessitates a vicious cut which will seriously disturb values and result in liquidation of labor and capital and serious loss to many towns and cities. Although the Democratic ticket was elected, the people have not expressed themselves as opposing the protective feature and favoring a tariff for revenue only.

The adoption of the proposed bill by the Ways and Means Committee on a basis not supported by the testimony at the hearing is to be deplored, and that such action was taken without any reason being given

for ignoring expert testimony raises doubt as to the sincerity of those who dominate the Ways and Means Committee.

As stated in my brief, 2 per cent of our population, about 2,000,000, are directly affected and should be informed why the Ways and Means Committee ignored such testimony and have it explained to them why rates are made on a given number of yarn as compared with a rate on other numbers. For instance, why is the ad valorem rate on gray yarns Nos. 20s to 39s made 10 per cent; on 40s to 49s, 15 per cent; on 50s to 59s, 17½ per cent; on 60s to 99s, 20 per cent? Assuming that cotton was a commodity in which there was a regular standard price, the different percentage rates then would give a net duty of a given number of cents per pound. As a manufacturer I know positively that the cost of manufacturing No. 99s is about double that of 59s. Therefore whatever system is used the number of cents per pound should be double on 99s what it is on 59s, and 59s should be over three times as much as that on 19s.

These comparative differences are not based on theory; they are based on facts which can be easily proven to anyone whose sense of justice is such that he has the desire to act in accordance with the facts and merits of the case. It involves no intricacies or mysteries that need confuse any intelligent man. It is not necessary to know what it costs to make similar goods in Germany, England, or France; the comparative difference can be determined from our own costs. I challenge any person to produce evidence to controvert these assertions or to give a convincing illustration that a tariff on a strictly ad valorem basis will, when figured out, show a rate in cents per pound that will remain the same on any given yarn from one year to another or that will give the same comparative differences from one yarn to another in any one year. Therefore the proposed schedule is not a protective, competitive, or revenue tariff.

On cloth in the gray I challenge any person who possesses practical knowledge of the business to produce evidence that will justify the action of the Ways and Means Committee in putting only an additional duty of only 2½ per cent over gray yarns.

On fabrics in the gray the cost is increased about half as much again over yarns. Therefore whatever system is used the duty per pound of cloth woven of a given number should be over half as much again over gray yarn in cents per pound, or its equivalent per yard. On fancy fabrics in the gray it is more than double the cost of gray yarn; in some fabrics more than three times the cost. On an average it is certainly more than double the cost. So whatever method is used the results should be that the duty should be in cents per pound or its equivalent per yard over twice as much as that of gray yarn. In support of this I will state that the pay roll of the weaving departments of the Dartmouth Manufacturing Corporation is greater than that of the spinning and all labor incidental to spinning yarn.

The working out of the proposed cotton schedule on a given number of yarn, assuming a fair cost or market value, when cotton was at its lowest price, would be 6 cents per pound. Using the same figures of cost, under cotton at the highest price in recent years the duty would be 9 cents per pound, showing a fluctuating difference in duty of 50 per cent. This is no theory; it is an actual fact, and any method that results in such a change because of the changes in the price of raw material is not a good tariff from a protective, revenue, or competitive standpoint, and is certainly bound to be a constant cause of disturbance to the industry.

Under extremely high-priced cotton there would be no revenue. Under extremely low-priced cotton there would be importations, a superabundance of revenue, and a large number of people thrown out of employment. We can not possibly progress on economic lines under such a law.

On gray plain cloth the calculated results are even worse. The duty is in cents per pound all out of proportion to yarns. That is on a calculation using the same basis of cost for conversion and for cotton, and because of a rate on a strictly ad valorem basis the proportion is changed when worked out on high-priced cotton as compared with low-priced cotton.

On fancy and figured gray cloth—which is comparatively a new industry in this country—there is practically no consideration given to the large increased cost of conversion over and above plain gray yarns and plain gray cloth. There is certainly not over 15 per cent of our products in this country that is on fancy and figured work. A large portion is made in New Bedford, and plants have been equipped to do this work, and the little consideration shown for the increased cost in adjusting the rate of duty as compared with other classes is singular considering Chairman UNDERWOOD's significant remark, when asked by a Congressman from this district to give New Bedford more consideration. He said, "New Bedford mills are rich; they can stand it." Rather a suggestive remark and unbecoming one who is such a dominating factor at this period of the Nation's affairs, even if true; but the implication would hardly stand, as there are five or six mills which were projected and completed about three years ago which have not paid or earned a dividend, and the stocks are very much below par, some of them as low as 45 per share, and no buyers.

There are the old mills which have good records whose stock has declined 20 to 40 per cent within three or four years. (See quotations attached.) Such conditions should certainly have important bearing and influence with those who are to decide what kind of a cotton schedule is to be adopted.

In face of these facts do you wonder that those interested in gray cotton fabrics, mostly fancy, in New Bedford or elsewhere, are alarmed at the possibility of such a measure becoming a law? The Dingley rate of duty was unreasonably high, but did not affect the consumer, as gray plain cloths and yarns ruled much below a price at which they could have been imported. The rate was left high evidently for the purpose of making it so as to cover the increased cost of manufacturing fancy fabrics, as there was no distinction made between plain and fancy figured work. There has been considerable growth, particularly in New Bedford, in the last few years, and this growth has resulted in domestic manufacturers underselling importers on special fabrics, hence the antagonism of the importers, who, I believe, have been given too much consideration in the making of the cotton schedule in the proposed bill.

In the act of 1897 the rate was based on so much per number. This is the correct way, but the rate should be changed about every 10 numbers. The duty on that bill of 60/s was 15 cents per pound. Assuming that 10 cents was decided upon, the tariff per pound would be reduced 33⅓ per cent.

On plain woven gray cloths the duty should be about 15 to 16 cents per pound; on fancy, which represents, as before stated, less than 15 per cent of our output in cloth, the duty should be about 20 to 22 cents a pound; other numbers in the same proportion. By a schedule on this basis the duty per pound would be fixed and not be disturbed by the change in the price of cotton.

In the matter of figuring the yarn on the cloth, it is simply a mathematical calculation of ends per inch and inches in width and yards per pound, to determine, with due allowances for contraction, what is the average number. This method is much better than a tariff based on the finest number in the cloth, which would not always be easy to determine.

We have listened to lectures by those who are very much removed from the problem that faces those in the cotton industry, and it has been assumed that we are lacking in efficiency and courage. We have in New Bedford many English employees, and the quality and quantity produced is little, if any, below any known standard, certainly not more than would be natural, considering that we have a limited market of skilled textile operatives and that our growth has been rapid.

In some instances where the dividends have been exceptionally large we are given no credit for efficiency, but are condemned as being avaricious. In instances where the dividends are small or omitted entirely we are accused of keeping antiquated machinery, and therefore condemned and criticized because we do not buy new machinery and presumably pay 45 per cent duty into the United States Treasury, and then be called to task because we asked consideration to which conditions entitled us.

If we carry our capital much less than cost and run the risk involved in borrowing money, and then win out, our dividends are too high. If we hold in reserve earnings to make ourselves strong, and later pay it out and give the stockholders an opportunity to buy a few more shares at par, we are accused of watering the stock. I am reminded of a remark which I think was made by Grover Cleveland in his first campaign, that he was "too tall when he stood up and too short when he sat down."

Two years ago Chairman UNDERWOOD wrote me asking for specific information. I asked for an opportunity to appear before those who were engaged in the work, but no opportunity was given me. It was my intention that if I was convinced of the sincerity of those who had the work in hand to have given them all the information I had at my command. This year, since the hearing, I have endeavored to arrange for a meeting with Chairman UNDERWOOD for the purpose of discussing the subject, but failed. I am now convinced that the request for information was made because it was known that I favored a moderate reduction and was opposed to the policy of the "stand-pat" element, and that some of the information I might give could be used for political effect rather than for the introduction of economic principle in legislation.

The consideration shown one of experience and wide knowledge of the business, who favored a reduction in the tariff, is strangely in contract with that shown to an importer who, I understand, has had the ears of a portion of the committee, and who, desiring to poach on our industrial preserves, is simply representing foreign capital.

The attempt of an importer to controvert a statement of men of experience and interest in this business, on which the welfare of many communities depends, by mention of the duties and costs of some specific cloths, even if they were correct, has no more to do with the main questions involved in this matter than has the price of Poland Spring water to do with the cost per horsepower of the water at Niagara Falls.

The Ways and Means Committee thus far has acted as the judge and jury, yet it is, in a measure, a packed jury, because the majority is comprised of those whose politics are the same as those of the party in power. The chairman, who should be the judge, really becomes the prosecuting attorney. The testimony of the defendants, the manufacturers, is thrown out, and evidence in favor of the prosecution is introduced at special interviews and the defendants given no opportunity to offer new evidence or testimony in rebuttal.

Chairman UNDERWOOD, in a speech to Congress, stated that "conditions of the consumer and manufacturer have changed since the Dingley law was enacted in 1897." While this may be introduced as an argument in favor of a revision, even on a lower basis, it is no argument in favor of the Underwood bill. He also stated that "all commodities have increased an average of 46 per cent." Note that he uses the word "average," a word he criticizes others for introducing into the tariff features, in the same speech. If a portion of this increase has grown because of high protection, in what proportion and in what industry? That is the specific thing we want to know—what industry has been benefited unduly and out of proportion to others, all things considered?

Prices of cotton, wheat, and other commodities have advanced, and common cotton has fluctuated between 6 cents and 17 cents a pound. Special cottons, American and Egyptians, have sold as low as 10 cents and as high as 35 cents for same grade and staple. Is the protective tariff to blame for this? If not, why is it not possible that the same underlying cause is responsible in many of the manufactured commodities, as in the raw materials?

He states, "There is one law of supply and demand." True, and there is no industry, business, or profession in which the law of supply and demand has been applied more effectively than in the cotton industry. The testimony supports it—the proofs can be found by those who seek them.

He further states "that there will be no immediate benefit to consumer because retailers have goods on their shelves bought under protective duties. The merchant will not buy more goods until he has sold these." This illustrates the crudeness of the theories or hypocrisy of some men who pose as leaders in reform movements.

A large number of people in New England would be pleased to have Mr. UNDERWOOD give us a practical illustration of the application of this theory by disposing of some of our shares, including new mills.

There are thousands of bales of cotton and cloth in storehouses which millmen would like to sell at cost, also some new mills. I have one, bought under "protective duties." Part of it has been stopped two years because we can not get cost for its product. I would like to find a customer at cost or even 20 per cent less. Why is Mr. UNDERWOOD so much more considerate of the retailers' welfare than for those who depend on the cotton-manufacturing industry for a living?

He states that "the tariff has been putting a premium on incompetency. We find that industries highly protected are running with equipment 60 years old." For every instance he will find in the cotton industry here, I will find a similar one in England, which is the leader in cotton textiles. Incompetency is not confined to manufacturing; it is in all trades and professions.

Who is responsible for the laws which render it easy for unskilled labor and incompetency to come here in large numbers, but makes it a penalty for any inducement to skilled labor, even though we need them to establish an industry? This condition is contrary to economics, and manufacturers didn't bring it about.

He states that no favored manufacturer has sat behind the committee doors and prepared this bill and dictated its provisions. I should put it that no manufacturer, certainly not in the textile industry,

has received any consideration. Personally, I ask for no favors; I do ask for justice and the introduction of some intelligence into a measure that is to affect 2 per cent of the population. I admit that the protective feature has been abused, but because there is a malignant growth is no reason why the patient should be killed or maimed by a bungling operation.

His reference to the raised tax on the luxuries of the rich and reduced on the necessities of the poor is in line with his reference to New Bedford mills mentioned in a previous paragraph. Expressions of this kind raise a question of the motives that govern Mr. UNDERWOOD'S action, and it would appear that the desire is to do something for political effect rather than for the permanent good of humanity. He states on cotton cloth that the people were taxed 50 per cent; they have reduced it 30 per cent. These are the kind of stump speeches that are spread over the country by one who occupies a position that makes it easy to do. We are selling some fine cotton cloths in New England to-day at a less base price than similar goods are sold in England, and considerable of our standard products are sold at over a cent per yard less than they could be imported.

The general tone of his address and a comparison of the inferences drawn from it with the actual facts indicates how essential it is that a commission should be established and the tariff taken out of politics. The business interests of this country have suffered because of the cheap political demagogues, the "ins" on one side and the "outs" on the other, playing the game for political preferment.

There is over $28,000,000 deposited in savings banks in New Bedford. A dollar invested in a corporation is entitled to as much consideration as the dollar borrowed by the mills from the savings bank, no matter who invests in, whether it is the man of great wealth or the comparatively poor man. Most of the stockholders are people of moderate means. The city of New Bedford has increased about 60,000 in the last 20 years. Thousands of the employees in the mills have built their homes and borrowed money on mortgages. I know elderly people and widows who depend, in a measure—in fact, almost entirely—on the income of their modest investments. Therefore it is essential that, if justice is to prevail, these facts should have influence in the kind of a tariff law that is to be enacted.

The steel industry yielded hundreds of millions to those who were prominently identified with it, and, according to "The New Freedom," Mr. Carnegie sold out at about four or five times the estimated value of the property. There is no doubt but what this was due, in a measure, to excessive duty and limited competition, but nobody ever heard of anything like this in the cotton-mill business. Although there have been instances where exceptional profit has been made, it was with plenty of competition, such as is done in any business.

Because the Steel Trust magnates in the past have gathered their harvest and stored it away it is no reason why the cotton industry should be filched and demoralized.

I am on record, as stated in my brief and pamphlet recently published, as favoring for years a moderate reduction, and am opposed to the method of the stand-pat element who were the controlling factors in the Congress that passed the Payne-Aldrich bill. I am not seeking more wealth or trying to build up a monopoly; there is nothing of the kind that could be built up in this business; there are too many in it and it is too diversified. I expect and am willing to make a reasonable contribution for the common cause in the form of reduced valuations, if I can be relieved of the uncertainty and troubles due to pernicious legislation.

What is desired principally is an accurate comparative duty for different classes of gray cotton yarns and cotton cloth, which represent by far the greater portion of the industry.

First. A duty which can be based on our costs by a method that will not be subjected to violent changes because of fluctuations in the price of cotton or because of change in fashion. This is very important, because any irregularity in the proportionate duty per pound of one yarn as compared with another, or with cotton comprised of certain yarns compared with another, or with cloth as compared with yarn, or with fancy cloth as compared with plain cloth, is bound to result seriously when the fashion changes materially.

Second. I naturally desire that the rate of duty be not lower, certainly not at this period, than is justified, considering the high cost of our equipment, for which we have paid 45 per cent, or the equivalent, more than our foreign competitors, as shown by importations of machinery, and of the difference in wages, which is from 30 to 50 per cent, as can be substantiated.

If the social and industrial welfare of this country is to be given more consideration than cheap politics, it is now time to begin, and the present administration could give no better demonstration of their good faith than by passing a tariff bill which, even though it may be somewhat lower than is justified, will be at least scientific and comparatively equitable.

I believe that the fundamental cause of the apparent discontent of the masses, which is not limited to this country alone, is due to a feeling on the part of those who labor long and diligently all of their lives that they do not receive a return in proportion to the share of the world's work which they perform, and I certainly believe they do not receive their proper share. I do not believe that it is due to avariciousness, selfishness, or tyranny on the part of men engaged in any manufacturing business. It is due to the inherent selfishness of the human being as expressed in all walks of life, and consolidated capital, under the name of corporation, has been a target for all those who wish to pose as friends of labor, particularly a portion of our politicians and professional agitators, who reap a harvest through the gullibility of the laboring man.

The cost of living is high here, more so than some time ago. So it is in other countries with a high tariff and with a low tariff, therefore, the tariff now in force, inadequate as it may be, is not entirely, if in a degree, responsible for the increased cost of living. Undoubtedly the cost of living is higher here than in other countries, but the margin between wages earned and cost of living is certainly better than that which exists in other countries. If this were not so immigration would cease. I know for a fact that many who, for homesickness or other reasons, return to the land of their birth, are glad to get back here again. I know of a few who are unable to do so because they could not save the money to pay their passage. Therefore it would seem as though there must be some other cause for the increased cost of living, particularly in this country.

Personally I believe it is due to the tremendous increase in numbers of parasites, and people who live by their wits and those who labor and perform a kind of work which would be unnecessary if economic laws applied in all avenues of life. Political bosses, ward heelers, professional ambulance chasers, and blackmailers—men who use their cleverness to win a case and defend a man they know to be guilty and defeat the ends of justice and increase the cost of administering it; the large number that are engaged in competing for trade; unnecessary solicitors, the cost of and the energy used in providing the consumer with an inferior article, which, if properly applied along creative or inventive lines, would provide the consumer with a superior article. Until legislation devotes more time to these features, the margin between the cost of living and compensation received for labor will not be increased.

New Freedom has a chapter entitled "Let there be light." I would like some light to explain why the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee ignored the testimony of men who, unquestionably, were not identified with the radical "stand-pat" element, and why they made certain rates on one class as compared with another. New Freedom also refers to a "Government by trusteeships" and the "Political boss," and, in accordance with the sentiment expressed, will you not, my dear Senator and Congressman, consider this question carefully and be patriotic and support that which you believe worthy according to the merits of the case?

Writers and speakers, particularly those affiliated in politics, are disposed to devote too much attention to "rich malefactors," particularly those identified with corporations. For 25 years I labored in the ranks with the workers. My letter is not because of a desire that action should be taken to enable me to retain what wealth I have accumulated or to add to it. I am satisfied with what I have and could be perfectly happy with much less, and, no matter how the tariff is adjusted, I shall have enough. My plea is principally on behalf of those who I know are not in as fortunate circumstances.

Yours, very truly,

WALTER H. LANGSHAW,
New Bedford, Mass.

(President and manager Dartmouth Manufacturing Co. and Bristol Manufacturing Co.)

LANCASHIRE'S VIEW OF PROPOSED CUT IN COTTON-GOODS TARIFF.

Sir Charles Macara, president of the Federation of Master Cotton Spinners' Associations of Lancashire, discussing industrial conditions in the American cotton industry and the new Underwood tariff bill, said:

"All their concerns have cost them a tremendous amount more to capitalize than ours have. They are left with this big handicap. At present, despite their tremendous tariffs, we have retained the finer end of the trade, and there is every likelihood that in this branch of the industry the tariff reductions will benefit us, because it is very difficult for them to secure the skilled workers that we have at our disposal. Their workers are of mixed nationalities and constantly migrating, and they can not compete with Lancashire in fine fabrics. The reduced tariff will increase this end of our trade, but it will not give us any greater opportunity on the lower and middle class goods, which Lancashire has not had recently."

The following table shows the high prices reached by local mill shares during the year 1909, their selling prices in September, 1912, and their present prices:

	High, 1909.	September, 1912.	Present value.
Acushnet Mill	360	150	135
Beacon Manufacturing Co	102½	102½	102½
Beacon Manufacturing Co., preferred	111	112½	112½
Booth Manufacturing Co., common		70	50
Booth Manufacturing Co., preferred		85	75
Bristol Manufacturing Co	150	100	75
Butler Mill	175	132	122
City Manufacturing Co	253	110	100
Dartmouth Manufacturing Co	300	245	225
Dartmouth Manufacturing Co., preferred	106	104	103
Gosnold Mills, preferred	113½	95	90
Grinnell Manufacturing Co	250	180	160
Holmes Manufacturing Co	102	99	100
Holmes Manufacturing Co., preferred	103	115	102½
Hathaway Manufacturing Co	200	200	175
Kilburn Mill	195	127½	120
Manomet Mills	138	122	117½
Nashawena Mills	107	75	58
Neild Manufacturing Co		95	95
N. B. Cotton Mills Corporation		125	125
N. B. Cotton Mills Corporation, preferred	101	100	99
Nonquitt Spinning Co	132	94	92
Page Manufacturing Co	130	90	87½
Pierce Manufacturing Co		390	325
Pierce Bros. (Ltd.)		100	100
Potomska Mills	137½	120	116
Quissett Mills, common		85	90
Quissett Mills, preferred		100	98
Sharp Manufacturing Co., common		90	82½
Sharp Manufacturing Co., preferred		102½	105
Soule Mill	175	97½	90
Taber Mill	127	105	102½
Wamsutta Mills	142½	125	116
Whitman Mills	225	160	131

I also append a portion of the testimony given by Mr. Simeon B. Chase, treasurer of the King Philip Mills, Fall River, Mass., in the hearing held before the Committee on Ways and Means on Schedule I, and the colloquy which occurred between himself and members of the committee. I print this extract from the hearings referred to, because I was refused an opportunity to make a statement regarding the same before the House because of the lack of time allowed for its presentation:

Mr. HILL. Would it not necessarily compel a very severe reduction in wages when it would become impossible for the industry to meet the foreign competition on any other basis?

Mr. CHASE. I think that would necessarily be a result under those conditions.

Mr. HILL. In view of the fact that the Tariff Board states that many of the products of the cotton industry are now sold for less than the English product by a considerable percentage in a number of cases, would not that intensify the difficulty in passing that point and then securing revenue after that? In other words, is it possible, in your judgment as president of the Cotton Manufacturers' Association of

this country, for any committee to fix a tariff rate which will establish a certain amount of competition and stop there, without imperiling the whole industry?

Mr. CHASE. I do not think so.

Mr. HILL. You do not think it possible?

Mr. CHASE. I do not think so. Nobody knows where that point is, either.

Mr. HILL. That is it exactly. I fully agree with you.

The CHAIRMAN. You recognize the fact we are going to get revenue from this tariff? We have to have a reasonable competitive rate somewhere and there is no reason why you should not stand your proportion of that reasonable competitive rate, as well as the other fellow.

Mr. CHASE. I expect to.

The CHAIRMAN. And all we are trying to do is to bring about a parity. The present tariff bill is written like a mountain range with some high peaks and low valleys. Some fellows are standing the competition coming through the low valleys, and others are having the advantage of the high peaks. We are trying to equalize you, and I am sure you will agree with me that if we can succeed in doing that, you ought to stand your share, as well as the other fellow.

Mr. CHASE. I think this, Mr. Chairman, in all candor, that even from your own point of view, you are not going to accomplish what you think you are as far as the American consumer is concerned. You may get some revenue for the Government.

We have heard a good deal about the high price of cotton and gentlemen have said a good deal about large dividends that have been paid by certain corporations in years gone by. I sold a lot of goods to a retailer. This is a matter of record and can be proved. There were about forty or fifty thousand yards. I put them up in pieces and shipped them to his store. The expense on a yard from my mill to his store was practically nothing; there was no use to consider it as anything. My price for those goods was 8¾ cents. He refused to buy them at that price. At any rate, he came back with a bid of 8½ cents.

I could, at 8½ cents, get possibly a little over a cent a yard profit, but I sold the goods. The man hurried me a good deal for delivery. I went to the city where the merchant did business a short time afterwards, and went into the store and wandered around until I came to the counter and recognized the goods that I had made. I asked the clerk how much it was, and I found it was then selling for 25 cents a yard.

The CHAIRMAN. I recognize, of course, the great difference between the wholesale price and the retail price, but this committee can not adjust that. We do hope to relieve the consumer in some places, but if we are wrong about that and you are right, and we do not succeed in doing that, if we equalize these duties so that they are reasonably competitive all along the line, at least we will give more revenue to the Government; and the other people, through the Government, will get some benefit from this tax, which they do not get when it is a prohibitive tax. You recognize that?

Mr. CHASE. I recognize the revenue feature.

The CHAIRMAN. And I think you will agree that we ought to make the effort.

Mr. CHASE. But when it comes to the consumer, I do not believe you are going to do anything.

The CHAIRMAN. But at any rate, we will give the people the benefit of getting some portion of the tax that is left. But I do not think you will disagree that that is a commendable purpose, if we do it in moderation.

Mr. CHASE. If you will be careful, I have nothing to say. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is there any class of cotton goods with the manufacture of which you are familiar that the statement made in the circular quoted by Mr. Palmer would be a true statement?

Mr. CHASE. I think there are cotton goods made in this country where the tariff would not make a particle of difference; that is, you would hardly know the difference whether there is a tariff or not. The amount of labor employed would be so little, with goods made as they are now, with automatic machinery, that it would cut hardly any figure.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does it apply to any goods you manufacture yourself?

Mr. CHASE. No; it does not apply to anything made in our town, either, so far as I know.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Or made in Fall River?

Mr. CHASE. No.

Mr. FORDNEY. You stated a minute ago you sold a certain grade of goods to a certain merchant for 8½ cents per yard, and later on those goods were being retailed at 25 cents a yard.

Mr. CHASE. That is true.

Mr. FORDNEY. In reference to reducing the cost of the article to the consumer, I can give an illustration in another way which would be just as fair, as to reducing the duty on manufactured articles which we produce.

In the State of Michigan to-day, in which State I have the honor to live, a bushel of potatoes can be purchased for 40 cents. The other morning when leaving for Washington I stepped into a dining car, and paid 15 cents for one baked potato. [Laughter.]

The duty on a bushel of potatoes is 25 cents, and in order to reduce the value or the cost of that baked potato to the consumer that duty of 25 cents on a bushel of potatoes must be distributed. [Laughter.] That is a fair illustration, is it not?

Mr. CHASE. As far as the consumer is concerned, it is. I have not any more question about it than I stand here that, as far as concerns the duties on cotton goods or the general duties on articles of consumption that are levied in the customhouse, the consumer does not know anything about it. They do not cut any figure worth mentioning.

I am not trying to whack the people who retail goods. They are doing a legitimate business, and Mr. Parker touched upon that. The cost of distribution in this country is something that is a perfect scandal; there is no question about it.

We have made money in our business at times—big money at times. I am not here to deny that. All these statistics that have been poked at me, most of them are true, I guess. But if you take 25 years, instead of going back three or four or a half dozen or ten, they will tell a different story. The average has not been so big. We have had these periods when we have made money. I have known a mill to make 40 or 50 per cent in one year, when they had not been making any for five or six years, to speak of, but perhaps had lost money. That is the nature of the business.

But if you are going to help out the consumer you have to get at something else besides the tariff. If you are going ahead to get some revenue for the Government, that is another matter.

COTTON GOODS—BRIEF OF S. B. CHASE.

An impression prevails that the tariff on cotton goods has been largely advanced by the so-called Payne-Aldrich bill. This is not the case so far as it applies to 80 to 90 per cent of the cotton goods produced or consumed in this country.

Except in the very highest schedules, which do not apply to any considerable proportion of goods consumed in this country, the rates are identical with the Wilson bill.

The Wilson bill reduced the rates of duty on cloths made from coarse yarns from 33⅓ to 50 per cent, on medium goods from 22 to 33⅓ per cent, and on cloths made from fine yarns from 11 to 22½ per cent.

Previous to the Wilson bill no element for classification was taken into consideration in fixing the rates of duties excepting the count of the threads per square inch.

It was proven to the satisfaction of the framers of the Wilson bill that duties to be just and fair should be based also upon the fineness of the yarns used in the construction of the cloth, and the so-called Fall River schedule was adopted. While that schedule was not perfect from the standpoint of high-tariff or low-tariff men, both schools of thought regarded it as the most perfect and scientific ever enacted. Subsequent tariff bills have retained this principle, and, as before stated, but few changes have been made. We appreciate the fact that there is an apparent demand for a further revision of tariff schedules, and do not propose to offer objections to a reasonable modification of rates. We are willing to try to adapt our business to such rates as will afford us an opportunity to compete with our foreign rivals. We do not believe this committee or the people of the country at large will require us to do business on a basis that will not afford a decent living to those engaged in the industry according to the American standard.

Public sentiment and legislation is making every effort to eliminate child labor, to shorten the hours of work, to provide compensation for accidents, and to increase in many ways the obligations of the employer to the employees. Progress in these lines has already largely increased the cost of production.

We feel that the approach toward lower duties should be made with great care and moderation. Drastic action in that direction may, and we think will, lead to demoralization and suffering among a large body of people whose wages may be lowered or whose employment may be utterly taken away.

While making no objection to a reasonable reduction of rates, we think it should be done by slow and successive steps.

We wish to point out the difficulties and dangers attending the method of ascertaining the numbers of yarns contained in a fabric and of the ad valorem system. Yarns in the finer numbers especially are subject to great variation in size even when spun upon the same machine. A slight variation in the diameter of rolls on a mule or frame owing to unavoidable difference in thickness of roll covering will cause a variation of as much as 20 per cent. For instance, cloths made from No. 100 yarn will have individual threads as coarse as No. 90 and as fine as No. 110, and we doubt if any expert at the customhouse would be able to properly classify a fabric by sizing the yarns.

A simple method of evading an ad valorem duty will be the consignment by foreign manufacturers of goods to a sales agent in this country, he putting an estimated nominal value upon the merchandise which may enable him to evade a large fraction of the duty intended to be collected.

Respectfully submitted.

S. B. CHASE,
Treasurer King Philip Mill, Fall River, Mass.

I also append the following article, which expresses very forcibly the views of Mr. Robert Kenneth McLea, in which I most heartily concur:

OVERDOING TARIFF REDUCTION—PUSHING THE PENDULUM BEYOND ITS NATURAL LIMIT IS NOW REFLECTED BY A SWING TOO FAR IN THE OTHER DIRECTION.

(By Robert Kenneth MacLea, formerly consulting expert of the Tariff Board.)

[EDITOR'S NOTE.—The importance of the following article will be appreciated. During the recent campaign, Mr. MacLea was an ardent supporter of Mr. Wilson, not only arguing in his behalf at the various tariff exhibits in New York, Brooklyn, and elsewhere, but in organizing and handling the details of one of the greatest demonstrations ever given to a candidate for the Presidency. As chairman of the executive committee for the famous Wilson parade, in which nearly 100,000 men were to march all day and thousands of business houses to shut down in honor of the occasion, he accomplished the seemingly impossible. This great pageant set for Saturday, November 2, had to be called off because of the funeral of the late Vice President Sherman, which took place at the hour when Mr. Wilson was to have reviewed the great body of industrial workmen. Mr. MacLea is an expert on tariff matters and administration, and is recognized as a leading authority in this country.]

Textiles, O fickle "goddess of azure" in woman's world, thou art to prove the means of making or breaking another party of "political power" as of old.

Chagrin and unhappiness reign in the textile world to-day because, like a bolt of lightning out of a clear sky, the new Underwood tariff on textiles (wool and cotton particularly) was thrust upon the commercial horizon on the afternoon of April 7. Nothing approaching it had been thought of by even the most ardent advocates of a low tariff. It stunned. Honest men, who have never been guilty of asking or wishing for favors at the hands of the Government, and who stand highest in the cotton industry, had done everything possible to show the facts from all angles to the Ways and Means Committee at Washington, influenced by President Wilson's preelection statement at Hartford, Conn., September 25, 1912, used all over the land to elect him, in which he said:

"What the Democrats propose is a very practical thing, indeed. They propose to unearth these special privileges and to cut them out of the tariff. They propose not to leave a single concealed private advantage in the statutes concerning the duties that can possibly be eradicated *without affecting the part of the business that is sound and legitimate and which we all wish to see promoted.*"

Then again, to more fully reassure the people of the business world, he said at Pittsburgh on October 17, 1912:

"The Democratic Party does not propose free trade or anything approaching free trade. It proposes merely a reconsideration of the tariff schedules, such as will adjust them to the actual business conditions and interests of the country."

So it came about that the cotton textile men of the South met the new power at Washington in "the spirit of accommodation" and showed frankness and willingness to help the new administration.

Business proceeded normally from January 22 and 23, when the hearings were held, until April 7, when the terrific cuts in cotton textiles were uncovered. Steadily since the cotton market has declined, until at the time of writing over 100 points, or $10 a bale, has been lopped off the farmers' holdings of unsold cotton. The *radical cuts* in cotton tariff have done this thing. Cloths have felt the influence, too. Great declines from day to day have put the market down in quick order to the low, unprofitable level of 1911. The equivalent can be estimated only in millions of dollars of unnecessary loss.

The reason for this chaotic condition is simple. Men who know had publicly stated that some of the rates proposed on textiles are below the difference in cost of production between here and abroad, which is *free trade* pure and simple.

It seems almost incredible that the attitude of the lower branch of Congress is such as it has proven to be. The Ways and Means Committee has sought and obtained advice and information from all directions. Much of it has been thrown in the wastebasket, and they have brought out a bill on cotton textiles which will hit some parts of the industry a blow it is unable to stand.

Approximately 10 to 12 per cent of the distribution in this country consists of fine plain and fancy cotton cloths, which under the census of 1910 amounts to about $50,000,000 at mill valuation, but over $100,000,000 consumers' values. These productions are made by a class of mills which can not hope to compete successfully with the English production under the American conditions if these proposed rates become a law.

According to the census of 1910, there was over $200,000,000 worth at mill value of all other cotton-mill productions (excluding cloths). Portions of this part of the industry are facing absolute disaster. Quilts, for instance, dutiable presumably at 25 per cent under one paragraph, are really dutiable at 10 or 12½ per cent under another, which is extending "special privilege" to certain importers who have been most active with the Ways and Means Committee, and will turn the entire business on this class of material to Germany. The same remark applies to an enormous quantity of cotton blankets. Space does not permit of giving the details of many similar examples whereby whole industries of this or that class will be hurt beyond calculation and unnecessarily.

There are a large number of mills making a different class of goods that will not suffer, especially under the proposed rates, which are calculated to prevent the secondary distributer or middleman from asking too much for fabrics converted by him. This, however, is confined only to plain goods.

The great complaint of the people and the trade of this country with the Payne-Aldrich law on cotton textiles was the special graft written into the law for the benefit of a handful of manufacturers, who have already received their just deserts, for internal competition directed at their productions as a result of the publicity achieved by their alliance with Senator Aldrich four years ago, has brought all such goods to their lowest level of values in the home market.

But the Democrats in the lower branch of Congress have apparently placed the honest business man in the cotton industry on trial *instead of appreciating that they themselves are on trial.* There is still time for the upper branch of Congress to eradicate these errors, and I sincerely believe Mr. Wilson will not permit such gross injustice to be perpetrated. At any rate, Congress should understand that it could do more in textiles to cheapen the cost of living to the consumer with a proper pure textile law than by such ridiculous cuts in the cotton tariff.

The statement made by Mr. UNDERWOOD in his published explanation of the new bill that "no part of the committee's work has been founded upon a belief in the cost-of-production theory, and the theory is absolutely rejected as a guide to tariff making," shows a political stubbornness in adhering to the opposite of business requirements. Mr. UNDERWOOD states in his latest excuse for the cotton schedule:

"When we consider that the average ad valorem rate of duty levied at the customhouse on manufactures of cotton goods, for example, is 45 per cent of the value of the article imported, and the total labor cost of production of cotton goods in this country averages only 21 per cent of the factory value of the product, that the difference in labor cost at home and abroad is about as one to two, and that 10 or 11 per cent of the value of the product levied at the customhouse would equal the difference in the labor wage, it is apparent that our present tariff rates have been misused for the purpose of protecting profits for the home manufacturer. This is not only true of the manufacturer of cotton goods, but of almost every other schedule in the tariff act. To protect profits of necessity means to protect inefficiency."

Why stop at labor cost? Let Mr. UNDERWOOD and the powers who must make our tariff laws study the *conversion* cost of cotton cloths, of which the labor cost is but a small portion. Take ordinary plain cloths containing yarns of from 20s to 30s. It will be found by examination of the 1,285 different constructions fully analyzed by the Tariff Board report that over 700 gray cloth constructions show a spread of conversion costs of from 9 to 57 per cent on plain fabrics containing not higher than No. 30s yarns. Certainly this represents goods that have successfully gone into market distribution. Why are the conversion costs, which are the actual costs, ignored? Particularly when they are actually known after an investigation. The only excuse Mr. UNDERWOOD can give for comparing the difference in labor cost alone is that the Republican Party used that basis as an argument for its intended tariff making four years ago, which on further investigation it had to abandon.

The proposed reductions will not cheapen the great mass of fabrics for the consumer. It will transfer the business on a great part of the fabrics used from the United States to England. The retailer will still get his profits and so will the middleman who remains in business. The interference with business as a result of these proposed tariff rates is already greater than it should have been. The Ways and Means Committee, in justification of its low rates, claim that it has reduced the cotton-cloth tariff from 42.74 to 26.69 per cent. The absurdity of this statement can be seen—yet it is made broadcast throughout the country—when it is known that these figures are based on the small amount of importations during 1912, which were fine goods and which were already coming in in a competitive way with American-made materials and amounted to but 2 per cent of the distribution.

With the new rates the real reductions are so great that the average is *16.23 per cent*—this is *injustice.* The rates should be compared with the known distribution of fabrics used in the industry in this country. This shows to business men a strong reason for a permanent tariff commission or tariff board for the study and elucidation of the various phases of trade. It is because politicians are apt to think more of their constituents than of the welfare of the country in tariff making that such strong political changes are witnessed from year to year. But as President Wilson said, prior to election on September 21 last, "*For there is a God in the heaven; there is justice in the souls of men.*" So I say let justice be done to the hundreds of thousands of mill workers dependent upon a successful continuation of business in the many branches of the cotton industry, as well as those who have built up the industry and asked only that the rates be fair.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILDER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILDER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WILDER. Mr. Chairman, I hope to obtain forgiveness, either in this world or the next, for constantly harping on this manufacturing side of these propositions. But cotton is one of the large industries of this country, one of the largest, and the wage scale paid is low, one of the lowest. There are many mills in my district making an extensive variety of cotton goods from the commonest to the high grade, such as Lancaster-Bigelow, carpet; Parkhill-Southbridge, printing; big yarn mills, and so forth.

Now, I understand it is the purpose of this bill that is before us to reduce the tariff on this schedule as a whole, purposely, substantially. The query in my mind is, as a manufacturer, whom is this coming out of? I know of one schedule at the present time—on ginghams—where over one-half of the amount of ginghams used in this country of that class is imported. This of itself indicates that the tariff is low enough, does it not?

I want to repeat that, that more than one-half of a certain class of ginghams consumed in this country is imported, and in the case of those ginghams the tariff has been cut in two. The cut is about 50 per cent on that schedule. Now, whom is this coming out of?

Presumably we are trying to lower the cost of living. I wish we might. But is there any virtue in lowering the cost of living by taking it out of our poorest class of people? I ask again, Whom is this reduction coming out of?

If some goods are sold at such a price that one-half of the amount consumed is coming in now from abroad—and that is true also with respect to other smaller portions of the cotton schedule—and the tariff is lowered, what is going to happen? That is a plain, simple, academic proposition. What is going to happen?

If the American manufacturers compete with the foreigner so that the foreigner's goods do not come in, something must be reduced, must it not? Do any of you gentlemen know that the cotton manufacturers of this country, year in and year out, are making less than 5 per cent on the selling cost of their goods? Can you then come down more than 5 per cent without losing all your profits? I am stating this as a practical man. Where is this reduction coming from? It will come from where it always comes from.

This should be clearly understood if the cost of goods is to be lowered; and if the cost of goods is to be lowered, there is only one place for it to come from, and that is from the workingman, because it is all work. Go through it and find out what there is in the manufacture of goods, and you will see that there is nothing but work from first to last. It is all labor.

Mr. FORDNEY. What is the percentage of labor?

Mr. WILDER. It is all labor, figured through from the beginning. Either directly or indirectly and remotely, it is all labor.

Now, there is but one alternative, if these goods are brought in from abroad—that is, if $100,000,000 worth of goods from abroad comes, $100,000,000 worth of work is thrown out, is not it?—including work on the goods in the building of factories, and in the machinery, and the tools, and the selling, and every other expense and activity that enter into the production. It represents just so much lost abroad to this country. And if those goods, as I say, must be lowered in price in this country, the cost must be lowered, and it can come only out of the workingman.

Gentlemen, do not make a mistake about this. If the goods come in from abroad, one of these two things must happen, and in either event it is loss. I do not know of any way by which you can figure it out otherwise, either in this tariff bill or any other. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, under the agreement I was to have 5 minutes on each of the paragraphs numbered 264 and 265. I ask unanimous consent now that I may have that 10 minutes at this time, and not take it when those paragraphs are reached.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent to have the 10 minutes to be allowed on paragraphs 264 and 265 consumed in general debate at this time, and not to be used at that time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Ten minutes of that time was to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] anyhow, and I yield to him 15 minutes. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, no section of our great country has grown faster in industrial development than the Southland in the last 30 years under the American protective system or policy. In mining development, in agricultural and manufacturing growth and development, and especially in the cotton industry, I challenge any section of the United States. We have a new South. While the other side of the House will vote almost solidly for this bill, there are thousands and thousands of Democrats among their constituents who believe in a protective tariff. Prior to the Civil War the South was exclusively an agricultural country, with cheap slave labor; but the great God had stored in our mountains and hills inexhaustible quantities of coal, iron, marble, kaolin, zinc, copper, and other minerals, and away up and down the slopes of the Allegheny and Cumberland Mountains the finest body of hardwood timber on the American Continent.

In those days before the war we were sending our money from every State in the South to New England for every piece of calico that our people needed. When we did not purchase in New England we shipped our raw material 3,000 miles across the ocean, to be made up by foreign operatives in the cotton mills of Manchester, England, and reshipped the finished article across the Atlantic Ocean, to be purchased and used in the South. We paid the freight both ways. But times have changed and conditions have changed in the South. I match the southern business man and manufacturer against the business intellect of any set of men in the world on equal terms and conditions. We took from New England more than half of the manufacture of American cotton goods. We have a splendid lot of cotton mills in Virginia and the Carolinas, Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, and in other States of the South. There are 850 of these mills, representing $300,000,000 in plants, houses, and machinery, with more than 200,000 operatives. We have built many new manufacturing towns and cities. We have furnished better wages to the boys, girls, and men, and through them we have put more money in local circulation for the professional men, the coal operators, the merchants, and the tax-gatherer. The farmer has a new and better market for his cotton and the railroads have greatly increased their earnings.

What is this bill? It is the most injurious and destructive bill to the interests of the South that was ever written by mortal man, the Wilson bill not excepted.

What has the South to gain in this bill for the future increase of her commercial, agricultural, and manufacturing interests? Our rivals in Pennsylvania exacted tribute from the southern people for more than a hundred years under a protective tariff. You have given them free iron ore in order to meet the iron furnaces of the South in competition in the Mississippi Valley and on the Atlantic seacoast. You have reduced the price of pig iron until you have made it impossible for the southern furnaces to sell a dollar's worth of pig iron on the Pacific coast in competition with the cheap Chinese pig iron. You have made it impossible for Birmingham and Tennessee to sell in successful competition along the Atlantic coast with pig iron made in Germany and England, not to mention the furnaces of Pennsylvania. You have given up our iron ore, our pig iron, our zinc, our lead, and our coal market in New England. You are going to destroy a great industry of a sovereign State of the South—Louisiana—which has followed the Democratic banner ever since its creation. By this legislation you will bankrupt countless people in that State, throw their machinery into the scrap heap, and wipe out $100,000,000 of their investments, and turn the operatives loose without employment.

And here is this cotton schedule. Why, the southern cotton manufacturers met in this city and appealed to you in a letter which was read to your caucus. More than 140 of the cotton mills of the South have never paid a dividend. A number of them have gone into the hands of receivers. Instead of encouraging them, instead of helping them, now that you are in power and are writing the tariff bill, you turn your backs upon them. Is it fair? Is it just?

I love the people of the South, my own, my native South, and, God helping me, as long as I am a Member of this House I will never cast a vote against her interests or one that will retard her progress or development. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We purchased abroad last year $65,000,000 of cotton goods. Although we grow 60 per cent of the cotton of the world, what did we export? We exported $50,000,000. We bought $15,000,000 more than we sold in foreign lands. And you are not satisfied with that? Southern men helped write this tariff bill, which says, "We are not buying enough from England and Japan; let us buy more." This bill, according to your own figures and reports, estimates we are going to buy from foreigners in the first year of its operation $12,568,000 more rather than buy it from our own people—from the 850 cotton mills of the South—making under the first year of the Underwood bill the valuation of total imports of cotton goods $77,821,000, which sum will be taken out of this country, out of the channels of trade, sent to foreign lands, giving employment to foreigners when we have an army of deserving American working people here at home.

You say this is Democracy. You say this is a compliance with your promise when you wrote in your platform that no "legitimate industry" in this country would be harmed or injured if you were intrusted with power. Will it harm the cotton mills of the South and the working people in these mills to take every year $12,000,000 additional from them and place those orders in Manchester, England, and in Japan? The cotton industry of the South is a legitimate industry. I dare you to say that it is not. Why, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means says that under the Payne tariff bill we are putting money into the pockets of the "special interests." When we pay wages to the men and women, boys and girls employed in American cotton mills, is the money going into the pockets of the "special interests"? Take the 200,000 people in the South, many of them girls and boys who are aiding in the support of the families that need the money; they are all a part of the so-called "special interests."

Oh, but you say there is a high-tariff wall around America. Last year, under the Payne tariff bill, we permitted to come into this country free goods to the value of $881,512,000. There was no high-tariff wall to keep them out. The foreigners sold more goods coming in free last year than they did of goods paying a duty. This is the first time this has happened in 17 years in this country.

What do you propose to do in this bill? You say we are not now getting enough on the free list. We are going to add $102,400,000 to be admitted without the payment of duty, making a total under your bill with the amount imported free under the Payne law last year $983,915,000. In other words, this amount of goods will be sold in competition with American mills and wage earners without paying a cent of duty.

How about Japan, where they pay 10 or 15 cents a day to women and the men 22 cents a day in their cotton mills? Why, they have constructed in their manufacturing cities the best type of English-made cotton machinery. Where the mills of New England and the South furnish cotton goods on the Pacific coast the Japanese have sold in the past two years cotton goods to the amount of $1,300,000 in this country as against $10,470 in 1890 and $292,915 in 1910.

What will they do if the duty is reduced? Mark the prediction: Within 12 months after this bill becomes a law the Japanese importation of cheap cotton goods will be three times what it is to-day.

Mr. KITCHIN. How much is it to-day?

Mr. AUSTIN. In two years it was $1,300,000. Then, when the Panama Canal is opened and you have cheap water transportation to Japan, they will capture and control the markets of the Eastern States.

Mr. KITCHIN. How much do we send there?

Mr. AUSTIN. My good and genial friend, the Demosthenes of the House that saved a satisfactory duty on peanuts of his State, North Carolina, in this bill, asks me how much we send there.

Mr. KITCHIN. Let me ask the gentleman. He said that China sent a million and a half dollars' worth of cheap goods to this country.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I said Japan. If not, I meant Japan.

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, the gentleman knew, if he knew anything, that she did no such thing. The gentleman knew another thing—that we export ten times more of the cheap goods that are imported from all the world. He knows that we export to China in competition with Japan five times more cheap goods—cheap cotton cloths that are imported into this country from all countries in the world.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman says I made a misstatement as to cotton goods imported from Japan. I will hand him the Government reports from the Bureau of Statistics, furnished me by the Department of Commerce, on Japanese imports.

Mr. KITCHIN. Those are not cheap cloths; they are all figured fancy Japan goods.

Mr. PETERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who saved free coal for Massachusetts at the expense of the coal industry of West Virginia and Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman give me a few minutes more? I want to answer the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KITCHIN. You had better give him half an hour, for it will take that time to answer.

Mr. MANN. I will give him as much time on this side as the gentleman will give him from that side.

Mr. KITCHIN. I have not control of the time.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I thought the gentleman had them all by strangle hold. I yield three minutes more to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. AUSTIN. Now I will give the gentleman the figures.

Mr. KITCHIN. The figures the gentleman has given me do not show a yard of cloth coming from Japan—it is cotton waste.

Mr. AUSTIN. Look at all the schedules. The gentleman talks about our exports.

We shipped to China cheap cotton goods to the amount of $29,814,000 in 1906, and last year we shipped $7,454,000, showing a loss or difference in the two years quoted of $22,359,000. The English trade papers complained that the Japanese, with their new machinery and their cheap labor, have been enabled to drive them out and supplant them in a number of the Provinces of China in the sale of cheap cotton goods.

Take the question of hosiery——

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I will not yield with only three minutes at my disposal. Take the question of hosiery. There are 10 or 12 mills in my town, and the people of the South have a large number of mills making hosiery all through the South, with practically every dollar of it southern capital. What are you doing with that industry under this bill? You are increasing the importation of hosiery $1,500,000. Most of that is in wages, and you are giving that trade to Germany. That is what you are doing—taking it from our mills and wage earners and giving it to Germany.

I am going to put in the RECORD an interview from one of the leading cotton manufacturers in my town, one of the ablest and best Democrats in Tennessee, a man who recently came within 4 votes of being elected United States Senator—Col. L. D. Tyson—in which he says that this proposed legislation is drastic and will prove injurious to the cotton mills and to the South. What else? I will give you also in the RECORD a statement from Robert Kenneth MacLea, who supported President Wilson and who made addresses in New York City in his interest and who was selected chairman of the committee to get up that great industrial reception to President Wilson, as a candidate, which was called off on account of the funeral of Vice President Sherman.

Here is an open statement, a letter, stating that the Democratic Party had violated its promise in its platform, and that the President had violated his promise in speeches made in Pittsburgh and in New Jersey, when he said that no legitimate industry would be crippled or injured by the Democratic Party, and that the party was not for free trade and would not favor legislation that would endanger any legitimate, honest business in this country. [Applause.] I will also add a copy of the letter of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association of the South read in the Democratic caucus and a day letter or telegram from a Tennessee cotton-mill company.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Daily Journal and Tribune.]

COL. L. D. TYSON'S INTERVIEW.

"Blue" is no name for the cotton-mill operators of the South. In North and South Carolina, in Alabama, and in Georgia they are in very bad spirits, and do not know to what ends the action on the tariff as to the cotton schedule will bring the cotton business. The cut in the schedule is pronounced by cotton men as being "drastic," and its effects will probably begin to be felt after September.

Col. L. D. Tyson, who, with James Maynard, Esq., went to Washington recently to present the position of the cotton operators of the Southeastern States, returned to the city yesterday evening. Mr. Maynard went on to New York and the East.

In reply to a query as to how the cotton-mill men expect their business to be affected by the tariff revision, Col. Tyson said:

"The cut on all cotton goods has been very drastic. A cut was expected, but it has placed the tariff below anything that had been expected or anticipated. We had no idea that the tariff would be placed as low as it is now scheduled to be reported on for passage. The cotton men, in fact, are pretty blue.

"I do not know what effect the revision will have on the business. The cut amounted to as much as 50 per cent in some items. Cotton underwear and hosiery were cut from 80 per cent to 25 per cent. On cloths the revision was from about 60 per cent down to 25 per cent. On yarns it was 40 per cent as the highest down to 5 per cent as the lowest, and, of course, the cuts were different on different yarns. I haven't the proposed schedule before me and can not give the details as to these cuts.

"Many think that they will have to shut down their mills and many workers will be thrown out of employment if the bill is passed as it now stands, and it looks as if it would pass. If there is any change in the present schedule, it will have to be made in the Senate. It seems that Mr. Wilson is doing everything in his power to get the bill through as it stands

"I don't know when the bill will become effective, whether immediately on its passage or at a given later date, but the operators do not look for a probable change in the conditions resulting from it before the 1st of October; that is to say, nearly all mills have orders which will keep them running until about that time, and unless the present proposed bill causes much agitation it may be that there will be no change in the business until the contracts now operative are filled.

"Of course, the bill will curtail all projected enterprises in the textile industry, and I don't suppose there will be another spindle put in the South for some time.

"The yarn men seem to be in the most unfortunate position of any of the textile manufacturers, as the cut is, of course, worse there than anywhere else, unless it was in hosiery and underwear.

"What I have said as to the conditions is the consensus of opinions among the cotton men. For my own part I think the Ways and Means Committee has gone too far. Of course, there must be a revision. I expected that. It was in the Democratic platform, which demanded a substantial revision, but the proposed revision has not only been substantial but it has been drastic."

[From May Issue of Dry Goods.]

OVERDOING TARIFF REDUCTION.

(By Robert Kenneth MacLea, formerly consulting expert of the Tariff Board.)

[EDITOR'S NOTE.—The importance of the following article will be appreciated. During the recent campaign, Mr. MacLea was an ardent supporter of Mr. Wilson, not only arguing in his behalf at the various tariff exhibits in New York, Brooklyn, and elsewhere, but in organizing and handling the details of one of the greatest demonstrations ever given to a candidate for the Presidency. As chairman of the executive committee for the famous Wilson parade, in which nearly 100,000 men were to march all day and thousands of business houses to shut down in honor of the occasion, he accomplished the seemingly impossible. This great pageant set for Saturday, November 2, had to be called off because of the funeral of the late Vice President Sherman, which took place at the hour when Mr. Wilson was to have reviewed the great body of industrial workmen. Mr. MacLea is an expert on tariff matters and administration, and is recognized as a leading authority in this country.]

Textiles, oh, fickle "Goddess of Azure" in woman's world, thou art to prove the means of making or breaking another party of "political power" as of old.

Chagrin and unhappiness reign in the textile world to-day because, like a bolt of lightning out of a clear sky, the new Underwood tariff on textiles (wool and cotton particularly) was thrust upon the commercial horizon on the afternoon of April 7. Nothing approaching it had been thought of by even the most ardent advocates of a low tariff. It stunned. Honest men, who have never been guilty of asking or wishing for favors at the hands of the Government, and who stand highest in the cotton industry, had done everything possible to show the facts from all angles to the Ways and Means Committee at Washington, influenced by President Wilson's preelection statement at Hartford, Conn., September 25, 1912, used all over the land to elect him, in which he said:

"What the Democrats propose is a very practical thing, indeed. They propose to unearth these special privileges and to cut them out of the tariff. They propose not to leave a single concealed private advantage in the statutes concerning the duties that can possibly be eradicated *without affecting the part of the business that is sound and legitimate and which we all wish to see promoted.*"

Then, again, to more fully reassure the people of the business world, he said at Pittsburgh on October 17, 1912:

"The Democratic Party does not propose free trade or anything approaching free trade. It proposes merely a reconsideration of the tariff schedules, such as will adjust them to the actual business conditions and interests of the country."

So it came about that the cotton textile men of the South met the new power at Washington in "the spirit of accommodation," and showed frankness and willingness to help the new administration.

Business proceeded normally from January 22 and 23, when the hearings were held, until April 7, when the terrific cuts in cotton textiles were uncovered. Steadily since the cotton market has declined, until at the time of writing over 100 points, or $10 a bale, has been lopped off the farmer's holdings of unsold cotton. The *radical cuts* in cotton tariff have done this thing. Cloths have felt the influence, too. Great declines from day to day have put the market down in quick order to the low, unprofitable level of 1911. The equivalent can be estimated only in millions of dollars of unnecessary loss.

The reason for this chaotic condition is simple. Men who know had publicly stated that some of the rates proposed on textiles are below the difference in cost of production between here and abroad, which is *free trade* pure and simple.

It seems almost incredible that the attitude of the lower branch of Congress is such as it has proven to be. The Ways and Means Committee has sought and obtained advice and information from all directions. Much of it has been thrown in the wastebasket, and they have brought out a bill on cotton textiles which will hit some parts of the industry a blow it is unable to stand.

Approximately 10 to 12 per cent of the distribution in this country consists of fine plain and fancy cotton cloths, which under the census of 1910 amounts to about $50,000,000 at mill valuation, but over $100,000,000 consumers' values. These productions are made by a class of mills which can not hope to compete successfully with the English production under the American conditions if these proposed rates become law.

According to the census of 1910 there was over $200,000,000 worth at mill value of all other cotton mill productions (excluding cloths). Portions of this part of the industry are facing absolute disaster. Quilts, for instance, dutiable presumably at 25 per cent under one paragraph are really dutiable at 10 or 12½ per cent under another, which is extending "special privilege" to certain importers who have been most active with the Ways and Means Committee, and will turn the entire business on this class of material to Germany. The same remark applies to an enormous quantity of cotton blankets. Space does not permit of giving the details of many similar examples, whereby whole industries of this or that class will be hurt beyond calculation and unnecessarily.

There are a large number of mills making a different class of goods that will not suffer especially under the proposed rates which are calculated to prevent the secondary distributor or middleman from

asking to much for fabrics converted by him. This, however, is confined only to plain goods.

The great complaint of the people and the trade of this country with the Payne-Aldrich law on cotton textiles was the special graft written into the law for the benefit of a handful of manufacturers, who have already received their just deserts, for internal competition directed at their productions as a result of the publicity achieved by their alliance with Senator Aldrich four years ago has brought all such goods to their lowest level of values in the home market.

But the Democrats in the lower branch of Congress have apparently placed the honest business man in the cotton industry on trial, *instead of appreciating that they themselves are on trial.* There is still time for the upper branch of Congress to eradicate these errors, and I sincerely believe Mr. Wilson will not permit such gross injustice to be perpetrated. At any rate, Congress should understand that it could do more in textiles to cheapen the cost of living to the consumer with a proper pure textile law than by such ridiculous cuts in the cotton tariff.

The statement made by Mr. UNDERWOOD in his published explanation of the new bill that "no part of the committee's work has been founded upon a belief in the cost-of-production theory, and the theory is absolutely rejected as a guide to tariff making" shows a political stubbornness in adhering to the opposite of business requirements. Mr. UNDERWOOD states in his latest excuse for the cotton schedule:

"When we consider that the average *ad valorem* rate of duty levied at the customhouse on manufactures of cotton goods, for example, is 45 per cent of the value of the article imported, and the total labor cost of production of cotton goods in this country averages only 21 per cent of the factory value of the product, that the difference in labor cost at home and abroad is about as 1 to 2, and that 10 or 11 per cent of the value of the product levied at the customhouse would equal the difference in the labor wage, it is apparent that our present tariff rates have been misused for the purpose of protecting profits for the home manufacturer. This is not only true of the manufacture of cotton goods, but of almost every other schedule in the tariff act. To protect profits of necessity means to protect inefficiency."

Why stop at labor cost? Let Mr. UNDERWOOD and the powers who must make our tariff laws study the *conversion* cost of cotton cloths, of which the labor cost is but a small portion. Take ordinary plain cloths containing yarns of from twenties to thirties. It will be found by examination of the 1,285 different constructions fully analyzed by the Tariff Board report that over 700 gray cloth constructions show a spread of conversion costs of from 9 to 57 per cent on plain fabrics containing not higher than No. 30 yarns. Certainly this represents goods that have successfully gone into market distribution. Why are the conversion costs, which are the actual costs, ignored? Particularly when they are actually known after an investigation. The only excuse Mr. UNDERWOOD can give for comparing the difference in labor cost alone is that the Republican Party used that basis as an argument for its intended tariff making four years ago, which on further investigation it had to abandon.

The proposed reductions will not cheapen the great mass of fabrics for the consumer. It will transfer the business on a great part of the fabrics used from the United States to England. The retailer will still get his profits, and so will the middleman who remains in business. The interference with business as a result of these proposed tariff rates is already greater than it should have been. The Ways and Means Committee, in justification of its low rates, claim it has reduced the cotton cloth tariff from 42.74 to 26.69 per cent. The absurdity of this statement can be seen (yet it is made broadcast throughout the country) when it is known that these figures are based on the small amount of importations during 1912, which were fine goods and which were already coming in in a competitive way with American-made materials and amounted to but 2 per cent of the distribution.

With the new rates the real reductions are so great that the average is *16.23 per cent.* This is injustice. The rates should be compared with the known distribution of fabrics used in the industry in this country. This shows to business men a strong reason for a permanent tariff commission or tariff board for the study and elucidation of the various phases of trade. It is because politicians are apt to think more of their constituents than of the welfare of the country in tariff making that such strong political changes are witnessed from year to year. But, as President Wilson said prior to election on September 21 last, "For there is a God in the heaven; there is justice in the souls of men." So I say let justice be done to the hundreds of thousands of mill workers dependent upon a successful continuation of business in the many branches of the cotton industry, as well as those who have built up the industry and asked only that the rates be fair.

—

LETTER TO THE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS.

APRIL 12, 1913.

Hon. A. MITCHELL PALMER,
Chairman Democratic Caucus, House of Representatives, Washington D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the annual meeting of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, held this day, a committee was appointed to present to the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives a protest on behalf of the cotton manufacturers of the United States against the rates proposed in the bill known as H. R. 10, introduced on April 7, 1913, by Hon. O. W. UNDERWOOD and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

This association begs to present to your body a resolution adopted by it at its meeting held in April, 1912, which resolution reads as follows:

"That this association records itself as favoring such reasonable revision of the cotton schedule, based upon differences in cost of production and other conditions, at home and abroad, as shall be consistent with the raising of revenue and the conservation of our home markets."

At a subsequent meeting of the tariff committee appointed by this association the following resolution was also adopted:

"We favor the reasonable revision of the cotton schedule based upon figures at which importations are actually being made and can be made, as shown by the comparative manufacturers' selling price at home and abroad, as shall be consistent with the raising of revenue and conservation of our home markets."

Acting upon this resolution, the tariff committee, at public hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, presented from time to time statements, in which this association, with frankness and at length, gave information with regard to conditions affecting the industry and suggested such reductions as in the judgment of the association could be consistently made without injury to the domestic industry of cotton manufacturing, and at the same time in consistency with the policy of reasonable downward revision and tariff for revenue.

We recognize the propriety of there being adopted at this time such provision in the tariff as would bring domestic and foreign manufacturers into competitive relation.

To the best of our belief the schedules suggested by this association to the Ways and Means Committee contained the lowest rates which could be in reason adopted without danger of injury to the industry of cotton manufacturing in this country.

We recognize, of course, that any suggestions made by ourselves are necessarily addressed to the discretion of the honorable committee charged with the consideration of the subject, and we can only say that we have with perfect frankness presented to the committee all information bearing upon the subject which could be obtained by us. We have not asked the committee to accept our unconfirmed statements upon these subjects, but we have in every instance referred the committee to the findings of the Tariff Board, confirming and proving the correctness of the statements made by ourselves to the committee. In addition, we supplied the committee with other authoritative data, fully confirming the statements of the representatives of the association.

It is therefore with the greatest regret and consternation that we have seen the publication of rates on cotton products recommended by the Ways and Means Committee.

In all sincerity we state to your honorable body that if the rates thus suggested are made effective we believe the injury to our industry will be unparalleled.

We earnestly enter a protest against the suggested rates and state with positive conviction on our part that the effect of these rates will be to transfer a far larger proportion of cotton manufacturing from the United States to foreign fields, where cheaper labor and other favorable conditions obtain, than the Ways and Means Committee can have any conception of.

In an absolute conviction of the truth of our statements we appeal to your body not to make reduction in the rates as drastic as presented in the bill referred to, and would conclude with the statement that if the bill becomes enacted into law a condition of depression will follow in the industry of cotton manufacturing which will, in our judgment, be appalling. Cotton manufacturing is an industry confined not to one community, but distributed throughout a large portion of our country, in portions of which it is the chief industry. It is an industry in which hundreds of thousands of employees are engaged, in which there are many plants, with many thousands of stockholders.

There is absolutely an untrammeled competition between manufacturing plants in the cotton industry, so that there is no condition presented of a monopolistic industry whose control needs in any sense to be broken.

In these views we respectfully present our earnest request that further consideration be given to the cotton schedule in the bill referred to.

Very respectfully,

AMERICAN COTTON MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
W. A. ERWIN, *President.*
C. B. BRYANT, *Secretary.*

—

DAY LETTER FROM A TENNESSEE COTTON MILL COMPANY.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *April 30, 1913.*

Hon. RICHARD W. AUSTIN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We beg to protest against the adoption of the present proposed tariff rates on cotton goods. The American Cotton Manufacturers' Association rates were placed before the committee sincerely and honestly, and are as low as the industry can stand without being permanently injured. If the proposed rates are passed, wages must be reduced and the industry seriously injured, much of it wiped out. Please save us by voting for the amendments that will embrace rates proposed by the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association.

WARIOTO COTTON MILLS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALLIN].

Mr. WALLIN. Mr. Chairman, a little later I wish to offer an amendment to paragraph 266 of the bill. I do this in behalf of the great industry known as the cotton knit-underwear industry. In this industry there are about 800 factories scattered throughout the United States. Some of them are very small. Seventy-five thousand people are employed in these mills, and they pay out annually over $35,000,000 in wages. In the bill that first came before the House, in this paragraph, there was a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem. That has now been changed to 30 per cent. The committee evidently thought that 25 per cent was too low, and it was right. Twenty-five per cent was too low, and 30 is too low. I hope the committee will raise it a little and give these industries opportunity to become accustomed to this close competition about which we hear so much. Whenever a doubt exists, as it evidently did with the committee in this case, I believe the preference should be given to American workers and business men, rather than to foreign labor and foreign capital.

I have figures showing the different rates of wages paid here and abroad with the hours of labor, and so forth, and I will ask to have them printed in the RECORD with my remarks, and yield back the remainder of my time.

The statements referred to are as follows:

NEW YORK CITY, *April 4, 1913.*

The PRESIDENT,
Executive Offices, Washington, D. C.:

Reliable information has reached our association that it is the intention of the Ways and Means Committee to change the present tariff rates on cotton knit underwear to 30 per cent.

This drastic change means the decline of the cotton knit-underwear industry in the United States, and the amount of business which the

foreign manufacturer can do with this rate of tariff will be limited only to their facilities for manufacturing goods for our market.

Without regard to politics thousands of voters in this country were influenced by your declaration that "No legitimate industry need fear your election."

This statement was accepted in entire good faith by a great number of your fellow citizens, among whom were thousands of our own work people. We are therefore unwilling to believe that the effects of the drastic change proposed can be understood either by yourself or the individual members of the Ways and Means Committee.

The chief competition which we have to fear is from Germany and France.

To give you some idea of the rate of wages paid in those countries we quote from the report of United States consular agent, George A. Makinson, Sorau, Saxony, as follows:

"The men and women weavers generally work by the piece, and earn $2.75 to $3.25 per week; master weavers, exclusively men, earn $3.50 to $4.50; spooling, twisting, throwing, and stitching are in charge of women, who are paid $1.90 to $3 per week; half-timers, boys and girls over 16 years, engaged in miscellaneous light work, receive 75 cents to $1.50 weekly."

Similar rates of wages, and even lower, are paid in France, while in Spain, see special agent series No. 46, by Ralph N. Odell, agent of Department of Commerce and Labor, covering living and working conditions of mill workers in Spain.

"Eleven hours constitute a working day, according to law, but several of the mills that I visited were running 12 hours. Work usually begins at 5.30 a. m. and ends at 6 p. m."

Spain probably employs the lowest paid labor in Europe, and in a short while our work people would be in direct competition with people whose standard of living is far below the American standard.

While we hold no brief for the wage earners employed in our industry, we believe that their interest should be considered before our own, and in behalf of the 75,000 men and women employed by us and living under American conditions we urge your careful consideration of this revolutionary chance, which threatens our very existence.

We have agreed among ourselves as to that rate of tariff which would still make it possible for us to continue as manufacturers and maintain the present wage scale.

We suggest for your consideration the rates given below, which, in our opinion, will meet every condition demanded by the Ways and Means Committee:

First. The change from a combined specific and ad valorem rate to a strictly ad valorem rate, which, however, we oppose as unjust and unfair.

Second. A reduction of the present rates, which amount to from 90 per cent to 50 per cent, to a new rate which we suggest of from 50 per cent to 40 per cent.

Third. The lowest rate which would conserve the American standard of wages and at the same time give a measure of foreign competition such as we have never known in this country.

We therefore ask that the Schedule I, paragraph 266, should be amended to read as follows:

"Shirts and drawers, pants, vests, union suits, combination suits, tights, sweaters, corset covers, and all underwear of every description made wholly or in part on knitting machines, frames, or looms, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, weighing up to and including 9 pounds per dozen, 50 per cent ad valorem; weighing more than 9 pounds per dozen, 40 per cent ad valorem."

This letter is an appeal to you for the very existence of one of the most worthy American industries, and to your sense of fairness, to give our committee an opportunity to demonstrate the vicious effect that the reduction proposed would have upon the existing prosperity and success of the knit underwear manufacturers of the United States.

A copy of this letter is being mailed to each member of the Ways and Means committee of the House and to each member of the Finance Committee of the Senate.

Respectfully submitted.

KNIT UNDERWEAR MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
Per Jos. Feldenheimer, Secretary-Treasurer; Andrew Frey, President, Utica, N. Y.; Clifton P. Baker, Boston, Mass.; L. M. Flesh, Piqua, Ohio; P. H. Hanes, Winston-Salem, N. C.; W. C. Spaulding, Minneapolis, Minn.; Henry S. Cooper, Kenosha, Wis.; W. C. Ruffin, Mayodan, N. C.; Harry Querns, Philadelphia, Pa.; Nathan Hatch, Albany, N. Y.; William Sloane, Norfolk, Va.; Edward H. Clift, New York City; John K. Stewart, Amsterdam, N. Y.; J. W. Hanson, Macon, Ga.; Geo. W. Kavanaugh, Waterford, N. Y.

RELATING TO SCHEDULE I, PARAGRAPH 329, ACT OF AUGUST 5, 1909.

JANUARY, 1913.

SIR: The cotton-underwear manufacturers' tariff committee of the National Association of Hosiery and Underwear Manufacturers, representing manufacturers engaged in the knitting industry in nearly every State in the Union, submit for the consideration of your committee some statements, which we trust will receive full and careful consideration.

The present tariff rates are exactly the same under the Payne law as they were under the Dingley law, there having been no change or increase of rates whatsoever, and we ask that the present rates shall remain unchanged.

Our business is one that can be engaged in by small manufacturers with limited means in almost any community.

There are about 800 concerns engaged in the manufacture of knitted cotton underwear scattered all over the United States doing a total business of over $60,000,000. The amount of wages paid out by these 800 concerns represents fully 50 per cent to 75 per cent of the total, or about $35,000,000.

There has never been a trust or combination formed by manufacturers in our branch of the knitting industry for the purpose of controlling either selling price or output, and we do not believe that a trust, combination, or monopoly would be possible owing to the small amount of money it takes to engage in the knitting business.

Furthermore, there is no American industry in which competition is so keen and returns from investment or enterprise so unsatisfactory; as a proof of this statement we can point to at least 125 failures in the knit-underwear business within recent years.

We enjoy no advantages on account of being nearer the source of our raw material than foreign manufacturers, as cotton can be delivered as cheaply in Hamburg, Havre, or Barcelona as it can be delivered in the leading manufacturing cities of this country.

We enjoy no advantage owing to the use of special and more rapid machinery, inasmuch as the foreigners have adopted and are building the same class of knitting and sewing machinery that we use.

The present rate of duty is absolutely essential to the continued existence of manufacturers in our line. Any lowering of the rate would result eventually in the closing down of the mills of this country, throwing out of employment thousands of wage earners, who receive compensation three to four times as great as the same class of employees receive in foreign countries, where the help are better trained and more settled.

Skilled sewing-machine operators in this country earn from $1.50 to $2.50 per day. Other classes of labor, such as winders, knitters, and general help earn fully three to four times as much as similar classes of help in France, Germany, or Spain, and we know from the prices paid for knitted underwear sold in the West Indies and the Latin-American countries to the exclusion of American goods that if the tariff were lowered it would be possible to bring into the United States an unlimited quantity of goods which would undersell the cheapest of the American products.

The rates of duty should not be based alone upon the difference in labor costs of manufacturing and greater expense of doing business in this country as compared with foreign countries, but should also take into consideration the higher rates of interest, the greater cost of installation.

The cost of building and equipping a cotton underwear mill in the United States is fully 70 per cent greater than in Europe; therefore a mill constructed and equipped abroad with a capital of $100,000 could not be duplicated in the United States for less than $170,000. This would result in a corresponding reduction of general expense in favor of the foreign manufacturer.

The foundation of all these higher costs for construction, equipment, and maintenance lies in the higher wages paid to American artisans and laborers in the building, mechanical, and other trades and industries drawn upon by American manufacturers, and are most important factors in the cost of production.

If the tariff should be reduced the jobber and retailer would give preference to foreign goods, but the *consumer buying the foreign article would still pay the fixed retail selling price; thus there would be no advantage whatever to the consumer but a greater profit to the retailer.*

At this point we wish to emphasize the fact that in spite of *the increased cost of living, the quality of our class of manufacture has steadily improved, but the fixed selling prices to the consumer for the past 20 years have remained the same.*

The concerns engaged in this line of business use great quantities of cotton yarns, spun largely in the Southern and Eastern States; pearl buttons, cotton fabrics, bindings, cardboard, and many small wares from other sections of the United States, and these industries would likewise be adversely affected by the lowering of the present rate.

Furthermore, the American manufacturer would be compelled to curtail output as importations increase, and in a short while all these industries would be removed from this country to foreign countries.

Of course we always have the alternative of reducing wages to offset the cheap labor, greater number of working hours, and lower standard of living which obtain in foreign countries, applying to our own as well as the collateral branches named; but we can not believe that it is the intention or desire of your committee to inflict such conditions upon our workpeople, and, as American citizens, we hope that such will not be done.

We urge upon you that a specific duty is absolutely necessary in fairness to our industry, in which there are so many grades and classifications of goods, and also for the reason that an exclusive ad valorem duty makes it possible for the foreign manufacturer to use our market as a dumping ground, disturbing conditions in this country, which a specific duty will prevent, and at the same time eliminate the opportunity for undervaluation.

In conclusion, we invite the closest investigation of our statements, and we stand ready to prove the facts which we have set forth.

Respectfully submitted.

Andrew Frey, chairman, Utica, N. Y.; Clifton P. Baker, Boston, Mass.; L. M. Flesh, Piqua, Ohio; P. H. Hanes, Winston-Salem, N. C.; W. C. Spaulding, Minneapolis, Minn.; Henry S. Cooper, Kenosha, Wis.; W. C. Ruffin, Mayodan, N. C.; Harry Querns, Philadelphia; Nathan Hatch, Albany, N. Y.; William Sloane, Norfolk, Va.; Edward H. Clift, New York City; John K. Stewart, Amsterdam, N. Y.; J. W. Hanson, Macon, Ga.; George W. Kavanaugh, Waterford, N. Y.; Joseph Feldenheimer, secretary, Philadelphia.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish I had sufficient time to say all I would like to say on this schedule. I will take the time to say this, that in the United States there are 29,500,000 spindles in our cotton mills. In England there are 54,200,000 spindles in their cotton mills. We supply England with practically all her raw cotton, and with her 54,200,000 spindles she consumed last year three and a half million bales of cotton, and with our 29,500,000 spindles we consumed nearly 5,000,000 bales of cotton, showing that our cotton has gone abroad and found cheap labor that makes the finest grades of goods. According to the census report there are 1,306 cotton mills in the United States, 669 of which are located in the Southern States and 637 in the Northern States. In the cotton mills the average wage is $265 per year for 300 days' work. In the States of North and South Carolina 428 out of 669 cotton mills are located, or 64½ per cent of all the cotton mills in the South. In the States of North Carolina and South Carolina 61½ per cent of all the employees in the southern cotton mills are found. The wages in the cotton mills of North Carolina and South Carolina are 85½ cents per day, figuring 300 days for a year's work, while in the North the wages are $1.36 a day; yet Mr. Parker, president of 16 factories, I believe, all located in those two States, North and South Carolina, came before the Committee on Ways and

Means and recommended lower rates of duty on cotton goods, and said with the rates recommended by him the mills of the South could run and compete with the mills of Europe. When asked whether or not there was any difference in the wage scale between the South and the North in cotton mills, he said there was not. He was mistaken, sadly mistaken. My friends, I want to have read in my time, if you please, a letter which I have just received.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. RUSSELL). Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., *April 27, 1913.*

Hon. J. MITCHELL PALMER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I notice in a quotation from your speech on tariff matters you say "some of the manufacturers may close down out of spite, etc."; this regarding principally the textile factories.

Why do not you and those who believe with you that we can compete successfully with foreign manufacturers arrange to take over these concerns as fast as they close—as they did in 1894–1899—and demonstrate the practicability of your theories?

With Mr. Redfield, you could organize a syndicate to do this, getting those brainy, financial men of Texas and the South to join with you and "prove up." This is where you failed before and thus lost out to the protectionists. Get in ahead of them this time, as they will certainly close down—some have already done so, more will, and we will have thousands out of employment and the scene of those days be reenacted.

That great business element of the South has never had a chance to "show us," as they say in Missouri, what they can do along manufacturing lines, and now is your and their chance.

With the extraordinary high cost of manufactured goods to-day no wonder the people have authorized you to take over the Government. Think of it! We have to pay as high as $15 to have a suit made to order right here in industrial Detroit; 10 to 15 cents for socks; even calico, the favorite garbing of our southern women, costs them here 5 cents a yard; ginghams, from 7 to 10 cents a yard; can't get a decent piece of underwear for less than 25 cents, while we are forced to pay 5 cents for two papers of pins! And nails—just think of it—cost our carpenters 2 cents per pound, and they are only getting from four to five dollars a day to drive them, though there is a prospect of their getting decent wages, as they are demanding a raise right now.

Just think of it! Our housewives can't get a sewing machine under $12.50, though it is warranted for 10 years, with all attachments. Forty-five per cent tariff on these; awful! And think what the housewife has to pay for her sugar right now—11 pounds for 50 cents. Such extortion! Our beet-sugar magnates holding up the wholesale price at $4.35 per 100 pounds. Why, I can recollect way back in the good old days of the Walker tariff—I am 79 now—when all calico cost me for wife's dress was 12½ cents a yard. Nails were 6 cents per pound. To be sure I got $1.75 a day for driving them. Then the farmer's wife brought in 20 dozen eggs to the storekeeper and exchanged them for 8 yards of calico for a dress, or paid for it with butter at 8 cents, or a dozen of chickens at $1.25, while now she can buy a whole dress for less than one of her chickens. Its outrageous the way we are being robbed by this awful tariff. A whole hen now of respectable size she is paid about $1 for, while the eggs she brings in in her auto, the 20 dozen, will buy her a silk-dress pattern. No wonder the common people are kicking at such prices as we are forced to pay to the trusts. Why, our bricklayers are only getting $6 a day here, but as they are going to demand a raise perhaps they will be better paid when you knock out the iniquitous Payne-Aldrich bill. Do you note how much cheaper print paper is since it was put on the free list from Canada? I have not heard any paper boasting about it, but the Canadian paper maker is putting the tariff in his pocket, I understand, instead of it going into our Treasury. But I am glad to note one thing in your new bill, borax goes back on the free list, from which the Payne-Aldrich bill took it and put on a tariff of 2 cents per pound, when, to the wonder and consternation of toolmakers, the price actually went down 50 per cent. "Do I sleep, do I dream, are there visions about, is protection a failure, and to be wiped out?" a la Bret Harte. But do not forget, while relieving the workingman, that you will take off the internal-revenue tax on butter substitutes, that 10 cents per pound when colored and the lighter tax when plain. I do not think you can cheapen calicos and muslins, socks or underwear, but you can cheapen this substitute for cow butter very much to the poor man, as it actually increases the cost of it. Now, do try and take over the factories your bill will close, and show the American people that you can not only compete with all the world but drive them out of their market, both here and abroad.

I would like to have the whole of your speech, but will have to be satisfied with the short extract from which I quote.

Respectfully,
H. PARKER,
512 Fourth Street, Detroit, Mich.

During the reading of the letter,

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Illinois for sufficient time to finish reading the letter. It will take but a minute or two more.

Mr. MANN. I yield the gentleman one minute additional.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yield enough to have the letter finished; it is very good; it is extraordinary; it states facts. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise not so much to ask for the protection of cotton mills which now exist in Oklahoma as to plead for legislation which will bring cotton mills into existence in our new State.

If judged by the number of its cotton mills at present Oklahoma would have no great interest in this schedule, but if judged by the possibilities of having cotton mills in the future, Oklahoma is deeply and vitally interested in this schedule.

The census of 1910 shows that in 1909 Oklahoma cultivated to cotton 1,976,935 acres of land, on which was produced 555,742 bales of cotton, which was valued at $35,399,356. But seven States in the Union produced more cotton in 1909 than Oklahoma. The raising of cotton is one of the chief industries of our State, and contributes largely to the wealth of our people.

Agriculture is the chief industry in Oklahoma.

As I have said before on this floor, Oklahoma is, however, capable of becoming a great manufacturing State.

In a recent bulletin issued by the Bureau of the Census referring to the manufacturing interests of Oklahoma it was said:

A marked increase in the independent industrial activities of the State commenced with the development of the old fields in 1907 and the discovery of natural gas. This cheap fuel has attracted manufacturers who have established a number of new enterprises. An abundance of coal and lumber and the location of such minerals as gypsum, cement rock, asphalt, granite, limestone, and zinc have further stimulated manufactures. In 1899 the total value of manufactured products amounted to only $8,133,000, as compared with $24,459,000 in 1904 and $53,682,000 in 1909.

There were in Oklahoma at that time 2,310 manufacturing establishments, employing 18,034 persons, including proprietors, salaried employees, and wage earners. Thirty-eight million eight hundred and seventy-three thousand dollars of capital were invested. In wages and salaries these manufacturing establishments paid out $9,285,000.

The bulletin issued by the Census Bureau on Oklahoma does not report a single cotton factory. However, there are a few cotton factories in the State at the present time.

Oklahoma is a large producer of raw cotton. She has almost an unlimited supply of cheap fuel. Her coal fields are extensive and almost inexhaustible. Natural gas exists in such abundance as to give promise of lasting for an indefinite time. Her oil fields in extent and productiveness are hardly surpassed in any State of the Union. There are few, if any, States in the Union better supplied with fuel than Oklahoma. Cheap fuel is one of the primary elements in developing and maintaining industries.

While I shall have the honor to in part represent the State of Oklahoma in this Congress, I shall deem it my duty to vote for national legislation which I think will contribute in the largest degree to the material growth and development of my own State.

The provisions of this bill are intended, as I understand it, to invite and secure competition in manufacturing lines from foregn countries. The Ways and Means Committee, in their report, estimate that in every line of manufacture the reduction of the tariff duty will largely increase the importations to this country from abroad.

The importation of additional cotton goods from abroad will not encourage the establishment of cotton mills in my State. Competition from abroad in cotton goods will not tend to develop cotton factories in Oklahoma. The policy which this bill inaugurates will not encourage men with capital to come to Oklahoma and invest their money in the building and operating of cotton manufacturing establishments.

And what I say of cotton factories is, of course, true of any and all other kinds of manufacturing establishments. I believe that the provisions of this bill if enacted into law will retard the development of Oklahoma in the line of manufacturing industries.

The largest city in our State, Oklahoma City, the capital of the State and the commercial center of the State, I am proud to say, is in my district. The daily papers of that city frequently call attention to the importance of securing for that city mills and manufacturing establishments. Not long ago I read in one of those papers an article telling of the steps which were being taken by some enterprising citizens to establish in Oklahoma City a great cotton factory that would bring millions of money to the city, give employment to thousands of intelligent workingmen, and thus contribute to the prosperity of citizens of the city regardless of their business or occupation.

There is not a city in Oklahoma that would not give a reasonable cash bonus to secure a cotton mill or any other important manufacturing industry. Will the reduction of our tariff, the opening of our markets to foreign products, the increase of competition by the sale of goods manufactured abroad—will these things encourage the investment of capital in new mills in Oklahoma or elsewhere in this country? Certainly not.

I am therefore in favor of national legislation that will aid my own State in its material development, that will encourage the founding of new industries within its borders, that will add to its wealth and population and multiply the blessings enjoyed by all our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman on the other side will use some of his time. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Sixteen minutes, as the Chair has kept it.

Mr. PETERS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, cotton manufacturing is a great industry in the State where I live and the district which I represent. We not only have factories that produce the common, coarser grade of goods, but in the city I live in and in other parts of my district there are factories that produce the finer grades of goods.

There have come to me but few objections to this bill. These people who have erected those factories, the native people, the Georgians, are not protectionists. They are Democrats in every sense of the word. They believe in the Democratic doctrine of a tariff for revenue, and not a tariff for protection. It is true there have been a few who have left the Democratic Party upon the matter of the tariff, but they were men who cared more for their own personal fortune than they did for the interests of the entire country.

I hold in my hand a letter just received from the president of a cotton factory in my district, and I propose to read it. We are not to be lured from our devotion to the party to which all these men belong by saying that we are to be benefited by maintaining upon the statute books a tariff such as now is carried upon the goods that they produce. A majority of the cotton manufacturers in the State of Georgia, while they may believe, some of them, that the rates of this bill are too low—I do not blame them for wanting the rates as high as they can get them, whether they manufacture cotton goods or whether they manufacture woolen goods—but the cotton manufacturers of the State are not devoted to these highly protected goods and do not ask for them. This is the letter to which I refer:

> We are noticing the tariff agitation with a good deal of interest, and, while we are Democrats and standing by the party, we hope you will try and make things as light on us as possible. We do not propose going Republican even if our business is damaged. We had arranged capital to double our plant, and while we have been compelled to suspend for the present we really believe we are going to stay in business and do our building at an early date.

That is but an indication that an attempt has been made to frighten these people, and they are not to be driven from their party allegiance by an effort to say that their business is to be destroyed.

Now, I want to call attention to another fact. The chief cost of erecting a factory in the South is in the cotton machinery, which is 50 per cent of the cost.

I read from a cotton manufacturer in my State who is as well posted as anybody, and he says:

> These burdens, particularly in the matter of high cost of machinery, are probably the most serious which American mills must contend with. Practically the direct effect of the high cost of machinery makes it necessary to employ almost double the capital needed in establishing foreign mills, and American mills must earn from 60 to 80 per cent more per spindle in order to secure a fair return on the investment over European mills.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes more to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Now, after going through the various costs of cotton machinery per spindle, and how much it costs in this country, and how much in England and Germany, he says:

> Cheaper machinery will place this country nearer on a parity with foreign competitors and enable us to better compete with them in the struggle for foreign trade.

Now, what have we done in this bill? The Republicans put in the basket clause 45 per cent on mill machinery, and because of that tax of 45 per cent on mill machinery it has cost the cotton manufacturer, when he built a mill in the South, an amount equivalent to 50 per cent of the cost of the factory. And, says this man, Mr. G. Gunby Jordan, of the Phoenix Mill, in Columbus, Ga., who knows what he is talking about and who has had as wide an experience as any man in the South, that cheaper machinery will place the manufacturers of the South nearer on a parity with their foreign competitors and enable them better to compete with them in the struggle for the foreign trade.

And, at last it is the foreign trade that the people who manufacture cotton goods in the South are seeking. Take off the tax, as we have done in this bill, reduce the tariff upon cotton mill machinery from 45 to 25 per cent, cut it in two, reduce the rates upon the indigo and the other dyes they use, giving them a fair chance in the markets of the world, and they do not need any protection upon their goods and do not ask for it.

Mr. Chairman, one other word. It was stated here in a debate this morning by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], whom I do not see present, in a reply that he made to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS], that Georgia had no law upon its statute books in reference to the employment of children in its factories. On the impulse of the moment, when he named Georgia as one of those States, I said that that was not true, and it is not true. I had occasion to call attention to that fact in the last session of Congress in reply to the gentleman from New York, Mr. Michael E. Driscoll, who made the same statement in reference to the State of Georgia. Now, I am not familiar with the laws of the other Southern States on that subject, but I put in the RECORD last year the laws of the State of Georgia on that subject, in which I showed and demonstrated that the people of Georgia in 1889 had had the laws placed upon their statute books which prohibited the employment of children in factories under a certain age.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, if I have time; yes.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I would like to inquire if you have in Georgia a board of inspectors whose duty it is to visit your mills and see that the law is complied with?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes, I will answer the gentleman. And not only that, but by statute the grand jury twice every year especially investigates the question of the enforcement of the law and reports results to the court. In the city where I live I have seen men indicted and convicted for the violation of that law.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I am glad to hear of that, because that is an advance.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes. And I will say to the gentleman that I have read the laws of his State in reference to this matter, and we in Georgia have in great measure copied the laws of Massachusetts in that matter.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Every other State could do it with advantage, too.

Mr. BARTLETT. Massachusetts has led the way often and often again in the enactment of good laws, and we are not ashamed to follow them when they are good. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to be anything of an expert upon the technicalities of the cotton schedule, and I shall not discuss this schedule in the manner in which it has been discussed by minority members of the committee here with regard to its details; but I want to call attention to a few general propositions with respect to this particular schedule.

The history of tariff revisions during the past few years makes the questions arising out of the revision of Schedule I amongst the most interesting in all the work of tariff changes, because it is what happened to Schedule I and what did not happen to Schedule K that so incensed the public mind that the people began digging into the entire Payne law, until it was condemned from cover to cover in this country from ocean to ocean.

Despite the fact that a Republican President had declared that Schedule K was indefensible; despite the fact that no satisfactory testimony was offered to the Committee on Ways and Means to justify the retention of the then existing rates, much less increases in the rates, Schedule K was permitted to be rewritten in the law under the Payne revision in exactly the form that it had been upon the statute books for generations. Schedule I fared even better, for while seeming reductions were made in Schedule I in the House, when it reached another branch of the American Congress it was so manipulated that had it not been for the unceasing activity of some patriotic and hard-working statesmen over there the country would never have waked up to the discovery that the cotton manufacturers of the country were protected under the Payne-Aldrich revision to a very much higher degree than they had been under the previous law.

Anybody who wants to get an interesting side light on recent Republican methods of revising tariffs ought to read a little volume which was published about four years ago, entitled "The speeches of ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE in the United States Senate," for in that work he showed how the cotton manufacturers had entered the Senate of the United States and indirectly were able to accomplish what plain persuasion and arguments never would have accomplished before the Ways and Means Committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

I think I am well within the mark when I say that to these two causes—the failure to make any change in Schedule K and the willingness to make changes indirectly and by subterfuge in Schedule I, in the interest of the cotton manufacturers of the country—was due more than to any other thing the universal

condemnation by the people which followed the enactment of the Payne law.

Another interesting thing about this schedule is that the recent history of its proposed revision reveals in a striking way the real attitude of the old-fashioned protection Republicans upon this much-advertised Tariff Board proposition. The Tariff Board, named by a Republican President, conceived by Republican legislators in this House, and born in an appropriation bill, went to work upon the cotton industry, and finally made quite a voluminous report. After it had been made, one of the most distinguished members of the Ways and Means Committee in the last Congress and one of the most able tariff makers who has sat in this House certainly during my time, went to work upon this Schedule I with the intent and purpose of writing a bill which would be in exact accordance with the findings of the tariff board which he and other Republican Members had defended and which his President had appointed. The gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. Hill, who is no longer a Member of this House, but whose ability to construct tariff legislation with accuracy and regard for the facts from his point of view—I mean with regard to the principle upon which Republicans would write a law—no man will gainsay, and whose industry, capacity for work, and desire to do what in good faith he started out to accomplish no man in the House will criticize—this gentleman prepared a revision of Schedule I in collaboration with experts who worked for the Tariff Board.

He had the assistance not only of the experts of the Tariff Board, who really did the work for this Tariff Board, but he sat day and night with the distinguished Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Curtis, who is in the Treasury Department in charge of the administration of the customs laws, and who is himself a considerable expert, than whom perhaps no man in the country could better say whether the language of the proposed bill was in exact accordance with the recommendations of the Tariff Board. With all this help, Mr. Hill wrote and finally introduced his cotton schedule revision bill.

Well, one day, just when the gentlemen on the other side were criticizing us because in writing our metal schedule bill we refused to wait until the Tariff Board had come in with its report, when they were criticizing us because we reported a Schedule K revision which did not take into consideration any of the findings of the Tariff Board, Mr. Hill brought his bill into the Ways and Means Committee and offered it as a substitute for the Underwood bill, because, as he said, having stood for a Tariff Board and his party having stood for a Tariff Board he wanted to present a bill which was in exact accord with the Tariff Board's report. He submitted it as a Republican Tariff Board substitute for the Underwood cotton-revision bill, and my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], would not vote for it, and every Republican member of the committee, with the exception of Mr. Hill, repudiated it absolutely. Why they did so I do not know, except that they are not prepared or ready to follow a Tariff Board, even of their own creation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER. Here is a telegram from the president of the Tariff Board:

HARTFORD, CONN., *April 18, 1913.*

Hon AUGUSTUS H. GARDNER, *Washington, D. C.:*

Mr. Hill received assistance from staff of Tariff Board in preparation of his bill, but the bill was never officially considered by the board. Personally, I was too busy at the moment to consider his rates in relation to our report, and the same was true of most members. I stated to him throughout that I was not prepared to indorse it without further consideration. You can use this, but will try to write more detailed statement.

HENRY C. EMERY.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman will agree with what I have said about his distinguished fellow citizen of Massachusetts, Mr. Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Curtis, will he not?

Mr. GARDNER. Except that I have always understood he was a Democrat. He is an excellent man, even as a Democrat.

Mr. PALMER. He will agree with me in saying that no man in the country perhaps, or certainly in the public service, is better qualified to determine how the language of a proposed act will conform with the findings of any other board of the public service?

Mr. GARDNER. If it were not for the fact that we had found in that table 18 absolute mistakes in figuring, we might agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALMER. I should like a little more time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. PALMER. I am not quite clear, from the gentleman's statement, whether it is the Tariff Board schedule in which he has discovered the 18 mistakes or Mr. Hill's table or Mr. Curtis's table, and I have as much confidence in Mr. Curtis's ability to decide a question of this kind as I have even in the ability of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. He says that the bill was written just as closely as language could make it in accordance with the report of the Tariff Board. Mr. Hill believed so, and his opinion would have as much weight with me as that of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I yield.

Mr. GARDNER. Can the gentleman quote from the RECORD any such statement from Mr. Curtis, and couple it with the statement he made that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] voted against that bill?

Mr. PALMER. I do not quite understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman said Mr. PAYNE voted against the Hill bill on the floor of the House.

Mr. PALMER. No; I said Mr. Hill offered this bill in the Committee on Ways and Means and it got his vote, and he could not get anybody else to vote for it.

Mr. GARDNER. But the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] voted for it on the floor of the House, and the gentleman knew it.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman is mistaken about that. I declined to vote on the ground that I had never seen the bill until it was read in the committee, and because it was nearly all ad valorem rates.

Mr. PALMER. I do not think the gentleman will dispute the accuracy of my relation of it.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. PALMER. I do not want to do the gentleman an injustice. I am not excusing or justifying the action of the gentleman from New York or anybody else on that side; I am simply commenting on the fact that the Tariff Board revision of the cotton schedule, in spite of all we have heard about the infallibility of such a commission, could not receive the vote of more than one member of the Ways and Means Committee in the Sixty-second Congress.

Now, it seems to me, in view of that kind of history, that it is about time that we heard less about the Republican desire to have a tariff board prepare legislation for the body which is charged by the Constitution with the duty of preparing such legislation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I think this is very illuminating, and I wish the gentleman would go on with his narration as to the cotton-schedule bill. What became of the bill which came out of the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. KITCHIN. May I interrupt the gentleman? The gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. Hill, produced a substitute in this House—the Hill bill. Did not the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE], who is now a Republican, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], now a Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] all vote for it?

Mr. PALMER. I can not speak about the number of Members who voted for it. I will simply say that Mr. Hill, relying as a sincere man would, having stated that the Tariff Board was a proper thing in revenue legislation, upon the report of that board, appealed from his fellow members of the Ways and Means Committee and went upon the floor of the House with his bill, where the miserable support he got for it was the most severe condemnation of the Tariff Board that has ever been uttered in the country.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is not the gentleman incorrect about the support it received?

Mr. PALMER. Well, it was inconsiderable.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Are not the rates that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has brought in nearer the Hill bill than the bill you bring in to-day is nearer the bill you had last year?

Mr. PALMER. Oh, that is beside the question.

Mr. AUSTIN. If the gentleman will pardon me, I think he will find that every Republican on this side of the House voted for the bill except the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE], Mr. Ames, of Massachusetts, and myself.

Mr. PALMER. That may be true; and if I said it was inconsiderable support I will say that it would have been much more considerable if the gentleman from Tennessee had voted for it. [Laughter.]

Mr. AUSTIN. I am a standpatter from Standpattersville.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman is not for a tariff board?

Mr. AUSTIN. If it is right, I am; and if it is wrong, I am not.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman from Tennessee voted against the Hill bill because the rates were a good deal lower than the rates in this Underwood bill, and you thought it would destroy all the industries of the country?

Mr. AUSTIN. I voted against both the Hill bill and the Underwood bill because the rates were not high enough.

Mr. KITCHIN. They were lower than the Underwood bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. I voted against both because the duties were too low.

Mr. KITCHIN. Were not the rates in the Hill bill lower than in the Underwood bill?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not know.

Mr. PALMER. Now, Mr. Chairman, if gentlemen are willing, I would like to make my speech myself. [Laughter.] I want to discuss, as I said in the beginning, the schedule in a somewhat general way. We have heard from our friends from New England, as, indeed, we have heard from other parts of the country, from the friends of the cotton manufacturers, that this revision of the cotton schedule will ruin them, will put their mills out of business; and I suppose we have heard as awful things about the dire effects of the revision with respect to this schedule as we have with respect to any in the whole tariff bill. According to the census reports, the total production in this country of all the articles covered by Schedule I amounts to $1,500,000,000 in round figures. Of course, it is possible that the census has duplicated many of them; but as near as we can get at it, speaking in round terms, $1,500,000,000 worth of these goods are made in America. If that figure, by reason of duplications in the census reports, is high, it does not change the force of the argument I make, except in slight degree. Last year the imports amounted to $24,358,360, which was 1½ per cent, or to be exact, 1.58 per cent, of the total American production in 1910 of the articles covered in this schedule, and the exports during the same year were $50,769,511, or $26,000,000 more than the imports.

Mr. AUSTIN rose.

Mr. PALMER. I can not yield just now.

Mr. AUSTIN. I just want to correct the gentleman's figures.

Mr. PALMER. I will yield if the gentleman thinks I have made a mistake in my figures.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman's figures on the exports are correct, but Mr. O. P. Austin gave me the imports as being something over $63,000,000, and he gave them to me to-day.

Mr. PALMER. That is a mistake.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has deducted from that the laces, which we do not make here, amounting to $37,000,000 of these $63,000,000. Deduct that $37,000,000 and that leaves $26,000,000 for cloths and yarns.

Mr. PALMER. Yes. I am discussing the imports of the kind of articles covered by Schedule I in the present bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. They contain laces.

Mr. PALMER. They are not in Schedule I.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then you have transferred them?

Mr. PALMER. That is true. The gentleman ought to keep up with the march of events.

Mr. AUSTIN. You change them so often it is hard to do that.

Mr. PALMER. The point I am making is this: While it is easily possible that in readjusting rates over an entire industry in the country we might make such a change as would bring some distress to one particular mill here or there, yet we can not, in legislating for 100,000,000 people and a country as great as this Republic, stop because here and there a pin may be put down where somebody is going to squeal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, when the Underwood tariff bills were prepared in the Sixty-second Congress we were anxious to know as accurately as we could find out what would be the effect of the reduced rates on imports, and we had estimates of imports and the revenues resulting therefrom made, not by the Committee on Ways and Means, but by experts in the Treasury Department.

As was shown in our first report, when the Underwood bill providing for a revision of the woolen schedule came into the House, those estimates were made by experts in the Treasury Department, then controlled by the Republican Party, and they based their estimates upon a system of calculation which had been in vogue in the Treasury Department in making such estimates for many years. They figured the effect of the reduced rates in the Dingley law and made calculations in advance. They figured the effect of such reductions as appeared in the Payne law, and made calculations in advance as to probable imports, and the amount of the imports which followed the changes in the Dingley law and in the Payne law came so close to the estimates made by these experts before the laws were put upon the statute books that it is a safe conclusion to assert that the basis which they adopted was a conservative and proper one. These same gentlemen, figuring in exactly the same way, make the estimate that under the present reduction of Schedule I the imports by reason of the reduced rates will increase to $36,927,000—that is to say, from $24,000,000 to $36,000,000, or from $1\frac{58}{100}$ per cent to $2\frac{49}{100}$ per cent. Let me ask you if there is any man of sense and experience in this House who believes that an increase of imports of the articles covered by this schedule from 1½ per cent to 2½ per cent of the American production is going to injure or destroy the legitimate industry of cotton manufacturing in this country?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I will yield.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman, along the same line of reasoning, whether, in his judgment, the slight prospective increase in importations will materially affect the prices of these commodities?

Mr. PALMER. Well, I will get to that in a moment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Before the gentleman gets to that proposition I desire to ask him this question: Was the Underwood cotton bill a year ago, or two years ago, framed on a policy for revenue only?

Mr. PALMER. It was.

Mr. MURDOCK. Where does the present schedule differ from that Underwood bill?

Mr. PALMER. It was framed with the further thought in mind, which runs through every Democratic effort at making a tariff, that those things which are the necessities of life, even at the expense of revenue to the Government, must have duties which will modify the prices of the articles in the interest of the consumer. Now, let me go a little further, and I will answer the gentleman before I conclude. Production in this country of a billion and a half. Suppose that the merchants on Pennsylvania Avenue, here in the city of Washington, were doing a business of $1,500,000 per annum in a certain line of goods. Suppose that the merchants in the city of Baltimore were sending over into this market to the people of Washington, to compete with those merchants, $24,000 worth of goods; and then suppose that we would pass a law which would have the effect of reducing the freight rates or express tariff to such an extent that by reason of that reduced rate of transportation, which is nothing but a tariff, the Baltimore merchants would be able to increase their sales in the Washington market from $24,000 to $36,000 a year. Do you believe that those merchants on Pennsylvania Avenue, doing a business of $1,500,000, would go out of business, would close up their shops, cash in, or throw their labor out of employment because $12,000 worth of additional goods from Baltimore came in here? Why, no; you do not, and they would not. What would they do? Why, they would pay a little more attention to the efficiency of their working force. They would get up a little earlier in the morning and perhaps work a little later at night. They would devise means to attract the people so that custom should come to them and keep this competition from Baltimore down to the point of safety, and they would be content with a little less profit in order that they might keep that competition down to the point of safety, and they would be compelled—indeed, they would be glad—to sell their products at a little less profit to the Washington consumer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, that is exactly what will happen in the cotton industry. If this reduction were so low that the floodgates would be open and foreign goods would come in here in enormous quantities your mills might close down and labor might go out of employment; but if the reductions are sufficiently moderate to permit only a moderate increase of importation the only effect will be a reduction in the price of the product to the American consumer at the expense of the profits of the American manufacturer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I will yield.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman was present when Mr. Chase, of Fall River, testified to a sale of goods that he made and what he found they were selling for by the retailer. It was a statement before the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PALMER. I do not remember it. I might have been present; I do not know.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman permit me to state it?

Mr. PALMER. I really have not the time to permit the gentleman to do that.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Well, this is very important, and I should state it, I think, in line with what the gentleman said.

Mr. PALMER. I decline to yield for that purpose. The gentleman is going to state something from memory which must appear in the RECORD.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. It is what I heard—what he told me himself.

Mr. PALMER. I want to conclude by adding simply this: That that idea, if you follow it out, will run through all the line of manufactured products in this country, and labor will not be touched by reason of the reduced price of the product, because the amount of production by the American manufacturer will not be materially decreased.

Why, this $12,000,000 increase of importations can be largely absorbed in the growing population in this country, and yet the American manufacturer will be compelled to keep his price down in order to keep those imports to the point of safety for himself.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. In the illustration the gentleman has given he has spoken with the utmost fairness, I think——

Mr. PALMER. I am trying to.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. He has referred simply to the negligible increase in importations. Does he expect more than a negligible decrease in prices?

Mr. PALMER. The imports are going to be negligibly increased, because the American producer will considerably reduce the prices of his product. That is what keeps the competition down to the point of safety for the American producer. He must keep his price down or the competition from imports must be very much larger.

Mr. AUSTIN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. On pages 34 and 35 of your report, you say you are going to increase the imports to about $140,000,000. Sixty per cent of that in wages would be about $80,000,000. Would not that hurt any laboring people in this country?

Mr. PALMER. That is a fallacious argument that has sunk into the mind of my distinguished friend, who is a self-confessed, high protection standpatter, and proud opponent of the tariff board legislation, which he ought to get out of his head.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman declare that there is a trust in the cotton business?

Mr. PALMER. I have not declared so.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman declare there is a trust in the wool business?

Mr. PALMER. I have not declared so. I think there is something like a Woolen Trust.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not a fact that the price is kept down to the consumers, as far as woolen and cotton products are concerned in the United States, because there is actual competition in the industries in this country, and that mill works against mill, and the wits of one mill owner operate against the wits of another mill owner, right here in the United States?

Mr. PALMER. The answer to that is that while competition takes place at certain seasons and under certain conditions, there is another kind of competition which they do not have, which will come from the lowering of this tariff wall. The people of this country do not make all these things with equal efficiency and economy, and the manufacturers here do not make some of them as cheaply as they can be made abroad, beyond question, so that in particular lines only, not generally, this competition will take place.

Mr. MOORE. There is such competition now, is there not?

Mr. PALMER. I am not going to talk about trusts. I am trying to discuss this bill and stick to the subject without making a political speech, and I think I am succeeding fairly well. [Applause.] I just wanted to add this one thought, that in any line of industry in this country where we moderately increase imports the effect will be, as I have stated, to reduce the price of the product in order that the American producer may keep down that foreign competition to the point of safety, resulting in benefit to the American consumer. And the earnings, in all those branches of industry where that will be the result, and especially in the industry covered by the cotton schedule, have been so enormous, taken in a large and general way, that the American manufacturer can afford to reduce the price of his product and still get as a return upon the capital that he invests as much money as you and I in that or other lines of industry should expect to get or ought to have. [Applause.]

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman's time expired? I think there is a little time left.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. DONOVAN. Of course, I being an amateur, it is only an intelligent Member that I can get any information out of.

Mr. FITZGERALD. After that—after that. [Laughter.]

Mr. PALMER. After that, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. I understood the gentleman to say that our exports were $50,000,000. That is true, I think?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania familiar as to where those goods went? Did they go to Europe wholly?

Mr. PALMER. Not to Europe wholly.

Mr. DONOVAN. The statement was made here that some had gone to China, and the statement was also made here that the trade with China had fallen off in six years about $22,000,000.

Mr. PALMER. Well, what is the gentleman's question?

Mr. DONOVAN. Is it true that our export trade has fallen off to the amount of $22,000,000 in six years with China, for instance?

Mr. PALMER. Oh, no; it has increased.

Mr. DONOVAN. Increased to China?

Mr. PALMER. Yes; as I understand it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I challenge that statement.

Mr. PALMER. Well, I present, in answer to the challenge of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], the figures of the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. AUSTIN. Those figures that he quoted are from the Department, too.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No challenges here; I will not stand for them. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN] concluded?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, have I the floor?

Mr. DONOVAN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly willing to give the gentleman the floor if I can get time later.

Mr. DONOVAN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I listened, as I always do, with interest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], but on this occasion I listened with some surprise to the statements made by him—I think not in his usual fair and candid manner—concerning the Hill bill and the circumstances of its being drawn and presented. I doubt very much whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania is posted on the facts as well as one might assume from the statements which he made.

I will say, Mr. Chairman, that this side of the House, which stands for a tariff commission, is willing now, as it has been for the last year, to vote for a cotton schedule based on the report of the Tariff Board. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The Tariff Board did not recommend tariff rates. It found facts. Mr. Hill undertook to draw a bill which, in his judgment, would conform to the facts. I discussed the matter with Mr. Hill on several occasions. When he had drawn the bill he himself did not pretend that there was not or might not be a difference of opinion as to what a bill should be, based upon the facts found by the tariff commission.

This side of the House has never contended that when a tariff commission reported the facts as to the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, that of itself wrote the bill, or that everyone would accept the same figures in the bill as following the facts found by the commission. Everywhere people have differences of opinion as to what certain facts find. They have differences of opinion as to what the facts are which are found no matter who may find the facts, and when the Hill bill was presented to the Committee on Ways and Means without any previous agreement among the minority members of the committee the rest of the minority members declined to commit themselves on the bill as conforming with the findings of the Tariff Board without an opportunity of making a full examination.

Subsequently, upon the motion to recommit the cotton-schedule bill, Mr. Hill made the motion to substitute his bill. He did it with my consent, although he did it and voted for it, and the rest of the Republican Members of the House who voted for it—and most of them did—voted for it as against the Underwood

bill, not then being fully satisfied that it conformed with the findings of the tariff commission.

Further examination of that bill has convinced the Republicans of the House, in the main at least, that the Hill bill did not conform to the findings of the Tariff Commission. But we shall offer a motion to recommit this bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with directions to bring in a cotton schedule which will conform with the findings of the Tariff Board; and when we put forward the proposition that we are willing to establish a tariff commission to ascertain facts upon which tariff legislation shall be based we carry with our action the good faith of accepting the legislation which is to be actually based upon the facts which are found by the commission, and which as to the cotton schedule were found by the Tariff Board. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIES. What is the status of the debate as to time?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS] whether he will consume some time now or what disposition he wishes to make of the balance of his time? I believe I have 11 minutes remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. PETERS. I will use some of my time now.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me ask the gentleman when he is going to move a recess.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] submitted a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANN. Perhaps that has been answered by what has occurred since.

Mr. DIES. I wanted to know how much time remained to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS] has 55 minutes remaining, or 45. There was 10 minutes taken from the paragraph while the present occupant of the chair was not in the chair. Adding that time the gentleman from Massachusetts has 55 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIES. I should like to have 5 minutes from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PETERS. I have promised to yield to one or two other gentlemen first.

Mr. MANN. May I ask when the gentleman intends to move that the committee rise?

Mr. FORDNEY. Why not rise now?

Mr. PETERS. I think the general debate had better run a little longer—until half past 6. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] five minutes.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, in the exceedingly brief time allotted to me I am only going to refer to one or two questions that have been involved in this discussion.

During the last four or five years that tariff debate has been going on in this House I have never heard a single Republican discuss the question of cost of units of production in the discussion of any schedule. In their comparisons between the wages paid here and abroad it has always been by the day, the week, or the year. We have always contended that the amount of efficiency on the part of the American laborer has been equal to the productive capacity of the foreign labor, the price being taken into consideration. We have not always had at hand the evidence to show this fact, and I want particularly to show this with reference to my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] in his discussion this afternoon. I am going to quote from an editorial in the Wool and Cotton Reporter, published in Boston, Mass., the direct representative of the cotton and woolen industries of this country, for the purpose of establishing our position.

Weavers in the domestic industry will operate 8, 10, and sometimes 12 nonautomatic looms on plain cloth, a condition which is not noted in foreign countries, because it is an exceptional case where a weaver will operate 6 looms in the foreign industry, and in the majority of cases the number operated is only 4 on plain cloth.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLINE. I have only five minutes. Do not ask me to do that, please. This editorial continues:

To show more clearly the general situation, it can be said that in the domestic industry a weaver will ordinarily operate 6 and even 8 dobby looms on fancy work, the usual number operated being 6, and in most domestic mills a weaver will also run 6 Jacquard looms on the majority of Jacquard cloths which are being produced, while this number is never even approached in foreign countries, the number of looms on dobby work being less than 4, and for jacquard work less than for dobby work. This condition is noted because of the strict rules which are formulated by the manufacturers and union organizations, and because of the standard set prices for weaving.

On any kind of fabric which is made on an automatic loom there is absolutely no comparison between the domestic industry and that of foreign countries, because American mills are so far in advance that no comparison is possible, and while the number of automatic looms in England is increasing, the domestic industry is equipped with probably over fifteen times as many automatic looms, and for a much smaller total number of looms. The use of better cotton makes possible the operation of a greater number of looms per operative in the domestic industry, thus placing the domestic manufacturer on a much more equal basis than the mere wages which are paid to the operative would indicate.

There is ample proof that the production per operative in the domestic industry in the majority of cases is much larger than that of the foreign operative, and manufacturers who speak the truth admit it to be a fact.

Now, gentlemen, this is your witness whom I have had on the stand, and I have read from an editorial written by the proprietor of that journal. It establishes our position pretty conclusively that the efficiency of American labor on the Jacquard looms, which make the same quality of high-grade cloth that the gentleman exhibited here, is from three to four times as great in this country as the labor in the best English mill.

Mr. FARR. Who is the editor of that paper, please?

Mr. CLINE. I do not know the editor. This paper represents the textile products.

Mr. FARR. Published in Boston?

Mr. CLINE. Published in Boston.

Mr. FARR. Oh, yes; that gentleman was before the committee and fought the industry.

Mr. CLINE. Now, I want to say just another word about my friend from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] on the question of the condition that exists by virtue of this bill. My friends, we have had this bill before this country for two successive years. The exports of the various items in this schedule were $35,000,000 in 1910, $45,000,000 in 1911, and $52,600,000 in 1912, an increase of 50 per cent on the very articles that we are discussing in this schedule.

My friend from Tennessee goes into predictions as to what will happen—industries will close down, men go out of work, and it is the most vicious bill that ever was written in this country. Now, you can not fool the American people; you can not fool the people down in Tennessee. I am quoting from Cotton, a magazine published at Macon, Ga., giving a direct account of the mills existing in the southern country and the products they have and the amount of money that is invested. There is not a Southern State but what is putting money into new industries in the cotton line every month in the year. In Nashville the Warioto Cotton Mills are investing $15,000 in remodeling their factory.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have a telegram from that company saying that it will ruin them.

Mr. CLINE. The Elwood Manufacturing Co., incorporated with a capital of $50,000, is another. Nashville has a manufactory of waterproof cloth, and Memphis only last month organized a company with a capital of $250,000 to go into the cotton industry. Now, I say you can not fool the people of Tennessee; they know that the profits of this business are sufficient to warrant them in investing their money in these enterprises.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me ask the gentleman if any cotton mills were built after the Wilson bill became a law?

Mr. CLINE. Oh, the Wilson bill seems to worry the Republicans. That song has been sung at every opportunity. I am talking about the conditions that exist now.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am speaking of the conditions under the Wilson bill.

Mr. CLINE. I am talking about the conditions that exist now, when the country knows that we are going to pass this bill, and they are ready to put their money into these enterprises.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have a telegram from the Warioto Co., at Nashville, Tenn., protesting against the bill and saying that it will ruin their industry.

Mr. CLINE. The article from the Cotton magazine is as follows:

TENNESSEE.

Nashville: The Warioto Cotton Mills are to invest about $15,000 in the remodeling of their present buildings and erect an office structure. Plans and specifications have been prepared. This company operates 25,000 ring spindles, 700 looms.

Englewood: The Englewood Manufacturing Co., of this place, have incorporated with an authorized capital of $50,000 for the manufacture of knit goods.

Nashville: It is reported that Reeves & Ely Co. have recently incorporated to manufacture waterproof cloth.

Memphis: The Memphis Cotton Manufacturing Co. was recently chartered with a capitalization of $250,000. Of this it will invest $100,000 for the purchase of a site and erection of buildings, where it will install machinery for the manufacture of cotton goods from linter cotton.

Mr. MANN. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, the textile industry would be very much surprised if it heard that the editor of that news-

paper which has been read is its official representative. The editor is my friend Mr. Frank P. Bennett. He has not been looked upon in the light in which the gentleman pictures him. Yet there is a good deal of truth in what he says. It is true that we use automatic looms, and it is true that English trades-unions frown on their introduction into Great Britain. But for the most part these automatic looms are used on coarse goods, and that is the very reason why the Green-Gardner amendment makes the duties on coarse cotton cloth less than is provided in the Underwood bill.

In the city of New Bedford, which largely manufactures fine goods, 90 per cent of the looms are nonautomatic and only 10 per cent are automatic. The reason is that New Bedford manufacturers, as I am informed, find that the automatic looms are not suitable for the production of goods such as they make. Automatic looms, as I understand it, produce a cloth with a rough surface, and ladies who are paying high prices for fine fabrics do not like the feeling of rough dress goods. Moreover, although the cost of tending 15 looms—and that is about the number of automatic looms which, on an average, one man operates—although the actual cost of loom tending is small, the cost of superintendence is very great. In addition, various high-class employees must be employed in connection with automatic looms beyond what is necessary in connection with ordinary looms. I have been told that the automatic loom constantly breaks threads, but, of course, is unable to mend them again. For this reason it is desirable to use coarse yarns which are not readily broken.

These are the various reasons assigned by manufacturers for the circumstance that the use of automatic looms for fine goods has never gained a satisfactory footing.

As to coarse goods the case is different. Automatic looms are under the ban of the British weavers' unions, whereas those looms are extensively used in this country. That is the reason why the Green-Gardner amendment makes a lower rate than does the Underwood bill for coarse cloth made from yarns below twenties.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the editor of the paper—Mr. Bennett—alluded to by the gentleman from Indiana, came before the Committee on Ways and Means as an enemy of the cotton and wool industry, and so asserted himself. The hearings are quite full of his testimony. It is not true, and there is no evidence anywhere in any official report, that the labor in the cotton or woolen mills is more efficient in the United States than abroad. There is evidence in abundance that in the cotton and woolen mills of England the son follows his father with an apprenticeship of four years at very low wages. If I had the time to present it, I could show that the labor in the cotton mills and woolen mills in Europe is more efficient than in the cotton and woolen mills of the United States. There is an abundance of proof of this kind. I defy any man to show reliable reports, official reports, or any other kind, to the contrary, unless it be something from some man who is an enemy of the industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess until 7.45 p. m.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until 7.45 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has 44 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Alabama permit me to make a suggestion to him? Why not read the paragraphs that are not to be amended and adopt such committee amendments as the gentleman desires before we finish debate?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is satisfactory. Without objection, Mr. Chairman, we will read until the crowd gets in.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

262. Plushes, velvets, velveteens, corduroys, and all pile fabrics, cut or uncut, whether or not the pile covers the entire surface; any of the foregoing composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, except flax; and manufactures or articles in any form, including such as are commonly known as bias dress facings or skirt bindings, made or cut from plushes, velvets, velveteens, corduroys, or other pile fabrics composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 67, line 6, after the word "fiber," insert the words "except flax."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

263. Curtains, table covers, and all articles manufactured of cotton chenille, or of which cotton chenille is the component material of chief value, tapestries, and other Jacquard figured upholstery goods, composed wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber; any of the foregoing, in the piece or otherwise, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 67, line 14, by striking out the period after the words "ad valorem" and insert a semicolon and adding the words "all other Jacquard figured manufactures of cotton or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 30 per cent ad valorem."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. As I understand it, we will have the right to recur to five of these paragraphs for the purpose of offering amendments?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; I do not think it will be necessary to read them through again.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed to ask a question in connection with this amendment, or would it be in order at some later period?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand there is no debate. The amendment has been adopted.

Mr. TREADWAY. I will wait until we recur to it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

265. Stockings, hose and half hose, selvedged, fashioned, narrowed, or shaped wholly or in part by knitting machines or frames, or knit by hand, including such as are commercially known as seamless stockings, hose and half hose, and clocked stockings, hose and half hose, all of the above composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, finished or unfinished; if valued at not more than 70 cents per dozen pairs, 40 per cent ad valorem; if valued at more than 70 cents per dozen pairs, 50 per cent ad valorem. Cotton gloves, knitted or woven, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 2, strike out the words "Cotton gloves, knitted or woven," and insert the words "Gloves, by whatever process made, composed wholly or in chief value of cotton."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

266. Shirts and drawers, pants, vests, union suits, combination suits, tights, sweaters, corset covers, and all underwear of every description, made wholly or in part on knitting machines or frames, or knit by hand, finished or unfinished, not including stockings, hose and half hose, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 8, after the word "unfinished," insert the words "not including such as are trimmed with lace, imitation lace, or crochet, or as are embroidered and."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

269. Towels, doilies, bath mats, quilts, blankets, polishing cloths, mop cloths, wash rags or cloths, sheets, pillowcases, and batting, any of the foregoing made of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, whether in the piece or otherwise, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer two committee amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report them.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 69, line 8, strike out the word "doilies."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 69, line 12, after the word "otherwise," insert the words "not embroidered nor in part of lace and not otherwise provided for."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the schedule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Alabama that the Clerk has concluded the reading of the schedule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman let me call his attention to an obvious error in paragraph 255 which I do not think has been corrected?

It says, as to yarns, "Nos. 1 to 9, inclusive, 5 per cent ad valorem; Nos. 10 to 19, inclusive," and so forth, "7½ per cent ad valorem." Now, there is a No. 9½ and a No. 19½ all the way through.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand that, but last year I took that up with the Bureau of Standards in fixing this classification. We had a letter which was read to the House last year. I do not have it at my hand now. In that letter it was stated that none of the yarns could be stated with absolute accuracy—that is, they only approximate the number—and, of course, the importer in bringing in the yarn will not make it 9½ or 19½, because he would thereby throw it to a higher rate. He would throw it to the basket clause, which would bring a higher rate.

Mr. PAYNE. He would not on all, but he would on some of them.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We had the matter up last year, and I wrote a letter to the Bureau of Standards, and published the reply then.

Mr. PAYNE. He might do that on some of the higher numbers.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I looked into that last year and, as I say, published the letter; and as the yarns are only approximate I do not think there will be any difficulty about making it 9 or 10.

Mr. PAYNE. I think it might give rise to litigation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think so. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the highest rate in this bill on yarns is 25 per cent. The basket clause is 30 per cent. Of course, the cloth goes higher. But that difficulty does not arise in the cloth paragraph, and in this paragraph I do not think any importer would try to enter it at a higher rate than he would have to pay in the regular way.

Mr. PAYNE. If he brings it in at 9½ he would have to perjure himself to get the rate fixed at 10.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They said at the department that it was difficult to ascertain that with absolute certainty.

Mr. PAYNE. They do import them now, I understand.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They are numbered that way, but it is very difficult to tell the difference between No. 9 and No. 9½.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not suppose they would perjure themselves in order to come in.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS] is to close the debate, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] is expected to be here.

Mr. MURRAY. He is on his way.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not sure that the gentleman from North Carolina will be here, and I will be glad if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] would use up his time.

Mr. MANN. I am perfectly willing to use the time if only one speech follows.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. So far as I know there will be only one. The gentleman from Illinois is right about it, but I do not like to cut out the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] if he happens to come in.

Mr. MANN. I know; but I do not want to go ahead and have both the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Massachusetts to follow.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand now that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] will not speak.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield nine minutes of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] this afternoon devoted a great deal of his time to a discussion of the Tariff Board and the bill introduced at the last session by Mr. Hill of Connecticut revising this schedule, based upon the report of the Tariff Board, and tried to make much of the fact that there was some disagreement among Republicans on that subject as to the exact terms of that bill.

Now, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania and every other Member on that side of the aisle could only forget their prejudices for a little while, and exercise a little of that intellectual honesty that was spoken of so often this afternoon, and examine into the purposes and theory of a tariff board they will certainly see, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] explained this afternoon, that it is not the purpose or thought of anybody that the Tariff Board will make a report that will determine exactly the rate that shall go into each item of every schedule. What does happen and what has happened with reference to this report is that it does set limits between which there may be honest differences of opinion among Republicans as to a tariff along protection lines, and among Democrats as to a tariff along revenue lines. Between those limits there may be, Mr. Chairman, honest differences of opinion, but outside of those limits there can not be any differences of opinion.

And with reference to the bill that is before us—the Democratic bill—if those gentlemen would examine the report of that Tariff Board as to the cloth and yarn schedules of this bill, they will find that the Hill bill does come within the limits of the report of the Tariff Board. They will find that the cloth paragraph also does, but it is the first one that they have introduced, revising the schedule, that does do it.

And what is the situation, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the Democratic revision of Schedule I?

In 1911, at the special session, they introduced and passed through this House a bill revising the cotton schedule. I voted for that bill. I tried to show at that time that that bill, so far as these coarser cotton cloths were concerned, purchased by the great masses of the people, was a protective bill and not a tariff for revenue bill at all. We all know what happened to the bill finally.

A year went by. In March last the Tariff Board made its report upon the cotton schedule, and last August the Democrats again brought in a cotton bill. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] stated that during that year they had given this cotton schedule deep thought and careful study, and I do not know but prayerful consideration, that he and his committee had examined thoroughly the report of the Tariff Board, and after all of that study and all of that information, they had come to the conclusion that their bill of 1911 was absolutely perfect, without a flaw, and they introduced into the session last year the same bill identically, word for word and rate for rate. That bill went through this House, and here we have the third bill. But this bill is not at all like the two previous bills that the Democrats have brought in. Out of 37 rates in this bill and in the previous bill they have changed 22, or nearly 66 per cent of the rates.

Now, what has brought about this change among the Democratic leadership to change these rates in this cotton schedule? I am speaking now of these paragraphs under consideration. What has happened since that time? Only one thing, and that is that the cotton manufacturers, whom our Democratic friends have so often reviled as writing tariff bills, have appeared and testified before the Committee on Ways and Means, and either this bill has been rewritten because of the testimony and statements of the cotton manufacturers or else you have gone to the report of the Tariff Board, but have not been frank enough to acknowledge it.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do believe that the Democracy have so much pride of opinion that they would not have been willing to change those rates in any particular, except for a circumstance that happened in the hearings last winter that compelled them to do so. And what was that? Why, the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association itself proposed a bill to the Democratic Committee on Ways and Means revising this cotton schedule, and in that bill they proposed to reduce the rates upon coarse cotton cloth 50 per cent lower than they did in their bills of 1912 and 1911, and, of course, they could not have come in here and put in a bill calling for rates on coarse cotton cloth 100 per cent higher than the manufacturers themselves asked for.

But though you have reduced those rates 50 per cent upon the coarse cotton cloths, I challenge any gentleman upon that side of the aisle to show that it is a tariff for revenue only. It is a protective tariff, a tariff that every Member upon this side of the aisle can vote for, because the rate is not large, but it is a rate that no man upon that side of the aisle, unless he is willing to say that he is voting for protection, can vote for. And why, Mr. Chairman? Because in these coarse cotton cloths the report of the Tariff Board shows, and the testimony of the

cotton manufacturers themselves shows, that we can and do compete with the world in those cotton cloths.

Why, Mr. Chairman, this afternoon the gentleman from Georgia read a letter from a southern cotton manufacturer, in which you remember he said, "Treat us as lightly as possible." Well, you have done so. He has nothing to complain of as to the coarse cotton cloths that he makes down in Georgia. Give the New England manufacturer the same protection in his higher counts that you have given the southern manufacturer in his low counts, and you have a protective bill from A to Z in this cotton schedule.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on these coarse cotton cloths we are not only competing with the world, but in 1911 we sent 11,000,000 yards to Canada, not only in competition with Great Britain, but with a tariff charge of 7½ per cent against us. The tariff upon these cloths into Canada from this country was 32½ per cent. The tariff from England was 25 per cent. So that you can not say that this is a tariff for revenue only so far as these cloths are concerned. If you be intellectually honest, you will admit that you are protecting the southern cotton manufacturer in the things that he makes so largely.

You have lowered some rates because you were compelled to. You have raised others, either because of the demand of the cotton manufacturers, or else because you have studied to some purpose the report of the Tariff Board. If you would take another year to study the subject, you might get a fair and consistent bill. We are ready to do the work now. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, many of my colleagues from Massachusetts on the opposite side of the House have presented their views to the committee, and have shown at least that there is irreconcilable differences in their views.

We have reached the time in our industrial history when the old prohibitive-tariff system is outgrown. It may have been necessary to have had high rates of duty to raise the revenue in war time, and it may have been beneficial in some instances to continue them afterwards; but that it should be necessary to continue the prohibitive tariff rates which have been in existence on cotton goods for the last 10 or 15 years nobody who has studied the industry can believe.

My colleagues from my own State on the other side have tried to get together and get some common point of view. Their singular lack of success has been shown by their views this afternoon, when one amendment presented by my colleague, Mr. GARDNER, received its severest criticism from his colleague, Mr. GREENE.

It has been stated that the cotton industry will receive a terrible blow from the enactment of the rates in this bill. I believe the result will show not that the cotton industry will suffer but that it will be put on a sounder basis by the rates we propose in the bill. We have had prohibitive rates. They have placed a heavy burden on the consumers, and I believe have not been to the ultimate advantage either of the industry or the people employed in it.

The result of prohibitive rates has been to tremendously overstimulate certain branches of the cotton industry. Some concern will make tremendous profits, there will be a rush into that branch of industry, and the market will be overproduced. The unnatural production forced by prohibitive rates must be invariably followed by overproduction and depression.

This bill places rates on a competitive basis. The rates on yarns and cloths and all cotton products are at points which will allow reasonable importations.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERS. No; I can not yield now.

A careful investigation has been made of the increases which it is thought would be stimulated by adopting the rates recommended in this schedule. The importations in cotton last year were $24,000,000.

It is estimated that under this bill which we have before us imports will be increased to $36,000,000, an increase of $12,000,000. See what that increase amounts to, when compared with the huge product of this industry. In 1904 the total production in the United States of cotton goods, including cotton small wares, according to the report of the Census Bureau, was valued at $450,468,000. In 1909, the last year for which we have corresponding statistics, manufactures of cotton in this country were valued at $628,392,000, or an increase in five years of $177,900,000 in the total production of the mills and factories of this country, an average yearly increase of over $35,000,000. It will be seen that an increase of importations of $12,000,000 is by no means going to ruin any industry which increases its yearly production by three times that amount and which exported last year goods to the value of $31,388,998.

It is absurd to claim that this tariff will revise the cotton schedule in such a way as to throw men out of employment or to upset the industry. Such remarks are made largely by those who desire to create a feeling of uncertainty, to create a political feeling against a party for their own political purposes, or else they are lamentably blind to the facts concerning the industry.

I believe firmly that the industries of the whole of our country are going to be put by this tariff bill on a firmer, sounder foundation. Removed from the uncertainties of tariff discussions and from the unfortunate overstimulation of prohibitive duties, our industries will develop on a sound basis that will make the next years ones of prosperity. Connected with that prosperity will be the name of the man whose sound judgment has shaped the preparation of the bill, the chairman of our committee, Mr. UNDERWOOD. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, this side surrenders the balance of the time in general debate. I understand that the gentleman from Illinois has still 15 minutes on amendments to be offered.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, there are 15 minutes yet remaining. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS] going to yield to his colleague [Mr. TREADWAY] for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the gentleman to ask the question in his own time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS] would yield to answer a question.

Mr. PETERS. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ADAMSON). Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERS. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I intended to ask the gentleman a question before he finished his remarks. I would like to ask, in view of the fact that the amendment just adopted to section 263, at the request of the committee, puts all other Jacquard goods at a 30 per cent rate, why the rate is not made 35 per cent, as in the other portion of this section? We read in section 263 that "Jacquard figured upholstery goods," etc., bear a rate of 35 per cent. Why is the distinction made between one kind of Jacquard goods made on a Jacquard loom and another?

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, there was some doubt in the minds of the committee whether the Jacquard goods referred to would come in under section 269 or under the basket clause at 30 per cent, and to remove that doubt they were fixed in section 263, which contained the other Jacquard goods, and were fixed at 30 per cent, which was the rate intended by the committee.

Mr. TREADWAY. Just one other question, please. An amendment was adopted to section 269 striking out the word "doilies." The particular question I would ask now has to do with mills making quilts. I understand that it is the intention of the committee to have it construed that Jacquard quilts will, of course, come in under 30 per cent rate rather than under section 269, line 8, where the word "quilts" appears.

Mr. PETERS. That will bring all Jacquard quilts under 30 per cent rate.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is to be recognized to offer an amendment to paragraph 263, and then I yield five minutes to him from this side.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following as a new paragraph, as a substitute for paragraph 263.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out paragraph 263 and insert the following:

"263. Curtain, table covers, and all articles manufactured of cotton chenille, or of which cotton chenille is the component material of chief value, tapestries and other Jacquard figured upholstery goods, if valued at not over 30 cents per square yard, composed wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber; any of the foregoing, in the piece or otherwise, 45 per cent ad valorem; if valued at more than 30 cents per square yard and not exceeding $1 per square yard, 50 per cent ad valorem; if valued at more than $1 per square yard, 55 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I have not indulged in general debate on the cotton schedule, although I come from the greatest textile city in the United States——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman put the rates higher than in the Payne law?

Mr. MOORE. No; 5 per cent less on the lower grades.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The last division is higher, and that is the important division.

Mr. MOORE. That is on the finer goods that are used by the richer class of——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The reason I asked the gentleman—is there any indication that this industry is not prospering under the Payne bill?

Mr. MOORE. The industry at present is prospering.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I ask the gentleman why did he raise the rates.

Mr. MOORE. Under the Dingley bill the industry did not prosper, because the mills were working half time and some of them quarter time and because generally there was a retardation of all production of upholstery goods in the United States. This is a case that illustrates as clearly as any I can present the necessity of a protective-tariff duty. Foreign upholstery manufacturers were able to keep their goods in this country under the Dingley law. The rates were raised in the Payne law, and as a result of the raising of those rates the mills began again to thrive in the United States, and particularly in my city. I know personally that men were walking the streets for want of work because the Dingley rates were too low. Now, I know personally that when the Payne rates were in effect the mills began to work again full time and the employees had plenty to do.

The industry is thriving now because every mill is working full tilt and doing the very best it can with the raw material on hand to fill orders in anticipation of what is coming. That may account to a very large extent for the statements that some gentlemen have advanced here as to our present prosperity. The textile mills to-day, with what raw material they have on hand, are working full tilt in order to prepare for what is to come. Now, as I said, I did not discuss this matter under general debate. It is one of the unwritten laws of this particular session of Congress that a man who comes from a district where there are interests of this kind must leave the whole discussion to a Member who comes from a district where nothing is known about it and in which there is no interest. In fact, this seems to be a session of Congress where a man who is a lawyer can discuss everything until the cows come home and settle questions affecting industries whether he knows anything about them or not. I do not want to offend the other side of the House or this side of the House when I say the discussion we have just had on the cotton schedule illustrates better than anything else could have done that we are not now prepared to pass an intelligent or scientific cotton bill.

The differences of opinion upon both sides, the lack of information upon all sides, the utter disregard of the men actually engaged in the business, who know by experience what is best for the trade, confirms the statement I have made. Oh, of course the gentlemen upon the other side say that the man who is interested in the business naturally will take care of his local interests. I would like to know a lawyer of this House who will refuse to discuss here problems of law in which he is interested and which only serve to confuse the public mind and delay public business; hair-splitting, while the men who want business done wait to have it done. I have presented this amendment in the interest of the industries of my city. If that is a crime, it can not be helped. I am ready to plead guilty to an effort to persuade you to stay a bill particularly with respect to upholstery products, so that the mills engaged in this industry may not be placed upon half time and the men now employed will not be put upon the streets.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the remarkable unity in the Republican Party in its effort to write a tariff bill is well illustrated by the last two speeches that have been made on that side of the House. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], although he advises his Republican colleagues to vote for our cotton schedule, says we have not reduced it enough, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], not satisfied with our cotton schedule, not even satisfied with the Payne bill, not only proposes to raise this paragraph under which he admits the business interests of the country affected by it have prospered, but proposes to raise it and ask you to vote to raise it above the rate in the present Payne law. Now, where does the Republican Party stand?

All of you gentlemen stand for a revision by a tariff board. The most complete report that you had in the last Congress by a tariff board of your own creation was on the cotton schedule. You have had it before you for study for two years, and at the end of that time, still proclaiming that you believe in a revision of the tariff by a tariff board, we find one distinguished gentleman representing you here complaining that this bill is too high, according to the Tariff Board reports, and the other distinguished gentleman, the Representative from Pennsylvania, is not only not satisfied with this bill, but is not satisfied with the Payne bill; but under your theory of a tariff board revision he desires to raise the rate still higher and increase the burdens on the American people, when he admits on the floor that the industry is prosperous under the present rate.

Now, I do not want to indulge in captious criticism, but I am perfectly willing to accept the captious criticism that that side of the House throws us. That is your business. That is what you are here for. You are the critics of the Congress, as we have been sometimes in the past. It is the part of the Government that belongs to you [applause on the Democratic side], and I do not want to invade your privilege, but I ask you, and the country is going to ask you, when you proclaim yourselves in favor of a revision by a tariff board, and you have had the best report of a tariff board, that you stood for and proclaimed all right, before you for two years, and you can not agree among yourselves on a rate that should go into this schedule. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE] is to be recognized to offer an amendment to paragraph 266, after which I yield him the 5 minutes' time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On line 9, page 68, paragraph 266, instead of—
"Composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 30 per cent ad valorem."
To read:
"Composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 50 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is not to restore the Payne duty of 1912 of 60.27 per cent. It is not to restore the Dingley rate of 61.41 per cent ad valorem, but it is simply asking the Democratic Party to give the manufacturers and workingmen of the city of Philadelphia, which I have the honor in part to represent, the same rate—50 per cent ad valorem—that was given them in the Wilson-Gorman bill of 1896.

I do not intend to take the time of the committee in discussing the fiscal policy which is being put into effect by the Democratic Party and the overturning of the protective principle, under which this country has obtained its great growth and under which wages have been maintained at a standard higher than in any other country in the world. The city of Philadelphia, which I have the honor to represent in part, is the greatest manufacturing city in this country. It is also known throughout this and all other countries as the city of homes, containing, exclusive of hotels and apartment houses, 350,000 dwellings, the major part of which are occupied by mechanics and other wage earners. The fact that the city of Philadelphia is regarded as the home city of the country is due almost entirely to the splendid opportunities for employment in these manufacturing industries, and I therefore feel that I would be recreant to my trust if I did not raise my voice to protest against the passage of this bill, which so seriously affects virtually every industry in Philadelphia. I feel that I should call attention to the fact that inasmuch as the Ways and Means Committee admitted that an injustice had been done in reducing the duty on knitted underwear from 60 to 25 per cent ad valorem and withdrew this paragraph from the Democratic caucus in order to increase the reduced duty to 30 per cent ad valorem that it is quite probable that other mistakes have been made. The increase from 25 to 30 per cent will not afford the slightest protection to Philadelphia's underwear industry. Where we are paying our employees from $1.75 to $2.50 a day the same class of operators in Germany are receiving only from 50 to 75 cents a day. Where the foreigners are able to sell in this country at $2.50 a dozen, including their profit, our Philadelphia manufacturers, without counting profit, must pay $3.60 a dozen to turn out the same kind of underwear. The same thing is true of hosiery and all other textile interests, in which Philadelphia has millions of dollars of capital invested and on which thousands of our workmen are dependent for a livelihood.

It has been intimated that the Republicans are engaged in calamity howling and that no harm will really be done to American industry by the passage of the Wilson-Underwood bill. For the information of Democrats who hold this view, I merely wish to cite an instance of what is already happening. In Bradford, England, the firm of Joseph Benn & Sons has long been engaged in the worsted business. After the passage of the Dingley tariff law they found that they could more profitably make in this country such goods as they had formerly made in their English mill for export here. So they established another plant in Rhode Island to make goods for the United States market.

In both mills they made the same kind of goods, with the same kind of machinery, and of identical raw material. The conditions are practically identical in all respects except the wages paid.

Many of the employees of the Bradford mill came to this country when the firm established itself in Rhode Island, and they testify that sorters who receive $7.79 in the English branch of the business receive $16.50 per week in the Rhode Island branch. Mechanics receive $7.30 in the English branch and $15 per week in the Rhode Island branch. Weavers receive $3.41 a week in the English branch and $12 per week in the Rhode Island branch. They say that if they lived the same way in the United States as they do in England they could save at least half of their wages.

If what the Democrats have said is true, namely, that the working people of this country will prosper under the new bill, it would seem that the firm of Joseph Benn & Sons would be willing to continue in business; and yet on April 18 last the following announcement was posted on the door of the firm for the information of 1,500 American employees:

The provisions in the new Wilson-Underwood tariff bill make it absolutely impossible for us to successfully compete with imported goods. Therefore the stoppage of machinery will take place immediately.

JOSEPH BENN & SONS.
HARRISON BENN.

Mr. Benn has stated publicly that the notice speaks for itself. He has explained that it is not the intention of the company to close up all its factories at once. There will be a lay off of employees a few at a time, at intermittent periods, which will depend probably on the question of orders that are to be filled in the future. Mr. Benn is quoted as saying:

There is no mystery in the closing of our mill. I find that under the proposed new tariff act I can make goods in Bradford, England, and land them in New York at about 4 cents a yard cheaper than I can make them in Rhode Island and ship them to New York. On 13 numbers or styles I find that I can save from 10.6 per cent to 14.6 per cent a yard by making the goods in the Bradford plant and shipping them to New York. For that reason I have ordered all work that is being done stopped at this plant, and am sending a cable to the Bradford plant to start 500 pieces of goods to take the places of the goods which we have stopped making here.

This is a concrete example of what is taking place in the textile industry, and I merely call it to the attention of the Democratic Party for what it may be worth to them. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WALLIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WALLIN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 68, paragraph 266, line 9, by striking out the figures "30," after the word "fiber," and inserting the figures "40" in lieu thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALLIN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago I inadvertently misled the Chair by asking him to recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE] to offer his amendment before the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] had been disposed of. I now ask to have a vote upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], which is now pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask the Chair to recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] to offer an amendment to paragraph 270, and then I will yield him five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] offers the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for paragraph 270:

"Lace window curtains, nets, nettings, pillow shams, and bed sets, finished or unfinished, made on the Nottingham lace-curtain machine or on the Nottingham warp machine, and composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, when counting 5 points or spaces between the warp threads to the inch, 1 cent per square yard; when counting more than 5 such points or spaces to the inch, one-half of 1 cent per square yard in addition for each such point or space to the inch in excess of 5; and in addition thereto, on all the foregoing articles in this paragraph, 20 per centum ad valorem: *Provided*, That none of the above-named articles shall pay a less rate of duty than 50 per centum ad valorem."

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that with Schedule C, metals and manufactures of, we would have seen the finish of the injuries that will be inflicted upon the district which I have the honor to represent—injuries which will follow directly from the provisions in this bill—but I find that a lace mill in the district, employing 400 or more people, will be in serious danger if the reduced tariff in this section of the bill becomes a law. Therefore I have offered my amendment as a substitute for section 270. The amendment constitutes the existing law.

I am in receipt of a communication from the secretary of the Chartered Society of Amalgamated Lace Operators of America, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, under date of April 24, 1913, which reads as follows:

To the Hon. JOHN R. FARR:

DEAR SIR: I am mailing you under separate cover a petition from the employees of the Scranton Lace Curtain Co. Knowing, as you do, the hardships that we, the employees, went through during the time that the Wilson bill was in effect, and you understanding the local conditions, I am sure I can thank you in advance for your voice and influence in regard to this matter.

I am, yours, JAMES GOODALL, *Secretary.*

SCRANTON, PA.

Now, the friends of organized labor have an opportunity to save an industry which employs organized labor. It is one of the best organized industries in this country, and is now on a competitive basis with the product of foreign industries, paying 68½ per cent more wages than are paid in England, and three times the rate of wages for a 9-hour day that is paid in Scotland for a 10-hour day—industries with which our Scranton industry is in direct competition. One-third of the capacity of the Nottingham machines in this country is now unused. Importations are increasing.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Is that a communication from an organization of labor?

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Has it a seal on it?

Mr. FARR. Yes. It reads, "The Chartered Society of Amalgamated Lace Operatives of America, Branch No. 3."

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Has it got the organization seal on it?

Mr. FARR. Yes; it has its seal on it.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I mean the seal of the organization.

Mr. FARR. It has the seal on it. There is no question about it. I know the organization.

Now, Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] has been made acquainted with that fact, as a member of organized labor, I am looking for his support.

In the petition to which I have referred these petitioners say:

We, the undersigned, do hereby petition the honorable Senator and Congressman from our district to vote against the recommendation of the Ways and Means Committee concerning laces and lace curtains.

The adoption of the recommendation of the Ways and Means Committee means an increase in foreign competition and also means less employment and a reduction in the pay envelope for the undersigned.

Mr. Chairman, I desire the members of organized labor on that side of the aisle to remember that in Scranton and elsewhere in all these industries in this country engaged in the manufacture of Nottingham laces we are paying three times the wages that are paid in Scotland for the same kind of work and for just as much work, and I am going to ask them if they are going to support this provision to put this industry in danger?

Relative to the lower tariff, Mr. Paul B. Belin, treasurer of Scranton Lace Co., writes me as follows:

As a matter of fact, the existing duties on our imported yarns run about 26 per cent, and under the new bill they will average about 22 per cent, which is practically inappreciable. On the coarser numbers, which are spun in the South, we will not be able to get a better price, owing to the fact that the duties in most cases are raised rather than lowered; so that, with cotton out of the way as a negligible quantity apparently, we would be forced to compete on wages.

As a local man, you are quite well aware of the position we have always taken in reference to this matter, and you are also quite well aware that we have always paid more than anybody.

As an actual fact we are paying just exactly three times as much wages as the Scotch lace manufacturers, who will compete directly with us if this bill should pass. We work 9 hours a day, whereas the Scotchmen work 10. At the present moment there is practically very little difference between our prices and the prices of Scotch or English curtains. It is only due to our strenuous selling efforts that we are able to keep out the Scotch and English curtains, and if they were given an advantage of 20 per cent on the low-grade curtains, as proposed in the new tariff bill, I, for one, fail to see how it will be possible for us to run the mill, as I am quite sure there is no possibility of reducing wages.

Trusting you will use your earnest endeavors to prevent any such bill being passed, I am,

Very truly, yours, THE SCRANTON LACE CURTAIN CO.,
PAUL B. BELIN, *Treasurer.*

I notice a communication to a gentleman on the other side of the aisle, my colleague, Mr. CASEY, in which the writers say there are numbers of skilled mechanics in the Wilkes-Barre, Pa., mills now idle.

Now, the question has been asked here frequently as to why this difference of wages in foreign countries exists. We are not nearly so much concerned with wages in foreign countries as we are with the wages paid our working people, and I repeat that here is an opportunity to maintain a splendid industry, furnishing the product at a price lower than it was sold for before the industry was established in this country, paying splendid wages to a splendid class of people. The passage of this bill will mean the displacement of a large number of male employees. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, if I understood the gentleman aright, he stated that he had communications from the men who were working in these mills appealing to him that this industry should not return to the disastrous condition in which it was under the Wilson bill. Did I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. FARR. That is what the gentleman wrote to me.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And the gentleman charges, I suppose, that the rates in the Wilson bill were the cause of this industry being in such a disastrous condition.

Mr. FARR. At that time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is your opinion about it?

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, this is a very good illustration of how a Republican wants to make up a tariff bill—the "scientific method." He comes before this House and appeals to the House to return to the rates under the Payne bill because the workmen in the factory in his district have written to him that they want to be saved from the disastrous conditions that were forced on them by reason of the enactment of the Wilson bill. Now, he feels sure about that, because I have just asked him, and that is the great issue that he has brought before this House on these Nottingham curtains.

Now, under the Payne bill these curtains in 1912 had a rate whose ad valorem equivalent was 52 per cent. Under the Wilson bill the rate was 50 per cent.

Mr. FARR. That is a difference of 52 per cent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And to the difference between 50 per cent and 52 per cent the gentleman attributes some calamitous conditions. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I can not yield now.

Mr. FARR. I will explain the difference, if you will permit me to do so.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand the difference.

Mr. FARR. Of course you do.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand the difference. The difference is that the gentleman now knows what the Wilson rate was, and he did not know it when he made his speech. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FARR. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did know, and I can explain the difference, and the gentleman knows the difference, but he does not want me to state it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman talks most of the time in this House, but I ask him not to talk in my time.

Now, the gentleman reminds me of a condition I met with in the campaign last fall. It is a well-known fact that when Mr. Dingley wrote the Dingley bill he adopted the Wilson rates on the iron and steel schedule, with one or two insignificant changes. Otherwise the Wilson bill and the Dingley bill were the same on the iron and steel schedules. When I was making a speech last fall in a town in Connecticut a gentleman rose in the audience and he said, "It does not make any difference about what you say about this matter. We remember when our iron and steel works were closed under the Wilson bill."

I asked him if he attributed that to the rates in the Wilson bill, and he said he did. I then asked him if they had prospered under the rates in the Dingley bill, and he told me that they had had the most amazing prosperity that they had ever known. Then I invited him to the platform, with both the Dingley bill and the Wilson bill lying there, and I promised him I would turn Republican if he would find any material difference in the iron and steel rates between the two bills, and he has not found them yet. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And that is about the condition of you calamity howlers. Because Mr. Wilson's bill happened to run into a Republican panic, a panic that was brewing before the bill was ever enacted, you are ready at all times and on all occasions, whether there is a change in the rate or not, to attribute those conditions to the enactment of a law that had nothing to do with it. [Applause.]

Now, so far as this particular schedule is concerned, everybody knows that this class of lace curtains are made almost entirely by machinery. They are machine-made goods. They are taking possession of the American market, as far as the American market can absorb the goods.

There may be a part of the industry that does not employ the full number, so far as the capacity of the machines are concerned, but that is due to the fact that the enormous profit these men have made in the past year has invited capital into making Nottingham lace curtains until they have increased the production beyond the capacity of the American market to absorb it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] was to be recognized to offer an amendment to paragraphs 264 and 265 without debate.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: I move to strike out, in line 18, page 67, the figures "20" and insert the figures "30."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, line 18, page 67, by striking out "20" and inserting "30."

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the further amendment, on page 68, on line 1, strike out the figures "40" and insert "70," and, in line 2, strike out "50" and insert "71."

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 1, strike out "40" and insert "70"; in line 2, strike out "50" and insert "71."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

273. Flax, hackled, known as "dressed line," 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 70, line 6, after the word "line," strike out "1½" and insert "2½."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the old rates, as I recall them, of the paragraphs corresponding to paragraphs 272 and 273 were, respectively, 1 cent per pound in the former paragraph and 3 cents per pound in the latter. The rate in paragraph 272 has been reduced to one-half of 1 cent. There seems no good reason, then, for not assenting to a similar reduction of one-half of 1 cent on the present dressed-flax rate to 2½ cents. The product referred to in paragraph 272 is the raw material for the commodity in paragraph 273.

There is in my district, in the town of Andover, one of the few hackling-flax plants in the United States—one of the half a dozen, I am told. About two months ago the operatives of that plant sent me a petition, asking me to come over from Lowell to Andover and listen to their story in connection with these two paragraphs of the tariff.

I went there, and in an upper room in one of their mill buildings during the noon hour, the men having hurried back from dinner in order to be present, they explained their grievance. They told me, with every apparent sincerity, that if these compensatory duties between undressed flax on the one hand and the dressed flax on the other were not retained this branch of their activity, employing 100 men more or less in this mill alone, would be driven out of business, because the men in this country who make use of the flax would in that event have the hackling done on the other side, where they could have it done more cheaply than they could here. They pleaded with me, and I plead with you now, to retain this compensatory duty undiminished, so that this industry, one of only a half a dozen in this country, and one which in no wise keeps up the price of the product or interferes with any other manufacture, may not be legislated out of existence.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the copious interchange of unfavorable opinion on this floor in the last few days I deem it a bad time to tinker with the hemp market, as proposed in the amendment just offered. I would not, however, be impolite enough to remind the gentleman of the old adage: "No thief e'er felt the halter draw, with good opinion of the law." Gentlemen here are not culprits, nor fit subjects for a halter. They are merely the apologists for the real thieves—the beneficiaries of the robber protective tariff. I am constrained, however, by these complimentary remarks to lament the decadence of honesty in this country. A wicked and degenerate world makes the doubled-barreled minority miserable.

There are no honest men among the Democrats, it seems. The very mildest characterization made of their duplicity and meanness is by that meek and elegant gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], who says we are not frank, and sometimes not decent.

Honesty is confined to the scattered, disjointed, dismantled, discordant fragments of the stand-pat Republicans and the new-fledged Bull Moose Party, which, like the wasp, is bigger at its birth than it ever becomes in after life. [Laughter.] Great God! Is that all the chance there is for honesty in this world? Both of these other bodies have admitted that they are honest; that is, each admits it for itself but denies it to the other fragment. The Democrats, however, have the excuse for their meanness that they are ignorant, because both the other bunches have also called them ignorant. Our critics will find that the Democrats understand this bill. A waiting country and a suffering people, for 50 years wandering in the wilderness, being robbed of their earnings, hope for it soon to become a law and that it may long bless the land. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But if honesty is confined to the standpatters and Bull Moose adventurers described, I say, Come on, fire and brimstone—there will be no Lot found exempt from the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. [Laughter and applause.] If there were anybody escaping and looking back, to be transmuted into pillars of salt, there would not be enough to save the old fragmentary stand-pat party nor the Bull Moose claimants to a monopoly of holiness.

Mr. Chairman, there are several wonderful things under the sun that have been developed by this debate. My extremely witty friend from Philadelphia [Mr. MOORE], who makes a joke out of the most serious and sacred things, excuses robber protection in this country by showing how little was collected at the ports and how little was the per capita share of each citizen. Great heavens, that is the very objection we have to it—that it is an infernal, infamous system that collects one-eighth of the tax for the Government, which any honest man would be willing to pay for the support of his Government, but licenses the robbers to take the other seven-eighths of the tax and put it in their own pockets. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He did not figure out that view of it.

Another proof of their great honesty is that all they attempt here is the plea of the criminal asking for a continuance of the case in the form of a tariff board. Whoever heard of a Republican during 50 years of misrule and misuse of power insisting on surrendering their power over the tariff to a tariff board until the election in 1910 turned them out of power in this House? Then they began to clamor for a tariff board to prevent a triumphant Democracy from revising the tariff downward. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They also talk about open caucuses; and their younger brother, the slab-off, the offshoot, the Bull Moose Party, also takes up the cry, and they say that they, too, must have open caucuses. Did you ever hear of Republicans while in power and capable of doing any devilment wanting open caucuses? [Laughter.] When they are reduced by an outraged people to an insignificant minority, then they begin to talk about coming out in the open, for they can not do further harm. [Laughter and applause.]

What is there now in either of these caucuses that anybody cares anything about? What would the play of Hamlet be with Hamlet eliminated? Of course, the bosses fixed everything for the Republicans while they were in the majority, whether they had a caucus to ratify it or not. The combination of that party, with all the special interests working automatically and passing the word down the line, was all that was necessary with or without a caucus, but now when there is no devilment they can do, no further inequalities to create and maintain, no further power to rob the people to enrich their favorites and pile up campaign funds for future emergencies; when their councils are vapid, meaningless, powerless, not even noticed by the newspapers, they can do nothing but talk, talk, talk, and, of course, an open caucus affords them a few more auditors and can not decrease effectiveness which does not exist. There is one remarkable thing about the Bull Moose experiment in the fortunes of political warfare, which is sufficient unerringly to indicate its paternity even if we had no other knowledge of that subject. Their much vaunted open caucus is always widely heralded and the result fully announced in advance, thereby suggesting the inheritance from its parent party of corruption and disaster of that traditional practice of having everything arranged—cut and dried—ready, so that the open caucus will have no difficulty in working smoothly and automatically, but the result is always just as predestined by some master mind who has laid the plans and prepared the way.

It would be impolite to use the word "boss" in connection with the statecraft of such great and eminent reformers.

There is another matter of wonder forced on my mind by the repeated suggestions that workmen intelligent enough to turn out the most finished articles, work which in this country commands as much as $2.40 per day, done by the same character of workmen, are nevertheless content and happy and glad to remain in Europe and produce the same character of work at 80 cents per day. What there is in Europe to charm their senses, fill their pockets, save their money, make them fat and happy at one-third the rewards afforded in this country, my reading of history, geography, and ethnology fails to disclose. Everybody but protectionists knows that for 2,000 years most of the countries in Europe have been supposed to possess considerable general information and some special knowledge on particular subjects. The truth or fallacy of such statements must depend either on the ignorance of Europe or the poetic license of gentlemen who make inaccurate statements on the subject. Far be it from me to ascribe either ignorance or incorrect statements to distinguished gentlemen on this floor whom we have so often heard admit both their honesty and their wisdom. The only alternative is the conclusion that Europe is densely ignorant and that all our helpless pampered protected industries have to be hothoused to enable them to extort from their fellow citizens high prices for their goods made in competition with ignorant pauper laborers of Europe, who are smart enough to compete with our best workmen in the production of the finest articles for one-third the wages, but are yet too ignorant to know that they could do better in this country or that they could be happier than they are.

Now, such logical statements as that do not surprise me. I am somewhat accustomed to liberal statements in debate here, not to say fantastical nor extravagant latitude. The only thing that surprises me is that some of our enterprising brethren, who can work cheaper abroad than at home and sell all their goods cheaper abroad than they do at home do not start a newspaper over in Europe. The work over there is so cheap it would not cost much to run the paper. Those workmen are so prosperous and well satisfied they would certainly be able to take the paper, and, as they began to realize their ignorance, they would certainly appreciate the paper. By that means they might learn of this goodly land which for a small sum in a few days they could reach in safety and treble their earnings by the same work. I have no doubt some of them would move over if they were duly advised on the subject. I do not want any of them myself unless they are healthy, honest, intelligent, and wealthy, but I understand some of my protection friends are not as hard to please on the subject as I am; they actually find means to slip the information to some of those benighted people and inveigle them over here by the thousand and work them at the same old prices, still charging their customers the same old high prices for the products. The most remarkable thing, however, of this remarkable debate is the persistent calamity howl of the bifurcated minority. They have done their best to talk up a panic before it comes. Instead of infecting my part of the country with their dishonest politics they have aroused a protest from our manufacturers, who write me "for God's sake hurry through the passage of this bill; that if any harm is done to business it will not be the result of the bill, but the result of the calamity talk, the direful forebodings of disaster which the protected interests, dying hard, holding with a death grip to the instruments of their ill-gotten gain, are indulging so lustily either to postpone or defeat this bill." Of course, such continual talk can scare the timid, and money is always timid. In fact, it is afraid of anything but a Government bond, and charges for the use of itself in proportion to its fears when investing in anything but Government bonds.

You have all heard of the man who in the perfect bloom of health was nevertheless sensitive and credulous. Some of his associates planning a practical joke expressed concern about his health, and one at a time in succession met him and told him how bad he looked, asked him how long he had been sick; another one had heard of the bad reports of his dangerous malady; another one apprehended his death soon, he looked so bad. The poor loon, frightened to death, died before night. This kind of talk, however, can not kill the patient in this instance, because they have talked so long and so falsely that the American people know them, and their prophecies are no longer heeded. Bill Arp wrote about a man who hated another so bad that the unfortunate victim went to the bad, all of his hair came out, and he drowned himself in a mudhole that night. If maledictions meant hatred, the fierce denunciations of the dual and clamorous minority in this House would destroy every patriot here and permit the return to power of that horde which has held high carnival of misrule discrimination and robbery with short intermissions and slight hindrance for 50 years. That gallant old king, warrior, priest, and poet, the Psalmist

David, said in his wrath, "All men are liars." As it was easy for him to get forgiveness, I have no doubt he was forgiven for that unkind remark, but if he had lived in this day and familiarized himself with the jargon of protection apologists he would have been able to conclude in his sober judgment that some men in high places are careless about their information and reckless about their statements. He might have been tempted to sing in the sweetest strains of sacred verse his religious opinions about the heterophemy of discredited politicians, the dissensions of divided political camps quarreling over the method of their destruction while railing at the victors and indulging in the wildest flights of hyperbolical language. Selah. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I admire the sympathy of my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] for the employees affected by paragraphs 272 and 273, but I can not admire his accuracy. He complains that in changing the rates we have made rates which now place the men engaged in hackling flax at a disadvantage. I will inform him that we have cut much of the rates in half, using exactly the same language. At present paragraph 334 of the Payne Act fixes 1 cent per pound. We have made it one-half of 1 cent per pound. Section 273 of the present bill takes the place of section 335 of the present law and reduces the rate from 3 cents to 1½ cents per pound. I think my arithmetic is accurate on this; and if not, I hope I will be corrected.

Mr. ROGERS. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Is not it a question as to the protection afforded to the workman what the difference is between the two items and not what particular divisor you use in connection with each item?

Mr. PETERS. If we divide you receive the same ad valorem rate which you have at present.

Mr. ROGERS. You have 1 cent between the two rates in this Underwood bill. You had 2 cents between the two rates as compensatory duty in the old bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the question of organized labor has been brought up here this evening by a gentleman for whom I have great regard, my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR], who I believe is sincere in what he advocates, but who has been deluded by the party and the people with whom he has been associated. I stated the other day that organized labor, in the main, was not in favor of a protective tariff; that they were aware of the fact that a protective tariff did not protect labor but protected the big business interests of the country, the manufacturers who were bringing in foreigners here by the shipload for the purpose of keeping down their wages; and I want to quote again from the Secretary of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Morrison, who is a man for whom all who know him have great respect for his integrity, honesty, and loyalty to a principle, and I believe at this time he ought to be in closer touch with the organized labor movement, even labor as a whole, than most any other man, because his position requires him to keep posted in regard to those things, as the organizers report to him from different parts of the country. So he ought to be in a position to know whereof he speaks, and this is what the Secretary of the American Federation of Labor states:

THREAT TO SHIFT TARIFF BURDEN TO LABOR RESENTED—SPEAKER FOR 2,000,000 WORKERS CALLS CRY OF PROTECTED INTERESTS A SHAM—WAGES WON'T BE CUT—"PROTECTED INDUSTRIES NOTORIOUS FOR LOW PAY OF EMPLOYEES," SAYS MORRISON.

[By Samuel M. Williams, staff correspondent of The Evening World.]

WASHINGTON, *April 29.*

The American Federation of Labor has 2,000,000 enrolled and organized members. Employers of a number of these members are saying that reduction of the tariff duties, foreign competition, and lower prices for commodities will bring also a reduction of workingmen's wages.

At the headquarters in Washington of this greatest of labor unions Frank Morrison, general secretary, the man in closest touch with its activities and sentiment, was asked what would be the result if tariff reductions brought wage reductions. This was his answer:

"Labor's wages will not be cut. Labor's wages can not be cut because, in many industries, they are already at the lowest living point. If attempt is made there will be strikes all along the line. It will be fought to the finish. We are in the midst of a tremendous campaign of organization to strengthen the position of labor against further exploitation for the benefit of capital.

"It is notorious that, as a rule, the higher the tariff protection an industry has enjoyed, the lower the wages paid to its employees. Some of the most favored of protected trusts, like steel, sugar, wool, cotton, beef, have paid the worst starvation wages. Simply because capital is liable to lose some of its protection profits the burden can not be shifted to labor and the worker made to contribute the loss out of his own pocket.

PROTECTED INTERESTS HAVE EXPLOITED LABOR.

"Capital has had protection, but labor has had to face unrestricted competition. Importations of goods are taxed, but immigration is free. Employers have taken advantage of this fact and exploited labor to the very limit, until now the exploited victims are revolting.

"The cotton manufacturer, the silk manufacturer, the steel manufacturer have had the advantage of a protected market for their products. But when labor sought its share of the rewards there was no law to prevent the coming in of foreign labor to beat down wages. The price of manufactured products could be raised to the limit of production, but the price of the labor could be kept down to the minimum by untaxed drafts on Europe. There was merely the price of transportation to be reckoned.

"Now, let us see what is happening. The swarms of unskilled foreign labor, brought in originally to combat American labor, are turning on their employers. The demonstrations of the Industrial Workers of the World are the logical result of this exploitation of humanity. They were unorganized. They were, in many cases, ignorant and unable to speak the language of the country. The employer took advantage of their helplessness and screwed down wages until the men and women simply could not stand it any longer.

PROTECTION FOR LABOR, NOT PRODUCTS ONLY.

"They broke out in revolt in Lawrence, and now in Paterson. We of the American Federation of Labor are not responsible for these conditions. Capital has brought them on itself, because it sought to combat and defeat organized labor with unorganized labor. And you see the results.

"We believe in protection for American labor, not protection alone for American products. While a literacy test may not be the best qualification for admission to this country, yet I favored the immigration bill along that line which President Taft vetoed last year.

"Since the law to-day gives practically free admission to foreign labor the American Federation has undertaken on its own account a propaganda to restrict immigration. We are sending everywhere throughout Europe notices to check the incoming tide at its source. We are urging that any proposed removal be deferred for two or three years until economic conditions in this country have opportunity to adjust themselves to a better basis. Otherwise we shall have a great mass of unskilled, unorganized labor dumped in upon the market, resulting in decreases in wages, increases in strife, and widespread suffering.

"Our reports from the country at large indicate that to-day there is about an even demand for labor. There is no appreciable slackening in industry, but there is a clearly defined tendency toward shading off the rewards of labor. It is not at present so much in the form of actual cut in wages as it is in the demands for increased output, which is equivalent to lower wages. Take the case of certain iron and steel mills around Pittsburgh. Every new manager coming into power has fresh schemes for more economical production that result in less net return to the laborer.

ONLY CHANCE OF LABOR IS IN ORGANIZATION.

"We are entering an era of vital interest to all classes of wage earners, because of changing economic conditions. We believe that the only way to protect the laborer is by organization, and the American Federation of Labor is concentrating its efforts along that line.

"We are having rapid growth in numbers. The two million mark has been passed for the first time. We are endeavoring to bring the unorganized in, to make them strong where they were weak. We are printing a newspaper in 18 languages to circulate among this great mass of foreign workingmen who have been so horribly exploited, not only to their own suffering, but to the injury of their fellow workers of America.

"No; there can be no reduction in wages, because some of the tariff-protected trusts are in danger of losing their protection. The workingmen of America realize too clearly the state of affairs to permit that. I do not know just what will happen, but labor is determined to fight any proposition to reduce its rewards."

Now, it may be said by gentlemen on that side of the House, as was said by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FALCONER] the other day, that the labor man who makes statements of that sort has not got any brains in his cranium, but I want to say, if the gentleman is here, and if not I am sorry he is not here, that men in that position do not get their convictions from the same source that the gentleman from Washington does. He, no doubt, gets his convictions from where he has his profits, in a shingle industry and the timberland business in the Northwest—and it might be of interest to those who are here to know that there has been a recent strike in the shingle industry in that locality due to the fact that they were not paying wages so that they could live up to the standard that American workmen should live. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Those things might be of interest to the gentleman, if he were here. It may also be of interest for you to know that men who do not know the needs of the laboring people of this country and know how they have suffered due to the combined forces of the great combined manufacturing interests of this country beating down the price of labor—big business—come to this Congress asking for protection under the name of labor, and when they get their protective tariff exercise their influence everywhere and all the time to crush labor down, as the great Steel Trust in recent years has done, and used their influence to encourage the importation of large numbers of foreigners; and in advertising for labor in that locality they express their preference for the foreigner while the American workman is walking the highways looking for work. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

273. Flax, hackled, known as "dressed line," 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do not rise for the purpose of discussing this paragraph except incidentally. My real purpose is to preach a funeral sermon over the remains of an infant industry, an industry that had promise of future development equal to that almost of the cotton industry. I wish to point a moral from its untimely demise.

Mr. Chairman, if you were to ask the first man you met on the street whether it were possible to raise flax in this country suitable for the making of good linen cloth, he doubtless would tell you no. And I have no doubt that any majority member of the Ways and Means Committee would make the same statement from the fund of misinformation that has written this bill. The statement never has been and is not now true. It has always been possible to raise flax in this country suitable for making linen cloth. The difficulty has not been there, but in the fact that the process by which flax straw was made into flax fiber, suitable for spinning, was so disgusting in its nature that American workmen would not engage in it. It was the custom to rot the flax in a river or a small stream to separate the fiber from the chive or gum of the straw.

The result was a condition so disgusting, as I say, that American workmen would not work in it. But in the last four years a chemical process has been discovered by which the former one can be eliminated, and which is performed under conditions suitable to the American workmen. A syndicate of eight gentlemen was formed in Chicago for the purpose of experimentally developing the industry. Out of the fertile acres of the district which I have the honor to represent they chose some hundreds of acres upon which to try the experiment of raising flax for linen cloth. It is only necessary to say here that that experiment proved an unqualified success. The farmers received on the average of $2.95 per acre for the sale of the flax straw in addition to the seed that came from it. Process by process and stage by stage these patriotic men developed the industry until they succeeded in securing a fiber that would produce a linen yarn as fine as 60 lea, a quality very nearly as good as that which is raised in Ireland, Scotland, or France, at a price slightly but not very much higher than the cost of production in those countries. They wished to make this industry distinctly American, from growing the flax to weaving the cloth. These men came to Washington with a view of retaining a duty upon the flax and linen cloth sufficient to permit the industry to live. The hearings are full of the promise of that industry. Yet they were refused the necessary protection, and within the last 10 days they have notified their manager in my district to shut down their mill and cancel the contracts with the farmers.

Mr. Chairman, this industry does not die a natural death. It is murdered at the hands of a ruthless majority, destroyed before its sun had fairly risen in the very morning of its usefulness. The beautiful blue of the flax blossom will no longer adorn the fields, but in its place we shall have the sear and unromantic yellow brown of the oats and the wheat. The music of the mill and the factory turning the flax straw into fiber will be stilled, and in the place of the song of the toiler we shall listen to the plaintive wail of the idler, the tramp, and the beggar. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANTRILL and Mr. CAMPBELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL] is recognized.

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, I desire to take a position to-night in striking contrast to the position taken by the gentleman on the other side who has just taken his seat in discussing this schedule of flax and hemp. The district which I represent and the district which is represented by my colleague, Mr. HELM, on the floor of this House produce practically all of the hemp that is grown in the United States. This bill has cut the rate one half. Back in the old days, if I am correctly informed, the tariff on hemp was as high as $60 a ton, and it is now cut under this bill to $10 a ton.

But I want to say to this committee, holding up the farmers of central Kentucky as the true exponents of Democracy, that since this bill was reported I have not had a single letter from a farmer in my district protesting against the action of this committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The farmers in my country realize that to impose a duty of high protection upon jute and manila and other fibers that come in competition with hemp would be to lay a tax upon every grain grower in the country for his binding twine and his sacks, and upon the cotton growers of the South for their burlaps; and the farmers of central Kentucky, the truest Democrats in the country, are not making a single protest, because they are willing to surrender their own particular interests if it is for the common weal and welfare. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Fellow Representatives, I do not to-night make a request that the grain growers of the West or the cotton growers of the South shall be taxed in order that the hemp growers of Kentucky may grow rich at their expense. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If we are to be sacrificed on the altar for the common good and for the benefit of democracy, well and good. We do not ask that the rest of the country be taxed for our benefit. I commend the example of the farmers of central Kentucky to gentlemen on that side of the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

275. Hemp, and tow of hemp, one-half cent per pound; hemp, hackled, known as "line of hemp," 1 cent per pound.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit surprised at the extremities to which my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the chairman of the committee, is driven in his attempts to defend this "indefensible" bill that is now before the House. [Laughter on the Republican side.] It was well illustrated by the speech that he made, closing the debate on the cotton schedule. And, by the way, he said he had been in the party of critics for the Lord knows how long—15 or 20 years—and that we are the critics now, and then he turned around and began to criticize our people. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

He says that the gentleman from Pennsylvania criticizes this bill because the rates of duty in the cotton schedule are not high enough. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] was talking about high-priced goods when he said the duties were not high enough, and he was seeking to raise those. Then the gentleman from Alabama said the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] criticized the schedule because the rates were too high. Yet I understood that the gentleman from Wisconsin, or at least the House did, even if the gentleman from Alabama did not, was criticizing the rates on the low-priced goods, the coarse goods, and said they were too high, and also said that the rates on the high-priced goods were not high enough.

Then the gentleman from Alabama gave an account of how he slew some unsuspecting Republican—I think it was in Connecticut—in the campaign last fall. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The Republican was complaining that in 1894 the industries in his community were suspended and the people did not get work. Of course that man was testifying from the facts that he knew and from conditions that he had seen right there in Connecticut when the metal industry was suspended, when he said the shops were idle and the people were not able to find employment. Those were the facts. Then the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means says he stated to that Republican that the rates in the Wilson bill were as high as the rates in the Dingley bill on the metal schedule, and says that he offered that unsuspecting Republican in Connecticut some book, perhaps of comparison, showing the rates of the two bills, and promised him that if he would find a single rate in that schedule——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I said there were several rates that were different. Stick to it.

Mr. PAYNE. That is the way I understand the gentleman. But I do not care whether it was several rates or a dozen. The gentleman from Alabama promised that if not more than a dozen or so of the rates were not found to be as high in the Wilson bill as in the Dingley bill, he would turn Republican; and he said he has not heard from that man since. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Why, the man after hearing that speech probably did not desire to have him become a Republican. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.]

Why, if you would examine that schedule you would find 50 rates that were higher in the Dingley bill than in the Wilson bill, and if the committee had put all the rates in the Wilson bill in a column side by side with the rates of the Dingley bill they would find a good many more differences, because there were so many blanks in the Wilson bill. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Oh, the differences in rates occur along on every page or so. Take it on page 131, lead in sheets: Wilson bill, 32.34 per cent; Dingley bill, 58.89 per cent. In the next paragraph, 54.50 per cent in the Wilson bill, as against 58.71 per cent in the Dingley

bill. Go on a little further, and on paragraph 158 you will find 31.77 per cent in the Wilson bill, as against 49.50 per cent in the Dingley bill. Type metal, 31.15 under the Wilson bill and 42.90 under the Dingley bill. And so we go on down the line. We get to some more interesting articles that are made down there in Connecticut; small hand goods. There are lots of them.

Mr. MOORE. I want to call the attention of the gentleman——

Mr. PAYNE. Do not interrupt me. I can point out any number of them. Articles not specially provided for, 35 per cent under the Wilson bill and 45 per cent under the Dingley bill. Lead articles, 35 per cent under the Wilson bill and 45 per cent under the Dingley bill; metal and metal compositions, 35 per cent under the Wilson bill and 45 per cent under the Dingley bill; nickel wares, 35 per cent and 45 per cent; pewter wares, 35 per cent and 45 per cent; platinum wares, tinfoil, zinc wares, 35 per cent and 45 per cent. We will go back further than that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, let me read the metal schedule for the information of the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will give you the information right now.

Mr. PAYNE. Now the gentleman gets in to amend his speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I am going to amend the gentleman from New York—not my speech. I never did understand how the Republicans ran their heads on the rock, which they did four years ago, until to-night. Here is a distinguished gentleman, a gentleman of charming personality, and we could not understand how he made the mistake he did in writing the Payne bill until to-night. My distinguished friend from New York has served more years on the Ways and Means Committee than any other man that has ever served on it as chairman, and yet he gets up here and tries to contradict my statement by reading to you the ad valorem equivalent. Now, I will ask my friend, Was not the tax on pig iron under the Wilson bill $4 a ton, and was it not $4 a ton under the Dingley bill?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, I can not repeat from memory the schedules of the Wilson bill that I have not read now in these 20 years.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My friend knows it was; but he reads you the ad valorem equivalent, as if the price of pig iron never changed. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] Because the specific rate, when worked into the price of the ad valorem equivalent, very clearly makes a change. And the distinguished new member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, was rampant to join his colleague from New York and point out the difference in the ad valorem equivalent of specific rates in different years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, of course, my friend knows that the rate on pig iron was the same under the Wilson bill and the Dingley bill; yet I find the ad valorem equivalent in 1896 under the Wilson bill was 22 per cent and a fraction, and under the Dingley bill it was 27 per cent. So you can go on through the schedules. You can take all of these rates, and you will find that——

Mr. PAYNE. Come down to paragraph 130.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There are one or two places——

Mr. PAYNE. You have only picked out one so far where the specific rate was the same.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will read you some more if you want to hear them.

Mr. MOORE. Take the upholstery schedule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. You will find, if you go right through this schedule on these various rates, that the specific rates were the same in all except a few differences, and here is the book right in my hand; but when you come to the ad valorem equivalent, of course you find the difference, because the ad valorem equivalent of the various iron and steel articles changes with the change in price, which change in price produces a different ad valorem equivalent, which the gentleman from New York, when he is reminded of the fact, knows just as well as I do.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; and you know that the rates were different just as well as I do. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] seem to have some difference of opinion with regard to the relative rates of the Dingley bill and the Wilson bill. In a way both of the gentlemen are no doubt in some degree correct; but as a matter of fact the controversy between them is, in my opinion, relatively unimportant. The real question, the one that interested the American people most tremendously, was what happened under the Wilson bill and what occurred under the Dingley bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] My dear friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] may have proved to his satisfaction, may have drawn the wool over the eyes of the gentleman in Connecticut without intending to do it, with regard to the rates, but he did not attempt to disprove the only really imporant fact in the equation presented by the Connecticut ironmaster.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That a Republican panic was on.

Mr. MONDELL. And that was that the gentleman's industry was paralyzed under the Wilson bill and it was not to him material whether the rate was high or low.

My recollection is—and if I am not correct I hope some of these tariff sharps will correct me—that the average ad valorem under the present Payne law is lower than the average ad valorem under the Wilson bill of infamous memory. Under the one, depression, idle mills, 4,000,000 men out of employment, Coxey's army, soup houses, sheriff's sales, and a depleted and nearly bankrupt Treasury. Under the other, abundant revenue, prosperity, overflowing and spreading to every corner of the land, the people generally prosperous and contented. And yet the rates in the one that brought prosperity on the average lower than in the one that brought disaster. Why? Because one was drawn and framed in accordance with a logical, well understood, and clearly defined principle of protection and the other an attempt to fulfill impossible promises, a sectional makeshift, lame, halting, high here, low there, misfit, no matter what the rates were they disarranged the industries of a mighty Nation, and started its people on the road to the poorhouse. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not want to take up the time of the House in debating an ancient proposition, but I do not think we are justified in letting the few remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Wyoming go unnoticed. It is difficult to drive into the head of any Republican that the Wilson bill did not go on the statute books until August, 1894. Everybody knows, and it has been told to the gentleman so often that his memory has failed him again, that when President Harrison went out of the White House the bonds were printed and waiting for signature to take care of the deficit left by the Republican administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Everybody but the gentleman from Wyoming knows that a Republican panic was in full blast, banks failing from one end of this country to the other, in June and July of 1893, more than a year before this Wilson bill went on the statute books, and before the Democratic Congress was called in session for any purpose.

Mr. MONDELL. In anticipation of it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I knew my friend from Wyoming would say that, because we have served here together for two decades and this is not the first time he has made this speech; it is an annual production. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] And after his attention is called to the fact that the panic occurred a year before he locates his soup houses and before the Wilson bill went upon the statute books, he always throws up his hands and comes back with the same reply and says it was in anticipation of Democratic action. [Laughter.] But I want to say to my friend if that was all there was in it the country has had more than six months to anticipate the continuation in power of the Democratic Party for the next half century [applause on the Democratic side] and the soup houses have not opened up yet. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman does not understand it; the people think it will last but two years, and they are keeping up their courage. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They are looking down on this House, and they know that the aggregation on the Republican side will never get together in two years. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

276. Single yarns made of jute, not finer than five lea or number, 15 per cent ad valorem; if finer than five lea or number and yarns made of jute not otherwise specially provided for in this section, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL] says that the farmers of that State are willing and ready, if need be, to be sacrificed upon the altar of Democratic Party expediency. Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party does not expect the farmer to permit himself to be manacled and led to slaughter on the altar of the expediency of the Republican Party; it does not believe in destroying industry. But, Mr. Chairman, I did not have an opportunity when I was on my feet before to point the moral which would naturally follow as a conclusion of the

little story I tried to relate. If the Republican Party were in power it would have prospered and encouraged this little industry in my district until we would have a flax mill in every hamlet, a linen mill in every village. The Democratic Party has destroyed it in its youth and vigor; nothing could more eloquently point out the difference in policy. The Republican Party believes in life, development, and progress. The Democratic policy leads to death, destruction, and decay. Yes; the farmers of Minnesota will still till their fields and tend their flocks and herds, but if, where peace, plenty, and prosperity now reign supreme, want, worry, and weariness shall raise their ghoulish heads, the farmers of Minnesota will know where to place the responsibility and will exact the full penalty from those who are responsible.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, for a week or two I have observed with a good deal of interest the inundation of high-tariff crocodile tears on that side of the House, and when I think of all that have been shed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], and the others, not including the old high-protection war horses down on the front seat there, it seems to me there has been enough of that sort of copiousness to float all of the battleships that Capt. HOBSON would build, if he could, in the next quarter of a century. I very well recall, as a newspaper man, the scarecrow efforts of the Republican leaders and the Republican press in 1893-94, at the time of the panic, and I want to call special attention to the difference in the patriotism as displayed by the Republican leaders and press at that time and that displayed by the Democratic leaders and Democratic press during the panic of 1907-8. In 1893-94 every Republican orator and every Republican newspaper wailed calamity, calamity, calamity, in ghoulish glee, without regard to results.

In 1907-8 when the Republican panic came upon us, when the business of the country was utterly paralyzed, the Democrats everywhere, Democratic press and Democratic patriots, begged of their constituents to stand back of the banks, to be manly, to be patriotic, and to save the country from the national peril which engulfed it. The result was that we finally wiggled through by Democrats helping to hold up where Republicans would have torn down.

These Republican calamity promoters, as you might call them, have been talking all sorts of scare stuff. Why, these old Republican leaders down here, these biased men, have been talking high tariff from a holier than thou attitude all these years.

The other day I heard the statement of an earnest high tariffite, who said he had a camp in Mexico during the summer months, and that while there he bought half a carcass of beef twice a week, for which he paid 4½ cents a pound. He said the other half of that carcass was taken just across the line into the United States and sold for 35 cents a pound, and you high tariffites applauded.

The tariff on that beef, according to the statement of the chairman, was about 6 cents a pound ad valorem, but according to the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] it was 1½ cents a pound specific. The cost of the carcass being 4½ cents a pound, if you estimate the tariff at the maximum of 6 cents a pound, that would make the beef cost 10½ cents plus freight within the United States line, where it was sold for 35 cents, leaving a profit of twenty-odd cents a pound for shipping that meat across the line from Mexico into the United States. It seems to me that if such conditions prevail—and I am not disputing anybody's word, for I have no reason to do so—a man could go there and make more profit than any moneybag in Wall Street. And many other high-tariff arguments made here figure out the same seemly way.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. No; I can not yield, because I have not taken any time, while the gentleman from Wyoming has taken nearly all the time. To the gentlemen from Wyoming and Iowa and Pennsylvania and Washington, especially, who have been juggling facts and screaming calamity in this debate, and who pretend to have fear in their hearts of direful calamities to come, I wish to recite a little verse that my old friend Gen. SHERWOOD gave me the other day, and which illustrates their pretended peril:

There was a man named Joseph Cable,
Who bought a goat, just for his stable;
One day the goat, too prone to dine,
Ate a red shirt, right off the line.
Then Cable to the goat did say,
"Your time has come; you'll die this day."
And took him to the railroad track,
And there he bound him on his back.
The train then came, and the whistle blew;
And the goat well knew his time was due,
But with a mighty shriek of pain,
Coughed up the shirt and flagged the train.

Gentlemen, you are not half as bad off as you think you are, or as you pretend to be, for you may yet cough it up. [Prolonged laughter and applause.]

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE. A little while ago I had the pleasure of listening, as you did, to that splendid speciment of Georgia statesship, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. ADAMSON], whose oratory is sui generis, and who has a style like unto which there is none other in this House. He denounced the Republicans for standing up for their industries and gave us a homily upon the honesty and integrity of the Democratic Party upon the tariff question. And now comes the goat story of my friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART]. I anticipated that story and find it most appropriate to illustrate the Democratic position, in Texas at least, by an effusion which is the result of the day's deliberations. I would match the Sherwood poem recited by the gentleman from Indiana with—

GARNER'S GOAT OF TEXAS.

Of all the creatures in the land,
Of pedigrees supremely grand,
There's none that do respect command
Like Garner's goat of Texas.

The modest sheep may browse around
From Maine way out to Puget Sound,
But they don't count a cent a pound
With Garner's goat of Texas.

The noble steer may be of use
If freed from tyrant trust abuse;
But even that would be the deuce
To Garner's goat of Texas.

If you want wool, the wool is fair;
If you want hair, the wool is hair;
If you want meat, the meat is there!
That's Garner's goat of Texas.

So, while you kick the wool of sheep,
And beef and mutton make so cheap,
Protective tariff now will keep
The Garner goat of Texas.

Oh, wondrous breed of Lone Star State,
Premier of wool and hair, thy rate
Of 10 per cent is truly great—
Thou Garner's goat of Texas!

[Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

280. Gill nettings, nets, webs, and seines made of flax, hemp, or ramie, or a mixture of any of them, or of which any of them is the component material of chief value, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. But I rose more particularly to refer to a few remarks made in one of the infrequent intervals in which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] has honored us with his presence. He has been abusing the Republican Party for so long and in such unmeasured terms that while he has not been here much during the debate he imagines that we must have been abusing the gentlemen on the other side as he habitually abuses us. For fear nothing of that kind had occurred in his absence he concluded his interesting remarks by referring to us as he ordinarily does, the mildest term used being, as I recall, something like robbers, looters, despoilers, partners of the wicked trusts, and agents of special interests.

Now, the fact is that during this discussion, so far as I have heard it, no one on this side has said anything that brought into question the motives of anyone on the other side. We are assuming that, misguided as you are, you are trying in your poor, misguided way to carry out some impossible promises you have made. But it is just barely possible that not here but elsewhere, after this bill passes and has been analyzed, some people will suggest this, that, while the bill may have been drawn in good faith, it was drawn with devilish ingenuity. Some may suggest that industries were sacrificed without benefit of clergy, certain regions left with all of their opportunities for development taken from them, and all so artfully as not to entirely wipe out a Democratic majority in the country.

The newspapers are blessed with free print paper, without regard to the effect on the American makers of paper, who, however, only occupy a few districts, which are probably Republican anyway. The woolgrower is not expected to affect many districts, and the sugar grower of Louisiana is a Democrat, anyway, whatever you do to him. As for the beet-sugar grower, it may be suggested by some one that he has not enough influence to greatly change congressional representation, and thus jeopardize your control.

And then there are the powerful automobile makers. Our tariff of 45 per cent on the machine and all its parts compelled their manufacture here. Your rate of 45 per cent on the complete machine gives the manufacturer control of the market. Your rates of 20 and 30 per cent on parts gives the manufacturer a chance to import an automobile complete, except tires and name plate, at an average rate of less than 25 per cent. The powerful and influential manufacturer has a high protection—the workman who makes the parts whistles for a job; but the workman has not much influence, some folks think, while the automobile manufacturer is most influential and the largest advertiser in newspapers and magazines in the country. Some folks may think this all looks very peculiar.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, we have enjoyed ourselves with our political debates for two hours, and I would like to address myself to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] in order to see if we can not agree to swap tobacco between the lines, and do business for an hour, read the bill, and confine ourselves to the actual amendments.

Mr. MANN. I am quite willing to have the rule enforced, so far as I am concerned, for the balance of the evening session.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to read down to the wool schedule if I can.

Mr. MANN. I think that is desirable, too. There are some amendments that will be offered and discussed on this side.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not mean to cut out amendments, but if we can have an understanding for an hour we will——

Mr. MANN. I am quite willing that the gentleman shall confine himself to the rule for the next hour.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman does not intend to go into Schedule K to-night?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

281. Floor mattings, plain, fancy, or figured, including mats and rugs, manufactured from straw, round or split, or other vegetable substances, not otherwise provided for in this section, and having a warp of cotton, hemp, or other vegetable substances, including what are commonly known as China, Japan, and India straw matting, 2½ cents per square yard.

Mr. MOORE and Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS].

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 71, paragraph 281, lines 12 and 13, by striking out the words "including mats and rugs."

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the hilarity of the occasion has been dispensed with, so that we can now get some information concerning the amendments which I shall offer, since they concern some important business enterprises and a large number of good citizens in our section of the country and the good and cheap living of our citizens everywhere. There is possibly some inconsistency between the words which would be the subject of the amendment which I offer, "including mats and rugs manufactured from straw, round or split, or other vegetable substances not otherwise provided for in this section," and the paragraph below, which provides for mats and rugs made of flax, hemp, jute, and other vegetable fibers. Apparently the paragraphs seek to make a distinction between the products of vegetable substances, on the one hand, and vegetable fibers on the other. This difference may be sound and sensible to a botanist, but not to the average American business man when it imperils his industry.

This paragraph 281 changes existing law by including "mats and rugs" within its provision along with mattings of the same material, and differentiates them from the paragraph below, which includes the general subject of mats and rugs though of kindred materials and for exactly the same use. My amendment is designed to place the mats and rugs where naturally they would seem to belong, in the paragraph covering the general subject of mats and rugs. Whether this classification and grouping is sound and fair depends on the viewpoint. If the sole object is to bring into one class articles of the same material, irrespective of the business situation, use, and consequences, then, of course, we must submit. But if natural and necessary business conditions and uses and the proper revenue to be obtained and the proper values of the articles should be considered, then the committee is wrong and the items should be changed. The particular reason why this ought to be done is, briefly, this: The mats and rugs which would be covered by the amendment which I have offered and the one which I will offer to the next paragraph come into competition with those made in this country, known as Crex or wire grass rugs, made in Minnesota and Wisconsin. The mats and rugs made in China, Japan, and India, covered by my amendment, are made by the cheapest sort of oriental labor and in surroundings often filthy and sometimes bearing disease.

The labor in the Orient receives a wage of from 17½ to 25 and 30 cents a day, while the rugs and mats with which they compete here in this country are made by a high class of white labor of our own people, paid from $1.90 to $3 and $4 a day, and in new and most modern and sanitary factories and from the most cleanly and healthful materials.

Two of the large factories are in the district which I have the honor to represent, but of course there are others competing strongly for our domestic trade, which has developed within the last few years and really constitutes one of the industries which are of great benefit to our whole section of the country. It is not merely a local industry. I do not plead for that, but it is an industry which has aided in the development of some of our farming districts by utilizing wire grass, a waste product heretofore, and thus has increased fivefold the value of such lands and furnish remunerative and diversified employment to many hundred men in our rural districts. The factories in our cities employ a high and deserving class of our people and supply a cleanly and cheap and very artistic floor covering which our people did not get before and would not secure if you allow it to be supplanted by the cheaper, doubtful, and less durable and valuable competing product of the Orient.

Now, this paragraph reduces the rate from the existing law that would cover this sort of material from about 7½ cents to 10 cents a yard to 2½ cents a yard, or at least 66⅔ to 75 per cent. The committee must realize and their hearings clearly show that the present rate and conditions are highly competitive and absolutely necessary for the existence of this important industry. The existing tariff on a standard 12-yard rug is about $1.09, while the difference of labor cost alone is more than $1.22. So the rate in this paragraph is utterly inadequate and will be ruinous, and for that reason it is difficult to conceive why this particular class of grass mats and rugs are singled out from all of the other classes, from other fibers, and included in this paragraph, where naturally they would not belong. So for that reason, for the reason of giving an industry that is struggling for existence a fair chance, preventing misapprehension, and preventing difficulty and litigation in the future and making a logical arrangement of these two paragraphs, I have ventured to suggest this amendment, and trust that the committee will consider it. Now, these mats and rugs are in the basket clause and have a tariff rate of about 20 per cent. There is no complaint about that rate. But you reduce this rate to 2½ cents per yard, which would be from 5 to 10 per cent, and this you realize would be practically nothing, and be ruinous to this new and struggling industry. The sole reason of more convenient classification by the customs officials on account of the material of which it is composed should not be a sufficient reason for the committee to consign a very deserving and struggling industry to the cemetery. Rather should your committee indicate its purpose to place all materials and articles together which properly can be, and articles of kindred materials and for the same use together, as my amendment seeks to do.

I realize that the committee have already considered this subject. I have read the hearings. But at the same time it should be understood that the people in several States are vitally interested in successfully carrying on the industry which has been started so auspiciously, and we earnestly urge the very best consideration for the amendments I have offered. I only seek to continue the policy laid down by the distinguished chairman of the committee—that of a fair, competitive tariff. We do not ask more. You have given us far less now as well as an inconvenient and illogical arrangement. But by classing all rugs and mattings together, striking them out of paragraph 281 and including all of them in paragraph 282, you thus place together all articles for the same use of kindred materials and which compete with each other. My amendments striking out the words "including mats and rugs" from paragraph 281 and including "grass and its substitutes," after "flax," in paragraph 282, accomplishing all of these very desirable purposes, and I very much hope they will be acceptable to the committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that this amendment was placed here intentionally. Heretofore, under the Payne bill, these manufactures of mats and rugs fell under paragraph 463, in the sundry schedule, and we had that same paragraph in this bill on sundries, where, if the gentleman's motion should prevail and they were stricken out of this para-

graph they would fall at 25 per cent under the sundry schedule, and the rate now is higher than that.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Would they not fall under paragraph 282? The next paragraph is "Mats and rugs made of flax, hemp, jute, or other vegetable fiber except cotton."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I have the book here. They fell in paragraph 463, and that was put in intentionally. If the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] prevailed, they would now fall in paragraph 379 and be taxed at 25 per cent. As a matter of fact, they have a better rate where they are. But the purpose of putting them in here and putting a specific rate on this particular paragraph was to prevent the undervaluation of these mats and rugs that have been complained of, mostly coming from Japan; and the gentleman's motion, if it prevailed, would have the effect of reducing the rate under which they are taxed in this bill.

Mr. MANN. Of course, if the gentleman's motion should prevail, a further motion could be offered. Does the gentleman from Alabama happen to be familiar with the grass-mat industry that has grown up in the Northwest?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I have no detailed knowledge about it; but the matter came up in the hearings in our committee and was discussed, and the expert of the Treasury Department, Mr. Nevius, prepared this provision and it was intended to bring the basket and mat provision from the sundry schedule and place it here.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Would not this cover the subject that the gentleman has in mind? In the next paragraph, after the word "flax," insert the words "grass and substitutes therefor." Would not that cover the subject?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It might carry it to a higher rate here, but it would throw these Japanese mats into a paragraph where they never have been heretofore and where they do not belong, because they are not composed of the same fiber.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. But that is what the gentleman is doing now.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No. We are simply bringing them back to the paragraph with the other manufactures of straw, whereas, they not being mentioned in the old law, the courts have held that they fall in paragraph 463, in sundries.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. But, Mr. Chairman, these mats that I have in mind, that would be covered by the language I suggest, are not the mats provided for in that paragraph. They are not the same kind of mats. They are not a cheap, ordinary kind of mat, but they are a high-grade mat, made from grass.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The decisions of the courts do not sustain the gentleman in that. The decisions of the courts threw them into the sundry schedule.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. But the decisions of the courts would have to follow the language of the gentleman's law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They would if we changed the law. We changed it to carry them into the same paragraph as the other class of straw carpeting. It was simply that the words were left out of that paragraph.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. These mats and rugs cost, ordinarily, between 25 and 40 cents a yard. You make the duty only 2½ cents, or less than 10 per cent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We may differ on the rates——

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. You place them in the wrong class. You should not place them in the class with very cheap material.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We were advised by the importers and experts who were interested in the matter and who appeared before us in the hearings that they did belong there, and we put them there for that reason.

I ask that all debate on this paragraph be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

Mr. MOORE. I want to offer an amendment. I do not care to discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the chairman of the committee is in error when he states that the experts who were heard at the hearings classified the Japanese importations in the schedule in which they are placed. I have before me the testimony taken at the hearing when Mr. Wirtz, one of the importers referred to, I presume, testified as follows:

> For about five years we have been experimenting in Japan with the manufacture of a rug similar to this. It is not made of the same material—

He was referring to the Crex rug manufactured in Minnesota—

> and it is probably not, at least at present, as good an article. It costs laid down here, duty paid, at the present time, practically the same as the domestic.

Later on, on page 3791:

> Mr. WIRTZ. Those are under the 35 per cent duty. Under that 35 per cent duty, foreign competition has not been a factor.
> Mr. HARRISON. What figure do you suggest?
> Mr. WIRTZ. We suggest 5 cents per square yard.

He afterwards said that 5 cents a yard was equivalent to 20 per cent. Then he made this statement:

> We claim that if the consumers are to have the benefit of foreign competition—and I believe the idea is to make the duty a competitive one—that it will have to be reduced, because at 35 per cent it has been shown that the manufacturers in foreign countries are not able to produce an article at a price that will compete with the domestic.

This is the testimony of a man who was partial to the importation of these competitive Japanese rugs, and he says that at 5 cents per square yard they could compete. Now, I can not understand how the committee could make the rate on this article, sent in here from Japan and China to compete with the domestic manufacture, half the rate suggested.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman will hardly maintain that the Japanese floor matting comes into direct competition with these single-piece Crex straw rugs.

Mr. MANN. Not in ordinary form.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. On the Pacific coast the Japanese rugs do come into competition under this very tariff, and that applies to a great many articles. We hear a great deal about the railroad rate protecting various products as against the Japanese. On the Pacific coast the contrary is true. The Crex rug can hardly be sold at all on the Pacific coast on account of the difference in the cost of transportation.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make this observation in support of the amendment transferring mats and rugs made of grass from paragraph 281 to paragraph 282: Here is an importer upon the strength of whose testimony the 2½ cents per square yard is imposed by this bill. As I have shown by this testimony taken by the committee, he himself puts them as competitive with the domestic article under a rate of 5 cents per square yard. He refers to them as being competitive when coming in from Japan and China under a rate of 5 cents per square yard, and complains of the present duty of 35 per cent ad valorem as unfair to the importers. Naturally that is his argument, but he himself volunteers to the committee the only testimony that the committee has where a figure is named, as far as I can find, and he says that 5 cents a yard would be fairly competitive. Yet in the face of that testimony by a great importer of these Japanese rugs this committee puts the rate at 2½ cents—one-half the figure suggested by him. What chance has a domestic manufacturer when his competitor can bring in his goods under a rate only one-half as high as he himself considers competitive?

Mr. Chairman, when you consider the fact that these rugs are made in China and Japan by laborers working at from 17½ to 25 cents a day, as shown by this very testimony, in competition with white men working in Minnesota for approximately $2 a day—practically eight times as high wages paid by the domestic manufacturer—it is clear that this is glaringly defective as a schedule. Labor is a very important item in the manufacture of rugs and mats of this character.

The raw material in this country, as well as in China and Japan, is comparatively cheap. Many men are employed in cutting the wire grass from lands which would be otherwise practically valueless. Many men are employed in the factory weaving and making rugs. In this country the work is done by farmers and other high-class laboring men, among the best of our citizens. In Asia the work is done by a cheap, low type of man at a miserable wage, approximately one-eighth of what we pay. In this country the grass is cut from clean, new fields, handled by clean white men and women in clean, well-ventilated factories, and the result is a clean and sanitary rug upon which little children can with safety play in the homes of our country. In Asia the material for these rugs is gathered from ancient fields, saturated with the germ-laden refuse of the countless ages of an overcongested race of inferior men. The work is done over there by the dirty hands of a subnormal type of an inferior race, and the rugs and mats when made are stored in all sorts of places and shipped in old ships with other unwholesome cargoes of the Orient, and when they finally reach the homes of the American people they are not clean or sanitary or fit to be played upon by our children.

Furthermore, all the money that is paid for these imported rugs and mats goes to China and Japan and stays there forever. The money paid for the rugs and mats of our factories stays in this country in continual service of the people. It is not fair to make a rate that will discourage or destroy this new and important industry built up in the Northwest. It is not statesmanship to legislate for the benefit of foreigners. It is not honest if this particular schedule was designed to enable large importers in New York to drive our own producers out of their legitimate markets. And whether that was the purpose of the men who urged the change or not it will have that effect. This reduction will lessen the revenue of the Government and benefit no one but the importers of Japan and New York. It is indefensible on the theory of competition and unfair as a matter of economy. I say more than that. This schedule bears upon its face the evidence of having been made without regard to the showing of facts, without regard to the rights of the domestic producer, but in solicitous consideration of the profits of selfish importers. They talk about reducing the cost to the consumer, apparently oblivious of the fact that reducing the cost to the consumers of this country will benefit no one if at the same time they reduce the producing power of the same people to a corresponding degree. Legislation destructive of domestic enterprise, laws that handicap producers, rates that favor foreigners are all unwise beyond telling. It does no good to make things cheap if the people generally have nothing with which to buy even cheap things. There must be a husbanding of our resources within our own borders, a stopping of leaks to foreign lands.

We must, of course, change laws that take from our people for the benefit of a few of our own selfish citizens, but our changes must not go so far as to put our men—men who toil—on a level contest with the degraded men of a decadent nation like China. We must not legislate like blind dreamers. Tax laws should be made according to fair business principles based on facts as they are. I hope this amendment will be accepted. It is simple justice—that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendemnt offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 71, line 17, after the word "matting," strike out "2½ cents" and insert "3 cents."

Mr. MOORE. This is to give additional protection.

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

282. Carpets, carpeting, mats and rugs made of flax, hemp, jute, or other vegetable fiber (except cotton), 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 71, line 19, amend by adding after the word "flax" the words "grass and substitutes therefor."

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I realize somewhat the problem which the committee has had, and I have tried to meet it by carrying out their theories of classification and grouping by providing clearly that the first paragraph relating to this subject, No. 281, should cover mattings made from vegetable substances, while the second paragraph, No. 282, should cover mats and rugs of all descriptions, and with a sufficient identification and inclusion of materials so that there shall not be any opportunity for fraud or misdescription. I think we all agree that this is desirable, and I have no disposition, and I would not urge the amendment if I thought it would accomplish any such result as fraud on the Treasury. But the inclusion of wire-grass rugs and mats under the rate of 2½ cents per square yard is a very gross injustice. The cheaper grades of floor mattings should not have a higher rate, but the better grade and entirely different kind of floor covering, such as wire-grass mats and rugs, certainly needs a different rate and class.

I think the language I have drawn clearly provides for this difference. The definition of each class is clear and distinct. A mat and rug covering a limited surface is an entirely different article from matting, which is extended and requires cutting and fitting. The mats or rugs made of grass or substitutes for grass are made from high grade of straw, such as is grown in the Orient—in China, Japan, or Formosa—for that purpose. That kind of an article is well known and defined, and if any court or appraiser has made a mistake in the past this language will bring them back to the right position and indicate what should be the proper class and rate; it would thus put this industry in our own country in a position to meet the intensely severe competition from the Orient.

Now, if the gentlemen of the committee are sincere in desiring competitive conditions between the oriental products and similar products in this country, considering all the different problems of labor and distribution, here is an opportunity to use as a practical example a legitimate industry which is doing the best it can to solve some of the conditions of decent and economical living by providing a cheap, sanitary, and durable floor covering of good appearance and made of clean and healthful materials. So far these companies engaged in this business have developed an entirely new industry, are utilizing materials entirely waste before, and without any great profit. Why, the profits of this concern average only about 8 per cent per annum, while the profits of the importers of the competing products average more than 10 per cent on their goods. It does seem that our own citizens, taking the risk and making the development, employing our own citizens, should be entitled to an equal show with the importers of competing oriental products. These importers, under the rates which you have in the bill, would have an interest in developing the industry in China and Japan instead of in this country, and would greatly push these foreign goods, because it would be for their advantage to do so. I append to my remarks some advertisements of these foreign rugs competing with the domestic, to show this is what is actually going on. The customers receive no advantage of lower prices, but the dealers get larger profits, and so will push the foreign rugs. The language of my amendment is now so clear as to relieve the apprehension which the chairman of the committee has as to confusion and hereafter placing these articles in the wrong class. This would take them out of the basket clause and put them clearly where they belong, among certain classes of material made of vegetable fiber and of a certain kindred kind and shape, and all for a certain well-known and defined specific purpose, which can not be mistaken. That is, by taking all mats and rugs out of paragraph 281, it confines such paragraph to the general subject of mattings of straw and other vegetable substances. So, by including in the general subject of mats and rugs paragraph 282, all mats and rugs of flax, grass, and substitutes therefor are called for in my amendment, it makes it very clear that kindred articles should be treated together and alike.

[From Washington Post of Sunday, May 4, 1913.]

Summer floor coverings to replace those of winter.

The spring cleaning should include the replacing of winter rugs and floor covering with these cool summer ones. Not much to pay here.

Wool fiber rugs, in green, olive, red, and brown; neat all-over and medallion designs; also plain centers, with Walls of Troy border; noted for their durability. Size, 9 by 12 feet; $8 values. Monday, choice at $5.95.

Japanese matting rugs, in attractive woven-in designs; very effective for summer use. Size, 9 by 12 feet; $5 values. Monday, for $3.19.

6 by 9 foot size	$1.59
3 by 6 foot size	.59
27 by 54 inch size	.29

Grass matting rugs, a comprehensive display of these, embracing colors of green, blue, red, and brown; plain and striped borders. Sizes and prices as follows:

54 inches by 90 inches	$2.10
6 feet by 9 feet	3.50
8 feet by 10 feet	5.25
9 feet by 12 feet	7.00
9 feet by 12 feet	9.10
12 feet by 15 feet	12.95
Stenciled rugs.	
54 inches by 90 inches	$2.45
6 feet by 9 feet	4.15
8 feet by 10 feet	6.10
9 feet by 12 feet	8.10
12 feet by 15 feet	10.10

Spot deliveries of "Dixie" grass rugs for the present retail season.

Always on the alert for something new and good, merchants everywhere were quick to appreciate the merits of our "Dixie" grass rugs, the latest entrant in the race for supremacy in goods of this class.

A twisted weave of selected grass, cleverly put together, durable, handsomely designed, beautifully colored and smooth in surface, made of very superior materials, attractively priced, the success of the "Dixie" grass rugs was assured from the outset.

The first product of the looms was sold last year within a few days. Production facilities were enlarged, and we are now in a position to make immediate deliveries of all patterns and colorings.

Special terms of shipment.

Stock carried in New York and St. Paul warehouses. From St. Paul we make free delivery to any common overland point of orders aggregating 210 pounds or more.

We of course have a color catalogue, and it will afford us pleasure to send you a copy. Write for it to-day.

Resolution urging the Congress of the United States to take the necessary steps for the establishing of a Federal telegraph and telephone system rendering a local and interstate service.

Whereas the telegraph and telephone are ever-increasing public necessities; and

Whereas these services could be more certainly and more fairly rendered under a system of Government ownership of these utilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the city council of the city of Minneapolis, That it is the judgment of the council that the time is ripe for the acquisition of these utilities by the Government of the United States, and that the Congress of the United States be urged to take the necessary steps for the establishing of a Federal telegraph and telephone system rendering

a local and interstate service, such as is rendered by the Post Office Department; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be directed to send copies of this resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives and to the Senators from Minnesota and Representative from the fifth congressional district.

Passed April 11, 1913.

KARL DELAITTRE,
President of the Council.

Attest:

HENRY N. KNOTT, *City Clerk.*

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, just a word. I do not know whether any member of the committee has had any occasion to have his attention especially called to this grass mat, which I believe is called Crex, a name given to it by the manufacturer. It is an industry which has been developed somewhat in Minnesota, making a fancy sort of mat out of grass that was not utilized before, and which being established, as I understand they are now, it is being copied in Japan, where they can produce it undoubtedly a little cheaper, and producing a little cheaper grade of mat than is made here.

The rate that is fixed here in the bill would be a very low ad valorem rate, 2½ cents a square yard, and while I do not expect that the committee will agree to an amendment offhand with reference to the subject, I am quite sure that if the committee will have the opportunity to make any investigation of this, they will see that it is desirable, both from a revenue standpoint and from our standpoint, a protective standpoint, to raise the rates somewhat on that Crex grass matting, because, if it be not raised, I am quite positive the Japanese will drive the people here out of business, and then probably after that all we will get will be ordinary Japanese floor matting. Of course, this is not in competition in the main with Japanese floor matting. I do not know whether the gentleman happened to notice it or not, but at one time down town at one of the stores there was a large amount of this Crex matting on exhibition in one of the windows. I took the trouble, having a little curiosity, to satisfy that curiosity in regard to it. It was a new industry and making quite a development. I think it is quite a desirable thing to aid an industry of that sort.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, the witnesses before the committee did produce some imitations that the Japanese had made, but I am bound to say that they were very poor imitations. In the first place, the Japanese have not the wire grass that grows in Minnesota, and in the next place, the dyeing was of a very inferior quality, so altogether I think no one would hesitate about which to choose as between the two rugs. That is as far as the Japanese have gone up to date.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says no one would hesitate, but after all nearly every one does hesitate between buying a thing which is a little expensive and one which is very much less expensive, which looks like it. The gentleman from New York and I may proceed upon the theory that it is economy to pay a little more for an article, but I apprehend the majority of people unfortunately do not proceed on that theory, but that where two articles look alike and are apparently very much the same, they will be very apt to buy the cheaper article and drive the other out of competition with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

285. Linoleum, plain, stamped, painted, or printed, including corticine and cork carpet, figured or plain, also linoleum known as granite and oak plank, 30 per cent ad valorem; inlaid linoleum, 35 per cent ad valorem; oilcloth for floors, plain, stamped, painted, or printed, 20 per cent ad valorem; mats or rugs made of oilcloth, linoleum, corticine, or cork carpet shall be subject to the same rate of duty as herein provided for oilcloth, linoleum, corticine, or cork carpet.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to get some information. I would like the attention of the gentleman from Alabama. The manufacture of linoleum is a very large industry, and I would offer amendments if I thought they would pass. I want the gentleman to state his position in regard to one or two propositions. Linoleum is made largely of linseed oil and burlap. Burlap was formerly on the free list. It comes in from India, because it is not profitable to make it in this country. Placing burlap on the dutiable list, of course, makes it more difficult for the manufacturer of linoleum to obtain his raw material, and adds to his cost. Linseed oil, I think, has also been raised, that being a raw material. The duty on linoleum, however, the manufactured product, has been reduced. If this is in line with the policy of the committee to tax the raw materials and lower the duty on the manufactured article, of course an amendment would be of no avail. I do not care to offer one if the gentleman maintains that the item is as the committee intended.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is mistaken. Neither linseed oil nor linoleum has been increased. They have been decreased.

Mr. MOORE. I said that the duty on linoleum had been decreased, but that burlap had been taken from the free list and put on the dutiable list.

Mr. PETERS. Burlap is not on the free list. It has been decreased. It came in last year at an ad valorem equivalent of 23.92, and in the bill before us, section 288, it is placed at 20 per cent.

Mr. MOORE. There is a duty on burlap now in this bill?

Mr. PETERS. Yes; and there is a duty in the present law.

Mr. MOORE. But the duty has been increased.

Mr. PETERS. No; the gentleman is mistaken. It has been reduced.

Mr. MOORE. Then I have been misinformed. I understood burlap, which heretofore had been free, had now been made dutiable. If the gentleman is right about that, I will not press the matter.

Mr. PETERS. If the gentleman will look at page 225 of the handbook, he will see that the duty on burlap is given at the ad valorem equivalent of 23.92.

Mr. MOORE. Then I may have been mistaken.

Mr. MANN. The duty on burlap is the same as jute cloth, which is nine-sixteenths cent per pound plus 15 per cent under the existing law.

Mr. PETERS. I give the ad valorem equivalent on burlaps coming under the existing law. Not exceeding 30 threads to the square inch nine-sixteenths cent per pound plus 15 per cent, which is equivalent to 23.86. Exceeding 30 and not exceeding 55 threads to the square inch seven-eighths cent plus 15, or an equivalent of 23.19. The total burlaps coming in at 23.92.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is prepared to stand by the rates in this paragraph on the lower grade of linoleum?

Mr. PETERS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Then I will not offer any amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

287. Bands, bandings, belts, beltings, bindings, cords, ribbons, tapes, webs and webbings, all the foregoing composed wholly or in chief value of flax, hemp, or ramie, or of flax, hemp, or ramie and india rubber, and not otherwise specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent ad valorem; wearing apparel composed wholly or in chief value of flax, hemp, or ramie, 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 72, line 20, after the word "ramie," insert the words "or of flax or ramie and india rubber."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer this amendment without discussion. It is an amendment to paragraph 286.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to return to paragraph 286 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 72, line 13, after the word "linen," strike out "30 per cent ad valorem" and insert the following: "40 cents per dozen pieces and 20 per cent ad valorem."

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

288. Plain woven fabrics of single jute yarns, by whatever name known, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, while I shall refrain from offering an amendment to section 288 of this bill—as all amendments offered by gentlemen on this side are promptly rejected—I wish to state that it is manifestly unfair that a duty should be placed on burlap, which is included in this item. Not one yard of burlap is made in this country, most of it being imported from England, and it is the foundation of floor oilcloth, which is the poor man's carpet. Now, to decrease the duty on floor oilcloth and retain the duty on burlap works an injustice to manufacturer and consumer alike, and this is one of the many inequalities in the bill now under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

290. Bags or sacks made from plain woven fabrics, of single jute yarns, not dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or bleached, 25 per cent ad valorem

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment. On page 73, paragraph 290, after the word "bleached," in line 5, strike out "25 per cent ad valorem" and add "be transferred to the free list."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 73, line 5, after the word "bleached," strike out "25 per cent ad valorem" and insert "free of duty."

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman he offer the motion to strike out the paragraph 295 with the statement that if that prevails he will offer to put it on the free list when it is reached. It amounts to the same thing.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will accept that.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified as suggested.

There was no objection.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, this particular bagging, made of single-thread jute fiber or jute yarn, is used altogether, as far as I know, for covering or sacking agricultural products. All of the wool of this country that is sent to market is sacked in this kind of material. You have placed wool on the free list. Oats and wheat from the Pacific coast are shipped largely in this kind of bag. Millions of these bags are used for transporting grain to Liverpool around the Horn. That staple of the Southland, cotton, is also wrapped in this class of material. You have seen fit in this bill to place the covering for cotton made of this same material on the free list. Now, I submit to you this question: Would it not be fair and somewhat compensatory to your wool and grain raisers of the North and West if you would give them the same privilege that you give to your cotton raisers and give them a covering for their wool and grain free of duty, the same that you are giving to the cotton raisers of the South?

The same might be said of the sack that covers potatoes and mill products—bran, shorts, and feed stuffs. Mill stuffs that you have placed on the free list are largely sacked with this same material, and it looks to me like it would be only fair that you place bags of this character on the free list, as you have the covering for your cotton raisers. I hope this amendment may prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 73, line 3, strike out paragraph 290 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"290. Bags or sacks made from plain woven fabrics, of single jute yarns, not dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or bleached, and not exceeding 30 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, seven-eighths of 1 cent per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE K—WOOL AND MANUFACTURES OF.

295. Combed wool or tops and roving or roping made wholly or in part of wool or camel's hair, and on other wool and hair which have been advanced in any manner or by any process of manufacture beyond the washed or scoured condition, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Saturday, May 3, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 4578) amending section 808 of the Criminal Code of the District of Columbia, providing punishment for rape, etc.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 4579) making appropriation for the completion of jetties at the entrance to Humboldt Bay, Cal.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4580) to authorize a survey of Bolinas Channel, Marin County, Cal.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 4581) providing for the sale of certain remnant lands in the Kiowa-Comanche and Apache ceded reservation in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. L'ENGLE: A bill (H. R. 4582) to levy and collect an internal-revenue tax from manufacturers of tariff-protected articles who do not pay living wages and maintain certain labor conditions in their factories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 4583) to furnish bronze medals of honor to surviving soldiers who responded to President's Lincoln's first call for troops; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 4584) to protect our national food supply by the extermination of certain enemies of food fishes of the Atlantic coast; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 4585) to amend paragraph 1, section 24, of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 4606) to provide for 1-cent postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4607) regulating trials by jury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4608) declaring that persons, firms, or corporations in any manner engaged in interstate-commerce business who shall become engaged or concerned in the fixing of prices of any foodstuffs contrary to the rules of competition shall be guilty of a felony, and providing for their punishment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: Resolution (H. Res. 85) authorizing the chairman of the Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers to appoint a messenger to said committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 86) authorizing the chairman of the Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers to appoint a clerk to said committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HOLLAND: Resolution (H. Res. 87) authorizing the Clerk of the House to pay to Mary C. Adams the sum of $60; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AINEY: A bill (H. R. 4586) granting a pension to Lent B. Gage; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4587) granting a pension to Margaret A. Seeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4588) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Tiffany; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4589) granting an increase of pension to William Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4590) granting an increase of pension to Hebron B. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 4591) granting a pension to Ann Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 4592) granting an increase of pension to Lloyd G. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4593) granting an increase of pension to A. A. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 4594) granting a pension to Albert Pringnitz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 4595) granting a pension to W. S. Richey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4596) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Pryor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4597) granting an increase of pension to Richard Van Dusen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 4598) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 4599) granting an increase of pension to James M. Dilley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 4600) for the relief of Mrs. Thomas S. Ferral; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 4601) granting a pension to Francelia Frost; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4602) granting an increase of pension to David Foley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 4603) for the relief of A. R. Butler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4604) to amend an act entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Marie J. Blaisdell," approved May, 24, 1900; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 4605) granting a pension to Zella Ruby Kilmer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 4609) granting a pension to Rosa Drumm Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4610) granting a pension to Ellen Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4611) granting a pension to Henry Fleig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 4612) granting a pension to Sarah Whidden; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4613) granting a pension to Mary S. Ryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4614) granting a pension to Luvinia Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petitions of sundry citizens of New York City and of the State of Missouri, against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of the council of the city of Toledo, Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation for the Government to acquire ownership and control of all telephone and telegraph systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petitions of Miles Dorsey and Abbert Kaselow, of Missouri, against mutual life insurance companies in income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AINEY: Petition of sundry citizens of the fourteenth congressional district of Pennsylvania, against mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of Joseph Ringleins, against mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of J. E. Foster, Coshocton; Henry G. Crew, New Philadelphia; C. M. Gilmore, Alexandria; Harry Swisher, Newark; and J. A. Cree, Utica, all in the State of Ohio, protesting against the nonexemption of insurance-policy holders in the income-tax section of House bill 10; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petition of M. M. Stephens and Dr. C. B. Vonnahme, of East St. Louis, Ill., and J. C. Jarvis, of Centerville Station, Ill., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of W. B. Biddle, of the St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co., and 155 other citizens, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Lewis-Zukoski Mercantile Co., St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of the legislation prohibiting the importation of the feathers and plumes of wild birds for commercial use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the St. Louis Top Co., St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the proposed reduction of the duty on rice; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Oats Co. and the D'Arvy Advertising Co., St. Louis, Mo., asking that the manufactured products of oats be put on an exact parity with the raw material; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John L. Messmore and 70 other citizens, of St. Louis, Mo.; the Home Life Insurance Co., St. Louis, Mo.; and other citizens of Missouri, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Henry Heil Chemical Co., St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the proposed reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Prufrock-Litton Furniture Co., St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the removal of goat hides from the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRODBECK: Petition of cigar manufacturers and Cigar Makers' Union No. 315, of the twentieth congressional district of Pennsylvania, against free tobacco and cigars from the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 14 citizens of the twentieth congressional district of Pennsylvania, against mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of cigar manufacturers of York and McSherrytown, Pa., against free cigars from the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNETT: Petition of E. M. Harris, M. D., of Russellville, Ala., against mutual life insurance companies in the tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of F. R. Schmidt and 40 citizens of Portage, John W. Limla and 16 citizens of Washington County, Edward Johne and 4 other citizens of Sheboygan, and Louis Detz and 14 other citizens of Hericon, all in the State of Wisconsin, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of sundry citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., against mutual life insurance in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Public Museum of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the clause in the tariff bill prohibiting importation of skins and plumage of wild birds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the insular government of Porto Rico, against reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the G. G. Bollworth Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., relative to the tariff on horticultural products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Federal Rubber Manufacturing Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., against the reduction of duties on bicycles, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of the Florida State Horticultural Society of the State of Florida, favoring the retention of the present duty on citrus fruits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the Central Federated Union of New York City, against the proposed revision of the tariff in relation to cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. F. Taylor, of Philadelphia, Pa., relative to the method of solving the Philippine question; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, N. Y., protesting against the removal of the duty on Philippine tobacco and cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petition of the National Bank of Commerce, of St. Louis, Mo., and other banks and citizens of Missouri, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of 21 citizens of New Jersey, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the mayor and the board of council of the town of West New York, protesting against the reduction of the tariff on laces and embroideries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the New York Life Insurance Co., of New York, N. Y., against mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of sundry North Carolina monazite miners, against a further reduction in the duty on monazite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., relative to the proposed tariff changes affecting the flour-milling, live-stock, and packing industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERRY: Petition of George E. Hoey, Henry H. Wardle, C. B. Blivell, Katherine McKone, Thomas Brook, Charles W. Littlefield, Alfred K. Potter, William G. Smythe, Edward E. Rice, R. G. Hazard, W. S. Redfields, Maurice H. Stearns, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., John Bennett, Alfred Green, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., Charles Matteson, Archibald C. Matteson, William J. Brown, John Champlin, J. H. Hambly, and Archibald W. Couper, all in the State of Rhode Island, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Nicholson File Co., of Providence, R. I., against the reduction of the tariff on files, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of B. A. Ballow & Co., of Providence, R. I., against the reduction of the tariff on jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Alice Hall Walter, of Providence R. I., and Flora Jarver, of Kingston Hill, R. I., favoring the clause prohibiting importation of wild-bird plumage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the W. J. Feeley Co., of Providence, R. I., against the reduction of the tariff on ecclesiastical goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the International Braid Co., of Providence, R. I., against the reduction of the tariff on cotton small wares; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 94, of Pawtucket and Providence, R. I., against the importation of cigars from the Philippines free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Regina Manufacturing Co., of East Greenwich, R. I., against the reduction of the tariff on tracing cloth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pawtucket Woolen Mills, of Westerly, R. I., against the reduction of the tariff on woolens and wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Quidnick Windham Manufacturing Co., of Providence, R. I., the Lebanon Mill Co. and the Dexter Yarn Co., of Pawtucket, R. I., against the sections of the tariff bill relating to the textile industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Blodgett & Orswell Co., of Pawtucket, R. I., against the reduction of the tariff on cotton yarns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the United States Bobbin & Shuttle Co. and the Providence Mill Supply Co., of Warwick Mills, against the reduction of the tariff on cotton and woolens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of sundry citizens of the twenty-third congressional district of New York, against putting Philippine cigars on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the twenty-third congressional district of New York, against mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of George G. Meade Post, No. 1, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, of Philadelphia, Pa., against mutual life insurance in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., against the clause in sundry civil bill forbidding the use of money for prosecution of labor and farmers' organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINDS: Petition of the Yarmouth Board of Trade, of Yarmouth, Me., favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Petition of Oscar Schmidt (Inc.), of Jersey City, N. J., against the duty on grain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Petition of the City Council of Portland, Oreg., favoring Government ownership of the telegraph and telephones; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEVY: Petitions of sundry citizens and the Central Federated Union of New York, against free cigars from the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Estey Piano Co. and F. Radle & Bjur Bros. Co., of New York, against the duty on ivory tusks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the John Ogden Co., of New York, against the duty on metal sashes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Cloak & Suit Co., of New York, against assessment of fee in relation to filing protest against assessment of duties by collector of customs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mrs. Clara Huyler, of New York, against placing Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Uda Biggs & Stewart Hess Co., of New York City, against the clause prohibiting importation of wild-bird plumage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of John W. Borden and Benjamin Bronstein, of New York, against mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of J. T. Lampman & Co., Claverack, N. Y., asking that the same consideration as to the duty be given to rye and buckwheat as to wheat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Consumers' Albany Brewing Co., Albany, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation to remove the duty on barley and malt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: Petition of Androscoggin Local, No. 15, I. B. of P. M., Lisbon Falls, Me., protesting against the removal of the duty on imported paper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of the Central Federated Union of Greater New York, against change in the tariff on cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Rocky Mountain lead-ore producers, against the reduction of the duty on lead ore; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of St. Regis Local, No. 45, of Deferiet, N. Y., against the reduction of the duty on paper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Utah Chapter of the American Mining Congress, against the reduction of the duty on lead ore; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Linnæan Society of New York City, favoring the feather proviso in Schedule N of the tariff act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Local No. 144, International Brotherhood of Paper Workers, of Blood River, N. Y., against the reduction of the duty on paper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, N. Y., protesting against the removal of the duty on Philippine tobacco and cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John Lieberguth, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the removal of the duty on stained and painted glass; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Joseph Hyman, Bernard Frankenfelder, G. Kimpel, and Harry Glemly, of New York City, protesting against Schedule N, affecting the importation of human hair; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles H. Dominge and Herman Friedlander, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the income tax on life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Margaret O'Grady and Nora Sweeney, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and E. K. Stewart, of New York City, protesting against the passage of legislation preventing the importation of feathers and plumes of wild birds for commercial use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Angora Specialty Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of sundry citizens of New Haven, Wallingford, Meriden, and Hartford, Conn., protesting against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petition of the Columbia and Snake River Association, Pendleton, Oreg., protesting against the repeal of the free-tolls section of the Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of the Joseph Dixon Crucible Co. and the Hawaiian Fertilizer Co. of San Francisco, Cal., against placing sugar on free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Brownstein-Louis Co., of Los Angeles, Cal., against the duty on indigo; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against submitting the Panama Canal controversy to the arbitration court; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Lewis-Simas-Jones Co., San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Petition of Local Union No. 305, Cigar Makers' International Union of America, of Monmouth, Ill., against free cigars from the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of sundry citizens of New York City, against the removal of the tariff on cigars made in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the thirtieth district of New York, against the inclusion of life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Central Federated Union of New York City, against the proposed revision of the tariff in relation to cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Linnæan Society of New York, favoring the feather proviso in Schedule N of the tariff act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

UNIV. OF MICHIGAN,

MAY 18 1914